

V. 43
1

CONCORDIA
THEOLOGICAL
QUARTERLY

CTQ

Volume 43, Number 1

JANUARY 1979

A Tribute to Walter E. Buszin Kirby L. Koriath 1

Faith and Music M. Alfred Bichsel 12

Abortion: Historical and Biblical
Perspectives John A. Rasmussen 17

The Doctrine of the Word in Orthodox
Lutheranism C. George Fry 24

Theological Observer 45

Book Reviews 50

Books Received 75

98880



CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
 CONFESSIO DOMINI
 1848

Theological Observer

I.C.B.I. SUMMIT REPORT

In its first major activity designed to assert inerrancy as "a central and urgent theological issue of our day," the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy (I.C.B.I.) held a three-day summit meeting in Chicago, October 26-28, 1978, culminating in the development of "The Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy." Fourteen LC-MS members joined 270 other participants in the activities of this conference.

The I.C.B.I. was founded in 1977 by individual scholars from many organizations and denominations. Its declared purpose is "to take a united stand in elucidating, vindicating and applying the truth of Biblical inerrancy as an integral element in the authority of Scripture." The Chicago Summit was viewed by the 16 members of the Council (which includes Dr. Robert Preus of the LC-MS) as a vehicle for the "creation and publication of a clear, convincing statement on inerrancy endorsed by a united coalition of prominent scholars." In developing a ten-year plan of action, the I.C.B.I. hopes that the "Chicago Statement" will be the foundation for a vigorous program of supporting inerrancy on both scholarly and lay levels.

The program of the summit meeting, held at the Hyatt Regency O'Hare, called for the presentation and discussion of fourteen major papers, addressing such topics as "Christ's View of the Scriptures," "Supposed 'Errors' in the Original Manuscripts of the Bible," "The View of the Bible Held by the Church," and "The Inerrancy of the Autographa." Most observers seemed to feel that all of the papers were well-written and valuable with the greatest contributions to the case for inerrancy coming from the papers of James I. Packer (Trinity College, Bristol, England) and Norman L. Geisler (Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois). Packer's contribution, "The Adequacy of Human Language," called attention to the present-day skepticism about the capacity of human language to convey truth about God. Packer agreed with John H. Gerstner (Pittsburgh Theological Seminary) that one must reject as untrue the oft-held position that "to err is human"; Gerstner rightly corrected this notion: to err is *sinful*, not human! Packer called for Christians to examine and reject presuppositions which "are contrary to the knowledge of God."

Geisler's paper, "Philosophical Presuppositions of Biblical Errancy," urged the responsible examination of the presuppositions with which we think, those beliefs that are behind one's position on Biblical inerrancy. Quoting the Scriptural admonition, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy" (Col. 2:8), Geisler observed that one cannot *beware* of philosophy unless one is *aware* of its influences. Behind the positions of those who reject inerrancy (including LC-MS "moderates") one finds presuppositions which are alien to the Scriptures. After surveying the way in which various schools of philosophical thought have influenced Christians to move away from the inerrancy of Holy Scripture, Geisler concluded: "The history of the philosophical influences leading to the denial of the full authority of Scripture show unmistakably that essentially it is not new facts but old philosophies that are leading evangelicals astray. They are—often unwittingly—buying into philosophical presuppositions that are inimical to the historic evangelical view of Scripture. The real problem is not factual but philosophical. It is the acceptance, often uncritically, of philosophical premises, such as inductivism, naturalism, rationalism or existentialism, that are basically unreconcilable with the doctrine of the full inspiration of Scripture."

Throughout the Summit various drafts of a proposed statement on inerrancy

were distributed for discussion and suggestions. It was most heartening to note that every suggestion made by Missouri Synod participants was included in the final draft of the statement. Indeed, participants from the LC-MS reported a warm and sensitive reception to their presence and their ideas. In the words of one I.C.B.I. member, "we regard the presence of Missouri Synod members as crucial for our endeavor; you are the one church body in America that has fought this battle and won!"

The final product of the summit meeting, "The Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy," is comprised of a short statement and nineteen articles of affirmations and antitheses, plus an accompanying exposition of major themes in the statement itself. The short statement asserts:

1. God, who is Himself Truth and speaks truth only, has inspired Holy Scripture in order thereby to reveal Himself to lost mankind through Jesus Christ as Creator and Lord, Redeemer and Judge. Holy Scripture is God's witness to Himself.
2. Holy Scripture, being God's own Word, written by men prepared and superintended by His Spirit, is of infallible divine authority in all matters upon which it touches: it is to be believed, as God's instruction, in all that it affirms; obeyed, as God's command, in all that it requires; embraced, as God's pledge, in all that it promises.
3. The Holy Spirit, its divine Author, both authenticates it to us by His inward witness and opens our minds to understand its meaning.
4. Being wholly and verbally God-given, Scripture is without error or fault in all its teaching, no less in what it states about God's acts in creation and the events of world history, and about its own literary origins under God, than in its witness to God's saving grace in individual lives.
5. The authority of Scripture is inescapably impaired if this total divine inerrancy is in any way limited or disregarded, or made relative to a view of truth contrary to the Bible's own; and such lapses bring serious loss to both the individual and the Church.

With the Summit completed, the I.C.B.I. now intends to focus on the production of materials for both scholars and laymen, development of seminars for regional and local situations, and dialogue with those who reject inerrancy, to promote clarity on the issues. As of this time, the first publication of the Council has been released, *The Foundation of Biblical Authority*, ed. by James M. Boice (Zondervan, 1978). The Council promises to have the essays presented at the Summit in published form by next summer. Meanwhile, tapes of all sessions have also been released.

As Lutherans we have a significant investment in the future of this young movement. It represents many who are facing, or soon will face, the same theological confrontation which has racked the LC-MS for the past decade; in this regard we ought to make an investment in leadership. Furthermore, one only needs to examine the textbooks of our pastors to realize the debt which the Missouri Synod owes to these evangelical scholars. Yet the greatest reason for our investment is the matter of truth. Here, in Chicago, truth has been confessed, truth which we in the Missouri Synod hold and have confessed publicly in numerous official statements.

Rev. Robert W. Schaibley
 Concordia Teachers College
 River Forest, Illinois

THE SHROUD OF TURIN: PROTESTANT OPPORTUNITY OR EMBARRASSMENT?

A shroud now in the Italian city of Turin is allegedly the burial cloth in

which the body of the Jesus was placed after His crucifixion (Matthew 27:19; Mark 15:46; Luke 23:53; John 19:40). Should the Shroud of Turin continue to pass the scientific tests, it would have to be the most significant historical artifact yet to be unearthed. Christianity is not without historical proofs at the present time, but the shroud, if authentic, would have to go to the head of the line.

Attention was focused on the shroud when two photographers in the last century discovered the form of a crucified man when they were developing a photograph they had taken of the Shroud of Turin. Here was one relic among the myriads of relics in the storehouse of the Roman Catholic Church that had to be taken seriously. Societies both in America and Europe have since been founded to foster further scientific and historical research on the shroud. To date not one shred of negative evidence has surfaced. Discussion about the shroud has been carried on in scientific journals as well as in newspapers, magazines, and television programs. While Roman Catholic authorities have exercised an admirable hesitancy to solve an historical problem by means of an infallible dogmatic assertion (it is officially called the Shroud of Turin and *not* the Shroud of Jesus), *The Christian Century* has pontificated upon the shroud in the following manner: "There's one chance in a billion times a billion times a billion times a billion that the image on the cloth could be Christ" (May 10, 1978).

This weighty pronouncement is certainly an overstatement. The image on the shroud fits perfectly the accounts of the suffering and death of Jesus portrayed in the Gospels. The nails in the feet and hands, the wounded side, the excessive number of stripes on the back, the blow to the head, the wound on the knee from falling, and the crown of thorns are all easily detected on the shroud. The hair style of the victim indicates a member of the Jewish race. Recent pollen tests show some connection with Palestine. The science of pathology, developed in connection with modern homicide investigation, has provided further arguments for the authenticity of the shroud. There is absolutely no evidence that the image was painted or artificially imposed on the shroud. The chances that another Jewish victim of the Roman soldiers would so perfectly fit the Gospel description of Jesus are statistically insignificant. The idea that a man was deliberately crucified in such a way as to match the account in the Gospels cannot be considered seriously. Such a theory makes a good horror story, but not good history. In spite of the increasing attention being given to the shroud, the Protestant world has been remarkably reticent about its possible authenticity.

One basic reason for the lack of any widespread Protestant enthusiasm for the shroud may be a general negativism towards relics that is part of the heritage of the Reformation. Luther's doctrine of free grace flew right in the face of the medieval idea that one could obtain forgiveness of sins through the veneration of relics. It cannot be doubted that there will be mass veneration of the Shroud of Turin if the Pope puts his stamp of approval on the garment. Pilgrimages from all parts of the world will be organized. The Roman Catholic Church authorities will doubtless claim the working of many miracles by the shroud.

One's judgment, however, as to the authenticity of the Shroud of Turin should not be influenced by the use or abuse of relics in the Roman Catholic Church or any decision which the Pope may make. We object, to be sure, to the idea that the grace of God is conveyed through relics. Yet evidence of the shroud's authenticity cannot simply be dismissed on the grounds that most relics are frauds or that they have been abused. By this kind of reasoning, the existence of Palestine itself would come into question. The question of the shroud's authenticity must be judged on its own merits.

Two questions must be addressed to the shroud that must be asked of any other artifact which is supposed to have a particular history. (1) Can the

claims concerning the relic be shown to be in direct contradiction to evidence derived from the relic itself? For example, if the shroud were woven in a style developed centuries after the death of Christ, it could not possibly be authentic. To date, however, the shroud has not produced any evidence against the claims attached to it. In fact, it would be difficult to find an historical artifact that has been tested and investigated for a longer time and with more intensity. The number of possible forms of investigation now available has been nearly exhausted. (2) Even if no effective negative evidence can be brought to bear against the reputed authenticity of an historical artifact, are other explanations of its origin just as plausible? If the victim whose image is outlined in the shroud is not that of Jesus, to whom then does it belong? Here we are dealing with the laws of probability; each possible explanation must be weighed against the others. No one has offered a satisfactory alternate explanation of the image on the shroud. The similarity between the testimony of the shroud and the Gospel accounts is simply uncanny. Can anyone offer any sound reason why the Shroud of Turin should not, in fact, be the very cloth in which Jesus was buried? Simply stating that it cannot be is only a refusal to face the evidence.

Contemporary interest with past is hardly on the decline. People have stood in line for hours to see the treasures of a pharaoh's tomb. No one seriously doubts the authenticity of these artifacts, even though they do not have the broad spectrum of collaborating evidence provided in the Gospel accounts for the Shroud of Turin. The search for Noah's Ark has also sparked public interest. The arguments for the authenticity of the ark depend on photographic evidence taken from planes and the hearsay testimony of those who have seen the evidence. The Shroud of Turin is an object which has been seen by many scientists and which is still undergoing scientific tests. Evidence here is of the most valuable variety. Those who have done research on the shroud have included those who cannot, by any definition, be called believers. Yet, despite the growing weight of evidence of the shroud's authenticity, *The Christian Century* has offered the verdict of "No, it cannot be" without any serious discussion of the evidence.

One suspects that the noticeable lack of Protestant enthusiasm for the shroud stems not only from the natural aversion to relics previously noted, but also from an ideological bias engendered by the thought of Barth and Bultmann. Karl Barth based his theology upon a concept of "God's Word" which had no need of real history. The reluctance of much of conservative Protestantism to tackle such thorny historical questions as the authenticity of the shroud may, in fact, derive from an unrecognized and undiagnosed Barthianism that relies on the "Heavenly Word" and ignores historical questions. Answering historical questions is often, in fact, considered the height of unbelief by the followers of Barth.

Revelation in both Biblical and Reformation theology, however, is not a message given directly from heaven, but one given by God in and through history. The incarnation when "the Word became flesh" is the quintessential instance of divine revelation. The Word which became flesh was also "crucified, dead, and buried." Part of this burial was the placing of the corpse of Jesus within a shroud in a tomb. A shroud was part of the history of the salvation of the world. There is, therefore, no valid theological objection to identification of the Shroud of Turin as the shroud in which Jesus was buried.

Modern biblical scholarship, to be sure, has narrowed itself down to a bare-bones historical minimalism. Scarcely the shadow of Jesus is left. Although most Biblical scholars pride themselves on practicing the "historical-critical method, it would be better described as the "philosophical-critical" method. In fact, the "historical-critical" method is a collection of methods controlled by an anti-historical bias! The probability that the Shroud of Turin is the actual burial cloth in which the corpse of Jesus was laid as described in the Gospels

threatens these contemporary exegetical methods at the very heart of the matter. If the shroud be authentic, we have no longer a mere shadow of Jesus, but the *corpus dilecti* itself.

Many Christians of the first decades saw almost daily the palace of Pilate, the temple, Golgotha, and the tomb where Jesus was laid. These things were constant historical reminders that the Jesus who was now reigning in glory at the Father's right hand had indeed lived and died among these people. For them these sacred places were authentic ties to the life of Jesus. The Shroud of Turin may very well be an authentic link with a past which was not only sacred but real. Acceptance of the authenticity of the shroud obviously cannot be made a criterion of orthodoxy, but a prior refusal to consider the question borders on disregard of the historical claims of Christianity. Perhaps we shall be given the same opportunity as Peter and John to see the burial garments of the Lord (John 20:6, 7).

David P. Scaer