

# THE SPRINGFIELDER

Vol. XXVI

Spring, 1962

No. 1

THE SPRINGFIELDER is published quarterly by the faculty of Concordia Theological Seminary, Springfield, Illinois, of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod.

## EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

ERICH H. HEINTZEN, *Editor*

J. A. O. PREUS, *Associate Editor*

MARK J. STEEGE, *Associate Editor*

RICHARD P. JUNGKUNTZ, *Associate Editor*

## Contents

Page

### EDITORIALS

"G. J. B." .....	1
Acting President .....	2
Toward the Cleveland Convention.....	2
Hermann Sasse .....	3
Why Physical Fitness? .....	4

NEW DEVELOPMENTS AT SPRINGFIELD.....	8
Dr. J. A. O. Preus, Acting President .....	

IN MEMORIAM .....	9
-------------------	---

IMPLICATIONS OF THE HISTORICO-CRITICAL METHOD IN INTERPRETING THE OLD TESTAMENT .....	10
Raymond Surburg, Professor, Old Testament .....	

THE APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION IN RECENT LUTHERAN DISCUSSIONS .....	36
Otto F. Stahlke, Professor, Systematics Department .....	

THE LANGUAGE OF FAITH.....	41
Curtis Huber, Professor, Systematics Department .....	

BOOK REVIEWS .....	53
Books Received .....	75

Clergy changes of address reported to Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., will also cover mailing change of *The Springfielder*. Other changes of address should be sent to the Business Manager of *The Springfielder*, Concordia Theological Seminary, Springfield, Illinois.

Address communications to the Editor, Erich H. Heintzen, Concordia Theological Seminary, Springfield, Illinois.

Business correspondence should be addressed to Norman A. Bumby, Business Manager, Concordia Theological Seminary, Springfield, Illinois.

## Editorials

### "G. J. B."

Dr. George J. Beto's resignation from the presidency of our seminary to accept the appointment of director of corrections and chief of chaplains for the Texas Board of Corrections is probably no longer news to most of our readers.

A Lutheran churchman of broad vision and supra-parochial concerns, Dr. Beto, in addition to his numerous synodical commitments, has long been active in the interests of good government and community life. While president of Concordia College in Austin, Texas, he rendered distinguished service as a member of the Texas Board of Corrections. After assuming the presidency of our seminary, he was appointed by the Governor of Illinois to the State Pardon and Parole Board. We have, therefore, no doubt that the shift from academic to public administration is one which our former colleague will accomplish with uncommon dexterity.

As president of Concordia Theological Seminary, Dr. Beto infused his office with high vision, vitality, and positive Christian direction—all geared to the seminary's single objective: to train able ministers of the New Testament. In this great task he personally exemplified the constant pursuit of excellence and an unceasing war against mediocrity.

Evidence of his vigorous administration may be seen, as well as sensed, in many areas: most obviously perhaps in the expanded physical plant, particularly in the new library building and its equipment; in significant curriculum revision and in raising of standards; in administrative and faculty staffing; in opportunities for advanced study for faculty and students; in attracting distinguished lecturers to the campus; in projecting the distinctive role of our seminary to the church at large. For all this we are grateful.

Dr. Beto has left the seminary with the good will and respect of faculty and students, and with the assurance of their prayers for God's blessing in his new field of work. We should, however, be less than candid if we did not add that we shall miss him.

*The Springfielder* staff, especially, will miss his strong personal



encouragement, as well as his pungent, relevant editorials—a feature which our readers had come to look for over the familiar signature, “G. J. B.”

E. H. H.

\* \* \*

#### *Dr. J. A. O. Preus, Acting President*

WE CONGRATULATE our genial and capable colleague, Dr. J. A. O. Preus, who has been appointed acting president of the seminary by the Board of Control. Dr. Preus is a member of the department of Exegetical Theology. Readers will also recognize him as a member of *The Springfielder* editorial committee. We look forward to his contributions which now emanate from the “executive suite.”

E. H. H.

\* \* \*

#### *Toward The Cleveland Convention*

IN LESS than two months Synod will be in session. The Cleveland Convention will have a great deal of business to transact. The major problems appear to be in the area of Finances (as always), Higher Education, Mission Expansion, and Doctrine. In another article we are referring to some of Springfield’s interests in Higher Education matters. However, as a theological seminary, we also have a very large stake in doctrinal and theological concerns.

We need less than prophetic gifts to forecast that Resolution 9 of the San Francisco convention and the whole matter of the status of the Brief Statement will be aired. On the positive side, it is good that we have so much concern about doctrine. A church which loses interest in theology is dead. Negatively, we hope that acrimony and bad blood can be kept to a minimum. Nothing breeds more trouble for the church than loveless and thoughtless theological shooting from the hip. Of this we have all been guilty, and of it we must all beware.

With regard to Resolution 9, however, it is our opinion that while the Resolution needs some shoring up, it is a good, proper, and perfectly correct procedure. A church body has a right to insist upon a doctrinal position, and it has the right to exercise disci-

pline upon those who fail to uphold this position. This is so axiomatic, especially for Lutherans, that it needs no further elaboration.

The Brief Statement has come in for a great deal of criticism, some proper, some rather irrelevant. Some time ago the undersigned had as a guest in his home the president of one of the large seminaries of the American Lutheran Church. This president, in discussing some of the problems which disturb both his church and ours, made the wise statement that both of our churches are oriented against the background of the 16th and 17th centuries. Today we find many theologians who are trying to change this orientation. But, said this man, until they can show us where they are trying to take us, until they can cease being only critical of the past and actually give direction to the present-day church, we had better stay with what we have. This is our thinking regarding the Brief Statement. It has served us well. It has kept us sound in doctrine. It fails to cope with some of the issues raised by Bultmann, Barth, Tillich, and others: but neither do the Confessions or the great Creeds. We are not among those who advocate adding the Brief Statement to the Book of Concord, nor are we among those who suggest abolishing it. But we do feel that it still serves a valuable purpose in our church, that it gives much help in a day when we still are talking about creation, evolution, inspiration, inerrancy, justification, church fellowship, and the rest. Let those who want to repudiate this document on the theological grounds show us what kind of theology they wish to substitute for that of our historic position. Those who worry about its unconstitutionality should remember that it teaches only what we have always believed, and this ought cause us very little loss of sleep.

Cleveland will be another historic milestone in our great church’s onward march. We pray that this convention will be worthy of the great church which is there assembled and of the great message we proclaim.

J. A. O. P.

\* \* \*

#### *Hermann Sasse*

VENI, VIDI, VICI. Seldom, since they were first spoken, have Caesar’s famous words been more completely fulfilled than they were by Latin-German-Greek-Hebrew-quoting Hermann Sasse



during his two-month stay in Springfield. He came humbly, quietly, unobtrusively; he looked over the situation; and he won the hearts of students and faculty as few have done. It was both amusing and thrilling to see these so-called "practical" students taking in hours of lectures, well larded with foreign quotations from all ages of the church by this soft-spoken yet remarkably keen and winning man. Sasse's whole concern is for the preservation and perpetuation of Biblical Confessional Lutheranism. His knowledge of the Bible, the Confessions, Patristics and church history is phenomenal, but this knowledge is not used for display or "snowing" the audience, but always for his basic purpose.

One question occurred again and again, Do we want Lutheranism to survive? This is the important question today. With ecumenism, Kerygmatic theology, and incessant attacks on the authority and inspiration of Scripture, the question Lutheranism faces, and as Sasse points out, particularly Missouri Synod Lutheranism, is simply this: Do we want to remain Lutheran?

Sasse pointed out that "orthodoxy" means more than pure teaching, though it does mean that; but it also means the right and correct praise of God. Hence there is a call not only for study and academics; but for a heart-born praise of God for His grace toward us. Orthodoxy means sound doctrine, worthy liturgical practices, a faithful ministry, adherence to the great Confessions of the church, a love for the truth as God has shown it to us in His Scripture. This is what Sasse told us. We are glad he was here. Our school benefited from his visit.

J. A. O. P.

\* \* \*

### *Why Physical Fitness?*

IT IS increasingly apparent that this nation is to become physically strong and fit. The emphasis and direction of nationwide fitness has been charted on a course of action painstakingly and thoroughly prepared for all ages, and it is bound to make itself felt sooner than later.

The strength and vitality of the fitness movement in this country has evolved from meager beginnings and isolated attempts on the part of physical educators. It took two international crises and

a prevailing cold war situation to trigger an awareness of the need for an extensive effort in this direction. We are all acquainted with the physical ineptitudes of servicemen reporting for armed duty. The climax to an oft frustrating campaign designed to counteract this distressing phenomenon was reached in July, 1961, when President John F. Kennedy threw the influence of his office behind the fitness preparations developed under his Council on Youth Fitness.

Testimony to the effectiveness of this national effort—which, incidentally, represents the culmination of an uphill battle waged by physical educators for more than a score of years—is to be found at every hand; for example: mass consciousness of the weight problem and its related implications; the resurgence of physical activity and exercise groups and clubs; courses in all school curricula at every age level of the educational pattern; and a proliferation of printed material on all related health and fitness subjects in circular and book form.

Why should I be physically fit? Can the schools, or even the Youth Fitness Council, provide me with sound reasons? For what purpose am I to be physically strong and fit?

Voluminous writing of experts in this field leads me to believe that if the question of the purpose of fitness has been answered at all, it has been done by inference, and has pointed in a narrow, stilted direction. Two objectives come through strongly: a) fitness is essential to the nation's welfare *because* the nation must bear arms, and it must achieve a status of war and survival readiness at all times; b) fitness is essential for those engaged in competitive athletics, since this is the inevitable climax to the fitness program in the school situation.

In support of the position taken above (which will be unpopular with the great majority of readers especially within this field) permit me to point out that the programs for fitness as established in the schools (largely high school and college) have been developed for the benefit of track and football coaches, etc., and that the average exercise programs for civilians have been developed in the various branches of the Armed Forces. While it is true that these programs may for some be necessary and vital, what about the overwhelming majority of us who neither bear arms nor engage in com-



petitive athletics? Must we be subjected to the same treatment and for the same reasons? Common sense suggests that this is an unintelligible approach.

But are there not other basic premises—worthy of moral justification—for a general physical fitness program?

The search for these grounds is not in vain if we consult God's Word. The Bible speaks to us on numerous occasions regarding health, the activity of life, strength, healing, etc., all of which find summarization in what today is called physical fitness. I fear that the physical educator himself must shoulder the major share of blame for not revealing the sound moral ground as found in the Bible. Nor has he pointed out on the state level, that fitness is moral since it involves the capacity of the human being, in so far as he is able, to perform his moral obligation of contributing to the achievement and maintenance of a worthwhile culture and civilization. This approach, it seems to me, sets the appropriate foundation from which must stem any exhortation to physical fitness. If the American culture is to be meaningful and productive, it is totally dependent on healthy, active, and alert cultural agents. There has never been a vibrant, significant culture or civilization without vibrant, healthy, viz., fit citizens. Therefore, the natural and morally defensible conclusion is that fitness of the citizenry is of prime import. This approach also tells us something about the extent of fitness necessary; the appropriate research in health, medicine, and exercise; the content of courses offered; and finally, the intelligent applications all must make to their personal and national welfare.

There have been, in years gone by—and for that matter still today on occasion—some rather devastating statements and derogatory barbs thrown at physical educators and the discipline they represent. Not all have been unjust, but most have been inaccurate in that they have linked physical fitness with competitive athletics or the armed services. For this, as indicated above, we physical educators have ourselves to blame, for there has never been a simple, clear-cut articulation that has been at one and the same time logically and morally defensible. Nor has offhand quoting of Scripture, e.g.: "bodily exercise profiteth little," helped matters. The plain fact is that the Christian is under obligation to his God to preserve God's gift under His direction, to the extent that he

is able to serve effectively Him whose Son made the supreme sacrifice. Effective service can hardly be rendered while convalescing from a heart attack, over-exhaustion, or lack of strength due to inadequate or unbalanced diet. And we are to be reminded that God has ordained service to the state among those duties mankind is to perform? Neither is effective unless the body is "up to it" from a fitness or health standpoint.

Thus, the physical educator is on solid ground; in fact, needs no further incentive to carry out his mission. His service is worthwhile, vitally important, and above all, based on tenable ground. A thorough search of Scripture will substantiate his position, but the all important factor remains: outline the why's and wherefore's, and ground your own fitness program in His all sufficient Word!

Warren N. Wilbert,  
Practical Department