TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION TO THE LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
by Roger J. Humann, Dean ............................................................... i

WHAT IT MEANS TO CONFESS: A LUTHERAN PERSPECTIVE
by Ulrich Asendorf ............................................................................ 1

WHY IT WAS NECESSARY FOR THE PHARISEES TO OPPOSE
JESUS by John R. Wilch .................................................................... 20

LUTHERAN WORSHIP: AN ANALYTICAL REVIEW—ARTICLE ON
THE NEW HYMNAL by Lowell C. Green ............................................ 37

LUTHER AND THE JEWS: AN EXCHANGE OF LETTERS BETWEEN
ROLAND H. BAINTON AND PRIME MINISTER MENACHEM
BEGIN .................................................................................................. 49

BOOK REVIEW:
HOW MELANCHTHON HELPED LUTHER DISCOVER THE
GOSPEL by Lowell C. Green
Reviewed by Robert Kolb, Concordia College,
St. Paul, Minnesota ......................................................................... 55
LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW is published semi-annually by Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary, St. Catharines, Ontario. The periodical exists for the discussion of theological issues within the frame of reference of Confessional Lutheranism, but views represented are not necessarily those of the seminary faculty.

Editor: Lowell C. Green
Student Assistant: Richard Thrift
Make-up: Lorraine Bogusat

Changes of address, paid subscriptions and other business matters should be sent to CONCORDIA LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, 400 Glenridge Avenue, St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada L2T 3L2

Annual Subscription Rate: $5.00
INTRODUCTION TO THE LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Now in its seventh year, Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary is a relative newcomer to the Canadian theological scene. Lutheran Theological Review is the new journal to be published twice yearly by Concordia's faculty.

But let us make it clear at the outset, this journal has not come into being simply as an outlet for the literary ambitions of a few theological professors. Those opportunities are already there. And it is much easier to submit materials to someone else's journal than to prepare, edit, finance, print, and circulate one's own. Rather, the LTR is one means by which the seminary is attempting to meet what it believes is its responsibility both to the church which maintains and supports it and on behalf of that church.

The LTR reflects the seminary's responsibility to the church to be more than a 'preacher factory,' but to be a genuine theological resource for the church's life and ministry. To this end we intend to provide the LTR gratis to all pastors of Lutheran Church-Canada. By sharing with our brethren insights and studies from the broad range of theological disciplines, perhaps we may contribute to their continuing education and growth in ministry. We welcome the response of these pastors (and others) and solicit suggestions as to ways in which we may prove more helpful.

Beyond this parochial interest, the seminary has, as the church's school, a responsibility on behalf of the church. The Lutheran Church-Canada shares a commitment which is unequivocally Biblical and unashamedly Confessional. Unfortunately, caricature often lumps us indiscriminately with assorted biblicists and fundamentalists (which we are not!) and in the ecumenical arena our confessional stance tends to cast us in the role of 'His Majesty's loyal opposition.' Therefore it is incumbent that in the broader Canadian academic and theological world we articulate that viewpoint which is distinctively and uniquely Lutheran. To this end we commend our journal to a much wider readership in the hope that it will make a positive contribution to theological study and dialogue.

—Roger J. Humann, Dean
WHAT IT MEANS TO CONFESSION: A LUTHERAN PERSPECTIVE

Ulrich Asendorf

I. Secular Confessions

Confession means more than simply to reflect on theological subjects of a traditional kind. It means as well to realize that we are surrounded by secular confessions of various types. Modern totalitarian regimes urge their subjects to give permanent confessions which come not from the heart but only from the lips. Every pupil in eastern Germany learns this technique perfectly at school: to repeat all the claptrap of political propaganda in the form wanted by his masters. This seems to be the way to survive. This schizoid structure characterizes all the so-called socialistic countries. The Geneva ecumenism, of course, is not willing to put this permanence of lies before the world; instead of faith, the ecumenism of discussion likes to debate even with Satan himself.

There is another type of perverted secular confession in our time. We recall, for example, the Vietnam demonstrations all over the world, and the rebellion of the students in the late sixties from Tokyo to Beverly Hills, and from Paris to Frankfurt. This style of protest formulated new confessions and forced everyone to take notice of a new confessional vocabulary. Other recent examples are the antiatomic demonstrations. Here, secularistic forms of modern religion parade with some modern irrationalism of fear, promoting a new community by means of their own dogmas. Everyone in the democracy of the masses that wants to be heard is inclined to formulate confessions. Our times are filled with perverted religiosity fitted with such forms. Here is the new way of salvation. We face a time in which secular confessions are running all over the world. Even the secular world makes it necessary for us to formulate what it means to confess today.

This paper was presented at the Concordia Academy, Dubuque, Iowa, Aug. 5, 1980.
II. Excluded Factors

Our theme is so broad that it must be restricted. I shall only sum up several of these aspects. In the Old Testament we could begin with the "small historical creed" (Gerhard von Rad), Deut. 26. Investigation reveals in the New Testament several confessional formulas such as I Cor. 15:3-5 and Rom. 4:25. Later came the discussion of *homologein* with all its derivatives.

Turning to church history, different problems and forms appear. We might first reflect on the doxological function of the classical confessions of the early church, especially the creed of *Nicaea*, where baptism and confession are connected. The Nicene and Apostles creeds were confessions originally combined and connected with the administration of Holy Baptism. The renunciations belong to baptism in the same way and sense as to confession. We know from the texts of the tripartite formulas that the person being baptized is first asked to give confession to the Father, whereon the first immersion follows, and so on.

Another aspect is the fight against the different types of heterodoxy. Here, confession takes the form of the *regula fidei*. Of practical meaning for the inner life of the early church are confessions for the instruction of the catechumens. We mention these without enumeration or comment.

If we turn to systematic questions, we have to deal with confession as an answer on the works of God Himself. This answer includes both confession of sins and praise to God. We shall not concern ourselves further with these aspects but shall now turn to the Lutheran perspective of confession.

III. The Eschatological Aspect of Confession According to Martin Luther

Whatever the hour of Luther's reformational breakthrough may mean, the eschatological dimension is of special concern to us. One year before his death,
Luther looked back as he was writing the Preface to the first volume of his collected Latin works.\textsuperscript{1} Of course, we cannot discuss here all the historical questions around this text but this much is quite clear: Luther remembered his struggle with the words, "the righteousness of God." Those words at first terrified him but later became a sweet consolation. He pondered day and night until he came to the evangelical sense of the iustitia passiva rather than justification by works. Luther recalled: "Here it was as though I had been born again, as though the gates of paradise had opened and I stepped in."\textsuperscript{2} There are many parallels dealing with the terrores conscientiae which brought him to the outer edges of existence, unable to bear the burden any longer. The grace of Christ, coming from his cross and accepted by faith, marked the new life of the monk Martin Luther. This, indeed, is the eschatological aspect of his confession: Doomsday itself had come into time. There was no distance between the eternal judge and the man, Luther. Without trumpets, the last judgment had reached him. The question was eternal life or eternal damnation. All that late-medieval piety had erected to save men from the final wrath of God was swept away. God himself, in his wrath and in his grace, had revealed himself to Luther. Justification by faith, the confession of sins, and the acceptance of grace are all of eschatological quality. That man standing before the eternal God is simul iustus et peccator (simultaneously a righteous one and a sinner) was the beginning of the Reformation, and this remains the everlasting theme of the Lutheran faith until the Lord returns. The doors of paradise had opened before his feet, and being accepted by the grace of God was the motor of the Reformation. Therefore, confession has an eschatological quality. The strength and striking power of Lutheran preaching is not a preoccupation with facts about this world but the world to come. From this

\textsuperscript{1}Preface\ to the complete edition of Luther's Latin writings, WA 54:185-86 = AE 34:327-28.

\textsuperscript{2}Explanation of the Disputation Concerning the Value of Indulgences, WA 1:557-58 = AE 31:83-84.
absolute point of view, all contingencies of this life and world get their measure and meaning. The force of eternity itself reached this world in the days of the Reformation.

But it is essential to see the dimensions of what had happened. Luther was not the man of Gewissensreligion (religion of conscience), as Karl Holl classified him. Luther had no ambition to be the forerunner of Immanuel Kant. He who stands before the eternal God is not interested in Neo-Protestant minimalism. Luther did not want to be regarded as a person on his own, as the Protestant individualist par excellence. There is, however, a grain of truth in that interpretation. Standing before God, coram Deo, everyone has to stand for himself, and there is no substitute, as Luther stated in the beginning of his Invocavit sermons. But the eschatological quality of confession is an ecclesiastical one as well. As I attempted to show in my book, Eschatologie bei Luther, it is the evening of the world, the last hour when God himself brings his word to men. His word cannot be hindered. Not man but God determines this. Because God appears to the church in his Word, Satan rises and apostasy reaches its climax. Therefore, the true faith has to be confessed in the world as before God Himself. Only he who confesses Christ as Lord before men will the Son of Man confess before his heavenly Father (Mt. 10:32-33). What happened to Luther has little to do with his person, which was secondary; the Reformation was not the question of Luther alone, but the question of the whole Church.

When the Word came once more to life in the Church, the pope and all factions rose to hinder the Word. But the Lord himself would destroy the Antichrist with the "breath of his mouth" (II Thess. 2:8). In the last hour of the world, Satan will stir the peasants to rise in rebellion. Streams of blood will be shed. This will come to pass not because of any political errors but because the Last Times have come, when all this shall happen according to the Scriptures. But Christ's elected ones will raise their heads because redemption is near. That is what it

---
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means to confess.4

There is room for martyrs in this chapter.5 They signal the last days. When the first martyrs were burnt at Brussels on July 7, 1523, Luther wrote the first of his hymns, Eyn newes lyd wyr heben on. It was especially the martyrdom of Leonhard Kaser that made Martin Luther long for the same honor. These confessors shed their blood to testify to the coming of Christ. This eschatological vision, both of the single Christian in his justification by faith and the church, always causes reformation. Without eschatology there is no real understanding of reformation.

This explains Luther's enormous success in historical respect. The incredible power of his life and the spiritual strength to face even the last challenge came from his eschatological understanding of justification. It was this wide horizon in which the confession at Worms must be regarded. There is no other context in which the public act of confession might take place. It takes place coram Deo as in the last days of the world. It is in this respect that Christians must confess their faith before men. What began with Luther at the Reichstag of Worms leads to the protestation of Speyer in 1529, and finally to the Confession of Augsburg in 1530.

But we must mention still other points. We cannot confine ourselves to the affairs of the Reformation. Besides the eschatological meaning of confession, we must also examine certain aspects of today such as the autonomy of man. Immanuel Kant brought this out in his distinction between heteronomy and autonomy in ethics.6 Only autonomy in ethics is morally relevant according to Kant. This is the absolute opposite of Luther's iustitia passiva. Modern ethics accepts enthusiastically what Luther rejected with all the energy of his faith and character. The struggle with Erasmus sharpened this to extreme hardness. It has

---

4Ulrich Asendorf, Eschatologie bei Luther (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), 207-08.
5Ibid., pp. 210-12.
6Immanuel Kant, Kritik der praktischen Vernunft (Riga: Johann Friedrich Hartknoch, 1787), pp. 58-59.
been said that Luther did Erasmus an injustice in more than a single question. But he was not fighting over details but over final principals. Hans Joachim Iwand hit the nail on the head with his remark that Luther felt that Erasmus had the Antichrist of Nietzsche in his loins. Erasmus, with his semi-Pelagianism, was the forerunner of modern ethics. This was not his intention, but *de facto* it was his historical mission. Therefore, it is significant to Neo-Protestantism that Albrecht Ritschl despised *De servo arbitrio*. To him it seemed to be remnant of the Middle Ages, with which the heir of Kant wanted nothing to do.

As for us, we have reached the end of the beginning with Erasmus. What we have to face now is what Nietzsche signaled in his nihilism. God is dead. That meant to him, as he said in his posthumous papers, that the moral god has died—something that the modern God-is-dead theologians never really noticed. Therefore, the Roman Catholic scholar Romano Guardini was right when he published in 1950 a book under the title, *Das Ende der Neuzeit* (The End of the Modern Age). He wrote that all the great ideals of our modern times have lost their value, personality, nature, culture, and the list can be made longer and longer. We are faced with the question of how things should go on.

We have seen the collapse of existentialism and Marxism. The question is now, more than ever: What is man? How can human responsibility be re-established? The answer of the Lutherans is: by justification through faith alone. Both the confession of our sins and the praise of the unmerited grace of Christ are built up to a new sort of human action. It is not society that has to be changed but it is man that has to change. This is the only correct sequence. It is an error to regard these as theological questions only, but the question is, in

---
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Hamlet’s sense, “to be or not to be.” Justification for the sake of Christ through faith (justificatio propter Christum per fidem) is the answer. This is the center, the focus of the Christian faith, and this concentration on the one thing needful is the striking evidence of the Lutheran faith, past and present.

IV. The Augsburg Confession as the Beginning of a Confessional Church

It was directly against the declared will of the subscribers to establish a new church, and this was the explicit position of Luther himself. He saw the Reformation as an eschatological phenomenon that had primarily nothing to do with him because it was God himself who reformed his church at the end of the world.

What really happened when the Augsburg Confession was delivered and when the foundation of the Lutheran Church was laid? There was first the need to justify their own position, to take over the responsibility for what had happened, and to declare under what sort of principals this had been done. Finally, the subscribers announced this statement as their own in responsibility before the emperor and the German Reich. The invitation of the emperor indicated his irenic desire to hear everyone’s position in kindness and friendship, because, according to the quotation in the preface by the Saxon chancellor, Gregor Brück, “We are all enlisted under one Christ” (Preface §3). This was said according to the old distinction of the church militant and the church triumphant. Although the emperor was the declared enemy of the Lutherans, from the very beginning his invitation was kindly and moderate, although he had already reached the climax of power and there was no longer any necessity for compromises.

According to the opening of the later Book of Concord regarding the three ancient creeds, the first articles of the Augsburg Confession deal with the classical confessions, especially with the creed of Nicaea. Not only are these old confessions accepted, but even the rejection of the ancient heretics is explicitly repeated. This was
no mere tactical maneuver, but it was in full concordance with Luther's ecclesiology to stand by the old church against the new church of the pope, as he especially said in Von den Konzilien und Kirchen (1539) and Wider Hans Worst (1541). Therefore, the often heard concept of constantly reforming the church (ecclesia semper reformanda) is a slogan more fitting for the left wing of the Reformation than the Lutheran. There is a difference between rebellion and reformation. And re-formation is not reformation, as the makers of the Leuenberg Concord want us to believe today.

Three points were combined to make the typical form of the Confessio Augustana.—a) The remembrance of Nicaea kept the doxological function of the old confessions in mind. Nicaea showed as well the necessity to watch over the pure doctrine, which was always in danger of being perverted by all sorts of heretics. It is not a new situation Lutherans had to face, but had been the same since the early church. b) As the early church rejected Arius and the Donatists, for example, now the Anabaptists had to be rejected. Of course the equilibrium could not be restored simply by the correction of a few abuses. Hence the weights were not equally distributed in comparison with Luther, who spoke about the papal antichrist and faced the eschatological necessity of leaving Babylon to save his own soul. But Luther still approved of the Melanchthonian form, moderate when compared to his own. c) The text is a checklist of those princes and towns who described themselves in the way religion was dealt with. Therefore the Confession is no prospectus or draft of a church to come but a report of things that had already happened and were now brought before the emperor and Reich to get their legal status. The details are not explained but only the main points, referring to a future council to settle the case of religion.

9Asendorf, p. 213.
11Against Hansworst, WA 51:499 = AE 41:206.
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Progress was impeded by the fact that Melanchthon had to revoke his original conclusion to Part One of the confession because it sounded too harmless. The Lutherans presented the report of what their preachers and teachers were actually doing in the different territories. No one intended to establish a new church.

Nevertheless, the pathway to the confessional churches had been marked out. The way led to the Book of Concord and to the various other Protestant denominations; on the side of the Roman Catholic Church, it led the way to the Council of Trent. Until the Peace of Westphalia (1648) ended the Thirty Years War, the different denominations regarded themselves as religious parties of the one church. This is why the Calvinists only then, for the first time, earned tolerance.

This is highly relevant in our own time because we are far more aware of the uniting than of the separating factors. If the Roman Catholic Church receives the Confession of Augsburg, it will come to our minds more than before what the Preface means in our actual situation. Therefore, the preceding commentary should be appreciated, because our aim is not to harmonize but first to understand the distinct positions. Therefore, the proceedings were quite different from the recent meetings at Leuenberg, because there was no pretence at Augsburg regarding church fellowship ahead. At Leuenberg the texts were re-interpreted as though the result was already known and had only to be certified publicly. The new edition of the Confutatio is a typical example of the modern editorial techniques which help

---

12Cf. the Confessio Augustana in the first Wittenberg edition of 1531.
14H. Meyer and H. Schütte, eds., Confessio Augustana: Bekenntnis des einen Glaubens (Frankfurt am Main and Paderborn, 1980).
to sharpen the decision concerning the single articles. We will not go into the details here.

The common task both ecumenical sides have to face lies in the examination of confessions formulated since the *Confessio Augustana*. This is a new situation among Christianity that cannot be compared with earlier times. These confessions after the *Augustana*, unlike the old confessions, were not based on the liturgical and doxological function in both the service and baptism. They were not catechisms in the old sense, nor documents rejecting heretics, but a new type of ecclesiastical document that had to be proved from church to church. In this way the situation is not the same one as in the nineteenth century when Möhler in Tübingen started the first project of comparative symbolics (*Konfessionskunde*), comparing the different churches by their explicit confessions. This was the first step toward the ecumenical approach of our century. Now the churches are meeting in dialogue, and this dialogue is only of substance if each has a clear position. For the Lutheran Church and its theology this is far different from the various Calvinistic confessions which have only regional validity and force. Therefore, the Lutheran claim to confess the one catholic church has to be proved under the conditions of our times. If Wilhelm Löhe called the Lutheran Church the middle of the confessions,\(^\text{16}\) we must give even more witness for the evidence supporting this assertion. It is not only our task to keep in mind the enormous meaning of Luther's theology in a dialogue with the Roman Catholic Luther scholars and their high standard, but even more to bear the ecclesiastical responsibility for all that happened since the delivery of the Augsburg Confession.

The main point is that the different confessional churches have had the tendency to set their positions as absolute. The Lutheran perspective, as documented in the Augsburg Confession, establishes the Scriptures as the basis for the unity of the one church in Christ. Therefore, the differences have to be com-

---

pared. The unity has to be restored. The state of different churches is a transient one, whenever the eschatological character of confession is really true. Therefore, confession in a Lutheran perspective means to do penance, and that penance is a real form of confession, not primarily before man, but before God and his coming final judgment. That means the different confessions are not settled forever but lead to penance and spiritual unrest. This spiritual unrest is in sharp contrast to all the many kinds of enthusiasm we see all around. The unity of the church cannot be made by men. It is the eschatological movement, coming from God himself and Christ as Lord. The Holy Spirit has nothing to do with unionism. Even in the miserable state of contemporary ecumenism with its many false views of confession and church union, the Lutherans, as a confessional church, must set clear marks for the future. We shall now deal with this subject.

V. The Special Function of the Lutheran Confessions

There are many forms of confession in the Augustana and in the Book Concord as a whole. Their purpose is to explain how Luther, based on the Scriptures, understood the Christian faith, and what it means here and now. Actual confessions and Corpus doctrinae as they are represented in the Book of Concord are in correspondence with one another. This is not understood only historically but also systematically. The history of unionism in Germany shows very clearly that the Augsburg Confession is often misused as a document of unionism. Even Calvin belonged to the subscribers of the Variata. Therefore it is necessary to regard the Formula Concordiae as a commentary on the Confession of Augsburg. The unity of the Lutheran confessions cannot be yielded. The Confession cannot be separated from the Smalcald Articles or from the Catechisms.

The Book of Concord is the norma normata that has to be subscribed by all ministers before their ordination. What this means received new actuality in the Kirchenkampf of the 1930s and 1940s and more recently in all the trouble with the modern fanatics and heretics. Not only the minister but the entire congregation as
well must participate. If Luther's Small Catechism is learned by the confirmands, everyone in our parishes will know what the main lines of our faith are.

Therefore a confession has to say yes or no, and not something in the middle. We cannot eliminate the condemnations of false doctrine (damnant secus docentes). This means that the confusion of the Leuenberg Concord is intolerable and not in concordance with the Lutheran Confessions. It is purely misleading to say that the former teachings are not fit for the modern partner. During the past centuries what we call Protestantism went off into many directions, so that it is very difficult to say what Protestantism may stand for. Deep marks came over even our Lutheran theology, as seen, for example, in the philosophy of Kant or the religious philosophy of Schleiermacher. The sharp contrasts still remain between the Calvinistic spiritual presence in the Lord's Supper and the Lutheran confession of the Real Presence. Despite Calvin's own political thinking that his position is built on Luther's Two Kingdoms, the predominant confusion between Law and Gospel remains in Calvinism, especially in the later form, which is the origin of most of the theocratic gamble of modern ecumenism. To say that the old condemnations are obsolete for the modern partners is misleading, and the same is true with reference to enthusiasm. Similarly, it is not very helpful to bring up such lofty constructions as a proleptic consensus of doctrine, truth in process, or whatever the modern style of formulation may say. Our fathers were not such fools that they have to be corrected by their keen-witted successors. On the contrary, it is a very essential task for ecumenical theology to clarify the differences in doctrine and practice.

There was an example in our own Church of Hannover after the war. Many refugees from eastern Germany had belonged formally to the unionistic church of old Prussia. Some of them came near the Dutch borders in Calvinistic areas, and

they were told that it made no difference because they had come from a united church. But it did not take very long before they came to our bishop and demanded urgently the establishing of Lutheran churches, because the church into which they had been driven was not their church according to Luther’s *Small Catechism*. No cross on the altar, no candles, no emergency Baptism for the newborn children in those miserable times, no Holy Communion for sick and dying persons—this was not their church. These people, previously hardly aware that they were Lutherans, very quickly learned what the Lutheran faith and the Lutheran confessions mean. We should be deaf to all unqualified ecumenical propaganda and its formulations.\(^\text{18}\)

Another essential theological point is the hermeneutic circle between Scripture and confession. The Lutheran confessions depend on the Scriptures and not on a sort of modern kerygma. Therefore doctrine and preaching are not synonyms as is often the case in modern theology. The preached Word is absolutized at the expense of the written Word. The unity of the Scriptures is lost. The Old Testament is put aside both by Schleiermacher and Bultmann. The gap is accidentally filled with monstrous man-made words that can hardly be translated into Latin and into English such as *Wortgeschehen* (word-occurrence) and *Sprachereignis* (speech-experience). One wonders whether the authors really know what they are trying to say. What they intend is to get away from what they call static sentences and come to dynamic forms of expression. This is partly the consequence of theology of the moment (Kierkegaard) and loses all sense of historical continuity. They forget that the early forms of Christian confession depend on a double “according to the Scriptures” in 1 Cor. 15:3-5. They forget that the books of the New Testament were not written by enthusiasts who lacked a sense of history but by men well aware of God’s

revelation in history in the Old Testament as well as in the New Testament, when Christ was crucified under Pontius Pilate.

Lutherans depend and rely on the Scriptures (the *verbum externum*) instead of the "inner word" (*verbum internum*) of the enthusiasts. The Existentialists in some sense are the heirs of these enthusiasts, and they have had some success in modern times. French structuralism as represented by Paul Ricoeur, for example, showed that all understanding depends essentially on written traditions. Scriptures are the basis and not the actual word of the moment. In a similar way the great Swedish bishop, Anders Nygren, showed in his work on the philosophy of religions, under the title *Meaning and Method* (1972), that all understanding depends on the context, the written traditions. Here is one of the essential roots of the severe embarrassment of modern theology: it cannot say what the authority of the Scriptures means. Luther's fight against Erasmus has a very modern parallel in the struggle against demythologizing, because the main thesis of Erasmus, as for Bultmann, is that the Scriptures are not clear in themselves. But the position of Luther is that Scripture is its own interpreter because if you take Christ from the Scriptures, there is nothing left. The modern version claims that the Scriptures are obscure until they have been cleared up by demythologizing.

It appears that the German theologian, Gerhard Gloege, was right in saying that the two extreme positions, a confessional absolutism and an unionistic actualism, must both be avoided. We must face the question as to whether we really follow the truth of the Gospel, or are we busy taking our own position as an absolute one? Dogmatically we have learned that the Scriptures are the norm according to which our preaching and teaching has to be judged, but practically it is our permanent task to look for the right way under the special circumstances of the situation.

---

19 *The Bondage of the Will*, WA 18:606-10 = AE 33:15-16
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There is yet another point: We are convinced that nothing can be compared with the clarity and distinction of our Lutheran confessions. But truth can make us lazy. A new exertion is necessary for Lutherans both spiritually and intellectually. On the German scene, three theological movements of this century have come to an end: the dialectic theology in the form of Karl Barth as well as Rudolf Bultmann, and the Luther renaissance. There is no future for a Barthian Neorthodoxy or for a Bultmannian theological existentialism. So far as the Luther renaissance is concerned, it was evident for all participants of the Luther Congress in Lund, Sweden (1977) that Luther-research has come to an impasse. The reasons are methodological, because Luther has been treated primarily under two aspects, the development of the Young Luther, and "Luther from the existentialist point of view." This was because Kierkegaard and Luther were both rediscovered together in the days of Karl Holl and Emanuel Hirsch. As Heinrich Bornkamm wrote in his recent biography of the middle years of Luther, the middle and the late Luther (1532-46) have not yet been scientifically discovered. A new effort has to be made. This is the situation of "paradigm-changing" as Thomas K. Kuhn says. Dialectic theology comes to a similar end. The methodological problems have been neglected. So far as I can see, specific Kantian presuppositions direct the Barthian positivism of revelation as well as the existentialistic concepts since Kierkegaard. Theology needs a new start with quite different modes of operation. One might say it in one sentence: Hegel as a Lutheran thinker has not yet been discovered. He has shown us the way to combine philosophy and theology under a new form of logic.

---


Primarily Lutheran impulses led him to another logic than the old Aristotelianism, but this cannot be explained in only a few words at this time.

The other danger to be avoided is unionistic actualism. This is the normal form of today’s ecumenism, going back to the Variata (the Altered Augsburg Confession) as well as to Bucer’s Wittenberg Concord of 1536. All ontological sentences are disregarded and replaced by actualistic ones. This is evident in the text of the Variata. In the revision of Article X, the preposition “with” (cum) can be interpreted in a Calvinistic way. The text sounds treacherous: “de coena domini docent, quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeatum corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus in coena domini” (Concerning the Lord’s Supper they teach that with the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ are truly distributed to all who eat in the Supper of the Lord). The act, the distribution, is emphasized. This distribution with bread and wine masks whether the body and blood of Christ are really present. The vere (truly) is not set in relation to the body and the blood of Christ but to the distribution. This is just opposite of the first question of the Small Catechism, Part V, which states that only because Christ is really present under the bread and wine are His body and blood distributed in the Lord’s Supper.

The ontological truth has been turned to a functional one that is open to all sorts of other interpretations, including the Lutheran one. Thereby, the substance of faith is minimalized and dissolved. The ambiguity of formulas has taken the place of confession. Confessions are not mere diplomatic phrases; clarity comes from the eschatological situation of confession.

What has happened with the Lord’s Supper is the schema that we find everywhere in modern ecumenism. Relativity is the word of the day: “the church has no fixed position; she is always wandering.” But although that was true of the people of God in the Old Testament and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is no unchangeable charter, because the church has the clear confession of Jesus Christ as Lord. It is true that she has no abiding city. But we cannot relegate the confessions
to a relative status on the grounds that the church is nowhere firmly fixed but is ever moving from place to place. The mixing of the categories constantly confuses issues in our day. Often the same orthodox and biblical words are used but are turned to quite another meaning that has nothing to do with the exact one. For example, one can say "theology of the cross," as Jürgen Moltmann does, when he really means emancipation according to a strange blending of Luther and Karl Marx. We must stand at all points against this modern misuse of Lutheran traditions\textsuperscript{23} because counterfeiters are at work among theologians. Someone takes this for the modern form of theology.

VI. The Confessional Existence of the Christian

Not only the church as the community of all believers in Christ is confession, but every Christian must daily confess Christ as Lord. This personal testimony is more necessary in our day than ever. Christian traditions are dissolving all over the world. There are a lot of reasons for this. One is the mobility of our times. Different generations of the same family do not live in the same place. The number of members in many churches is reduced drastically. Therefore, every voice is important in confessing Christ as Lord.

This means to discover the Augsburg Confession in a new way. If we look at the list of subscribers from 1530, we notice very quickly that these were not only theologians but also princes and the representatives of the towns such as mayors and senators. The confession was presented by laymen. Hegel pointed out this phenomenon in his Berlin anniversary address when he said: What humanism tried was fulfilled in the Reformation of the church, namely, the leading to a new secular culture.\textsuperscript{24} The medieval church had been especially the church of the priests and the


monks. Christianity was divided into religiosi and prophanis, spiritual and secular persons. Luther’s freedom of the Christian was built on a different basis. All who have been baptized have been consecrated priests, bishops and popes. This was not a word of enthusiasm and revolutionary pathos; Luther had rediscovered the priesthood of all Christians, coming from their Baptism. There is a clear distinction in Lutheran theology between the priesthood of all believers and the special ministry of the Word.

The priesthood of all believers means the universal testimony for Christ everywhere and every moment, a total confessional existence for all Christians. Either we are confessing Christians or we have lost our Christian mission and are not worthy to be called Christians. Especially the German folk churches need a recollection of what such confession means.

This brings us to the last step in our investigations. The personal confession of every Christian has nothing to do with Protestant individualism. The confession of the church, the confession of the universal church of all people and centuries, and the personal confession of the Christian individual belong to one another as the same spiritual task and work. One cannot delegate personal confession to the church as an institution, as the former Catholicism did, but the more the process of the modern world is going on, the more every Christian needs the universal church and its confession.

This makes us aware of the immense importance of the Lutheran understanding of confession. We are by no means at the end of a long and venerable tradition but only at its very beginning. Because the confession of the church is of eschatological quality, it is before and above all times and therefore in all time. It is not necessary to find new forms of adaptation, but it is really essential to discover the eschatological quality of confession day by day. Modernity and tradition, tradition and modernity, are the distinct marks of the Lutheran church. This is what it means to confess in a Lutheran perspective.

---

25 Address to the Christian Nobility (1520), WA 6:408 = AB 44:129.
There is no better way of summing up than to follow the lines of Luther’s interpretation of Hebrews 3:1:  

[This is] a new way of speaking, but one that comes from a Hebrew idiom and expresses the matter with remarkable fitness, since our whole work is a confession, as Ps. 96:6 says: “Confession and beauty are before Him” (that is, in His church), “Holiness and magnificence are in His sanctification.” And Ps. 111:3: “Confession and magnificence are His work.” The meaning of these verses is expressed in Ps. 145:5: “they will speak of the magnificence and sanctification, with which they praise, confess, glorify, and sanctify Thee. Yet all this is Thy work in them, as Ps. 8:2 says: “Out of the mouth of infants and of sucklings Thou hast fashioned praise.” Likewise Is. 43:21: “This people I have formed for Myself: they will declare My praise.” therefore Christ has on the cross the title King of the Jews, that is, of the confessors. This confession is understood as a confession not only of sins but also of praise. Indeed, the confession of sins and of praise is one and the same confession...26

---

WHY IT WAS NECESSARY FOR THE PHARISEES TO OPPOSE JESUS

John R. Wilch

I. The Problem

Recent New Testament scholarship has given rise to a significant contradiction. On the one hand, the gospels clearly indicate that Jesus was condemned by the Sanhedrin and handed over to Pilate for execution and that Pharisees joined with chief priests, Sadducees and elders in condemning Jesus. On the other hand, many Christian as well as Jewish scholars, noting that Judaism has never condemned a Messianic pretender as a heretic nor turned one over to Gentile authorities, claim that Jesus had been a good Pharisee.

How rapidly the opposition to Jesus materialized and consolidated among Pharisees is particularly emphasized in Mark. The first hint of polarity between Jesus and Pharisaic scribes is indicated when the people were astonished that "He was teaching them as one having authority, not as the scribes" (1:22). Scribes and Pharisees must early have begun to take notice of Jesus, for He was soon preaching

---

The rabbinic primary sources cited here are as follows:

1) Targums:  
   - Targum Is.  
   - Targum Cant.

2) Mishnah:  
   - Aboth  
   - Berakoth  
   - Peah  
   - Shabbath  
   - Yoma

3) Tosephta:  
   - T. Sanhedrin  
   - T. Shabbath

4) Palestinian Talmud:  
   - p. Berakoth

5) Babylonian Talmud:  
   - Aboda Zara  
   - Aboth R. Nathan  
   - Baba Bathra  
   - Baba Mezia  
   - b. Berakoth  
   - Hagigah

6) Midrashim:  
   - Deuteronomy Rabba  
   - Genesis Rabba  
   - Leviticus Rabba  
   - Midrash Qoheleth  
   - Midrash Psalms  
   - Mekhita Exodus  
   - Pesiqta R. Kahana  
   - Pesiqta Rabbathi  
   - Sifra Leviticus  
   - Sifre Deuteronomy
and healing throughout Galilee and gaining a great following (1:32-34, 38-39, 45). Their first indication of opposition is recorded in 2:7, when Jesus forgave a paralytic his sins; this was considered blasphemy. After Jesus called Levi the tax-collector to follow Him and dined with him, Pharisaic scribes accused Him of fraternizing with sinners (2:16). Pharisees objected to the fact that Jesus’ disciples neglected fasting (2:18), and charged them with unlawful behaviour for picking ears of grain on the Sabbath (2:24). Thereafter, Pharisees began to watch for opportunities to test and accuse Jesus for infractions of the Law (3:2). When Jesus healed a man’s withered hand on the Sabbath (3:5), contrary to the scribes’ interpretation of the Law, at least some Pharisees knew that He had gone too far and “took counsel with the Herodians against Him, how they might destroy Him” (3:6). From then on, Pharisees are nearly always sworn opponents of Jesus (7:5; 8:11; 10:2; 12:13).¹

II. The Jewish Viewpoint

The tradition of the ancient rabbis that produced modern Judaism was a direct outgrowth of the Pharisaic movement, so that all modern denominations of Jews consider themselves followers of the Pharisees.² Instead of finding fault with Jesus, however, their heirs today compare Him favourably to their ancient forerunners. They note that He upheld the Law of Moses, recognized its true essence and was


²This means, of course, that a use of the terms “Pharisee” and “Pharisaical” in any derogatory way is, for Jews and knowledgeable Christians, a prejudiced antisemitism.
obedient to it. He did not transgress any dietary laws, generally avoided contact with Gentiles, regularly travelled to Jerusalem for the pilgrimage festivals, knew the Scriptures well enough to be invited to preach in the synagogues, and looked for the imminent realization of the Kingdom of God.

It is pointed out that Pharisees were supportive of both Jesus and, later, His disciples. In contrast, in both practice and doctrine, it was much more the Sadducees with whom Jesus was in fundamental disagreement. It is therefore concluded by modern Jewish scholars that the Pharisees had no reason to oppose Jesus, but that the priests and Sadducees, who strenuously objected to the Messianic movement in general, did decidedly oppose Him.

Positive comparisons are also drawn between Jesus and the rabbis (usually called “scribes” in the New Testament): He had disciples as they did; He taught similarly as they did; using apt illustrations and parables from daily life; He was deeply concerned about the poor of His people; His teaching represents some of the best in Jewish tradition—not even excluding his Messianic claim. Summa sum-

---


8 Kohler, pp. 219-20; Flusser, Jesus, pp. 72-77.

9 Kohler, p. 231.
Whether or not Jesus could be characterized as a Pharisee Himself, today’s Pharisees at least declare: Jesus was a Jew’s Jew!  

Jewish scholars do not, of course, overlook the Pharisees’ opposition to Jesus recorded in the gospels, nor His scolding them. Earlier, Pharisaic rejection might be attributed to deviations on Jesus’ part or to misunderstanding. However, the current trend is to follow the higher-critical lead of Christian scholars by casting doubt on the credibility of the gospel record, at least where, contrary to such indications as mentioned above, conflict between Jesus and Pharisees is reported. Two explanations are usually given. First, Jesus castigated some Pharisees justifiably, which was in good Pharisaic tradition. Every religious movement has both its super-zealous radicals and its hypocrites. Jesus is thus seen as taking the bad Pharisees to task who either overemphasized the fine points of the Law and of the rabbis’ tradition, or only made an outward show of fulfilling the principles of Judaism. The rabbis and good Pharisees of Jesus’ day brought the same criticisms to bear. Secondly, the conclusion is reached that the gospels have introduced an anti-Semitic tendency. Pharisees—and other Jewish parties or groups, as in the Synoptics, or Jews in general, as in John—are presented as enemies of Jesus for the purpose of discrediting the Jews in the opinion of the Gentile audience. This would make Jesus and Christianity more acceptable to Gentiles who might be reluctant to worship a crucified Jew.

---

12Bamberger, p. 98; Ben-Chorin, pp. 12-13; cf. Lindeskog, p. 323.  
13Kohler, p. 112; Ben-Chorin, pp. 21-22; Lapide, *Rabbi*, p. 60; cf. Sorah 22b.
III. The Evidence of the Gospels and Rabbis

The above opinions of modern scholars prove to be superficial upon more thorough consideration, not only of the gospels but also of the principles of Pharisaism. The objection of the Pharisees to Jesus’ intimate associations with obviously unrepentant sinners was genuine. Since their meals were consecrated with benedictions, they constituted worship services. Because they imposed Levitical purity upon themselves, they required the washing of hands before meals. Further, an Israelite is responsible for the conduct of his fellow Israelites and should try to prevent their transgressions. Should, then, those who honestly endeavoured to be serious worshippers of God and good examples to their people, practice worship fellowship with the immoral? A fellowship meal should preferably be an edifying event, and the pious should remain above suspicion and resist temptation in their dealings with all people. An Israelite faithful to God and His covenant with Israel will naturally wish to keep His Law, whereas those who break the divine Law have removed themselves from the religious community of Israel and must be treated as outsiders until they repent and give evidence of faith and obedience. Because the conscientiously religious Jew could not be sure that the common person

---


15 Aboth 3:3; Abrahams, 1:55.

16 Bamberger, p. 78.


18 R. Shabbath 17b; Kohler, p. 113; Abrahams, 1:56-57. Avoiding incriminating contact with the immoral is also commanded by the Apostle Paul, e.g., 1 Cor. 5:11; Thess. 3:6.

WILCH: PHARISEES OPPOSE JESUS

Our subject, the Pharisees, had paid all his tithes and observed all the Biblical laws of purity, and because fraternization would implicate him in the other's transgressions, the only proper course was to avoid any contact that would not be above suspicion. For the Pharisees, this was not pre-occupation with trivialities, but with the essential aspects of the life of holiness.

To come to the aid of the sick or suffering was not frowned upon, although disease, misfortune and an early death were generally assessed to be punishment for sin. For a pious Jew to demonstrate overly concern for suffering strangers, then, there ought first to be evidence of repentance. As far as efforts toward alleviating suffering are concerned, nothing involving work was permitted to be performed on the Sabbath unless it was a matter of life and death. In fact, necessary deeds of mercy should be executed on the Sabbath. However, this must not be interpreted too indiscriminately or generously, lest the performance of a duty to one's neighbour justify transgressing a divine prohibition.

That Jesus almost always healed by means of a command alone, was in itself a transgression of neither the Biblical prohibition nor of the rabbinical interpretation. But since He did not hesitate to heal people on the Sabbath who either were not seriously ill or whose condition would not worsen if one waited until after the Sabbath (see Luke 13:14), Jesus' practice was misleading. The common people were not trained in the fine points of interpreting the Law. Thus, His Sabbath healings could easily be understood by them as license to break the Sabbath by performing work

---

23Shabbath 18:3; T. Shabbath 15:14f.; b. Yoma 84; Abrahams, 1:134-35; Nothmann, pp. 11-12; Moore, 2:30-31. The rabbis defined work prohibited on the Sabbath on the basis of what was permitted in the Temple; see b. Shabbath 74a; Abrahams, 1:134; but cf. Matt. 12:5.
24See Abrahams, 1:135.
that was not absolutely necessary. Similarly, although it was not expressly forbidden for the disciples to pick grain on the Sabbath, this could be construed as the forbidden work of harvesting. But in John, Jesus Himself twice flagrantly violated the Sabbath law: He ordered the man who had been sick thirty-eight years, when healed, to carry his pallet (5:8), and He performed a work by putting clay on the eyes of the blind man to heal a non-worsening defect (9:6). Breaking the Sabbath was a prohibition punishable by death; to teach and mislead the people to do so was equally punishable.25

One important reason why Jesus sometimes forgave the sins of a sick person before healing him may have been to allay the misgivings of Pharisees who objected to aiding unrepentant sufferers. But His manner of forgiving sins aroused their objections even more so than did His Sabbath healings. First, He forgave sins without receiving any assurance from the individual that he had repented and would attempt to mend his ways. According to the understanding of the Pharisees, man must take the initiative in returning to God in repentance; he must at least begin to deserve forgiveness, although God mercifully offers plentiful assistance and ready pardon.26 Besides, a man has direct access to God as the sole and immediate source of forgiveness.27

Second, instead of praying to God to forgive the sinner, Jesus simply pronounced the forgiveness of sins Himself, that is, by His own authority. This was tantamount to blasphemy for the Pharisees (as it also is for Christians), for it presumed for Himself a prerogative that God has reserved for Himself


27Abrahams, 1:140.
alone. It meant that Jesus was presuming the right to judge people, in effect, to judge the world. He was setting Himself up as mediator: the way to God was through Him. The authority of the Pharisees and rabbis was derived from established channels, namely, the scholarly discussions and decisions of the rabbis concerning the interpretation of the divine Word in the Torah. (Even miracles and voices from heaven were ruled out of order in influencing their deliberations.) They therefore surely recognized quickly and clearly enough in what ramifications the teaching and work of Jesus would result. John reports: “For this reason, therefore, the Jews (Judeans?) were seeking all the more to kill Him, because He was not only breaking the Sabbath, but was also calling God His own Father, making Himself equal with God:”(5:18), and, “for a good work we are not about to stone You, but for blasphemy, and because You, being a man, are making yourself God!” (10:33). It was the overt acts of Jesus and His own radical claims that alienated Him from Pharisaism.

If Jesus were neither mad, possessed by demons nor heretical, He would have to have been divine in order to assume such divine prerogatives. However, Jews then as now had to reject such a possibility. The “essence of Judaism is the doctrine of the absolute and unmodified unity of God,” as Jakob Jocz expresses it. It was therefore impossible for Pharisees to admit the absolute authority, uniqueness or

\[\text{References:}\]


perfection that Jesus claimed for Himself, as they likewise rejected it for any other man, even including Moses.\textsuperscript{32}

In Christianity, the gulf between the transcendent, holy God and finite, sinful man is bridged by the divine-human Saviour. In Judaism, however, this chasm is overcome by man in his inherent, essential goodness reaching to God,\textsuperscript{33} and this he is able to do by virtue of his moral integrity and free will.\textsuperscript{34} Of course, God does not remain aloof from anyone who takes the step towards Him, but mercifully helps toward further righteousness and holiness.\textsuperscript{35} Nevertheless, all does not depend on this, for all Israelites will enjoy a share of the world to come by virtue of the original election by God of the people of Israel, unless someone forfeit this by inordinately severe crimes of heresy, injustice or immorality and the refusal to repent.\textsuperscript{36} Because, then, Judaism does not intend to save the lost but to preserve the saved in their saved state, the Jew has need of neither a saviour nor a mediator.\textsuperscript{37} Since God did not create man capable of perfection, He is not so unreasonable as to demand it as a condition of retaining the right to realize the lasting relationship with Him.\textsuperscript{38}

This is attained rather by the free decision and will to repentance and to imitate

\textsuperscript{32}Ben-Chorin, pp. 12-13; Jocz, p. 266.

\textsuperscript{33}Aboth 3:13, 15; Kohler, p. 140; Abrahams, vol. 2 (1924; reprint ed. published with vol. 1), p. 207; Sandmel, p. 209; Jocz, pp. 268-69, 276.


\textsuperscript{35}Pesiqa R. Kahana 163b; Bamberger, p. 126; cf. Heford, pp. 155-56; Moore 1:531.

\textsuperscript{36}Sanhedrin 90a ff.; cf. Moore, 2:94-95.


\textsuperscript{38}Sandmel, p. 209; cf. Moore, 1:495.
God in the performance of His will as one is able.\textsuperscript{39}

This, in fact, was the aim of the Pharisee: to serve God by doing His will, by which God bestowed His goodness. The one essential thing, then, was to train oneself in doing the will of God as revealed in His Word, the Torah.\textsuperscript{40} In response to God's mercy in helping the repentant believer to live righteously, the highest motive for righteous conduct is to do God's will for its own sake, that is, to love God for His sake.\textsuperscript{41}

The role of the Messiah was by no means thereby eliminated. The Pharisees understood the mission of the Messiah as primarily to free Israel from subservience to foreign rulers and to rule sovereignly upon the reestablished throne of David over the restored people of Israel.\textsuperscript{42} Although the Torah of Moses would remain unchanged forever, the Messiah would teach the people the Torah in such a way as to reveal all its divine thoughts and solve all its riddles.\textsuperscript{43} But He should not be a mediator of the Holy Spirit or of other spiritual blessing.\textsuperscript{44}

The Torah was the \textit{norma normans} of Pharisaism, valued as the most perfect and gracious gift of God to Israel. It embodied His will and purpose and the sure guide for life in all its aspects, so that man might be purified and sanctified. Sanctification and fulfillment in life came through study of the Torah and following its

\textsuperscript{39}Sirach 15:14; Berakoth 4a; Megillah 28b; b. Shabbath 153a; Taanith 22a; Aboda Zara 10b; Sifre Deut. 83a; Schechter, p. 78; Kohler, p. 113; Abrahams, 1:167, 2:146, 154, 187-88; Jocz, pp. 275-77; cf. Moore, 1:494.
\textsuperscript{40}Cf. Herford, pp. 75, 136-37.
\textsuperscript{41}Aboth 1:3, 2:2, 12; 4:11; Aboda Zara 19a; b. Berakoth 17a; Taanith 7a; Sifre Deut. 41, 48, 306; Schechter, p. 121; Bamberger, pp. 127-28; Baeck, p. 185; Flusser, \textit{Jesus}, p. 66; cf. Moore, 2:95-100.
\textsuperscript{42}Sirach 47:11; Sanhedrin 38b; Sandmel, p. 29; Lapide, \textit{Rabbi}, pp. 8-17, 32; Vermes, p. 131; Jocz, p. 283-84; cf. Dalman, p. 299; Moore, 2:324-27, 336.
\textsuperscript{43}Targum Is. 9:5; 53:11-12; Targum Cant. 8:1-2; Gen. Rabba 49:11; Midrash Ps. 110 233B; Midrash Qoh. 11:8; Pesiqta R. Kahana 39a; Jocz, pp. 282-83; cf. Billerbeck, 4:1.
\textsuperscript{44}Cf. Dalman, p. 299.
precepts. 45 Not surprisingly, one of the three essential principles of Pharisaism came to be reverence for the teachers of Israel. 46 Instead of Moses having received from God all laws for all situations for all time, the Pharisees understood an open-ended Torah that implicitly included the interpretations and applications arrived at by the authoritative academies of the rabbis, the harvest from the seed sown in the original revelation. 47 In fact, the Torah even today, as the fullest revelation of the divine mind, has come to include all laws of nature and even human reason that is morally good. 48

The appellative "Pharisee" means literally "Separatist," for the movement was originally a separation from the more conservative Sadducees who rejected the theory of an ongoing revelation in the deductions of the rabbis. But the Pharisees soon justified their separations just as strongly over against the common people, who did not become educated in the Torah and showed no inclination to do so. 49 Because the merciful God of Israel would not have given any laws that could not be observed, the rabbis adopted the principle that no application should be imposed that the majority of the people could not endure. 50 Nevertheless, the meticulous obedience demanded by the Pharisees proved too manifold, onerous and burden-

45 Baruch 4:1; Aboth 6:7; Rosh Hashanah 12a; b. Shabbath 88b; Bamberger, pp. 117, 123; cf. Schlatter, p. 192; Gunter Mayer, "Die Tora in der rabbinischen Literatur," Friede über Israel 64 (1981): 52.

46 Baba Bathra 4a; b. Berakoth 28b; Midrash Ps. 16:11; Schechter, p. 83; Abrahams, 2:16; cf. Dalman, pp. 312-13; Schlatter, p. 180. The rabbinic master-pupil relationship was borrowed from the Greek model; see Rengstorf, Mathetes, pp. 421-41; Hengel, p. 81.

47 Peah 2:6; p. Peah 17a; Hagigah 3b; b. Shabbath 31a; Yebamoth 20a; Abrahams, 2:12, 115; Bamberger, pp. 111-12, 125; Sandmel, pp. 25-26; Jocz, pp. 290-91; Neustner, pp. 218-221; cf. Herford, pp. 66, 72, 85, 109-10; Moore, 1:112, 262-63; Mayer, p. 55.

48 Aboth 3:14; Jocz, p. 291; cf. Mayer, p. 51. This view of the Torah was borrowed from the Stoic concept of the ontological cosmic law; see Rengstorf, Mathetes, p. 440; Hengel, pp. 173, 250, 252.

49 Bamberger, p. 78.

50 Baba Bathra 60b; Abrahams, 2:11-12; cf. Herford, p. 110; Nissen (Seebass, pp. 52-53).
some for most of the common people. Of course, the innumerable restrictions were well meant, designed as a "hedge around the Law" to protect the Jew in his life of obedience to God from transgressing any of the Biblical injunctions. Pharisaism was therefore a system of morality expressed as law; the essence of its religion was an ethical way of life.

This development produced three significant results in the Jewish situation: First, the over-riding principle at the foundation of the religion for the Pharisees became human reason. On it, the hermeneutical principles of Hillel were based in order to derive the implications within the Torah. To it, the doctrine of retribution was removed from its inaccessible position in the inscrutable wisdom of God. The logical consequence of this procedure was to require that a good deed must fulfill a command in order to have merit.

Second, the Pharisaic scribes were ultimately concerned with preserving the people of Israel by ensuring its holiness and by enhancing the power of the Torah to sanctify life. Therefore, they appropriated the laws that were originally intended only to regulate the purity of the priests and required them to be practiced by all Jews. Their programme was thus to legislate the realization of the goal of Israel to become "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Exodus 19:6): everyone should
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51 Aboda Zara 36a; Abrahams, 2:12; Nothmann, p. 14.
52 Aboth 1:1; Kohler, p. 113; Nothmann, p. 5.
54 T. Sanhedrin 7:11; Bamberger, p. 110; Neusner, p. 268; cf. Mayer, pp. 55-56. In order to offset the negative influences of Hellenism on Judaism, the early Jewish teachers and scribes adopted the Socratic dialectical form of instruction, but thereby assimilated the rational principles of the Greek philosophical schools; Hengel, pp. 81, 103.
55 B. Berakoth 7a, 33a; Aboth R. Nathan 40a, 59b, 62b, cf. Schechter, pp. 106, 109-111; Bamberger, p. 127.
56 Schlatter, p. 223.
practice the standards of priestly ritual separateness and cleanness and so attain holiness and righteousness.\textsuperscript{57}

Third, the primary objective of doing God’s will was predominantly concentrated in the “First Great Commandment” in the sense that everything one does should sanctify the name of God.\textsuperscript{58} This was so projected that service to one’s neighbour was not allowed to interfere with service to God. The “neighbour” was understood as a fellow Israelite who was not guilty of obvious disobedience to the Law, which would obligate others to hostility towards him. Whereas obedience to God was definitively legislated by myriads of rulings, the love of the neighbour was left to the conscience.\textsuperscript{59}

IV. The Solution

The Pharisees had no choice but to reject Jesus for three major reasons. The first was, on the one hand, that such actions as fraternizing with unreformed sinners, healing non-critical cases on the Sabbath, and refusing to object to those who failed to wash their hands before eating set a poor example for the people in attaining the objective of doing the will of God clearly and unmistakably as God’s holy people. On the other hand, these actions effectively recognized as \textit{bona fide} Israelites those who should be excommunicated from the community because of their unrepentant disobedience and uncleanness (cf. Luke 19:9).

Second, Jesus reinterpreted the Law of Moses in a way that went at cross purposes to the programme of the Pharisees and their scribes.\textsuperscript{60} Both they and


\textsuperscript{58} Berakoth 9:5; b. Berakoth 5a; Baba Mezia 58b; Sifra Lev. 25:36; Schechter pp. 78-79; Abrahams, 1:18-19; Kohler, pp. 113-14; Bamberger, pp. 27-28; cf. Herford, p. 145; Moore, 1:491, 2:82.

\textsuperscript{59} Nissen (Seebass, pp. 52-53). Cf. Mark 7:8-13.

\textsuperscript{60} Herford, pp. 115, 205; Sandmel, p. 116; Hengel, p. 309.
Jesus accepted the maxims, “the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath,” and, “the Law was made to promote life, and not to hinder it.” However, Jesus repudiated their principle of applying the laws of priestly purity to all Jews (see Luke 11:39-41; cf. Mark 7:19). This meant that He not only rejected their principle of extending the application of the Law and casuistically multiplying its instances of practical application, but also their principle of working out their own sanctification by force of human will and effort, both individually and as a people. Purity for Jesus was to be moral, not ceremonial. Furthermore, He also rejected their principle of exalting the “First Great Commandment” above the second one in such a way as to allow legal obligations to God to cancel out opportunities for serving one’s neighbour in love, mercy and self-sacrifice. For Him, to do this amounted to fulfilling the “First Great Commandment” (see Matt. 15:1-6; 25:31-46). Ironically, Hillel himself agreed with Jesus on this point in principle. However, the agreement is only superficial because Hillel did not carry through on it in practice. While his negative formulation of the “Golden Rule” is merely an expression of normal human selfishness, the positive formulation of Jesus challenges the believer to the mercy that transcends selfish concerns. Whereas Jesus rejected as impossible what the Pharisees considered to be humanly possible, they considered His expectations to be impossible. But the countless selfless sacrifices of Christian mercy in the intervening ages have shown that, for those who depend on God to inspire and empower their service, nothing is impossible (see Matt. 17:20; Mark 9:23; John 14:12).

---

61 Mark 2:27; b. Yoma 85a, b; T. Shabbath 15:16-17; Mekhila Ex. 31:13-14; cf. Baruch 14:18.
64 Matt, 7:12; Aboth 2:5; b. Shabbath 31a; cf. Abrahams, 1:22-23; Bamberger, p. 99. At any rate, to summarize the Torah “in an nutshell” can at most be only a directive for keeping the whole Torah, for the rabbinical understanding of it requires that all the commandments have equal value; Nissen (Seebass, p. 54).
Third, Pharisees understood Jesus' teaching, healing and forgiving of sins without substantiation through earlier competent authorities, without reference to divine inspiration or even without prayer to be a most arrogant usurpation of exclusively divine prerogatives. According to the current interpretation of Mosaic Law, this amounted to the capital crime of blasphemy. Thus, Pharisees as well as Sadducees understandably believed that Jesus had perpetrated the most presumptuous form of blasphemy when He explicitly or implicitly made Himself equal to God (cf. Matt. 26:64).

V. Conclusions

1. Considering their presuppositions, it was necessary for the Pharisees and their scribes to reject Jesus and seek to eliminate Him. As they understood their religion, the obvious result of the work of Jesus would be to destroy Judaism at its roots and transform it into an antinomian idolatry.

2. Christianity is not the only possible extension of Israel and the Old Testament. Both Pharisaism and modern Judaism are also natural results and deserve to be recognized as such by Christians.

3. The real opponents of Jesus in the more profound sense were not just the Pharisees and their rabbis. The kind of opposition they represented then has been championed by many people of various backgrounds ever since. The one term that might define them all is "secular humanism." They have supplanted genuine dependence on God by human standards of reason and action.65

4. The Pharisees were in the process of reducing the high ideals of the religion of the Old Testament to a practicable, logical reality. Jesus renewed those high ideals and put them in sharper focus as He made them attainable through His vicarious atonement and through faith in Him. In once sense,

65Cf. Neusner: "...the question taken up by the Mishnah is, What can a man do? And the answer laid down by the Mishnah is, Man, through will and deed, is master of this world, the measure of all things" (p. 271).
neither Pharisees nor secular humanists need be opposed to Jesus. The alternative is the same that confronts everyone: to accept Him as the Messiah of Israel and to believe in Him as the Saviour of all people.
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LUTHERAN WORSHIP:
AN ANALYTICAL REVIEW-ARTICLE ON THE NEW HYMNAL

Lowell C. Green

PART ONE: ITS STRUCTURE AND UNDERLYING THEOLOGY,
ESPECIALLY IN THE ORDERS FOR THE DIVINE SERVICES

The publication of a new service book and hymnal, regardless of its merits, will shape the lives of thousands of men and women and children. Therefore, the appearance of Lutheran Worship (1982) calls for a scholarly and impartial analysis of its contents, especially from the theological teachers of the church.¹

The publication of LW was preceded and accompanied with an unusual amount of criticism, both favourable and negative. This reviewer cannot subscribe the position that the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod did not have the right to come out with its own hymnbook after having worked on the LBW for a number of years. Actually, if Synod participated in the preparation of LBW for a time until it discovered that there were certain features in it that would not be acceptable to its constituency, it had the obvious need to withdraw, no matter how embarrassing and painful the action. LW is a revised form of LBW, and there is sufficient precedent for church bodies adopting a hymnbook in principle but then issuing a special edi-

¹The following hymnbooks will be cited in this review with the abbreviations as indicated. SBH = Service Book and Hymnal, authorized by the Lutheran Churches cooperating in The Commission on the Liturgy and Hymnal, copyrighted 1958 by the American Evangelical Lutheran Church, the American Lutheran Church, the Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church, the Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the United Lutheran Church in America (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1958). TLH = The Lutheran Hymnal, authorized by the Synods constituting The Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1941). LBW = Lutheran Book of Worship, prepared by the churches participating in the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship (=ILCW): Lutheran Church in America, The American Lutheran Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada, and the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1978). LW = Lutheran Worship, prepared by the Commission on Worship of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1982).
tion to meet the particular needs of its adherents. After all, the EKG of Germany as a matter of principal was published in many diverging but similar versions as approved by such bodies as the Lutheran churches of Bavaria, Hannover, or Württemberg, the union churches of Prussia or Hessen, or the Reformed and independent Lutheran jurisdictions. This was considered astute churchmanship rather than theological rancor or isolationism. The LC-MS had every right and privilege to publish a service book meeting its tradition.  

Therefore, a review of LW must needs take cognizance of the objections of Synod to LBW, analyze their validity, and determine to what extent LW has succeeded in solving those problems. Several review-articles have come to this writer’s attention, none of which, however, centres upon the problems that LW was supposed to solve. An article in Lutheran Forum has centred in the relationship between LBW and LW, another one in Lutheran Education largely defends contemporary English in the “updating” of the texts in both LBW and LW, and a series of reviews and criticisms in Christian News mainly evaluates LW from the standpoint of TLH, thus falling into the trap of letting “what we’ve always done” serve as criterion, rather than the Scriptures or the Confessions. In none of these cases, however, has the theology of the Lutheran cultus as reflected in these books been evaluated in respect to the distinction of Law and Gospel. Such a procedure will be

---

2Walter E. Keller, “A Hymnal With a History: Review Essay: Lutheran Worship’’, The Cresset 46 (Nov. 1982): 23-25, feels that the Synod was not justified in publishing LW. He presents the one-sided criticism typical of defenders of LBW who have refused to listen to its critics. Those who have pointed out “the numerous serious theological defects of the LBW” are not merely “ill tempered” persons. Nor were criticisms of LBW merely “the inflated rhetoric of the heated polemics which characterized the life of the LC-MS in the painful decade of the 70s” (Keller, p. 23). Very few substantive criticisms came from the LC-MS. Critics of the restoration of the medieaval Canon of the Mass in the form of the “Prayer of Thanksgiving” were chiefly from The ALC—Oliver K. Olson, Gerhard O. Forde, Herman A. Preus, James S. Preus, Gerhard Belgium, and this writer, to name a few. The fact that these critics of LBW are standing on the side of Luther does not mean that they have a position that needs to be reckoned with; it “exhibits more the deep and lingering trauma in Lutheranism over the break with Rome in the days of the Reformation” (p. 25). Over against this inferior position, Keller feels that he and LBW represent the only valid position, for they “breathe more the contemporary ecumenical spirit documented in the great accord reached by the Lutheran/Catholic[sic!] bilateral dialogs in this country.” It is said that many supporters of LBW find it hard to be tolerant of other theological persuasions and that defenders of this innovative book have been unable to listen to the other side.
the aspiration of this article, which will appear in two installments, embracing these components: an overview of LW, a more extensive discussion of the theological issues, and a critical review of the hymn selections.

I. AN OVERVIEW OF THE BOOK, LUTHERAN WORSHIP

LW is a large book of 1005 pages with the texts printed in black and rubrics in red, set in clear type and handsomely bound in blue. Within its covers is a collection of hymns and spiritual songs numbering 520 selections and an imposing array of liturgical materials.

In accord with the wishes of the Missouri Synod, the first of these services is the familiar Anglican-Chant liturgy that was given in TLH. LW pp. 136-57 is a judicious combining of the Missa brevis setting, TLH pp. 5-14 and of the full Lutheran mass, TLH pp. 15-31; since they are virtually identical until after the General Prayer, it would be a needless waste of space to print them separately. LW pp. 158-96 presents the new ecumenical "Holy Communion" service from LBW pp. 57-119, giving the first two settings which are contemporary and omitting the third setting which was based on chants from the Reformation era. A fourth choice is "Divine Service III," based on Luther’s Deutsche Messe of 1526 and employing Lutheran chorales for the ordinary parts of the mass.

LBW is to be faulted for having made excessive changes in the historical Matins and Vespers, services deeply rooted in the Lutheran school and church tradition. The Vespers has virtually been abandoned in favour of an "Evening Prayer" based upon the Eastern Orthodox feast-of-the-lights tradition; beautiful in itself, this innovative liturgy should not have usurped the place of the western vespers. LW has taken a more considered position, giving an extensive revision of these orders as they were printed in TLH, LW pp. 208-35, followed by the new "Morning Prayer" and "Evening Prayer" of LBW, LW pp. 236-62 as well as Compline, LW pp. 263-69.

LW places in the hands of the whole congregation the chants for all the introits andgraduals as well as many psalms. The practice of "reading" rather than singing introits or psalms is senseless since they are church music. LW enjoyed the services of
Paul Bunjes as musical editor: whereas LBW has many fine settings of the psalms and other such texts, the settings are ever better in LW. Moreover, LW offers the further advantage that the appropriate melody is provided for each psalm at the appropriate place in the psalter; unfortunately, space permitted giving only sixty psalms and led to the omission of such important ones as Pss. 30, 31, 42, 43, 56, 57, 102, 127 and 128 (the wedding psalms), and 145 and 150. However, the missing psalms can be taken from the Altar Book of LW where all the Psalter is given.

Several forms of suffrages are given (pp. 270-75) as well as bidding prayer (pp. 276-78) and the litany (pp. 279-87), which was used much more widely by our Lutheran forefathers than by us today. The setting by Johann Spangenberg (1545), TLH No. 661, has been retained. The considerable "updating" of the litany in LBW has been partly followed, with the exclusion of several undesirable innovations; however, the reader prefers the addition of LBW which includes the petition for "orphans, widowers, and widows" (LBW p. 171: cf. LW's deletion of widowers, p. 282).

In spite of the relatively high level of the musical settings, it is nevertheless unfortunate that LW has restored none of the chant melodies of Luther's day that were missing in TLH. The service settings generally come either in Anglican chant (usually of inferior Victorian vintage) or else in contemporary music. LW has failed to follow the lead of the Lutheran Hymnal of the Lutheran Church in Australia (Adelaide: Lutheran Publishing House, 1973) which published the mass, the matins and the vespers all set to the tunes used in the Reformation era. Furthermore, in omitting the third setting of the LBW form of the mass, LW left out a similar setting. In "updating" the pointing of the texts of the services carried over from TLH, some parts were excessively altered, requiring the congregation to learn them all over again, whereas the Te Deum Laudamus, an Anglican chant badly pointed in TLH (p. 35), was allowed to stand as it was. LW gives a much better contemporary form of the Te Deum than LBW: "We praise You, O God" (LW p. 214 and No. 8), but it also repeats the undesirable ICET from LBW: "You are God: we
praise You" (LBW p. 139; in LW p. 246). Likewise LW improves upon the Magnificat in LBW with this new version: "My soul magnifies the Lord" (LW p. 228), but it also repeats the strange ICET translation from LBW: "My soul proclaims the greatness of the Lord" (LBW p. 147; in LW p. 255). But this raises an additional problem. It is desirable that the congregation know liturgical texts by heart. The traditional versions are in superb English which will not easily be forgotten: how are the people now to deal with two new translations? This multiplicity of versions should have been avoided.

This brings us to the larger problem of "contemporary English." At this stage we shall not discuss the problem whether LW should have gone to the extreme lengths it took in introducing innovatively "modern" texts. But if "contemporary English" had to be used, it is unfortunate that the New International Version (NIV) was selected. A Biblical version that is used in the Divine-Service must not only represent sound scholarship in its translating and interpreting but it must also be couched in dignified language of literary merit. The Bible must be read in words of poetic beauty and force which will wing its message into the hearts of the bearers. We dare not overlook the difference between oral and written English, between English suitable for silent reading and English that is effective in public reading. NIV lacks those literary qualities needed for a liturgical text. Furthermore, since the same version must be used in parish education that is read in the Service, the Biblical text must be one that will lend itself to memorization on the part of the children. Again, NIV fails to be a memorable text. NIV tries to be colloquial or even chatty. For example, it has a strong preference for contracted verbs (doesn't for does not, hasn't for has not, etc.): we know that such forms are allowable in daily conversation but are out of place in scholarly writing or in formal discourse. Thus, the Easter pericope from John 20 is trivialized. After witnessing one of the greatest wonders of all time, Mary Magdalene reports casually to Peter: "They have taken the Lord out of the tomb, and we don't know where they have put him" (v. 2). The unduly altered rendition of v. 27, "Stop doubting and believe," is far inferior to
the rendering of the Authorized Version of 1611, "be not faithless but believing"; it might sound more "modern," but it transforms the sounds of the Gospel to those of the Law, making the avoidance of doubt and the having of faith into a good work of the will. Furthermore, a consultation of the Greek original will show that NIV introduced an unwarranted change in meaning. Fortunately, LW avoided following the Words of Institution as given in NIV, "This cup is the new convent in my blood," to retain Luther's rendition, "This is my blood of the new testament." The word covenant needs to be used with increasing discrimination in Lutheran circles.

The pericopal system is a compromise between the modern "ecumenical" three-year cycle and the ancient series. It is regrettable that the ancient series was revised almost beyond recognition. This in turn was partly due to the departure from the traditional church-year. This writer prefers retention of the "gesima" Sundays as a transition between the Epiphany and Lenten cycles, and the retention of the Sundays after Trinity rather than after Pentecost. Little seems gained by the innovations other than a certain conformity with other religious bodies with which, however, we should avoid giving the impression that we are in agreement. This tampering with the traditional church year places in limbo much of the great church music of men such as Schuetz or Bach, now that the liturgical year has been altered, since their music was geared to the ancient pericopal system.

II. THE UNDERLYING THEOLOGY OF LUTHERAN WORSHIP

The revision of LBW has been demanded because of certain theological features in it which were found to be doctrinally objectionable. We shall seek to evaluate how well LW has succeeded in improving its theology. This is difficult since a manual to LW has not yet appeared. However, five pamphlets have come to this reviewer's attention. Most extensive is the Guide to Introducing Lutheran Worship (1981), edited by Roger D. Pittelko and Fred L. Precht (abbreviated Guide), presenting considerable theological theory as well as rubrics (pp. 32-40). Moreover, there
are two pamphlets prepared by the Board of Parish Education of LC-MS and written by William J. Schmelder, *Oh Come, Let us Worship* (1981), which we shall cite as *Leaders' Guide* and *Study Guide.* Short but especially well written are two anonymous interpretations for the congregation. They are *Lutheran Worship—Divine Service I:* Narrative for Adults (abbreviated DS I), and *Lift Up Your Hearts—Divine Service II:* Narrative for Youth—Lutheran Worship (DS II). After this study was made, the *Lutheran Worship: Altar Book* (1982) appeared. We shall add references to it under the short-title of *Altar Book.*

To develop Lutheran theology of the divine service with English terms is difficult because of their synergistic overtones. The terms *Liturgy* (work of the people) and *Liturgist* are seldom used in the New Testament or the Confessions. However, Schleiermacher popularized them. *Worship* (ascribing worth to the deity), *eucharist* (giving thanks rather than receiving something), and *celebration* (re-enacting the myth of the deity) all tend to confuse the work of God with the work of man (synergism). These terms tend to mingle Law and Gospel. Such a vocabulary

---

3 If I understand Schmelder, he is setting up worship patterns on the model of the Old Testament ceremonial law (*Leaders Guide:* 9-13). Such a procedure stands in tension with the Lutheran distinction of Law and Gospel. Whereas the Reformed have interpreted Holy Writ as a book of laws, the Lutheran reformers and confessors taught that the ceremonial law was done away by Christ (Augsburg Confession 28:59, Apology 24:64, FC Epitome 10:9, etc.), and the priesthood together with all priestly sacrifices forever abolished (Apology 13:7-11). The danger of legalism lies close at hand. For a sound distinction of the Old and the New Testament, see Martin Chemnitz, *Examination of the Council of Trent,* Preface, IV:6.

4 DS I asserts: "The New Testament frequently uses *liturgy* and its various derivatives to designate service, ministry, and worship" (p. 4). None of the proof-texts applies. Hermann Strathmann demonstrates that the current usage of "liturgy" is neither that of classical Greek (Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* IV:222) nor does it represent the usage of the New Testament (IV:232-34; cf. 234-38). Old Lutheranism and the German language knew no word equivalent to "worship," or "ascribing worth to the deity" (cf. *Leaders Guide:* 9-10). Since ascribing worth is an action of man, it is hard to understand these sentences of Schmelder: Worship does not begin with us, but with God. It is therefore theocentric (God-centered) rather than anthropocentric (people-centered). Worship is Christocentric; it is centered in what God has done for us in Jesus Christ." Here, "worship" seems to be a good-work almost as fully as the offering of the unbloody sacrifice by the priest in Old Roman Catholicism. Schmelder's reasoning is typical, understandable, and widely representative of Lutheran theologians, but it seems to confound Law and Gospel, or the work of God and the work of man.
cannot adequately explain the evangelical Lutheran doctrine of the *Media salutis*, "Means of Salvation," or less exactly. "Means of Grace," a doctrine which places human salvation solely in the grace or benevolence of God (monergism), as it is channeled through those earthen vessels, the means of salvation or means of grace. Accordingly, classical Lutheran theology speaks of the divine-service rather than of the liturgy, and regards God as the subject or the one who acts, and man as the direct object or the one who is acted upon in the work of salvation. This distinction of the work of God from the work of man in the divine-service inevitably leads to a deep concentration upon the Means of Grace, that is, the preaching of the Word divided into Law and Gospel and the sacraments of Baptism, Absolution, and the Holy Supper. Such a practice of the Means of Grace reinforces the consciousness that God is active and man is passive in the work of redemption.

In classical Lutheran teaching the doctrine of the Means of Grace and the divine-service (liturgics) was included under Systematic Theology. The theological curriculum was revised and arranged in its present form by the Reformed theologian, Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834), who established the science of liturgics and located it within the new department of Practical Theology. His doctrine of worship went out from ethics and aesthetics: the divine-service was the expression by the congregation of their religious consciousness and feeling of dependence upon God. In other words, worship became something enacted by the congregation. In Confessional Lutheran thought, the central concept of the divine-service was that it was the institution for the distribution of the Means of Grace: God acted upon man through the instrumentality of the ministry. The purpose of the service, accordingly, was to create faith and to nurture it by instruction. Schleiermacher dismissed this by his assertion that faith was not produced by the service but was its presupposition, and that where faith did not precede there could be no divine-service: he denied that the purpose of the service was instruction in the Word of God but held that it was only edification. Schleiermacher's teachings really
pointed to things to come. The "ecumenical liturgies" of today are the result. 5

Another root of "celebration theology" is recent liberalism. The "ecumenical liturgies" of the twentieth century drew heavily upon a comparative-religions approach (Religionsgeschichtliche-Schule) and higher criticism. Wilhelm Heitmueller (1869-1926) had distinguished between the Last Supper of Jesus and the Lord's Supper of I Cor. II, which he said was founded by Paul. Jesus' supper was conducted with the rite of a Jewish community meal, which Hans Lietzmann (1875-1942) soon identified with a notorious fabrication, the kiddush: his supper had no connection with the Passover and was a "happy meal." Jesus did not intend for his supper to be repeated. It was Paul who revived Jesus' Last Supper, understood as connected with Jesus' last Passover, and, inserting the command to repeat the meal, presented it to the Corinthians as a revision of the celebrations of the Greek mystery religions. 6 The Liturgical movement today stresses that one should avoid the "sad meal" of Paul and get back to the "happy meal" of Jesus. 7 The Roman Catholic liturgical innovator, Odo Casel (1886-1948), whose influence spread since Vatican Council II, frankly conceded that Christian worship was the

5 The transition from the divine service as God's action in the Means of Salvation to that of a good-work by man is clearly heralded in these words: "Worship is work. It is, to be sure, 'good' work, gracious work [?], the work of God's people, but it is work nevertheless...The starting point for worship is not to ask, 'What's in it for me?' as in the Means-of-Grace theology of classical Lutheranism [?]. Rather, the starting point for worship is the question, 'How can I repay the Lord for all his goodness to me?' (Study Guide: 10-11). 'Liturgy, then, is essentially a work performed by people for the benefit of others. It is a work in which the priesthood of all believers shares' (DS 1:4).

6 This development was traced many years ago in Johann Michael Reu, "Can We Still Hold to the Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper?" (1940), reprint in Two Treatises on the Means of Grace, ed. Emil W. Matzner (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1952), pp. 40-61. It is unfortunate that Reu's presentation was overlooked by many theologians and church musicians. See also Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus.

7 The melancholy mood of Communion, taken into Lutheran from Reformed churches, is out of place. This, however, does not justify adopting the "happy meal" vs. "sad meal" dichotomy of Heitmueller and Lietzmann. The liberal notion of a "happy meal," distinct from I Cor. 11, calls for the use of leavened bread (the whole loaf) and other practices which will make it seem more like a family meal. Therefore, careful pastors would do well to avoid this innovation and use individual wafers, in accord with the principle of adiaphora, FC 10. Guide: 29 is rightly cool to this innovation.
adaptation of pagan myth and mystery of Christianity. Out of the pagan celebration as re-enactment of the myth of the deity came the modern concept of Christian worship as the “celebration” of the acts of God for our salvation, or the re-enactment (or re-presentation) of them. Regarding Christ’s suffering, death, and resurrection, “the liturgy re-enacts these redemptive events” (LW Altar Book, p. 7).

A voluminous literature preceded the publication of LBW in which we can trace the evolution of its characteristic “celebration theology”: this culminated in the Manual on the Liturgy—Lutheran Book of Worship, edited by Philip H. Pfatteicher and Carlos R. Messerli (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1979). Whereas Lutherans have traditionally regarded the divine-service as God serving man with the Means of Grace (Gospel), celebration theology consciously employs the synergistic concepts of the terms “liturgy” and “worship,” so that they became a good work in which man serves God (Law). “...Liturgical worship is most of all that which is done... ‘Liturgy’ means ‘work of the people’ we remind ourselves again and again. It therefore implies action—dramatic ritual in which the participants do certain things. Even when they listen to the readings and the sermon (the Gospel), their listening should be an active participation in the actions of proclaiming God’s word” (Manual—LBW, p. 148). Therefore, the leading of the service must not be left to the ordained clergy (as Augsburg Confession 14 insisted), but this “action” must be shared by all the “people” (ibid., pp. 9-10).

8Odo Casel expressed his views in the little volume, Die Christliche Kulismystikum, 3rd ed. (Regensburg: Gregorius, 1948), tr. by Burkhard Neunheuser, The Mystery of Christian Worship and Other Writings (Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1963). Casel replaced the Old Roman Catholic doctrine of the mass as the daily repetition of the sacrifice of Christ with the mass as the re-presentation or the re-enactment of Christ’s sacrifice, thereby supposedly avoiding protestant criticisms of a contradiction with the uniqueness of the atoning sacrifice (Hebr. 9, 11-14). Since protestants did not have this problem, it seems strange that they adopted Casel’s position, which held these problems: a) it regarded the Lord’s supper as a development from the Greek pagan mystery religions. b) it was built on the Roman ideas of Christ as the model to be imitated, rather than as the giver of a once-for-all salvation, c) it was linked with a progressive rather than forensic justification, and d) it was synergistic. “To the action of God upon us (opus operans) responds our co-operation (opus operans), carried out (by us) through grace from him” (The Mystery, p. 14). This worship of re-presentation or re-enactment seems to be the basis for the new protestant “celebration theology” that has appeared in LBW and LW.
Where does LW stand in relation to "celebration theology," with its mingling of comparative religions, higher criticism, and concept of worship as a good work? It takes a mixed position. "The divine services of LW are celebrations of the victory of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Guide 24). This brings us dangerously close to the Christus Victor theology of Aulén which helped shape LBW, including the subordination of Good Friday and the atonement to Easter and triumphalism. That concept of natural theology and reason which is called "worship," totally absent in classical Lutheranism, is included in materials for promoting LW, i.e., worship as ascribing worth to God (Guide: 9). At times LW supports the position of Augsburg Confession 14 by which only ordained clergy take part in the Divine-Service ("If non-ordained assisting ministers or leaders are considered either necessary or desirable or both..." LW Altar Book, p. 11). At other times, the opposite position is supported. "The liturgy is the celebration of all who gather... It is appropriate, therefore, that... lay persons fulfill certain functions within the service" (ibid., p. 25). The Guide announces "a significant change in the leadership of worship" between TLH and LW. The statement is false which says: "The Reformers...understood worship to be a corporate action" (Guide: 23). "The corporate quality of worship is a concept that LW attempts to expand with the use of assisting ministers...Laymen are encouraged to assume the assisting minister role (ibid.).

Classical Lutheranism avoided the Offertory and Eucharistic Prayer which had been parts of the Canon of the Mass. Wilhelm Loehe re-introduced the Offertory to Lutheran usage when he revised his agenda in 1853; from there is passed into the Common Service of 1887 in North America. Already TLH followed the Common Service and reintroduced a form of the Offertory, but it followed the sermon and

---

9I cannot agree with this "ecumenical" value-judgment: "As far as the Evangelical Lutheran Church was concerned, the period of the Reformation, ending near the close of the 16th century, saw an end of liturgical development. The next centuries witnessed a decline in church life and worship" (Guide: 14). Instead, the seventeenth century, with its magnificent church-music, choral work, development of the organ, liturgical ringing of bells, etc., within the framework of the Confessions, was the greatest period ever for this. It is inappropriate to speak of Luther writing "harshly" when he condemned the idolatrous Canon of the Mass (Guide: 12).
was separated from the sacrament by the collection and the General Prayer. SBH relocated the Offertory sentence to a place after the taking of the collection, and linked it with a money procession. LBW has followed the "ecumenical" pattern and turned this into a large-scale Offertory in which monies, bread and wine are brought in solemn procession to the altar in preparation for the consecration: this gives the appearance of a transaction between man and God and seems to confuse the gift of God in the sacrament with the good works of man. LW has provided for a similar act of Offertory (Rubrics 19-20 in Guide: 35). This suggests that if the distinction of Law and Gospel is of great concern, the Offertory might be omitted completely and North American churches might return to the practice of European Lutheranism where the collection is taken during hymns and any act of offering or its ceremonial presentation is avoided.

Fortunately, LW has avoided the "Great Thanksgiving" (Eucharistic Prayer) of LBW in which the Words of Institution were changed into prayer after the model of the Canon of the Mass. The Words of Institution are presented in LW to be chanted in good Lutheran custom; however, a short Eucharistic Prayer (not a consecratory action) is inserted between the Sanctus and the Lord's Prayer. Although this solution does not follow Luther's clear-cut break with the Canon of the Mass, it seems to avoid confusing a human work with a divine action.

LW is to be congratulated for a number of returns to sound Confessional Lutheranism. Instead of calling the rite "Holy Communion I," etc., it restores the traditional name of "Divine Service I," etc. Whereas most service rubrics among English-speaking Lutherans speak of distributing the bread and wine, LW restores the terminology that the pastor distributes the body and blood of Christ. A conscious endeavor has been made to be faithful to the Holy Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions. As indicated in this review, the lack of familiarity with the origins of "celebration theology" and other recent innovations has occasionally led to unfortunate adoptions in LW. However, LW is, theologically speaking, an immense improvement over LBW.

The next issue will discuss hymnody in Lutheran Worship.
Lutheran Theological Review
(Spring 1983) 1:49 - 54

LUTHER AND THE JEWS: AN EXCHANGE OF LETTERS BETWEEN
ROLAND H. BAINTON AND PRIME MINISTER MENACHEM BEGIN

In April 1982 Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary had the privilege of presenting the noted Reformation scholar, Roland H. Bainton, in its annual Lutheran Life Lectures series. While on campus, Bainton spoke concerning Luther’s political views and discussed his controversy with Prime Minister Begin, in which Bainton defended Luther from allegations raised against him. Bainton has given us permission and we reprint the correspondence which, we feel, will be of interest to our readers.—The Editor.

Professor Roland H. Bainton
c/o Christianity and Crisis
New York, NY

Dear Professor Bainton:

A friend recently provided me with your article entitled, “Luther, Begin and the Jews,” which appeared in the publication Christianity and Crisis, October 5, 1981. I read it with great attention and learned much from it.

As you are not only a student of Luther’s life but also a teacher of, and an authority on, his doctrine, I find myself somewhat perplexed when you say: “Begin’s accusations are not wholly false,” and then you add: “The other charges are fabrications. Luther was not anti-Semitic, but rather anti-Judaic.” I simply do not understand this last sentence. What is the difference between anti-Semitic and anti-Judaic? Anti-Semitism is a term of German invention. It was a term they applied exclusively to the Jews, never to the Arabs although they are Semites exactly as are the Jews. Can you honestly differentiate between “anti-Jewishness” and “anti-Judaism”?

Now, to the Luther sources. I quoted from the book by [William L.] Shirer, who himself is a Protestant, and who, in his well-known work, The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich, quotes (from a source he does not cite): “He [Luther] wanted to rid
Germany of the Jews and when expelled he advised to deprive them of all their money, their jewelry and their gold; and more, to burn their synagogues, to break into their houses and destroy them, to put them into cages or into stables like gypsies, in suffering and in captivity, as they always complain against us before God.” Shirer adds: “An advice which Hitler, Goering and Himmler fulfilled completely, 400 years later.”

In my address to the gathering of holocaust survivors in Jerusalem, to which the Associated Press refers, I spoke from memory, but I remembered well Shirer’s quotation. I did not add one word to it; perhaps I detracted a word or two from it. I cited truth, not fabrication.

Another source is the Encyclopaedia Judaica, from which the following passage will suffice:

Although Luther poured out such violent language on the heads of all his enemies—princess, lawyers, bishops and especially the Pope—in the case of the Jews he also made practical suggestions ranging from forced labor to outright banishment. As many of the Protestant rulers of the times relied on Luther’s political advice, his attitude resulted in the expulsion of the Jews from Saxony in 1543 and the hostile Judenordnung of Landgrave Philip of Hesse in the same year. The tenor of his suggestions was equally virulent in his “Admonition against the Jews,” a sermon preached in 1546, shortly before his death.

Since this letter is a response to your article in Christianity and Crisis, I am forwarding a copy of it to the editor of that publication with the request that it be printed.

Sincerely,

M. BEGIN,
Jerusalem, Israel

Your Excellency:

I am grateful to you for your courtesy in replying to my request for the source of your statement about Luther’s “anti-Semitism.” You referred me to William L. Shirer’s Rise and Fall of the Third Reich (New York, Simon and Schuster, 1960). He in turn drew from Franz L. Neumann, Behemoth (Oxford University Press, 1944)
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And for Neumann a source was an essay on anti-Semitism by an anonymous committee of the New York Institute of Social Research, published in *Studies in Philosophy and Social Science IX* (1941).

This survey for the age of the Reformation centered entirely on Luther. Because it quoted not from the standard critical Weimar edition of Luther’s works but instead from an edition issued in Munich in 1936—and since this was the period in which the National Socialists were whipping up antipathy toward the Jews—I suspected that the text might have received interpolations. Through the courtesy of the Library of Congress I have now received copies of the pages cited. My surmise was incorrect. This edition differed from the original only in modernization of the language and spelling. From this, one can infer no more than that the rising swell of Nazism in Germany at that moment believed the modernized version of Luther’s tract would serve its ends.

What use was made of it in Germany I am not in a position to say. But I can show how Luther’s words were garbled in the American essay that, through successive authors, found its way to your notice. Luther at the outset is described as an anti-rationalist who said that reason is a whore. Yes, but in what area? Certainly not in mundane affairs. Luther appealed to reason when, for example, he told the Jews that circumcision did not make one a member of the chosen people because Abraham was chosen before he was circumcised. Nor was being of the seed of Abraham a qualification, since Esau and Ishmael were rejected, though of the seed. “Any child can see this,” said Luther. Surely this was an appeal to reason. But in spiritual matters plain logic is inadequate, as for example to explain how God can be three and one. “There is much else that we cannot fathom. How does a leaf come out of a log or grass out of soil?”

The next point in the survey is that just as Hitler “forbade discussion between National Socialists and members of the other race,” so also Luther said, “Don’t discuss much with the Jews about our faith.” But Luther himself did talk with the Jews about religion. Three learned Jews came to Wittenberg for an interchange. He received them cordially. But when he propounded to them difficulties in their interpretations of the Hebrew Scriptures they brushed him off and referred him to the
rabbis. There was no achievement of common ground. Hence in his latter days he advised a Christian on meeting a Jew to expound the Gospel. If the Jew responded (he counseled), give the right hand of fellowship. If not, drop discussion as futile.

The next assertion is that Luther wanted the Jews cut of Germany. "Country and streets are open to them so they might move to the country (i.e., Palastine) if they like. We'll give them gifts with pleasure in order to get rid of them because they are a heavy burden, like a plague, pestilence and misfortune in our country." Yes, Luther did say that the Christians had not imported the Jews and would be pleased if they deported themselves. The two religions would be better off in separate countries. This was the principle of cuius regio eius religio, "whose region his religion." Once in Israel the Jews could revile Christ at their pleasure.

The American essay continues that Luther was inconsistent about giving the Jews assistance to leave because he would take from them "all their cash and jewels of silver and gold and set it apart to be guarded." But the remainder of the original text is omitted: "It should be guarded in a special fund to be used for no other purpose than to assist a converted Jew to become established so as to care for wife and child, and for the aged."

The essay then cites the words of Luther that "Into the hands of young, strong Jews and Jewesses are placed flails, axes, mattocks, trowels, distaffs and spindles, and they are made to earn their daily bread by the sweat of their brows." The point was not that if the Jews remained they were to be set to forced labor at whatsoever arduous task, but forced to labor in some form of work of their choice within the spectrum of farming and handicrafts.

There is here an implicit intimation that the Jews are not to live by usury. Luther did excoriate them on this score, while recognizing that not all Jews were usurers. Some were physicians, and not all were rich. Some in fact were very poor. In any case Luther condemned usury no matter by whom practiced. Moses forbade it as between Jew and Jew. Luther universalized the precept. One needs to remember that in his village of Wittenberg borrowing was for consumption, not investment.
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The next item in the indictment is Luther's word that "their synagogues or schools should be set on fire." Such advice is certainly not to be extenuated. Historically one must, however, bear in mind that Christians of varying beliefs were guilty of such tactics against each other. Lutherans burned the chapel of St. Mary at Alstedt. Iconoclasm by Protestants against Catholics was rampant: smashing of crucifixes and images of the saints, pulling down altars and desecrating relics. Catholics burned Lutherans, and Lutherans, in company with other Protestants, drowned Anabaptists. The prophets of tolerance were few. I have sought to honor them in my [book] The Travail of Religious Liberty.

The final item is that "their [the Jews] right of escort on the streets should be altogether abolished, for they have nothing to do in the country because they are neither knights, nor officials, nor merchants." I am not sure here, but I think he is inveighing against the practice, elsewhere described, of a Jew traveling with a retinue of 12 horses to collect the fruits of usury.

The American essay that influenced Neumann, Shirer and yourself assumed a causal relationship between Luther and Hitler. One marvels then that the authors did not go on to upbraid Luther's advice to confiscate the books of the Jews, including the Scriptures, which to his mind they distorted. Such destruction of writings is deplorable but must be seen in context. The burning of the books of religious opponents was then a common practice. Rome burned Luther's books. He retaliated by burning the book of canon law and the papal bull against himself. Only three copies survive of the book for which Servetus was burned in Geneva.

When we pass judgment on Luther we also need to bear in mind that, having been on death row for a quarter of a century—he would have gone to the stake had the emperor been free to invade Germany—his nerves were at times overwrought.

But this does not explain the impact of his words. Did his tract Of the Jews and Their Lies incite or reduce persecution? This we know, that it came out in the same year in which John Frederick, the Elector of Saxony, Luther's prince, revoked his order for the deportation of the Jews. The new edict granted "freedom of travel
throughout the province to Jews and Jewesses, provided they do not assail the Gospel as proclaimed by Doctor Luther." Whether the edict softened Luther or Luther the edict we cannot tell.

We do know that after the publication of Luther’s tract he said that he would give the right hand of Christian fellowship to a converted Jew. This prompts me again to say that Luther was anti-Judaic, not anti-Semitic. You have told me the terms and synonymous. If that be so, we must then find a terminology that will differentiate the basis of measures against the Jews in Luther’s day and in Hitler’s. In the late Middle Ages and the period of the Renaissance and Reformation, the Jews were persecuted purely on grounds of religion. A converted Jew suffered no disabilities. Paulus Borgensis, a highly learned Jew, converted through the reading of Aquinas, became a Catholic archbishop. The maternal grandfather of St. Teresa was a Jew. So also were a number of the early Jesuits. The convert was freed from all disabilities. With Hitler the test was blood. Being a Christian was utterly of no avail.

Respectfully yours,
ROLAND H. BAINTON
New Haven, CT
The fruits of more than a quarter century of personal study of Reformation texts and personal reflection provide the basis of this study of a series of questions of significance both for contemporary Reformation scholarship and for the life of the church. Green addresses historical and theological problems, among them the development of Luther’s understanding of justification, Melanchthon’s doctrine of justification and the impact of his insights on Luther’s development, the relationship between the two Wittenberg reformers, and the role of Biblical humanism in the unfolding of the Wittenberg movement.

Green’s demonstration of the importance of the linguistic and theological insights of the Biblical humanists, above all Melanchthon, for the development of the Wittenberg theology reminds us today that the academic disciplines must play a vital role in the church’s thought if the church is to be able to address the world around it effectively and to interpret the Scriptures faithfully. Not only Philip but also Erasmus of Rotterdam and Johannes Reuchlin made indispensable contributions to Luther’s deepening insight into the Biblical message of salvation, and the process by which he came to understand the Gospel depended on the aids which their writings provided. However critical of abuses by students of the social sciences and of ancient history and language we must at times be, we dare never forget that their insights can nonetheless offer us valuable assistance in proclaiming God’s Word in our world. The Lutheran Reformation was born in the university, and its heirs are unfaithful to their heritage when they fall into anti-intellectualism rather than use the academic disciplines in the service of their Lord.
For much of the past four hundred years since his death, Luther’s close friend and confidant, Philip Melanchthon, has received sharp criticism from Luther’s heirs. Green shows that much of this criticism has been unfair and uninformed. He certainly does not hide the differences in theological emphasis which are to be found in the writings of Luther and Melanchthon, and he is not by any means a blind fan of the latter. It must also be said that Green’s study does not focus on the later Melanchthon, whose utterances on the role of the human will in conversion and the nature of Christ’s presence in the Lord’s Supper have aroused most of the criticism directed against him. Elsewhere Green has demonstrated in more detail that at least the former question cannot be solved as simply as scholars such as F. Bente thought it could—if the relevant texts are studied as historical documents rather than seized as occasions for condemnation. And Green recognizes that Melanchthon’s anthropological focus led him to a point of view which invited a drift toward synergism.

But Green’s careful study reveals above all that Melanchthon’s assistance in understanding the Scriptures gave Luther indispensable linguistic and theological insights, without which he could not have completed his “evangelical breakthrough.” Green analyzes the development of Luther’s concepts of grace, faith, and justification, and demonstrates that in each case Melanchthon contributed significantly to the completion of Luther’s mature teaching. That does not mean that certain differences in perspective cannot be found in the writing of the reformers throughout their lives, but it does offer significant insight into the process by which Luther arrived at his understanding of Biblical teaching: through intense study of the Scriptures, aided by the best scholarship of his day.

This volume examines at length the question of Luther’s so-called “tower experience” and its dating. Green’s dissertation, when written in 1954, was among the first of what has grown to be a series of contemporary scholarly works which argue against an “early” dating for Luther’s coming to his reformationary insights. Since the turn of the century most Reformation scholars had agreed with those who found the critical turning point in Luther’s theological development at one point or another in
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his first Psalms lectures. He therefore rejects any specific dating for Luther’s arrival at his mature insights and instead is content with a careful rehearsal of the stages through which Luther traveled as he sought to proclaim the Biblical message faithfully.

Finally, Green also demonstrates that Luther’s doctrine of justification, multi-faceted as it was, did emphasize the imputation of Christ’s righteousness to the sinner. Though a concept of imputation can be found already in Luther’s earlier writings, he came to speak of the forensic justification of the sinner more frequently in his later years. Forensic justification is bound up inextricably in Luther’s thought with his theology of the Word and with prominent concepts such as “the joyous exchange” and *simul justus et peccator*. Green provides most helpful insights into the context of Luther’s view of justification with sketches of Melanchthon’s doctrine as well as treatments of justification in Brenz, in the Osiandrian controversy, and the Formula of Concord. In the midst of current unclarity over the doctrine of justification, particularly in Lutheran circles, Green’s lucid analysis of the Reformation understanding of this key Biblical theme could contribute to solving current problems.

This volume offers its readers a wide-ranging view of a series of critical questions regarding the development of the Reformation at Wittenberg and the heart of its theology. Not just professional historians but also interested Christians, both clergy and lay, will profit from reading Green’s analysis and exposition of these questions. For this volume brings Reformation insights out of the sixteenth century context and presents them in such a way that they may be used in our day.