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FOREWORD

An ancient philosopher once said, "Man never steps into the same river twice." What he meant was that as human beings, we are constantly in a state of flux. As Christians we believe that God is always the same in His love and mercy toward us. But He is the only one and so we can expect that also among us in the church tasks carried out by one person will eventually be taken over by another.

Thus we bid farewell to our colleague Howard Kramer and we bid welcome to Jonathan Grothe, the second president of our St. Catharines’ seminary. (A similar changing of the guard at our Edmonton seminary occurred in 1987 when W. Th. Janzow was succeeded as president by Milton Rudnick.) It is appropriate that we should dedicate this issue of Lutheran Theological Review to Howard Kramer. He has done much to make Concordia Seminary, St. Catharines the respected institution which it is today. And, through various means, he has also influenced Concordia Seminary, Edmonton.

In his "In Nomine Jesu" Ed Hackmann, a long-time friend of Howard Kramer, puts Kramer’s contribution to the St. Catharines seminary, and to the church, into perspective. This is followed by the first contribution to our journal by Jonathan Grothe, Kramer’s successor. In "A Missionary in Fellowship with the Church," Grothe provides a study of Paul as an instructive paradigm for church leaders today. Thereafter, Hackmann focuses on the somewhat controversial question, "Is Christian Ethics Possible?" His negative answer to the question is not shared by all Lutheran ethicists in Canada. His article is followed by that of another seminary colleague of Kramer’s. Roger Humann provides us with a New Testament study, "James and the Background to Galatians," which provides some insights important for the issue of faith and works with which "Christian Ethics" must deal. The fifth article, by Milton Rudnick, our Edmonton seminary president, and Dennis Kendel addresses one of the new frontiers for "Christian Ethics." "The Lutheran Church-Canada Submission to the Royal Commission on New Reproductive Technologies" is herewith shared with the church as a contribution to the discussion of this very contemporary topic. We trust that individuals and pastoral conferences will benefit from having this document carefully prepared by a theologian and a medical doctor of our church. The final two articles are of an historical nature: John Stoudt looks at "John Gerhard on examples of Clerical Marriage in the Early and Medieval
Church" and Norman Threinen sketches "Some European Influences on Inter-Lutheran Relationships in Ontario."

Dear reader, our goal in this journal is to attempt to provide articles of interest in various fields of theological reflection. We hope we have done this and we continue to welcome your comments and suggestions.

As a final comment on change, we should note that John Stephenson has succeeded Roger Humann as co-editor from the St. Catharines seminary faculty. Farewell and welcome here as well.

N.J.T.
IN NOMINE JESU

"In the name of Him Who ..." These words invariably introduced each chapel homily given by Howard Kramer during his presidency of Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary. The words which completed these introductory greetings changed with each homily; but they were always carefully chosen to adumbrate the theme of the devotional message which followed; and they made clear that it was the Lord Jesus Who was being honored and worshipped.

"In the name of Jesus" was not merely a phrase which characterized his chapel devotions. Living and working in the name of Him Who is our Lord and Savior characterized the entire presidency of Howard Kramer. In the name of Jesus he first undertook the presidency in spite of formidable obstacles which he had to overcome in his initial years. In the name of Jesus he moulded the administrative organization of the seminary into an effective efficient operation. In the name of Jesus he was conscientiously concerned with the quality and spiritual fitness of men who were admitted to the seminary and certified for placement in the ministry. In the name of Jesus he was deeply concerned with the academic respectability of this fledgling educational institution. In the name of Jesus he garnered generous gifts for the seminary from motivated donors. He moved with equal Christian demeanor whether supervising seminary staff, conversing with students, working with faculty, negotiating seminary concerns with the board of regents, entertaining guests in his home or maintaining excellent relations with the church-at-large. His preparation for the seminary presidency was enhanced by his considerable experience as a parish pastor and college educator. He served parishes in Kentucky and Missouri for some eighteen years. In 1966 he accepted the call to join the faculty of Concordia College, Ann Arbor, Michigan. He taught in the areas of English, New Testament, and the Humanities before assuming the position of Academic Dean.

During his professional career he pursued advanced academic degrees, acquiring the Master of Arts degree from the University of Louisville in Kentucky; the Master of Sacred Theology degree from Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri; and the Doctor of Philosophy degree from the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. He served in various church offices and as a member of the Board of Directors in the Central District and the Michigan District of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. He published more than
one hundred sermons and devotions in *The Concordia Pulpit, Portals of Prayer, My Devotions, Teenagers Pray*, and a variety of similar publications.

In the midst of a distinguished career he was called to be the first president of Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary. He was the president of the St. Catharines seminary for one third of its existence up to the time of his retirement. That is not impressive in number of years of service, but it is impressive in that he was able to influence many aspects of the character of this seminary in the critical years as it changed from an institution nurtured in temporary quarters of a local Lutheran Church, to an institution housed in its own permanent facilities on the campus of Brock University and academically recognized as an affiliated college of that university. As a consequence of the Kramer years, Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary will reflect the image of its first president for some years in the future. Eventually conditions change with changing times, and early influences imperceptibly disappear. But for the influence Howard Kramer had on the formative years of this seminary he deserves our grateful tribute. This issue of the Lutheran Theological Review is a small token of that appreciation.

We wish Howard and his wife Valerie the continued abundant blessings of Him Who is our common Lord and Savior as they enjoy their retirement years in His name.

E.E.H.
A MISSIONARY IN FELLOWSHIP WITH THE CHURCH

Jonathan F. Grothe

THE POINT

The point which the following brief historical-exegetical studies illustrate is simply stated: as Paul carried out his special missionary charge, he was always concerned to maintain fellowship in confession with the rest of Christ's church and in particular with the recognized leaders who had been disciples of Jesus during His earthly ministry. The first illustration is from Acts and Galatians and is sufficient to establish the point quite clearly. The second illustration involves presentation of a hypothesis about the context of the writing of Romans. The third refers to a fascinating few verses in Second Corinthians which connect this point to Paul's gathering of the collection for the saints in Jerusalem.

THE CURRENT CONTEXT

These reflections are presented, however, not just as an historical curiosity about Paul, but as an instructive paradigm for church leaders today. For in every generation, preachers and teachers of the Gospel are confronted with the need to adapt their presenting of the revealed truth to new and ever-changing contexts. With adaptation comes the danger of losing the truth handed down from above and from the past. Every pastor and teacher needs to be equally concerned with both the preservation of the truth and the adaptation of its delivery for the sake of more effective communication. This tension -- which can be a healthy tension -- is what lies beneath the apparent differences between practicing-theologians-in-missionary-situations and teaching-theologians-in-evaluating-situations. In the New Testament paradigm, those are represented by Paul on the one hand, and the Jerusalem apostles on the other. In our present context they might be seen as represented by innovating ("risk-taking") missionaries (including advocates of the Church Growth Movement), on the one hand, and, on the other, by professors

---

1 This is a revised version of a portion of an address given to the Southern Region of the Northern Illinois District Pastoral Conference. The design of the address was to carry forward some of the thoughts in my book *Reclaiming Patterns of Pastoral Ministry: Jesus and Paul* (Concordia, 1988).
and pastors concerned as to whether the innovations are, indeed, consistent with the truth handed down from the Lord, recorded in Scripture, and taught through many generations.

If this application is apt, one obvious point needs to be pondered. The missionary tends primarily to be an innovator in communication of the Gospel in new contexts (whether foreign fields or the changing North American scene). But the professor is more naturally a conservator of the truth received from above, checking to see whether the innovators have gone too far and lost the Gospel. They need each other. The church needs them to respect and help each other. May that awareness grow in our circles!

PAUL’S IMPACT ON HIS CONTEMPORARIES

Saint Paul must have appeared to some of the early Christians as one of the most daring missionary innovators ever. He preached almost anywhere, anytime. He quoted pagan poets. And he enjoyed considerable success by not requiring converts to be circumcised or keep the whole law of Moses. He clearly said that he was willing to become all things to all men in order that by all means he might gain some.

It is also quite evident that some of his contemporaries were very uncomfortable with him as an apostle. This former Pharisee and persecutor seemed to have flipped over: an erstwhile extremist for the Law, he was now a fanatic for the Gospel. In Jerusalem and Judaea there were concerns about his former life and about his practices in Antioch. After he established congregations in Galatia, Jewish Christians from Judaea felt compelled to go up there to straighten things out. Outsiders came into Corinth, apparently with letters of recommendation, to oppose and correct his teaching. And in Rome . . . well, on to that shortly.

PAUL’S POSTURE TOWARD HIS CONTEMPORARIES

What was Paul’s response? He said: God has revealed it to me to preach this way and has charged me to go on this mission to Gentile lands. But he did NOT say: "and it’s too bad if you don’t like it, Peter, James . . . all of you ‘old guard’ who knew Jesus during His earthly ministry but haven’t been called to do what I am doing." No, he was careful to give a defense of what he was doing, to provide a patient explanation of his position and practice for the sake of preserving fellowship with the apostolic leadership of the Church. As we observe him in action as a missionary and a churchman, at least three things demonstrate this.
First consider what is reported in Galatians chapters one and two and in Acts chapter eleven. The question at issue is whether circumcised Christians can be in the fellowship of the church with uncircumcised Christians such as Paul’s converts in Galatia. Paul’s position is that they can, but this is still a new idea to many in the churches of Jerusalem and Judaea. Paul says God had revealed it to him and that is not subject to approval by other men. But, even though it is a new idea to the others, Paul asserts that his position and practice are in accord with the Gospel promised in the Old Testament and revealed in Jesus -- the very Old Testament which the other apostles revered along with the historical Jesus Whom they knew and followed. And Paul goes to considerable effort to explain this to them and to have visible confirmation of the fellowship.

That is why he went, three years after his conversion, to visit Cephas and James in Jerusalem (1:18). He went voluntarily, not to report or be examined, but to let them "get to know me."

And that is also why he subsequently went again, when there was need, to meet with those known as the pillars of the Apostolic Church. This time (Gal 2:1-10) there was confrontation in the air. Paul took Titus along, and made it clear that he would not yield to pressure from those who insisted on circumcision. But it is interesting to listen carefully to the words of verse 2: "and I declared to [laid out or set before] them the Gospel I preach among the Gentiles (I did this privately to the men of reputation) lest somehow [it come about that] I was running or had been running in vain." Most commentators say (rightly): by no means was Paul open to the notion that he was wrong. Nevertheless, we must take what he says seriously. We are then led to propose some interpretation such as this: Paul believed that even if he was right about including the Gentiles in the Body of Christ without circumcising them, he would have failed in his mission -- it would have been all for nought -- if he had not been able to convince the original disciples of the historical Jesus and the eye-witnesses of His resurrection that his (Paul’s) Gospel was the Gospel of the Jesus they had known and followed. The new thing revealed to him had to be made recognizably consistent with the Old Testament and the Good News preached by Jesus, or else Paul’s effort would

---

2 Thus, for example, Luther: "This does not mean that Paul was in doubt about whether or not he had been, or was, running in vain. . . . This conference was to make it clear to everyone that his Gospel was not contrary in any way to the doctrine of the other apostles, so that in this way he could silence his opponents, who might otherwise be able to say that he was running, or had run, in vain." Lectures on Galatians, 1535 Chapters 1-4, Luther’s Works 26 (St. Louis: Concordia, 1963), 83.
have been for nought. Hence the urgency to be in true and evident fellowship with Peter and James . . . and to identify and isolate those who are "false brethren."

3 For the zealotic "freedom-fighters" who were undermining the truth of the Gospel are enemies of the true freedom given in the Gospel of Christ. They (not Paul) are the non-Christians, outside the fellowship of Jesus’ disciples.

Paul did not bow to pressures to circumcise Titus. And still he also shook the right hand of fellowship with those who, so far as worldly evidences can be applied, were the authoritative representatives of what Jesus Himself taught (οἱ δοκοῦντες στῶλοι, 2:9).

That trip sealed the unity and should have settled the problem. But it didn’t, as the Galatian controversy and the letter show. Paul’s understanding of the need for visiting, discussing, and giving evidence of fellowship, however, is clear.

A LETTER OF SELF-EXPLANATION

It is my contention that this same concern of Paul’s is the motivation for his writing the Epistle to the Romans. "Why did Paul write Romans?" is a perennial question. 4 Did Paul feel it was time to produce a compendium of theology, or was he defending a thesis before real opponents in Rome? With due apologies to Melanchthon, I propose the defend the latter view.

On the surface the question is easy to answer: Romans 1:8-13 and 15:23-33 make it clear. Paul means to come to Rome, preach there, impart something spiritual to them, be mutually strengthened, and be supported in his further missionary journeying so as to have some results among them also. Romans is written to prepare for his coming and to cultivate the congregations of Christians in Rome as a base of support for his further missionary travels, just as the church in Antioch has been for him in the East. It is, as Dr. Franzmann said, a letter of a westward-moving missionary. 5

Well and good. But why, then, did Paul write this letter, with this thesis and content from Rom. 1:16-17 to 15:22? Franzmann, noting the need for a full and complete understanding of the Gospel in order to attain that purpose,

3 Of course, Gal. 2:11-14 makes it clear that it is not fellowship with Peter-as-human-being that is important, but with Peter-as-confessing-apostle. The "truth of the Gospel" is the measure of apostolicity; a human holder of the apostolic office can behave in a hypocritical way (2:14) or might conceivably even preach contrary to the Gospel (1:8).


5 Romans, Concordia Commentary (St. Louis: Concordia, 1968), pp. 15-19.
also suggested that the strong antithesis to Judaism be accounted for by Paul’s personal experience, his experience as a missionary, and "possibly the situation in Rome also."\(^6\) If we sharpen those helpful observations, we might view Romans as strongly apologetic: to (especially Jewish-Christian) gainsayers Paul answers the questions raised by his missionary work and its results.

In his little *Grammatical Insights Into the New Testament*,\(^7\) Nigel Turner translates Rom. 1:15 as "Therefore I am anxious to tell you in Rome also my own point of view." He construes τὸ κατ'ἐμε as a noun, the object of εὐαγγελίσασθαι. That is plausible philologically; historically it is likely.

For among the scattered and various Christians in Rome were undoubtedly not only gentile Christians,\(^8\) but gatherings of Jewish Christians, including Andronicus and Junias, whom Paul notes to be "prominent persons among the apostles" and "in Christ before me" (Rom 16:7). Perhaps Hellenistic Jews or proselytes who had become Christians before, at, or soon after Pentecost, these individuals were known to be representatives and teachers, persons with a special relationship and link to Jesus and His teachings. If one assumes -- and it is not a difficult assumption to undertake -- that in Rome some such prominent persons and groups were looking askance at Paul’s gospel of the forgiveness of sins by grace through faith to Jew and Greek, arguing that the way Paul preached and did mission work made God out to be a liar in the Old Testament, then the thesis of this epistle (Rom. 1:16-17) and all the passionate Christian arguing from the Old Testament in every main section make perfect sense as a response.

This hypothesis of the historical circumstance which evoked the writing of Romans then would say: There are conservative (old guard) Jewish Christians in Rome who have objections to the Gospel as Paul preaches it. They include people with links to the Apostles and perhaps to Jesus Himself. Paul wants to gather the Christians in Rome together into a body in fellowship in the true Gospel so that he may continue his missionary work in the West. To do so, he must present his version of the Gospel and demonstrate that it does not make God out to be a liar but rather establishes the Old Testament Torah and demonstrates the righteousness of God. That is exactly


what his argument does, from 1:16 to (at least) the end of chapter 11 -- nor are the materials in chapters 12 to 15 unrelated.

Seen in this light, the writing of Romans stands as another illustration of Paul's concern to be a missionary in fellowship with the church. Instead of just launching into a new mission venture in and around Rome, the apostle writes to solidify fellowship in confession through theological and exegetical argumentation. His harvest among them is linked to their being reciprocally strengthened by each other’s faith. Persons who teach otherwise must be noted and avoided, for they are placing stumbling blocks, points of teaching contrary to the doctrine which had been learned, in the path of the Christian people (Rom. 16:17).

UNITY IN FELLOWSHIP AND THE PRAISE OF GOD

Finally, it is informative also to read another passage in this same light, a passage roughly contemporary with the Epistle to the Romans and pertaining to the collection project. In Rom. 15:25-33 Paul described his intention to come to Rome after he had delivered the collection gathered for the relief of the saints in Jerusalem. In II Cor. 9, he encouraged the Corinthians to complete their participation in this good work. In verses 9 to 15 of that chapter Paul gives a remarkable summary of his rationale for the whole project. It arises out of and also gives special expression to the fellowship in the faith that exists between Paul’s "congregations in the Gentiles’ lands" and the "mother church" in Jerusalem.

Commenting on Ps. 112:9, Paul says that God has sown the seed which has grown in the Corinthians into the produce of righteousness. He says that they have been caused to be rich, resulting in a heightened singleness of purpose and vision; from this arise thanksgiving and praise to God (v. 11). The reason for this, verse 12 explains parenthetically, is that their participation in this service project of the collection will not only relieve the needs of the Jerusalem saints but also will cause prayers and deeds of Thanksgiving to God to brim up and overflow from many other persons. Verse 13 says that these persons are praising God on account of the completion of this diaconal work because of "the submission of your confession to the Gospel of Christ and the single-mindedness of your fellowship in relationship to them and in relationship to all."

Two remarkable thoughts arise out of that phrase from verse 13. First, the unity, singleness of purpose, singlemindedness, or singleness of focus, of Christian persons in what they share with each other is a basis for other
people praising and thanking God. Secondly, the structure of the sentence clearly implies that this singleness of focus in the fellowship is parallel to submission to the confession. Unity in the fellowship is created by (Spirit-wrought) common obedience to the truth, a jointly-spoken "amen!" to what God has revealed from above. From faith, created by the power of God at work in the Gospel, arise obedience and confession; in having such things in common, Christian people have a unity which causes further glorification and thanksgiving to God.

So at the precise moment that Paul was looking toward Rome and patiently setting forth an exegetical demonstration of the unity of his Gospel with the Old Testament, he also had his eye on Jerusalem, whither he should travel to celebrate the unity of the common confession that he and his churches have with the Christians there. For, once again, it is the churches of Jerusalem and Judaea which are most closely associated with the disciples of the earthly Jesus and the first Pentecost preaching. In II Cor. 9 Paul again shows his desire to be a missionary in fellowship with the church. Moreover, he there also shows why that is so important to him and how it is to be accomplished.

CONCLUSION

St. Paul the missionary was also theologian, exegete, and churchman. This was necessary. Otherwise he would have been all alone out on a limb, preaching about a Jesus different from the Jesus spoken about by those who had known Him best. Paul initiated theological conversation, therefore, with critics and gainsayers within the early Christian church. He gave a Biblical and exegetical defense of his position. It was a convincing defense. Peter and the others acknowledged it. They shook hands on it. "Something new" was accepted and integrated into the tradition as consistent with the truth handed down.

Exegetical study, theological exposition, careful explanation -- not in any spirit of "checking on someone" or of conducting a witchhunt -- are sound procedures to follow in the church today as we continue to struggle with the issues of conserving the truth but adapting its communication to new contexts.

Foundational to the entire enterprise is our common submission, in faith and in worship, to the revealed truth of Scripture as expounded in the Lutheran Confessions. Confirmation and ordination vows provide a point of departure for both conservators and risk-takers to discuss their respective
callings for the sake of the effective communication of the received truth.

It is a pleasure and privilege, in closing, to direct the reader’s attention to the careful scholarship and the humble search for new and powerful means of communicating which characterize Dr. Howard Kramer, retired president of Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary, St. Catharines. With genuine respect and friendship these words are written also to honour his virtuous example.

*Jonathan F. Grothe is President and Professor of Exegetical Theology at Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary, St. Catharines, Ontario.*
"Is ‘Christian ethics’ possible?" has become a standard question discussed by almost all recent writers who profess to be Christian ethicists. The fact that they commonly write large volumes on ethics and employ the term "Christian ethics" with abandon in their literary endeavors makes it clear that invariably they answer the question in the affirmative.

It is furthermore true that "Christian Ethics" is a commonly offered course in institutions of higher learning affiliated with Christian denominations. The existence of such courses would seem to indicate that there is something or other which is to be identified as "Christian ethics," which is the object of study in such courses. However, as one observes what is studied in at least some courses of "Christian ethics," the question seems to arise anew: "Is ‘Christian ethics’ possible?"

While the existence of books and academic courses on "Christian ethics" indicates that for many people the question doesn’t even arise, and that most people assume that Christian ethics must be a completely legitimate intellectual discipline, the thesis of this essay is that the expression "Christian ethics" is a contradiction in terms, and consequently that "Christian ethics" is a conceptual confusion and an actual impossibility, at least for Lutheran theology.

To establish this thesis we need, first of all, to come to some common understanding of what we mean by "Christian," as well as what we mean by "ethics." When "Christian" is used as a noun we have little difficulty, I think, in agreeing upon what we mean by the term. It might be put in slightly varying ways, but we probably would agree that essentially a "Christian" is a person who trusts in Jesus Christ, the very Son of God, as one’s personal Lord and Savior from sin and eternal death. While we might readily agree upon this meaning of "Christian" it immediately entails that one can never, with absolute certainty, identify a particular individual as a Christian. For while such trust in Jesus Christ may be evidenced through external actions and lifestyle, it is always possible that these very actions and lifestyle are nothing more than hypocrisy and deception. And that leads to the difficulty of trying to establish a meaning for the term "Christian" when it is used as an adjective. The difficulty and questionableness become readily apparent when one speaks of, e.g., "a Christian university," "a Christian nation,"
"Christian Socialism," or "Christian Science."

The difficulty is no less acute when one speaks of "Christian ethics." In fact, the difficulty is compounded because there is no commonly agreed upon meaning of the term "ethics," even among ethicists. While this has led to widely differing views regarding just what constitutes "ethics," it is commonly acknowledged that there are basically three distinct ways in which the term is used. The first way is that in which "ethics" is understood as the study of what is good or right, or what one ought to do in order to do that which is good or right. This concept of ethics is commonly referred to as "normative ethics." This is the earliest and traditional meaning of "ethics." The second usage of the term is that in which "ethics" is understood to refer to the customs or modes of behaviour of a particular society or group of people, and so describes what certain groups hold to be the good or right way to live. This concept of ethics is commonly referred to as "descriptive ethics." This meaning of ethics is commonly employed in observational or statistical studies of sociologists, anthropologists, or psychologists.

The third usage of the term is that in which "ethics" is understood to be the study of the meaning or the logical status of moral language including such terms as "good," "right," and "ought." This concept of ethics has been emphasized in recent philosophical ethics and is more specifically referred to as "metaethics."

Now if one agrees with these basic clarifications of the meanings of "Christian" and "ethics," the first question which might be raised is: "Is it even logically possible to maintain a concept of 'Christian ethics'?" I would suggest such a concept is illogical whether ethics is understood in its metaethical, descriptive, or normative sense. Let me indicate why this is the case.

In the sense of metaethics, one can certainly analyze and clarify the meaning of value words in Christian theology, Christian sermons, or in the language of people who profess to be Christian. But such analysis may be done by anyone, whether that person is a Christian or not - there is no distinct Christian metaethics, and consequently, in this sense, no distinct "Christian ethics."

But can't one speak of this enterprise as "Christian ethics" because it is concerned uniquely with Christian value language? If this is how one understands "Christian ethics," one has slipped into the area of descriptive ethics; for what the enterprise now is concerned with is describing how professed Christians use value words and, as a result, how they conduct themselves. At first thought, this seems to be a viable way for one to speak
of "Christian ethics," namely as descriptive ethics. However, several difficulties immediately present themselves.

The first is that language and conduct do not make a Christian. There are hypocrites, on the one hand, and outwardly unsanctified Christians, on the other. Since what makes a person a Christian is the Holy Spirit through faith in Jesus Christ, and neither faith nor the Holy Spirit are observable, one cannot identify Christians with certainty. Consequently, one can never know whether the language or behaviour one is describing is the language and behaviour of actual Christians or not. This would seem to eliminate the possibility of Christian ethics as descriptive ethics.

One may, of course, attempt to avoid this difficulty by retorting that there are, however, certain external marks of the Christian Church which are empirically observable and that wherever the proclamation of the pure Word of God and the administration of Christ’s sacraments are found, there we can be sure that Christians are to be found. Consequently, by observing the behaviour of those who have the pure Gospel and sacraments in their midst, we can observe common behaviours and so can identify and describe Christian behaviour. One hardly needs to be logically skilled to recognize the fallacy of such argumentation.

This leads to the next difficulty in attempting to establish Christian ethics as descriptive ethics, and that is that those engaged in descriptive Christian ethics are not describing observed Christian behaviour, but rather behaviour which they identify as Christian. This, in turn, is soon maintained as the norm for any given behaviour to be classified as Christian. This, of course, is tautologous. But it does introduce the idea of normative behaviour, and consequently normative ethics. And that brings us to what writers on Christian ethics invariably maintain, namely that Christian ethics is essentially normative ethics, not simply descriptive ethics or metaethics. Even Werner Elert who, among writers on Christian ethics, is perhaps the most faithful to Lutheran theology in his *The Christian Ethos* asserts at the outset, "Ethics, the science of the ethos, is . . . normative"\(^1\).

As normative, the domain of ethics is that of duty and obligation. It is concerned with the distinction between right and wrong, between justice and injustice, between good and bad, between responsibility and irresponsibility. It attempts to delineate how a person ought to act, or what a person ought to do in order to do what is right, just, good, and responsible; all of which aims at producing the "good" person. Now if normative ethics is concerned with

---

what one ought to do in order to do that which is good, it isn’t difficult to see that normative ethics is a discipline of law and principle. And so if ethics is put in a theological context it is an enterprise of the Law. Thus theological ethics, logically, may be understood as a legitimate enterprise, but the same thing cannot be said for Christian ethics. This is because being a Christian is not primarily a matter of Law, while it is essentially a matter of Gospel. So to maintain any kind of Christian ethics invariably becomes a confusion of Law and Gospel. This, incidentally, helps to explain why Reformed ethicists and Roman Catholic moral philosophers are among the foremost and most frequent writers on "Christian ethics."

The typical way in which Law and Gospel begin to be confused may be detected in Paul Lehmann’s attempt to justify "Christian ethics" as a legitimate theological discipline. He proposes:

Christian ethics, as a theological discipline, is the reflection upon the question, and its answer. What am I, as a believer in Jesus Christ and as a member of his church, to do? To undertake the reflection upon and analysis of this question and its answer - this is Christian ethics.²

And what is the Christian to do? Lehmann’s answer is, essentially, "The will of God." Now the will of God which expresses what an individual is to do is Law, and so again it makes "Christian ethics" a discipline of the Law. The Christian who is such purely through the Gospel is once again put back under the Law as the criterion of his Christianity. It is unfortunate that Christian ethicists who acknowledge that Christ has freed the Christian from the bondage of the Law fail to see that it is equally true that Christ frees the Christian from bondage to "ethics," even when it is labeled "Christian ethics."

But ought not the Christian obey God’s Law? Doesn’t Scripture itself contain many imperatives asserting what the child of God should do and not do? Of course it does, but to properly understand these Scriptural imperatives for the Christian, one must clearly understand the function of the Law. When one clearly understands this, then it will also be clear what the relationship of ethics is to the Christian, and that it is a mutually exclusive relationship.

God’s Law in Lutheran theology has a threefold function although some of our dogmaticians distinguish a fourth. This fourth, however, is simply a distinction within the second function, and that is how I will treat it here.

The first two are the functions of the Law with respect to unregenerate persons, the third is its function with respect to the regenerate or to Christians. The first is what Luther and our orthodox theologians designated as the political or civil function of the Law. By this they understood the Law as it serves to preserve social order and common decency in human societies. The familiar threefold use of the Law as a curb, mirror, and rule may be seen as applicable to this political function. As a curb, it keeps gross sins in check to some degree among unregenerate people as it discloses the moral boundaries of human societies. As a mirror, it reveals to all the unregenerate the moral failures and injustices of human social life. As a rule, it proposes laws and standards according to which human societies should structure their personal and institutional relationships.

The effect of the civil use of the Law is varied. On the one hand, it may produce rebellion against law which may then produce attempts to maintain social anarchy; or, on the other hand, it may produce submission to law which then produces attempts to establish some form of social ethics. Here, incidentally, one might note that ethics has its logically legitimate (no pun intended) place, as an enterprise of the political function of the Law.

The second function of the Law is what our orthodox theologians speak of as the pedagogical or elenchical function. Some of the theologians make these two separate, distinct functions of the Law. In general, this second function of the Law is its accusatory function condemning unregenerate persons as lawless, transgressors of law, or in theological terms - sinners. When the elenchical and pedagogical uses are distinguished, the distinction is made on the basis of the different types of persons with respect to whom the Law is seen as functioning. The elenchical function is understood specifically with respect to morally concerned unregenerate individuals. To these persons, too, the threefold use of the Law as curb, mirror, and rule is applicable. As a curb, it again keeps gross sins in check as it discloses the moral boundaries of human behaviour. As a mirror, it reveals to the morally concerned individual the moral failure and lapses in the individual’s life. As a rule, it establishes rules and standards of personal moral conduct.

The effect of the elenchical function of the Law is also varied. It may produce a kind of moral contrition which laments the moral failures and vices of one’s personal conduct. The highly morally sensitive individual may even be driven to moral despair through such contrition. On the other hand, this function of the Law may cause an individual to determine to lead a better life, and so the individual may establish an ethical code according to which he determines to live. This in turn may produce further moral frustration, or
if the individual succeeds in morally improving his life, it may lead to a self-righteous pride in his virtuous character. Here again note that ethics enters in as a logically legitimate product of the elenchtical function of the Law.

The pedagogical function of the Law is understood specifically with respect to unregenerate individuals whom the Holy Spirit is bringing to the point of conversion or subjective justification. Here again the threefold use of curb, mirror, and rule is applicable. As in the elenchtical function, the Law again serves to disclose the moral boundaries of human behaviour. Likewise, as a mirror, it reveals the individual's moral failures; and as a rule, it establishes rules and standards of personal moral conduct.

The principal difference between the elenchtical and pedagogical functions of the Law is found in their effect. While the elenchtical function may produce either frustration, despair, or self-righteousness, the pedagogical function leads the individual to recognize the vanity of his own efforts to rid his life of sin or moral evil and demonstrates to the individual his helplessness in living perfectly according to the Law. But most importantly it emphasizes for the individual the absolute necessity for help beyond himself if he is to escape the wrath of God's judgment for failure to live according to His Law. In so far as such individuals attempt to live according to the Law, they too attempt to live according to a moral code which will justify them before God. And so here again ethics surfaces as a logically legitimate product of the pedagogical use of the Law.

Thus ethics can play a logically legitimate role with respect to the Law and the unregenerate; however, as soon as the focus shifts to the Law and the regenerate person, ethics ceases to be a valid enterprise.

The function of the Law with respect to the regenerate, or the third function of the Law, our theologians labeled the didactic or normative function. In this function the Law reveals what God's Will is with respect to the actions of human beings. But what changes the whole situation with respect to the Christian, or the regenerate child of God, is that, on the one hand, the Christian still needs the Law in its didactic role because he remains a sinner, and yet, on the other hand, the Christian is a saint before God in Christ. In Christ the saint is free from the Law and all its demands for obedience, threats of punishment, and promises of reward, and so ethics becomes a dead enterprise.

The Law in its didactic function still operates as a curb, mirror, and rule in the life of the Christian, however. This is because the Christian is both old man and new man. It is with respect to the old man that the Law continues
to function as a curb and a mirror, checking the coarse outbursts of sin which the old man still desires, and revealing all of the actions of the old man as sin before God. This leads to godly contrition and repentance, and an ever renewed recognition of the need for a Savior and God’s forgiveness. This didactic function of the Law serves as a rule for both old and new man. As it teaches the old man what God’s Will is, the old man would like to turn it into a system of ethics through which, as he lived according to it, he could gain some kind of feeling of worthiness before God. But as often as he attempts to construct a system of ethics, the new man rejects it; for although the Law also portrays for the new man what the Will of God is, the new man does not see it as the way to achieve goodness or worthiness before God, but rather as revealing the way in which the Christian can, out of love for Him Who has freed him from the Law, joyfully live as the new creature God has made him, in harmony with God’s Will in the Law. This latter is not "ethical" living, but "religious" living. (To understand this distinction one might study Kierkegaard’s *Stages on Life’s Way*, and his distinction between the ethical and religious stages.) Or to put it in familiar terms of Lutheran theology, the Christian life is not a life of ethics but a life of sanctification lived in the fear and love of God, in faith in Christ, through the power of the Holy Spirit.

What this analysis of the functions of the Law should make clear is that ethics is a product of the function of the Law among the unregenerate; it can never operate to produce a system of ethics for the Christian without rendering the Christian unregenerate. Certainly the Christian may do things which are in complete compliance with the Law, but if they are truly Christian acts they are not works of the Law, but actions which manifest the fruits of the Spirit. They are not ethical acts, but religious acts done in faith in Christ.

Thus the conclusion of Lutheran theology must be that "Christian ethics" is impossible.

*E. Edward Hackmann is Professor of Systematic Theology at Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary, St. Catharines, Ontario*

---

JAMES 2 AND THE BACKGROUND TO GALATIANS:

AN HYPOTHESIS

Roger J. Humann

The purpose of this brief study is to present the evidence and explore the possibility which suggest that a relationship exists between the contents of James 2 and Galatians, namely: the Judaizers drew upon James 2 as part of their argumentation in unsettling the congregations founded by Paul in Galatia, and that this fact dictated to a large extent the terminology and approach which Paul used in responding to the situation.¹ This study will simply isolate what appear to be pertinent data from the New Testament text itself and offer an interpretation. There are four sections: 1) a brief analysis of James 2; 2) the significance of James of Jerusalem in the Epistle to the Galatians; 3) the terminological correspondence between James 2 and Galatians; and, 4) conclusions and amplifications of the hypothesis.

I.

James 2 is a rather clearly defined unit within the larger epistle and although its content is related to what immediately precedes, the address, ἀδελφοί μου,² begins what looks very much like a brief homily on a specific

---

¹ John A. T. Robinson discusses the battle Paul wages in Galatians and Romans as the issue relates to James of Jerusalem and the Epistle of James. The position he espouses, but without offering any specific evidence, is congenial to the hypothesis argued here, in particular if one sees Romans as an expansion of Paul's original argument in Galatians. In discussing the priority of the works he comments: "As a reply to Paul's position James' argument totally misses the point; for Paul never contended for faith without works. But as a reply, not indeed to James, but to the use made of him by the Judaizers in a subtly different context (that of the basis of salvation for Gentiles), the argument of Rom. 4 is very effective." Redating the New Testament (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1976), pp. 127-8.

² It is beyond the scope of this paper to investigate whether the Judaizers had simply misread James or to what extent they may have deliberately misused him. Nor is it necessary to demonstrate the ultimate theological compatibility between the Apostle to the Gentiles and his Jerusalem compatriot. Finally, the hypothesis presented here is not meant to suggest that James 2 is the source of the Galatian problem, but only that it is part of the arsenal that the Judaizers drew upon in their attack on Pauline Christianity.

² Not too much significance should be attached to these words of address. Although they do introduce a new topic at this point, they also occur at other locations in the epistle (e.g. 1:2, 16, 19, etc.). They do reinforce, however, the basically exhortatory/homiletic nature of the epistle.
application of the Christian faith. The opening exhortation focuses on the issue to be addressed: show no partiality as you hold the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory (v.1). The homily concludes with an appropriate summarizing theological statement: so faith apart from works is dead (v. 26). In between is the homily on faith and works which falls into two sections.

The first part deals with the fact that partiality is not to be practiced. A negative example from the life of the worshipping community is presented (vv. 2-4) followed by argumentation which relates the experience of the hearers to the way in which God deals with the poor (vv. 5-7). Partiality is then viewed in the light of the 'royal law' and shown to be a sin which incurs God’s judgement (vv. 8-13).

James then deals very practically with the basic theological issue, namely the relationship of works to the Christian faith, and concludes that "faith by itself, if it has no works, is dead" (vv. 14-17). This truth is now demonstrated on the basis of Scripture. Faith which is only assent to a true theological statement is inadequate (vv. 18-20). The concrete Scriptural example is Abraham. His offering of Isaac was a work subsequent to the fact that he "believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness" (vv. 18-24). The further example of Rahab brings the homily to its concluding statement (vv. 25-26).

Chapter 2 stands out as a distinct unit within the Epistle of James. There is a significant linguistic factor which reinforces the conceptual unity of the chapter. The term ἐργον occurs 14 times in James, 12 of them in chapter 2. Likewise πιστις occurs 16 times in the epistle as a whole, but 13 of these occurrences are in chapter 2.

---

3 The following outline of the 'homily' is offered by Peter H. Davids, *The Epistle of James*, in the *New International Greek Testament Commentary* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1982), p. 27:

"The Excellence of Poverty and Generosity"

1. No partiality is allowable 2:1-13
   a. Illustration: judicial assembly 2:1-4
   b. Rational argument 2:5-7
   c. Biblical argument 2:8-12
   d. Call to obedience (translation) 2:13

2. Generosity is necessary 2:14-26
   a. Illustration: poor Christian 2:14-17
   b. Rational argument 2:18-20
   c. Biblical argument (two parts): Abraham, Rahab 2:21-26
The point of demonstrating the basic literary unity of James 2 is that the significant verbal correspondence with Galatians is not with James as a whole but primarily with chapter 2. This raises the distinct possibility that James 2 circulated as an independent homily or tract of James of Jerusalem prior to its later incorporation by him in his epistle. It should be noted that the hypothesis set forth in this study is in no way dependent upon the separate circulation of James 2; the Judaizers were perfectly capable of making selective use of a section within the whole. On the other hand, the possibility of the initial independent circulation of James 2 means that one need not accept an early date for James or a later date for Galatians to account for a relationship between Galatians and James 2.

II.

This study is proceeding on the assumption that the author of the Epistle of James is the person identified elsewhere as the brother of the Lord and leader in the Jerusalem church. Furthermore, he exercised considerable influence in the wider circle of Palestinian Christianity. Paul, in all his writings, makes reference to this James four times. Once is in I Cor. 15:7, where Paul is referring to an established credal statement of the early church which included the reference to a special appearance of the risen Christ to James. The other three occurrences are all in Galatians. Obviously, therefore, James is of some significance with respect to the subject matter addressed by Paul in Galatians.

In 1:19 Paul indicates that on his trip to Jerusalem three years after his conversion, when he spent 15 days with Cephas, ἔτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ γὰρ ἔδωκεν ἐν μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου. This phrase emphasizes the stature and authority of James. He is identified as the Lord’s brother and the ἐν μὴ, taken in its most natural sense, indicates that Paul did not hesitate to accord him the title ἀπόστολος.

4 Davids suggests that James is a two-stage work: an initial series of sermons and sayings and a later redaction of these units into an epistle either by James or a member of the church. He points to features of a Jewish synagogue homily and the rhetorical structure of some of the discourses. James, p. 22.


6 That this term was not restricted to 'The Twelve' is evident also from Acts 14:14 where ἀπόστολοι applies to both Barnabas and Paul. See also F. F. Bruce, Commentary on Galatians, in The New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), p. 100f.
The second instance is in 2:9: καὶ γνώντες τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθείσαν μοι, Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς καὶ Ἰωάννης, δι δοκοῦντες στολοί εἶναι, δεξιοῦς ἐξωκεν ἐμοὶ καὶ βαρναβᾶς κοινωνίας. We note that James is linked with two of 'The Twelve' and in such a way that he is given priority of place. The three are termed 'pillars' and conjointly validate the ministry of Paul and Barnabas εἰς τὸ ἔθνη (which, we assume, also included the Galatians.)

The final mention of James is the more indirect reference in 2:12: πινακίδα ἵνα Ἰακόβου. Paul identifies a group of individuals who presumably demonstrated certain tendencies or viewpoints not unlike those of the people troubling the Galatian congregations. What is significant is that Paul reports that he openly reprimanded Cephas who was influenced by these people but there is no mention of any direct attack upon the party ἵνα Ἰακόβου. Paul has indeed distanced himself from their viewpoint but he has not gone on record as specifically opposing the person of James.8

III.

Following are the significant verbal parallels between James 2 and Galatians. Correspondences individually may not always be impressive. In some cases the correspondence is obviously fortuitous; in other cases not so. Cumulatively, however, one derives the clear impression that there is a definite relationship which is more than coincidence. Examples which are considered to be of particular significance are noted (!).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAMES</th>
<th>GALATIANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2:1, 5, 14)</td>
<td>(1:11; 3:15; 4:12, 28, 31; 5:11, 13; 6:1, 18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Αδελφοί as a form of address to the hearers/readers occurs at various places in James in addition to those of chapter 2. Its significance to our present discussion is probably minimal.

---

7 As Bruce notes, of δοκοῦντες (2:2, 6, 9) "carries no insinuation of sarcasm or irony, as though they only seemed to be leaders but were not really so." Galatians, p. 109. Two studies which deal with the term στολοί are: Roger D. Aus, "Three Pillars and Three Patriarchs: A Proposal Concerning Gal. 2:9," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 70 (1979): 252-61; and C. K. Barrett, "Paul and the 'Pillar Apostles'," in Studia Patavina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan (Haarlem, 1953): 1-19.

8 Thus Robinson states: "In Galatians Paul distinguishes the attitude of James himself (2:9) from that of 'certain persons . . . from James' (2:12)." Redating, p. 131.
The concept of non-partiality occurs at various points in Paul’s writings and in each instance it has to do with a quality of God as He deals with people. In James it has to do with Christians in their relationship with one another.

3. \(\pi\tau\circ\chi^{\circ}\)  

(2:2, 3, 5, 6) (2:10; 4:9)

The only occurrences of this term in James are in chapter 2. Here we have the primary practical concern of James in his homily where he speaks to the way in which the brothers treat the person who is poor. It is a test of the vitality of their faith. The first usage of Paul in Galatians is where he reports the concern and request of James: \(\mu\circ\nu \tau\nu\nu \pi\tau\omega\chi\sigma\nu \iota\nu\alpha \mu\nu\gamma\mu\nu\varepsilon\nu\omega\mu\varepsilon\nu\). This is certainly in keeping with the character of James who concerns himself with the poor in his homily. Paul uses the term the second time in a different context to describe the \(\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\chi\epsilon\iota\alpha\).
Both James and Paul are here quoting directly from Lev. 19:18, but perhaps in response to Jesus Who called this injunction the second (δεύτερα) great commandment (Mt. 22:39; Mk. 12:31).  

James’ designation of the law as βασιλικός may reflect the teaching of Jesus Who speaks of this commandment in relation to the Kingdom of God (Mk. 12:34). What is unique to both James and Paul, and is absent from the Synoptic context, is the idea of ‘fulfilment’ (τελέω and πληρῶ can be used in a similar sense). Both also seem to be directing the citation to hearers/readers who are somewhat inclined toward an antinomian attitude with respect to the Christian life.

James here refers to that aspect of the law which ought to determine relationships with one another and emphasizes the ultimate unity of the law. He has the final judgement in view and encourages his hearers/readers to live as those "who are to be judged under the law of liberty" (v. 12; see also below).

Paul also, in this context, views the law as a norm for relationships between Christians. The freedom which believers have (v. 13; see also below) is not to be an occasion for self-indulgence, but rather an opportunity to serve one another through love.

7. παραβάτης

(2:9, 11) (2:18)

This term occurs five times in the New Testament, the three times noted above and twice in Romans (2:25, 27). In James it is used to denote a ‘transgressor’ of certain provisions of the law. The Galatians usage is more general.

8.(!)

(2:10) (5:3)

---

9 It is important to note that Paul again quotes Lev. 19:18 in Rom. 13:9 and in connection with it he enumerates several of the commandments in a manner very reminiscent of James 2.

It is also significant that in his use of Lev. 19:18 (reflecting the usage of Jesus) James is probably dependent upon the material contained in the Synoptic tradition, particularly in Matt. This conclusion is reinforced by noting that the phrase ὃλον τὸν νόμον is used by Jesus in the same context as His citation of Lev. 19:18 (Matt. 22:40) and then reappears in James 2:10 also in connection with the citation of Lev. 19:18. We next find the phrase (ὅλον τὸν νόμον) in Galatians near the Lev. citation but in a somewhat different context (5:3). These are the only occurrences of the phrase in the NT. One explanation is that in Galatians and then later in Romans Paul drew upon the teaching of Jesus which had come to him by way of James.

10 It also occurs in D at Luke 6:4, 5, but this is obviously an interpolation.
This key phrase occurs only here in James and only here in all of Paul’s writings. Its significance has been discussed above (n.9).

9.(!)  ἐλευθερία

(2:12) (2:4; 5:1, 13, 13)

This important term occurs twice in James, once in chapter 2 and also in 1:25. In both instances it is in the genitive and is used to qualify νόμος. 11 Paul introduces the concept by speaking of freedom as that which ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ ήσου. Then in chapter 5 he uses the verb to describe Christ’s work with respect to the believer: Christ has set you free (v.1). Ἐλευθερία is consequently the state in which the believer finds himself as a result of Christ’s work; it is that which he is to maintain and to which he has been called. At the same time Paul warns against turning this freedom into some sort of libertinism.

The significance of Paul’s use of Ἐλευθερία perhaps becomes clearer when contrasted with phrases such as the following:

πον νόμον ἐφρονοῦμεθα (3:23);
υπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἡμεθα δεδουλωμένοι (4:3);
ἐδουλεύσατε τοις φύσει μὴ συσίν θεοῖς (4:8); and
νῦν ἱερουσαλήμ δουλεύει γὰρ μετὰ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς (4:25).

Passages which further elucidate the concept of freedom include: 4:23, 26, 30, 31. It should be noted that freedom is also connected to ‘promise’ (4:23ff).

10. σὺ πιστεύεις ὅτι εἶς ἐστιν ἐστιν ὅ θεος εἰς ἔτεος

(2:19) (3:20)

James cites this fundamental Jewish credal affirmation to demonstrate that believing, in the sense of assenting to a true formulation, is no guarantee of the genuineness of faith. Paul’s use of the statement is basically to advance

---

11 The expression ‘law of liberty’ in James is admittedly an interpretive problem. Davids suggests that it refers to “nothing less than the law of Moses as interpreted (and to some extent altered) by Jesus and the early church, which took its cues from Jesus,” James, p. 118; see also p. 99f. Bo Reicke equates the ‘law of liberty’ with “the law of love. Confronted with the law in this form the believers, as is evident from vs. 13, will have a judgment that is both sterner and milder than under the law of Moses.” The Epistle of James, Peter and Jude, in the Anchor Bible (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1964), p. 30. On the other hand, David Scarr is probably correct when he states that ‘James’ ‘Law of Liberty’ is the Gospel and not the Law as condemnation and punishment.” He suggests that the James phrase might be paraphrased: “The law which has now been perfected by Christ’s atonement releases Christians from the fear of condemnation by it in their fulfilling it.” He also points to the similarity of James’ concept of ‘Law of Liberty’ with what Paul writes in Rom. 8:2. James the Apostle of Faith (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1983), p. 67.
his argument of the oneness of both Jew and Gentile in Christ; such unity is in keeping with the nature of God Himself.

11. Ἄβρααμ ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν
(2:21) ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν (3:7; see also: 3:14, 29)

In leading into the key quotations from Genesis, James identified Abraham as ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν thereby linking the patriarch in a special way to himself and his hearers/readers. The figure of Abraham looms large in Paul’s letter to the Galatians. It is ἐκ πίστεως or by belonging to Christ (Χριστοῦ) that also Gentiles are Abraham’s sons and seed (τοῦ Ἀβραάμ σπέρματος) and thereby heirs κατ’ ἐπαγγελίαν.

12. (!) ἐπίστευσεν (δὲ-Js.) τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην.
(2:23) (3:6)

The citation of Gen. 15:6 is central to the argumentation of both James and Paul. Each makes his point in combination with other Old Testament references. James cites Gen. 15.6 as referring to Abraham’s faith, but this is to be understood in the light of Abraham’s subsequent offering of Isaac. The point is: ὅτι ἡ πίστις συνήργη τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἡ πίστις ἔτελεσθή.

Paul likewise points to Gen. 15.6 as the key statement regarding Abraham’s faith. He goes on to interpret it, however, in the light of the promise made to Abraham that in him all the nations (ἐκ ἡθνῶν) would be blessed. Paul’s conclusion is: ὅτι οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ; and, οἱ ἐκ πίστεως εὑλογοῦνται σὺν τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραάμ.

13. (!)

As indicated earlier, the term ἔργον occurs no fewer than 12 times in James 2,13 frequently in phrases such as ἐκ τῶν ἔργων (vv. 18, 22), ἐξ ἔργων (vv. 21, 24, 25), or ἄριστος τῶν ἔργων (vv. 18, 20, 26). πίστις occurs 13 times14 and is also found in phrases such as ἐν πίστει (v. 5), ἐχειν πίστιν (vv. 14, 18), and οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως μόνον (v.24).

12 That Gen. 15:6 and the person of Abraham held a prominent place in Judaism is well known. For the rabbis, Abraham’s faith was the supreme good work for which God rewarded him. In good rabbinic fashion both James and Paul interpret Gen. 15:6 in the light of other OT texts; however, neither understands the verse in the traditional sense. Neither James nor Paul treats the faith spoken of as a good work. Paul undertakes a fuller exegetical treatment of the text in Rom. 4 where he brings it into conjunction with Ps. 32:1.

13 2:14, 17, 18, 18, 18, 20, 21, 22, 22, 24, 25, 26.

14 2:1, 5, 14, 17, 18, 18, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26; see also πιστεύω: 2:19, 23.
These are also key terms in Galatians. ¹⁵ ἐξ ἐργῶν νόμου is a standard phrase (2:16, 16; 3:2, 5, 10) often in contrast with ἐκ πίστεως (2:16; 3:9, 11, 12, 14) or διὰ (τῆς) πίστεως (2:16; 3:14, 26). In both documents the two terms are contrasted sharply with one another, and in particular as they are brought into relationship with δικαίωμα. The following quotations summarize the respective positions:

εξ ἐργῶν ἐδικαίωθη
(2:24)

ἐκ πίστεως δικαίωθημεν
(3:24)

dιὰ εξ ἐργῶν δικαιοῦται
ἐνθώπος καὶ οὐκ ἐκ
πίστεως μόνον
(2:21)

ἐνα δικαιωθημεν ἐκ
πίστεως χριστοῦ καὶ οὐκ
εξ ἐργῶν νόμου
(2:16)

IV.

A. The Judaizers and James: Hypothetical Reconstructions

We can picture the following situation in the Galatian congregations immediately prior to the influence of Paul’s opponents. ¹⁶ The people were recent converts, some of whom perhaps came into the church by way of Judaism, but the majority of whom were Gentiles. They had been brought to faith through the evangelizing activity of Paul and Barnabas. ¹⁷ When the apostle moved on they were left with the teaching and oral instruction he had given them, the Greek Old Testament (which to many was no doubt still a relatively unfamiliar authority), and the rudiments of a church organization.

And they were left with the liberating effect of the Holy Spirit which they experienced when they first came to faith! They were free from the oppression of sin, guilt, and death; free from all the onerous prescriptions and restrictions imposed by their previous religious allegiances, whether Jewish or otherwise. But they were also left to live out this faith and experience in this ‘present evil age’ (Gal. 1:4) surrounded by a variety of religious and moral options. Thus when the dizzying effects of such freedom

---


¹⁶ This reconstruction recognizes the ‘South Galatian’ theory as to the location of these congregations as correct. This dates the events shortly after Paul’s first missionary journey and before the council in Jerusalem (Acts 15).

began to wear off, a vacuum of sorts existed for these novices in the faith which was ripe for a ‘corrective’. ¹⁸

We have no way of ascertaining why the Judaizers began to work in the Galatian congregations. There are various theories as to motive which need not concern us here. ¹⁹ That they were Jewish Christians seems almost certain -- therefore coming from Jerusalem, or at least from Jewish Christian communities which would have roots in and close ties to Jerusalem. They brought a messianic faith combined with a Jewish observance of the law. These emissaries did not come to deny the reality or validity of the faith and experience of the Galatian Christians, but to confirm it and to offer the necessary corrective and stability which the present situation called for. The Judaizers offered ‘roots’ and a tried and true way of life to these fledgling believers. They offered the inheritance of the promised blessings to Abraham along with the necessity of the rite of circumcision which marked full incorporation into the ancient people of God.

But with what authority, apart from their use of the Old Testament, the weight of logic, and the art of persuasion, could they urge their corrective? The Galatian congregations, after all, were founded by the Apostle Paul and had been built upon and instructed in an apostolic word. If the apostleship of Paul is to be connected or supplemented, what is suggested as the standard? James of Jerusalem! He was the very brother of the Lord and one of the ‘pillars’ of the mother church. Furthermore, the Judaizers could point to an apostolic document, a homily of James, to bolster their case. Their approach may have been somewhat as follows:

Brothers, see, here is how James helps us to understand these vital matters.

Faith does not exist in a vacuum. It is not good enough just to

¹⁸ Gerhard Ebeling writes: ‘The real reason for their instability must be connected with the liberating effect of the Spirit they had experienced when they first became Christians . . . Not in the sense that enthusiasm waned and freedom gave way once more to the pressures of daily life, as though the motive were inward exhaustion. This would have made reversion to paganism more likely. On the other hand, the Judaizers can hardly have precipitated a crisis not already in the making. Thus it is reasonable to suppose that the Galatians had been dazzled by their enthusiastic freedom, so that the transports of their religious experience left them finally without religious anchor. The Judaizing message rushed in to fill this vacuum.

‘It could be depicted as a necessary corrective to the first phase of their life as Christians, not diminishing their spirituality but enhancing and confirming it . . . The Judaizers offered concrete guarantees and criteria for salvation. And it made more sense to consider Jesus the Christ—although he had been crucified—than, as Paul so offensively taught, because he had been crucified.” The Truth of the Gospel: An Exposition of Galatians, trans. by David Green (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), p. 54.

confess the right words. (Even the devils can say: "God is one.") To have value, faith must do the things that God requires. That is the way it was with our father Abraham.

This is why the law is so important. James even calls it "the royal law" and he learned that from his Brother, Jesus. Now, there are two things we need to remember about the law. First, it offers that structure which is the way to freedom. Keeping the law brings real freedom. Why else would James call it "the law of freedom"?

Secondly, you have to keep the whole law. Our Lord Jesus Christ has taught us that. You cannot pick and choose among the law’s requirements. If you break one, you are guilty of the whole. God does not want us to show partiality in dealing with one another and therefore we can be assured that He will show none in dealing with us.

Now, can you not see why circumcision is so important? It is part of what the law requires. Circumcision is the way you can genuinely demonstrate that you have faith and become a true child of Abraham. In this way you show that you love God and become an heir of the kingdom He has promised.

B. Paul’s Response

The letter to the Galatians is Paul’s response to this situation and in it he does two things. First, he refuses to permit a wedge to be driven between himself and James. James is portrayed in a favourable light. James is, after all, an apostle and brother of the Lord. In a sense, James himself had validated and confirmed Paul’s ministry when he, along with Cephas and John, gave Paul the right hand of fellowship. It was Paul’s subsequent going to the Gentiles which resulted in the Galatian congregations. And James, who had prepared such a beautiful little homily about caring for the poor, this James had personally shared this same concern with Paul, and Paul responded affirmatively. No, the problem did not lie with James, although on at least one occasion in the past some who claimed association with him had managed to mislead even Peter. Therefore to claim association with James does not confer automatically the authority of James or make one’s actions above rebuke.
The second thing that Paul does is to take the terminology away from the Judaizers. He reinterprets it and uses it in his own way and to suit his own purposes. The following examples illustrate how Paul has done this:

i) Circumcision is indeed part of 'the whole law' -- but it is more than that. Circumcision obligates you to keep the whole law.

ii) The law does not go with freedom but with works; it goes with performance and with the fact that failure to perform up to God's expectations brings a curse. It is from this curse that Christ has redeemed us by hanging on a tree.

iii) The chief function of the law, therefore, is to bring us to Christ. The law, in this sense, has nothing to do with freedom; it has to do with bondage. But Christ makes us free.

iv) Now we know how to understand what it means that Abraham believed God; we understand it in the light of the promise of Christ. It is faith in Christ which makes us (both Jews and Gentiles) the free children of Abraham and heirs of God.

v) True, those without a vital faith may confess: "God is one"; but this does not invalidate the truth of the confession and the fact that the consequence of the unity of God is the oneness of both Jew and Gentile in Christ through faith.

vi) This freedom does not mean we can do whatever we please. The requirement to love our neighbour still stands, but now the motive and power come from the Spirit.

vii) This is the whole of the matter, then, with respect to faith and works: A person is declared just by God on the basis of faith in Jesus Christ and not on the basis of works of law.

The preceding is an hypothesis, nothing more. Nor is it by any means an exhaustive study of the proposal. Further study and exploration could prove fruitful at almost every point. Yet far more elaborate theories have commended themselves on the basis of far less data. It is plausible; it grows out of observable data; it does not do violence to the New Testament text as

20 Not unrelated to this hypothesis and perhaps suggesting further amplification of it is the comment of C.K. Barrett re: Gal. 4:21-31: "It can here by argued with some probability that Paul is here using Jewish methods of exegesis to counter the use made by his Judaizing opponents of biblical passages which they, not he, had selected. From this it is possible to work back through ch. 4 and ch. 3, noting at point after point that Paul is not using the OT freely but is putting right the interpretations of quotations that had been used to build up the Judaizers' case." "Galatians as an 'Apologetic Letter'" [a review of Dieter Betz, Galatians], Interpretation, Vol. 34, No. 4 (October 1980), p. 417.
we have it. And it does suggest one more factor which may help us answer the questions as to why the Galatian Christians were moved so quickly to desert the Gospel Paul had preached to them and why the apostle responded in the way he did.

Roger J. Humann is Associate Professor of Exegetical Theology at Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary, St. Catharines, Ontario.
THE LUTHERAN CHURCH-CANADA
SUBMISSION TO THE ROYAL COMMISSION
ON NEW REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGIES

Milton L. Rudnick and Dennis A. Kendel

We of the Lutheran Church-Canada approach New Reproductive Technologies from a clear, strong pro-life commitment. At our founding convention in June, 1988, without a dissenting vote or voice, we passed a resolution calling for protection of the unborn from the time of conception. We have not wavered from that commitment.

Our approach in this submission is to comment as briefly as possible on many of the particulars in the mandate to the Commission.

(a) Implications of new reproductive technologies for women’s reproductive health and well being:

We support measures to protect and improve the reproductive health and well-being of women. However, we believe that the understanding of reproductive health and well-being in this discussion is often narrowly restricted to one perspective, namely, that of radical feminists. Fairness and completeness require that these values be defined in such a way as to incorporate the views of the many traditional women in our society.

(b) The causes, treatment, and prevention of male and female infertility:

We support appropriate procedures to prevent and treat infertility. This is the primary purpose of much reproductive research and experimentation. To be pro-life, as we are, is to be favourably disposed toward responsible human reproduction. Certain aspects of the new reproductive technologies and certain applications are, in our view, not in the best interests of individuals and society. However, their basic purpose is. Our government is well-advised to encourage married couples to have children and to assist them in doing so both medically and financially. We are an underpopulated country with a declining birthrate. Our situation will be improved by the births of additional children who are the result of assisted reproduction.

(c) Reversals of sterilization procedures, artificial insemination, in vitro fertilization, embryo transfers, prenatal screening and diagnostic techniques, genetic manipulation and therapeutic
intervention to correct genetic anomalies, sex selection techniques, embryo experimentation, and fetal transplants:

We argue emphatically that attempts to assist reproduction be restricted to married couples in stable relationships. Virtually all authorities agree that this is the best environment for child care and development. Why should our medical resources be invested in assisting reproduction for those who are in less than ideal situations? The welfare of individual children as well as that of society itself is jeopardized by extra-marital reproduction.

Prenatal screening and therapy are valid and valuable, if and when they are performed with the intent to help that particular fetus in the womb. Frequently these problems are related to decisions about abortion, which we abhor. However, they may also provide opportunities for fetal therapy, which we support.

Sex selection techniques should be prohibited because they are sexist and dehumanizing. Most often they are used in the interest of producing a male child. This reflects and may foster a demeaning and destructive attitude toward females, which must not be permitted to flourish in our society. Furthermore, if widely practiced, sex selection could lead to a serious imbalance of the sexes, which no society can afford.

We have some grave concerns about pre-embryonic research and experimentation and some serious objections. Only with reluctance can we agree with these procedures and then only if they are restricted to the first 14 days after fertilization. We approve the restraints proposed by the medical and legal communities on the utilization of these technologies, but do not in every case agree with what they permit. (See Appendices B & C).

Fetal tissue implants may be regarded as great blessings which can be salvaged from the tragedy of pre-natal death. We deem them acceptable, if effective measures are enacted to prevent conception and/or abortion for the sake of such transplants.

(d) Social and legal arrangements, such as surrogate child bearing, judicial interventions during gestation and birth, and "ownership" of ova, sperm, embryos, and fetal tissue:

We are convinced that the state has the right and the duty to protect the interests and the well-being of the unborn. Consequently, legal regulation and judicial intervention are appropriate and necessary for the sake of the unborn.

Because of the potential for emotional, familial, social, and legal problems, we favour strong controls, but not absolute prohibition, of sur-
rogate child-bearing. The burden of proof should rest with those wishing to be involved in it. The welfare of the prospective child should take precedence over the wishes of the prospective parents, when these are in conflict.

The "ownership" of ova, sperm, embryo, and fetal tissues raises the question of reproductive responsibilities. This we have addressed in Appendix A. At this point we observe merely that much of the discussion of the new reproductive technologies is based on consideration of reproductive rights. Our contention is that reproduction as a high privilege and as a serious responsibility also should be brought into the discussion. Canadian society has traditionally taken the responsibilities of citizens as seriously as their rights. We perceive a lack of such balance in much of what is being said and written about the new reproductive technologies.

(e) The status and rights of people using or contributing to reproductive services, such as access to procedures, "rights" to parenthood, informed consent, status of gamete donors and confidentiality, and the impact of these services on all concerned parties, particularly the children:

We believe that the emphasis in all of these matters should be on reproduction as a privilege which carries with it serious responsibilities. The privilege of participating in the reproductive process, whether naturally or "artificially," should be restricted to those who will adequately exercise the responsibilities which this entails - the child(ren) which may result from that activity. Gamete and embryo donors bear this responsibility and must be required to exercise it. The concept of "ownership" is demeaning to the potential human beings which may issue from these "donations." The well-being of potential persons, rather than the ownership of products, should be the over-riding concern and perspective of those involved in reproductive services. An awesome challenge facing those involved in assisted reproduction is to maintain reverence, humility, and caution in dealing with the elements of new human life.

(f) The economic ramifications of these technologies, such as the commercial marketing of ova, sperm, and embryos, the application of patent law, and the funding of research and procedures including infertility treatment.

We believe that considerations mentioned above require the complete decommercialization of all reproductive research, experimentation, and assistance. In this crucial and sensitive area of the human experience,
commercialization too easily could lead to dehumanization. Only not-for-profit, medically supervised agencies should be permitted to work in this area. Cost for reproductive cells or services should be only at those levels appropriate to not-for-profit enterprises.

We believe that funding of research and procedures should be by the government and only through bona fide medical and educational institutions. We believe, furthermore, that such funding should be modest. Our limited medical resources are desperately needed for more urgent purposes. It would be irrational and unjust to divert large amounts to lesser needs and desires. A society that devotes significant resources each year to destroying tens of thousands of the unborn cannot responsibly invest large sums in treating infertility.

APPENDIX A REPRODUCTIVE RESPONSIBILITIES

Exaggerated Emphasis on Rights

In the discussion about new reproductive technologies, great emphasis is placed on reproductive rights. Couples (married or not) and even single women are presumed by many to have the right to procreate, even if this requires the aid of new reproductive technologies such as AID or IVF. It is argued that they are entitled by right to access to these reproductive services and even to government funding for these services. To deny or even limit access to these services for reasons less than danger and harm to the desired child is regarded as a violation of personal reproductive rights.

According to this perspective, which we oppose, the donation of one's gametes for research and experimentation is also viewed as an aspect of reproductive rights.

Support for these views is often sought from the parallel case of adoption. If a woman who is faced with an unwanted pregnancy chooses to bear the child and give it up for adoption rather than have an abortion, many would defend this as her right, and the morally preferable way to deal with an unwanted pregnancy.

If a woman has a right to give up her newborn infant for adoption, it is argued, why doesn't any man or woman have the right to provide gametes to enable others to conceive and bear children? Why can't they provide gametes for research and experimentation?
The Issue of Responsibility

A dimension largely ignored in the arguments about reproductive rights is the issue of reproductive responsibilities. Almost everyone agrees that reproductive rights are not absolute. Under certain circumstances reproductive rights may be limited. For example, men and women who test positively for AIDS should be prevented from reproducing. No one has a right to bring a child into the world who is certain to be infected with the deadly disease.

That example illustrates the fact that reproductive rights may and should be limited by certain responsibilities, most importantly by responsibility for the welfare of the child.

Adoption is an arrangement that grows out of tragedy. The pregnancy was not planned or desired. The mother is too young and without the resources required properly to rear and care for the child. Or both birth parents die or are killed and substitute parents are required to meet the needs of the child. It is the child’s needs growing out of tragedies such as these that make adoption socially acceptable and even beneficial.

To give a child away for lesser reasons, even for reasons related to the desires or needs of the recipients rather than the welfare of the child would be regarded by most as immoral, if not criminal.

There is a profound responsibility connected with reproductive rights and privileges. That responsibility is to the child who may be born as a result of one’s reproductive activity. The person who participates in the reproductive process - whether naturally or artificially - must be concerned about the welfare of any human life that may come into the world through that process.

Promoting Reproductive Responsibility

Gamete and embryo donors frequently shirk responsibility for potential or real offspring. They deliberately participate in the beginning of human life without any intention of assuming responsibility for that life. They turn that life-giving cell or living human entity (in the case of an embryo) over to others who may experiment with it, or use it to initiate fertilization and then destroy it, or, upon fertilization, implant it in someone whose character, actions, beliefs and values are unknown to the donors and completely out of their control.

Can our society afford to permit or facilitate this kind of reproductive irresponsibility? The argument is not that gamete and embryo donation is always immoral, although, in our conviction, it often is. Rather the argument is that, unless carefully controlled, such donations are also dehumanizing to
all participants in the process, and, therefore, threatening to the society itself. The society that permits or facilitates reproductive irresponsibility invites dangerous consequences.

We are not taking the position here that all donations of reproductive cells and embryos should be prohibited. Rather we contend that, if it is permitted, this should be done in such a manner as to promote donor responsibility. How this might be done is best determined by those who work in this field. The privilege of engaging in the new reproductive technologies should be restricted to those willing to promote reproductive responsibility.

One practical arrangement which might be helpful to some cases, would be to restrict research and experimentation to reproductive cells provided by members of the research team themselves. Hopefully, the experience of observing and manipulating one’s own life cells would stimulate greater reverence, humility, and caution.

APPENDIX B


D Legal limits on research

42. The embryo of the human species should be afforded some protection in law. 11.17

43. Any unauthorized use of an in vitro embryo would in itself constitute a criminal offence. 11.18

44. Legislation should provide that research may be carried out on any embryo resulting from in vitro fertilization, whatever its provenance, up to the end of the fourteenth day after fertilization, but subject to all other restrictions as may be imposed by the licensing body. 11.30

45. It shall be a criminal offence to handle or to use as a research subject any live human embryo derived from in vitro fertilization beyond that limit (i.e. fourteen days after fertilization). 11.22

46. No embryo which has been used for research should be transferred to a woman. 11.22

47. Any unlicensed use of trans-species fertilization involving human
gametes should be a criminal offense. 12.3

48. The placing of a human embryo in the uterus of another species for gestation should be a criminal offense. 12.9

49. The proposed licensing body promulgates guidance on what types of research, apart from those precluded by law, would be unlikely to be considered ethically acceptable in any circumstances and therefore would not be licensed. 12.16

50. Unauthorized sale or purchase of human gametes or embryos should be made a criminal offense. 13.13

Note To Pastors Of Lutheran-Church Canada About This Submission

1. Background.

This submission presents several views which have not previously been expressed by us and the LCMS. Very little has come out of the LCMS on the topic of new reproductive technologies. The CTCR document on Human Sexuality approves artificial insemination with the husband’s sperm (AIH) but discourages artificial insemination with donor sperm (AID). LCMS contributors to the LCUSA study on In Vitro Fertilization approve IVF only for married couples, only with their gametes, and only if all fertilized ova are placed in the uterus. We have taken a fresh look at the issues and attempted to address them in greater depth.

2. Responding to Uncertainty.

Our church’s position on abortion is based on inferences from Scripture, not explicit statements. (So is our position on infant baptism). The Bible never says that a fertilized ovum is a human being and should always be treated as such. However, a number of statements that the Bible makes on related matters seem to add up to this. Consequently, our church takes the position that human life is present from conception and should be protected. However, it should be noted that, though convincing to us, the biblical evidence is not unequivocal on this matter. There is some uncertainty. In the face of this uncertainty, we believe that we should give the conceptus the benefit of the doubt and protect it. There is a similar uncertainty in the medical, biological evidence. The genetic code is set at conception, but does that make it a person? Developmental individuality is not established until the embryonic axis is formed about the 14th day after conception. Is that
when it becomes a person? Or should authentic personhood be set at viability (a rapidly shifting point) or even at birth? Medical, biological data cannot answer these questions with finality. Here, too, we are faced with ambiguity. Rapid developments in reproductive technologies require decisions from us in the face of these uncertainties. While we may and must take positions also in the face of these uncertainties, it is important to us and to others that we acknowledge the difference between what we know and what we do not know.

3. **Hard Questions about the Preembryo**

(a) Any concerns and objections to embryonic research and experimentation as well as to IVF are related to wastage. Some, perhaps most, of the ova fertilized in these procedures are not implanted in a uterus and brought to term. The deliberate destruction of these potential human lives is regarded as immoral. However, in the natural reproductive process most fertilized ova (estimated 70%) are never implanted either. There is vast wastage here, too. May it not be argued that wastage in artificial or assisted reproduction is no more evil than it is in God's own creative work?

(b) What do we mean by the personhood of the preembryo, embryo, fetus? Personhood may be defined in terms of self awareness, self determination, the capacity to relate to others, including God. To what extent can these experiences be attributed to the earliest forms of human life? If one were to conclude, as one might on the basis of our theology, that the wasted preembryo went to hell, what would be the nature or level of its experience in the state of condemnation? Would it experience anything? Should we distinguish between early human life and human personhood, perhaps reserving the latter for the developing human being sometime after successful implantation?

(c) Can we withhold or limit our objection to pre-embryonic research and experimentation in the interest of supporting the 14 day rule? Both in the medical and legal communities there is strong support for restricting research and experimentation to 14 days after conception, the period before successful implantation has usually occurred. There is virtually no support for banning all embryonic research and experimentation. In other words there is a broad consensus in support of limiting research and experimentation, which would likely be ignored, we are trying to help hold the line on early research and experimentation, as the best that can be hoped for at this time.
4. The Nature and Purpose of a Submission.

The primary purpose of the Submission to the Royal Commission is to attempt to influence public policy. We accept this opportunity to share our views and values with the hope that, at least to some extent, this will result in better legislation and regulation than would otherwise come into being. This purpose and the procedure employed in trying to attain it identify this submission as a political venture.


According to Lutheran theology, society is to be regulated by the natural knowledge of God's law (second table) as known and applied by reason - not by the Gospel or by distinctively Christian values. Consequently, even as a church we do not try to address our pluralistic society out of the fullness of our convictions. We do not try to compel others to do everything that we know and believe to be right. Rather we speak from and to more limited ethical concerns and values that are shared by many other citizens of this pluralistic society. We appeal to reason and self interest, rather than to the Word of God and the example of Jesus. By its very nature, the political process in a democratic society involves compromise. It is "the art of the possible." Consequently, in our attempt to shape public policy, we are prepared to settle for less than the ideal. We strive for reasonably attainable goals, even though these goals may be less than the will of God as we know it. Such compromise in the political arena does not imply theological or ethical compromise. Rather it reflects the difference between the church and the world - different standards, different motivation, different purposes.

6. Relation to the Abortion Issue.

At a number of points the information, presuppositions, and values of reproductive technologies also have a bearing upon the abortion issue. However, we do not address abortion in this document, except incidentally. Our church body is emphatically pro-life and we have articulated this position publicly more than once. Here we speak to procedures designed to initiate and sustain new human life, which is the very opposite of abortion. We will evaluate them in the light of that purpose and not be unduly preoccupied with their possible application to abortion.
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JOHN GERHARD ON EXAMPLES
OF CLERICAL MARRIAGE
IN THE EARLY & MEDIEVAL CHURCH.

John P. Stoudt

One of the most notable differences between the Roman and Lutheran churches at the time of the Reformation was the Lutheran practice of allowing clergy to marry. The fact that it generated considerable controversy is attested by its treatment in Article 23 of the Augsburg Confession and in the corresponding article of the Apology. In both of these, the Lutherans defended clerical marriage on three grounds: historical, anthropological, and theological.

Despite these efforts, however, the issue was still alive almost a century later when John Gerhard (1582-1637), the "arch-theologian of Lutheran orthodoxy," deemed it advisable once again to defend the marriage of Lutheran clergy against the polemics of the Jesuit Cardinal Bellarmine. In his Loci, Gerhard treats in much greater detail the three arguments presented in the Confessions. Locus XXIII, "On the Ecclesiastical Ministry," contains in section 345 a discussion of proven examples of clerical marriages in the early and medieval church. The basic argument of this section is that a married priesthood was the norm in the Western church until about 400 years before the Reformation, when Gregory VII and the Cluniac reformers introduced mandatory clerical celibacy.

Gerhard begins his brief discussion with the example of the evangelist Luke and proceeds to document (mostly from Eusebius) other examples of married priests and bishops in the early church. From the time of Urban II he produces a list of popes who were the sons of married clergymen, and notes that all three Cappadocian fathers, of the later fourth century, were born to bishops. Even crusty St. Jerome, himself a monk, observes that there are innumerable married bishops throughout the world.

For the high medieval period, Gerhard draws on church historians, poets, humanists, and the acts of local councils to support his contention that an unmarried clergy is a novelty, and that enforced celibacy has resulted in serious scandal within the church. The section concludes with a description of the stiff opposition which Gregory and the Cluniacs encountered when they tried to impose celibacy on clergymen who viewed it as an unwarranted aberration from traditional catholic practice. Indeed, Gregory not only
forbade sacerdotal marriage in the future, but also tried to dissolve existing marriages between priests and their wives.

Gerhard's point is that the Lutheran church (which he identifies with the true catholic church) looks for its polity to the centuries of an undivided Christendom, when married priests formed the majority of the clergy. The Roman church, bent on maintaining false standards of purity, has deviated from the tradition of the fathers and from the word of God by allowing only celibates to take holy orders.

We present the first class of arguments from proven examples of clerical marriages in the primitive church. We spoke above concerning the patriarchs, prophets, Old Testament priests, and apostles. Concerning the evangelist Luke, Platina in Clero writes thus: "He lived 83 years and had a wife" (Onuphrius in later editions added the negative, "did not have a wife," contrary to the testimony of the old manuscripts). Clement of Rome (the disciple of Peter) and his letter to the Corinthians are referred to in book 4 of the Stromateis of Clement of Alexandria, who writes thus about him: "Let us direct our wives to that which is good, that they may manifest the lovely habits of chastity." Hermes, whom Paul greets in Rom.16:14 and who is thought to be the author of the book whose title is Shepherd (which by Athanasius in On the Incarnation of the Word and by Jerome in the Catalogue is called "very useful," and by Eusebius in book 3, chapter 3 of the History and by Nicephorus in book 2, chapter 46 is called "very necessary") had a wife and children, as it seems from visions 1 and 2.

Polycrates, bishop of the Ephesian church, in a letter to Victor, the Roman pontiff (see Eusebius History 5.22 and Nicephorus 4.27), refers to seven of his elders or ancestors (Rufinus, a contemporary of Jerome, renders it "parents") as bishops, and lists himself as the eighth. From Eusebius it is known that Nicholas the deacon had a wife. Tertullian, the Carthaginian presbyter, wrote a book to his wife. Irenaeus (Against Heresies 1.9.46) mentions the wife of a certain deacon in Asia who "was corrupted, first in mind, then in body" by Marcus Valentineus.

Agapetus I, who headed the Roman church under the Emperor Justinian,
had as his father Gordianus, a Roman priest, according to Platina and Volaterranus.\footnote{possibly Jacobo de Volterra, 15th century Italian humanist.} Urban II,\footnote{quoted from a letter of Urban to the archbishop of Tours.} in his chapter "Pius," section 56 (based on the letter of Damasus to Jerome), lists the names of certain other Roman pontiffs who were the sons of bishops, presbyters, deacons, and so forth.

Pius the pope was the son of Stephanus the subdeacon; Boniface the pope was the son of Jucundus the presbyter; Felix the pope was the son of Felix the presbyter; Agapetus the pope was the son of Gordianus the presbyter; Theodore the pope was the son of Theodore the bishop; Sylverius the pope was the son of Sylverius the bishop; Deusdedit the pope was the son of Jucundus the presbyter. Felix III was a Roman by descent from his father, the presbyter Felix. Gelasius was born an African because of his father, the bishop Valerius. Many others are found who, the sons of priests, rose to the apostolic see. Later on, in the chapter "Cenomanensem," he says the same things. When it is read that the sons of priests were promoted to the supreme pontificate, these are not to be thought of as having been begotten by fornication, but as the sons of legitimate wives, which were everywhere permitted to priests before the prohibition.

According to Eusebius (\textit{History} 6.36), Dionysius of Alexandria said of himself, "After scarcely four days, with God directing me to depart thence, and revealing Himself to be the marvellous leader of my journey, I myself and my children and many other brothers went out at the same time." Concerning Hilary of Poitiers, Baptista of Mantua\footnote{cleric, poet, humanist, and advocate of church reform; 1447-1516.} writes thus: Integrity of life, prudence in laws, the heavenly cultus, the care of the poor, the diadem and the crozier; these, Poitiers, took you away from every ambition, far from the applauding crowd, since you care nothing for mortal affairs, and since you live content with your lot. Your children have not harmed you; your wife, joined in a lawful marriage bed, has not been an obstacle to you. God did not at that time shudder at marriage beds, nuptial couches and wedding torches. That virtue was held to be of great value which,
now unknown, lives besmirched and degraded among the common people. Because of this the wisdom of the fathers condemns as evil those laws which are contrary to marriage; they say that whatever cannot take away from us that which thrives by nature does not sufficiently free us from it. Christ did not wish to impose on us this bitter yoke -- that burden which up to now has led to so many monstrous things. Some speak a novelty because of their foolish piety. Others desire to be safer by following along the way which the divine law allowed and in the footsteps of the fathers of old, whose life was better with marriage than ours is now, when the marriage bed and the custom of matrimony are excluded.

These words Baptista writes about Hilary, whom we know to have been a married man from his epistle to his daughter, Apra.

Eusebius (History 6.40) relates that Chaeremon, most holy bishop of Egypt of the Nile, when the impious were most grievously persecuting the Christians, fled at just about that time to the mountain of Arabia with his wife. Gregory of Nazianzus in Oration 19 writes about his mother Nonna, who was married to his father, the Nazianzene pastor.

She was not only a helper, but also a leader and a model, who herself, by her life and conversation, led others to all the best things. Indeed, in other matters, as the laws of matrimony commanded, she judged it best to submit to her husband; but she was by no means ashamed to show herself to be a teacher of faith and piety.

Thus Baptista writes about Nazianzus: "The son of a leader (for then the laws permitted this), after his father’s demise he took up the bishop’s crozier."

Concerning Gregory of Nyssa, brother of Basil the Great, Nicephorus writes (11.19): "Basil had two brothers, one of whom -- Gregory -- was the light and ornament of the church of Nyssa, a man just like his brother in learning, character, and sanctity of life. And although he had a wife, nevertheless in other matters he scarcely yielded to his brother." In the same way the father of Basil the Great was a bishop, according to the testimony of Nazianzus. Nicephorus (14.55) relates concerning Synesius, the Cyrene bishop, that although Theophilus of Alexandria persuaded him to be ordained to the ministry, he was afraid that he might be forced, by the example of certain men, to give up his wife. He protested with these words:
God Himself, the laws, and the sacred hand of Theophilus gave me my wife. Therefore I declare and wish to testify before all, that I am not at all about to desert her, nor am I about to have a clandestine relationship with her as an adulterer. The one option is impious, and the other is contrary to the law. As a matter of fact, I rather wish and hope that more and virtuous children will be born to me. Because of this it was conceded that Synesius might retain his priesthood and his wife.

Moreover, we know from the laws concerning bishops and clerics that the privileges granted to clergymen were extended by the Emperor Constantine even to their wives and children. It is evident from this that in the time of Constantine married priests were common. Athanasius writes thus to Diacontius, who, because he was a monk, despised the Alexandrian episcopate: "Let not your counsellors object to such things. Indeed, we know both starving bishops and gluttonous monks," and so forth. "Many of the bishops did not enter into marriage, and became monks instead of the parents of children; just as in turn, you may notice, bishops who were the fathers of children, and monks, did not seek power of this kind." Thus at the time of Athanasius marriage was still open to bishops.

Gaudentius of Brescia 10 writes in his sermon on the dedication of the temple that he "made a journey to Jerusalem. And on the way, as he passed through Caesarea of Cappodocia, he accepted as a gift the relics of forty martyrs from two women who were the grand-daughters of Basil the Great." How did Basil have grand-daughters if he never married? According to Jerome (Catalogue 114) the father of Apollinarius of Laodicea held the office of bishop. Jerome again, in letter 83 to Oceanus, remembers a certain married Roman priest.

Carterius, bishop of Spain, was a person advanced both in age and in his priesthood. He had one wife before he was baptized, and another after his washing, when his first wife had died. Do you think that he acted contrary to the opinion of the apostle, who in his catalogue of virtues prescribed that he should be ordained who is the husband of one wife? I am amazed indeed that you have brought this out into the open, when all the world is full of persons so ordained. And

10 learned Italian bishop and poet; flourished around 400.
I am speaking not about presbyters, nor about clergy of a lower rank; I am referring to bishops. If I desired to name them individually, so great a number would be gathered together that the multitude would surpass that of the Ariminensian synod.\(^\text{11}\)

Again, in book 1 *Against Jovinian* he writes: "As is not the case today, very many priests were allowed to marry; thus may the apostle describe the bishop as the husband of one wife, having sons with all chasteness."

The Roman pontiff Pelagius writes in his chapter "On the Syracusans," section 28, that by reason of circumstances, it is permitted that "a married man be ordained a bishop." Sidonius Apollinaris,\(^\text{12}\) bishop of Clermont (who lived after Siricius,\(^\text{13}\) the legislator of celibacy), was a married man, as is proved from book 5, letter 16, and from Gregory of Tours,\(^\text{14}\) book 2, chapter 21. The same Sidonius relates in book 7, letter 9, that it was his prayer that Benedict Simplicius, an honest and married man, be created archbishop and metropolitan of the Biturgians,\(^\text{15}\) for he was born of the priestly stock and rightly ruled over his wife, together with his children and his modest family; and also because he was pleasing to the whole people.

Concerning Spiridio, bishop of Cyprus, Socrates (1.8), the *Tripartite History* (1.10) and Nicephorus (8.42) write as follows: "Although he was a rustic and had both a wife in matrimony and children born of her, he was not at all inferior in divine matters." Concerning Francilio, bishop of Tours, Gregory of Tours writes thus (10.31): "He was a Pietavian citizen of the senatorial class, an ordained bishop having a wife by the name of Clara, but no children." Nicephorus (12.34) writes about the middle of the chapter:

In Thessaly it was permitted any cleric, before he was ordained, lawfully to take a wife; but if thereafter as it was received by custom [note, therefore, that it was not constituted by apostolic law, nor by an ecclesiastical canon], he had known his wife, he was removed from the order, since in the East all men, and even bishops, if they desire by their own will (not forced by any restraint of the law),

---

11 convened by the Emperor Constantius in 359; it promulgated an Arian formula on the divinity of Christ.
12 often considered the last of the classical Latin poets; flourished in the middle of the 5th century.
13 "reformer" pope who advanced the cause of clerical celibacy; died 399.
14 Frankish bishop and author of the *History of the Franks*; 538-594.
15 in the region of modern Aquitaine.
may decline union with their wives. Nevertheless, many --
    even while performing their episcopal duties in the episcopal residence -- sire many children by their wives, whom
they had beforehand joined to themselves in lawful matrimony. Now, however, it is held that a bishop does not
    guiltlessly lie with his wife even in sleep.

The Tripartite History (9.38) and Socrates (15.21) say the same things.

The Spanish bishops at the time of Siricius not only had wives and begot
children by them; they also defended their marriages as permitted by God in
the Old and New Testaments. These are the men whom, on account of this,
Siricius calls "teachers of lust and followers of the vices." Nicetas Pectoratus,16 the abbot who was by birth a Greek but by see a Latin, around the
year 1050 set himself mightily against the law of celibacy. Who is it (he
asked) who has handed it down to prohibit and to break apart the marriages
of priests? Which of the doctors of the church has handed down to you this
depravity? Leo IX (in his chapter "Omnino," section 31) and Humbert,
cardinal bishop of Sylva Candida, opposed this Nicetas.

In his history of the people of Bourbon, about the year 1070, Aven-
tinus17 writes: "In that time, priests openly had wives, just as did other
Christians. They also begot children, as I find it attested in the instruments
of donation to temples, mystics and monks. These witnesses are listed by
name along with their wives, who are openly called 'presbyterissae'." Balaeus18 and Polydorus Vergilius19 bear witness that the marriage of
priests was retained in Britain up to the year 1100. Indeed, around the year
975, at the synod of Winchester,20 the English priests demonstrated from
the word of God and from examples in the early church that marriage is
lawful for priests. Concerning Celsus, archbishop of Armagh and primate of
all Ireland around the year 1120, Balaecus says that by a custom received in
Ireland he had both his wife and his children during his archiepiscopacy. At
the council of London in the year 1129, Henry, King of England, allowed
the priests to keep their wives, while the archbishops, bishops and abbots
gathered in council protested in vain -- they who were more tolerant of
fornication than of conjugal cohabitation.

16 Studite monk and anti-Roman Catholic polemicist.
17 Johannes Aventinus, anti-clerical humanist and friend of Melanchthon.
18 John Bale, bishop of Ossory and colleague of Thomas Cromwell; 1495-1568.
19 Italian humanist and author of the first modern history of England; died 1555.
20 Both this and the council of London were minor local synods.
Matthew Paris\textsuperscript{21} records in book 3 of his *Chronicles* that the priests in Germany resisted the law of celibacy for a long time. Although Gregory VII (the former Hildebrand) promulgated, around the year 1074, the law that required presbyters who had lawful wives either to send them away or to resign from the priesthood, the clerics opposed it with a great effort, about which Lambert\textsuperscript{22} wrote:

The entire group of clerics immediately and vehemently raged against this decree, shouting that he is plainly heretical and possessed of insane doctrine who, heedless of the word of the Lord ("Not all receive this word; but he who is able to receive it, let him receive," Mt.19:11) and of the apostle ("Whoever is not able to be continent, let him marry: for it is better to marry than to burn," 1 Cor.7:8-9), by violent means forces men to live by the custom of angels, and -- since he denies the accustomed course of nature -- lets loose the restraints on fornication and filth. Moreover, they affirmed that if he continued to adhere to this opinion, they would rather give up the priesthood than dissolve their marriages, and would see him as the one to whom being a human seems degrading -- the one who would then compare the angels to the common people who ought to be governed through the church of God.

When the leader of the proceedings at the council of Mainz repeated the decree of the Roman pontiff about giving up either the priesthood or marriage, the clerics with one voice produced from the word of God illustrative sayings confirming the marriage of priests; second, the example of the church of Christ; and third, very many reasons in addition to the fact that this was an ancient and long-standing practice. And so in the following year (1075) another council was convened at Mainz. Once again the leader, wishing to please the Roman pontiff, tried to forbid the marriage of priests. The clerics so rioted against him that he scarcely got out of the synod alive.\textsuperscript{23}

Sigebert,\textsuperscript{24} in an entry for the year 1074, mentions this interdict of Gregory and adds these things: "By novel example and -- as it seemed to many -- by thoughtless judgment against the opinion of the holy fathers, he

\textsuperscript{21} famous Benedictine illuminator and chronicler; 1199-1259.
\textsuperscript{22} Lambert of Hersfeld, an important source for medieval German church history; died after 1077.
\textsuperscript{23} The president of the council was Siegfried of Mainz. The *Augsburg Confession* mentions this incident in 23.12.
\textsuperscript{24} Sigebert of Gembloux, Benedictine chronicler; 1030-1112.
removed married priests from divine office and forbade the laity to hear their masses." In the same way he recounts many troublesome things that arose from that decree. Aventinus in book 5 writes about a council that was held at Brescia against the same Hildebrand: "The legates of the other pontiffs of France, Italy and Germany were present. By the consensus of all present, Hildebrand's method for achieving Christian piety is repugnant, discrediting, and deplorable." Dudithius, the ambassador of the Emperor Maximilian to Poland, was able to demonstrate from the annals (in which the lives of the bishops and archbishops of Poland were described) that priests in the kingdom of Poland had wives up to the year 1219.

John P. Stoudt, a student at Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary, St. Catharines, Ontario, holds a Ph.D. in church history from Fordham University, and is currently vicar of Our Saviour Lutheran Church, Bronx, New York.
SOME EUROPEAN INFLUENCES ON INTER-LUTHERAN RELATIONSHIPS IN ONTARIO

Norman J. Threinen

Looking at the Lutheran scene in Ontario around the turn of the last century, two bodies emerge prominently, both of them German. They were the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Canada (presently the Ontario part of the Eastern Synod of the ELCIC) and the Canada District of the Missouri Synod (now the Lutheran Church-Canada East District). There were, of course, others on the scene as well. The Ohio Synod had a congregation in Waterloo County. The Buffalo Synod had a couple of congregations in the vicinity of what is now Port Colborne. The Central Canada Synod existed for a period of years to give attention to English work. There were also some Norwegian congregations and later congregations of other ethnic groups. However, the main players in Ontario were the Canada Synod and the Canada District of the Missouri Synod. So it is these two synods and the missionaries who helped constitute them whose European background this study will focus on.

Of these two, it is the Canada District which will largely receive attention here. For the European influences on the Missouri Synod missionaries are more easily recognized, both as to how they affected the identity of this body and how they affected the way this body viewed other Lutherans. Before one looks at some of these European influences, however, one needs to set the stage. What were the religious conditions on the frontier in Ontario? And how did the missionaries, whose efforts lie behind the formation of the Canada District, approach the congregations on the frontier?

I.

As is well known, frontier conditions in Ontario as in many other areas of North America resulted in a religious mish-mash in almost every German community which took root. Some groups had come to the new world for religious reasons. Examples are the Salzburgers who went to Georgia in the eighteenth century and the Prussians who went to Buffalo and Milwaukee a century later. Most of the people who came to the frontier of Upper Canada (later to be known as Canada West prior to becoming Ontario) came to the
new world primarily for economic reasons. They came to escape the priva-
tion of war-torn Germany. Or, they came from Pennsylvania and New York
and were following the North American frontier. Because they came for
economic rather than religious reasons, they tended to settle as individual
families rather than as a cluster of families whose identity centred in their
church affiliation. Furthermore, while they still tended to locate in areas
where other Germans were settling, little consideration seems to have been
given to whether they were of the same religious orientation as the people
in these settlements.

Thus, even where people had lived in fairly homogeneous religious
contexts in Germany and sometimes also in the United States, they often
found themselves in frontier German communities in Canada with people
who adhered to a variety of religious positions, many of them different from
their own. The Lutheran, Reformed, and Roman Catholic faiths had more or
less become regionally established in the Old Country before settlement in
Canada occurred. But since few Germans came from the Roman Catholic
south, one is essentially dealing only with the transplanting of Protestants
from the northern German lands. This does not mean, however, that one is
only dealing with two confessional groupings. For in addition to the
Lutherans and Reformed, the beginning of the nineteenth century had seen
the development of the generic Protestant religious faith of the Prussian
Union, which produced some missionaries for the frontier and also had its
adherents among some of the settlers.

In addition, regardless of confessional heritage, the faith of many people
had been seriously undermined by rationalism. Others had experienced
strong pietistic influences. As well, the new world had attracted some
German groups which had their roots in the Radical Reformation, of which
various kinds of Mennonites found their way to Canada. Some Germans had
also become Methodists on their pilgrimage to Canada via Ireland and New
York. The new world had also spawned some of its own indigenous religious
groups among the Germans largely as a result of the religious awakenings,
groups such as the Albright Brethren, Baptists and others.

The lack of religious homogeneity was further complicated by the
shortage on the frontier of pastors with proper credentials. Even properly
trained pastors tended to become mavericks when they were cut off by
distance and the border from larger concentrations of their co-religionists.
Since the majority of the Lutheran settlers did not come to Canada for
religious reasons and did not come as organized groups, they brought no
clergymen with them. Lack of pastors compelled the German settlers to look
for spiritual care from whatever clergyman might be available. Where the English had been able to find an Anglican missionary for the area, German settlers often went to him. He was paid by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and, since he represented the established church such as it was, also out of Government coffers. Since the Mennonites arrived first on the scene in Waterloo County, many other Germans initially looked to them for spiritual care. Waterloo County also had a pious printer, the son of a Lutheran pastor, who functioned in religious matters. It was also the scene very early of the activities of a missionary of the Prussian Union. Since their spiritual care required few funds, Lutherans on the frontier sometimes looked to the circuit-riding Methodist preachers, especially where their neighbours were German Methodists and where they themselves had been served by revivalist preachers from some of the American Lutheran Synods. There were roving impostors, self-acclaimed, religiously generic clergymen -- who were out to get whatever financial gain was available. Not that there was so much money to be made at being a clergyman, but most of these impostors had been failures at whatever they had tried before and the ministry seemed to be a soft touch.

With so few pastors of any religious denomination to choose from, those who were religious usually banded together to form non-confessional or interconfessional Protestant churches. As the options became broader and some genuine Lutheran pastors became available, separate congregations often emerged which had more of a Lutheran identity. However, most of the Lutheran clergy who first made contact with the settlers had no problems permitting and even encouraging non-Lutherans to become an integral part of Lutheran congregations and to participate in communion fellowship.

In Pennsylvania from which much of the initial impetus for German diaspora mission work in Southern Ontario came, there had been a long history of close cooperation and a great deal of intermarriage between Reformed and Lutherans. John George Schmucker could write in his Evangelisches Magazin in 1814, "The Lutheran and Reformed Churches are so interwoven and bound together that their minor differences in doctrine are almost forgotten through the similarity of their church organization and religion." By the middle of the nineteenth century the theological pendulum had generally swung away from this brand of "American Lutheranism" advocated by Samuel Simon Schmucker and the General Synod. However,

the missionaries of the synods which were to constitute the General Council in 1867, including the Canada Synod, still functioned with a fairly open stance toward non-Lutherans with regard to both altar and pulpit fellowship.

Into this situation came the missionaries of the Missouri Synod in the mid-nineteenth century. In contrast to the prevailing attitude of the missionaries of the Pittsburgh Synod mentioned above, they had pledged "renunciation of unionism and syncretism of every description." What this meant in concrete terms for them was that they had pledged to refrain from "serving congregations of mixed confession... and taking part in the services and sacramental rites of heterodox congregations or the congregations of mixed confession." 2 One can readily see that these missionaries faced a considerable challenge in coming with these principles of fellowship into a frontier situation where congregations of mixed confession were the rule rather than the exception. One can also readily see that relationships between them and the missionaries who preceded them and did not follow such fellowship principles would be strained. Indeed, from their perspective these missionaries already on the field were united (uniert) because the approach which they took looked to them like the approach which the Prussian Union was taking in Germany.

II.

That these Missouri Synod missionaries should take the stand which they did is not surprising when one looks at the circumstances which shaped them. Some of their attitudes on church fellowship were formed in North America. However, one must also look to the influences which had been brought to bear on them in Germany. Significantly prominent in the European background and influence for the position of the Missouri Synod missionaries were the religious and confessional Awakenings in Germany during the half century or so before they arrived in Ontario. This subject is too vast to receive adequate treatment here so it will only be touched on briefly.

Ironically, the religious Awakening in the German lands began with little regard for confessional distinctions. In 1780 the German Society for the Promotion of Pure Doctrine and True Christianity (Die Deutsche Christentumsgesellschaft) was formed, partially in reaction against the rationalis-

2 "Conditions of Membership," Handbook of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod 1981 edition, 13. The Conditions of Membership included in current handbooks of the Missouri Synod are a translation of the German which was first printed in Der Lutheraner 3 (September 5, 1846), 3.
tic Enlightenment. This organization was devoted to the revival of biblical piety and included not just Lutherans but also Reformed among its members. Like-minded persons of both confessions gathered monthly for Bible reading and prayer and joined their efforts to build the Kingdom of God, particularly through the distribution of the Bible and other Christian literature. With the Awakening of genuine Christian faith and a life which reflected this faith came an intense interest in missions throughout the various German lands invariably resulting in the formation of mission societies.

Initially these mission societies tried to transcend both confessional heritage and national boundaries. The Basel Mission, whose school was begun in 1815, "was based on the premise that there exists a single evangelical church and a common evangelical faith within the various confessional churches." The Basel Society deliberately omitted from its doctrinal basis any Lutheran or Reformed confessional statements and resisted any efforts to integrate it into the life of the churches. For a time, it effectively combined the efforts of Lutherans in Wurttemberg and Northern Germany with the Reformed in Switzerland and on the Rhine.

As time went on, however, those who were products of the Awakening began to experience a confessional revival as well. As a major factor in this latter revival was the unilateral union without doctrinal consensus and without the prior approval of the clergy of Lutherans and Reformed in Prussia. The formation of the Prussian Evangelical Union Church in 1817 to mark the tercentenary of the Reformation and its forced imposition by Frederick Wilhelm III in 1830 caused a sharp reaction among Lutherans and helped to consolidate the scattered resistance to such unionistic pressures by territorial church governments.

Reaction to the Prussian Union affected the mission societies in that some of the people involved in the regional mission societies in Lutheran territories began to call for independence from their pan-Christian mother societies and for a clearer confessional orientation to their work. The Dresden (later relocated to Leipzig) Mission was one example. After functioning as an active auxiliary of the Basel Mission for a number of years, the Dresden Mission organized in 1836 as a separate Lutheran Society which committed itself to God’s Word as interpreted by the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

That the formation of the Dresden (Leipzig) Mission Society was part

of the reaction to the Prussian Union and arose specifically because of the issue of intercommunion with non-Lutherans, there can be no doubt. Among the early people to react to the Prussian Union was Johann Gottfried Scheibel, Professor at the University of Breslau. Because of his opposition to the Prussian Union, he had been suspended from office and left Silesia in 1830. By the following year, he had established himself in Dresden and had become one of the directors of the Dresden Society. It was only after Scheibel’s coming that the directors of the Society began to recognize a problem with the Basel Mission’s requirement that Lutheran candidates in the Basel mission house participate in a Reformed administration of the Lord’s Supper. There were also three Lutheran missionary candidates from Prussia and Saxony who had studied in Berlin and who were being assigned to serve in a mission field under the Anglicans. These felt unable for reasons of conscience to subscribe to the 39 Articles which was required if they were to serve in the field to which they had been assigned and be funded by the Anglican Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

The influences which resulted in the formation of the Dresden (Leipzig) Mission Society were also at work shaping the outlook on church fellowship of C. F. W. Walther and many of the other pastors who subsequently helped form the Missouri Synod in North America. As theological students at the University of Leipzig, they formed a Christian student group there and were part of the Awakening as it was manifested in Leipzig. Somewhat later they were also part of the Muldenthal Pastoral Conference, organized on May 17, 1831, whose purpose it was to make the Saxon Church a confessional church.

Martin Stephan, under whose influence Walther and the other Saxon pastors came and who headed up the immigration movement which brought the Saxons to Missouri, was the pastor of St. John’s Lutheran Church in Dresden. At one point he was under consideration as a director of the Mission Society but, probably because he had an earlier falling out with Scheibel, was not asked. In spite of this, the Missouri Synod leaders felt a kinship with the people involved with the Leipzig Mission Society. This can be seen by the fact that even after immigration to North America, the former continued to take note of the Society’s activities and to encourage financial support of the Society. On one occasion, for example, the Missouri Synod’s church paper highlights the question which the German mission societies were

6 Fleisch, 3.
7 Ibid.
facing: "Should a missionary to the heathen also be committed to the Symbolic books?" In response, the paper quoted excerpts of a speech which Director Graul of the Dresden Mission Society delivered to the second Leipzig Conference of members and friends of the Evangelical Lutheran Church on September 6, 1844. In the speech, Graul had said that "as long as the church does not give up on itself, it can do nothing else... As they preach among the heathen, the emissaries (of the church) can have no other faith than that of the church which sends them. 8

III.

Adam Ernst, the first Missouri Synod missionary to make contact with settlers in Ontario, is looked upon as the father of the Canada District. He was not one of the men directly involved with the Dresden (Leipzig) Mission. Although he was a founding member of the Missouri Synod in 1847, he was not part of the Saxon immigration group which settled in Missouri and from whom this body got its distinctive name and direction. Yet he was influenced indirectly by the same forces which worked on the Saxon pastors. This influence on Adam Ernst came through Wilhelm Loehe, his mentor in Neuendettelsau, Bavaria.

Loehe's journey of faith and confessional commitment was similar to the pattern described above. Loehe's father died when he was eight years old but his mother moved in pietist circles. She read Arndt's True Christianity and used Starck's Gebetbuch. As well, she regularly went to hear a couple of preachers from the vicinity of Erlangen who espoused pure Lutheranism. In fact, quite a number of people from Fuerth, where Loehe grew up, travelled the considerable distance required to hear these preachers. Loehe studied theology in Erlangen and was particularly influenced by a Reformed professor there by the name of J. Chr. G. Krafft, who was responsible for a regional Basel Mission Society being organized in Erlangen in 1819. As a result of Krafft's influence, Loehe also established a mission society in Fuerth connected with the Basel Mission on November 10, 1827. As Loehe matured, he combined the concern for pure Lutheran doctrine, gained in the course of his upbringing, with the zeal for missions learned from Krafft. As a pastor, his interest in missions continued but he took the approach that "proper doctrine without a proper life is dead, however, proper

8 Der Lutheraner 4 (November 4, 1847), 37.
life without proper doctrine is blind."⁹ Loehe decided in 1843 to establish a Lutheran mission school, but when the Dresden Mission Society was founded he joined it instead.

As was true of most of the products of the Awakening, the kind of mission work which interested Wilhelm Loehe was mission work among the heathen. However, along with this interest in foreign missions there was usually at least some concern for the diaspora Germans in North America and elsewhere, much of which was also pan-Christian. There was, for example, the Christian Society for Evangelical Germans in North America organized July 27, 1837 in Langenburg in the Rheinland. While there were these pan-Christian societies, it was soon recognized that non-confessional societies were ill-equipped to promote confessional diaspora work. Thus, confessionally focused societies quickly arose. On November 10, 1840 a Society for the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America was also organized in Dresden to prepare and send pastors for the Lutheran immigrants in America.

How separate this Dresden Society for diaspora German Lutherans was from the Dresden Mission Society which promoted work among the heathen is uncertain; it is likely that there was at least considerable overlapping among the supporters of these two ventures. In fact, except for missionaries sent to North America to try to convert the Indians and who also worked among the German settlers, only two missionaries were sent by the Dresden Society to do diaspora work in America. Both of them, Wilhelm Sihler and A. Schmidt, became charter members of the Missouri Synod in 1847. On the other hand when Adam Ernst, an apprentice shoemaker, came to the society early in 1841, he received the advice that he should first become educated at home in Bavaria. These events led Ernst to Loehe who decided to educate Ernst himself as a teacher to see if he was teachable. If so, Loehe’s first plan of action was to then send him to study in Erlangen. When this did not appeal to Ernst, Loehe adjusted his thinking and sent Ernst as the first of many emergency pastors for the frontier in North America.

A very important player in the story of diaspora mission work which related to the development of the Missouri Synod was Ludwig Adolf Petri, a Lutheran pastor in Hannover. At first, Petri was actively involved in the North German Mission which attempted not to transplant particular confessional appreciation of the need for a clear confessional stand. Thus, when

the North German Mission adopted a compromise statement on the Lord’s Supper for the mission field in 1839, Petri broke with the society and convinced most Lutheran groups to withdraw their support. He thereby strengthened the Lutheran character of several other mission societies. Based in Hannover, Petri became an important link for Lutheran diaspora mission in North America. Many missionaries stopped off there en route to Bremen and he helped cover the cost of their passage. As well, he was the director for many years of the Hannover seminary which trained pastors. He also organized a "Candidates Society" in 1837, out of which several men were provided for work in North America. Prominent among them was a C. L. A. Wolter, who assisted Sihler in the establishment of what was to be the Missouri Synod seminary in Fort Wayne, Indiana. To provide students for the Fort Wayne seminary, there was founded on April 23, 1846 a Preparatory Institution in Nuernberg. There the course of study was either a half or a full year depending on the time of departure to Fort Wayne.

As one looks at the life of Sihler, one sees the way many of these men who were involved in the Awakening and in the Lutheran Confessional Renewal, interfaced. Sihler had early been influenced by Scheibel, as well as by Martin Stephan. A. G. Rudelbach, the leader of the Muldenthal Conference of Evangelical pastors, visited with him and made a deep impression on him. Rudelbach also later examined him theologically and provided Latin credentials for Sihler. In 1843, Sihler was given a copy of Wyneken’s Notruf. This also attracted Ernst to Wilhelm Loehe and started the flow of emergency pastors for the North American frontier. Although Sihler is sometimes pictured as being one of Loehe’s emergency pastors, he was actually called to go to North America by the Dresden Mission Society. Travelling to Dresden, he brought a gift of 200 rubles from the Lutheran Mission Society in Riga to the Dresden Society, which was then used by the Society to pay for his trip to the New World.

Louis Harms was another individual who initially participated in the North German Mission. In 1844 he became the assistant pastor to his father in a congregation in Hermannsburg and four years later the chief pastor. During this time he became more confessional in his theology and in 1850 organized the Hermannsburg Mission as an independent Lutheran mission. While Harms’ main emphasis was missions among the heathen he also sent a number of missionaries to North America. After the death of Louis Harms, his brother Theodore took over direction of the society. At least one Hermannsburg man came as a member of the Missouri Synod to Ontario. Five others found their way for a time into Canada Synod.
IV.

Thus, the Missouri Synod missionaries who came to Ontario beginning in 1854 were part of a church body which was the recipient of many of the impulses of the Awakening in Germany which had moved in the direction of a Lutheran confessional renewal. Virtually every confessionally Lutheran effort in Germany which concerned itself with diaspora missions in North America provided some pastors for the Missouri Synod. Although the Missouri Synod also developed in an indigenous fashion in North America and eventually broke from a number of its European contacts -- Neuendettelsau in 1853; Leipzig in 1876; and Hermannsburg in 1881 -- it is significant that these contacts were maintained over a period of several decades.

The Saxon immigration movement under Martin Stephan, almost a cultist group, turned its back on Europe and the church in the Old Country. However, with Stephan no longer in the picture and with the involvement of pastors who were not part of the Stephanite immigration, the Missouri Synod had no problems looking across the sea to the Lutheran confessional movement still going on after the departure of the Saxons and appreciating what was occurring. The thing the pastors of the Missouri Synod continued to be concerned about from their own experience, as well as from what they continued to see happening in Europe, was that a communion practice be maintained where Lutherans and Reformed were not sharing the Sacrament. As far as they were concerned, such intercommunion smacked of the Prussian Union and an indifferent witness to the Lutheran position which had been in danger of being lost in Europe.

The Missouri Synod missionaries, who came to Ontario and later the Canada District, included a number of pastors who came out of Europe and became the Missouri Synod; the first missionaries arrived only seven years after the Synod was formed. Other missionaries to Ontario studied at one of the two Missouri Synod seminaries (Ft. Wayne or St. Louis) under professors who had come out of the European experience. In either case, it is understandable that they would view with suspicion and even brand as uniert any group of Lutheran pastors who took a less strict approach than they did regarding those whom they admitted to the altar.

Whether some of the impulses of the Awakening and confessional renewal were represented in pastors of the Canada Synod in the mid-nineteenth century, one cannot be certain; the products of the Kropp seminary would not arrive on the scene until the 1880’s. If these representatives of a stricter Lutheran practice were on the scene, they did not substantially
affect the stance of the Canada Synod in its early years. At any rate, they were not recognized by Adam Ernst and the Canada District men.

On one occasion when several such representatives were received by the Canada Synod, the situation ended unhappily both for the Synod and for the men involved. These representatives of the Lutheran confessional renewal in Europe came from the Hermannsburg Mission School around the end of the 1860's. How they came to be in the Canada Synod is not known; they certainly did not fit the prevailing theological mold of the Canada Synod. Adam Ernst and the Canada District men recognized this. On March 15, 1871, Ernst repeated in the pages of his Volksblatt the oftmade statement that the Canada Synod was uniert because it allowed Calvinists and Zwinglians, who do not believe the Lutheran teaching on the Lord's Supper, to come to the Sacrament. But, said Ernst, there is good seed in the Synod -- the Hermannsburg brethren. If they do their duty -- to open the heart, eyes, and mouth -- there is hope.

Ernst was optimistic that perhaps the Hermannsburg men would be a leaven for a more confessional Lutheran stance within the Canada Synod. Thus, through the Volksblatt, he issued an invitation on July 15 for the Canada Synod to join in a free conference to "attempt to discover where the truth lies." It took until mid-January the following year for the proposed three-day conference to materialize. Even then, there were only three Canada Synod pastors who came out, two of them Hermannsburg men. The free conference had the effect of bringing to the surface the difference in theological stance and practice between the Hermannsburg men and the rest of the Canada Synod. By May 1872 the Hermannsburg men had withdrawn from the Synod and not long thereafter the Synod expelled them from its ranks. (Which action was determinative is academic.) In a "Protest" later published by Ernst in the Volksblatt, three of the four Hermannsburg men (a fourth had earlier accepted a call to Wisconsin) cited the following reasons for the conflict: 1) the refusal of the Canada Synod's Kirchenblatt to print Old Lutheran views; 2) the refusal of the Kirchenblatt to print a defence against charges made after a free conference of the Canada Synod with the Missouri Synod; 3) a letter from the President of the Canada Synod to one of the Hermannsburg men saying: If you feel that the Missourians are correct and their actions pleasing to God, you can no longer have anything to do with us; 4) a letter from the same person to another Hermannsburg man saying: Don't worry about Methodists, Baptists, Reformed or even Papists.
By this time, the Canada Synod had no objections to the Hermannsburg men leaving but it was not happy about them taking their congregations out of the Synod. The Hermannsburg men, supported by Ernst, took the position that their association with the Canada Synod was a human matter while their relationship with their congregations was based on a divine call. Eventually, the Hermannsburg men left the Synod and took their congregations with them.

Around the same time, F. W. Franke, another Hermannsburg man located in the Ottawa Valley, also resigned from the Canada Synod. When he refused to appear before the Synod to justify his actions, he was expelled and his congregations were advised to remove him from office. The result was a split in a number of congregations so that still today one sees opposition churches within sight of one another in a number of rural locations in the Ottawa Valley.

While the above episode regarding these five Hermannsburg men may on the surface seem to be the result of factious pastors on the one hand and undiplomatic synodical leaders on the other, one needs to be reminded of the broader issues which were confronting the Canada Synod. Although the General Council, of which the Canada Synod was a founding member, was formed in 1867 as a conservative alternative to the more liberal General Synod, it by no means satisfied a number of conservative synods. Among these was the Missouri Synod. The Wisconsin Synod, which at the time was less conservative than the Missouri Synod, had joined the General Council but eventually withdrew because it was not satisfied with the answers it was raising about the General Council’s position on Four Questions: chiliasm, altar fellowship, pulpit fellowship, and secret societies. Significantly, the Wisconsin Synod had strong ties with the leaders of the Hermannsburg Mission in Germany where these five pastors had been trained. Thus, at least one of the issues at stake likely had to do with permitting non-Lutherans to commune at Lutheran altars.

Norman J. Threinen is Associate Professor of Historical Theology at Concordia Lutheran Seminary, Edmonton, Alberta. This paper was originally presented to the Canadian Lutheran Historical Association in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan October 3-5, 1989.
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