LOGIA

A JOURNAL OF LUTHERAN THEOLOGY

LUTHERAN EDUCATION

EASTERTIDE 2002 VOLUME XI, NUMBER 2

LOGIA

A JOURNAL OF LUTHERAN THEOLOGY

EASTERTIDE 2002 VOLUME XI, NUMBER 2

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

REVIEWS 47

LOGIA FORUM 61

ALSO THIS ISSUE

Why Should I Learn Latin When Everything Has Been Translated into English?

JOHN G. NORDLING

Teachers, principals, and pastors—fellow educators, all:

THANK YOU FOR INVITING ME TO ADDRESS the North Texas Classical Lutheran Education Conference this year.[1] I come from a family of Lutheran church workers, and am married to a woman who was trained as a deaconess at Concordia, River Forest, Illinois. I also have a younger sister and brother who are both Lutheran educators in "the system," and two brothers-in-law who are Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod (hereafter LCMS) pastors. Whenever we get together as a family, I hear about their joys and struggles as church workers in today's world. At such times I wonder if what I do—teach classics in the academy—pertains in any way to what most Lutheran church workers go through on a daily basis "in the real world." Or have I truly become, after all, a living fossil in contemporary America? Is Latin just a quaint relic from an earlier "age of innocence"? Such will be for you to decide, by the conclusion of this address. At any rate, I am honored to have this opportunity to speak to you today.

THE TITLE

The title, "Why should I learn Latin when everything has been translated into English?" sprang quickly to mind when I received the invitation last spring to read a paper at this conference. As you might suspect, I have had many versions of this question put to me over the seven years I have taught classics, first at Valparaiso University, and now at Baylor. Undergraduate education has become horrendously expensive nowadays, so today's students are under constant pressure from their parents and from our market-driven economy to have lucrative jobs and careers all lined up by the time they graduate and leave the ivory tower.

"Why should I learn Latin when everything has been translated into English?" really means something like the following: "Why should I learn Latin when everyone knows that Latin is a difficult subject, and the only thing I could possibly do with such a course of study is teach high school Latin myself someday?" As I get to know my students, and they me, I answer this question in its various guises daily. I have thought long and hard about the question, of course—and what classicist hasn't? Hence it should not surprise you to know that, in my opinion, lots and lots of people should be studying Latin nowadays, in spite of the fact that "everything has been translated into English."

Or has it? In fact, not everything has been translated into English, as this paper's title presumes. In central Texas I live not far from Repristination Press, whose goal is to locate, translate, publish, and then disseminate as many of the hoary old Lutheran texts as possible—works that, in many cases, generations of Lutherans have not read, let alone known anything about, for hundreds of years. When I had the privilege of studying Latin with Father Reginald Foster in Rome, I was amazed to discover that Latin remains to this day an important language for many in the modern world, and not just for pedantic monks or high church officials, although a lot of them pursue Latin too! Latin truly is the scarlet thread that has united untold millions of people in western Christendom over the past two thousand years. It was a wonderful privilege to encounter just a few of the texts that remain, for the most part, untouched, unread, unknown about—and, of course, untranslated—more Latin verbiage than any one person could possibly read.[2]

LEARNING LATIN: THE INITIAL STAGES

This argument will scarcely make much headway with most American undergraduates nowadays, many of whom could care less about the Lutheran devotional materials written in Latin and German, to say nothing about the ponderous papal tomes. It would be best to stick to those documents that have been translated and are right beneath our noses, yet are so little appreciated. Take a common text—the Bible, for example. This has been translated into English, of course. "Yes," the typical Christian undergraduate student will respond: "But we all know the Bible. We've had to memorize it from childhood on. There was church and Sunday school, and obligatory doctrine courses at Christian High. What more could there be to learn about such stuff in college? I'm here to fulfill a requirement, then move on." This is the mindset that I and most professors face on opening day at the university.

For such students, then—and for their parents and for vast segments of American society—what must be learned and what Latin will surely teach, is that language is more than mere data transmission—passing message A on to hearer B. I submit that learning something priceless and beautiful like the Latin language is first of all an inner process, a profound change in one's soul, that most of the students have never experienced before. From the very beginning there has to be a submission to the holy paradigms of the Latin language and an internalization of them, so that novice

DR. JOHN G. NORDLING is an assistant professor in the Department of Classics at Baylor University, Waco, Texas, and an ordained minister in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod.

Latin students become—in effect—walking incarnations of Wheelock's *Latin Grammar.*

By now I have taught enough first- and second-semester Latin students to understand how the process works. The first thing I tell my students is that Latin is intended for very intelligent students who work very hard and come to class every day, all of the time. It is not for students who are so smart that they don't have to study—to say nothing about intellectually disadvantaged students who won't study, which is an even worse combination! No, Latin is for disadvantaged students who know they are disadvantaged, but are willing to overcome this defect by concentrated effort and *diligentia* over time—for *diligentia omnia vincit.*[3] The gospel, and what our dear Lord Jesus Christ earned for every sinner on the cross, is true, and I believe this and hope they do too; but this is not Sunday school. We are gathered to submit to the glorious Latin language itself! This is the greatest class in the entire university, and what a privilege has become yours today, to study Latin—something that not everyone gets to do. After this, or a similar spiel, I talk briefly about grades, and tell the students that they can expect to study Latin two hours per night—every night including weekends—except for Friday evenings, when they should ask someone of the opposite gender out for a date. The two-hour-per-night rule works pretty well, unless there is a midterm examination the next day, in which case it may be necessary to "pull an all-nighter" to be sufficiently prepared for whatever exam they will face the next day. Then we begin, orally, the first declension of the Latin language: -A -AE -AE -AM -A; -AE -ARUM -IS -AS -IS.

Unwilling learners often turn out worse than if they had had no encounter at all with the glorious Latin language.

And so it goes for the rest of the semester. Learning Latin in the initial stages is a wearisome process—kind of like lifting weights with the mind. Right when the students have about got one paradigm mastered, Wheelock's *Grammar* rushes on and introduces another bewildering form or paradigm. Mastering all that Latin vocabulary in the dictionary form, as I force my students to do, is an ongoing, relentless task. In its initial stages, learning Latin is very much like submitting to the Nautilus machine at the weight room. The goal is to create strong Latin muscles in the head: *cerebrum musculus est et laborandum.*[4] While we are on the topic, I would not recommend that you Lutheran educators talk to, or teach, your students in the manner just described. University students between the ages of eighteen and twenty-two, and Lutheran elementary students, are two different kinds of student. I hope you can see that allowances have to be made to bring both types of student to excellence. Professors like me are no longer teaching the docile and obedient collegians of the 1950s, when Latin was king and entire classrooms, sitting in straight rows, would meekly recite *amo, amas, amat.* Nevertheless, in anno Domini 2002 it still is possible to produce outstanding Latin students—perhaps much better and more dedicated young scholars than ever were produced back in the '50s and '60s. So bit by bit we pass from paradigms, to sentences, to short passages, and finally to glorious periodic sentences written by the likes of Cicero. As this happens I can stop being like a drill instructor of the U. S. Marine Corps and increasingly my students' mentor and friend. University students need to know that their professor loves them, even as he tightens down the screws. Once they know that, they'll walk through fire for him. So that is another reason to learn Latin, even though everything has been translated into English.

BAD REASONS FOR STUDYING LATIN

Up until now I have been talking about the initial stages of the process—a kind of boot camp for the mind, if you will. Some parents and football coaches have recommended that students should take Latin for precisely these reasons: to develop good study skills, word derivations, time management—or, one suspects, to submit to the same unspeakable drudgery that they themselves had to endure during their own benighted youths:

> Latin's a dead language,
> As dead as dead can be.
> First it killed the Romans;
> Now it's killing me![5]

I submit that these are not very good reasons either for teaching or for learning Latin. This approach often backfires, and unwilling learners often turn out worse than if they had had no encounter at all with the glorious Latin language. For if the language is taught purely for the sake of perceived pedagogical advantage, and nothing more, and students hate having it rammed down their throats, they all will revolt and run at the first sign of freedom.

I believe that this is exactly what happened during the late '50s and early '60s in the schools of this country—yes, even within the highly touted preparatory schools of the Concordia system. Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and German must have been personally hated by many young men who were at that time forced to endure such philological torture in order to become Lutheran pastors. When the language requirements were scaled back in the mid-to-late '60s, no one objected too strenuously, supposing that being a Christian and learning Latin and Greek really do not have that much in common. I suspect that some well-intentioned administrators believed that they were doing future generations of pastors and church workers a huge favor by sparing them the painful ordeal of learning the languages well and by just scrapping the whole antiquated system.

Obviously, I do not know the full story here, and so speak from a dangerous ignorance. Take what I say about past educational requirements in the LCMS *magno cum grano salis.*[6] Nevertheless, I can say that while our church was scaling back its language requirements because they were too expensive, or impractical, or whatever, I was doing my best to learn as much Greek and Latin as possible—first within the "system" where I had my first positive encounter with Greek from Doctor Reinisch at Concordia,

Portland, and then by going outside the system. For me, learning these so-called dead languages was not some painful requirement that had to be endured, but was a hard-won privilege and quickly became core to whatever else I was learning at the seminary about being a pastor. Plus, I just loved learning classical literature for its own sake, all questions of utility and future purpose aside. I just could not help myself, and that is the truth. I am of the opinion that knowing the languages well and teaching what they transmit to students in the academy is at the heart also of whatever a pastor does in a congregation for the Christians who called him to be their pastor. To impoverish a pastor's training because it is thought to be too daunting a task, or somehow irrelevant to what goes on at the parish level, is to impoverish Christ's saints in that place, to impoverish Christ himself, and to cut off that congregation's nose to spite its face. So I have been led to believe.

Enough of the soap box. The point is that opportunities to read untranslated texts, acquire better study skills, and educate our clergy better still do no sufficient justice to the original question, "Why should I learn Latin when everything has been translated into English?" As this question has been posed and considered to this point, there remain still others who could yet be helped—and greatly—by a positive encounter with the Latin language.

LATIN AS A MEANS OF CONFRONTING POST-MODERNISM

Another, and I hope better response to the question might run along the following lines. We have all heard about the great menace to teaching, learning, and believing that lurks in contemporary American culture. I refer, of course, to that horrible monster known as postmodernism. Some of you know a lot more about postmodernism than I do, so I won't waste time by trying to define what postmodernism is. I will get to the point by telling a true story involving my sister Stephanie, one of the Lutheran teachers in my family, and then suggesting that not just Latin, but the type of gifts that Latin bestows may help to counteract postmodernism in America and so help many additional Christians to grow and mature in the one true faith.

Now for the story. While I was in graduate school at the University of Wisconsin—Madison studying classics, my younger sister Stephanie, then a coed at one of our Concordia colleges, came to visit during the first week of spring break in 1987. My wife and I had to move all our worldly effects from one apartment to another, and hard-working Stephanie was a huge help during the move. Anyway, it was in the midst of cleaning and boxing and painting that Stephanie and I had a memorable tiff—a trivial incident, really, that I would not proclaim upon the housetops, were it not so typical of what has happened in the LCMS, and was already then so much a sign of the times. There was a Bible study in which Stephanie liked to participate with other members of her college dorm. This was not some weird cult group on campus. It was a group of Lutheran young people who got together to discuss what different passages of the word of God meant to them. She was telling me about a particular passage and what it meant to her, when suddenly I cut her off and told her, with all the arrogance of a big brother, that the particular passage did not mean what she and the other young ladies thought it meant. They were wrong; they were misinformed; they did not know anything about the background history or language or doctrines of the faith (*fides quae creditur*[7]) to which the passage was related. To me it seemed as though they were all involved in a purely subjective and idiosyncratic exercise. You can imagine my sister's response to what I had just told her!

That tiff with Stephanie calls to mind a problem that faces our church nowadays, and not only ours, but any other great church that is resolved to walk faithfully together in postmodern America. There are many people involved here who have much to be repentant of, and isn't it wonderful that Jesus Christ came to draw all manner of sinners to himself! On the one hand, there are the modern scribes and Pharisees—if you'll permit me to call them—who love the doctrines and hymns and traditions of holy mother church and are resolved to die for them, or at least to be run out of a congregation, before giving one inch. On the other hand, there are the well-intended innovators, I would call them, who say, in effect, "but we've always done it that way!"—the implication being that now it is high time for a change.

Not just Latin, but the type of gifts that Latin bestows may help to counteract postmodernism.

These are the two extremes in our church right now, and differences between the two camps are growing rapidly in the present climate. Under such circumstances it is very tempting for, let us say, a congregational board of elders or a church council simply to try to placate both sides. The hidebound old fogeys can worship God in the purity of their narrow, Pharisaical hearts at the traditional service where the minister adheres to page 5 or 15, no matter what; and the young hipster Christians can sleep in, go to contemporary services later that same morning, and feel good about themselves and their "happy, hippy Jesus." Just so everybody is happy, gets along, and contributes generously to the offering plate. It is sobering to see how many congregations have split in just about this way. The feeling seems very much to be: I will worship my Jesus my way, and you can worship Jesus your way, but how dare you try to inflict your Jesus on me!

This divide, my friends, is a good example of postmodernism in our congregations, postmodernism at its worst. There can be no unity within even Lutheran congregations anymore, but we must all adhere to our preferred worship styles, and must respect, listen to, and plaster over diverse worship practices that are in fact poles apart.

PAUL'S CONCERN FOR UNITY IN WORSHIP

I see very little in such an attitude that is genuinely Christian, that really does show love and respect for the entire body of Christ that is to be of "one heart and mind in Christ Jesus." In order to convey this point, which I hope you can see is not mine, but the apostle Paul's, I would like to consider briefly some passages that

Latin students become—in effect—walking incarnations of Wheelock's *Latin Grammar.*

By now I have taught enough first- and second-semester Latin students to understand how the process works. The first thing I tell my students is that Latin is intended for very intelligent students who work very hard and come to class every day, all of the time. It is not for students who are so smart that they don't have to study—to say nothing about intellectually disadvantaged students who won't study, which is an even worse combination! No, Latin is for disadvantaged students who know they are disadvantaged, but are willing to overcome this defect by concentrated effort and *diligentia* over time—for *diligentia omnia vincit.*[3] The gospel, and what our dear Lord Jesus Christ earned for every sinner on the cross, is true, and I believe this and hope they do too; but this is not Sunday school. We are gathered to submit to the glorious Latin language itself! This is the greatest class in the entire university, and what a privilege has become yours today, to study Latin—something that not everyone gets to do. After this, or a similar spiel, I talk briefly about grades, and tell the students that they can expect to study Latin two hours per night—every night including weekends—except for Friday evenings, when they should ask someone of the opposite gender out for a date. The two-hour-per-night rule works pretty well, unless there is a midterm examination the next day, in which case it may be necessary to "pull an all-nighter" to be sufficiently prepared for whatever exam they will face the next day. Then we begin, orally, the first declension of the Latin language: -A -AE -AE -AM -A; -AE -ARUM -IS -AS -IS.

Unwilling learners often turn out worse than if they had had no encounter at all with the glorious Latin language.

And so it goes for the rest of the semester. Learning Latin in the initial stages is a wearisome process—kind of like lifting weights with the mind. Right when the students have about got one paradigm mastered, Wheelock's *Grammar* rushes on and introduces another bewildering form or paradigm. Mastering all that Latin vocabulary in the dictionary form, as I force my students to do, is an ongoing, relentless task. In its initial stages, learning Latin is very much like submitting to the Nautilus machine at the weight room. The goal is to create strong Latin muscles in the head: *cerebrum musculus est et laborandum.*[4] While we are on the topic, I would not recommend that you Lutheran educators talk to, or teach, your students in the manner just described. University students between the ages of eighteen and twenty-two, and Lutheran elementary students, are two different kinds of student. I hope you can see that allowances have to be made to bring both types of student to excellence. Professors like me are no longer teaching the docile and obedient collegians of the 1950s, when Latin was king and entire classrooms, sitting in straight rows, would meekly recite *amo, amas, amat.* Nevertheless, in anno Domini 2002 it still is possible to produce outstanding Latin students—perhaps much better and more dedicated young scholars than ever were produced back in the '50s and '60s. So bit by bit we pass from paradigms, to sentences, to short passages, and finally to glorious periodic sentences written by the likes of Cicero. As this happens I can stop being like a drill instructor of the U. S. Marine Corps and increasingly my students' mentor and friend. University students need to know that their professor loves them, even as he tightens down the screws. Once they know that, they'll walk through fire for him. So that is another reason to learn Latin, even though everything has been translated into English.

BAD REASONS FOR STUDYING LATIN

Up until now I have been talking about the initial stages of the process—a kind of boot camp for the mind, if you will. Some parents and football coaches have recommended that students should take Latin for precisely these reasons: to develop good study skills, word derivations, time management—or, one suspects, to submit to the same unspeakable drudgery that they themselves had to endure during their own benighted youths:

> Latin's a dead language,
> As dead as dead can be.
> First it killed the Romans;
> Now it's killing me![5]

I submit that these are not very good reasons either for teaching or for learning Latin. This approach often backfires, and unwilling learners often turn out worse than if they had had no encounter at all with the glorious Latin language. For if the language is taught purely for the sake of perceived pedagogical advantage, and nothing more, and students hate having it rammed down their throats, they all will revolt and run at the first sign of freedom.

I believe that this is exactly what happened during the late '50s and early '60s in the schools of this country—yes, even within the highly touted preparatory schools of the Concordia system. Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and German must have been personally hated by many young men who were at that time forced to endure such philological torture in order to become Lutheran pastors. When the language requirements were scaled back in the mid-to-late '60s, no one objected too strenuously, supposing that being a Christian and learning Latin and Greek really do not have that much in common. I suspect that some well-intentioned administrators believed that they were doing future generations of pastors and church workers a huge favor by sparing them the painful ordeal of learning the languages well and by just scrapping the whole antiquated system.

Obviously, I do not know the full story here, and so speak from a dangerous ignorance. Take what I say about past educational requirements in the LCMS *magno cum grano salis.*[6] Nevertheless, I can say that while our church was scaling back its language requirements because they were too expensive, or impractical, or whatever, I was doing my best to learn as much Greek and Latin as possible—first within the "system" where I had my first positive encounter with Greek from Doctor Reinisch at Concordia,

Portland, and then by going outside the system. For me, learning these so-called dead languages was not some painful requirement that had to be endured, but was a hard-won privilege and quickly became core to whatever else I was learning at the seminary about being a pastor. Plus, I just loved learning classical literature for its own sake, all questions of utility and future purpose aside. I just could not help myself, and that is the truth. I am of the opinion that knowing the languages well and teaching what they transmit to students in the academy is at the heart also of whatever a pastor does in a congregation for the Christians who called him to be their pastor. To impoverish a pastor's training because it is thought to be too daunting a task, or somehow irrelevant to what goes on at the parish level, is to impoverish Christ's saints in that place, to impoverish Christ himself, and to cut off that congregation's nose to spite its face. So I have been led to believe.

Enough of the soap box. The point is that opportunities to read untranslated texts, acquire better study skills, and educate our clergy better still do no sufficient justice to the original question, "Why should I learn Latin when everything has been translated into English?" As this question has been posed and considered to this point, there remain still others who could yet be helped—and greatly—by a positive encounter with the Latin language.

LATIN AS A MEANS OF CONFRONTING POST-MODERNISM

Another, and I hope better response to the question might run along the following lines. We have all heard about the great menace to teaching, learning, and believing that lurks in contemporary American culture. I refer, of course, to that horrible monster known as postmodernism. Some of you know a lot more about postmodernism than I do, so I won't waste time by trying to define what postmodernism is. I will get to the point by telling a true story involving my sister Stephanie, one of the Lutheran teachers in my family, and then suggesting that not just Latin, but the type of gifts that Latin bestows may help to counteract postmodernism in America and so help many additional Christians to grow and mature in the one true faith.

Now for the story. While I was in graduate school at the University of Wisconsin—Madison studying classics, my younger sister Stephanie, then a coed at one of our Concordia colleges, came to visit during the first week of spring break in 1987. My wife and I had to move all our worldly effects from one apartment to another, and hard-working Stephanie was a huge help during the move. Anyway, it was in the midst of cleaning and boxing and painting that Stephanie and I had a memorable tiff—a trivial incident, really, that I would not proclaim upon the housetops, were it not so typical of what has happened in the LCMS, and was already then so much a sign of the times. There was a Bible study in which Stephanie liked to participate with other members of her college dorm. This was not some weird cult group on campus. It was a group of Lutheran young people who got together to discuss what different passages of the word of God meant to them. She was telling me about a particular passage and what it meant to her, when suddenly I cut her off and told her, with all the arrogance of a big brother, that the particular passage did not mean what she and the other young ladies thought it meant. They were wrong; they were misinformed; they did not know anything about the background history or language or doctrines of the faith (*fides quae creditur*[7]) to which the passage was related. To me it seemed as though they were all involved in a purely subjective and idiosyncratic exercise. You can imagine my sister's response to what I had just told her!

That tiff with Stephanie calls to mind a problem that faces our church nowadays, and not only ours, but any other great church that is resolved to walk faithfully together in postmodern America. There are many people involved here who have much to be repentant of, and isn't it wonderful that Jesus Christ came to draw all manner of sinners to himself! On the one hand, there are the modern scribes and Pharisees—if you'll permit me to call them—who love the doctrines and hymns and traditions of holy mother church and are resolved to die for them, or at least to be run out of a congregation, before giving one inch. On the other hand, there are the well-intended innovators, I would call them, who say, in effect, "but we've always done it that way!"—the implication being that now it is high time for a change.

Not just Latin, but the type of gifts that Latin bestows may help to counteract postmodernism.

These are the two extremes in our church right now, and differences between the two camps are growing rapidly in the present climate. Under such circumstances it is very tempting for, let us say, a congregational board of elders or a church council simply to try to placate both sides. The hidebound old fogeys can worship God in the purity of their narrow, Pharisaical hearts at the traditional service where the minister adheres to page 5 or 15, no matter what; and the young hipster Christians can sleep in, go to contemporary services later that same morning, and feel good about themselves and their "happy, hippy Jesus." Just so everybody is happy, gets along, and contributes generously to the offering plate. It is sobering to see how many congregations have split in just about this way. The feeling seems very much to be: I will worship my Jesus my way, and you can worship Jesus your way, but how dare you try to inflict your Jesus on me!

This divide, my friends, is a good example of postmodernism in our congregations, postmodernism at its worst. There can be no unity within even Lutheran congregations anymore, but we must all adhere to our preferred worship styles, and must respect, listen to, and plaster over diverse worship practices that are in fact poles apart.

PAUL'S CONCERN FOR UNITY IN WORSHIP

I see very little in such an attitude that is genuinely Christian, that really does show love and respect for the entire body of Christ that is to be of "one heart and mind in Christ Jesus." In order to convey this point, which I hope you can see is not mine, but the apostle Paul's, I would like to consider briefly some passages that

suggest that Christians in the New Testament cared deeply about unity in every matter, including, I submit, unity in worship. Consider the first passage. After Paul learned from Cloe's people about various "factions" (ἔριδες) that were now dividing the congregation at Corinth, he wrote:

> I appeal to you, brethren, through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all say the same thing [ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες] so that there may be no divisions among you [καὶ μὴ ᾖ ἐν ὑμῖν σχίσματα], and that you might be perfectly united [ἦτε . . . κατηρτισμένοι] in the same mind and in the same thought [ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοι καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ] (1 Cor 1:10).

This high regard for congregational unity is presupposed in a catena of Scripture passages that we cannot consider here thoroughly.[8] Nevertheless, the catena[9] reveals a clarity in Paul's mind about the desirability of congregational one-mindedness, in spite of the fact that he penned his epistles for diverse congregations which were, at the time, widely scattered throughout the far-flung Roman empire. The churchly unity to which Paul aspired was surely a lot more than a minimum standard of doctrinal agreement to which the individual congregations would conform, although it was certainly that, at the very least. No, Paul seems to have envisioned a high standard in every matter—an organic unity throughout the una Sancta[10]—by which the individual congregation would maintain its distinctive "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs"[11] of the Christ-centered worship over against the tawdry tunes and ditties of this world, the world that is passing away (1 Cor 7:31).

The churchly unity to which Paul aspired was surely a lot more than a minimum standard of doctrinal agreement to which the individual congregations would conform.

We have time only to consider 1 Cor 1:10 in any depth, although all the passages listed in the catena function similarly. Notice that Paul comes to the Corinthian Christians "through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ [διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ]." "Name" calls to mind how God allows himself to be known by us, and that is through the godly preaching and teaching of the word.[12] There is a process at work here that liturgical scholars have called the synaxis (ἡ σύναξις, "the gathering," "the assembly"). Brunner bemoans the fact this term died out in late antiquity,[13] even though it has solid New Testament roots[14] and even persists in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession (XXIV, 79).[15] At any rate, synaxis refers to the unifying action of the Word and the Sacraments upon the diverse Christians as they are exposed to the same kerygmatic preaching by the called pastor. Through his faithful preaching and teaching they remember the common death and resurrection in Christ that all the assembled share in Holy Baptism. As the climactic expression of the congregational unity, there is the common reception of the body and the blood of the Lord in the Holy Communion. Agendas, hymnals, and hymns are hardly incidental to this process, so they also should be largely the same from congregation to congregation in a church that shares the same confession of faith, so that "the many," those scattered near and far, may truly be gathered into the same unifying presence of Christ: "Worship in the sense of the assembly of the Christian congregation in the name of Jesus is virtually the dominant mode of the manifestation of the church on earth. In such an assembly the epiphany of the church takes place."[16]

Returning to 1 Cor 1:10, it is very tempting to suppose that "ye all say the same thing" had a liturgical significance the first time Paul wrote that phrase for the benefit of the corporate people of God at Corinth. One cannot be dogmatic about this possibility, because λέγω ("I say") occurs so commonly in 1 Corinthians that it seems at first to signify "saying" or "speaking" in only the most generic sense. Most of the time Paul himself is the subject of λέγω in 1 Corinthians: "I say [λέγω] this to your shame" (6:5, RSV).[17] Elsewhere Paul summarizes what the Law (νόμος) "says" (9:8; 14:34), or Scripture (15:27), or God (9:10), or the Lord (14:21), or even the Lord Jesus at the original administration of the Lord's Supper (ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς . . . λέγων plus *verba*, 11:25; cf. 11:24). This leaves a number of passages where a sense of what the Corinthians themselves "said" has been preserved.[18] Three of these latter passages seem to have had to do with public worship and so present some picture of what the Corinthians said in that context: (1) either the vilification of Jesus (Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς) or the faithful confession of his Lordship (Κύριος Ἰησοῦς), wrought by the Holy Ghost, 12:3;[19] (2) the great "Amen!" (τὸ Ἀμήν) of the corporate service that had been taken over from the synagogue (14:16)[20] ; and (3) the response of unbelieving outsiders who, as a hypothetical possibility, might enter an assembly at worship, witness the Corinthian Christians speaking in tongues, and say, "You are out of your minds [μαίνεσθε]!" (14:23).[21] I submit that "you all say the same thing" in 1:10 should be considered with the passages that have to do with speaking during the congregational service. The Corinthians' speaking at worship must have resembled, in however rudimentary a fashion, the same type of spoken response and exchange that goes on still today between the gathered people of God and their Lord at the Divine Service:

> *Saying* back to him [God] what he has *said* to us, we *repeat* what is most true and sure. Most true and sure in his name, which he put upon us with the water of our Baptism. We are his. This we *acknowledge* at the beginning of the Divine Service. Where his name is, there is he. Before him we *acknowledge* that we are sinners, and we *plead* for forgiveness. His forgiveness is given us, and we, freed and forgiven, *acclaim* him as our great and gracious God as we apply to ourselves the words he has used to make himself known to us.[22]

Italicized portions of this quote from the Introduction to *Lutheran Worship* demonstrate how much spoken activity does

in fact go on in routine, liturgical worship—yes, even worship that is governed by a synodically approved hymnal, and then faithfully adhered to by local congregations throughout the entire synod.

One text that cannot be overlooked, since it pertains so directly to the postmodern menace, is 2 Cor 10:3 ff:

> For though we live in the world, we are not carrying on a worldly war, for the weapons of our warfare [τὰ ὅπλα τῆς στρατείας ἡμῶν] are not worldly but have divine power to destroy strongholds. We destroy arguments and every proud obstacle to the knowledge of God [κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ], and take every thought captive to obey Christ [αἰχμαλωτίζοντες πᾶν νόημα εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ], being ready to punish every disobedience, when your obedience is complete (2 Cor 10:3–6, RSV).

I cannot imagine on the basis of such a passage that Paul would have been content to say, in effect, "Well, that's just your opinion, Corinthians, and I'll respect that and keep my opinions too!" No, one always has the sense that Paul was involved to the death in a combat against the devil and many doctrinal antagonists at Corinth, Galatia, and other congregations that just did not like Paul that much, challenged his apostleship, and harassed him mercilessly throughout his entire ministry.[23]

There are more than surface similarities between learning Latin well and submitting to the historic Christian faith as lifelong learners of the word.

How is it that Paul "destroyed arguments and every proud obstacle to the knowledge of God"? How is it that he "took every thought captive to obey Christ"? What weapons (2 Cor 10:4) did Paul use: submachine guns, perhaps? Did he scream or yell at them? I submit that he did not. Instead, he presented the word of God to them in all its fullness, Christ-centeredness, and sweetness, in the sure confidence that some of those stiff-necked Corinthians would have to yield and so eventually would become willing captives of Christ Jesus through the gospel. Why, Paul was even gentle with the Corinthians in his own, gruff, St.-Paul sort of way! Did you catch that statement at the end of the text: "being ready to punish [ἐκδικῆσαι] every disobedience when your obedience is complete"? That means that he could not punish them yet—it would have been premature—until they were fully formed in Christ Jesus and so mature in the faith. Then, to be sure, he would punish them! I suspect that we have a flash here of the Pauline humor that comes out so well and so gloriously in the original Greek.

So the strong are not to tyrannize or terrorize the weak. Elder brothers should not beat up on younger sisters. Learning the one true faith is an ongoing and lifelong process, St. Paul seems to be saying, and there are many fits and starts along the way. On the other hand, repentance and maturity are highly valued commodities in the church. No one can claim to be a Christian without growing in what the word of God in fact says, rather than, as so often happens, attempt to twist the plain meaning of Scripture to suit a particular culture—a particular American mentality, for example. No, it is the American mentality that must yield to the word of God! God's means of grace set the agenda and pull a largely reluctant body of Christians from out of the flotsam of the fallen world into Christ's glorious kingdom, though we all fight and struggle every inch of the way.

LATIN: A GIFT FOR GROWING AND MATURING CHRISTIANS

What does any of this have to do with Latin? The Jesus we worship is truly Lord—Lord over everything as he rules far above "in the heavenlies [ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις]."[24] Yet he deigns to dwell with us sinners, right here on earth. This is true liturgically, in the Divine Service, as I have just attempted to show. Expanding outward from that foundation, our Incarnate Lord provides other indications of himself, even within this fallen world. This truth is expressed quite profoundly in the three enormous stained glass windows in the Chapel of the Resurrection at Valparaiso University: the Father window, the Son window, and the Holy Spirit window. In addition to expressing the traditional iconography of the three Persons of the Godhead, the artist also incorporated symbols of several learned disciplines that typically are offered at a Christian university: artists' palettes, textbooks, test tubes, compasses and protractors, musical scores, harps, coronets, and much more. I used to think that all those extra things were like the gifts that the gentile kings offered to the Christ Child when they came in joyful search of him, guided by the star. Forgiven sinners, they were moved to offer costly offerings to the Savior, in joyful oblation to his lordship. Unfortunately, a scroll representing Homer, or a toga representing Cicero, was not part of the Valpo design. Nevertheless, they could have been: nothing but the best for the Lord.

I submit that Latin is one such discipline wherein our incarnate Lord reveals himself to growing and to maturing Christians in a special way. There are more than surface similarities between learning Latin well and submitting to the historic Christian faith as lifelong learners of the word—never content with mere surface meaning and shallow understanding, but always running on ahead to learn more and deeper and better. This, in fact, is a process that has only begun in this life for a Christian and will never be brought to full completion—no, not even in the life to come.[25]

> And as he spoke he no longer looked to them like a lion; but the things that began to happen after that were so great and beautiful that I cannot write them. And for us this is the end of all the stories, and we can most truly say that they all lived happily ever after. But for them it was only the beginning of the real story. All their life in this world and all their adventures in Narnia had only been the cover and the title page: now at last they were beginning Chapter One of the Great Story, which no one on earth has read: which goes on for ever: in which every chapter is better than the one before.[26]

suggest that Christians in the New Testament cared deeply about unity in every matter, including, I submit, unity in worship. Consider the first passage. After Paul learned from Cloe's people about various "factions" (ἔριδες) that were now dividing the congregation at Corinth, he wrote:

> I appeal to you, brethren, through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all say the same thing [ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες] so that there may be no divisions among you [καὶ μὴ ᾖ ἐν ὑμῖν σχίσματα], and that you might be perfectly united [ἦτε . . . κατηρτισμένοι] in the same mind and in the same thought [ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοι καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ] (1 Cor 1:10).

This high regard for congregational unity is presupposed in a catena of Scripture passages that we cannot consider here thoroughly.[8] Nevertheless, the catena[9] reveals a clarity in Paul's mind about the desirability of congregational one-mindedness, in spite of the fact that he penned his epistles for diverse congregations which were, at the time, widely scattered throughout the far-flung Roman empire. The churchly unity to which Paul aspired was surely a lot more than a minimum standard of doctrinal agreement to which the individual congregations would conform, although it was certainly that, at the very least. No, Paul seems to have envisioned a high standard in every matter—an organic unity throughout the una Sancta[10]—by which the individual congregation would maintain its distinctive "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs"[11] of the Christ-centered worship over against the tawdry tunes and ditties of this world, the world that is passing away (1 Cor 7:31).

The churchly unity to which Paul aspired was surely a lot more than a minimum standard of doctrinal agreement to which the individual congregations would conform.

We have time only to consider 1 Cor 1:10 in any depth, although all the passages listed in the catena function similarly. Notice that Paul comes to the Corinthian Christians "through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ [διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ]." "Name" calls to mind how God allows himself to be known by us, and that is through the godly preaching and teaching of the word.[12] There is a process at work here that liturgical scholars have called the synaxis (ἡ σύναξις, "the gathering," "the assembly"). Brunner bemoans the fact this term died out in late antiquity,[13] even though it has solid New Testament roots[14] and even persists in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession (XXIV, 79).[15] At any rate, synaxis refers to the unifying action of the Word and the Sacraments upon the diverse Christians as they are exposed to the same kerygmatic preaching by the called pastor. Through his faithful preaching and teaching they remember the common death and resurrection in Christ that all the assembled share in Holy Baptism. As the climactic expression of the congregational unity, there is the common reception of the body and the blood of the Lord in the Holy Communion. Agendas, hymnals, and hymns are hardly incidental to this process, so they also should be largely the same from congregation to congregation in a church that shares the same confession of faith, so that "the many," those scattered near and far, may truly be gathered into the same unifying presence of Christ: "Worship in the sense of the assembly of the Christian congregation in the name of Jesus is virtually the dominant mode of the manifestation of the church on earth. In such an assembly the epiphany of the church takes place."[16]

Returning to 1 Cor 1:10, it is very tempting to suppose that "ye all say the same thing" had a liturgical significance the first time Paul wrote that phrase for the benefit of the corporate people of God at Corinth. One cannot be dogmatic about this possibility, because λέγω ("I say") occurs so commonly in 1 Corinthians that it seems at first to signify "saying" or "speaking" in only the most generic sense. Most of the time Paul himself is the subject of λέγω in 1 Corinthians: "I say [λέγω] this to your shame" (6:5, RSV).[17] Elsewhere Paul summarizes what the Law (νόμος) "says" (9:8; 14:34), or Scripture (15:27), or God (9:10), or the Lord (14:21), or even the Lord Jesus at the original administration of the Lord's Supper (ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς . . . λέγων plus *verba*, 11:25; cf. 11:24). This leaves a number of passages where a sense of what the Corinthians themselves "said" has been preserved.[18] Three of these latter passages seem to have had to do with public worship and so present some picture of what the Corinthians said in that context: (1) either the vilification of Jesus (Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς) or the faithful confession of his Lordship (Κύριος Ἰησοῦς), wrought by the Holy Ghost, 12:3;[19] (2) the great "Amen!" (τὸ Ἀμήν) of the corporate service that had been taken over from the synagogue (14:16)[20] ; and (3) the response of unbelieving outsiders who, as a hypothetical possibility, might enter an assembly at worship, witness the Corinthian Christians speaking in tongues, and say, "You are out of your minds [μαίνεσθε]!" (14:23).[21] I submit that "you all say the same thing" in 1:10 should be considered with the passages that have to do with speaking during the congregational service. The Corinthians' speaking at worship must have resembled, in however rudimentary a fashion, the same type of spoken response and exchange that goes on still today between the gathered people of God and their Lord at the Divine Service:

> *Saying* back to him [God] what he has *said* to us, we *repeat* what is most true and sure. Most true and sure in his name, which he put upon us with the water of our Baptism. We are his. This we *acknowledge* at the beginning of the Divine Service. Where his name is, there is he. Before him we *acknowledge* that we are sinners, and we *plead* for forgiveness. His forgiveness is given us, and we, freed and forgiven, *acclaim* him as our great and gracious God as we apply to ourselves the words he has used to make himself known to us.[22]

Italicized portions of this quote from the Introduction to *Lutheran Worship* demonstrate how much spoken activity does

in fact go on in routine, liturgical worship—yes, even worship that is governed by a synodically approved hymnal, and then faithfully adhered to by local congregations throughout the entire synod.

One text that cannot be overlooked, since it pertains so directly to the postmodern menace, is 2 Cor 10:3ff:

> For though we live in the world, we are not carrying on a worldly war, for the weapons of our warfare [τὰ ὅπλα τῆς στρατείας ἡμῶν] are not worldly but have divine power to destroy strongholds. We destroy arguments and every proud obstacle to the knowledge of God [κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ], and take every thought captive to obey Christ [αἰχμαλωτίζοντες πᾶν νόημα εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ], being ready to punish every disobedience, when your obedience is complete (2 Cor 10:3–6, RSV).

I cannot imagine on the basis of such a passage that Paul would have been content to say, in effect, "Well, that's just your opinion, Corinthians, and I'll respect that and keep my opinions too!" No, one always has the sense that Paul was involved to the death in a combat against the devil and many doctrinal antagonists at Corinth, Galatia, and other congregations that just did not like Paul that much, challenged his apostleship, and harassed him mercilessly throughout his entire ministry.[23]

There are more than surface similarities between learning Latin well and submitting to the historic Christian faith as lifelong learners of the word.

How is it that Paul "destroyed arguments and every proud obstacle to the knowledge of God"? How is it that he "took every thought captive to obey Christ"? What weapons (2 Cor 10:4) did Paul use: submachine guns, perhaps? Did he scream or yell at them? I submit that he did not. Instead, he presented the word of God to them in all its fullness, Christ-centeredness, and sweetness, in the sure confidence that some of those stiff-necked Corinthians would have to yield and so eventually would become willing captives of Christ Jesus through the gospel. Why, Paul was even gentle with the Corinthians in his own, gruff, St.-Paul sort of way! Did you catch that statement at the end of the text: "being ready to punish [ἐκδικῆσαι] every disobedience when your obedience is complete"? That means that he could not punish them yet—it would have been premature—until they were fully formed in Christ Jesus and so mature in the faith. Then, to be sure, he would punish them! I suspect that we have a flash here of the Pauline humor that comes out so well and so gloriously in the original Greek.

So the strong are not to tyrannize or terrorize the weak. Elder brothers should not beat up on younger sisters. Learning the one true faith is an ongoing and lifelong process, St. Paul seems to be saying, and there are many fits and starts along the way. On the other hand, repentance and maturity are highly valued commodities in the church. No one can claim to be a Christian without growing in what the word of God in fact says, rather than, as so often happens, attempt to twist the plain meaning of Scripture to suit a particular culture—a particular American mentality, for example. No, it is the American mentality that must yield to the word of God! God's means of grace set the agenda and pull a largely reluctant body of Christians from out of the flotsam of the fallen world into Christ's glorious kingdom, though we all fight and struggle every inch of the way.

LATIN: A GIFT FOR GROWING AND MATURING CHRISTIANS

What does any of this have to do with Latin? The Jesus we worship is truly Lord—Lord over everything as he rules far above "in the heavenlies [ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις]."[24] Yet he deigns to dwell with us sinners, right here on earth. This is true liturgically, in the Divine Service, as I have just attempted to show. Expanding outward from that foundation, our Incarnate Lord provides other indications of himself, even within this fallen world. This truth is expressed quite profoundly in the three enormous stained glass windows in the Chapel of the Resurrection at Valparaiso University: the Father window, the Son window, and the Holy Spirit window. In addition to expressing the traditional iconography of the three Persons of the Godhead, the artist also incorporated symbols of several learned disciplines that typically are offered at a Christian university: artists' palettes, textbooks, test tubes, compasses and protractors, musical scores, harps, coronets, and much more. I used to think that all those extra things were like the gifts that the gentile kings offered to the Christ Child when they came in joyful search of him, guided by the star. Forgiven sinners, they were moved to offer costly offerings to the Savior, in joyful oblation to his lordship. Unfortunately, a scroll representing Homer, or a toga representing Cicero, was not part of the Valpo design. Nevertheless, they could have been: nothing but the best for the Lord.

I submit that Latin is one such discipline wherein our incarnate Lord reveals himself to growing and to maturing Christians in a special way. There are more than surface similarities between learning Latin well and submitting to the historic Christian faith as lifelong learners of the word—never content with mere surface meaning and shallow understanding, but always running on ahead to learn more and deeper and better. This, in fact, is a process that has only begun in this life for a Christian and will never be brought to full completion—no, not even in the life to come.[25]

> And as he spoke he no longer looked to them like a lion; but the things that began to happen after that were so great and beautiful that I cannot write them. And for us this is the end of all the stories, and we can most truly say that they all lived happily ever after. But for them it was only the beginning of the real story. All their life in this world and all their adventures in Narnia had only been the cover and the title page: now at last they were beginning Chapter One of the Great Story, which no one on earth has read: which goes on for ever: in which every chapter is better than the one before.[26]

Both in being a perpetual learner of Latin and of the "one true faith," *repetitio mater discendi est.*[27] Americans need to accept the fact that repetition in learning is not necessarily a boring and stultifying enterprise. Instead, the "loop approach" to learning allows maturing students to see the same old things at ever-deepening and more sophisticated levels.

The phrase "life-long learner" is an enticing buzzword in the educational community nowadays. I usually tell my students sometime during the first semester that Latin is one of those few things in life that cannot be taken away the more one submits to it, the more one yields to its clutches. So many other pursuits in life are seasonal, by contrast—that is, they can and will be taken away. Take basketball, for instance: today's Latin professor [the author is speaking of himself—ed.] could dunk a basketball with both hands behind his head when he was nineteen years old!

Getting to teach such authors as Catullus, Lysias, Appian,* et alii *means getting to share these personalities with others.

Thank God, however, he learned in time that Latin, not basketball, is the precious gift that remains, even as so many other joys are taken away with the passing of the years. Catullus, however, improves with age the more one is privileged to read him. There is so much wit, so much profundity packed into a typical epigram that no third- or fourth-semester Latinist can possibly understand Catullus the first time through. No, the proper ordo discendi[28] is: read the entire Catullan corpus through in the Latin, then memorize selections of Catullus's Latin for public recitation, then teach Catullus to your own Latin students, then do research, present papers, and possibly publish scholarly works on Catullus. Each brush with this ancient poet is another opportunity to know Catullus better, to imbibe his mind and his spirit. The same approach works for Caesar too, and Cicero, Homer, St. Paul and all the classical authors in the canon. After passage of time these ancient personages become familiar friends, bosom-buddies for life—certainly not a quick way to pass a curriculum requirement at the university!

Getting to teach such authors as Catullus, Lysias, Appian, *et alii* means getting to share these personalities with others—hopefully, with many others. That is exactly how the Christian faith works too, focussed as it is upon Christ's word and Christ's sacraments in the Scriptures, communicated to the world through the pure doctrine and the liturgy:

> We praise Thee, O God; we acknowledge Thee to be the Lord.
> All the earth doth worship Thee, the Father everlasting.
> To Thee all angels cry aloud, the heavens and all the powers therein;
> To Thee cherubim and seraphim continually do cry . . . .[29]

The Te Deum, one of the western liturgy's oldest and most christological hymns, is a beautiful piece—like one of Horace's Odes, or a chorale stasimon in one of the Greek tragedies. To keep the congregation from rejoicing in such a hymn by substituting "Amazing Grace" or some other such song seems unthinkable. If the congregation is having trouble singing such hymns as the Te Deum, then let it allow the pastor and the organist to teach all the assembled worshipers this glorious hymn so that the Te Deum and so many hymns just like it in the approved hymnals can again be part of the congregational repertoire. This, I hope, is the direction that our entire synod will adopt very soon, instead of allowing innovators to trash the tradition and innovate with impunity, as if it made no difference.

CONCLUSION

"Why should I learn Latin when everything has been translated into English?" This provocative title outlined a problem I myself have been struggling with for quite some time. I am happy to have had opportunity to present this paper to you, simply because it helped me to consider whether what I now do as a classicist has any bearing upon what each one of you does so heroically in the church, set as it is within the world. To return to the title one last time: "Why *should* I learn Latin . . . ?" is already the wrong way for a Christian to consider the question, since "should" is a word of law, obligation, and necessity. I have tried to demonstrate throughout my talk that Latin represents a wonderful—indeed, life-changing—opportunity for such students as have been properly motivated to learn. Of course, Latin can boost SAT scores, get people into medical school who would not get there otherwise, and looks good on a resume for some future employer to notice. Nevertheless, I have tried hard to suggest that Latin is its own reward, and so should be studied and submitted to for its own sake, without slavish and ulterior motives. Latin ought not to be forced on anyone, so no one "should" study it at all; however, by God's grace, many "could" once again submit to this magnificent language, and this "could" make all the difference in our church and in our world. LOGIA

NOTES

1. This essay was presented originally on October 8, 2001, as an address spoken before the North Texas Classical Lutheran Education Conference. This year the conference was hosted by Faith Lutheran School, Plano, Texas, at Texoma Lutheran Camp in Pottsboro, Texas. The conference has the goal of promoting quality Christian education: "In a day when progressivism dictates what happens in our public and Lutheran schools there is a need to return to an educational philosophy and pedagogy that has stood the test of time, namely, classical education.," *Concord* 15, no. 2 (2001): 5.

2. For my adventures in Rome in the summer of 1997, see "A Lutheran Goes to Rome," *Logia* 8, no. 1 (Epiphany 1999): 39–43.

3. "Diligence conquers everything."

4. "The mind is a muscle, and it needs to be worked!"

5. Several beginning students have proudly recited this ditty on the opening day of Latin class, although I fail to know its source.

6. "With a huge grain of salt."

7. "*The faith that is believed*; namely, the content of faith as revealed by God, *fides* objectively considered." To be distinguished from *fides qua creditur*, "*the faith by which (it) is believed*; that is, the faith of the believer that receives and holds the revelation of God, *fides* subjectively considered." So Richard A. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1985), 117.

8. "May the God of steadfastness and encouragement grant you [ὑμῖν] same-mindedness among one another [τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν ἀλλήλοῖς] in Christ Jesus," Rom 15:5; "Finally, brothers, farewell! Be continually restored, be encouraged, have ye the same mind [τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖτε], be at peace, and the God of love and peace will be with you," 2 Cor 13:11; "Complete my joy by being of the same mind [τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε], having the same love, being unanimous [σύμψυχοι], thinking the one thing [τὸ ἓν φρονοῦντες]," Phil 2:2. Also Rom 12:16; Gal 5:10; Phil 2:5; 3:15; 4:2.

9. Latin for "chain" or "series."

10. "The one holy [church]."

11. [ἐν] ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς, Eph 5:19. Col 3:16 is nearly identical.

12. "How does it [God's name] become holy among us? The plainest answer is: When both our teaching and our life are godly and Christian" (LC III, 39).

13. Peter Brunner, *Worship in the Name of Jesus*, trans. Martin H. Bertram (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1968), 18.

14. From *synagesthai* (Mt 18:20; 1 Cor 5:4; Acts 4:31) and *synerchesthai* (1 Cor 11:18, 20; 14:23), according to Brunner, 18.

15. "Why do they not mention the old term 'communion' [*synaxis*], which shows that formerly the mass was the communion of many [*multorum communicationem*]?" So Theodore G. Tappert, *The Book of Concord* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1959), 264.

16. Peter Brunner, *Worship in the Name of Jesus*, 18–19.

17. Similarly, 1 Cor 1:12; 7:6, 8, 12, 35; 10:15, 29; 11:22; 15:51.

18. "No one can say [εἴπῃ] that you were baptized into my name," 1 Cor 1:15; "For whenever someone says [ὅταν γὰρ λέγῃ τις], 'I belong to Paul,'" etc., 1 Cor 3:4; "But if anyone says [εἴπῃ] to you, 'This has been offered in sacrifice,'" etc, 1 Cor 10:28; "No one speaking [λαλῶν] in the Spirit of God says [λέγει], 'Jesus be cursed,' and no one can say [δύναται εἰπεῖν], 'Jesus is Lord' except by the Holy Ghost," 1 Cor 12:3; "Otherwise, if you bless [ἐὰν εὐλογῇς] with the spirit, how will anyone in the position of an outsider say [ἐρεῖς] the 'Amen' to your thanksgiving when he does not know what you are saying [τί λέγεις]," 1 Cor 14:16; "If therefore the whole church comes together [Ἐὰν . . . συνέλθῃ ἡ ἐκκλησία ὅλη] in the same place and all speak [λαλῶσιν] in tongues, and outsiders, or unbelievers [ἰδιῶται ἢ ἄπιστοι] enter, will they not say [οὐκ ἐροῦσιν], 'you are out of your minds!'" 1 Cor 14:23; "How do some among you say [λέγουσιν] there is no resurrection of the dead?," 1 Cor 15:12; "But someone will say [ἐρεῖς], 'How are the dead raised?'" 1 Cor 15:35.

19. The problem is, why would Paul mention that anyone cursed Jesus at worship? Fee supposes (*The First Letter to the Corinthians* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987], 581) either that Paul waxed hypothetical here (the point consisted "in its shock value," 581), or it was the type of curse that some of the Corinthians had experienced earlier in their pagan past. At any rate, both types of utterance were carried on "at worship" according to Fee (*First Corinthians*, 579–582).

20. "Saying the (customary) 'Amen' assumes the setting of corporate worship," Fee, *First Corinthians*, 672. The one "in the position of an outsider [ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου]" (RSV) could refer to a proselyte or catechumen who was permitted to the Corinthian worship (cf. κατηχέω in nearby 1 Cor 14:19, which possibly had a technical sense). Nevertheless, Lockwood translates ὁ ἰδιώτης as "outsider" or "layman" here (Gregory Lockwood, 1 *Corinthians*, Concordia Commentary Series [St. Louis: CPH, 2000], 483, 486), on the basis of Acts 4:13 and 2 Cor 11:6.

21. "The visitors would think they had entered a gathering of yet another mystery cult like that of Dionysus or Cybele, with its adherents all carried away by religious mania," Lockwood, 1 *Corinthians*, 491. The passage demonstrates that "unbelievers" and those "untutored in the faith" were permitted to enter a Christian assembly at worship. Fee supposes (*First Corinthians*, 685) that Paul may have envisioned an unbelieving spouse who accompanied a Christian to his or her place of worship.

22. The Commission on Worship of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, *Lutheran Worship* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1982), 6. Added emphasis.

23. Antagonists: 1 Cor 9:3; 2 Cor 11:4; Gal 1:7; 5:10, 12; Phil 1:15–18; 2 Tim 4:14–15, etc. Attacks on Paul's apostleship: 1 Cor 9:2; 2 Cor 11:5, 13, etc.

24. Eph 1:3, 20; 2:6; 3:10; 6:12. The phrase serves a "liturgical and apologetic interest" by demonstrating that Christ rules in the heavenly realms and the church shares in his dominion. So H. Traub, "ἐπουράνιος," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 5: 540.

25. "Aslan turned to them and said: You do not yet look so happy as I mean you to be." Lucy said, "We're so afraid of being sent away, Aslan. And you have sent us back into our own world so often." "No fear of that," said Aslan. "Have you not guessed?" Their hears leaped and a wild hope rose within them. "There *was* a real railway accident," said Aslan softly. "Your father and mother and all of you are—as you used to call it in the Shadow-Lands—dead. The term is over: the holidays have begun. The dream is ended: this is the morning."

26. C. S. Lewis, *The Last Battle*. Book seven in the Chronicles of Narnia (New York: Collier, 1956), 183–184.

27. "Repetition is the mother of learning."

28. "Order of learning."

29. Te Deum laudamus: te Dominum confitemur./ Te aeternum Patrem, omnis terra veneratur./ Tibi omnes angeli, tibi caeli et universae potestates:/ tibi cherubim et seraphim incessabili voce proclamant, etc.

Both in being a perpetual learner of Latin and of the "one true faith," *repetitio mater discendi est.*[27] Americans need to accept the fact that repetition in learning is not necessarily a boring and stultifying enterprise. Instead, the "loop approach" to learning allows maturing students to see the same old things at ever-deepening and more sophisticated levels.

The phrase "life-long learner" is an enticing buzzword in the educational community nowadays. I usually tell my students sometime during the first semester that Latin is one of those few things in life that cannot be taken away the more one submits to it, the more one yields to its clutches. So many other pursuits in life are seasonal, by contrast—that is, they can and will be taken away. Take basketball, for instance: today's Latin professor [the author is speaking of himself—ed.] could dunk a basketball with both hands behind his head when he was nineteen years old!

Getting to teach such authors as Catullus, Lysias, Appian,* et alii *means getting to share these personalities with others.

Thank God, however, he learned in time that Latin, not basketball, is the precious gift that remains, even as so many other joys are taken away with the passing of the years. Catullus, however, improves with age the more one is privileged to read him. There is so much wit, so much profundity packed into a typical epigram that no third- or fourth-semester Latinist can possibly understand Catullus the first time through. No, the proper ordo discendi[28] is: read the entire Catullan corpus through in the Latin, then memorize selections of Catullus's Latin for public recitation, then teach Catullus to your own Latin students, then do research, present papers, and possibly publish scholarly works on Catullus. Each brush with this ancient poet is another opportunity to know Catullus better, to imbibe his mind and his spirit. The same approach works for Caesar too, and Cicero, Homer, St. Paul and all the classical authors in the canon. After passage of time these ancient personages become familiar friends, bosom-buddies for life—certainly not a quick way to pass a curriculum requirement at the university!

Getting to teach such authors as Catullus, Lysias, Appian, *et alii* means getting to share these personalities with others—hopefully, with many others. That is exactly how the Christian faith works too, focussed as it is upon Christ's word and Christ's sacraments in the Scriptures, communicated to the world through the pure doctrine and the liturgy:

> We praise Thee, O God; we acknowledge Thee to be the Lord.
> All the earth doth worship Thee, the Father everlasting.
> To Thee all angels cry aloud, the heavens and all the powers therein;
> To Thee cherubim and seraphim continually do cry . . . .[29]

The Te Deum, one of the western liturgy's oldest and most christological hymns, is a beautiful piece—like one of Horace's Odes, or a chorale stasimon in one of the Greek tragedies. To keep the congregation from rejoicing in such a hymn by substituting "Amazing Grace" or some other such song seems unthinkable. If the congregation is having trouble singing such hymns as the Te Deum, then let it allow the pastor and the organist to teach all the assembled worshipers this glorious hymn so that the Te Deum and so many hymns just like it in the approved hymnals can again be part of the congregational repertoire. This, I hope, is the direction that our entire synod will adopt very soon, instead of allowing innovators to trash the tradition and innovate with impunity, as if it made no difference.

CONCLUSION

"Why should I learn Latin when everything has been translated into English?" This provocative title outlined a problem I myself have been struggling with for quite some time. I am happy to have had opportunity to present this paper to you, simply because it helped me to consider whether what I now do as a classicist has any bearing upon what each one of you does so heroically in the church, set as it is within the world. To return to the title one last time: "Why *should* I learn Latin . . . ?" is already the wrong way for a Christian to consider the question, since "should" is a word of law, obligation, and necessity. I have tried to demonstrate throughout my talk that Latin represents a wonderful—indeed, life-changing—opportunity for such students as have been properly motivated to learn. Of course, Latin can boost SAT scores, get people into medical school who would not get there otherwise, and looks good on a resume for some future employer to notice. Nevertheless, I have tried hard to suggest that Latin is its own reward, and so should be studied and submitted to for its own sake, without slavish and ulterior motives. Latin ought not to be forced on anyone, so no one "should" study it at all; however, by God's grace, many "could" once again submit to this magnificent language, and this "could" make all the difference in our church and in our world. LOGIA

NOTES

1. This essay was presented originally on October 8, 2001, as an address spoken before the North Texas Classical Lutheran Education Conference. This year the conference was hosted by Faith Lutheran School, Plano, Texas, at Texoma Lutheran Camp in Pottsboro, Texas. The conference has the goal of promoting quality Christian education: "In a day when progressivism dictates what happens in our public and Lutheran schools there is a need to return to an educational philosophy and pedagogy that has stood the test of time, namely, classical education.," *Concord* 15, no. 2 (2001): 5.

2. For my adventures in Rome in the summer of 1997, see "A Lutheran Goes to Rome," *Logia* 8, no. 1 (Epiphany 1999): 39–43.

3. "Diligence conquers everything."

4. "The mind is a muscle, and it needs to be worked!"

5. Several beginning students have proudly recited this ditty on the opening day of Latin class, although I fail to know its source.

6. "With a huge grain of salt."

7. "*The faith that is believed*; namely, the content of faith as revealed by God, *fides* objectively considered." To be distinguished from *fides qua creditur*, "*the faith by which (it) is believed*; that is, the faith of the believer that receives and holds the revelation of God, *fides* subjectively considered." So Richard A. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1985), 117.

8. "May the God of steadfastness and encouragement grant you [ὑμῖν] same-mindedness among one another [τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν ἀλλήλοῖς] in Christ Jesus," Rom 15:5; "Finally, brothers, farewell! Be continually restored, be encouraged, have ye the same mind [τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖτε], be at peace, and the God of love and peace will be with you," 2 Cor 13:11; "Complete my joy by being of the same mind [τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε], having the same love, being unanimous [σύμψυχοι], thinking the one thing [τὸ ἓν φρονοῦντες]," Phil 2:2. Also Rom 12:16; Gal 5:10; Phil 2:5; 3:15; 4:2.

9. Latin for "chain" or "series."

10. "The one holy [church]."

11. [ἐν] ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς, Eph 5:19. Col 3:16 is nearly identical.

12. "How does it [God's name] become holy among us? The plainest answer is: When both our teaching and our life are godly and Christian" (LC III, 39).

13. Peter Brunner, *Worship in the Name of Jesus*, trans. Martin H. Bertram (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1968), 18.

14. From *synagesthai* (Mt 18:20; 1 Cor 5:4; Acts 4:31) and *synerchesthai* (1 Cor 11:18, 20; 14:23), according to Brunner, 18.

15. "Why do they not mention the old term 'communion' [*synaxis*], which shows that formerly the mass was the communion of many [*multorum communicationem*]?" So Theodore G. Tappert, *The Book of Concord* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1959), 264.

16. Peter Brunner, *Worship in the Name of Jesus*, 18–19.

17. Similarly, 1 Cor 1:12; 7:6, 8, 12, 35; 10:15, 29; 11:22; 15:51.

18. "No one can say [εἴπῃ] that you were baptized into my name," 1 Cor 1:15; "For whenever someone says [ὅταν γὰρ λέγῃ τις], 'I belong to Paul,'" etc., 1 Cor 3:4; "But if anyone says [εἴπῃ] to you, 'This has been offered in sacrifice,'" etc, 1 Cor 10:28; "No one speaking [λαλῶν] in the Spirit of God says [λέγει], 'Jesus be cursed,' and no one can say [δύναται εἰπεῖν], 'Jesus is Lord' except by the Holy Ghost," 1 Cor 12:3; "Otherwise, if you bless [ἐὰν εὐλογῇς] with the spirit, how will anyone in the position of an outsider say [ἐρεῖς] the 'Amen' to your thanksgiving when he does not know what you are saying [τί λέγεις]," 1 Cor 14:16; "If therefore the whole church comes together [Ἐὰν . . . συνέλθῃ ἡ ἐκκλησία ὅλη] in the same place and all speak [λαλῶσιν] in tongues, and outsiders, or unbelievers [ἰδιῶται ἢ ἄπιστοι] enter, will they not say [οὐκ ἐροῦσιν], 'you are out of your minds!'" 1 Cor 14:23; "How do some among you say [λέγουσιν] there is no resurrection of the dead?," 1 Cor 15:12; "But someone will say [ἐρεῖς], 'How are the dead raised?'" 1 Cor 15:35.

19. The problem is, why would Paul mention that anyone cursed Jesus at worship? Fee supposes (*The First Letter to the Corinthians* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987], 581) either that Paul waxed hypothetical here (the point consisted "in its shock value," 581), or it was the type of curse that some of the Corinthians had experienced earlier in their pagan past. At any rate, both types of utterance were carried on "at worship" according to Fee (*First Corinthians*, 579–582).

20. "Saying the (customary) 'Amen' assumes the setting of corporate worship," Fee, *First Corinthians*, 672. The one "in the position of an outsider [ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου]" (RSV) could refer to a proselyte or catechumen who was permitted to the Corinthian worship (cf. κατηχέω in nearby 1 Cor 14:19, which possibly had a technical sense). Nevertheless, Lockwood translates ὁ ἰδιώτης as "outsider" or "layman" here (Gregory Lockwood, 1 *Corinthians*, Concordia Commentary Series [St. Louis: CPH, 2000], 483, 486), on the basis of Acts 4:13 and 2 Cor 11:6.

21. "The visitors would think they had entered a gathering of yet another mystery cult like that of Dionysus or Cybele, with its adherents all carried away by religious mania," Lockwood, 1 *Corinthians*, 491. The passage demonstrates that "unbelievers" and those "untutored in the faith" were permitted to enter a Christian assembly at worship. Fee supposes (*First Corinthians*, 685) that Paul may have envisioned an unbelieving spouse who accompanied a Christian to his or her place of worship.

22. The Commission on Worship of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, *Lutheran Worship* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1982), 6. Added emphasis.

23. Antagonists: 1 Cor 9:3; 2 Cor 11:4; Gal 1:7; 5:10, 12; Phil 1:15–18; 2 Tim 4:14–15, etc. Attacks on Paul's apostleship: 1 Cor 9:2; 2 Cor 11:5, 13, etc.

24. Eph 1:3, 20; 2:6; 3:10; 6:12. The phrase serves a "liturgical and apologetic interest" by demonstrating that Christ rules in the heavenly realms and the church shares in his dominion. So H. Traub, "ἐπουράνιος," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 5: 540.

25. "Aslan turned to them and said: You do not yet look so happy as I mean you to be." Lucy said, "We're so afraid of being sent away, Aslan. And you have sent us back into our own world so often." "No fear of that," said Aslan. "Have you not guessed?" Their hears leaped and a wild hope rose within them. "There *was* a real railway accident," said Aslan softly. "Your father and mother and all of you are—as you used to call it in the Shadow-Lands—dead. The term is over: the holidays have begun. The dream is ended: this is the morning."

26. C. S. Lewis, *The Last Battle*. Book seven in the Chronicles of Narnia (New York: Collier, 1956), 183–184.

27. "Repetition is the mother of learning."

28. "Order of learning."

29. Te Deum laudamus: te Dominum confitemur./ Te aeternum Patrem, omnis terra veneratur./ Tibi omnes angeli, tibi caeli et universae potestates:/ tibi cherubim et seraphim incessabili voce proclamant, etc.