

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

published jointly by the faculties of
Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary
St. Catharines, Ontario,
and
Concordia Lutheran Seminary
Edmonton, Alberta

EDITORS

Edward G. Kettner
Thomas M. Winger

TECHNICAL EDITOR

Thomas M. Winger

∞ FACULTIES ∞

Edmonton

Arthur D. Bacon, M.A.T., M.S., Ph.D.
President
Steven E. Harold, Th.M., D.Min.
Edward G. Kettner, Th.D.
Vernon Raaflaub, M.Div., D.D.
Norman J. Threinen, Th.D.

St. Catharines

Jonathan F. Grothe, Th.D.
President
Roger J. Humann, S.T.M., D.D.
William F. Mundt, Dr.Theol.
John R. Stephenson, Ph.D.
Thomas M. Winger, Th.D.

Lutheran Theological Review is published by the seminary faculties of Lutheran Church–Canada. The periodical exists for the discussion of theological issues within the frame of reference of confessional Lutheranism, but the views represented by the individual writers are not necessarily those of the faculties. Guidelines for Contributors are available upon request.

Changes of address, paid subscriptions, and other business matters should be addressed to:

Lutheran Theological Review
Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary
470 Glenridge Avenue
St. Catharines, Ontario L2T 4C3
Canada

Annual subscription rate: \$7.00

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Volume XII

Academic Year 1999-2000

CONTENTS

Standard Abbreviations	4
Editorial Foreword	5
ARTICLES	
Redemptive Themes in Shakespeare.....	8
<i>Frederic W. Baue</i>	
“Faith in Christ” or “The Faith of Christ”? πίστις χριστοῦ in Paul	22
<i>Steven L. Chambers</i>	
The Roots of the Reformation.....	46
<i>John R. Stephenson</i>	
Friedrich Michael Ziegenhagen (1694-1776): German Lutheran Pietist in the English Court.....	58
<i>Norman J. Threinen</i>	
The Eucharist in the Epistle to the Hebrews	97
<i>Paul Williams</i>	
SERMONS	
We are Fishers of Men (Mt. 4:12-23).....	106
<i>Harold Ristau</i>	
Guidelines for Contributors	110

STANDARD ABBREVIATIONS

AE	<i>Luther's Works</i> . American edition. 55 vols. St. Louis: Concordia, and Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1958- .
BAG	Bauer, Walter. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1 st ed., edited by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, 1957.
BAGD	2 nd ed., edited by F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker, 1979.
BDAG	3 rd ed., edited by Frederick W. Danker, 2000.
BSLK	<i>Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche</i> . 12 editions. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1930- .
BHS	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> . Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1984.
EA	<i>Dr. Martin Luthers sämtlichen Schriften</i> . 1 st ed. 67 vols. Erlangen: Carl Heyder, 1826-57.
LW	<i>Lutheran Worship</i> . St. Louis: Concordia, 1982.
NA ²⁷	<i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> . Ed. Kurt and Barbara Aland, et al. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.
TDNT	Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964- .
TLH	<i>The Lutheran Hymnal</i> . St. Louis: Concordia, 1941.
W ¹	Walch, Johann Georg, ed. <i>D. Martin Luthers ... sämtlichen Schriften</i> . 1 st ["Walch"] ed. 24 vols. Halle: J. J. Gebauer, 1740-53.
W ²	Walch, Johann Georg, ed. <i>D. Martin Luthers sämtlichen Schriften</i> . 2 nd ["St. Louis"] ed. 23 vols. St. Louis: Concordia, 1880-1910.
WA	<i>D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe</i> . Weimarer Ausgabe. ["Weimar ed."] Weimar: Hermann Böhlau, 1883- .
WA DB	Weimarer Ausgabe Deutsche Bibel [German Bible]
WA Br	Weimarer Ausgabe Briefe [Letters]
WA Tr	Weimarer Ausgabe Tischreden [Table talk]
Abbreviations for the Lutheran Confessional writings:	
AC	Augsburg Confession
Ap	Apology of the Augsburg Confession
SA	Smalcald Articles
Tr	Tractate/Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope
SC	Small Catechism
LC	Large Catechism
FC Ep	Formula of Concord, Epitome
FC SD	Formula of Concord, Solid Declaration

EDITORIAL FOREWORD

This latest issue of *Lutheran Theological Review* provides a series of articles on a variety of topics from across the theological disciplines. The first article, by Dr Frederic W. Baue, discusses “Redemptive Themes in Shakespeare”, and notes how the greatest of English language playwrights sets forth the themes of law and grace in his plays. The article is geared to enable pastors to use these works in their preaching.

In the next article, “‘Faith in Christ’ or ‘The Faith of Christ’”, Pr Steven L. Chambers highlights recent discussions among exegetes as to whose faith it is that saves, according to Paul: the believer’s or Christ’s. This presentation will provide much food for thought as we mull over an intriguing question.

Next, Dr John R. Stephenson, in his article, “The Roots of the Reformation”, looks at the theological milieu out of which the Reformation grew, and sets forth the significance that a proper knowledge and understanding of the roots of the Reformation should have for Lutheran pastors today.

In his paper, “Friedrich Michael Ziegenhagen 1694-1776: German Lutheran Pietist in the English Court”, Dr Norman J. Threinen describes the significant place that Ziegenhagen had in England and elsewhere in the eighteenth century.

The final major piece, by Pr Paul Williams, “The Eucharist in the Epistle to the Hebrews”, discusses the place of the Eucharist in that letter, relating it to Christ’s fulfilment of the Old Testament sacrifices.

The issue concludes with a sermon by Pastoral Candidate Harold Ristau, preached on Mt. 4:12-23.

A new feature of LTR is the table of standard abbreviations. Please consult this table when an author uses an abbreviation without (apparent) explanation.

Also included in this issue is a set of guidelines for contributors. We encourage all readers who have interest in scholarly research to consider submitting your work to *Lutheran Theological Review*.

We hope that our readers will find the material presented herein to be helpful to them in their continuing study of God’s Word, and to their service to our Lord.

EGK

Pentecost 2001

REDEMPTIVE THEMES IN SHAKESPEARE¹

Frederic W. Baue

INTRODUCTION

My concern in this paper is not academic but pastoral. That is, my aim is not to develop a tightly-reasoned critical analysis for scholarly disputation, but rather to demonstrate in a simple way some redemptive themes in the plays of William Shakespeare: first, for the personal edification of pastors; second, to give them handy material for sermons.

William Shakespeare was born in 1564 in Stratford-upon-Avon, England. After a successful career as an actor and playwright in London, he returned in style to his home town, where he died in 1616. I visited Stratford in 1991 and spent a pleasant, sunny afternoon at the local church. There I saw records which demonstrate that Shakespeare was baptized at that congregation, held office as an active member, and received Christian burial in a state of grace. In fact, he was interred in the chancel, an honour granted only to the most prominent citizens.

While he was honoured in life by kings, in death by his congregation, and ever since has been esteemed by the world, today Shakespeare is under attack. *The Washington Times* reports that Arizona State University fired drama professor Jared Sakren because of “his determination to stage works from the ‘sexist European canon,’ including Aeschylus, Ibsen, and—most egregiously—Shakespeare.”² According to a *Philadelphia Inquirer* story, “Shakespeare, Melville, Chaucer, and Dickens may be on the way out in San Francisco, where school board officials are considering a proposal that up to 70 per cent of school reading should be books by ‘authors of color.’”³

Why is Shakespeare under attack? Because his works, like those of other classic writers, form the foundation of western civilization. It is clear from his plays that Shakespeare holds traditional views on many subjects. Take the role of women in *Taming of the Shrew*, where the termagant Kate finally submits to her husband. Regarding government, his history plays such as *Richard III* show that men who abuse power always come to a bad end. On religion, his protestant sympathies can be seen in his positive treatment of Anne Bullen, or Boleyn, mother of Queen Elizabeth I, in *Henry VIII*, where

¹ This essay was first presented to the LCMS English District Eastern Region Fall Conference, Atlantic City, NJ, 5-7 October 1998.

² *The Washington Times*, National Weekly Edition, 11-17 May 1998, p. 23.

³ *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, 11 March 1998, p. A2.

the villainous Cardinal Woolsey calls her, “A spleeny Lutheran” (IV.ii.99). If Shakespeare upholds traditional values, those who are out to destroy western civilization must destroy him.

We clergy who uphold traditional values in the area of religion find a hearty marching-companion in Shakespeare. His is a profoundly Christian mind, but one that expresses itself in drama. What are the tragedies but moral *exempla* of men who give themselves over to the passions of the Seven Deadly Sins? Julius Caesar cultivates *superbia*, or pride; Marc Antony, *luxuria*, or lechery; Othello, *ira*, or anger and jealousy. The tragedies give moral instruction by negative example.

On the Gospel side of the coin, Shakespeare’s mind is equally active. As you read Shakespeare’s plays, you cannot help but be struck by how often the mystery of the faith is portrayed in dramatic action. That which was lost is often found, as Antipholus is in *The Comedy of Errors*. Unmerited forgiveness is granted to Proteus in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Prince Hal, a prodigal son if there ever was one, comes to himself in *Henry IV*. Portia pleads for mercy over justice in *The Merchant of Venice*. But the central episode of the divine comedy is the Death and Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. Perhaps it is no surprise to find a resurrection worked out onstage in several comedies, such as *Much Ado About Nothing*.

Shakespeare has been called “the mirror of mankind”. What pastor cannot benefit from a close acquaintance with the greatest author in the English language, whose works not only demonstrate Christian themes explicitly, but also reflect in precise detail the complete range of the human character, noble and base, tragic and comic? Blessed are ye who live in southern Ontario, and can attend the excellent live performances at Stratford. Many states and cities in America have Shakespeare festivals. Arise and go! Also, many fine productions of the most popular Shakespeare plays are available at your video store, or the A/V section of your area public or college library. Verily I say unto you, watch!

LAW

Now to homiletical application. There are two areas of theology to which Shakespeare can provide insight: Law and Gospel. As for the Law, consider how much wisdom and insight is contained in the traditional Mediaeval schema of the Seven Deadly Sins. Taken together, they comprise a complete psychology of the human condition. Chaucer’s “The Parson’s Tale”, usually excluded from college texts of *The Canterbury Tales*, is nothing other than a sermon on these seven sins. Likewise, Shakespeare deals with these sins in several plays.

What better time to focus on these matters than Lent? In fact, if you begin a midweek series on Ash Wednesday and go through to Wednesday of Holy Week, you will find exactly seven evenings in which to develop this line of spiritual inquiry. If only six evenings are available, merely omit the particular sin to which you yourself are prone. If you find you want to omit all seven, it is time to visit your father confessor.

Each homily can be developed in a number of ways. For example, you might simply go through the plot of the play in some detail as an *exemplum* of the sin. Another tack might be to focus on the topic, bringing in Shakespeare as supporting material. Here follows a series of notes on seven plays, mostly tragedies, along with applicable verses from Proverbs. But lo, I hold before you a blessing and a curse: blessing to him who doth his homework, a curse upon him who readeth not the plays.

1. Pride

“Pride goes before destruction.” (Prov. 16:18)

Coriolanus

This tragedy is about a noble Roman general whose pride leads to his downfall. In the opening scene, a group of citizens discusses Coriolanus’ deeds, done “to be partly proud, which he is, even to the altitude of his virtue” (I.i.39). Coriolanus enters and says haughtily, “Hang ’em!” (I.i.190). Aghast, the citizens ask, “Was ever man so proud as this?” (I.i.252). But Rome needs the able Coriolanus, as events soon prove. The Volscies, led by Tullus, attack Rome, but Coriolanus single-handedly turns the tide of battle. He is accorded a Hero’s welcome but refuses to display his wounds, requisite to being acclaimed consul. “He’s vengeance proud,” the people complain, “and loves not the common people” (II.i.5). Meanwhile the Volscian army is regrouping while the unbending Coriolanus, taunted by his political enemies, is banished from Rome. In disdain he exclaims, “I banish you!” (III.iii.123). Then he leaves.

In all this there is still something sympathetic in this nobleman. One character says, “His nature is too noble for this world” (III.i.254). As internal strife erupts in Rome, Coriolanus goes over to the Volscies and befriends Tullus, his former enemy. Even there suspicions arise, and an officer describes Coriolanus as “insolent, / O’ercome with pride, ambitious past all thinking” (IV.vi.29-30). The Romans now have real reason to fear a Volscian army led by Coriolanus, even as Tullus begins to suspect and fear his new general. Before the battle, Rome in desperation sends Coriolanus’ mother, wife, and child to plead with him for mercy. “I melt,” he concedes, “and am not / Of stronger earth than others” (V.iii.28-29). He retreats, and an enraged Tullus vows revenge and meets with conspirators and kills

Coriolanus. His pride drove him to his enemies, where ironically he was killed because of his mercy.

With the sin established, it is easy to move to the Gospel by turning the sin over and examining the contrasting virtue as represented in Jesus Christ. If Coriolanus was proud, Jesus is humble. “He humbled himself and became obedient to death—even death on a cross” (Phil. 2:8).

2. *Envy*

“*Envy rots the bones.*” (Prov. 14:30)

Richard III

This is one of two history plays termed a “tragedy” in the title. It is about the culmination of the Wars of the Roses, that struggle over legitimate succession to the throne which kept England in turmoil for almost a hundred years. According to Herschel Baker, Richard is “a man so driven by his lust for power that despite his wit and charm and intellect ... he becomes the agent of his own destruction.”⁴ As in the classic Alec Guinness comedy, *Kind Hearts and Coronets*, Richard is at the end of the line for the crown, and goes about systematically bumping off everyone who stands in his way. Nothing funny about this play, though. Richard is a hunchback, deformed in both body and soul, “determined to prove a villain” in order to become King of England (I.i.30). In the previous play of this historical series, Richard kills King Henry VI. Now Richard, with a dazzling display of verbal ingenuity, successfully woos and weds Lady Anne, whose husband he had also killed, and who heretofore had hated Richard in her grief. In a soliloquy, he plans to “clothe my naked villainy / With odd old ends stol’n forth of holy writ / And seem a saint, when most I play the devil” (I.iii.335-37). Richard has his elder brother killed. Edward IV, the current king, dies. Richard gains the protectorate of the heir apparent and has him thrown into the Tower and assassinated. Finally, Richard is crowned, and gives orders to have his wife killed. An armed uprising against Richard ensues, led by the future King Henry VII. The night before the Battle of Bosworth field, the ghosts of those slain by Richard visit him in his sleep and say, “Despair and die!” (V.iii.127). Then they cross the stage and whisper to Henry, “Live and flourish!” (V.iii.130). Richard makes a feeble attempt at penitence, saying, “I rather hate myself / For deeds committed by myself” (V.iii.189-90). But there is no true change of heart. Envious and ambitious to the core, even before his death he is only sorry he has to pay the consequences of his evil,

⁴ G. Blakemore Evans, ed., *The Riverside Shakespeare* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974) 709. All Shakespeare quotations are taken from this edition, also cited as *RS* for critic’s remarks.

saying, “Conscience is but a word that cowards use” (V.iii.309). Henry VII triumphs and in this, as in all of Shakespeare’s tragedies, order is restored at the end.

If Richard was envious, consider Jesus, “who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped” (Phil. 2:6).

3. *Wrath*

“A fool gives full vent to his anger.” (Prov. 29:11)

King Lear

In this, Shakespeare’s greatest play, and possibly the greatest of all tragedies, the octogenarian King Lear decides to divide his kingdom between his three daughters, Regan, Goneril, and Cordelia, according to their profession of love for him. Regan and Goneril flatter the old man. Cordelia, Lear’s favourite, loves him truly but speaks plainly, “I love your Majesty / According to my bond, no more nor less” (I.i.92-93). Lear, enraged, disinherits and banishes Cordelia who is taken to wife by the King of France. The faithful Kent intercedes, but Lear shouts, “Come not between the dragon and his wrath”, as he banishes Kent, too (I.i.122).

The two cynical sisters discuss their father’s unbridled temper, and “the unruly waywardness that infirm and choleric years bring with them” (I.i.298-99). The reference is to the “choleric humour” in the old psychology which described an angry, aggressive person. Lear in the folly of his wrath is blind to truth, saying, “I have perceived a most faint neglect of late” (I.iv.68). As he is repeatedly abused by both daughters, only his Fool is able to speak the truth to him: “Thou shouldst not have been old till thou hadst been wise” (II.v.44-45). As the truth sinks in he begins to crack: “O, let me not be mad” (I.iv.46). In the end, the King is left with only two followers: his Fool, and Kent, who has re-entered his service in disguise. Now mad in mind as well as emotions, Lear wanders out into the storm which symbolizes “this tempest in my mind” (III.iv.12). Meanwhile the King of France, accompanied by Cordelia, has invaded Britain to set things right as Regan and Goneril fight over the same lover. Lear is found and brought to his true daughter, and quietly says to her, “I am a very foolish fond old man” (IV.iv.59). The attending Doctor observes, “the great rage, / You see, is kill’d in him” (IV.iv.77-78). Tragically, not only the rage is to be killed. In the ensuing battle, Lear and Cordelia are captured. Justice is served as Regan and Goneril kill each other, but in the confusion Cordelia is hanged in prison. “Howl, howl, howl,” cries Lear as he enters with her body, then dies of grief.

If Lear gave full vent to his anger, think of Jesus who “was oppressed and afflicted, yet he did not open his mouth” (Is.53:7).

4. Sloth

*“The sluggard is wiser in his own eyes
than seven men who answer discreetly.” (Prov. 25:16)*

Richard II

This play deals with the central issue of character in a ruler. King Richard II is called an “unstaidd youth” (II.i.2). That is, he is unrestrained in giving way to his passions and frivolities. Though he is king of England by legitimate succession, his neglect of responsibility and abuse of power makes him unfit to rule. He is eventually deposed.

Prior to the stage action, the Duke of Gloucester has been murdered by Mowbray, with the collusion of Richard (I.ii). Henry Bullingbrook challenges Mowbray to a duel, indirectly challenging the King himself. The fickle King stops the fight, and banishes Henry for six years (I.iii). Richard enjoys the company of his lowborn friends, and is “basely led / By flatterers” (II.i.242-43). A rebellion in Ireland arises, but the King finds he has overspent on court pleasures. He now unwisely leases crown lands.

The noble Duke of Lancaster, old John of Gaunt, Henry’s father, upbraids Richard for his folly, calling him “too careless” (II.i.97). Richard mocks the dying man, calling him “a lunatic, lean-witted fool” (II.i.115), and confiscates his estate to get more money. Rebuked again by the Duke of York, Richard heedlessly violates his authority by wrongdoing, antagonizing both nobles and common people, then goes off to fight the Irish. Meanwhile the banished Henry returns to claim his title and lands.

When Richard returns from Ireland, he crowns of immanent victory like an adolescent. But he soon learns the reality of diminished power: his army deserts and goes over to Henry. Richard is eloquent in his self-pity: “Let us sit upon the ground / And tell sad stories of the death of kings” (III.ii.155-56). Richard is taken captive to London, where he resigns “state and crown / To Henry” (IV.i.178-79). Now out of power, he is taken to the Tower of London where he is soon to die. On the way he meets his wife, and in a poignant exchange finally demonstrates a genuine humility and self-awareness that had eluded him while King: “I wasted time, and now doth Time waste me” (V.v.48).

Richard irresponsibly threw away his kingship, but Jesus “took up our infirmities, and carried our sorrows” (Is. 53:4).

5. *Avarice*

“A greedy man brings trouble.” (Prov. 15:27)

Timon of Athens

This tragedy is like a parable in its schematic structure. It is about a rich man, Timon, whose greed for status blinds him to the reality that greed for possessions is motivating his so-called friends. As the play opens, Timon pays the debts of a friend but is warned by the cynical philosopher Apemantus, “He that loves to be flattered is worthy of the flatterer” (I.i.225-26). Heedless, Timon throws a banquet, staged in one production like the Last Supper, with Timon surrounded by Judases. Flavius, Timon’s good and faithful servant, warns his master of depleted funds. Creditors clamour for payment. The bankrupt Timon exclaims in his vanity, “I am wealthy in my friends” (II.ii.184).

Of course each friend, in turn, refuses to help. “Cut my heart in sums,” cries the enraged Timon (III.iv.92). Alcibiades, Timon’s true friend, pleads with the Athenian Senate for mercy. They banish him, and he plans war against them. Meanwhile Timon has planned a second banquet. The guests arrive and Timon, after offering a cynical prayer, uncovers the dishes—plain water! He throws both water and dishes at the startled guests, driving them out and saying, “Most smiling, smooth, detested parasites” (III.vi.94). The embittered Timon curses Athens as he leaves for the woods. Now a complete misanthrope, Timon forages for food and digs roots to eat. One day in his digging he finds the root of all evil, a large quantity of gold. But he despises it: “This yellow slave / Will knit and break religions” (IV.iii.34-35). Alcibiades happens by with his army en route to Athens. Even though his men are deserting for lack of pay, he offers financial aid to Timon. Instead, Timon gives gold to his old friend, wishing disaster upon his former home. Word gets out that Timon is rich again, and streams of sycophants come to visit. Timon curses them all, even the Senators who now appeal to him for mercy. Alcibiades is more temperate than Timon, and reaches an agreement with the Senators to spare the innocent and exact vengeance only upon his and Timon’s enemies. It is too late for Timon; he dies and is buried under a mocking epitaph.

Timon begins in wealth and ends in wretched poverty. Jesus Christ was born in a manger, but “God exalted him to the highest place and gave Him the name that is above every name” (Phil.2:9).

6. *Gluttony*

*“He who keeps the law is a discerning son,
but a companion of gluttons disgraces his father.” (Prov. 28:7)*

Henry IV, Parts 1 and 2

Falstaff! Arguably one of Shakespeare’s greatest creations, this vibrant character steals every scene he’s in, from his introduction in *Henry IV*, to his back-by-popular-demand vehicle, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. At first glance, Falstaff is a jolly, fat old man. A deeper look reveals a darker side.

As the play opens, King Henry IV is lamenting his sins and the execution of his predecessor, King Richard II, whose throne Henry has usurped. He also grieves over his wastrel son, Prince Hal, saying, “riot and dishonor stain the brow / Of my young Harry” (I.i.85-86). The next scene is in the Boar’s Head Tavern in Eastcheap, where Prince Hal and his companion Falstaff are sleeping it off after a night of carousing. In the north, Hotspur is urging rebellion against King Henry, fuelled by the conflict over succession. In the next tavern scene, Falstaff refers to his “dagger of lath”, a prop which clearly links him to the character Vice in the old morality plays (II.iv.137). A messenger summons Hal to the palace to deal with the rebellion. Instead, the young prince and his friend stage a hilarious mock trial in which Falstaff plays the King questioning Hal. Even so, Prince Hal shows a growing awareness of the responsibility which is about to descend upon him with the crown. As preparations for war proceed, Falstaff protests, “I’ll repent” (III.iii.5). But it is Hal who is truly changing. In the battle, Hal fights and kills Hotspur, but the cowardly Falstaff feigns death, saying, “The better part of valor is discretion” (V.iv.120).

The action continues in the second part of *Henry IV*, where the rebels still think they can win the war. In London, the King is sick. Hal is back at the Boar’s Head, still frolicking with Falstaff, when a sobering word comes to him of his father’s rapid decline. Remember that Vice is a compendium of all faults, and to his gluttony Falstaff now adds avarice as he makes money by letting soldiers buy off their conscription. In parley before battle, Hal tricks the rebels and wins the victory without bloodshed. Still, the dying King thinks ill of his son and has it out with him: “O foolish youth, / Thou seek’st the greatness that will overwhelm thee” (IV.v.96-97). “O pardon me, my liege,” the prodigal cries out, and father and son are reconciled. The King dies, and Hal is to be crowned. Falstaff is wild with anticipation of advancement, and promises his friends that he will repay all debts. Yet when Falstaff meets the coronation procession, Hal says, “I know thee not old man, fall to thy prayers” (V.v.47). Having overcome Vice, the prince now deserves the crown.

Falstaff’s god is his belly and he comes to a bad end, but Jesus feeds the nations, saying, “Take and eat, this is My body” (Matt.26:26).

7. *Lechery*

“A man who commits adultery lacks judgement; whoever does so destroys himself.” (Prov. 6:32)

Antony and Cleopatra

The theme of lechery looms large in Shakespeare: Hamlet accuses his mother of adultery, two of King Lear’s daughters lust after the same man, Othello is convinced that his wife is unfaithful. The clearest exposition of this theme is in *Antony and Cleopatra*. One can, as Frank Kermode says, “easily discover in the play a simple moral scheme ... in which Antony neglects his rational responsibilities out of pure sensual indolence” (*RS*, 1344).

With Lepidus and Octavius, Marc Antony is a member of the Second Triumvirate, 44-30 BC. In the play’s opening speech, Philo laments, “you shall see in him / The triple pillar of the world transform’d / Into a strumpet’s fool” (I.i.11-13). Why should Antony care? He has given himself over completely to his lusts. “Let Rome in Tiber melt,” he says, “here is my space” (I.i.33). But duty calls him back to Rome, where Octavius pleads, “Antony, leave thy lascivious wassails” (I.iv.55).

Tension mounts as Pompey gathers an army to oppose the Triumvirate. Antony agrees to a politically expeditious marriage to Octavius’ sister. Cleopatra is enraged. Antony returns to her in Egypt, angering Octavius: “He hath given his empire / Up to a whore” (III.vi.66-67). A master of land warfare, Antony unwisely decides to fight Octavius by sea in the Battle of Actium. Cleopatra flees in her ship, and Antony follows, disgracing himself. “I have fled myself,” he grieves (III.x.7). Octavius sends an ambassador to win favour with Cleopatra. Antony explodes with anger when he sees him kiss her hand. Cleopatra easily charms Antony, and laughs at his bluster.

A second campaign against Octavius ensues. Antony wins the first battle on land, but loses the second battle at sea. He vows revenge against Cleopatra, who flees to her monument and feigns death. Antony falls on his sword, and is carried to the monument where he dies in Cleopatra’s arms. Octavius arrives and mourns Antony. Cleopatra fears capture and kills herself with a poisonous snake. Octavius buries them both together.

For the pleasures of the flesh Antony falls into disgrace. Jesus remained chaste in this life to save Himself for His future bride: “Blessed are those who are invited to the wedding supper of the Lamb” (Rev.19:9).

GOSPEL

Every preacher knows how difficult it is to say the same thing in fresh way week after week, and make the work of Christ on the cross and in His resurrection from the dead vivid and compelling.

Here the plays of Shakespeare can provide homiletical helps. There are six plays, all comedies or romances (which were originally classified as comedies) in which a “resurrection” is actually portrayed in the action on stage. Here follows a plot synopsis of each of those plays, with emphasis on the dead coming to life again. The Easter season is a “week of weeks”, that is, seven Sundays in all. Suppose you preach the Gospel lesson on Easter Sunday, you might consider working in one of the six “resurrection plays” of Shakespeare on each of the following six Sundays of Easter.

1. Much Ado About Nothing

This play contains a double love story. The subplot, with its development of a love affair between the verbally-sparring Benedick and Beatrice, often attracts the most attention. The main plot, however, centres on Claudio and Hero who are about to marry. The malcontent Don John hates Claudio, and sets up a scene in which his servant makes love to Hero’s maid in the window of Hero’s bedroom. Claudio observes this and is convinced that he has seen Hero being unchaste. At the wedding, he humiliates her publicly. The innocent, stricken woman collapses and “dies”. A friar advises Beatrice to “publish it that she is dead indeed” (IV.i.204). Meanwhile the bumbling sheriff Dogberry arrests Don John’s servant by chance, and the plot to deceive Claudio about Hero’s supposed unchastity is uncovered. Claudio is now penitent, and makes confession at Hero’s tomb. There, Hero’s father makes Claudio promise to marry a cousin of Hero’s. The “cousin” is of course Hero herself. At the wedding, she unmask to the astonishment of all, and says, “One Hero died defil’d but I do live” (V.iv.63).

How to apply this in a sermon? Consider this powerful ending, in which Shakespeare combines Christian themes of resurrection and wedding. In Scripture, the Resurrection of our Lord and the Wedding of the Lamb are discrete events. In *Much Ado*, Shakespeare conflates climactic events from the first and second advents of Christ.

2. Twelfth Night

Twins Viola and Sebastian are separated by a shipwreck. Each thinks the other is dead. Viola, washed up on the coast of Illyria, grieves the death of her brother. She disguises herself as a boy, “Cesario”, and enters the service of Olivia. Olivia sends Viola/“Cesario” on an errand to Duke Orsino. Viola falls madly in love with Orsino who is madly in love with Olivia who has

fallen madly in love with “Cesario” who is really Viola. Meanwhile Sebastian is rescued and comes to Illyria. The plot gets unbelievably complicated, with everybody now mistaking Sebastian for “Cesario” and vice-versa. Olivia flings herself at the happily confused Sebastian and they get married. Somehow, the “dead” brother and sister are identified and reunited onstage to the astonishment of all. Viola marries Orsino, and everybody lives happily ever after.

Here the poet combines themes again. To the “resurrection” of Sebastian he adds the theme of the Lost Being Found, which occurs at many places in the New Testament, especially in the parables of Luke.

3. All's Well That Ends Well

This play about unrequited love centres on Helena, daughter of a famous doctor, now deceased. Helena is protected by the old Countess of Rossillion, and loves the Countess’s son, Bertram. Bertram, a nobleman, disdains the commoner Helena. As the plot develops, Helena uses her medical knowledge to heal the King of France, who, in gratitude, gives her his ring and commands her to choose a husband. Guess who she picks? Bertram behaves like a cad, and goes through with the ceremony as required by the King but immediately leaves for the war in Florence. “Although before the solemn priest I have sworn, / I will not bed her” (II.iii.269-70). Bertram writes a letter—which Helena finds—in which he swears not to fulfil his marriage vow and consummate the relationship until Helena can do two impossible things: get the ancestral ring which he never takes off, and also present him with a child. Helena contrives a letter to the Countess which establishes to the court that she has “died”, then leaves for Florence. Bertram meanwhile has fallen in love with a girl named Diana, and is trying to seduce her. A bed trick is arranged, with Helena taking Diana’s place, and during the night of passion Helena and Bertram exchange rings. Bertram then returns to Paris, but is accused of murdering Helena when the King recognizes his ring. Chaos ensues until Helena appears, pregnant, and bearing Bertram’s ring. She has done the two impossible tasks, so all’s well. When Helena makes her entrance, Diana exclaims, “One that’s dead is quick” (V.iii.303).

By now the reader is seeing the advantage of poetry in harmonizing themes. Here is the virtuous woman, perhaps a type of the Church, a Christ-like healer who comes back to life again.

4. Measure for Measure

Shakespeare cites the Bible over 800 times, showing familiarity with several translations. This is his only title with a Biblical reference, citing Matthew in the Geneva translation: “Judge not ... with what measure ye mete, it shall be

measured unto you again.” The play centres around a corrupt governor who perverts justice to gratify his own lust. Critic Anne Barton misses the Christian truth in this play when she says, “Doctrinaire Christian interpretations ... are untractable. ... Shakespearean comedy is in general deeply distrustful of absolutes” (RS, 546).

The drama begins in Vienna, where the laws against immorality are exceedingly strict. The Duke of Vienna, a moderate man, decides to “go away” in order to test the laws. He disguises himself as a friar to stick around and observe things, and leaves in charge a man named Angelo, outwardly a sober judge, but inwardly seething with lust. Angelo immediately arrests young Claudio for impregnating his fiancée Julia and sentences him to death. There are mitigating circumstances: Claudio and Julia have a civil, and hence a legal, marriage, but have not yet been blessed by the church. Isabella, Claudio’s sister, comes to plead for her brother’s life. Angelo, who, like Bertram in *All’s Well*, has jilted his own fiancée Marianna, begins to lust after Isabella, even as she speaks. He makes a proposition: Claudio’s life in exchange for Isabella’s body. Isabella, who is preparing to enter a convent, agonizes over the moral dilemma she faces. Meanwhile the “friar” has been observing all of this, and arranges a bed trick in which Marianna is substituted for Isabella. Even so, the unjust Angelo orders Claudio executed. However the “friar” has been busy in the dungeon preventing Claudio’s death. Casting off the friar disguise, the Duke suddenly “returns” to judge, and sentences Angelo to death for his hypocrisy: “an Angelo for Claudio, death for death ... Measure still for Measure” (V.i.409, 411). A stricken Marianna beseeches Isabella for help. Still thinking her brother dead, she nobly begs mercy for the unjust Angelo. The “resurrected” Claudio is produced, the Duke is gracious to Angelo, and everybody ends up marrying the person they are supposed to.

The virtuous woman is here again in this play, but this time she is an advocate for mercy like Portia in *The Merchant of Venice*. In pleading for the life of her enemy Angelo, she is much like Jesus who says, “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.” As for the resurrection in this play, it is the redeemed sinner Claudio who finds new life.

5. Pericles, Prince of Tyre

Pericles is being pursued by assassins. He is shipwrecked and washes up in Pentapolis. There he falls in love and marries Thaisa, the daughter of the king. As they return to Tyre, Thaisa gives birth to Marina, but “dies” in childbirth. They put her in a coffin and bury her at sea. The coffin washes up in Ephesus, where Thaisa is recovered alive and becomes a priestess in the temple of Diana. Years go by, and Marina grows up to be a beautiful young lady. She is captured by pirates, and sold to a brothel in Mytilene. There she preaches holiness so effectively that business falls off sharply in the

whorehouse. The Bawd remarks, “She would make a puritan of the devil” (IV.vi.9). Later Pericles, grieving the deaths of both wife and daughter, comes to Myteline. He is so deep in depression that he has let his hair grow wild and refuses to speak to anyone. Marina, gifted with song and speech, restores him to sanity and they are reunited. Overjoyed, Pericles exclaims, “She is not dead” (V.i.215). They go to worship at Ephesus, where they encounter the priestess who cries, “That Thaisa am I, supposed dead / And drown’d” (V.iii.35-36).

In this play we have a double resurrection. Pericles’ wife and daughter come back to life. Marina is not only one of Shakespeare’s virtuous women; she is positively an evangelist, preaching righteousness in the midst of a very fallen world. Even Pericles himself, after losing his reason like Nebuchadnezzar, experiences a kind of rebirth.

6. *The Winter’s Tale*

Like *Measure for Measure*, this play has been a lightning rod for critics opposing Christianity. Hallet Smith contends, “considerable straining of the language, structure, and atmosphere of the play is required to make a specifically Christian doctrinal statement of it” (RS, 1567). Smith errs. Dogma is dogma, plays are plays. Dogma plays badly on stage, and plays are not written to expound dogma. Nevertheless, sound doctrine can inspire high art, and the greatest works of art can present Christian themes in imaginative ways inaccessible to academic theology. So we have in *The Winter’s Tale* a Christian story of redemption.

Leontes, King of Sicilia, is hosting his old friend Polixenes, the King of Bohemia. Leontes tends to be jealous, though, and can’t get it out of his mind that he is being cuckolded by his friend. Leontes trumps up charges and imprisons his virtuous wife, Hermione. In prison, she gives birth to a daughter, Perdita. Leontes rejects his own child and banishes it. Even when he is confronted with the truth, Leontes remains intransigent. Polixenes breaks with him, accompanied by the faithful Camillo, former servant of Leontes. Suddenly, news comes that the King’s son Mamillius is dead. Hermione collapses and is carried off. The virtuous Paulina says, “this news is mortal to the queen” (III.ii.148). Then, at last, Leontes repents and grieves his rash behaviour: “I have deserv’d / All tongues to talk their bitt’rest” (III.ii.215-16). He assumes that his daughter is dead also.

The banished child Perdita is taken to Bohemia where she found abandoned and raised by a shepherd. Eventually she falls in love with Florizel, son of Polixenes. In a parallel plotline, Polixenes disowns his son for courting a common shepherd-girl. Camillo reveals the truth of Perdita’s identity, and helps her and Florizel flee to Sicilia. Polixenes pursues them in anger. Leontes and reconciles with Polixenes and receives his “dead” daughter with astonishment. Paulina then takes them all to visit a “statue” of

Hermione. There Leontes, seeing the exact image of his wife, continues to express his penitence. Paulina promises even more amazing things, but admonishes the King, "It is requir'd / You do awake your faith" (V.iii.94-95). The "statue" comes to life and embraces the joyful and amazed Leontes as Polixenes wonders how she has been "stol'n from the dead" (V.iii.114). Paulina has hidden Hermione until the lost daughter is recovered.

Forgiveness is certainly a clear theme in this play, as Leontes finds true sorrow unto repentance. At work here also is the theme of reconciliation, as a father and son, and a father and daughter, and a husband and wife, and two estranged friends are all brought together in peace at the end. Central to the entire action is the resurrection of the "dead" wife, along with the finding of the lost child.

* * *

Many aspects of the Gospel can be seen dramatized in Shakespeare's plays. Preparatory to the Gospel is the Law, and Shakespeare certainly deals with various aspects of sin in his Histories and Tragedies. Central to the Gospel is the idea of death and resurrection, which Shakespeare portrays on stage in several Comedies and Romances. Shakespeare often combines these motifs with weddings, forgiveness, reconciliation, and other Christian ideas. It is significant that resurrection should be portrayed so often in this canonical author. I believe that this is the underlying reason why Shakespeare is misunderstood and hated by many critics. But for this very reason he should be loved and studied by those who also love the story of redemption.⁵

Rev. Frederic W. Baue, Ph.D., is Senior Editor of Church Resource Development, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri, USA.

⁵ For further study: Signet editions of individual plays, annotated, with critical introductions (\$3.95 each). G. B. Harrison, ed., *Shakespeare's Works*, annotated (Harcourt Brace, \$65.50). Video: many film versions available.

“FAITH IN CHRIST” OR “THE FAITH OF CHRIST”?
πίστις Χριστοῦ IN PAUL
Steven L. Chambers

1. INTRODUCTION

Partly because of its setting in the midst of some of Paul’s densest and most compact writing, the little phrase *πίστις Χριστοῦ* has proven to be unusually difficult to interpret. The phrase is found in various forms in seven places:¹

διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Romans 3:22; Galatians 2:16)

διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ (Philippians 3:9)

ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Galatians 3:22)

ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ (Romans 3:26)

ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ (Galatians 2:16)

ἐν πίστει ... τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ (Galatians 2:20)

In each case, the difficulty is the same: is the genitive case of the noun(s) best construed objectively or subjectively? Is Christ, in other words, the **object** toward whom faith is directed (“faith **in** Christ”), or the **subject** who experiences that faith (“the faith **of** Christ”)?

At first glance this might appear to be an elementary question, readily answerable with the help of an introductory grammar. The volume of literature devoted to its consideration, however, argues otherwise. Far from being a straightforward technical difficulty, the interpretation of *πίστις Χριστοῦ* is a complicated theological problem. It is by no means clear precisely what Paul intended to convey by means of this enigmatic expression.

After a brief historical sketch, I therefore propose to examine this problem from several angles: grammatical, contextual, and theological. Finally, I will pose a number of questions which might be important for any further discussion of this fascinating but difficult phrase.

¹ The only other similar phrase is in Eph 3:12: τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ. However, largely because this passage is not considered authentically Pauline by most proponents of the subjective interpretation, this passage is excluded from the general debate.

2. HISTORY OF THE QUESTION

In one sense, the suggestion that πίστις Χριστοῦ could be translated as a subjective genitive (“the faith **of** Christ”) is nothing new. The Vulgate left that option open by preserving precisely the ambiguity of the underlying Greek (*fides Iesu Christi*, “the faith of Jesus Christ”); so too did ancient Syriac and Coptic translations and Erasmus’ Latin New Testament. In English, the King James Version preserved “the faith of Christ” in every instance except Romans 3:26, which it amplified (in an objective direction) to read “him that believeth in Jesus”. Even Martin Luther, who is often considered the catalyst behind the widespread adoption of a purely objective reading, expressed greater openness toward a subjective interpretation than is generally recognized. Despite the fact that his seminal German New Testament of 1522 usually rendered πίστις Χριστοῦ objectively as “den Glauben an Christum”, at Galatians 2:20 he left the door open to a subjective understanding by translating πίστει ... τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ as “dem Glauben des Sohnes Gottes”.²

With just one exception, however, recent translators seem to have lost some of the nuance of these earlier, ambiguous translations. Every major English translation of the past century has rendered all of these phrases objectively: “faith **in** Jesus, faith **in** Christ, faith **in** Jesus Christ, faith **in** Christ Jesus”. The only exception is the New Revised Standard Version of 1989, which follows an objective pattern in its primary text but includes the subjective translation (“faith **of** Jesus,” etc.) in its footnotes.

Why did the NRSV re-introduce this long-lost “subjective” option? The scholarly history is fascinating. The first modern commentator to suggest a subjective sense for πίστις Χριστοῦ was Johannes Haussleiter, who argued in 1891 that Paul probably had Jesus’ personal faith in mind at Romans 3:26 because of the fact that he called Him by his personal name Ἰησοῦς, without a further title.³ Gerhard Kittel re-opened the question in 1906 not only by agreeing with Haussleiter regarding Romans 3:26 but also by claiming (as part of a larger agenda) that Paul **nowhere** advocated “believing in Jesus.”⁴

² Luther’s commentaries, too, include many instances of language that is at least sympathetic toward a subjective understanding. See especially the following: “Lectures on Romans” (1515-16), AE 25:242; “Lectures on Galatians” (1535) AE 26:129; and “Lectures on Galatians” (1519), AE 27:221.

³ Johannes Haussleiter, “Der Glaube Jesu Christi und der christliche Glaube: ein Beitrag zur Erklärung des Römerbriefes”, *NKZ* 2 (1891): 109-45, 205-30. An overview of Haussleiter’s argument in English is given by Richard B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11*, SBLDS 56 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983) 158-159.

⁴ Gerhard Kittel, “πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ bei Paulus”, *TSK* 79 (1906): 419-36. Once again, Richard B. Hays summarizes Kittel’s argument: *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 159.

Six years later, Adolf Deissmann drew further attention to these difficult genitival constructions by proposing that they represented “a special type of genitive, which might be called the ‘genitive of fellowship’ or the ‘mystical genitive,’ because it indicates mystical fellowship with Christ.”⁵

It wasn’t, however, until the late 1950s that the idea really began to catch on. The impetus was a pair of groundbreaking articles by Gabriel Herbert and Thomas Torrance, who once again raised the possibility that πίστις Χριστοῦ should be translated “faith of Christ”—not, however, due to the contextual or theological concerns that had motivated previous proponents, but because of what they considered to be the “Hebraic” idea of faith underlying Paul’s term πίστις.⁶ If πίστις, they argued, were actually the preferred Greek translation of אֱמוּנָה (faithfulness, distinct from faith), then Paul’s expression would mean that God was continuing to manifest **His** faithfulness through the faithfulness of His Son.

Within a few short years, however, this new version of the hypothesis was practically demolished with one blow by James Barr, who undercut the root of Hebert’s and Torrance’s assumptions about the “Hebraic” underpinnings of πίστις. Barr summarized part of his critique as follows: “This supposed ‘Hebrew meaning’ was sustained only through great and tendentious selectiveness within the linguistic evidence, through the use of theological argument in lieu of linguistic argument, and in particular through neglect of the verb אָמַן [i.e., hiphil of אָמַן].”⁷ Even more devastating was Barr’s observation that, although Hebrew definitely has ways of expressing both “faith” and “faithfulness”, it is the former idea, not the latter, which everywhere dominates the New Testament.⁸

Like a river blocked in its course, however, the proposal to translate πίστις Χριστοῦ as “the faith **of** Christ” simply found another channel in which to keep moving. No one since Hebert and Torrance has argued for a subjective interpretation of πίστις Χριστοῦ on semantic grounds, yet the ranks of those who favour that interpretation have increased manifold. Increasing in both number and sophistication, the proportion of Biblical scholars favouring “the faith of Christ” had grown by the late 1980s to the point that an exasperated James Dunn likened them at one Society for Biblical Literature meeting to “the headlong rush of the Gerasene swine into

⁵ Adolf Deissmann, *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1912) 163. This suggestion fit very well, of course, into Deissmann’s wider goal of interpreting Paul not so much as a theologian but rather as a “mystic”.

⁶ A. G. Herbert, “Faithfulness and ‘Faith’”, *Theology* 58 (1955): 373-79, and Thomas F. Torrance, “One Aspect of the Biblical Conception of Faith”, *ExpTim* 68 (1957): 111-14.

⁷ James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford University Press, 1961; repr. London: SCM Press, 1983) 201. Barr’s full critique occupies pp.161-205.

⁸ Barr 203.

the sea”—prompting Richard Hays to respond that Dunn, in that case, was himself ripe for comparison with “the Gerasene swineherds who begged Jesus to go away and leave them alone.”⁹

The history of the question has clearly been rancorous—at least partly because early proponents of the subjective interpretation tended to advance their theories on idiosyncratic grounds that were easily challenged. What remains to be seen, however, is how the arguments of more recent “subjective-πίστις Χριστοῦ” supporters have been advanced with greater sophistication grammatically and contextually.

3. THE GRAMMATICAL ISSUES

a) In favour of an objective understanding (faith “in” Christ)

It needs to be recognized at the outset that there are strong grammatical arguments in favour of the usual objective understanding of πίστις Χριστοῦ (faith **in** Christ). The case has been summarized well by Arland Hultgren,¹⁰ who makes the following points:

- i. When Paul clearly wants “πίστις + the genitive” to be understood in a subjective sense (“faith **of** ...”), he always supplies an article before πίστις (e.g. Romans 3:3, τὴν πίστιν τοῦ θεοῦ, “the faithfulness of God”). None of these seven passages includes an article with πίστις, and thus they are not **obviously** intended to be understood subjectively.
- ii. Writers other than Paul often use πίστις ἐν Χριστῷ or πίστις εἰς Χριστόν to express the objective sense (“faith **in** Christ”).¹¹ Yet Paul never uses that construction; he **never** makes Christ (or God) the object of a preposition following πίστις.¹² Thus, πίστις Χριστοῦ may well be an alternate, and uniquely Pauline, way of expressing “faith **in** Christ”.
- iii. The double occurrences of πίστις Χριστοῦ in Gal. 2:16 make more sense when they are read objectively as **clarifying** and **confirming** the intervening πιστεύειν εἰς Χριστόν clause (which obviously refers not to

⁹ This incident at the 1988 SBL meetings is reported in Richard B. Hays, “ΠΙΣΤΙΣ and Pauline Christology: What Is At Stake?” *SBL 1991 Seminar Papers*, SBLSPS 30, ed. Eugene H. Lovering, Jr. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991) 716.

¹⁰ Arland Hultgren, “The Pistis Christou Formulation in Paul”, *NovT* 22.3 (1980): 248-63.

¹¹ Hultgren 254. The examples he cites with ἐν include Eph. 1:15, Col. 1:4, I Tim. 3:13, II Tim. 3:15; with εἰς: Acts 20:21, 24:24, 26:18, Col. 2:5, I Pet. 1:21. Obviously, Hultgren’s assumption that none of these texts were written by Paul could—and should—be challenged.

¹² Hultgren denies that Gal. 3:26 is an exception, judging (along with E. D. Burton, *Galatians* [ICC: Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1921, 202-3], and the NRSV translators) that it should be rendered, “You are sons of God in Christ through faith.”

Christ's faith but to believers'), than when they are read subjectively as **clashing** with it.¹³

- iv. When Paul uses prepositional phrases made up of the three elements (preposition) + (anarthrous noun **other than** πίστις) + (Χριστοῦ), the sense is sometimes clearly subjective (e.g. Gal. 1:6, ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ, "in the grace of Christ") and sometimes clearly objective (e.g. Gal. 1:12, δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, "through a revelation of Jesus Christ"). It is therefore not true that the seven πίστις Χριστοῦ phrases, which follow this triple pattern, must be read subjectively.¹⁴
- v. Wherever Paul uses the prepositions διὰ, ἐκ, or ἐν together with πίστις but **without** a following noun, it is clear that he always has the faith of the believer in mind.¹⁵ Therefore it is likely that these seven instances which **add** Ἰησοῦ or Χριστοῦ after one of these three prepositions with πίστις maintain the same basic sense. Ἰησοῦ or Χριστοῦ would then be functioning adjectivally to qualify or define the believer's faith (i.e., "faith which is in-and-of Christ").¹⁶

The combined force of all of these arguments is considerable, and sufficient to demonstrate the grammatical legitimacy—if not quite the necessity—of translating πίστις Χριστοῦ objectively as "faith **in** Christ". Yet that is only half of the story.

b) In favour of a subjective understanding (faith "of" Christ)

Not surprisingly, Dunn's and Hultgren's arguments are rejected by those who prefer a subjective interpretation of πίστις Χριστοῦ. And they, too, are able to muster significant grammatical evidence in support of their view.

Sam Williams in particular challenges many of Hultgren's points.¹⁷ Regarding Hultgren's first point, for example—that when Paul is talking about faith and wants to express the subjective sense, he usually includes a definite article—Williams notes that virtually all of the instances in which

¹³ See, in this connection, the discussion of the context of this verse, below—especially Sam Williams' suggestion that this whole verse should **not** be assumed to be objective in meaning.

¹⁴ For a similar argument in the opposite direction, see further below!

¹⁵ Examples Hultgren notes include: διὰ πίστεως, Rom. 3:25, 30, 31; II Cor. 5:7; Gal. 3:14, 26; ἐκ πίστεως, Rom. 1:17; 3:30; 4:16a; 5:1; 9:30, 32; 10:6; 14:23; Gal. 3:7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 24; 5:5; and ἐν πίστει, I Cor. 16:13; II Cor. 13:5.

¹⁶ Hultgren 256-57. In support of this "adjectival" use of the genitive, Hultgren cites Blass and DeBrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, trans. and rev. Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 91-92, §165. As an example of this "adjectival" use, Hultgren refers to Rom 4:16b, ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ, which he understands to mean "Abrahamic faith", not "the faith of Abraham" (which would be a subjective sense!). Significantly, even Sam Williams, who otherwise favours a subjective interpretation, concedes Hultgren's point: "Again *Pistis Christou*", *CBQ* 49 (1987): 437.

¹⁷ Sam K. Williams, "Again *Pistis Christou*", *CBQ* 49 (1987), 431-447.

that observation is true involve a genitive **pronoun**, not a noun (or at least not a solitary noun without an accompanying pronoun).¹⁸ In such cases, Williams argues, the presence of the definite article is not due to the subjective sense which Paul is supposedly trying to convey, but rather due to the pronoun. This directly undercuts one of Hultgren's main points: the argument that unless Paul **specifically** indicates the subjective sense of the genitive **by using the article**, the genitive should be understood objectively.¹⁹ The article need not, according to Williams, have anything to do with the subjective sense at all: therefore its **absence** (as in πίστις Χριστοῦ) cannot be used in support of an **objective** understanding.

Further, Williams continues, the fact that Paul **does not** use πίστις ἐν or εἰς when he seems to mean "faith in Christ" does not lead to the inverse conclusion that he **does** mean "faith in Christ" every time he speaks of πίστις Χριστοῦ.²⁰ It is a basic logical error, Williams points out, to claim from the absence of any other standard formula for "faith **in** Christ" that Paul must have intended πίστις Χριστοῦ to carry that meaning.²¹

Two other proponents of the subjective interpretation, Richard Hays and Douglas Campbell, challenge Hultgren on another point as well.²² While Hultgren emphasises Paul's use of phrases consisting of the three elements (preposition) + (**a noun other than** πίστις) + (Χριστοῦ) in ways that sometimes need to be construed subjectively and other times objectively, Hays and Campbell draw on surveys of the usage (πίστις) + (**a genitive other than** Χριστοῦ) to show that that particular kind of phrase always does have a subjective meaning—not just in the NT but also in the LXX and in Hellenistic Judaism.

In terms of expressions that are grammatically parallel to πίστις Χριστοῦ, then, the evidence is absolutely evenly balanced. Those who favour a

¹⁸ Williams 432-33.

¹⁹ Ian G. Wallis concedes some value to both sides, on this one, noting that "The evidence here favours the view that the presence of the article signals a subjective genitive, but there is too much variation to be conclusive." *The Faith of Jesus Christ in Early Christian Traditions*, SNTSMS 84 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995) 69-70.

²⁰ Williams 433-34. Wallis draws the same conclusion by noting that "apart from Paul, there are no unambiguous cases in the New Testament where πίστις followed by Christ or God in the genitive case must be interpreted objectively" (71).

²¹ Dunn's comment on this conclusion is, however, apt: "the absence of such phrases [as πίστις ἐν or εἰς] leaves the proponents of the subjective genitive with a somewhat surprising conclusion: **either** πίστις Χριστοῦ is Paul's way of speaking of 'faith in Christ,' *or* Paul, for some yet to be explained reason, seems to have avoided speaking of 'faith in Christ'" (735), emphasis original.

²² Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ* 163-64, and Douglas A. Campbell, "The Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3:21-26" (Ph.D. Diss., University of Toronto, 1989, 97-98). Campbell's work was subsequently published in 1992 as JSNTSS 65.

subjective interpretation point to parallel constructions of the form (πίστις) + (a genitive other than Χριστοῦ) that have a dominantly subjective quality, while those who prefer an objective interpretation rely upon parallels of (a noun other than πίστις) + (Χριστοῦ) to support their case.

c) Grammatical issues: conclusion

The standoff over the direction in which parallel constructions “push” the proper understanding of πίστις Χριστοῦ epitomizes the entire grammatical debate. Neither side can score a decisive victory, for there is equal strength on both sides. Both camps can boast that, though falling back on one front, they are nonetheless advancing on the other.

The grammatical part of the debate is thus a stalemate. As Ian Wallis puts it, following a careful examination of the evidence on both sides, “We may conclude with some confidence that the question of whether πίστις Χριστοῦ and its variants should be interpreted subjectively or objectively cannot be decided on grammatical grounds alone. Moreover, the evidence is sufficiently ambiguous that neither option carries the burden of proof; rather, the matter remains open and must be decided on contextual and theological grounds.”²³ To these we therefore now turn.

4. CONTEXTUAL CONSIDERATIONS

Because the seven passages including some form of πίστις Χριστοῦ are grouped by proximity into four clusters, it makes sense to examine each cluster in turn within its context. Because of the cumulative nature of the arguments employed, the “subjective” interpretations of πίστις Χριστοῦ will be presented for each of these clusters seriatim, before responding to them all briefly (in section e, below) from an “objective” perspective.

a) Romans 3:22, 26

This section is clearly a “hinge” in Paul’s argument, a transition-point within the letter. Using the NRSV’s optional subjective reading, it may be translated as follows:

²¹ But now (νυνὶ δέ), apart from law, the righteousness of God has been disclosed, and is attested by the law and the prophets, ²² the righteousness of God **through the faith of Jesus Christ** [διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] for all who believe. For there is no distinction, ²³ since all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God; ²⁴ they are justified by his grace as a gift, through the

²³ Wallis 71-72.

redemption that is in Christ Jesus,²⁵ whom God put forward as a sacrifice of atonement by his blood, effective through faith. He did this to show his righteousness, because in his divine forbearance he had passed over the sins previously committed;²⁶ it was to prove at the present time that he himself is righteous and that he justifies **the one who has the faith of Jesus** [τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ].

What is the background to this transition? What point has Paul previously been making, which now provides the basis for this new direction (οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ νοῦνι δέ) in his thought? His previous argument can be picked up at 3:3-4:

³ What if some [of the Jews] were unfaithful? Will their faithlessness [ἀπιστία] nullify the faithfulness of God [τὴν πίστιν τοῦ θεοῦ]? ⁴ By no means! Although everyone is a liar, let God be proved true, as it is written, “So that you may be justified in your words, and prevail in your judging.”

How does this theme shed light on what follows? Ian Wallis makes the connection: “Clearly God’s πίστις is not mediated or controlled by humanity’s lack of response. It is improbable, therefore, that in Rom 3:21 [Paul] would maintain that the revelation of God’s righteousness was dependent upon or mediated by the faith of believers on hearing the gospel.”²⁴ As Wallis emphasizes, the entire argument from 3:4 through 3:20 reinforces a **dismal** view of human faithfulness, driving home the failure of Jews and Greeks alike to adequately respond to “the oracles of God” (3:2). Instead, “through the law comes the knowledge of sin” (3:20)—which, as 3:3 says, can certainly be characterized as “faithlessness” (ἀπιστία).

Wallis, again, draws together the larger argument of this section of Romans by defining the exact nature of the contrast that Paul is expressing at 3:21 by οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ νοῦνι δέ:

It seems more in keeping with Paul’s intention to frame the contrasting approaches to justification not in terms of the “faith-works” dichotomy, but rather of justification on the basis of human response versus justification on the basis of God’s universal grace in Christ or, expressed another way, of human righteousness versus God’s righteousness and covenantal faithfulness.²⁵

The question then is, however, in what specific way God’s faithfulness (τὴν πίστιν τοῦ θεοῦ, 3:3) has been revealed. Once again, the context of Romans’ early chapters provides clues for piecing together Paul’s argument. Back in 1:16-17 he had hinted at the overall theme of his letter by introducing the Gospel together with an allusion to Habakkuk 2:4.

²⁴ Wallis 75.

²⁵ Wallis 80.

1¹⁶ For I am not ashamed of the gospel; it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who has faith, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. 1⁷ For in it the righteousness of God is revealed through faith for faith [ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν]; as it is written, “The one who is righteous will live by faith” [Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται].

The problem is, who is “the one who is righteous” in v.17b? According to v. 17a, it is clearly someone who **reveals** the righteousness of God (“through faith, for faith”)—but otherwise this person is not clearly identified in the text. Even so, there are two good reasons to suggest that “the one who is righteous” and who reveals God’s righteousness “through faith, for faith” is Christ Himself.

The first argument flows from the phrase ὁ δίκαιος—part of Paul’s quote from Habakkuk 2:4, and the subject of the Gospel in 1:17. Richard Hays suggests that ὁ δίκαιος is best understood as a messianic title in the NT. Not only do other NT texts explicitly apply the title to Jesus (Acts 3:14, 7:52, 22:14; I Pet. 3:18, I Jn 2:1), but the expression is clearly messianic already in I Enoch 38:2 and Isaiah 53:11. Furthermore, according to Hays, the LXX version of Habakkuk 2:4 in particular “would have appeared to Paul as unmistakably messianic” due to the translators’ use of masculine pronouns and participles throughout Habakkuk 2:3-4.²⁶ As Hays explains, this insight—seeing Christ, not the believer, as “the righteous one” who lives by faith, not only here in Romans 1:17 but also in Galatians 3:11—improves the flow of Paul’s argument tremendously by reinforcing the theo- and christocentric character of God’s salvation.²⁷

The second argument concerns the expression “through faith, for faith” (ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, 1:17a). The meaning of the phrase is admittedly difficult, yet there is good reason to propose that it ought to be read with primary reference to Christ’s faith(fulness), not the believer’s. **His** faithfulness then becomes the instrument by which God’s righteousness is revealed “in the Gospel”—a view which keeps the focus squarely fixed **on** the Gospel, apart from its reception, and also coheres well with Paul’s previous statements in 1:3 that the Gospel is “concerning [God’s] Son” and in 1:9 that it is “the Gospel of His Son”.²⁸ This second argument stemming from Romans 1:17, then, reinforces the first: both of them together suggesting that Christ’s faith(fulness), not the believer’s, is the focus of Paul’s thinking not only at 1:17 but also at 3:20-26. From 1:17 onward, the

²⁶ Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ* 151.

²⁷ Hays’ full explanation of ὁ δίκαιος is found in *Faith of Jesus Christ* 151-58. Similar interpretations are advanced by Wallis 79-82; Hooker, “ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ”, 336; Markus Barth, “The Faith of the Messiah”, *Heythrop Journal* 10 (1969): 373-70; and especially Luke T. Johnson, “Romans 3:21-26 and the Faith of Jesus”, *CBQ* 44 (1982): 77-90.

²⁸ Campbell 115.

primary contrast Paul has in mind would therefore be consistent: humanity's faithlessness (ἀπιστία, 3:3) versus the faithfulness of God (τὴν πίστιν τοῦ θεοῦ, 3:3) in Christ.

b) Galatians 2:16 (twice), 20

The second cluster of passages is in Galatians 2. Once again we begin by considering the NRSV's optional "subjective" translation.

2¹⁵ We ourselves are Jews by birth and not Gentile sinners; ¹⁶ yet we know that a person is justified not by the works of the law but **through the faith of Jesus Christ** [διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ]. And we have come to believe in Christ Jesus [καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν], so that we might be justified **by the faith of Christ** [ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ], and not by doing the works of the law, because no one will be justified by the works of the law... ¹⁹ For through the law I died to the law, so that I might live to God. I have been crucified with Christ; ²⁰ and it is no longer I who live, but it is Christ who lives in me. And the life I now live in the flesh **I live by the faith of the Son of God** [ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ], who loved me and gave himself for me. ²¹ I do not nullify the grace of God; for if justification comes through the law, then Christ died for nothing.

As Richard Hays notes, this paragraph "provides a highly-condensed summary of the 'thesis' that Paul intends to argue in the subsequent chapters There is a sense in which all of Galatians 3 and 4 can be read as Paul's 'exegesis' of the concise authoritative formulations of 2:16."²⁹ That thesis is clearly inherent in the contrast expressed in 2:16. The question is, however, what are the two poles within that contrast?

There are several possibilities. The traditional "objective" reading of 2:16 understands the contrast as lying between "works of the law" and "faith in [Jesus] Christ"—but in a particular sense, emphasizing the leading word in each expression, "works" and "faith".

There are, however, several problems with this view, as Ian Wallis points out. Faith, in and of itself, is hardly a Christian innovation; the newer and more nuanced reading of Judaism which has come to the fore in the last several decades has exposed the fallacy of assuming that pre-Christian Judaism knew nothing of grace or faith but was merely characterized by legalism.³⁰ Furthermore, given the emphasis that Paul places on his own "conversion experience" in Galatians 1:11-17, it would seem odd for him to place more emphasis here on the human response to God's initiative than upon that overwhelming initiative itself. The more fundamental contrast,

²⁹ Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ* 141.

³⁰ See especially the groundbreaking work by E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977).

Wallis accordingly proposes, is between “works of the law” and “the faith of Christ” understood somewhat differently than usual: with the tension lying not so much between “works” and “faith” as between “law” and “Christ”.

Although the passage is difficult, Galatians 3:1-5 can also be read in support of this interpretation, in part because of the further contrast, twice within those verses, between ἐξ ἔργων νόμου and ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως. The latter phrase is especially difficult to interpret, containing at least four different exegetical possibilities.³¹ However, as Wallis explains, the former phrase (ἐξ ἔργων νόμου) seems quite plainly to describe “response to God outside of grace, that is to say, a dispensation of law characterized by the pursuit of self-attained righteousness.” On the other hand, then, to preserve a sense of contrast, ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως seems to denote “response to God ... engendered by a dispensation of faith which is intimately associated with God’s salvific initiatives in Jesus Christ.”³² The troublesome phrase ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως is thus taken to mean something like “the hearing stemming from faith”—in other words, an activity in which **God** is intimately involved, a hearing which He initiates and enables and bestows, in contrast to the “works of the law” which characterize humanity’s response.

It is at this point precisely that one of Sam Williams’ more adventuresome suggestions concerning Galatians 2:16 begins to make wonderful theological sense. One of the toughest problems in the verse is the threefold repetition of the idea that combines “belief” and “Christ”—the noun clauses διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ bracketing the verbal expression ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν. Most commentators assume that the only sensible way to understand that central verbal clause is “objectively”: i.e., “we who have **believed in** Christ Jesus”.³³

Williams, however, draws attention to the preposition εἰς— which, like ἐν, has an intrinsically “local” character, implying entry to or location at a certain specific **place**. After noting the way in which this nuance sheds light on expressions such as “in sin” (ἐν ἁμαρτίᾳ), “in the law” (ἐν νομῶ), and “in Christ” (ἐν Χριστῷ), Williams notes the significance of two similar expressions using εἰς which speak of “the means by which one comes to be in this new state (i.e., “in Christ”).³⁴ In Romans 6:3, Paul talks about the

³¹ Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ* 143-48. The difficulty of the passage is widely acknowledged; see for instance Hooker 326.

³² Wallis 107.

³³ Note, for instance, in the discussion above, that one of Hultgren’s grammatical points favouring the objective understanding of πίστεως Χριστοῦ is built around what he considers to be the “obvious” objective sense of this phrase—which Williams here disputes (hence my sense that his explanation is “adventuresome”!).

³⁴ Williams 438-41 (here, 441).

significance of “having been baptized **into** Christ Jesus” (ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν). Similarly, Williams says, Paul emphasizes in Galatians 2:16 the fact that he and other Christians have “believed **into** Christ” (ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν).

Just as Paul can say that one comes to be “in Christ” by being baptized into Christ, so he can say that one **believes** into Christ. In this second expression, too, *eis* implies movement, change, the transfer from one order of existence into another. Thus, to “believe into Christ” is the **means** by which one comes to be “in Christ.” That means is adopting the life-stance, *pistis*, which marked Christ’s own relationship to God, the life-stance of which he is the eschatological exemplar. To adopt this stance is to trust and obey Him who raised Jesus from the dead, to believe **like** Christ, and thereby to stand **with** Christ in that domain, that power field, created through his death and resurrection.³⁵

This primary connection between Christ and those who believe in(to) Him—which Williams’ reading of 2:16 highlights—coheres with 2:20a also, which says that “It is no longer I who live, but it is Christ who lives in me.” Although the “direction” of the preposition is different—Christ “in me”, rather than me being baptized or believing “into Christ”—the same essential contrast is present between the believer as the comparatively passive recipient of salvation, and Christ as its active distributor.

The second half of 2:20 continues to reinforce Christ’s activity on behalf of those who believe in Him: “The life I now live in the flesh **I live by the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave Himself for me**” (ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ). Richard Hays is especially receptive to the rich possibilities of translating this genitival chain either subjectively or as a *genitive auctoris* (genitive of author)—i.e., “The life that I now live in the flesh I live **by** the faith of the Son of God ...” or “... by the faith **which comes from** the Son of God”³⁶ Either way, Paul would be once again denying his own originating impulse in the faith which now animates his life; it is Christ’s doing, not his—the same way that Christ also loved him and gave Himself on his behalf. Together with 2:20a, this construction stresses Christ’s action, over against Paul as the (mere) instrument through whom Christ’s activity is seen. The entire thrust of Galatians 2:20—like 2:16—is thus emphatically Christocentric, over against the more traditional “objective” understanding.

³⁵ Ibid, 443. Williams’ suggestion is especially gratefully received by Hays, “ΠΙΣΤΙΣ and Pauline Christology”, 724-25.

³⁶ Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 168. According to James Dunn, 730, a *genitive auctoris* would express “faith effected by Christ” and represents a suggestion pioneered by Haussleiter in 1891.

As we shall see in the next section, this line of thinking—focussing on Christ as the active agent in salvation, over against the passive human role—also helps to clarify Paul’s line of thinking at Galatians 3:22ff. As far as Galatians 2:15-21 is concerned, however, understanding πίστις Χριστοῦ (Ἰησοῦ) in a subjective manner seems to clarify the whole passage by highlighting Paul’s absolute contrast between anthropocentric “works of law” and theocentric “faith of Christ”.

c) *Galatians 3:22*

Even though this verse follows shortly after the passage discussed above, a new factor has to be considered: the extended emphasis on Abraham throughout the intervening section. Because Richard Hays’ interpretation of this whole section, Galatians 3-4, sheds much light on its difficulties, his analysis provides a good place to enter the text.

The main problem of Galatians 3, according to Hays, is the dissonance between 3:6-14, which seem to suggest that **every believer** who shares Abraham’s faith is his heir, and 3:16-29, which identify **Christ** as the only “seed” of Abraham.³⁷ Hays attempts to solve this problem by identifying a narrative structure running from 3:1-4:11. The controlling idea of the whole section is found in 3:1—Paul’s reference to Jesus Christ being publicly exhibited as crucified—the brevity of which suggests that Paul is operating “in the mode of recapitulation”.³⁸ Thus, Paul still expects his readers to be hearing echoes of the Gospel about **Christ**—even when **Abraham** seems to be front and centre in the discussion in 3:6-14.³⁹

Can this argument be sustained? Can Christ really be the central figure in Paul’s thinking, even in 3:6-14? Hays’ exegesis shows how, first of all interpreting οἱ ἐκ πίστεως in 3:6 as “those who are given life on the basis of (Christ’s) faith”—a major departure from the usual reading which understands οἱ ἐκ πίστεως as if it were equivalent to οἱ πιστεύοντες (“the believing ones”) or ὅσοι πιστεύουσιν (“those who believe”).⁴⁰ As Hays says, though, “as the discussion unfolds, it becomes clear ... that these people share the blessing **not** because their faith imitates Abraham’s faith, but because they participate in Christ, who is Abraham’s ‘seed.’”⁴¹ He stresses

³⁷ Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ* 194-95.

³⁸ Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ* 198.

³⁹ As we saw before in the discussion of 3:5, understanding that verse’s difficult concluding phrase ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως as meaning “through the proclamation which evokes faith” is yet another invocation of the story of Christ, further suggesting that Christ is being “imported” into the subsequent discussion about Abraham. Note also, in this connection, Paul’s use of καθώς to make such a linkage explicit at 3:6.

⁴⁰ Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ* 200-1.

⁴¹ Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ* 202.

the fact that, when Paul quotes Genesis 12:3 and 18:18, he explicitly says that the Gentiles are blessed not in consequence of **their** faith—however analogous it may have been to Abraham’s—but rather as a result of **his** faith (3:8). “Abraham who believed” (3:9) therefore “receives from God a blessing which carries with it a promise that the Gentiles will be blessed ‘in him’ and/or ‘in his seed.’”⁴²

From there it is an easy jump forward to the later sections of Galatians 3—including the object of our greatest interest, 3:22. Once again interpreting 3:11 as a messianic use of Habakkuk 2:4, Hays sees the whole section from that point onward clearly pointing to Christ. **He** obeys God’s will (3:10), **He** bears the curse (3:13), **He** dies vicariously on behalf of others (3:13), **He** is vindicated by God and given life (3:11), and **He** receives the inheritance of God’s blessing which had first been promised to Abraham (3:14, 16). In all of this, Hays concludes, Paul is expressing an extremely consistent and well-developed Christocentric argument. “Just as others received the benefits of his death, so also they participate with him in the inheritance, which they have ‘in’ him (3:14).”⁴³ The phrase πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in 3:22, then, represents for Hays yet one more development of a theme already running throughout the chapter: the idea that Christ’s life, death, resurrection, and ascension represent the salvific climax of the relationship between God and humanity.

Morna Hooker, too, helps fit 3:22 into its following context by drawing attention to the unusual interplay of “faith” and “Christ” in 3:23–4:4. Paul begins a new section at 3:23 by saying “Now before **faith** came ...” before going on in the next verse to speak about the time prior to **Christ’s** coming, before reverting again in 3:25 to the statement, “Now that **faith** as come”. Then, in 4:4, there is yet another reference to God sending **His Son**. As Hooker points out, the fact that Paul refers to **faith** being revealed (ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, 3:23) provides still another clue that Paul is here using “faith” and “Christ” as synonyms, since in 1:16—the only other use in Galatians of ἀποκαλύπτω—it is **Christ** who is its object.⁴⁴ Sam Williams even notes in this connection that the arthrous forms in 3:23 (τῆν πίστιν and τῆν μέλλουσαν πίστιν) add demonstrative force to both expressions (“**this** faith” and “**this** incipient faith”), in addition to pointing back yet again to a subjective sense of πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in 3:22. “Faith comes in that Christ, the single *sperma* of Abraham (3:16), actualizes and exemplifies faith. In his trusting obedience, his complete reliance upon God as trustworthy and true, Christ **reveals** faith.”⁴⁵

⁴² Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 204-5.

⁴³ Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 209.

⁴⁴ Hooker 330.

⁴⁵ Williams 438.

As was true of both Romans 3:21-26 and Galatians 2:16-20, then, Galatians 3:22 also appears to fit very smoothly into its context when πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is understood subjectively as “the faith of Jesus Christ”.

d) Philippians 3:9

The final phrase under consideration is found at the end of Paul’s argument in Philippians 3:7-9, again as found in the alternate NRSV version.

3⁷ Yet whatever gains I had, these I have come to regard as loss because of Christ [ἡγήμαι διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν ζημίαν].⁸ More than that, I regard everything as loss [ἡγοῦμαι πάντα ζημίαν εἶναι] because of the surpassing value of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord. For his sake I have suffered the loss of all things, and I regard them as rubbish [ἡγοῦμαι σκύβαλα], in order that I may gain Christ⁹ and be found in him, not having a righteousness of my own that comes from the law, but one that comes **through the faith of Christ**, the righteousness from God based on faith [τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει].

As Morna Hooker points out, here, too, Paul introduces the idea of “the faith of Christ” in the context of a larger argument about Paul’s own non-existent contribution to salvation. In 3:4-6 he lists his privileges as a Jew, then in 3:7-9 makes it clear by the **threefold** use of the verb that he regards (ἡγέομαι) them all as nothing compared to what he has received in Christ. Each time, ἡγέομαι echoes back to the programmatic Christological 2:6, where Christ did not regard (ἡγήσατο) equality with God as “something to be exploited”. Now Paul, too, is following Christ’s example, considering as loss (ζημία) and rubbish (σκύβαλα) whatever was formerly to his advantage. In all of these parallels, Hooker thinks, “The echo of Philippians 2 suggests that this phrase ought to refer to the obedient self-surrender of Christ—that is, to **his** faithfulness.”⁴⁶

Ian Wallis, too, points out three other possessive genitives in Philippians that he thinks support this subjective interpretation. In 1:27a he understands τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ as a genitive of apposition (“the Gospel which is Christ”); in 1:27b he takes τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελιοῦ as an instrumental dative followed by a possessive genitive (“by means of the faith belonging to the Gospel”); and in 3:8 he prefers to see τῆς γνώσεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου μου subjectively (“the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord”, in the sense of being known by Him) rather than in the more usual objective manner (“knowing Christ Jesus, my Lord”). In 3:8 especially, Wallis thinks, it is important for Paul to continue emphasizing God’s initiative, with “the

⁴⁶ Hooker 332 (emphasis added).

knowledge of Christ” constituting “the grounds rather than the goal of Paul’s kenosis”.⁴⁷

According to these arguments too, then, a subjective understanding of πίστις Χριστοῦ in Philippians 3:9 helps to integrate Paul’s thought within the larger argument of the whole letter—just as subjective readings of similar phrases in other passages supported Paul’s purpose in other letters also.

e) Response from an “objective” perspective

Clearly, it would be an enormous task to respond to each of these suggestions individually; the greater part of Ian Wallis’ 1995 bibliography, which is more than 23 single-spaced pages long, represents works that favour the subjective perspective. Little wonder, then, that James Dunn felt (at the 1988 SBL meeting already mentioned) that he was being overwhelmed by a mass of onrushing Gerasene swine!

Not everybody, though, has been swept away completely as yet. Dunn, and Arland Hultgren, in particular, among others, both still raise pertinent objections to significant details of the subjective interpretations outlined above. Their arguments are organized below according to the text(s) they address most directly.

i) Romans 3:21-26

Hultgren raises the crucial point that, in terms of the **context** of πίστις Ἰησοῦ (Χριστοῦ), Paul does in fact speak fairly often about God justifying believers on the basis of **their own** faith. Hultgren lists 11 such passages from Romans and Galatians alone.⁴⁸ Even if a few of these passages are controversial (e.g. Rom. 1:17, Gal. 3:11, both of which are understood by some proponents of the subjective interpretation to support that view), the majority are quite indisputable.⁴⁹ Justification, for Paul, is both **frequently** and **obviously** linked with the faith of the believer.

Three texts from Hultgren’s list stand out because of the strength of the link they forge between these two ideas: righteousness, and the faith of the believer. In Romans 4:11, it is significant that Abraham is said to have obtained “**righteousness by faith**” (τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως) at the very same time that he is also explicitly called “the ancestor of all who **believe**”

⁴⁷ Wallis 123.

⁴⁸ The passages are: Rom. 3:28, 30; 4:5, 11, 13; 5:1; 9:30-32; 10:4-6; Gal. 3:8-9, 11, 24. Hultgren 258.

⁴⁹ It should be noted that Richard Longenecker, for one, does not see ἐκ πίστεως at Rom. 1:17 and Gal. 3:11 as a reference to Christ, but rather to human trust and faith. *Paul, Apostle of Liberty* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964) 150 n. 140.

(πατέρα πάντων τῶν πιστευόντων). Romans 10:4-6 is similar: “Christ is the end of the law so that there may be righteousness for all who **believe** [δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι] The **righteousness** that comes from **faith** [ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη]” And the third strong linkage is found in Galatians 3:8-9: “The scripture, foreseeing that God would **justify** the Gentiles by **faith** [ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοῦ τὰ ἔθνη ὁ θεός] ... Those who **believe** are blessed with Abraham who **believed** [οἱ ἐκ πίστεως εὐλογοῦνται σὺν τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραάμ].” In each of these verses, then, what in the disputed passages has been something of a “missing link” between God’s righteousness and the believer’s own faith is clearly present, as shown by the double use of πίστις and/or πιστεύω within the context of a discussion about δικαιοσύνη.⁵⁰ As Hultgren rightly says,

One can understand the uneasiness this causes the interpreter who wants to guard against the unPauline notion that the faith of the believer is itself a good work, especially when the Hebraic tradition affirms the “faithfulness of God,” which Paul himself affirms (Rom 3:3). But the issue is not whether Paul, true to his Hebraic heritage, affirms the faithfulness of God. The question is whether in these seven instances Paul is thinking of “the faithfulness of Christ” or the faith-response of the believer which accepts righteousness from God over against trying to establish one’s own righteousness by works of the law.⁵¹

Further pertinent to Romans 3 is Hultgren’s argument in support of the antithetical contrast between “law” and “faith” that supporters of the subjective interpretation reject (cf. the discussion of this issue in Galatians 2, above). “It is through the response of faith to the proclamation of Jesus Christ crucified that the believer beholds God’s righteousness, in light of which one’s own attempt at righteousness through works of the law is emptied of its significance and power.”⁵² Even more, Hultgren points out, “It is only when the term πίστις signifies the believer’s response to the gospel that the full significance of the contrast comes into the open.”⁵³ Unless “law” and “faith” are **both** understood to apply to the believer’s own situation, the contrast between them is blunted to the point of inconsequence.

True, proponents of the subjective interpretation might counter that **their** proposed contrast between “the believer” and “Christ” is sharper than any

⁵⁰ The same point is emphasized by James Dunn in his commentary on Gal. 2:16: “One would expect phrases using the verb to function as equivalent alternatives to phrases using the noun. This is just what we do find here ... and in 3:6-9, 22 (as still more clearly throughout Rom. 4).” *The Epistle to the Galatians*, Black’s NT Commentaries (London: A & C Black, 1993) 139.

⁵¹ Hultgren 259.

⁵² Hultgren 260.

⁵³ Hultgren 260.

possible contrast Hultgren might imagine between “the believer doing ‘A’ (works of the law)” and “the believer doing ‘B’ (faith)”. Yet Hultgren has a point. Some, following Krister Stendahl, might challenge the assumption that salvation for Paul’s first-century Jewish audience could possibly revolve in so narrow an orbit around their own “introspective consciences”.⁵⁴ But the way in which Paul himself phrases the contrast here in Romans does at least seem to allow the possibility—if not require the certainty—that this in fact precisely what he has in mind.⁵⁵

ii) *Galatians 2:16, 20*

Here, too, Hultgren argues from the internal logic of 2:16 that πίστις Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ must refer to the faith of the believer.⁵⁶ The hinge of his rather creative argument is the καί in the centre of the verse. In 2:16a Paul speaks of what he and other Jews **know**—“that a person is justified not by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ.” Then in 2:16b he goes on to speak of what they accordingly **do**: “And [καί] we have come to believe in Christ Jesus.” Justification, in other words, on this reading, involves both “knowing” and “doing”: knowing that one cannot justify oneself, and believing instead in God’s justification. Not only does this explanation diminish some of the redundancy within this verse that supporters of the subjective interpretation find so distressing (the double use of πίστις, bracketing πιστεύω), but it also acknowledges the concurrently active **and** passive nature of justification: **not** doing works of the law (passive), **but** believing (active).

A more substantial argument springing from internal considerations within Galatians 2:16 is mustered by James Voelz.⁵⁷ He begins by noting that authors sometimes assume meanings “under” the meanings which they actually express. Normally these assumed-but-unexpressed meanings are difficult to uncover; but sometimes (and this verse is a signal example) the unexpressed meaning can actually be detected through a “hint” of some kind in the context. In this case, Voelz attaches a great deal of significance to the presence of the verb πιστεύω right in the midst of the two πίστις Χριστοῦ clauses: “A person is justified ... διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, and we have come

⁵⁴ Krister Stendahl, “The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West”, in *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976) 78-96.

⁵⁵ A superb defence of this classic Lutheran understanding of what is really at stake for Paul in Galatians and Romans—over against Stendahl and many other 20th-century challengers who deny that Paul is really concerned about justification by grace through faith—is Stephen Westerholm’s *Israel’s Law and the Church’s Faith* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988).

⁵⁶ Hultgren 261.

⁵⁷ James Voelz, *What Does This Mean?* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1995) 193-94.

to believe in Christ Jesus (εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν) in order that we might be justified ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ.” The verbal clause “we have come to believe”, to Voelz, is a “hidden signifier” which determines the meaning of both of the disputed nominal (noun-based) phrases. Therefore, πίστις Χριστοῦ probably refers to human faith in Christ—not the faith of Christ Himself—due to the clarifying effect on the meaning of the whole sentence which is implied by the central verb ἐπιστεύσαμεν.⁵⁸

James Dunn, on his part, spots a more general weakness in the argument advanced by Hays and others, which might well be discussed in connection with 2:16 since it is here that some of the more extreme suggestions are rooted.⁵⁹ Hays’ entire argument, Dunn thinks, “is in danger of overkill”—in the sense that “almost without realising it, we find that every reference to πίστις in the body of Galatians ... [is] swept up into the defence of the subjective genitive.”⁶⁰ Even though both 2:16 and 3:22 include clear **verbal** references to the faith of believers, the tendency is, as Dunn puts it, to

hoover up every relevant reference to “faith” in Galatians in order to defend the subjective genitive reading of 2:16, 20 and 3:22. This is nothing short of astonishing. It now appears that a text (Galatians) which has provided such a powerful charter of “justifying faith” for Christian self-understanding, **nowhere** speaks clearly of that “faith.”⁶¹

To the extent that Dunn is right, and Hays and company have in fact pushed their interpretative stance to the point that the larger goal of Paul’s entire argument is swept aside (or “vacuumed up”!), it is obvious that context is not being allowed to influence the interpretation of individual texts with nearly the force that it should.

iii) Galatians 3:22

If the proposed absence of a noun-based expression of **the believer’s** faith creates an embarrassment for Hays, the very real lack of a verbal statement that **Christ** had faith poses great difficulties for Hooker. Her proposal to read every occurrence of πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ with Christ as its subject severely taxes Paul’s logic. Why would Paul have consistently **avoided** saying that “Christ believed as Abraham believed”, if that was indeed what he meant? The question becomes particularly acute especially at 3:26, where Paul’s potentially confusing statement, “You are all sons of God διὰ τῆς πίστεως

⁵⁸ Voelz concedes that there are “convincing arguments on both sides” of the whole πίστις Χριστοῦ question, but notes that “Those who opt for our faith in Jesus have the linguistic evidence we have here presented on their side” (194 n. 21).

⁵⁹ See the summary above for arguments advanced by Hays et al.

⁶⁰ Dunn 735, 736.

⁶¹ The only possible exception, Dunn 736 notes, is Gal 5:22.

ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ” (i.e., “through the faith [which is] in or of Christ Jesus”) could have been greatly simplified, if Paul did in fact mean to speak of Christ’s own faith, by the use of an equivalent verbal construction, such as “You are all sons of God in Christ Jesus who believed.”⁶² Yet that is precisely what Paul does not say!

iv) Philippians 3:9

Lastly, the expression τὴν [δικαιοσύνην] διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ in Philippians needs to be understood, Hultgren says, by comparison with other Pauline expressions that speak of both “righteousness” and “faith”. As already noted, in every other place where Paul uses these terms in close proximity it is quite clearly the faith of the believer—not God’s faithfulness—that Paul has in mind.

A little more specifically, Dunn makes three points against the subjective view in Philippians 3:9 in particular. First, the repetition of both δικαιοσύνη and πίστις within the verse shows that Paul was trying to emphasize the contrast between human and divine righteousness, not simply indulging in redundant repetition. Second, the fact that Paul uses the **anarthrous** form διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ in 3:9a suggests that he probably intended the expression to be taken objectively (“faith in Christ”) rather than subjectively (see again the grammatical discussion above). And third, the fact that the occurrence of “faith” in 3:9b is, by contrast, **arthrous** (τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει, “the righteousness from God based on faith”) conversely implies that Paul is here referring to “**the** faith”—that is, the faith of the believer just mentioned in 3:9a. “His Greek would be scarcely intelligible”, Dunn protests, “if he meant the first πίστις to refer to Christ’s faith and the second πίστις to ‘justifying faith.’”⁶³

5. THEOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

As this discussion has hopefully begun to illustrate, there are many important theological insights to be gained by interpreting πίστις Χριστοῦ subjectively. The messianic overtones of prophecy (i.e., Habakkuk 2:4) take on extra richness. God’s faithfulness to Israel is revealed and extended through Jesus. The “faithful servant” motif of the Old Testament reaches a new high point in the obedient Son. Abraham’s faith(fulness) is even surpassed by that of his “seed”. God’s plan of salvation, both generally and in each of these details, is clearly presented and commended to the believer

⁶² Dunn 738.

⁶³ Dunn 743-44 (this quote, 744).

as being theo- and Christocentric—while still calling for the believer’s full participation as one whose faith is bound up in every respect with Christ’s.⁶⁴

At the same time, however, it must be noted that very few of these theological implications are developed or expounded in the existing literature with any thoroughness. Partly this is due to the “occasional” nature the literature, since a glance at any bibliography reveals that the bulk of the work on πίστις Χριστοῦ consists of short exegetical articles. There is simply not enough space in the span of 15 or 20 pages to develop an integrated theology based on “the faith of Christ”—even if that were the goal, which in the case of most of these exegetically-minded scholars it clearly is not. The only two longer works on the topic, the volumes by Hays and Wallis, both suffer (in a sense!) from their authors’ preoccupation with advancing their arguments **textually** rather than **systematically**. The reader is left in both cases with the uneasy feeling that a great deal more needs to be said about this topic before it can be properly “settled”. Indeed, the ongoing acrimonious debate on the question points to the same conclusion: that the **theological** implications of reading πίστις Χριστοῦ subjectively have not yet fully been explored.

What are some of those implications?

Christology is perhaps the theological area most directly affected by this debate. Richard Hays, for example, bluntly charges that “Some opposition to the subjective genitive interpretation may be rooted in an implicitly docetic Christology.”⁶⁵ Docetic or not, though, one’s Christology cannot help being affected by the suggestion that Christ’s faith as the Son of God differed in no significant respect from our own. Granted, Aquinas may have exaggerated matters in a docetic direction by claiming that “from the moment of conception Christ had the full vision of the very being of God Therefore he could not have had faith.”⁶⁶ And surely Aquinas is not alone in defending the **divine** aspect of Christ’s person in such abstract and philosophical arguments that Jesus’ **humanity** is eclipsed to the point of practically disappearing. This pendulum, too, as every pendulum, swings to both sides. But it helps little—even in the face of borderline docetism—to rush headlong to the other extreme and insist, as some proponents of the subjective interpretation are on the verge of saying, that Christ’s faith exactly equals our own in every respect. Hooker’s suggestion, for example, that “The term ‘Son of God’ . . . needs to be interpreted in terms of Christ’s oneness with the Father and obedience to his will, rather than in terms of

⁶⁴ See Hooker 321-23 and 341-42; Wallis 67-69; and Hays, “ΠΙΣΤΙΣ” 727-29.

⁶⁵ Hays, “ΠΙΣΤΙΣ” 728.

⁶⁶ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 3a.7.3, quoted in Wallis 1.

divinity”, exposes her to the charge of kenoticism—an equally grave departure from orthodoxy as is docetism.⁶⁷

The Christological challenge therefore remains: How can one speak **appropriately** of “Christ’s faith”? That a significant number of New Testament texts quite apart from the πίστις Χριστοῦ passages repeatedly refer to Christ as “faithful” (πιστός) suggests that Christ’s own faith should at least be considered within, if not incorporated into, one’s overall Christological deliberations.⁶⁸

Soteriology, too, is deeply challenged by a subjective reading of πίστις Χριστοῦ. Although not all proponents of the idea advance the notion equally strongly, the principle of *imitatio Christi* is a frequent aspect of the subjective-genitive proposal.⁶⁹ Williams’ idea that one can “believe into Christ”, for instance, suggests that it is the believer’s own act that is salvifically essential: “To adopt this stance [of faith] is to trust and obey Him who raised Jesus from the dead, to believe **like** Christ, and thereby to stand **with** Christ in that domain, that power field, created through his death and resurrection. To do so is to become the beneficiary of Christ-faith.”⁷⁰ Granted that a “participationist” view of soteriology yields important insights (as Deissmann, Schweitzer, and others have shown),⁷¹ it nevertheless must be asked whether or not this is how Pauline soteriology really “works”—by patterning our faith after that of Christ. Does not the distinction between justification and sanctification insist that the ability to respond to God’s grace is a subsequent and, for that matter, secondary consequence of his prior initiative through Christ and the Holy Spirit?

Ironically, in this same connection, Hays too flirts with soteriological disaster in the opposite direction when he states that “‘Faith’ is not the precondition for receiving God’s blessing; instead, it is the appropriate mode of response to a blessing already given in Christ.”⁷² The underlying idea here, too—like Williams’—is laudable: salvation as *extra nos*, unbidden and

⁶⁷ Hooker 323.

⁶⁸ References to Christ as πιστός are found in II Thessalonians 3:3; II Timothy 2:13; Hebrews 2:14–3:6; and Revelation 1:5; 3:14; 19:11.

⁶⁹ See especially Hays, “ΠΙΣΤΙΣ” 728, and Williams 443, as strong advocates of this view.

⁷⁰ Williams 443.

⁷¹ I am thinking here of the ἐν Χριστῷ debate which Deissmann instigated, Schweitzer furthered, and Davies and (especially) Sanders fine-tuned. See Adolf Deissmann, *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History*, trans. from the 2nd German edition by William E. Wilson (1927; repr. New York: Harper Torchbooks 1957); Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, trans. William Montgomery (London: A. & C. Black, 1931; repr. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998); William D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: SPCK, 1948); John Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul*, rev. ed. (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1987); E. P. Sanders, *op. cit.*

⁷² Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 249.

unforeseen. Yet this specific way of articulating the universality of grace can easily verge into universalism by dispensing completely with the Christian's own faith. The fact that several commentators, in the course of recognizing this danger, minimize it, suggests that it should actually be explored with more, not less, attention and precision.⁷³

6. A PROPOSAL FOR FURTHER INQUIRY

What is obviously still needed, then, is a thorough investigation of the theological implications of reading πίστις Χριστοῦ subjectively. Of particular interest, as noted above, would be the doctrines of Christology and soteriology. Some of the questions that could be considered in such an inquiry would be these:

1. What would a Christology that paid full(er) attention to "Christ's faith" look like? In what specific ways might it resemble—or differ from—classical Christologies both orthodox and heterodox? What kind of Jesus would we have if faith were indeed (as Hays, for instance, suggests) His defining characteristic?
2. For that matter, how has the traditionally-objective understanding of this phrase affected the history of Christology? Soteriology? How important was it, for example, to Martin Luther, that Paul should be speaking of "faith in Christ" rather than "the faith of Christ" in these four key clusters? Is there any evidence that Luther considered "the faith of Christ" a viable option when he read these texts?
3. Conversely, it could be asked how unorthodox trends in contemporary Christology and soteriology might also be affecting the interpretation of πίστις Χριστοῦ. To what extent has the subjective interpretation flourished as a means of undermining orthodox Christology and/or soteriology?
4. What effect would it have on Lutheran theology to adopt a subjective reading of πίστις Χριστοῦ? At what points—if any—would "the faith of Christ" create conflict with historic Lutheran doctrine? Might the **linkage** between grace and faith, attested already in Ephesians 2:8-9 and reinforced in Luther's great "*solas*" be strengthened through seeing Christ as the **single** agent by and through whom **both** great principles are most clearly revealed?

Obviously these are complicated questions. The phrase πίστις Χριστοῦ is itself so seldom and so ambiguously used that it might well be impossible to draw out of such a small amount of textual raw material the large quantity of

⁷³ Wallis 68-69; Hooker 322; Barth 368-69.

highly-refined theology which I am seeking. But on the other hand, the volume and intensity of the debate in the last few decades both underscores the significance of these questions and begs for their further exploration.

Stephen L. Chambers, a pastor of Lutheran Church–Canada, is a Ph.D. candidate at Wycliffe College, University of Toronto.

THE ROOTS OF THE REFORMATION¹

John R. Stephenson

Before we start digging up and analysing roots, we'd better agree among ourselves which tree in the forest we intend to examine. "The Reformation" is an *omnium gatherum* term which refers to a whole thicket of trees of different size and shape and kind. For the truth of the matter is that at least six movements which made their mark on the religious history of the 16th century are accommodated by historians under the umbrella commonly dubbed "The Reformation". Nor do these various trees happily coexist in the forest of religious pluralism. Their distinct root systems have caused trees to sprout which compete for room and displace each other in a process which is far from over. Not all of them can have been divinely planted, and they do not enjoy equal access to the sun.

Now "reform" was a widespread aspiration at the end of the Middle Ages, and the first half of the 15th century saw the rise and eclipse of the star known as a General Council of the Church Universal. Gather the bishops of Western Christendom, allow input from the universities and religious orders and secular rulers, tame the Pope as a meek CEO, and the reform of the Church in head and members would surely follow. Elected at Constance to be the tool of the Council held in that city from 1414 to 1418, Martin V Colonna returned to Rome and promptly repudiated the conciliar theory. Nor was the Council of Basle able to deliver the desired goods as it sat resisting papal absolutism from 1431 to 1439.

Another avenue of reform was trodden by those who vested their hopes in the vigorous exercise of the papal office. Curialism would concentrate all power in the papal court and trust a godly successor of Peter to use it well. But the line of Popes who reigned from the middle of the 15th century until the accession of the transitional pontiff Paul III Farnese in 1534 were grand Renaissance princes who made it thinkable for half of Europe to break its age-old bond with the Holy See. Joseph Lortz tells how, at the coronation of Leo X in 1513, statues of three naked pagan gods depicted the two previous pontificates and the one just beginning. The image of Venus represented the time of Alexander VI Borgia (1492-1503) whose conduct in office is best understood by picturing to oneself the outgoing president of the United States clad in papal vestments. A likeness of Mars, the god of war, commemorated Julius II della Rovere (1503-1513), whose military campaigns on the Italian peninsula prompted Erasmus to pen the satirical

¹ This paper was delivered on the website eBiblecommentary.com on 31 October 2000.

pamphlet *Julius Exclusus*. The changed style of the new papacy was signalled by a statue of Athene, the goddess of the arts, whom the Medici prince Leo X would faithfully serve.² No impulse for churchly reform would be generated from the papacy until the major schisms of the 16th century were firmly in place.

A third mode of reform was in constant motion throughout the Middle Ages. Lord Macaulay famously pointed out that while Protestants with a programme tend to found a new church, Roman Catholics with the same inclination customarily establish new religious orders.³ So even those for whom the levers of ultimate power were out of reach could do their part to further reform. Such renewal was sought not only by such sparkling figures as Dominic Guzman (†1221) and Francis of Assisi (†1226), but also by such obscure figures as the deacon Gerard Groote (†1384), who formed his Brethren of the Common Life in faraway Holland to live out the spirituality articulated in *Imitatio Christi*.

The 16th century can justly be accused of a certain reckless generosity in its superabundant fulfilment of the previous age's yearnings for reform. Before Martin Luther became a household name Desiderius Erasmus (1469-1536) had already drafted and widely circulated a blueprint for the reform of Christendom. Good scholarship and good morals, the ditching of scholastic in favour of classical Latin, a return to the sources of Christian and pagan antiquity, the direct study of Holy Scripture—from such planks as these did Erasmus construct a reform platform breathing the “philosophy of Christ”. Erasmus' hopes for an end to warfare among nations were dashed as Henry VIII and Francis I turned out to be anything but peacemakers, and his blueprint for churchly reform was soon sidelined by other models.

The second pattern of reform to emerge in the 16th century took the shape of the Lutheran Reformation itself, of which much more anon. The third model of reform was proposed and enacted by Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531) and John Calvin (1509-1564) and took concrete shape in the historic Reformed churches. There are good reasons for not simply subsuming the English Reformation under the Zwingli-Calvin model, but rather for placing it in its own pigeonhole as the fourth 16th-century pattern of reformation. Moreover, historians must also take into account a fifth and a sixth such pattern in the shape of the Radicals and Anabaptists, on the one hand, and of the various components of the Counter-Reformation, on the other. The historian's own confessional perspective will determine which of these six

² Joseph Lortz. *The Reformation in Germany*, 2 vols., trans. Ronald Walls (New York: Herder and Herder, 1968) I:91.

³ See the celebrated review of Leopold von Ranke's *History of the Popes* in *Essays by Lord Macaulay* (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1887) 586f.

competing models of reform and renewal will be recognized as “**the Reformation**”.

On close inspection sharp fissures show up even within these six patterns of reformation themselves. Two parties, high and low respectively, are clearly discernible in the Church of England by the death of the first Elizabeth. The unity of the Lutheran pattern of reformation was almost wrecked by the tensions between the Reformer and Melanchthon, and Philipp and his followers have never accepted the divisive quality of the line drawn by Luther at Marburg in 1529. Moreover, there was nothing monolithic about the internal Roman renewal which got under way in the 1530s. Gasparo Contarini (1483-1542), whose affinity for Luther on the matter of justification was pointed out by Karl Barth,⁴ may not be confused with Giampetro Caraffa, the gruesome father of the Roman Inquisition who reigned as Paul IV from 1555 till 1559. Nor did the Radicals agree among themselves.

Furthermore, even though the second through the sixth patterns of reformation produced distinct and distinctive church bodies, we may not overlook the existence between the six patterns of a certain cross-fertilization which refused to respect neat confessional boundaries. While ostensibly heavily defeated by all the patterns of reformation which displaced his own, Erasmus also succeeded in leaving his mark on these subsequent models which took off in directions he would not go. Melanchthon's refusal to break with Erasmus at the time of the great humanist's dispute with Luther precipitated both the Formula of Concord in the 16th century and later Lutheran orthodoxy's slippage from the Reformer and Chemnitz in the next. The English Reformation was genetically modified by every other pattern of reform except the Roman and the Radical. Erasmus' hand was felt throughout the process that lasted from Henry through Elizabeth, and the early 20th-century Anglican Modernist H. D. A. Major was right to remark on the fusion of an essentially Lutheran liturgy with Calvinist articles of religion and traditional polity in the shaping of the English Church.

On 31 October we fitly focus on the pattern of reformation which developed almost overnight shortly after an obscure professor in a remote German university town proposed 95 Theses for disputation on this day 483 years ago. Imagination exercised on all sides of the Reformation divide has inaccurately pictured the posting of the Theses as a deliberate act of revolt. Yet while in the celebrated 95 Theses Luther showed considerable courage in tackling a sensitive matter of pastoral practice and made some barbed remarks in rebuke of the ecclesiastical powers that be, he nevertheless here

⁴ See Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics* IV/1; *The Doctrine of Reconciliation*, eds. G. W. Bromiley & T. Torrance, trans. G. W. Bromiley (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956): 624.

stayed within the parameters of late mediaeval Catholic orthodoxy, and he certainly had no intention of flinging down the gauntlet before the whole religious system then presided over by the first Medici Pope.

As a matter of fact, the young professor had already issued a bold and deliberate challenge to the school of theology in which he had been raised in a series of theses announced at the beginning of the previous month. On 4 September 1517 Luther posted and sent out his 97 Theses *Against Scholastic Theology*.⁵ The title of this pungent document is flatly misleading, since the target of the Reformer's attack was not the whole tradition of theology begun back in the 12th century by Anselm, Abelard, and Peter Lombard, but rather the anthropology of the school founded by William of Ockham, who died in 1349, the year of the Black Death.⁶ Taking in second place Luther's blistering attack of 4 September 1517 on the Pelagian tendencies of the *via moderna*, I beg your leave to name the fivefold root system of the second pattern of 16th-century reformation before examining the nature of the tree itself and reflecting on the fruits it continues to bear.

(1) No theologian, however gifted, could have triggered off the events that so drastically altered the ecclesiastical geography of 16th-century Europe if Western Christendom had not at that time been, so to say, a giant keg of gunpowder awaiting the lighting of a match. Writing before the Second Vatican Council, Karl Adam admitted that the 16th century would not have turned out as it did apart from an infamous document penned by Pope Gregory VII in 1075.⁷ The monk Hildebrand ascended the papal throne in 1073 determined to implement the goals of the so-called Cluniac Reform, which wanted to clean up the upper echelons of ecclesiastical power, chiefly by rendering them wholly independent of the secular authorities. The 27 propositions of the *Dictatus papae* signed by Gregory two years after his accession were a declaration of war on Emperor Henry IV and all his works and all his ways. At the cornerstone of Gregory's programme stood the veritable deification of the papal office and its holder. All bishops are but his vicars in the spiritual realm, as are all secular rulers in their own sphere. Thesis 8 indicates that the pope is the actual emperor, thesis 23 hints at his impeccability (i.e., his personal sinlessness!), and thesis 22 articulates a claim which would be brandished against Luther in the early months of 1518: "That the Roman church has never erred and will never err to all eternity, according to the testimony of the holy scriptures."

⁵ AE 34:9-16.

⁶ The same point can be made about Luther's remarks in SA III.i:3, to which compare Melancthon's nuanced treatment in Ap II:27-30!

⁷ For a translation of Gregory's *Dictatus papae*, see Donald A. White, *Medieval History; A Source Book* (Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press, 1965) 311f.

Gregory VII died a failure in exile in Salerno in 1085, boasting that, "I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity." For a brief season his vision of absolute papal power was realized in the early 13th century by Innocent III (1198-1216), but the hubris of many pontiffs was brought low when Boniface VIII took on Philip V of France and precipitated the papacy's 70-year "Babylonian captivity" in Avignon. Innocent's ostensible triumph was bought at a heavy price, for the existing legislation used by Henry VIII to prise the Church of England out of Europe had been enacted by English kings of the high Middle Ages in their attempts to rein back papal power. Only against the background of what he lambasted as the "imperial papacy" of the Cluniac reform can Luther's denunciation of the papal office be rightly understood. For the first of the "three walls" of the Romanists to be demolished in the *Appeal to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation* of 1520 is the papal claim of superiority over and immunity from the civil authorities.

It is one of the choicest and bitterest ironies of history that Luther's assault on the totalitarian claims of the mediaeval papacy permitted the pendulum to swing to the very opposite extreme. Despairing of meaningful reform at the hands of the established bishops, the Reformer begged the ruling princes to step into the vacuum. As is well known, in both Germany and the united kingdom of Denmark and Norway the territorial sovereigns soon progressed from the temporary status of "emergency bishops" (*Notbischöfe*) to become the "supreme bishops" (*summi episcopi*) of the churches in their realms. The Religious Peace of Augsburg of 1555 allowed for ruling princes to choose between two confessions, the Roman and the Lutheran, granting these sovereigns the right to determine the religion of their subjects according to the principle summarized in the phrase *cuius regio eius religio*. Shortly after the promulgation of the Book of Concord the Elector Palatine defected to the Reformed Faith, taking his subjects with him to Geneva. In 1613 Elector John Sigismund of Brandenburg likewise repudiated the Lutheran confession. The Pennsylvania historian Bodo Nischan provides a wealth of valuable detail as he approvingly describes the endeavours of John Sigismund to uproot Lutheran faith and practice from his realm. Readers of *Prince, People, and Confession* cannot take seriously Karl Barth's much publicized and widely accepted charge that cringing servility to the secular authorities pertains to the essence of Lutheranism. For in the years immediately following John Sigismund's apostasy, leading clergy bravely denounced their ruler's attack on the Church, some of them being forced into exile in neighbouring Saxony. A generation before princely absolutism was set in place by the woefully misnamed "Great Elector", the estates of Brandenburg and Prussia resisted John Sigismund's church policies. And the common people demonstrated by the force of their opposition that they were by now well catechized in the Lutheran Faith to

which they remained firmly and courageously loyal.⁸ In the long run, however, all three groups were subjugated as the Lutheran Faith was almost wholly wiped out from Bandenburg-Prussia by the Reformed House of Hohenzollern, that dynasty from hell. A line of usurping *summi episcopi* backed up by the imperially sanctioned *cuius regio eius religio* were able to hack down a tree rooted in deep revulsion against the imperial papacy of the Cluniac reform.

(2) If Luther had entered the Dominican Order and been schooled in the basically Augustinian anthropology and soteriology of Thomas Aquinas, his theological development would not have taken the shape it did. The sole satisfactory explanation of Martin's decision to enter the Order of Augustinian Eremites is that it alone among the monastic houses of the city of Erfurt offered its inmates a theological education in the spirit of the *via moderna*. The followers of Thomas Aquinas (1224-1274), Bonaventura (1217-1274), and Duns Scotus (ca. 1265-1308) were lumped together among the advocates of the ancient way, the *via antiqua*, while theologians who took their cue from William of Ockham were the avant-garde modernists of the day, the divines of the *via moderna*. Throughout his life Luther would acknowledge an ongoing epistemological debt to Ockham, gladly labelling himself a modernist, a terminist, or a nominalist. Heiko Oberman is disposed to see in nominalism well nigh the chief root of the Lutheran Reformation. But if Luther followed his nominalist teachers in their philosophical epistemology, he radically repudiated the leading theologians of the *via moderna* where their anthropology and soteriology were concerned. William of Ockham rejoiced that God graciously provided salvation to fallen mankind through His *potentia ordinata* realized in the Incarnation and the Church, but he considered that, if push came to shove, men could earn salvation through loving God above all things by their natural powers. And the Tübingen divine Gabriel Biel (†1495) taught that "*facienti quod in se est, Deus non denegat gratiam*", which being interpreted is roughly the encouragement, "If you do your very best, Almighty God will do the rest." The *via moderna* was the most Pelagian school of late mediaeval theology, and its teaching was geared to exacerbate Luther's scruples and plunge him into the depths of despair. The new Wittenberg theology developed as Dr Martin expounded Romans and Galatians, and strong attacks were mounted on the Pelagian tendencies of the *via moderna*, supremely but not exclusively in the 97 Theses of 4 September 1517. At this stage of his career Luther steps onto the stage clad in the mantle of St Augustine. The bottom line here is his conviction of the *servum arbitrium*, the enslaved will which can do nothing to promote its reconciliation with God. Within a decade

⁸ Bodo Nischan, *Prince, People, and Confession; The Second Reformation in Brandenburg* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994) 161-203.

Luther thanked Erasmus for attacking him on this very point rather than focusing on some minor issue. In this conviction, which took him back to the Augustinian root of mediaeval Christendom in the West, Luther did not stand alone, but had many sympathizers in Calvin, the theologians of the English Reformation, and even in some Fathers of the Council of Trent.

(3) Luther was above all a theologian of the means of grace, which he may not have become had not the *media salutis* been so terribly clogged up in his own day. Indulgences were a phenomenon that stood not at the heart but more towards the margin of the mediaeval Sacrament of Penance, whose “form” was Absolution but whose “matter” consisted of three works demanded of each penitent soul. In order for Absolution to be yours you must be contrite in heart, you must confess with your lips, and with body and soul you must discharge the satisfaction imposed on you by the priest who heard your confession. Even though Calvin in one of his better moments advocated pastorally administered private Absolution,⁹ and even though the classic Anglican Books of Common Prayer retained private priestly Absolution in the Order for the Visitation of the Sick, Lutheranism is the only non-Roman pattern of 16th-century reformation which dramatically highlighted private pastoral Absolution as the very heart of the Gospel. Two decades after the 95 Theses, Luther lamented in the Smalcald Articles that back in those days we had no appreciation of the power of Absolution (SA III.iii:20). The reformation discovery was that, even though our contrition and confession and getting our lives together after reconciliation are marred by many defects, nevertheless the soul that despairs of its own works can trust in Absolution. Unclogged, the means of grace were experienced in the early Reformation as a majestic, doxology-producing cataract of divine love. In the closing theses of 31 October 1517 Luther despises indulgences as a cowardly running away from confronting the scarred tissue that remains after Absolution. In the peace and pardon of God, the Christian should bear all crosses and thus be conformed to Christ his head.

(4) A fourth root of the Lutheran Reformation can be discerned in Luther’s recovery of the Christology of Cyril of Alexandria, which began no later than 1519 and which was complete by the mid-1520s. While all mainline Western theologians accepted the Chalcedonian Definition of 451, most of the scholastics had interpreted this dogma from a moderately Antiochene standpoint. This tendency would be carried much further by Calvin and the Reformed Church, which viewed Chalcedon through radically Antiochene, nay veritably Nestorian spectacles. The view, advocated in the 16th century and widespread today, that Lutheran and

⁹ See John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, two vols., ed. John T. McNeill, trans. Ford Lewis Battles (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977) III.iv.14; *Library of Christian Classics* 20:638f.

Reformed Christianity agree on the essentials and differ only on minor matters, is refuted already when one discerns the unique quality of Luther's Christology which, as Tom Hardt put it, unfurled the Cyrilline flag on the territory of Western Christendom. The truth pinpointed in the phrase *genus majesticum* has been consistently rejected by the Reformed, indicating that the differences between the second and third patterns of reformation go all the way down, all the way up, and all the way across.

(5) The fifth root of the Lutheran Reformation takes us all the way back to the second century of our era, thus almost to the dawn of Christendom. As he engaged in life and death battle with the Gnostics, St Irenaeus of Lyons pointed his readers and hearers to three visible marks of the true Church. Bishops standing in succession from the Apostles taught the Holy Scriptures in accordance with the "canon of truth" handed down from Christ through the Apostles. Irenaeus' contemporary Tertullian would label the "canon of truth" by a term more familiar to our eyes and ears by speaking of the *regula fidei*, the rule of faith. Once in the Apology (Ap XXVII:60) and once at the outset of the Solid Declaration, the word *regula* is used in its ancient sense. The selfsame content is communicated among us under the heading of "confession", *confessio*, *Bekennnis*. The rule of faith is both the summary core of Christian truth derived from Holy Scripture and also the coherent paradigm according to which Holy Scripture is properly interpreted. Irenaeus' summaries of the rule of faith are usually roughly congruous with the Apostles' Creed, though it included also such articles as the presence of the Lord's true flesh and blood in the Eucharist. In our present context it is vital to note that Irenaeus could not imagine the day when the successors of the Apostles would no longer interpret Sacred Scripture according to the orthodox rule of faith. For him, Scripture, office, and confession belonged inextricably together, each harmonizing smoothly with the other.

In the 95 Theses Luther asked for a discussion on the nature of the Gospel and received in response the threats of an entrenched power structure thrust onto the defensive. The first official curial response to the Theses of 31 October 1517 took the shape of an oddly named "Dialogue" *On the Power of the Pope* authored by Sylvester Mazzolini of Prierio (1456-1523), who as master of the sacred palace occupied roughly the same position in the administration of Leo X as the one filled by Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger in our own day. The Dominican Prierias formulated four ecclesiological maxims whose net effect was to rule the Reformer out of order even before his voice was heard. The third maxim, or *fundamentum*, bears witness to a long-standing imbalance between the three Dominically founded factors of Scripture, office, and rule/confession which Irenaeus had never envisaged. According to Prierias, "Whoever does not take his stand on the doctrine of

the Roman Pontiff as on the infallible rule of faith from which even Sacred Scripture draws its strength and authority, is a heretic.”¹⁰ Prierias’ paradigm, which simply expresses the state of affairs that had existed in Rome at least since the so-called Cluniac reform of the 11th century, no longer allows Sacred Scripture to breathe freely. Instead the written Word of God is straitjacketed by the solo interpretation of the Roman pontiff, who has arrogated the whole episcopal office, once shared among many equals, into his own hands. Roman Catholic scholars have no qualms about admitting the moral corruption of the Renaissance papacy, but they must hold that the rule of faith propounded by Alexander, Julius, and Leo was essentially orthodox. This proposition, and its converse, divide the Lutheran from the Roman Catholic pattern of 16th-century Reformation.

According to the church historian Adolf von Harnack (1851-1930), Luther’s significance consists in the fact that he abolished from the Church’s life the age-old factor of the rule of faith. This is what is meant by Harnack’s contention that the Reformer brought about the “end of dogma”. The Berlin Liberal Protestant got his facts completely wrong, for in his work of purifying and promulgating the rule of faith Luther gave dogma a fresh lease on life which lasted until the so-called Enlightenment. Indeed, the whole Lutheran Reformation is best understood as a multi-dimensional collegial endeavour of a united ministerium to remove the rust that had corroded the rule of faith and thus to restore the balance among Scripture, office, and confession that had seemed so self-evident to Irenaeus. It is no accident that the Reformer issued his Bible translation with the accompaniment of his celebrated Prefaces. In these brief documents Luther did not speak as a private citizen, but as a bearer of the Dominically instituted office instructing the sheep of Christ in the rule of faith which arises from Scripture and in terms of which Scripture is rightly understood. His acceptance of the grammatical sense of Scripture is customarily qualified with the admission that it cannot stand if it finds itself in conflict with an article of faith.¹¹ The Reformer’s devotional writings and his Catechisms, along with his liturgical reforms and hymn compositions, are all evidence of his aim to promulgate a purified rule of faith.

From this fivefold root the trunk of the Lutheran Reformation arose as a distinctive way of teaching and learning Christ in the one holy catholic and apostolic Church. Chemical analyses of the bark of this tree will yield the finding that not one article of the Reformer’s faith is, as such, unique to Lutheran Christendom. Our Christology is shared with Cyril and the Christian East. Our anthropology and soteriology stand in the succession of

¹⁰ See B. J. Kidd, ed., *Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation* (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1911) 31f.; my trans.

¹¹ AE 40:157 (*Against the Heavenly Prophets* [1525], Part Two) et passim.

St Augustine. Our confession of the Real Presence is robustly at one with the united testimony of Ignatius, Justin, and Irenaeus, which was given long before Scripture, office, and confession split up to go their separate ways. Nor is there anything unique about Luther's appeal to Sacred Scripture as such. For as Beryl Smalley wrote two generations ago, "The Bible was the most studied book of the Middle Ages."¹² The only unique element in the whole Lutheran Reformation was the Reformer's discernment of the distinction between Law and Gospel. Not only Erasmus but also such 16th-century Biblical humanists as the Englishman John Colet and the Frenchman Lefèvre d'Étaples were moralists without any inkling of the distinction between Law and Gospel. The closest any theologian prior to Luther came to explicitly articulating the distinction between Law and Gospel occurred in Augustine's writing of *On the Spirit and the Letter* at the height of the Pelagian controversy.¹³ Theologians had only dimly sensed the distinction between Law and Gospel, and yet the proper distinction resounds through the mediaeval sequence *Dies irae*, ascribed to Thomas of Celano, the first biographer of St. Francis of Assisi. Hymn 607 of *The Lutheran Hymnal* (1941) affords liturgical evidence that the actual life of the Church has always proceeded from the distinction between Law and Gospel, and historical theology as practised by Lutherans is faced by the still largely undischarged task of demonstrating that the best of non-Lutheran divinity in fact hinges on the distinction whose explicit recognition is the unique preserve of Lutheran Christendom.

In closing we glance briefly at the foliage currently put forth by this ecclesial tree with fivefold root. Remarkably, a certain aspect of Luther's own fate has been repeated in the fortunes of the segment of Christendom named after him. In the spring of 1521 the monk excommunicated by Leo X was also declared an outlaw of the Holy Roman Empire through the Edict of Worms promulgated by Charles V. By the time of the Formula of Concord German princes of Reformed stripe were promoting what today is known as the "Second Reformation". Calvin was here recognized as the true second-generation interpreter of Luther, and heavy pruning shears were taken to Lutheran liturgy and practice as these were reduced to the Reformed lowest common denominator. Bodo Nischan applauds the brutal persecution of the Lutheran Church in the territories of the Reformed Hohenzollerns, which began in earnest after the public apostasy of John Sigismund in 1613. In his narrative Nischan singles out for special honour a class of divines known as

¹² Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1941) ix.

¹³ Here Augustine discerns that the Pauline contrast between "spirit" and "letter" in II Cor. 3:6 has to do not with the literal and spiritual senses of Scripture, but with the distinction between Law and Gospel.

the “Reformed irenicists”, theologians in the Elector’s pay who were prepared to deal gently with such enlightened Lutherans as were prepared to give up the Real Presence in the Eucharist and the Christology of the *genus majestaticum*.¹⁴ All the way from John Sigismund to the Prussian Union of the early 19th century, the sentence once declared by pagan Rome, the judgement spoken against Luther by Charles V, was repeated against the loyal children of the Lutheran Reformation: *Non licet esse vos*, You have no right to exist!

Most of nominal Lutheranism on the European continent has long since been swallowed up hook, line and sinker into what Kurt Marquart describes as the black hole of union with the Reformed. The Lutherans of North Germany could at least plead in mitigation the brutal persecuting efforts of the Hohenzollern State, but the nominal Lutherans of North America can offer no such excuse. Two distinct models for being Lutheran have been available since the early decades of the 19th century. On the one hand, the Hohenzollern paradigm was advocated with democratic wrappings by S. S. Schmucker with his programme of “American Lutheranism”. Alas, the great majority of North American Lutherans now unblushingly walk the path signposted by Schmucker, which involves the wholesale surrender of the second pattern of reformation in favour of some conflation of the third and fifth patterns that emerged five centuries ago. On the other hand, the heirs of Krauth and Walther and of Löhe’s *Sendlinge* find themselves at odds with the prevailing religious culture as they confess Christ *in partibus infidelium*. Even within the conservative Lutheran synods powerful forces would join with the Hohenzollerns and Schmucker in hacking down the venerable ecclesial tree with fivefold root. Our only justification for seeking the conservation and flourishing of this tree is the conviction that the young professor who issued his 95 Theses 483 years ago was faithful to Christ and His Word as he sought to reconfigure the inter-relation of Scripture, office, and rule/confession in the life of the Church. On this anniversary night we may not indulge in cheap triumphalism, for all Western Christendom, including our own, is currently gripped in deep crisis, engulfed in dreadful desolation. Five centuries ago those who advocated all six patterns of reformation were agreed that Almighty God is all-holy and His wrath to be feared. As we now enter the fourth century of so-called Enlightenment, this consensus has broken down so that even the religious forces active within

¹⁴ See the closing chapters of Nischan’s *Prince, People, and Confession*, and the same writer’s *Lutherans and Calvinists in the Age of Confessionalism* (Brookfield, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 1999) chapters 12 and 13. These meticulously researched volumes, containing a wealth of otherwise inaccessible data and written from a bitterly anti-Lutheran perspective, are must reading for all seminarians and clergy who care a fig for confessional integrity!

our culture are hard at work to silence the Law which would convict us all of sin. Apart from the holiness of God and the severity of His wrath as wrought through the Law, the bottom line of the Lutheran Reformation degenerates into the bland announcement of the wimpiness of God. Thus, to allude to the closing theses of the 95, many an imparting of the general Absolution each Sunday morning may in fact be the proclamation of "Peace, peace, where there is no peace." The future of the Lutheran Reformation does not stand in human hands, but in the scarred hands of Him who suffered for us. In His all-wise providence He has entrusted treasures to us which are meant for His own people. Thus the conservation and flourishing of the ecclesial tree with fivefold root depends now on His work through Law and Gospel to bring about a state of affairs envisaged by Dr. Luther, who steps forth from the great cloud of witnesses to testify that, "When our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ, said 'Repent', He called for the entire life of believers to be one of repentance."

John R. Stephenson, Ph.D., is Associate Professor of Historical Theology at Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary, St. Catharines, Ontario.

FRIEDRICH MICHAEL ZIEGENHAGEN (1694-1776)

GERMAN LUTHERAN PIETIST IN THE ENGLISH COURT

Norman J. Threinen

For many years, there has been a tendency for historians writing about Pietism to focus almost exclusively on the two founders of this eighteenth-century religious movement in Germany: Philipp Jakob Spener (1635-1705) and August Hermann Francke (1663-1727). Spener provided many of the intellectual impulses for Pietism; Francke worked out the practical implications of the movement in the area of education, missions, and social concern. With the death of Francke, Pietism has been generally regarded as having reached a plateau and then having declined into an inward-looking, individualistic expression of piety, often with a law- and works-orientation. Yet, this view of Pietism overlooks the fact that most of the significant ventures emanating from Halle really occurred in the decades after Francke's death. Heinrich Melcheor Muehlenberg, for example, was sent to be the great organizer of Lutheranism in North America by the Pietist centre in Halle in 1742, fifteen years after the death of August Hermann Francke.

Perhaps this view of later Pietism as static and lifeless was encouraged right from the beginning. For, if a late eighteenth-century history of the Francke Foundations in Halle is correct, this view may already have been held *de facto* by Gotthilf August Francke, the son of the elder Francke, who succeeded his father as the head of the extensive pietist enterprises in Halle. In this early history of the Francke Foundations, Gotthilf Francke is depicted as having had one fundamental guiding principle: to keep everything exactly as his illustrious father had set it up and to carry on in his Spirit.¹ This approach of the younger Francke toward Halle Pietism after the death of its founder had the effect, according to the writers of this early history, of maintaining the positive things which had been achieved by the elder Francke. However, it had the disadvantage of discouraging any creative attention to the new challenges occasioned by the spirit of the times.

The view of Pietism as a movement which ceased to develop and which lacked vitality after the death of its founders is being questioned today. This has resulted in a closer look at the second generation of Halle Pietists, i.e., those who lived and worked in the half century after the death of August Hermann Francke. It has also resulted in an examination of Halle Pietism on

¹J. L. Schulze, G. C. Knapp, and A. H. Niemeyer, *Franckens Stiftungen* (Halle: Commission der Buchhandlungen des Waisenhauses, 1796) 3:277.

a broader scale, i.e., as it was manifested in locations other than Halle. Among the eighteenth century centres of Halle Pietism which are currently receiving greater attention is London, England, where the German Lutheran Court Chaplain of the day served an important function in facilitating Halle Pietism to make an impact as far away as India and North America. That the work of Halle Pietists in London was done in co-operation with organizations like the Anglican Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge (SPCK) and, in the case of the Tranquebar Mission in India, also with government authorities in Denmark, adds to the complexity of the historical developments of Halle Pietism in London and to the difficulty of understanding the historical happenings associated with it.

As evidence that a more serious look is being taken at Halle Pietism in London, we have two recent studies on Anton Wilhelm Boehme (Boehm) the first German Lutheran Court Chaplain in London with a Halle Pietist orientation.² So far no one has seriously focussed on Friedrich Michael Ziegenhagen, who followed Boehm and served a much longer time in office. While he receives some attention in one of these studies, no similar study to what has been done with Boehm has yet been undertaken on Ziegenhagen. As was the case with August Herman Francke in Halle, the reason may again be that Boehm serves the function of a founder; it is often more difficult to get excited about the person who builds on the work of the founder.

It is not that researchers in the field have lacked an appreciation of Ziegenhagen entirely. Renate Wilson, who typifies the people conducting current research into Halle Pietism, has expressed disappointment that no serious work on Ziegenhagen has been done in spite of “his prominence during the period and in the field at issue.”³ Similarly, a standard work in the field describes Ziegenhagen as “an organizing middleman between London and the Franckes ... with their plans to meet the Protestant crisis in Central Europe, and to provide for the needs of the rocketing German population in America. From the point of view of the Franckes, Ziegenhagen was indispensable.”⁴ Finally, Daniel Brunner correctly makes the comment that “Ziegenhagen’s years marked the pinnacle of the German Lutheran Royal Chapel.”⁵

²Daniel L. Brunner, *Halle Pietists in England: Antony William Boehm and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge* (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), volume 29 of *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Pietismus*, edited by K. Aland, E. Peschke, and G. Schaefer; Arno Sames, *Anton Wilhelm Boehme* (1996), volume 26 of the same series.

³Renate Wilson, “Continental Protestant Refugees and their Protectors in Germany and London: Commercial and Charitable Networks”, in *Pietismus und Neuzeit* (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995) 20:109.

⁴W. R. Ward, *The Protestant Evangelical Awakening* (Cambridge University Press, 1992) 307.

⁵Brunner 58.

It is also not that there is a lack of information on Ziegenhagen. The hundreds of hand-written letters in the archives of the Francke Foundations in Halle, which originated from the pen of Ziegenhagen and were sent to a variety of individuals, have been used selectively by almost everyone who has written about Halle Pietism. The trouble is that, while many of these letters have been used by researchers, no one has bothered to systematically bring together the information which these letters contain about the man and his work.

The interest of this writer in Ziegenhagen was sparked by Ziegenhagen's role in the history of Lutheranism in Canada. When the earliest Lutheran congregations in Canada—in Halifax, Nova Scotia—tried to find a pastor to serve them, they looked first to Ziegenhagen and the other German Lutheran pastors in London, their immediate place of origin in the old world. Later when Germans also came from Germany and settled in Lunenburg, they continued to look to Ziegenhagen to be their connection with Halle, Germany. As Muhlenberg was attempting to satisfy the need for pastors among the German Lutherans in America, he also looked to Ziegenhagen to be the middleman in providing such manpower support. And there were any number of other situations in which Ziegenhagen, strategically situated in London, England, played a significant role.

Thus, this writer spent a four and a half month sabbatical leave in Halle in the fall of 1999 researching Pietism with the person and work of Ziegenhagen as the focus. While a great wealth of secondary background material, an overview of the Ziegenhagen correspondence, and a detailed examination of the letters which he wrote from Hanover prior to coming to England was gained, the project is still not complete. A carefully examination of the more than three hundred letters which he wrote from London, as well as the archives of the SPCK in England, still need to be made to see what they will add to what can be known of the life and work of Ziegenhagen. This paper represents a report of the study thus far.

I

The one big problem in preparing a study of Ziegenhagen's life and work is that there appears on the surface to be very little concrete information about his parental family and early life. This is a problem which was already recognized by those who knew him during his lifetime. Gottlieb Anastasius Freylinghausen, who prepared a brief biography on "the life and character" of Ziegenhagen for the readers of the Halle mission publication immediately after Ziegenhagen's death, bemoaned the fact that he was unable to find any

information about the early life of the deceased Ziegenhagen.⁶ He was never married. He did not write a *Lebenslauf* (biography) of himself. He appears to have spoken very little about his parental family and early childhood even to his closest friends and associates. Yet a careful study of the early Ziegenhagen's letters and other contemporary sources has already yielded information about Ziegenhagen's early life and one can confidently anticipate that more is to be found.

What information about the parental family and origin of Ziegenhagen has surfaced so far from the study of this writer? In his death notice sketch of Ziegenhagen, Freylinghausen indicated that he thought the deceased came from Pomerania. This statement is supported by contemporary records.⁷

In the early eighteenth century, there were three areas loosely designated as Pomerania in Northern Germany by the Baltic Sea. Of these areas, there is strong evidence to support the fact that Ziegenhagen was born and raised somewhere in central Pomerania, the former Duchy of Stettin, also known as "Hinterpommern". It is an area which is bordered on the west by the Oder River which today forms the boundary between Germany in Poland. Thus, Hinterpommern today is located in Poland.⁸

While western and central Pomerania were ruled by Polish dukes until the seventeenth century, many Germans emigrated into the region beginning as early as the twelfth century. In 1637 when the ruling Polish ducal families died out from lack of male heirs, these two regions became the possession of the Elector of Brandenburg. This brought the German population in Pomerania under a German government which encouraged cultural links with its historic homeland. When the Peace of Westphalia ended the Thirty Years War in 1648, however, the region came under Swedish control, a state of affairs which continued until 1720 when Brandenburg-Prussia again acquired it. Born in 1694, Ziegenhagen was therefore raised in Hinterpommern, an area heavily populated by Germans, while it was politically controlled by Sweden.

⁶Gottlieb Anastasius Freylinghausen, "Kurzer Abriss des Lebens und Characters Herrn Friedrich Michael Ziegenhagen", in *Neuere Geschichte der Evangelischen Missions-Anstalten zu Bekehrung der Heiden in Ostindien* (Halle: In Verlegung des Waisenhauses, 1783) 2:xi-xxii.

⁷Ward, 307, refers to Ziegenhagen as "a Hanovarian by origin". This is clearly in error since the matriculation records of the University of Halle indicate his place of origin to be "Neogarensis Pomeranus". See Fritz Junke, editor, *Matrikel der Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg (1690-1730)* (Halle: Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, 1960) 496.

⁸The name "Ziegenhagen" was the name of a village in the duchy of Stettin and appears also as the family name of two clergymen who served in Pomerania around this time. See Hans Moderow, editor, *Die Evangelischen Geistlichen Pommers von der Reformation zur Gegenwart* (Stettin: Verlag von Paul Niekammer, 1903) 1:262. We also know that Ziegenhagen's step-father and nephew both served as government officials in Stettin.

Viewing the Prussian influence as a constant threat, the Swedish authorities cultivated an intensively orthodox Lutheran Church establishment to erect a cultural and religious barrier against the neighbouring Prussian territories.⁹ It is doubtful that Sweden was very effective in shutting out the influences filtering in from Prussia. For Berlin, which was only 90 miles away, tended historically to exert a considerable influence on Germans in Pomerania and contacts with Eastern Pomerania (later called East Prussia) were likely also not lacking.

In Berlin, Spener had become the pastor of St Nicholas Church by mid-1691. There his emphasis on a changed life in Christ rather than strict confessional Lutheran orthodoxy appealed to Elector Frederick III (King Frederick I in Prussia, 1688-1713), a Calvinist ruler in a land where the people were overwhelmingly Lutheran. As a Calvinist, the king was understandably concerned about the anti-Reformed, polemical approach to theology which characterized most orthodox Lutheran preaching of that day. In fact, he was so impressed with the emphasis of Spener's sermons that he forbade all anti-Pietistic preaching in his domain.

At the same time that Spener was making his presence felt in Berlin, his brother-in-law, Guenther H. Heiler, who shared Spener's Pietistic orientation, was serving as general superintendent in Eastern Pomerania where he used his influence to promote Pietism in the area over which he had responsibility.¹⁰ Thus, already as he was growing up, Ziegenhagen was likely influenced by Pietism which was becoming popular in Brandenburg-Prussia. That Ziegenhagen later went to Halle University rather than the strictly orthodox Lutheran universities in Wittenberg or Leipzig supports this conjecture.

The identity of Ziegenhagen's parents is not known. His father must have died early, for by the time Ziegenhagen was 31 his mother had married again. Her second husband was a government official by the name of Kiesling in the city of Stettin (Polish: Szczecin).¹¹ Ziegenhagen had at least one brother, Christoff S. Ziegenhagen, who resided in Berlin when Ziegenhagen made out his will. He also had at least two sisters. One of them was married to a government official. They had at least one son: Samuel Frederic Mueller, who became a counsellor of the Court of Justice at Stettin. Another sister had at least one son, Gunnor Matheson. All of these family

⁹Richard L. Gawthrop, *Pietism and the Making of Eighteenth Century Prussia* (Cambridge University Press, 1993) 217.

¹⁰Heiler, Guenther H., *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* (Berlin: Duncker & Humboldt, 1969) 11:315; Hugo Gotthard Bloth, *Die Kirche in Pommern* (Wien: Boehlau Verlag Koeln, 1979) 30; Martin Lachner, *Die Kirchenpolitik des Grossen Kurfuersten* (Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1973) 274.

¹¹Letter of Ziegenhagen to Francke, London, 5 February 1725.

members predeceased Ziegenhagen¹² so that, at the time of his death in 1776, he had no living heirs who were family members.

It is not known where Ziegenhagen received his early education or what he did during the first twenty years of his life. The first concrete information one has is that he enrolled in the faculty of theology at the University in Halle on 24 April 1714. Other students from Pomerania also enrolled at the University around that time, evidence of how ineffective the Swedish strategy was of using orthodox Lutheranism to advance their political agenda, and of the extent of Brandenburg-Prussia's influence on the German population in Pomerania. For, since the founding of the University of Halle in 1694, "the educated world of the Brandenburg-Prussian state gathered more and more around this new centre of intellectual life". Halle became the university to attend, particularly by future pastors; in 1717, the Prussian king went so far as to require Lutheran clergy in his land to study for two years in Halle.¹³ The Germans in Pomerania evidently followed the same trend even prior to 1720, when Pomerania again became part of Brandenburg-Prussia.

There is no information about Ziegenhagen's experiences in Halle except that he suffered from boils brought on by the "bad air".¹⁴ These physical ailments notwithstanding, he remained in Halle for three years. During this time, he became fully acquainted with August Hermann Francke who had the practice of meeting regularly with small groups of theological students for edification. Among his fellow theologians was Gotthilf Francke, son of August Hermann who also began studying theology in the University of Halle in 1714. In the summer of 1717, as Gotthilf Francke accompanied his father and two other men from the Francke Foundations on an extended trip to southern Germany, Ziegenhagen transferred to the University of Jena in the nearby Duchy of Saxony-Eisenach. He officially entered that university on 22 July 1717.¹⁵

In contrast to the University of Halle, Jena University at the time still viewed its role theologically as a seedbed for producing pastors who would adhere to orthodox Lutheran doctrine.¹⁶ Yet, it was a more moderate

¹²The will of the Rev. Frederic Michael Ziegenhagen.

¹³Rudolf von Thadden, *Die Brandenburgisch-Preussischen Hofprediger im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1959) 91.

¹⁴Freylinghausen, ix. As Richard Gawthrop, 169, observes, "Francke's interest in medicine stemmed in part from the problem posed to the Anstalten [institutions] by the unhealthy environment of Halle and its surroundings. Glaucha, in particular, was an unsanitary place; its populace, ignorant of elementary hygiene principles, lived amid the filth and stench of pigpens and distillery wastes."

¹⁵Reinhold Jauernig, editor, *Die Matrikel der University Jena, 1652-1723* (Weimar: Hermann Boehlaus Nachfolger, 1967) 2:922.

¹⁶*Geschichte der Univeresitaet Jena, 1548-1958* (Jena: Veb Gustav Fischer Verlag, 1958) 173.

Lutheran orthodoxy which prevailed in Jena at the time. Furthermore, its most prominent professor of theology was Johann Franz Buddeus (1667-1729), who had the reputation of leaning toward a moderate Pietism. In fact, the presence of Buddeus at the university attracted young Pietist students like Ziegenhagen in such numbers that it regained some of its earlier prominence as a centre of theological study.¹⁷ Two years later Gotthilf Francke also enrolled in Jena to finish off his theological education. While he was there, he lived in the home of Buddeus.

Like Ziegenhagen, Buddeus had originated in Pomerania while it was under Swedish control. Unlike Ziegenhagen, Buddeus first studied theology in Wittenberg. From Wittenberg, however, the student Buddeus had gone to Jena where he encountered the more moderate, less polemical form of Lutheran orthodoxy. At Jena, the student Buddeus was also introduced to Pietism in its early stages. In 1693, Buddeus accepted a call to teach moral philosophy in Halle just as the University was being formed and there became a trusted colleague and friend of Francke. In Halle, Buddeus also helped publish a history of the Bohemian Brethren, written decades earlier by John Amos Comenius (1592-1670)¹⁸ which later caused Buddeus to have a sympathetic view of the Moravians, who branched off from Halle Pietism and claimed the Bohemian Brethren as their roots. In 1705 Buddeus returned to Jena to teach theology and it was there that Ziegenhagen came under his influence twelve years later.

Ziegenhagen remained in Jena for an entire year.¹⁹ While there he would have seen firsthand the struggles Pietism often experienced outside of Brandenburg-Prussia during the first three decades of the eighteenth century. After 1709, a series of attacks were launched by anti-Pietistic elements in Saxony-Eisenach against Buddeus for his Pietistic activities. In 1714, Duke Ernst Wilhelm of Saxony-Eisenach was persuaded by these anti-Pietistic elements to issue a directive which forbade “unauthorized and dangerous prayer meetings and conventicles”.²⁰ While the directive seems to have been largely disregarded by the university, the threat of legal action against those involved in Pietistic gatherings for the purpose of mutual edification constantly hung over students like Ziegenhagen.

Either at Halle or Jena, Ziegenhagen experienced the type of religious awakening so important to Halle Pietists. While not providing specific details as to time and place, his biographer writes: “Already in the years during which he [Ziegenhagen] was preparing for the ministry, he was himself awakened to have an earnest sorrow for his soul, experienced the

¹⁷ *Geschichte der Universitaet Jena* 194.

¹⁸ *Geschichte der Universitaet Jena* 195.

¹⁹ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A.H. Francke, Jena, 18 July 1718.

²⁰ *Geschichte der Universitaet Jena* 195-96.

power of the Gospel for his illumination, his peace, and his sanctification.”²¹ Many young students were awakened to greater seriousness about Christianity during this period as the students banded together for mutual edification and practical study of the Bible. Ziegenhagen not only participated in such gatherings of theological students but was called upon to lead them, especially after he got to Jena. In June 1718, for example, he was leading a study over a period of weeks on “Repentance”. In typical Pietist fashion, he was concerned that he had not himself experienced enough about the subject, but trusted that God would not allow their study to be without His blessing.²²

Ziegenhagen’s time in Jena soon came to an end, and on 25 September 1718 he arrived in Linden near Hanover to accept a position as chaplain for the household of a certain Count von Platen. This position introduced Ziegenhagen to the world of the German nobility and provided him with experiences which would be crucial for his later activities in England.

II

The world of German and indeed European nobility to which Ziegenhagen was introduced in the employ of Count von Platen must have presented serious moral challenges to the young Pietist. The man who bore the title Count von Platen while Ziegenhagen was in his employ was somewhat loosely connected with the Electoral Court of Hanover. Franz Ernest, the first Count von Platen in Hanover (probably the father of the Count von Platen whom Ziegenhagen served) had achieved high military and political office in the court of Ernest August, Elector of Hanover (1629-1698). The Electoral Court of Ernest August had been a sumptuous affair, modelled after the French Court of Louis XIV, as were many of the European courts. It was the accepted rule of conduct that nobles had at least one mistress, a practice condoned both by the wives of the nobles and the husbands of the women involved. The mistress of Elector Ernest August had been the Countess von Platen and her semi-official position was one which was much coveted.²³

Elector Ernest August had six legitimate children, the oldest of which was George Louis (later George I of England). In 1682, twenty-one year old George Louis was married to his sixteen year old cousin Sophia Dorothea in 1682. The marriage, arranged by the first Count von Platen,²⁴ was soon in

²¹ Freylinghausen xii-xiii.

²² Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, Jena, 13 June 1718.

²³ Alvin Redman, *The House of Hanover* (Toronto: Longman, Green & Co., 1960) 21.

²⁴ Redman, 20.

shambles since both George Louis and Sophia Dorothea lived immoral lives amidst the gaiety of the court parties. Sophia Dorothea was ultimately tried for adultery and found guilty with Count von Platen conducting the case. Meanwhile, Countess von Platen, seeing Sophia Dorothea as a threat to her own future position, had encouraged George Louis to accept her daughter, Frau von Kielmannsegge, as his mistress. Then, when George Louis returned from war in Italy, he had taken another mistress, Melusina von Schulenburg. (Later, when George Louis became King of England, he brought both mistresses along to London.) In 1694 George Louis divorced Sophia Dorothea and had her imprisoned for the rest of her life. Then, in 1698, Elector Ernest August died and George Louis became the new Elector. The new appointments and changes which followed included the removal of the von Platens from the court and a lessening of their influence.²⁵

No longer directly involved in the Electoral Court of Hanover, the von Platens appear to have retired to Linden near Hanover. The first Count von Platen apparently died some time before Ziegenhagen came on the scene and specified in his will that his heirs were to engage a preacher for the castle. Failure to do so would result in a loss of their inheritance.²⁶ The succession of a new Count von Platen provided the occasion for Ziegenhagen to be called to Linden.²⁷

Why would the new Count von Platen chose the Pietist Ziegenhagen to fill this position rather than someone with the orthodox Lutheran orientation dominant in Hanover? The answer is that a churchly Pietism centring in Wernigerode had developed among the nobility of the Hanover region. The Stolberg family, which formed the centre of this awakened circle, promoted a conscious and deeper piety by encouraging their friends to call Pietist clergymen. Particularly favoured were students from Jena who had studied under Buddeus and therefore represented a milder form of Pietism from those whose only theological orientation had been Halle.²⁸ The Count von Platen likely had personal contact with Count von Stolberg and turned to him for assistance in finding a suitable preacher.²⁹ Stolberg, in turn, would have contacted Francke. Since Ziegenhagen fit the profile and would shortly be available for service, Francke approached him with the call to serve as

²⁵ Redman, 32.

²⁶ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, Linden, 26 October 1720.

²⁷ Although Count von Platen provided financial support for Francke's projects, his contributions always seemed to be tied in with some special favour which the Count asked of Francke. I would not, therefore, agree when Brunner, 57, calls Count von Platen "one of Francke's few Hanoverian friends".

²⁸ Rudolf Ruprecht, *Der Pietismus des 18. Jahrhunderts in den Hannoverschen Stammlaender* (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1919) 111.

²⁹ From the letters of Ziegenhagen to Francke, it is apparent that the new Count von Platen did not follow the practice of dealing directly with Francke.

chaplain to the von Platen household. With appropriate Pietist humility, Ziegenhagen responded that he would only accept the assignment if another more capable person was not available.³⁰ Thus, on completion of his studies in Jena, Ziegenhagen immediately relocated to Hanover.

It did not take long for Ziegenhagen to realize that Hanover was a stronghold of orthodox Lutheranism hostile to Pietism. Only fifteen years had passed since laws had been brought into force in Hanover prohibiting conventicles. Although they had been formulated to counteract the excesses of some Pietists who had become separatists, these conventicle laws were used against all Pietists. One law, passed in 1703, had been occasioned by the activities of a violent separatist, Ernst Christoph Hochmann (1670-1721), who had taken a militant stand against the church. Hochmann had been converted in Halle while studying under Francke and only later assumed his extreme position. However, his earlier connection with Halle was used by the orthodox Lutheran pastors in Hanover against Halle Pietism in general.³¹ Citing the 1703 Edict, Buddeus in 1723 pleaded that "Halle Pietism should be differentiated from separatism and that unjust accusations against the former should be withdrawn."³²

Ziegenhagen soon came under attack from the local orthodox Lutheran preachers. They questioned the right of the Count to maintain his own preacher. One of them used his "so-called prayer hours" to present a distorted view of Ziegenhagen and his Pietist position. He did "more harm" in these prayer hours than Ziegenhagen "could correct in many sermons". It got to the point where Ziegenhagen no longer wanted to attend these sessions because of the aggravation they caused him but he felt if he stayed away this would be interpreted as "neglect of duty". When he tried to talk to the offending preacher, matters only got worse. Already by the end of his fourth month in Hanover, he had concluded that he probably would not last much longer since he expected the "miserable man" to lay charges against him with the consistory.³³ Some pastors were open to having Ziegenhagen preach for them and many people came to hear him out of curiosity. As he preached, he tried to get the people to have Bibles with them to verify the truth of the message which he preached and he could happily report that the Count von Platen co-operated with this approach, thus setting a good example for his household. But as Ziegenhagen looked around, he observed

³⁰ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, Jena, 18 July 1718.

³¹ Ruprecht, 11-14; Gerhard Uhlhorn, *Hannoversche Kirchengeschichte* (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988) 112-13.

³² Ruprecht 22.

³³ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, Linden, 8 January 1719.

that not everyone was with him and that people were beginning to “take sides”.³⁴

Ziegenhagen also faced other difficulties. He was distressed by the loose living especially among the nobility. He rejoiced in the fact that many people came out to hear him. Yet he noted that many were still caught up in the world and their lives were characterized by divorce, fornication, and drunkenness.³⁵ He felt that he was making progress among those outside the castle where “people were beginning to read the Holy Scriptures”.³⁶ But he intimated that things were not going as well in the Count’s household. In a letter to Francke on 1 March 1719, Ziegenhagen alluded to a problem which was “too abominable to talk about”.³⁷ A month later, he said, “Things have become worse.” It appears that the problem had to do with a falling-out which the count had with a local pastor. In the so-called prayer hour, the pastor had spoken against fornication. His approach had apparently been very direct and the count felt the pastor had accused an individual (perhaps a member of the count’s household) of prostitution. Consequently, the count had forbidden his subjects to go to this pastor for confession. Ziegenhagen supported the pastor’s position. He himself had spoken against fornication, although more carefully, he said. But Ziegenhagen felt he could not continue to go to this pastor for confession in view of the position which the count had taken.³⁸

Ziegenhagen found that the count relied on him to be a messenger in his communication with Francke. This was the case even when Francke wrote the count directly to answer his concerns or to thank him for the generous gifts which he invariably sent for Francke’s orphanage and for the East Indian mission. In his very first letter to Francke from Hanover, Ziegenhagen asked Francke at the behest of Count von Platen whether he might be able to find someone as a “schoolmaster” to prepare his son for university and later to go along on his travels throughout Europe. The schoolmaster was to be pious but stable and to have experience. In response, Francke came up with a certain Mr Meyer.

But then the Count suddenly became concerned about getting caught in the struggle between the Pietists and the Orthodox. He felt that it would undermine the good effect of the schoolmaster if it was known that Meyer had been recommended by Francke. So the count asked Ziegenhagen to request Francke “for the sake of my son” to inform Meyer about the situation

³⁴ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, Linden, 5 April 1719.

³⁵ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, Linden, 8 January 1719.

³⁶ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, Linden, 5 April 1719.

³⁷ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, Linden, 1 March 1719.

³⁸ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, Linden, 5 April 1719.

and to ask him not to let anyone know that Francke had recommended him.³⁹ It turned out that Meyer was a good teacher but he could not control the young headstrong man the way the count wanted. So Ziegenhagen was called upon to negotiate having the son come to Halle instead to pursue his education. Ziegenhagen impressed on Francke the importance of providing a situation where the character of the young man would be built because he was the only male heir of the family. But Ziegenhagen's description of the young man probably made Francke apprehensive about the prospect of having to deal with him in Halle. Ziegenhagen described him as a volatile, opinionated, manipulative, unbalanced and immoral person, who would need a schoolmaster to control him and a servant to accompany him and provide for his daily needs.⁴⁰ In a very carefully crafted letter, Francke thanked the count for his recent gift and assured the father of his prayers that the Holy Spirit would keep the young count from the temptations of the world.⁴¹ Whether the young count ever became a student in Halle is not known.

After Ziegenhagen had been in the employ of Count von Platen for two years, his opponents followed a different line of attack on him. Where they had earlier questioned the propriety of the Count to call and maintain a court chaplain, now they began to question whether Ziegenhagen, who was at this point was not ordained, was fulfilling the terms of the will in response to which his employer had called him. To avoid the possibility of losing the property which he had inherited, the count asked Ziegenhagen whether he would consider becoming ordained.⁴² Although the Halle Pietists regarded themselves as Lutherans and held to the Lutheran Confessional writings, they did not regard ordination as essential for carrying out an effective ministry. Further, when Ziegenhagen was called to Hanover, his main pastoral duty involved preaching twice a week, but the administration of the sacraments, which would have required ordination, was not listed among his responsibilities. If he was now to be ordained, he would have to agree to a *quia* subscription to the Confessions, something about which he had some scruples.⁴³ Eventually his accusers determined that the will did not call for an ordained pastor after all and dropped the matter. The issue remained on the back burner for a time but Ziegenhagen made reference to it again in January 1722,⁴⁴ and may have had to face it again as he confronted his call to London.

³⁹ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, Linden, 2 November 1718.

⁴⁰ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, Linden, 29 April 1719.

⁴¹ Letter of A. H. Francke to Count von Platen, Halle, 21 November 1719.

⁴² Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, Linden, 26 October 1720.

⁴³ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, Linden, 3 April 1720.

⁴⁴ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, Linden, 31 January 1722.

The death of Anton Boehm on 27 May 1722 created a vacancy in the position of German Lutheran Court Chaplain in London. The following December, Ziegenhagen received a call from King George I to succeed Boehm in that position. How he came to be considered for this position is not clear.⁴⁵ Whether or not Francke was personally involved in recommending Ziegenhagen, it is apparent from Ziegenhagen's correspondence with him that Francke was aware of these developments and approved of them.

In October 1722, Ziegenhagen had become aware that he was being considered for the position. However, he was concerned that the matter be kept quiet to prevent various people in Hanover from making trouble for him, presumably by giving a bad report on him to the Elector of Hanover, who would have to issue the call as King of England.⁴⁶ In November, he travelled to London to meet with Georg Andreas Ruperti, who had served both as Boehm's associate chaplain and as the pastor of St. Mary's in the Savoy. On 6 December, Ziegenhagen preached in the royal chapel and was told by Ruperti that both of the chaplaincy positions would be commended to him. But, as Ziegenhagen wrote in a letter to Francke, he wasn't certain that he would be able to handle both positions. Since the call issued by King George I on 11/22 December 1722⁴⁷ was to be successor of Anton Boehm and to fill only that position, it appears that Ziegenhagen opted not to take over both chaplaincy positions.⁴⁸ Boehm had been able to avoid being ordained by having an associate who was an ordained pastor. Given the silence about this issue in his correspondence with Francke, it is likely that Ziegenhagen followed the same path. It was a full year after the king issued this call, however, before Ziegenhagen finally moved to London.⁴⁹

⁴⁵ Brunner says that "When Boehm died, Count von Platen had his cabinet preacher [Ziegenhagen] appointed Court chaplain." This is not supported by the correspondence of Ziegenhagen with Francke. Rather, it seems as if Francke had expressed concern about how von Platen had taken Ziegenhagen's leaving, for Ziegenhagen assured Francke that their parting in Hanover had been cordial. Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, London, 21 February 1724.

⁴⁶ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, Linden, 31 October 1722.

⁴⁷ The double date was due to the fact that Germany adopted the Gregorian calendar in 1700 while England did not adopt it until 1752. According to the old Julian calendar used in England in 1722, the date would be 11 December; according to the Gregorian calendar used in Germany it would be 22 December.

⁴⁸ Lists of chaplains of the German Royal Chapel show Ruperti serving as Court Chaplain from 1711 to 1731. John Southerden Burn, *The History of the French Walloon, Dutch and other Foreign Protestant Refugees settled in England* (London: Longman, Brown, Green and Langmans, 1846).

⁴⁹ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, London, 17 January 1724.

III

The German Lutheran Court Chapel to which Ziegenhagen received a call in December 1722 occupied a unique place in of the German Lutheran scene in London in the first half of the eighteenth century. For the Court Chaplain was positioned to advance the cause of the Halle Pietists in India and North America as none of the other German Lutheran pastors in London were able to do.

German Lutheranism in England dated back to the time of Edward VI in the sixteenth century. During his brief reign, Edward had granted a patent to a building where Germans could worship. In 1559, after Elizabeth I had ascended the English throne, the patent was renewed but the German Lutheran congregation which met in the building had to be satisfied to function under the supervision of the Bishop of London; the Queen's theological advisors argued that, under the conditions of an established church, there could not be another bishop in the diocese, especially a foreigner. When the so-called Hamburg Church split in 1692 and a second German Lutheran Church was formed in London's Savoy District (St Mary's), the same relationship with the Bishop of London prevailed.

The German Lutheran Court Chapel was effectively the third German Lutheran Church in London. It was founded in 1700 by Prince George of Denmark (1653-1708), the husband of Princess Anne (1665-1714), who became Queen of Great Britain in 1702. When George and Anne married in 1683, George brought with him from Copenhagen his own Lutheran court chaplain, J. W. Mecken. While he initially served as the chief contact for Francke and other Halle Pietists, Mecken himself was not a Pietist. He was especially not enamoured with Boehm who arrived in London in 1701. Mecken was offended at the Pietist gatherings which Boehm held on Sunday afternoons, and, dissatisfied with the content of a sermon which he heard Boehm preach at St Mary's in the Savoy, Mecken was determined to force Boehm to leave London.⁵⁰ At it turned out, Mecken was the one who had to leave. He fell out of favour with Prince George for presuming to censure his prince for taking Communion on two official occasions with his wife, who was now the queen. Obviously these worship services were under the auspices of the Church of England. In the meantime, Boehm's pietistic sermons had left a favourable impression on the prince, so Boehm was asked to assume Mecken's position as Court Chaplain in 1705.⁵¹ Although never

⁵⁰ According to a letter of Boehm to Francke, 19 April 1704, Mecken accused Boehm of trying to erect another German Church in London and withdrew the small stipend which helped sustain Boehm in his early days in London.

⁵¹ Brunner 51.

ordained, Boehm made this position one which would have strategic significance throughout the remainder of the eighteenth century.

How did this happen? Soon after he was named Court Chaplain in 1705, Boehm translated into English an account by Francke of the rise and progress of Francke's *Weisenhaus* (orphanage) and the other institutions in Halle.⁵² The translation, entitled *Pietas Hallensis*, familiarized the English public with the significant work which Francke was doing in Halle and raised the profile of the German Lutheran Court Chaplain within religious circles in London. In his preface to the translation, Boehm also wrote an account of the history of Pietism. The *Pietas Hallensis* was positively received not only by theologians but also from other prominent people in England. It marked the beginning of financial contributions and students from England for the Halle institutions. It also created an appreciation of Halle Pietists in England and provided the basis for co-operation in a number of charitable and missionary activities between Halle Pietists and the SPCK in London.

The first such activity involved care for a group of German Protestants from the Palatinate who arrived in London en route to America. Fleeing economic hardship in Germany from the ravages of high taxes, war, and bad weather, the first 53 emigrants arrived in 1708 under the leadership of a Lutheran pastor, Joshua Kocherthal. Prompted by Boehm, Queen Anne provided them with funds and clothing, German Bibles, and copies of Johann Arndt's *True Christianity* for their trip to New York. The following April over 800 more arrived on Boehm's doorstep, the beginning of a flood of emigrants which eventually reached many thousands. Boehm was absent on a trip to Germany when the highest number of emigrants arrived so the other German Lutheran pastors bore the brunt of the work. But when he returned, accompanied by a young theological student, Samuel Urlsperger, he once more became a key player in the help given.

When the Palatine emigrants headed for North America, it was suggested that Francke should provide a suitable minister for the emigrants and that the English would provide for his financial support. However, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG) had responsibility for the spiritual care of emigrants to North America and this society required that ministers to whom they provided financial support be ordained as Anglicans. Although Francke and Boehm had no difficulties dealing with the Anglicans as fellow Christians, they still regarded them as Calvinists and were not prepared to have their men accept Anglican orders to effect such co-operation. (The SPG also took the approach that Christian unity could be achieved and divisions overcome by official acceptance of the Anglican liturgy and the historic

⁵² *Die Fusstapfen des noch lebenden und waltenden liebeichen und getreuen Gottes* (Halle, 1701).

episcopate; the Halle Pietists saw unity being achieved through common spiritual renewal.)

The second such activity involved participation in the Danish-Halle mission effort in East India. In contrast to North America, the India mission began in Danish territory where the SPG had no spiritual responsibility. On top of that, mission work in India had a strong educational aspect to it. Thus, it was the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge (SPCK) which became involved. In contrast to the SPG, which had a royal charter and was dominated by clergy, the SPCK was not chartered and had a considerably more inclusive membership. Indeed, the largest number of SPCK members, by far, fell into the category of “corresponding members” who were not necessarily Anglican and often were not English; Francke, for example, became a corresponding member two months after the SPCK was formed. The responsibility of corresponding members was to disperse SPCK literature and ideas, and to provide information to the SPCK on various educational and missionary projects throughout the world. The much smaller number of “subscribing (or residing) members”,⁵³ who were responsible for gathering the funds and controlling the direction of the SPCK, were generally all Anglicans and most of them were laymen.

Although he did not fit the pattern, Boehm gained acceptance into this latter influential inner circle of the SPCK. Indeed, within the small number of the subscribing members, an even smaller number (sometimes less than a dozen) regularly attended meetings and made most of the decisions. By his regular attendance and active interest, even on occasion chairing meetings of the SPCK, Boehm was able to dominate the direction of the Society.⁵⁴ It was especially Boehm’s publication in 1709 of his translations of missionary letters from East India which brought Boehm into the mainstream of SPCK activity. Thus, the English entered into co-operation not only with Halle but also with representatives of the Danish government.

The financial support of the English came at a most opportune time. The initial impulse for the mission had come from King Frederick IV of Denmark who was concerned that missionary activity be undertaken in his Danish possession of Tranquebar in India. When the king was unable to find Danish clergy to go as missionaries, two Germans, both with previous Halle connections—Heinrich Pluetschau and Bartholomeus Ziegenbalg—had been recruited to go to India under Royal Danish auspices. But when the two Pietists appeared before the orthodox Lutheran bishop in Copenhagen to be examined for ordination, it took the king’s intervention to have the bishop ordain them. Then, when they arrived in the mission field in July 1706 and had established a congregation through catechetical instruction, the orthodox

⁵³ 80, compared to the 370 corresponding members in 1712.

⁵⁴ Brunner 27.

Lutheran Danish Chaplain in India accused them of being false prophets. This led Ziegenbalg to be imprisoned for four months.

The second group of missionaries also experienced difficulties. The king ordered the Danish East Indian Company to transport the missionaries and their belongings to India. But with the king absent in October 1708, the Company placed all kinds of difficulties in the way of the missionaries. The final blow for the mission came when the Danish Court Chaplain, who had been given responsibility by the king to guide the day-to-day activities of the mission, lost the king's support for his work with the mission.⁵⁵ This was the situation when Boehm decided to enlist the English to support of the missionaries in India. Whether or not he was fully aware of all these problems, Boehm was concerned because he sensed that "Copenhagen had forgotten" about the Tranquebar mission.⁵⁶ Recognizing that financial support for the mission had been realized in Germany through the publication of missionary letters,⁵⁷ Boehm decided to do the same in England.

Boehm's first appeal was to the SPG. Thus, he dedicated his first volume of translated letters in 1709 to the SPG and its president, Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury.⁵⁸ While Tenison personally supported the mission in response to this gesture and the SPG ordered 500 copies to be distributed among the missionaries in England and North America, the Society did not feel the support of the Tranquebar mission was part of its mandate.

Boehm then turned to the SPCK, arguing that the support of the mission fit into the purposes of the SPCK since the missionaries were building "charity schools". The members of the SPCK agreed and on 7 September 1710 admitted Plutschau and Ziegenbalg as corresponding members and opened a "subscription" for the mission.⁵⁹ The SPCK also appointed a Special Committee for the Mission to direct its involvement. Boehm was named to this committee and became an influential member of it. The Society also obtained concessions from the English East India Company to provide free shipping for books, a printer, a printing press and paper, and other cargo for the mission. It also tried to send an English missionary to the

⁵⁵ Anders Norgaard, *Mission und Obrigkeit* (Guetersloh: Guetersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1988) 55-56.

⁵⁶ W. Germann, *Johann Philipp Fabricius* (Erlangen: Verlag von Andreas Deichert, 1865) 79.

⁵⁷ *Merkwürdige Nachrichten aus Ost-Indien* (Leipzig/Frankfurt, 1708).

⁵⁸ When Boehm entitled the published missionary letters, "Propagation of the Gospel **in the East**", he was obviously trying to tie them in with the full name of the SPG, "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel **in Foreign Parts**" [emphases added].

⁵⁹ Brunner 104.

territories in East India under English control, but couldn't find any Anglican clergy with the qualifications of the German Lutheran missionaries.⁶⁰

While this support from England and Germany helped to strengthen the mission, the governance of the mission from Denmark continued to be problematic. It was not until 1714, when a Mission College was named to give direction to the mission, that the situation in Denmark improved. Under the auspices of the Mission College, which was responsible directly to the king, the mission received the status of a Royal Mission and money from the royal purse became available to help pay the missionaries.⁶¹ The efforts of Boehm helped establish, strengthen, and maintain the partnership which the SPCK and Halle had with Copenhagen. To this ongoing role, Ziegenhagen immediately fell heir as he followed Boehm as German Court Chaplain in London.

Aside from the co-operative activities which the Court Chaplain undertook, the Chapel functioned much like the other Lutheran congregations in London. It appears to have had a regular membership roll, which included the king and the German members of the royal household. The king, on his accession to the British throne in 1714, had become the head of the Church of England and theoretically an Anglican, but he never learned English. Besides this, he spent a great deal of his time in Germany where he continued to hold the title of Elector of Hanover and theoretically remained a Lutheran. Among King George's household were his two mistresses, which he had brought with him from Germany. One of them, the Duchess of Kendal had already been attracted to Boehm's preaching, and, at her request, Ziegenhagen arranged for a visit to her from the missionaries who were on their way to India in January 1725. The other mistress, the Duchess of Darlington, was a different matter. In April 1725, Ziegenhagen shared with Francke that the Duchess was very ill and subsequently that she had died. Ziegenhagen had often offered to visit her, but she had refused. Instead, she had "found comfort in plays" and had "surrounded herself with unbelievers". She claimed to belong to the Anglican Church but did not call an Anglican preacher to attend to her. Ziegenhagen wrote that she was a bad example and influenced others in the Court.

When George I died in 1727, he was succeeded by his son who became George II. The son lived until 1760 when he was succeeded by his grandson who became George III. With each accession to the throne, Ziegenhagen received a new call to be Court Chaplain. Although he had a large frame, according to his first biographer, he constantly referred to his weak constitution. On that account, he did not accept the responsibility in 1724 of serving St Mary's in the Savoy during a pastoral vacancy; preaching twice a

⁶⁰ Brunner 104-7.

⁶¹ Norgaard 70.

Sunday would have been too difficult for him, in his view. The following month, he again wrote about his heavy load; he had responsibility for preaching all of the sermons during the Passion season. He constantly suffered from the fever or some other illness. Until August Hermann Francke died in 1727, he constantly asked for Francke's advice. In spite of these shortcomings, Ziegenhagen played a significant role for half a century in the spreading influence of Halle Pietism in India and North America.

IV

Ziegenhagen had an interest in the mission work in India even before he became the German Lutheran Court Chaplain. One can safely assume that, if his parents were influenced by Pietism, the names of Heinrich Pluetschau and Bartholomeus Ziegenbalg were household words for Ziegenhagen by the time he was twelve or thirteen years old. Throughout his years of education, Ziegenhagen undoubtedly read the published letters from the missionaries as part of his devotional reading. Then, in Hanover, as Count von Platen sought favours from Francke and consequently also provided financial gifts for Francke's projects, the Count's gifts for the mission in India likely resulted from encouragement received from Ziegenhagen. On 20 August 1721, Francke wrote to Ziegenhagen, then still in Hanover, proposing that he accept a missionary post in Tranquebar which had been vacated by the death of Johann Gruendler, the leader of the mission. If Ziegenhagen had accepted the posting, his life would have been very different.

A brief overview of developments in Tranquebar, some of which may not have been known to Ziegenhagen, is useful to explain why.

Almost from the beginning, the mission had been plagued with conflict—conflict with the Danish chaplain and the local authorities, conflict with the largely Roman Catholic Portuguese and with the native population, but above all conflict among the missionaries. In the initial stages of planting the mission, Pluetschau and Ziegenbalg appear to have worked together amicably. But when the next group of missionaries arrived in 1709, conflict erupted almost immediately between two of the missionaries: Johann Georg Boevingh and Johan Ernst Greundler. At its core, the conflict seemed to have been over whether or not Boevingh was a “born-again Christian”.⁶² Since the conflict threatened to undermine the mission, Pluetschau returned to Europe in 1712 to try to gain support from the Danish authorities for the case against Boevingh. Boevingh also left India and both arrived in Copenhagen at the same time with their opposing stories.

⁶² Norgaard 48.

Three years later, since it was apparent that Pluetschau had not been successful, Ziegenbalg also decided to go to Europe. He left Gruendler in charge of the mission. After achieving his objective, Ziegenbalg left for Halle with the Danish Mission College and the Danish East India Company in Copenhagen hammering out the final form of an agreement which would prove beneficial both for the mission and the company. In Halle, Ziegenbalg reported to Francke. He also took time to find a wife, whom he married in November 1715. On his way back to India, he spent time in London solidifying relations with the SPCK. His return in 1716 after a two year absence as “a triumphant victor. When he left, the further existence of the entire mission was being threatened. He now returned, bearing the title of Probst with the directive from the leadership of the East Indian Company to the local government that it support the mission in the colony.”⁶³

Ziegenbalg’s return to India ushered in a period of growth and prosperity. Not only was there enlarged support from the SPCK but the mission work in Tranquebar was also consolidated and intensified. The relationship between the mission and the local government also showed a marked improvement. However, success came with a price. Apparently the comparison to a returning victor from battle was not an exaggeration. Later, Ziegenbalg’s wife unwisely wrote in her private letters to her family (which became public) about travelling from Madras to Tranquebar using twenty-four Indian bearers, about their large and beautiful home in Tranquebar, about their sumptuous meals prepared and served by many servants, about a servant whose only job it was to get fresh fish from the fishermen, and about their many other personal servants.⁶⁴ These candid reports of Ziegenbalg’s wife to relatives in Germany brought consternation in Europe, Copenhagen as well as Halle. Francke, who was particularly astonished at the number of servants which the missionaries reportedly had, tried to suppress the reports and asked her to be more circumspect. He told her that mission officials in Copenhagen had a copy of her letters and that the entire mission effort might suffer irreparable damage because of it. Francke’s fears were soon realized.

Gruendler, who took over the leadership of the mission during the two-year absence of Ziegenbalg, had also married in 1716. His wife, the widow of a former Vice-Commandant, was wealthy and accustomed to a life of luxury. The marriage and luxurious lifestyle of these two missionaries presented a special problem for the Danish Mission College which was raising support for the mission by promoting the ideal of missionaries who had left all to preach the Gospel to the heathen. From Copenhagen as well as from Halle, there were calls that the missionaries not marry and establish homes similar to those of other Europeans in India. Christian Wendt, the

⁶³ Norgaard 102.

⁶⁴ Norgaard 116, 118.

secretary of the Copenhagen-based Mission College, strongly advocated for the concept that missionaries should travel by foot as the Apostles did. Buildings and businesses which the mission had accumulated should be sold. God and mammon, heaven and earth, should not be united.⁶⁵ As the conflict between the missionaries and the Mission College was taking place, Ziegenbalg and Gruendler both died: Ziegenbalg in February 1719 and Gruendler in March 1720. In the eyes of those close to them, the deaths of both men were at least partially caused by the harsh criticism levelled against them by the Mission College.⁶⁶

A scant five months after Gruendler's death (much less if one factors in the time it would have taken for the news to reach Halle), Francke wrote a letter to Ziegenhagen telling him that the Danish Mission College had asked him to find someone to succeed Gruendler in India. He asked whether Ziegenhagen whether he could propose him for this position in the Tranquebar mission. Ziegenhagen was asked not to tell anyone but to respond as quickly as possible. Francke asked him to humbly reflect on the matter and seek what Christ wanted but he hoped that he would accept. To Francke, Ziegenhagen likely seemed to be tailor-made for the position. Ziegenhagen was unmarried and in a situation where conflict between the missionaries seemed endemic, the quiet and reserved but scholarly Ziegenhagen would provide steady leadership and easily fit into the role of arbitrator.

Francke's letter of 20 August 1720 reached Ziegenhagen six days later. The day after the letter arrived, Ziegenhagen responded in typical Pietist fashion, "What could a person wish more than to preach to those who have not heard. As often as I have read the reports of the East India mission, I have had great longing to do this mission work." But, it becomes a more difficult matter when one considers personal realities. 1) A person who goes to the mission field must have certain gifts of sanctification; 2) A person must have great ability in learning languages: Malibarian, Portuguese, and English, to start with. Even though Francke had written that there would be a year for language-study, Ziegenhagen did not feel he had the necessary aptitude to learn languages. He could understand English but was able neither to speak nor write it; 3) A person must be able, not only to stand the heat and endure the ocean voyage, but also to eat various foods; 4) On top of this, Ziegenhagen said that he had *malum hypocondriacum* for which he was taking medication. Thus, wrote Ziegenhagen, he did not feel he could go to the mission field.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ Norgaard 122-23.

⁶⁶ Norgaard 123, 125.

⁶⁷ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, Linden, 27 August 1720. While this letter of Ziegenhagen clearly shows that Ziegenhagen took himself out of consideration as a candidate

As Francke was seeking a replacement for Gruendler in India, matters in the mission were going from bad to worse. Before he died, Gruendler had ordained Benjamin Schultze, one of the three new missionaries who had arrived in India on 16 September 1719. Consequently, on Gruendler's death, Schultze took over leadership of the mission. When Heinrich Kistenmacher, one of the other new missionaries, questioned the validity of Schultze's ordination and opposed his autocratic leadership style, Schultze took steps to remove him.⁶⁸ When Kistenmacher died late in 1722, Nicolaus Dal, the third missionary who arrived in 1719, picked up the fight with Schultze over how the situation with Kistenmacher had been handled. Francke wrote to the missionaries but nothing he could advise seemed to help. Fifteen years later, Gotthilf August Francke wrote, "In 1723, the mission seemed to be at the point of death from the sad disputes engendered by Mr. Schultze."⁶⁹

Schultze, shifting the blame for the sad state of the mission away from himself, wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury (probably Francke and the Mission College, as well) asking for more co-workers. If they are not forthcoming, "the mission is dead", wrote Schultze.⁷⁰ The Archbishop wrote Francke, who already knew about the sad state of the mission and the need for more missionaries. But to find the right people was not a simple matter. The first two whom Francke identified declined to go. Finally on 25 September 1724, Francke wrote Ziegenhagen, who by then had moved to London, that he had found three men who were willing:⁷¹ Christoph Theodosius Walther, Christian Friedrich Pressier, and Martin Bosse.

The three new missionaries travelled to Copenhagen where they underwent a theological examination and were ordained.⁷² All three of them also preached before Frederick IV, King of Denmark. From Copenhagen, they travelled to Halle to meet with Francke and then went to England.⁷³ It was early December before they finally left Halle. Meanwhile, with

for the mission field in India, it is interesting that Germann, a nineteenth century Pietist historian of the Tranquebar mission, provides another version. "It was only by a thread that Ziegenhagen did not make the long trip to Tranquebar", writes Germann. "Francke had in mind to make him the *Probst* [of the mission] but Copenhagen rejected him for flimsy reasons." Germann 79.

⁶⁸ The nineteenth century biographer of Schultze didn't even mention the conflict but simply says that "Kistenmacher was not much help because he was seldom well enough to function." Johann Hartwig Brauer, *Die Heidenboten Friedrich IV von Dänemark, III, Benjamin Schultze* (Hamburg: Im Commission bei Perthes-Besser u. Mauke, 1841) 10-17.

⁶⁹ Quoted by Norgaard 136.

⁷⁰ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, London, 21 July 1724.

⁷¹ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, London, 25 September 1724.

⁷² Dal, Kistenmacher, and Schultze seemed to have missed this step in the rush to get more workers to India in 1719; hence, they had gone to India without ordination and thereby brought to the situation the seeds of discontent which erupted into conflict.

⁷³ Letter of A. H. Francke to Ziegenhagen, Halle, 22 October 1724.

Christmas coming up, the members of the SPCK were anxiously waiting for them in London.⁷⁴ They finally arrived in London on 20 December. Two days later, Ziegenhagen introduced them to the SPCK. There Pressier gave a message in Latin and a member of the SPCK responded in like manner.⁷⁵ On New Year's Day, Bosse preached in the Court Chapel and boosted the offering for the mission which had normally been 24 pounds to 93 pounds sterling. In addition, the king gave a donation of 30 pounds sterling. The missionaries became corresponding members of the SPCK.⁷⁶ They met with the Archbishop of Canterbury, who promised his support for the mission for the rest of his life. They also met with the future King George II, as well as other members of the royal household. On 19 January, they said farewell to the SPCK and departed. Because their books had not arrived, Ziegenhagen gave them the most necessary ones from his own library.⁷⁷

After they arrived in India, the new missionaries sent back a report with "fresh eyes" to Copenhagen on the conflicted situation in Tranquebar. Since their report did not put Schultze in a very good light, he no longer felt comfortable serving in Tranquebar under the Danish Mission College. A conflict erupted between Schultze and the new missionaries and Schultze decided to start his own new work in Madras which was located in English-held territory. He got permission from the English governor at Fort St George to begin a mission in Madras, and in 1726 he left Tranquebar.

When the Mission College first heard of the new conflict between Schultze and the other missionaries, it admonished all of the missionaries to maintain unity and informed them that no one was allowed to leave the service of the mission without prior permission from the Mission College.⁷⁸ By leaving Tranquebar and beginning mission work in Madras, Schultze had disobeyed this directive, so the Mission College decided to recall him, ordering him to return to Europe. But Schultze refused and sent a nasty letter to the Danish body.

The routing of letters from the missionaries in India to Europe does not seem to have followed a consistent pattern. Apparently, some of the letters went directly to the appropriate mission leadership in either Copenhagen or Halle. Copies of the Halle-bound letters were subsequently sent to Copenhagen. By the late 1720s, the original journals were all sent to Halle.⁷⁹ Letters intended for the SPCK went through Ziegenhagen in London who either had them translated into English or shared summaries of their contents

⁷⁴ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, London, 18 December 1724.

⁷⁵ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, London, 22 December 1724.

⁷⁶ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, London, 1 January 1725.

⁷⁷ Letter of Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, London, 19 January 1725.

⁷⁸ Norgaard 130.

⁷⁹ Norgaard 116.

with the members of the SPCK. Their contents and the action taken by the SPCK were also communicated to the Francke father and son.

Although Schultze's letter was intended for the Mission College in Copenhagen, it first came to Ziegenhagen. Feeling that the cause of missions in India would be harmed if the letter was sent in its original form to Copenhagen, Ziegenhagen "managed" the situation so that the letter which the Mission College received was shorter and less violent than the one which Schultze had written.⁸⁰ Since Madras was on British territory, Ziegenhagen then asked the SPCK to take Schultze on as their missionary.

The SPCK had, in fact, been wanting to begin mission work in a British territory in India for a decade and a half. This had been supported already by Boehm who did not, however, favour Gruendler moving to Madras because of the pressure which would be there for him to be ordained an Anglican. "Because of the influence of High Church clergy in England, he felt there would be no way to carry on the Lutheran Pietist nature of the mission if it should come under English control."⁸¹ The efforts of the Society had been thwarted by their inability to find an Englishman willing to go to India. Gruendler's death in 1720 ruled out his transfer to Madras. Schultze's request in 1726 was, therefore, welcomed by the members of the SPCK. Before accepting Schultze, however, the Society sought and receive permission from the English East Indian Company, which had local jurisdiction in the Indian territories under British control.⁸² Although Schultze had already begun work in September 1726, it took until the end of 1727 for the SPCK to arrive at its decision to accept Schultze as its missionary in Madras. When their directive to Schultze early in 1728 to begin Protestant work in Madras was sent, it meant more than anything that the SPCK was committed to supporting him in this work.⁸³

In the meanwhile, a couple of difficulties had threatened to derail the intentions of the SPCK. A former English chaplain at Madras began raising questions about the missionary methods of the Halle-Pietists. He found their theological exercises "excessively tedious", their catechetical instructions "obscure and unedifying", and their explanation of the conversion process confusing.⁸⁴ Ziegenhagen, who had assumed the position of protector of the India mission in England, asked to see the former chaplain's letter and

⁸⁰ Brunner, 114, suggests that Ziegenhagen had the letter rewritten. I find it difficult to understand how this could have been done since letters were hand-written and the Mission College would certainly have recognized it if a letter was not the original.

⁸¹ Brunner 116.

⁸² Brunner 116.

⁸³ One early biographer of Schultze erroneously indicates that Schultze's support came from the SPG. Reinhold Bornbaum, *Benjamin Schultze, evangelischer Missionar in Tranquebar und Madras* (Duesseldorf: Verlag der Schaub'schen Buchhandlung, 1850) 22.

⁸⁴ Stevenson to Newman, Colwall, 7 February 1727, cited in Brunner 117.

attempts were made to bring the two together, but nothing came of it. Also the Mission College wrote Ziegenhagen requesting that the Society not take Schultze into its service. But since Ziegenhagen had already recommended to the SPCK that they should accept Schultze as its missionary, he chose not to convey the Mission College's request to the SPCK.⁸⁵ Thus, two distinct mission efforts were being pursued by 1728. Both of them were supported financially by Ziegenhagen and the SPCK. Both looked to Halle for help in meeting their manpower needs. But one of them continued to be under the direction of the Danish Mission College; the other was supervised directly by the SPCK.

With Schultze no longer in Tranquebar, the Danish Indian Mission functioned smoothly. Dal was finally ordained in 1730 and was then accepted as a full-fledged missionary. Bosse, Pressier, and Walther who had arrived in 1725 worked together amicably among themselves and with Dal. Financial support was more than adequate. Membership in the mission grew annually more than in any earlier period.⁸⁶

In Madras, meanwhile, conflict again erupted. The efforts of the SPCK to get manpower from England had again met with failure, partly because missionaries were paid only 60% of what chaplains to the East India Company received. However, Francke had been able to send two additional Germans to work with Schultze in Madras: J. A. Satorius, and later J. E. Geister. By 1733, the SPCK through Ziegenhagen was receiving letters of grievances from each of the three missionaries in Madras. Realizing the potential damage which they could do to the mission, Ziegenhagen convinced Henry Newman, the secretary of the SPCK, to limit knowledge of their contents to a very small circle and to try to work out the differences on his own. Even the members of the Special Committee set up in 1710 to deal with the India Mission were not told. The Special Committee eventually learned about the difficulties and chastised Newman for not informing them.

Numerous further letters to try to reconcile the contending parties were sent to the missionaries, without success. Eventually in 1737, Sartorius and Geister left Schultze in Madras and they began new mission work in Cuddalore, another English-controlled territory between Tranquebar and Madras. For the rest of his life, Ziegenhagen continued actively to support the Danish mission in Tranquebar, as well as the English missions in Madras and Cuddalore, both personally and through an offering which he received annually in the German Lutheran Court Chapel.

In addition, Ziegenhagen made personal contact with the missionaries as they passed through London on their way to India. The experience of Johann Philipp Fabricius, who served first in Tranquebar and then in Madras, is

⁸⁵ Ziegenhagen to Schultze, 26 January 1730.

⁸⁶ Norgaard, 143-46.

illustrative. Born in 1711, Fabricius entered missionary service in 1739 at the age of twenty-eight. Together with fellow-missionary candidate Daniel Zeglin, Fabricius set out for Copenhagen to be examined for ordination on 22 September 1739. They returned to Halle on 6 November, and ten days later set out for England. In England, Ziegenhagen “received the anxiously awaited guests with great joy and praise to God, and provided them with living quarters near his home so they could eat the noon meal with him.” He regarded the time which he had with the missionaries as a time for him to prepare them further for the work they were entering. Thus,

he invited them to participate in the Bible studies which he conducted three times weekly with his household. Before they went out into the wilderness of heathenism they were led once more on a fresh green pasture, for Ziegenhagen was highly trained theologically and a deeply based Christian man who also willingly shared the treasure of his wisdom. He took pains systematically to lay out before his guests the content of the Scriptures in order to fill in the gaps of their theological knowledge.

Knowing that they would be far from home, the missionaries “enthusiastically followed his leads and studied his sermon manuscripts”. In the case of Fabricius and his missionary colleagues, they had an unexpected period of time to delve with Ziegenhagen into the Scriptures and to tap his theological knowledge, because they were not able to sail until 20 April 1740 due to the Thames freezing over that year. This extra time was used by the missionaries not only for theological study but also for study of English under the direction of another house guest of Ziegenhagen.⁸⁷

Ziegenhagen’s personal commitment to the India Mission is testified to by the terms of his will. After he had provided household items and smaller sums of money to his servants, his executor, and his secretary, he left the remainder of his estate to the three Protestant missions in India. Half of his estate was to be given to the Danish work in Tranquebar and the other half was to be divided equally between the English work in Madras and Cuddalore.

V

Things had not yet settled down in India when another major challenge requiring co-operation of Halle-Pietists and the SPCK occurred. The final outcome of this challenge was the settlement of German Lutheran refugees from Salzburg, Austria, in the American state of Georgia.

⁸⁷ Germann 80.

As background for this new challenge, it should be noted that the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries still saw some German lands governed by bishops. One such land encompassed Salzburg and its surrounding territory. In spite of repeated efforts over the years by the archbishops who ruled Salzburg to rid their territory of non-Catholics, the Protestant population continued to grow, particularly in the mountains around the city. One of the reasons was the natural alienation which developed between the mountain people and the urbanites in Salzburg. Another was the annual treks of rural people seeking seasonal work in the Lutheran territories to the north. When these migrants returned to their homes for the winter, they brought with them books to sell or to keep which invariably had a Protestant content. Reading these books occupied their time through the winter months.⁸⁸

When Leopold Anton von Firmian became Archbishop of Salzburg in 1727, he decided to take drastic action to address the issue once and for all. He had a strong Jesuit connection and so he sent Jesuits into the mountain villages around Salzburg as missionaries to reclaim Lutherans and other Protestants for Roman Catholicism. He backed up their efforts by issuing threats and fines. When these proved ineffective, he issued an immigration edict on 31 October 1731 giving Protestants the choice of renouncing their faith or leaving the country. Those who did not own property had to leave within eight days. Almost a quarter of the population chose to leave rather than give up their faith. Many died along the way as they were caught in the mountains by the onslaught of winter.

The cruel expulsion of these Salzburgers for their faith soon became known throughout Protestant Germany. Prussia was looking for people to resettle an area of East Prussia and Lithuania which had been decimated by a plague at the beginning of the century. So Frederick William I (1688-1740), who saw himself as the remaining champion of Protestantism after August of Saxony had turned Catholic in 1697, welcomed most of the Salzburgers into his domain. Of the estimated 21 000 people who left Salzburg, about 18 000 went to Prussia. As the Salzburg exiles were marched from city to city en route to their new home, they became a symbol of Protestant resistance to Catholic oppression.

One of the cities through which the Salzburg refugees came as they fled their homeland was Augsburg. There Samuel Urlsperger, a corresponding member of the SPCK who had assisted the German Lutheran pastors in London to care for the German Palatines en route to New York earlier in the century, was the Senior Pastor of St Anne Lutheran Church. Early in 1732, Urlsperger sent a report to the SPCK through Ziegenhagen on the sorry state of these persecuted Protestants. Ziegenhagen had Urlsperger's account

⁸⁸ Mack Walker, *The Salzburg Transaction* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1992) 12.

translated into English, and on 22 February 1732 he brought the matter to the SPCK. The Society quickly picked up on the cause. It first ordered that 3 000 copies of *An Account of the Suffering of Persecuted Protestants in the Archbishopric of Salzburg* be printed and distributed. It then also had 2 000 copies of Urlsperger's letter about the Salzburg refugees printed. Finally it had printed *A Further Account of the Sufferings of the Persecuted Protestants*, which contained testimonies of individual Salzburgers of their faith.

The plight of the Salzburg refugees, dramatically related by Urlsperger, sparked interest and sympathy not only among individual members of the SPCK but also within the British Royal family and the British population in general.⁸⁹ As a member of the SPCK who was close to the king, Ziegenhagen was approved to receive funds for the help of the Salzburgers. Through him, financial contributions soon began to flow to Urlsperger. On 14 April 1732, Urlsperger acknowledged the first gift—125 pounds sterling, perhaps donated by George II⁹⁰ or another member of the royal family. Before long, more than 1 000 pounds had been collected. From a 23 May 1732 letter from Ziegenhagen to Henry Newman, it is clear that by the middle of 1732, the SPCK had assumed responsibility for assisting the Salzburgers.⁹¹ To direct the SPCK involvement in the Salzburg refugee problem, the Society set up an “Extraordinary Committee for Salzburgers”, one of whose members was Ziegenhagen.⁹²

The initial concern was for the immediate care of the Salzburgers in Germany; funds were sent to Urlsperger in Augsburg for this purpose. Coincidentally, however, a charter had been granted by the British crown in 1732 to twenty-one trustees to establish a new colony in Georgia. The plan soon developed that perhaps some of the persecuted Salzburgers could be settled in the new colony as a long-term solution to their difficulties. With the approval of the trustees, Urlsperger was therefore directed to recruit about 300 people for Georgia. Emigrants were promised 50 acres of land per family at no cost, a German Lutheran pastor, free passage, and financial support in Georgia, along with all the rights and privileges enjoyed by

⁸⁹ Brunner 167.

⁹⁰ If it was from the king, it probably came through the influence of his wife, Caroline, who had the practice of guiding her husband's decisions in such a way that he ended up thinking her decision was his own. Basil Williams, *The Whig Supremacy, 1714-1760*, in *The Oxford History of England* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1962) 354. Queen Caroline, who originated in Ansbach, Germany, was in her own right an active patron of the German Lutheran Chapel in the Savoy, providing 400 pounds on one occasion for a small house for the education of German-speaking children. Brunner 58.

⁹¹ George Fenwick Jones, ed., *Henry Newman's Salzburger Letterbooks* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1966) 1:2.

⁹² Brunner 168.

British subjects. To aid in the immigration, the Trustees received a grant of 10 000 pounds from the British parliament. To guide the immigrants to their new home, Urlsperger enlisted the services of Philipp George Friedrich von Reck, whose uncle was in the employ of George II.

By the middle of 1732, the main wave of emigration had passed and Urlsperger was only able to gather a group of 42 families—78 persons in all—in Augsburg. Assuming that their experiences in Georgia would encourage others to come, the SPCK decided to send the group, even though the number was smaller than anticipated. Aware of the role which Halle had played in the East India mission effort, Urlsperger turned to Gotthilf August Francke for help in identifying pastors for the Georgia colonists. Halle had already provided young pastors to about twenty thousand Salzburger whom Prussian authorities had marched through Franconia and Saxony en route to East Prussia,⁹³ but Francke was also able to locate two pastors for Georgia. Both of them were already serving in Halle: John Martin Boltzius, the deputy director of the Latin School; and Israel Christian Gronau, a preceptor at the orphanage. They were ordained on 11 November 1733 in Wernigerode and arrived in Rotterdam to meet their new congregation on 26 November. On 3 December they set sail for England

In England, Heinrich Alard Butjenter, Ziegenhagen's associate chaplain, was given special responsibility for the spiritual care of the Salzburger. He not only checked out the theological understanding of the Salzburger, but also took the two colonial pastors under his wing. He went over the church agenda of the German Court Chaplain in London with them and showed them how they might best arrange their worship services.⁹⁴ Ziegenhagen also spent time with the emigrants. The colonial pastors recorded in their journal on 22 December, "We were no less pleased with the inspiring message from the court chaplain Mr Ziegenhagen, in which he added some instructions regarding our future church establishment."⁹⁵

A second group of Salzburger followed on 23 September 1734. Ziegenhagen again took the trouble of coming to visit them on the ship, *Prince Frederick*, as it lay at anchor awaiting favourable winds. After addressing the group based on Psalm 45, he baptized a new-born baby, had food and drink brought to the ship for all of the Salzburger, and gave each of them some money.⁹⁶ A third group of Georgia-bound persons was later arranged for and financially supported by the SPCK even though many were

⁹³ Walker 88.

⁹⁴ Jones 1:34.

⁹⁵ Jones 1:33.

⁹⁶ Jones 1:17.

not former Salzburgers. Eventually also a fourth group came, personally arranged for by Henry Newman, the secretary of the SPCK.⁹⁷

One of the ways in which spiritual care was provided—by Urlsperger in Augsburg and by Ziegenhagen and the SPCK in London—was by providing the emigrants with religious books: Bibles, hymnbooks, catechisms, and copies of Arndt's *True Christianity* and other edifying materials.⁹⁸ This was completely in tune with the way the Salzburgers were accustomed to supporting their faith.

The wide scattering of single-family economic units over the mountain slopes [around Salzburg] made it difficult for farmers to attend and receive regular religious services and difficult for the official church to organize them. ... Consequently, these conditions enjoined family devotions as the main religious exercise of the population; and for family devotions, the book is a basic implement.

Arndt's *True Christianity* and the Lutheran Bible were generally included among the books which the Salzburgers treasured.⁹⁹

The Georgia colony, which the Salzburgers named "Ebenezer", soon experienced great difficulties which discouraged and disheartened them. People died. Crops failed. The people and their pastors blamed Urlsperger, then the trustees.¹⁰⁰ Three years after the first colony was formed, it had to move to another location.¹⁰¹ In the midst of their troubles, Ziegenhagen was the person to whom they turned for help and whom they held in highest esteem.¹⁰² On 12 August 1734, for example, the journal of the pastors records the comment,

The very praiseworthy Society and the court chaplain Mr Ziegenhagen did us a great favour when they transmitted our salary and the benefactions received from Germany in English copper coins. We will be able to serve the members of our congregation with these because they can not make out very well in purchasing necessities with the paper money in use here, since most of them do not know it and suffer losses as a consequence.¹⁰³

On 7 February 1737, the journal records the comment, "The period for which the first and second transports were to receive provisions will run out this coming March. We have felt it necessary to approach Court Chaplain

⁹⁷ Brunner, 171.

⁹⁸ Jones, 1:6.

⁹⁹ Walker, 146-147.

¹⁰⁰ Brunner, 172.

¹⁰¹ Renata Wilson, *Halle and Ebenezer Pietism, Agriculture and Commerce* (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Maryland, 1988), 2.

¹⁰² To be sure, the letters and diaries which form the basis of our knowledge were edited for public consumption to promote the colony.

¹⁰³ Jones, 2:121.

Ziegenhagen again and describe to him the misery of our dear flock.”¹⁰⁴ Particularly striking is the way the pastors turned to Ziegenhagen’s letters for spiritual strength for themselves and their congregations. On 18 June 1737, their journal records the comment,

I read part of the letter by Court Chaplain Ziegenhagen during the evening prayer meeting, and I must confess, for the praise of our loving and generous Lord, that my heart was much enlightened by the letter’s instructive considerations of the beneficial and secret paths of the cross which He travelled and is still travelling with the believers of the old and the new covenant.¹⁰⁵

Again on 18 May 1740, the journal records the comment,

In yesterday evening’s prayer meeting we edified ourselves once more from Court Chaplain Ziegenhagen’s letter for which may the cherished name of the Lord be praised. May it help; us keep faith in the certain promises of the Lord, to which we have been directed, even in the present war troubles.¹⁰⁶

It was not only Ziegenhagen’s letters which the pastors used as strength for their ministry. On 22 March 1748, Boltzius records in his journal that he had been using a song which Ziegenhagen composed on the three main articles of the Christian faith as the basis for teaching the catechism to some older children on the plantation. In December the same year, the Salzburgers studied Ziegenhagen’s “excellent, sincere and inspiring thoughts” on Jesus’ words in John 12:20-33 in their evening prayer hours. These thoughts had been contained in a Good Friday sermon, which Ziegenhagen’s associate chaplain, Samuel Albinus, had sent to them.¹⁰⁷ On another occasion, the colonists looked to some printed materials composed by Ziegenhagen and put into print. One was a commentary on the Lord’s Prayer; another was a tract called “Precious drops of honey from the Rock Christ” (*Köstlichen Honigtropfen aus dem Felsen Christo*).¹⁰⁸

Not only copies of Ziegenhagen’s sermons, but also hymns which Ziegenhagen (and other court chaplains, such as Albinus) composed, were looked upon as precious input for the spiritual life of the colonists. Specifically noted in Boltzius’ journal are: “Oh, Holy God, We All Pray” (*O heiliger Gott, wir alle bethen an*), and “My Father, You Have Chosen Me” (*Mein Vater, du hast mich erwählt*).¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁴ Jones 4:16.

¹⁰⁵ Jones 4:107.

¹⁰⁶ Jones 7:126.

¹⁰⁷ Jones 14:192.

¹⁰⁸ Jones 17:15, 119.

¹⁰⁹ Jones 15:291. Two hymns composed by Albinus were entitled: “All Men Must Die” (*Alle Menschen müssen sterben*) and “World, Adieu, I Am Tired of You” (*Welt, ade, ich bin dein müde*).

Ziegenhagen also demonstrated his love for the Georgia congregation and the colony's pastors in other special ways. In 1750, for example, he donated to the Jerusalem church a five foot by four foot painting of the Last Supper. Calling it "exceedingly beautiful and costly", Boltzius mentioned in his journal that it was placed "very imposingly above the table against the wall between two windows where Holy Communion is always held."¹¹⁰ On another occasion, Ziegenhagen sent Boltzius a new pocket watch described by Boltzius as "a valuable and very cherished gift".¹¹¹

Because of their roles in establishing the Georgia Salzburg colony, Ziegenhagen, Urlsperger, and Gotthilf Francke were viewed as "fathers" to the colonists. Not only did they look to these three men for material help, but they also asked their advice in the many difficulties which they faced in Georgia.

One of the subjects about which they sought advice had to do with slavery. On 16 March 1746, Benjamin Martyn, the secretary of the London-based trustees of the Georgian colony, wrote that the trustees would never permit slavery in the colony. He looked to the industry of the Salzburger to demonstrate that slavery was not necessary. Yet the pressure to introduce slaves to Georgia was so great that by 10 January 1749, even Boltzius reluctantly agreed to sign a petition to allow slaves to be imported.¹¹² The matter still troubled Boltzius, and he asked for advice from Ziegenhagen. With no personal experience of slavery either in Germany or in England, Ziegenhagen responded on 11 July 1750. While the letter is not extant, Boltzius quoted part of it in his journal. Ziegenhagen had not ruled out slavery entirely. He approved of it "if God shows no other way or means to get along without Negroes", if "through their service and help some honest and hardworking members of Christ are kept in life and well-being", "if the need is there and one can find no other counsel." "One should not proceed to acquire them without dire necessity", he wrote.

Rationalizing the acceptance of slavery as a deed by which one does not inherently commit sin, Ziegenhagen pointed out that

a greater kindness is done to these people [the Negroes] if they ... are kept in a Christian manner than if they had remained in their homeland. For they have their physical subsistence. They have an opportunity to be brought to a true recognition of God and Jesus Christ and also of life.

As well, helping some honest and hard-pressed member of Christ to be kept in life and well-being would be "a blessing for the slaves" as well as a blessing for "an entire place and for an entire land". So then the basic

¹¹⁰ Jones 14:192.

¹¹¹ Jones 15:96.

¹¹² Jones, *Salzburger Saga* 103.

questions for Ziegenhagen are twofold: Is there a dire need? And, is the purpose “to lead them to Christ”.¹¹³

Boltzius was also troubled with having to deal with “non-spiritual” matters in the course of his pastoral functions. Turning again to Ziegenhagen for advice, he was told that the more he tries to flee and avoid the secular tasks that do not really belong to his office, the more they will fall upon him and follow him as a shadow does a body.¹¹⁴

The special affection with which the Georgian colonists regarded Ziegenhagen is seen in the fact that they celebrated his birthday, according to Boltzius’ journal, on at least two separate occasions. None of the other “fathers” of the colony appear to have been given this honour.¹¹⁵

VI

About the same time that Ziegenhagen was involved with the settlement of the Salzburg Lutherans in Georgia, the stage was being set for his involvement in the ministry to German Lutherans in the established colonies in Pennsylvania and other American states to the north. In fact the first requests for help from these northern states had come prior to the Georgia project—in 1724, only months after Ziegenhagen arrived in London.¹¹⁶ Two years later, a two-man delegation had arrived in London to ask for a pastor, but had to return empty-handed.¹¹⁷ A full decade passed before a concrete link was forged between Halle Pietists in Germany and German Lutherans in the north-eastern states. The initiative came from German Lutherans in the three Pennsylvania communities of Philadelphia, Neu Hannover, and Providence, who sent a three-man delegation to Ziegenhagen and Gotthilf Francke in 1734. This led Ziegenhagen and Francke to decide to make Halle and the German Court Chapel in London responsible for providing pastors for the German congregations in America. Even then, it took seven more years before a pastor could be located for the Pennsylvania parish.¹¹⁸ This pastor was Heinrich Melchior Muehlenberg.

In 1739, Muehlenberg had committed himself to go as a missionary to India. At Francke’s urging, however, he had accepted a call to serve instead as a deacon in a congregation and as the inspector of an orphanage in

¹¹³ Jones 15:49.

¹¹⁴ Jones 15:277.

¹¹⁵ Jones 16:49; 17:139.

¹¹⁶ Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, London, 24 November 1724.

¹¹⁷ Ziegenhagen to A. H. Francke, London, 4 November 1726.

¹¹⁸ Brunner 68.

Grosshennersdorf.¹¹⁹ Two years later, Francke chose Muehlenberg to be the first Halle pastor in Pennsylvania. After stopping for short periods to visit friends in Germany, Muehlenberg's trip to America brought him to London. It was from Ziegenhagen that Muehlenberg received his call to go to Pennsylvania on the strength of the contact which Ziegenhagen had with the congregations there.

Ziegenhagen had extensive contact with Muehlenberg over a period of nine weeks, during which this first Halle missionary made final preparations for sailing to America. After that length of time, he concluded that Muehlenberg was not the right man for the job.¹²⁰ On his side, Muehlenberg was very impressed with Ziegenhagen, who was seventeen years his senior and had already served for twenty years as Court Chaplain. In a letter to Francke, Muehlenberg commented on Ziegenhagen's "power in exegesis, especially in the New Testament." "If I did not have my present call", Muehlenberg wrote, "I would wish to be his amanuensis, in order to profit from his exegesis and dogmatic theology."¹²¹ Twenty-one years later, Muehlenberg still recalled a suggestion which Ziegenhagen had made on this earlier occasion about the significance of Jesus' washing the disciples' feet.¹²²

When Muehlenberg reached America, he wrote individual letters to both Ziegenhagen and Francke dated the same day (21 September 1742). The two letters contained some of the same information but his letter to Ziegenhagen was almost three times as long and contained material which was more "folksy" in nature. He had also written three letters earlier on his trip.¹²³ From these letters, it is apparent that, even though Ziegenhagen had a negative reaction to Muehlenberg, this first Halle missionary to America left London thinking that he and Ziegenhagen had established a strong personal relationship.

Since the mail from America normally went to London before it went on to the continent, it was convenient for Muehlenberg to address letters jointly to Ziegenhagen and Francke. Ziegenhagen received the letters first

¹¹⁹ Kurt Aland, *Die Korrespondenz Heinrich Melchior Muehlenberg* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1986) 1:6.

¹²⁰ Ziegenhagen was so unimpressed by Muehlenberg's preaching that he became convinced that Francke had chosen the wrong man for America. Martin Schmidt, "Die Pietismus in Nordwest Deutschland", in *Der Pietismus als Theologische Erscheinung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984) 222, on the basis of a letter of Ziegenhagen to Francke, 27 April 1742 (I E 4:89). Schmidt erroneously indicates that the letter was dated 15 January 1742, which would have been prior to Muehlenberg's arrival in London. The 15 January letter precedes the letter of 27 April in the manuscript collection.

¹²¹ Muehlenberg to F. A. Francke, Kensington, 22 June 1742 in Aland, 1:32.

¹²² Theodore G. Tappert and John W. Doberstein, trans., *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg* (Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1945) 2:64.

¹²³ Aland 1:33-38. See also footnote 3 in 1:36.

and then sent them on to Francke, sometimes appending his own comments on the issues discussed in the letters. Francke was the one who normally answered Muehlenberg's letters sending them first to Ziegenhagen. Ziegenhagen occasionally sent along his own note to Francke's response to Muehlenberg. This meant that the mail, already slow because it relied on sailing ships for passage across the ocean, might be further delayed, especially if Ziegenhagen was ill or away from home when the letter came from either direction. Thus, on 6 June 1743, Muehlenberg complained that he had already written three times without having received an answer. He was particularly distressed that Ziegenhagen was not moved to respond. On 24 May 1744, Muehlenberg related all of the places on the continent from which he had received mail, but said, "From our dear Fathers in London [translate: Ziegenhagen], I have not seen anything even though up to five ships arrived here or in New York this spring." When Ziegenhagen finally did write personally to Muehlenberg in fall 1744, it was to tell him that additional pastoral help was on the way.¹²⁴

Although Muehlenberg may have preferred to deal with Ziegenhagen rather than Francke, the pattern which emerged was that most of his correspondence was with Francke. Actually, since there was regular direct correspondence between Ziegenhagen and Francke, Francke often spoke for both of them. Thus, in a letter to the pastors in Philadelphia, Francke wrote, "In response to the desire expressed in several earlier letters for new workers, Court Chaplain Ziegenhagen and I have determined under the call of God to search for two new co-workers and to cover the travel costs from here and England."¹²⁵ Occasionally, Ziegenhagen did add his own comments to what Francke wrote. One such occasion was regarding whether Muehlenberg should leave Pennsylvania and accept a call to New York. Muehlenberg had written to Ziegenhagen and Francke from New York on 15 June 1751 telling them about the exciting challenge of uniting the Dutch and German congregations in that city and reminding them of the problems which he had encountered in Pennsylvania. He felt disheartened and inadequate for the work in Pennsylvania. As he said, "It is difficult to make a writing quill out of a pickaxe."¹²⁶ Muehlenberg soon changed his mind about moving to New York; after constantly being on horseback in Pennsylvania, he felt as though he was confined in a prison in New York. But his earlier letter about the New York call prompted a response both from Francke and

¹²⁴ Muehlenberg to Francke and Ziegenhagen, Philadelphia, 6 March 1745, printed in Aland 1:150. Ziegenhagen's letter is not extant but one gathers from Muehlenberg's letter that it was "business".

¹²⁵ Francke to Handschuh and Muehlenberg, Halle, 18 March 1751, printed in Aland 1:391.

¹²⁶ Muehlenberg to Francke and Ziegenhagen, New York, 15 June 1751, printed in Aland 1:406-415.

from Ziegenhagen. It was, in fact, the first personal response from Ziegenhagen to Muehlenberg in nine years.

Francke thanked Muehlenberg for opening his heart to himself and Ziegenhagen and relating what was bothering him. He promised to pray for him and the work in Pennsylvania. In response to Muehlenberg's questioning his adequacy for the work, Francke assured him that he had been faithful and had demonstrated wisdom. In his P. S., Ziegenhagen indicated that he may have changed his earlier negative assessment of Muehlenberg. He assured Muehlenberg that, although he had not written for a long time, he was of the same mind as Francke. He urged Muehlenberg not to abandon his Pennsylvania congregations. "God has sent you to the poor, unruly, and torn congregations in Philadelphia, New Hanover, and Providence", he said.

By His mercy, through your service and work, he has also begun to make improvement and show hope for the future. This is the station to which God has directed you and where you will most certainly experience His grace, help, and support. Therefore, it is by no means wise under any circumstance—unless you have indication that it is the clear and certain will of God—for you to leave it.¹²⁷

Prior to receiving the advice of Francke and Ziegenhagen, Muehlenberg had turned down the call and returned to Pennsylvania on 11 November 1751. But the people in New York still wanted Muehlenberg to come, and evidently Muehlenberg still struggled with whether he should not perhaps reverse his decision and go to New York. In the meantime, two new workers arrived in America on 1 December 1751, and Muehlenberg was anxious to know from them what Ziegenhagen and his associate, Court Chaplain Albinus, really thought about the idea. One of the two new workers was Frederick Schultze, a man who later showed himself to be spiritually and psychologically immature, and the message which Muehlenberg got about how Ziegenhagen viewed Muehlenberg and his situation was not entirely accurate. Among other things, Schultze told Muehlenberg that Ziegenhagen thought he wanted to enter this new field of service because he was dissatisfied with the poor conditions in Pennsylvania and was looking for greener pastures in New York.¹²⁸ Muehlenberg tried to correct what he perceived to be erroneous impressions of him in London. However, it is apparent that he was unhappy both with what he read in Ziegenhagen's advice to him as well as what he heard through the new workers about Ziegenhagen's attitude toward him. On 1 June 1752, Muehlenberg complained to Albinus about the "condescension" toward him in the letters

¹²⁷ Ziegenhagen to Muehlenberg, Kensington, 7 October 1751, printed in Aland 1:441-442.

¹²⁸ Muehlenberg to Ziegenhagen and Francke, Providence, 18 February 1752, printed in Aland 1:476-494.

which he received the previous year. While he recognized that Schultze had probably misrepresented the reactions in London to his own “confused letter out of New York”, Muehlenberg still had problems with Ziegenhagen’s advice that he remain in his rural congregation. He wrote,

If I am to be a victim for Hanover and Providence, my remaining strength will be expended. I cannot raise my children under such conditions but must commend them to God. If the Reverend Fathers in mercy would release me from carrying out this impossible task, then I will remain with one or even no congregation but will stay in my home, lead my family in spiritual matters through God’s grace and seek to supplement my earthly support through honourable secular work.¹²⁹

For the next four years, Muehlenberg’s letters to London were directed not to Ziegenhagen but to Albinus. As well, though letters were still directed to Ziegenhagen and Francke jointly, some were also directed only to Francke. On 22 February 1752, for example, Muehlenberg wrote to Francke, “Regarding the New York situation, please confer with Court Chaplain Ziegenhagen and send me your final directive. When I have before me the word and statement of the Reverend Fathers, I can function joyfully and my conscience will be at peace.”¹³⁰ These words have a strange ring to them, given the fact that Muehlenberg must by this time have received the advice separately from Francke and Ziegenhagen telling him in no uncertain terms that they felt he should stay where he was and not go to New York.

In a brief note to Muehlenberg on 9 August 1752, Francke tried to mend matters between Muehlenberg and Ziegenhagen. He wrote that Muehlenberg had not correctly understood Ziegenhagen and that Schultze had twisted his meaning further.¹³¹ He followed this up with a carefully worded letter on 13 September 1752.¹³² But, by the end of 1752, the development of the church in Pennsylvania and hence the relationship between Muehlenberg and the “Reverend Fathers” had reached a new phase. The Ministerium of North America, which had been organized in 1748,¹³³ was meeting annually and the Pennsylvania mission field was developing a distinct corporate identity. With eight pastors and two catechists serving over twenty congregations at the beginning of 1753, Muehlenberg had assumed a strategic leadership role. Thus, the reports from Muehlenberg to Ziegenhagen and Francke now focussed on the developments and conflicts in various congregations within the Ministerium and not just within his own congregation. Francke continued

¹²⁹ Muehlenberg to Albinus, New York, 1 June 1752, printed in Aland 1:515-524.

¹³⁰ Muehlenberg to Francke, Providence, 22 February 1752, printed in Aland 1:496-507.

¹³¹ Francke to Muehlenberg, Poelzig, 9 August 1752, printed in Aland 1:529.

¹³² Francke to Muehlenberg, Halle, 13 September 1752, printed in Aland 1:530-38.

¹³³ E. Clifford Nelson, ed., *The Lutherans in North America*, rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980) 49.

to be the one to comment with advice on what was occurring in America. Ziegenhagen resumed the position of a silent partner. If communication from London was called for, it was with Albinus rather than Ziegenhagen, an arrangement which was terminated when Albinus accepted a call to Germany on 2 June 1761.

Following the departure of Albinus from London, communication tapered off for a time. On 10 January 1762, Muehlenberg wrote to Ziegenhagen, "For the longest time, I have not received the tiniest report either from London or from Halle."¹³⁴ Almost a year later, Muehlenberg repeated his complaint. "If, without intending to do so or knowing it, I have offended the Reverend Fathers," wrote Muehlenberg, "I would rather receive fatherly chastisement and correction or even 'farewell' than to be left in suspense without any report." Muehlenberg directed his remarks particularly at Ziegenhagen when he wrote that a young English preacher from London had arrived again that week "but did not bring along even a note from the Reverend Fathers."¹³⁵

Ziegenhagen's response to Muehlenberg's letter of 1 December 1762 was uncharacteristically emotional. He turned the table on Muehlenberg as he told him that he and Francke had written: on 15 July 1761 (Francke) and August 13 (Ziegenhagen).

Why did it take the dear brother almost a year to acknowledge our letters? Even more, one must wonder why the 1 December 1762 letter did not give answer to the main point of our letters, that is, how the serious break in brotherly harmony between the beloved brother and Pastor Handschuh can be restored? ... These matters certainly call for an answer, but because none came, we thought that our earnest and loving proposal and admonition to brotherly unity was partly not found appropriate and also did not have the desired effect. ... We remained in darkness and ignorance as to the true condition of the Pennsylvania congregation and who was actually at fault for the conflict and still is! ... Your letter did not give us any more light or understanding but contained only a general expression of Satan and his cunning and the malignancy of satanic chaos. But who this Satan or his tools are and whether Handschuh is meant by this is not indicated.

Although he found certain parts of Muehlenberg's letter "offensive" and "irritating", he sent it on to Francke the day after he received it and admonished Muehlenberg not to be overwhelmed and rant against bad

¹³⁴ Muehlenberg to Ziegenhagen, Philadelphia, 10 January 1762, printed in Aland, 2:535-38.

¹³⁵ Muehlenberg to Francke and Ziegenhagen, Philadelphia, 1 December 1762, printed in Aland 2:578-585.

situations but to use his years of experience to provide support for the congregations.¹³⁶

From his letter of 9 March 1763, it appears that Ziegenhagen may have felt that his assessment of Muehlenberg twenty years earlier had been largely accurate. Twenty years of experience in America should have been sufficient for Muehlenberg to be able to handle the situations which presented themselves. Yet, he still came to Ziegenhagen and Francke, who had never been in America, for their advice. His limited information, however, made it difficult for them to provide proper advice, leaving Ziegenhagen to feel that Muehlenberg was more interested in complaining than in solving his problems. What also irritated Ziegenhagen was that he had cause to question Muehlenberg's objectivity in reporting situations. For Ziegenhagen had a visit from a certain Leimle who belonged to a group of people in Philadelphia who opposed Muehlenberg. Naturally, Leimle's view of things in Philadelphia would differ from Muehlenberg's report of them. But this left Ziegenhagen doubly in the dark and did not help his relationship with Muehlenberg. Thus, Ziegenhagen was relieved when Muehlenberg directed his London correspondence to F. W. Pasche, Ziegenhagen's assistant, and with G. A. Wachsels, the preacher at St George's German Church in London.

The natural development of the Lutheran Church in North America, which began to include pastors who had not been educated in Halle, as well as the advancing age of Ziegenhagen and Francke, meant that by the 1760s little central control was being exerted from London and Halle. To be sure, as long as these second generation Pietists were alive, a psychological tie was maintained and, materially, some help continued to come to North America from overseas. Thus, when Ziegenhagen died in 1776, Pasche informed Muehlenberg of his passing in the following words: "What a great loss this will be for the dear United Evangelical Lutheran congregations and their preachers in Pennsylvania" And, in spite of the fact that Ziegenhagen did not have as close a relationship as Muehlenberg had wished, the latter could say of him, "To lose such a spiritual father, counsellor, benefactor, intercessor, guide, etc., in these very critical and dangerous times is no small thing for the whole or for its smallest parts."¹³⁷

Norman J. Threinen, Th.D., is Professor of Historical Theology at Concordia Lutheran Seminary, Edmonton, Alberta.

¹³⁶ Ziegenhagen to Muehlenberg, Kensington, 9 March 1763, printed in Aland 3:31-41.

¹³⁷ Cited in Brunner 69.

THE EUCHARIST IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

Paul Williams

The question of the place of the Eucharist in the book of Hebrews has brought forth an extraordinarily diverse range of opinions. The 19th-century Anglican scholar J. E. Fields, for instance, finds there to be a “continuous line of allusion to the Holy Eucharist throughout the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews”,¹ a view echoed by such scholars as S. Aalen,² O. Moe,³ P. Andriessen,⁴ and especially J. Swetnam.⁵ Although the author of Hebrews nowhere refers to the Eucharist in such a straightforward way as does St Paul in I Cor. 11, nevertheless he seems to strongly allude to it in a number of places. One can hardly fail to think of the Lord’s Supper, for instance, when one reads in 10:19 of Christ’s “blood” and “body” in close proximity together as ways through which Christians “enter the Most Holy Place”, themes which are also anticipated already in 9:11. In 9:20, the author alters a quotation of Moses’ inauguration of the Old Covenant from Ex. 24:8 in order to make it quote precisely the eucharistic words of Institution, “This is the blood of the Covenant.” Such verses as these, along with others which speak of “tasting” the heavenly gift (6:4), of “eating” from an altar (13:10), and the often graphic description of Christian worship taking place in heavenly splendour (12:20), give ample room for one to argue for a sacramental eucharistic theme running throughout the book of Hebrews. Nevertheless, the majority of scholars who have addressed this issue agree with J. Moffatt that the author of Hebrews “never alludes to the Eucharist”⁶ at all. Such scholars as G. Theissen,⁷ F. F. Bruce,⁸ F. Schroger,⁹ and R.

¹F. E. Field, “The Apostolic Liturgy and the Epistle to the Hebrews” (London, 1882) v.

²S. Aalen, “Das Abendmahl als Opfermahl im Neuen Testament”, *Novum Testamentum* 6 (1963): 128-52

³O. Moe, *Das Abendmahl im Hebraerbrief*, *St. Th.* 4 (1951): 102-8

⁴P. Andriessen, “L’Eucharistie dans l’Épître aux Hébreux” 3 (1972) : 269-77.

⁵J. Swetnam, “‘The Greater and More Perfect Tent’: A Contribution to the Discussion of Hebrews 9,11”, *Biblica* 42 (1966): 91-106 [henceforth referred to as “Tent”]; “On the Imagery and Significance of Hebrews 9,9-10”, *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 28 (1966): 155-73 [henceforth referred to as “Imagery”]; “Christology and the Eucharist in the Epistle to the Hebrews” [henceforth referred to as “Christology”].

⁶J. Moffatt, *A Critical And Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Edinburgh, 1924), quoted by R. Williamson, “The Eucharist and the Epistle to the Hebrews”, *New Testament Studies* 21 (1974-75): 301.

⁷G. Theissen, *Untersuchungen zum Hebräerbrief* (Gutersloh) 77.

⁸F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1967).

⁹F. Schroger, “Der Gottesdienst der Hebraerbriefgemeinde”, *Münch. Th. Z.* 19 (1968).

Williamson¹⁰ advance plausible interpretations of Hebrews which do not require any reference to the Eucharist whatsoever.

General agreement seems to exist on both sides of this issue that the crucial text for the discussion of the Eucharist in Hebrews is 9:1-14.¹¹ Comparing and contrasting the Old and New Covenants, these verses describe the inadequacies of the Old which find completion in the New. Thus, while the gifts and sacrifices being offered in the Old Covenant are “not able to clear the conscience” (9:9), Christ “cleanses our conscience from acts which lead to death” (9:14). Furthermore, in the Old Covenant “the way of the Most Holy Place” is “not yet disclosed” (9:8), while Christ Himself enters and opens it “once and for all” (9:12).

Important to this discussion is precisely what is inadequate about the Old Covenant and how it is corrected by the New. It is clear that 9:10 finds inadequate the various ceremonial external regulations, such as “food and drink and various ceremonial washings” which the Old Covenant required to be followed. In view of this, R. Williamson strongly suggests the possibility that the new Covenant abolishes not only the specific cultic regulations of the Old Covenant but all cultic activity as well. “One of the distinctive emphases of Hebrews may well be,” says Williamson, “a view ... that the sacrifice of Christ was of a kind that rendered obsolete every form of cultus that placed a material means of sacramental communion between God and the worshipper.”¹² The central problem of the Old Covenant was the necessity for its *cultus* to be practised “again and again” (9:26), since it never could accomplish a complete purification for sins. However, Christ’s “once for all” sacrifice accomplishes what the Old Covenant could not, effecting an “objective deed which utterly transforms man’s position in relation to God.”¹³

Implicit in this is a particular view of Hebrews’ eschatology. Williamson recognizes that the book of Hebrews understands the Christian as a “pilgrim whose pilgrimage left them somewhere between the ‘already’ and the ‘not yet’.”¹⁴ In the “already” of this life, the “not yet” of the bliss of glory is only an “object of faith and hope”.¹⁵ Williamson gives the impression that he understands a Eucharistic participation, or even “anticipation” on earth of

¹⁰R. Williamson, “The Eucharist and the Epistle to the Hebrews”, *New Testament Studies* 21 (1974-75): 300-12.

¹¹Williamson, for example, in his analysis of “six particular passages” which are used to argue for a Eucharistic Hebrews, spends the most time discussing 9:1-14, while J. Swetnam has written two full papers on this verse alone. It is also perhaps noteworthy that A. Van Hoyer’s detailed outline puts 9:11 at the very heart and centre of the epistle.

¹²Williamson 310.

¹³Williamson 310.

¹⁴Williamson 312.

¹⁵Williamson 310.

that which we can only have in heaven to be an unwarranted moving of the “not yet” into the “already” which the Hebrews text would not allow. “Approaching the throne of grace by faith” is understood by Williamson to refer merely to a subjective hope and perseverance towards the “bliss of glory” which such faith has as its object. In this way, Williamson, though recognizing in theory the “already, but not yet” character of the Christian faith, nevertheless comes close in practice to playing the two concepts off against each other; the “not yet” is not so if one has a “foretaste” of it in the “already”. Williamson, therefore, views faith and cultic activity to be mutually exclusive. Because “according to Hebrews, the Gospel always comes as a promise, to be received in faith, it can never be anticipated materially in a sacramental cultus.”¹⁶ Through such faith, to be sure, “the worshipper has direct access to the throne of grace.”¹⁷ Nevertheless, faith always points to a hope of things in the future which are not now seen; “there is no suggestion anywhere in the epistle that at regular intervals, in eucharistic worship, the believer anticipates on earth what will be his fully only in heaven.”¹⁸

However, it must be asked what kind of “direct access” to the throne of grace a worshipper can have if on earth he only “anticipates ... what will be his fully in heaven.” Although Williamson does not directly answer this question, one might presume that he would agree with Attridge that “entering boldly into the throne of grace” in 4:16 is to be understood as an “encompassing image for entering into a covenant relationship with God.”¹⁹ Along with this is the sense that the believer may have help from God in his “life of active love and goodness”²⁰ and that he is able to approach God with his prayers with the confidence that they will be heard. Attridge notes how προσέρχομαι is to be understood in a “forensic context”, while the parallel term ἐγγίζομεν of 7:19 in “approaching the throne of grace” is understood as referring “not as a description of a Christian cultic act, but a relationship of God through Christ that displaces the cult of the older.”²¹ For both Williamson and Attridge, the strong language of entering and drawing near to God is no more than powerfully evocative language for describing the believer’s status and relationship with God.

However, does the author of Hebrews intend just “highly metaphorical” and “complex symbolism”²² in 10:19 when he says that “we have confidence

¹⁶Williamson 312.

¹⁷Williamson 310.

¹⁸Williamson 310.

¹⁹H. W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989) 141.

²⁰Williamson 310.

²¹Attridge 204.

²²Attridge 284.

to enter the Most Holy Place”, especially since the action of Christ doing this very same thing in 9:12 is unanimously understood as nothing less than entry into heaven itself?²³ N. A. Dahl²⁴ argues that far more than this must be meant in 9:12 and 10:19. He notes that the sanctuary (τὰ ἅγια/τὸν ἅγιον) mentioned in these verses is not pictured by the author of Hebrews as the same thing as the sanctuary of the Old Covenant as if both together are foreshadowings of the “real” sanctuary of God’s presence in heaven. Rather, the New Covenant sanctuary to which through Christ we have free access to God is identical with heaven itself”, and has, as its “essential characteristic ... the presence of God and undisturbed communion with Him, as they exist in heaven and in the age to come.”²⁵ The New Covenant sanctuary and heaven itself are to be seen as one and the same, which together are both foreshadowed by the Old Covenant sanctuary, and which together are the New Covenant which completely perfects the Old. Furthermore, it is this sanctuary, being the same as heaven itself, which the believer is said to “enter” in the present time. Dahl argues that this sanctuary “is equivalent to the ‘rest,’ the ‘sabbath Rest,’ and the ‘heritage,’ ‘the homeland,’ which is the higher, eschatological counterpart of the land of promise.”²⁶ Therefore the author of Hebrews constantly enjoins his readers to “draw near to God” (7:19, 10:22) and “approach the throne of grace” (4:16) because he considers such a thing possible in the present time, and not merely in the future.

In 9:11-12 the author of Hebrews speaks of Christ’s entering the sanctuary to take place “through the greater and more perfect tabernacle” and “by His own blood”. Precisely how does this “tent” and “blood” function as “means” through which Christ enters into the sanctuary? J. Swetnam notes that the central thought of 9:11-12 is that “Christ entered the sanctuary” and the means of entrance are the parallel “greater and more perfect tent” and “His own blood”. Swetnam argues that both the tent and the blood can be understood as “attestors” which “proclaim, present,” and “officially make known” as a “legal witness”.²⁷ He sees the sweep of chapter 9 to be discussing the official inauguration by God of a new διαθήκη which

²³Williamson notes—interestingly enough, as the “final word” of his argument of a Eucharistic interpretation of 9:1-14—“Christ, as high priest, has entered once and for all (ἐφάπαξ) into the presence of God through the greater and more perfect tent, which is (in?) heaven itself, and that the sacrifice on the basis of which, by means of which (διὰ) He makes His successful entry into the heavenly sanctuary is that of Himself” (306). Attridge, though downplaying a “realistically conceived heavenly journey made by Christ”, nevertheless finds this passage referring to an “entry into the realm where God is truly worshipped” (248).

²⁴N. A. Dahl, “A New and Living Way: The Approach to God According to Hebrews 10:19-25”, *Interpretation* 5:401-12 .

²⁵Dahl 402.

²⁶Dahl 402.

²⁷Swetnam, “Tent” 98.

officially displaces the old one of Moses. As Moses inaugurates his covenant by means of blood, (9:19) so also the New διαθήκη cannot be put into effect without blood. Such blood puts the διαθήκη into effect because it is the official evidence that the testator has, in fact, died. Therefore, what the blood of Christ does is to officially “proclaim, present,” and “officially make known” the fact that Christ had died, so that His New διαθήκη is in effect. Those to whom the blood needs to be made known are the Christians as its beneficiaries. Although Attridge claims the force of φέρεσθαι to be nothing more than a “technical legal sense of ‘to be reported’ or ‘registered’ and thus officially recognised”,²⁸ the description of the attestation of the first διαθήκη by Moses appears to suggest something more. In the Exodus 34 account as described in 10:19-22, Moses did not just report to the people the existence of the attesting blood. He, in fact, “made” the blood “known to them”, and “sprinkled all the people” with it. That implications from this can be drawn concerning the Lord’s Supper is suggested by the fact that the wording of Moses’ words are made to conform exactly to the Eucharist words of Institution according to the Gospel of Matthew.²⁹ Indeed, “the whole passage 9:11-28 is a carefully woven fabric of themes involving blood, testament, and forgiveness, with the old and the new dispensations being contrasted in all three points in the context of cult”, with “the cultic blood of the old ‘testament’ ... compared with Christ’s Eucharistic blood, the cultic blood of the new testament.”³⁰ In the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, each believer has the attesting blood of the new διαθήκη not merely talked about to them, but shown, presented, and made known to them.

A look at the parallel use of the term “tent” appears to offer more evidence for this conclusion. Since the term “tent” is used within a context of a comparison between the temple of the Old covenant and Christ, and that “New Testament catechesis attests to the close relationship between the earth and Resurrection of Christ and the theme of the temple”,³¹ it seems plausible that “tent” in 9:11 refers to Christ’s glorified body.³² 9:8 indicates that the

²⁸Attridge 256.

²⁹It is perhaps also significant that Matthew, more than any of the other Gospels, pictures Christ as the fulfilment the Old Testament and, in fact, as “the New Moses”.

³⁰Swetnam, “Tent” 99.

³¹Swetnam, “Tent” 94.

³²Swetnam demonstrates that there is ample evidence to show that Hebrews would have adopted the “New testament catechesis” which “attests to the close relationship between the death and resurrection of Christ and the theme of the temple: the early Christians were aware that the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem would not affect their access to God, for they could approach him through the risen body of Christ” (Swetnam, “Tent” 94). A most serious argument against referring to the tent as Christ’s body is that the tent is said to be “not made with hands, which would obviously not be the case with Christ’s body which is ‘in every way just as we are’” (4:15). However, Swetnam cites Mk 14:58 as one other place where Christ

Old Covenant tent, the exterior part of the Mosaic tabernacle, indicated the way into the presence of God in the Most Holy Place. However, the author of Hebrews notes this way to be “closed to the worshipper”—open only to the high priest—and open to all only by the coming of Christ (9:26), who Himself is the New and Living Way. Again the term φέρεσθαι is used to show that Christ “manifests and shows forth the way into the New tent” what is not manifested as long as the Old Covenant is in existence. The perfect tense *πεφανερῶσθαι* indicates, on the one hand, the “fixed”, “permanent-looking” nature of the closure of the Old Covenant, which nothing, it would seem, can open, along with the enduring fact of this for the Old Covenant worshipper. Also, on the other hand, it indicates the permanent fully accomplished once-and-for-all opening of the Covenant by Christ. The enduring quality of Christ’s opening expressed in the perfect tense of the verb *φανερῶ* indicates a continuous state of an open sanctuary “contemporaneous with the author of the epistle.”³³ Therefore, the author to the Hebrews can in the present frequently invite His readers to “draw near” and enter the Most Holy Place already.³⁴ Although in a sense Christ is unseen, and “will be seen” *ὀφθήσεται* only in the future (9:28), He is nevertheless “manifested” in an unseen way in the present.³⁵

Furthermore, it would seem that such a severe separation of “now” and “not yet” as suggested by Williamson does not do justice to the way in which the Hebrews text sees these two together. The enduring city which still “remains to come” *μέλλουσαν ἐπιζητούμεν* (13:14), is also the same “city of the Living God” to which the author of Hebrews tells his readers “have come” *προσεληλύθατε*³⁶ (12:22). The perfect tense of this verb suggests that the author of Hebrews is telling his readers that they have already completely entered the city of God, and are at the moment experiencing its effects and blessings. That this city of God is expressed as a “festive gathering” *πανήγυρις* amid “myriads of angels” further indicates not only that the believers have already experienced in the present the full presence of God in His glory, but have done so in the context of an ongoing established

characterizes His resurrected body as “not made by hands”. Swetnam argues that the phrase “not of His creation”, though not applicable to Christ’s mortal body, is certainly applicable to Christ’s risen body, which is heavenly (cf. I Cor. 15:47) and glorified (cf. Ph. 3:21).

³³Swetnam, “Tent” 100.

³⁴4:16, 7:19, 10:22.

³⁵This paradox is the same as that expressed in *LW* 243 st. 1, “Here, O my Lord, I **see** You face to face; Here I would touch and handle things **unseen**” (emphasis added).

³⁶The perfect tense, of course, suggests this “having come” to be a completed action with enduring results.

well-known cultic ritual within their worship.³⁷ What is more, since the city of Mt Zion in 10:22 is set in contrast with the Old Covenant's Mt Sinai, it is clear that the final eternal reign of God is to be seen in contrast to the Old Covenant, rather than with the present life of the believer.

Swetnam further notes that in v. 8, the author of Hebrews states that the Old Covenant still “has relevance ‘for the present time’”,³⁸ What can such relevance be? Swetnam looks carefully at the peculiar reference in 9:8 which refer to the “matter of food and drink and various ceremonial washings” which are “not able to clear the conscience”. Are these merely a random “loose and deprecatory reference to the purity laws of the Old Testament”,³⁹ examples of the “external regulations” of the old Covenant meant to illustrate the “burdensome” nature of the Old Covenant from which Christ sets us free (9:15)? Noting how such a conclusion does not seem likely from a skilled and polished writer such as the author of Hebrews,⁴⁰ Swetnam argues for a more precise reason for the 9:8 reference. He believes that “foods” and “drinks” and “cleansings” are mentioned because they are viewed as being the OT foreshadowing of Christ's Eucharistic Body and Blood and of baptism.⁴¹ He further notes that these OT ceremonies are in 9:10 described, “until the present” to be ἐπικεείμενα. Taking this term to mean to “lay upon” or “lay athwart”, as a stone is over a grave so that entrance to it is blocked off, he interprets 9:9-10 to say:

This is symbolic, pointing to the present time. According to the symbolism gifts and sacrifices are brought which cannot give the worshipper inward fulfilment, lying athwart (ἐπικεείμενα) only foods and drinks and various cleansings as rites of the flesh until the time of the setting straight (μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως).

In other words, Swetnam states the text to say that the OT rituals were “blocked off” by the Old Law rites of sacrifice connected with the day of Atonement”, and because the OT Day of Atonement was “unable to expiate sin, the various rituals of the OT which flowed from the expiation were powerless to give the worshipper ritual fulfilment, i.e., definite union with God.”⁴² Such powerless cultic ceremonies are therefore not swept away by Christ to find fulfilment in a non-cultic New Covenant. Rather, Christ's atonement unblocks, “sets straight”, and gives power to the food, drink, and

³⁷It is to be noted that in 10:28 the author of Hebrews tells his hearers, that since they have come to Mt Zion, they “are receiving the kingdom”, and that they are now to “worship God acceptably”.

³⁸Swetnam, “Imagery” 155.

³⁹Attridge 243.

⁴⁰Swetnam, “Imagery” 156ff.

⁴¹Swetnam, “Imagery” 158.

⁴²Swetnam, “Imagery” 158.

washings so that they can “clear the conscience”, and these powerful cultic rites manifest themselves as effective in the New Covenant as Baptism and the Eucharist.

Such a view helps to explain one of the “classic conundrums” of the Hebrews text, that to which the “models of heavenly things”, or “Heavenly sanctuary” (ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τούτοις) and “heavenly things” (αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουράνια) refer which the author states need to be cleansed. What could it mean that heavenly things would be in need of cleansing? Drawing upon the careful analysis of this passage by J. W. Roslin,⁴³ which finds the heavenly sanctuary and heavenly things of 9:23 to refer to the same thing, Swetnam argues that just as the Most Holy Place was cleansed in the Day of Atonement ritual so that it could become a worthy place for Yahweh’s special presence, so this same place is purified once and for all by Christ as a worthy place for God’s presence with His people. In other words, Christ Himself “enters” the Old Covenant sacred copies of heavenly things in order to sanctify them with His very own Divine Presence for use in the sacred things of the New Covenant. “The Eucharist—Christ’s Real Presence!—is really the heir of ancient cultic practices involving God’s presence and brought to their divinely-willed fulfilment in Christ.”⁴⁴

How confidently can one conclude that the author of Hebrews did in fact intend such a Eucharistic theme throughout his epistle? Swetnam is the first to say that his hypothesis is not absolutely conclusive; it is “in need of further study”,⁴⁵ and, in fact, still has “serious difficulties”.⁴⁶ Perhaps the most serious difficulty is the fact that in spite of all these apparent allusions to the Eucharist, it seems remarkable that the author of Hebrews would never actually mention it by name if it was, in fact, “a central point of the epistle”.⁴⁷ Bruce finds it to be a decisive argument for a Eucharist-free Hebrews that “our author avoids mentioning the Eucharist when he has every opportunity to do so.”⁴⁸

However, such silence need not pose insurmountable difficulties. Because the Hebrews community, as with the whole early church, would have been strictly under the “discipline of the Secret”, such “secrecy” about the Eucharist within a document read during the more public parts of the Liturgy of the Catechumens should not be thought of as strange.⁴⁹ Also, Swetnam notes that this “indirect method of presentation is probably much

⁴³J. W. Roslin, “ΤΑ ΕΠΟΥΡΑΝΙΑ in Epistola ad Hebraeos (8:5 et 9:23)”, *Roczniki Teologiczno-Kanoniczo-Kanoniczne* 10.2 (1963): 31-44.

⁴⁴Swetnam, “Christology” 94.

⁴⁵Swetnam, “Imagery” 172.

⁴⁶Swetnam, “Imagery” 173.

⁴⁷Swetnam, “Christology” 94.

⁴⁸F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1967) 401.

⁴⁹Swetnam, “Tent” 96.

more indirect for the modern reader than for the original addressees.”⁵⁰ He notes first, that the tent in 9:11 is referred to with the definite article—“the” tent (ἡ σκηνή)—suggesting it to be “something familiar from their experience.”⁵¹ Furthermore, he notes that:

The fact that a modern theological term like ‘Eucharist’ must be imposed on the epistle for the sake of clarity for the modern reader does not mean that the author of Hebrews did not have a reflex ordering of his knowledge (i.e., a theology) about Christ’s cultic body and blood. But this theology was in terms of Old Testament realities rather than in terms of philosophical analysis or of subsequent Christian thought.⁵²

Perhaps here Swetnam suggests an insight into the place of the Eucharist in Hebrews which is even deeper than he intended. The secondary theological enterprise of “philosophical analysis” and “dogmatic Christian thought”, as valuable as they certainly are, will never be enough to draw out from the Hebrews text the deep mysteries of what it may say and mean of the Eucharist and of the vision of the heavenly Jerusalem. This comes when the Hebrews text is proclaimed and heard as primary theology within the context of the joyful gathering together, precisely where the epistle endlessly exhorts one to be. Only then is the mystery of the Eucharist, revealed within the text, yet opaquely hidden, seen there, and “made manifest”—only while it is being “something familiar from their experience”.

Rev. Paul Williams is pastor of Grace Lutheran Church, Kitchener, Ontario.

⁵⁰Swetnam, “Tent” 106.

⁵¹Swetnam, “Tent” 106.

⁵²Swetnam, “Tent” 106.

SERMON:
WE ARE FISHERS OF MEN (MT. 4:12-23)

Harold Ristau

When Jesus calls His disciples “fishers of men”, it’s kind of a strange image. After all, fishing is about tricking fish, catching them, and then eating them. To the fish, the fisherman is an enemy. Yet I remember once watching some forest rangers netting fish out of a dirty river headed towards a polluted lake—not to eat them, but to transfer them to a clean lake. In that case, the fishermen were friends: they saved these fish from certain death. **This** is more like the kind of fisherman that Jesus promised to make His disciples—not harming, but helping people by fishing them out of the waters that kill, and transferring them to the waters that give life.

Jesus promised to make His disciples “fishers of men”, there to catch, to save people from death and the darkness in which they sat by “hooking” them with the Gospel, the light of Christ. But Jesus was not just talking to His first disciples. **He is also talking to us.** We, too, are His disciples. Therefore, we also are fishers of men. People are dying spiritually, they are headed down the river leading to Hell, and Jesus uses us as fishers to transfer them to the river leading to heaven. Much of discipleship is evangelism: fishing for people; leading them to God. God calls us in much the same way that He called these first disciples.

“But surely I can’t be compared with these great men of faith. God chose special men for His task. I don’t measure up.”

But when we look at the text, we see that God didn’t choose special people, but ordinary people to be His disciples. The disciples were normal simple men. They were merely fishermen. God made “unimportant” fishermen into “important” fishers of men. What could be more important than saving people’s lives? Jesus says, “Repent, the kingdom of God is at hand”, or “turn towards Me; swim into My net so that you can be scooped out of that polluted water and be saved.” This is the reason our holy and glorious God came to earth in the form of the Man Jesus, and these simple fishermen got to be part of it. The first disciples didn’t have a lot of education, nor were they morally cleaner than others. They were just simple, down to earth, paycheck-to-paycheck kind of people. Our mighty and great God used lowly, “not-so-great” ordinary people to build His holy, extra-ordinary kingdom.

And like the disciples, we are simple people, too. We live ordinary lives, have ordinary jobs, and from a worldly perspective, we are really not that important. If one of us passed away, the world would continue on as if

nothing happened. We come from all walks of life, have different levels of education and skills. Some have more money than others, or success. Yet I don't think that there are any "Einsteins" amongst us. I doubt that any of us will be remembered in history books one day. We're just simple people trying to make it through a complex world—**yet that's who God calls**. None of us have a special knack for doing God's work, but He chooses us anyway. That's like if Bill Gates of Microsoft asked those of us who know nothing about computers to work in his programming department. Like the disciples, He calls inexperienced, average people to work with Him. And though we may look little to the world, in God's eyes we are big, continuing to do the same important work to which He called His first disciples.

Yet sometimes it's hard to believe that we are equals to these great saints who built up the Church in so many incredible ways. How do we know that we are fishers just like them, used in just as great ways? **Because God promises**. He promises that he who follows Him **will be made** a fisher of men. Jesus called the disciples from their boats and they **immediately** got up and followed, leaving their jobs, families, and possessions behind. It's almost as if the power of Jesus' voice, His authoritative presence, was so strong that they didn't have any choice but to act in the way that they did. Jesus presence is like a net that no fish can escape; the disciples couldn't resist His offer. **God** made them followers, and **God** would make them fishers.

Our following began immediately on the day of our Baptism. That's when God said, "Follow Me." I was a baby; I didn't have a choice in the matter. Yet thank God. It's a choice I'm glad that He made for me. In Baptism we were drawn to Him. We were hauled out of the polluted water and given a new river in which to swim. **God** draws us to Him, **God** moves us to repent, and then **God** promises to continue His presence in our lives by making us His disciples, fishers of men, dedicating our daily lives to this great task of bringing good news to a hurting people. Following Jesus means **God** makes us fishers of men, sharers of the Faith.

"But if we are fishers, just like those first disciples, how come I never see results like them? We read in the Bible about all the great things that they did. They caught nets full; I catch nothing. I'm no good at being a disciple. I'm no good at evangelism. Sharing my faith scares me to death and when I have tried, it doesn't seem to work. I don't **feel** like much of a disciple. It doesn't seem like I'm **equipped** to be a good fisher."

Yet were the disciples equipped to be disciples? We already heard that they were ordinary men with no special insight into that which God was calling them. They had the equipment for catching **fish**, but not **people**! ... **God equipped them**. Jesus equipped them for their high calling. He gave them the tools, the equipment, to carry out the work.

Jesus equips us for His fishing. The Holy Spirit who comes into us in our Baptism gives us the equipment, handed on to us by our pastors through the proper teaching of the Word. And God's equipment works! The equipment Jesus gives us is made in heaven, it's fool-proof, top-of-the-line, miracle-working equipment. He gives us the strength, wisdom, and skill to carry out His fishing. He continues to care for our equipment when we read the Word, come to Church, and receive Holy Communion.

The key piece of "equipment" given to us is the bait: the Gospel of Christ and Him crucified. It is the tastiest bit of food; there is nothing else like it. It is so different from that which the world has to offer that a hungry fish cannot resist. When people grasp what Christ is all about, they can't resist but to bite: to follow Him. God equips us with this Gospel which is at work in our lives, drawing people to Him.

Over Christmas during my vicarage, my wife and I went ice fishing with some friends. We drove out onto the lake, drilled some holes, set up a hut, put some bait on the line, and almost immediately after dropping the line, I caught a fish! I had barely sat down. It surprised me how easy it was to catch a fish when you have the right equipment (mainly the right bait). Professional fishing is a different story, or sport fishing does take a lot of skill. But the process of catching any old fish is not that difficult. There's not much that you can really do once the line goes down. We can't control what's going on down there. Yet God can, and He brings the fish. It's Him and His equipment, not us, that succeed.

His equipment works well. Even the little things we say and do are His fishing equipment at work. "I'll pray for you": a fishing line is dropped. "Call me if you need anything": another line is dropped. "I forgive you; God forgives you": another line. "Welcome to Church this morning": fishing lines dropped all around the boat!

Now I realize that my ice fishing experience was exceptional; catching a fish doesn't usually happen **that** fast. Fishing takes a lot of patience, wisdom, even courage. And even though God equips us with these things too, the lack of seeing results discourages. It makes us want to give up. Trying to lead a loved one to the Lord, or back to the Lord (whether that be a sibling, parent, child or friend), is often frustrating and heart-breaking.

Our experience is often like a bunch of nibbles from that same fish, but no bite. Year after year, no bite. However, even though the bite may not come on your pole, there are other poles out there, other Christians that God is using to reach out to that same loved one throughout his or her life. And then one day, somewhere, there is that bite!

You see, net fishing was the kind of fishing that the disciples did, which works best when you have a couple of boats: fishermen working together. God promises that **all** Christians are at work using the same divine bait for

the same divine task: pointing people to the net of salvation who is Christ our Lord.

Fishing can often be a lot of work. There comes a time when there is not much you can do but merely wait. Evangelism is a lot of work and when you don't see many results, it can be draining. But the results **are** there. Fish **are** being caught. And **you** are part of it! God has made you His disciple and promises that He is using you as a fisher of men, of both strangers and loved ones alike. Even though you may not always **see** it, your work is never in vain. Although you may not always **feel** like much of a fisher, God **is** using you to bring dying fish into living water, dying people to the living Saviour, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Candidate Harold Ristau is Graduate Assistant at Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary during the academic year 2000-2001.

GUIDELINES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

Lutheran *Theological Review*, the official journal of Lutheran Church–Canada’s two seminaries (Edmonton and St. Catharines), “exists for the discussion of theological issues within the frame of reference of Confessional Lutheranism”. We invite contributors to submit carefully researched theological essays or sermons which will promote such discussion and strengthen our confession of the truth of the Gospel. Items may be submitted in either of Canada’s two official languages: English or French. The editors will determine what materials are suitable for publication.

If submitting by post, please send both printed copy and computer disk (see below). If the *LTR* editors must pay to have a submission entered onto computer, the added cost might prohibit its publication. Items may be mailed to:

Lutheran Theological Review
Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary
470 Glenridge Ave
St. Catharines, ON L2T 4C3
Canada

Alternatively, enquiries and proposals may be sent via e-mail to the editors at one of the following:

ekettner@connect.ab.ca
twinger@spartan.ac.brocku.ca

E-mailed files must be followed up by paper copy. Submissions, whether accepted or not, will not be returned. The editors will, however, inform the contributor of their decision. Furthermore, the editors will be greatly appreciative if contributors observe the following guidelines.

LANGUAGE (*the following comments apply to English language submissions*)

Spelling & Punctuation: *LTR* uses as its primary authority *The Canadian Oxford Dictionary* (1998). This excellent resource relies not only on the meticulously researched data of the British *OED*, but is also based on extensive research of Canadian usage. Recently adopted by the Canadian Press, it is widely becoming the standard. Writers should consult its “Style Guide”, Appendix 1, pp. 1698-1703. In general, punctuation should be used not merely for the sake of formal rules but to aid comprehension and avoid ambiguity. In the use of quotation marks, as recommended by the *COD* and Fowler’s *Modern English Usage*, *LTR* observes the so-called “logical” system: if the punctuation mark belongs

to the source, it should be included within the quotations marks; if the punctuation belongs to the essay, it should be outside the marks. The editors of *LTR* will not change the wording of submitted essays without the author's approval; they will, however, modify the spelling and punctuation to conform to this standard.

Abbreviations: Standard abbreviations of the Bible may be used without explanation. We ask only that you be consistent and avoid ambiguity (e.g. "Ezek." and "Ezra", not "Ez."). Roman numerals are preferred for sequential biblical books (e.g. "I Cor."; "II Cor.") and article numbers of the Lutheran Confessions (e.g. AC XX:2; Ap IV:3). Standard abbreviations for the Lutheran Confessions, Luther's works, some Lutheran hymnals, and some exegetical resources are now printed at the front of *LTR*. Authors may use these abbreviations without explanation.

FORMAT

Subheadings: Writers should not overcomplicate their documents with elaborate structure. The organization should be apparent through good writing. However, one or two levels of sub-headings are ordinarily permitted to organize the essay into sections.

Emphasis: Words or phrases to be emphasized should be placed in **bold** type. *Italics* are reserved for foreign words and book titles.

Foreign languages: Foreign words which occur within a vernacular sentence should be *italicized*. Whole sentences or paragraphs should not be italicized. It is always helpful to offer a vernacular translation of foreign words and quotations.

Greek/Hebrew: *LTR* includes these biblical languages in their proper fonts, with accents and vowels points. Transliteration is undesirable. *LTR* uses "Bwgrkl" for Greek and "Bwhebb" for Hebrew—TrueType fonts provided with "BibleWorks for Windows". Please use these fonts, if possible. Due to copyright restrictions, however, *LTR* cannot provide them to contributors. If the paper copy includes clear Greek or Hebrew words (either hand-written or computer printed), the editors will convert them into the proper fonts.

Computer format: *LTR* is edited and printed in Microsoft Word, version 9.0 (Word 2000). Therefore, we prefer submissions in this or any earlier Word format. Second best is WordPerfect format (6.1 or earlier), which converts well. If any other word processor is used, submit two versions: the original format, and one converted to "text only" (preferably: "Windows text"; 2nd choice: "MS-DOS text"). Macintosh users should have their files saved onto an IBM formatted disk. Alternatively, the file can be e-mailed as an attachment. Word for Mac (and WordPerfect for Mac) files convert well. Other Mac formats should be converted to text

only. In every case, indicate what format the files are in, and include a clear paper copy by which we may clean up electronic problems.

NOTES & REFERENCES

LTR uses footnotes, not endnotes. Please submit your computer file with the footnotes already prepared. Give full bibliographical details the first time a work is referenced. Subsequent references may be made by author and page number only. Do not use the Latin shorthand “ibid.” or “idem”. First references to major (especially multi-author) works should give complete details, but may then specify an abbreviation to be used in subsequent references. (Note also the Standard Abbreviations table at the front of *LTR*, as mentioned above.) A standard style book such as the *Modern Language Association’s* or Kate Turabian’s *A Manual for Writers* will help solve citation problems. However, please conform your footnotes to the general style illustrated in the following examples.

SAMPLE NOTES

¹Holsten Fagerberg, *Bekenntnis, Kirche, und Amt in der deutschen konfessionellen Theologie des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1952) 101. All original German works will be cited in the present author’s own translation, with annotations where necessary. Any emphasis given is original.

²Fagerberg 101.

³Wilhelm Löhe, *Gesammelte Werke* [hereafter abbreviated as *GW*], ed. Klaus Ganzert, vol. 5, *Die Kirche im Ringen um Wesen und Gestalt* (Neuendettelsau: Freimund-Verlag, 1954) 5.1:253-330.

⁴Löhe, *Three Books About the Church*, trans. James Schaaf (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969) 33-39.

⁵Walter H. Conser, “A Conservative Critique of Church and State: the Case of the Tractarians and Neo-Lutherans”, *Journal of Church and State* 25.1 (Spring 1983): 323-41.

⁶Hermann Sasse, “Ministry and Congregation: Letters to Lutheran Pastors, No. 8, July 1949”, in *We Confess the Church*, trans. Norman Nagel (St. Louis: Concordia, 1986) 70.

⁷Martin Luther, *Sermon on the Creed* (6 March 1521), WA 11:53²²⁻²³.

⁸Luther, *On the Sneaks and Clandestine Preachers* (1532), WA 30^{III}:518-27=AE 40:383-94.

⁹AC V:2; cf. Ap XIV:3.

¹⁰Sasse, “Ministry and Congregation” 72.

¹¹FC SD VII:126.