

The Voice

of the Mennonite Brethren Bible College

VOL. X

MARCH - APRIL, 1961

No 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEVOTIONAL	
Gott der Vater, und das Kreuz	1
DENOMINATIONAL	
Christ's Challenge to Re-orientation and Restoration	3
The Principal Functions of a Board	7
MUSIC	
Music for Weddings	12
THEOLOGICAL	
Die Lehre von der Demut	13
CHRISTIAN EDUCATION	
Biography of Johann Amos Comenius	17
YOUR QUESTION	20
CHRISTIAN WORKER'S LIBRARY	
Illustrating the Sermon	22

Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of aruth. — 2 Tim.2:15.

THE VOICE

of the Mennonite Brethren Bible College

VOL. X

MARCH - APRIL, 1961

No 2

THE VOICE is the publication of the Mennonite Brethren Bible College, published bi-monthly in the interest of sound Christian teaching, and setting forth the doctrinal position of the institution. Printed by The Christian Press, Ltd., 159 Kelvin St., Winnipeg. Subscription price: \$1.00 per year. Send your subscription to:

THE VOICE, 77 Kelvin Street, Winnipeg 5, Man.

Editor: DAVID EWERT

No Articles May be Re-printed Without Permission.

Authorized as second class mail, Post Office Department, Ottawa.

Passion und Mission

“Also ist's geschrieben, und also mußte Christus leiden und auferstehen von den Toten am dritten Tage, und predigen lassen in seinem Namen Buße und Vergebung der Sünden unter allen Völkern und anheben zu Jerusalem” (Lukas 24, 46-47).

Der Evangelist Lukas verbindet in diesem Schriftwort die Passion des Heilandes mit der Weltmission. Vom Kreuze aus können wir nun den Heilspartikularismus des Alten Testaments verstehen, warum Gott aus den vielen Völkern ein Volk erwählte, um sich diesem Volk in Gnade und Gericht zu offenbaren. Vom Kreuze aus können wir nun auch sehen, daß Gott von Anfang an den Heilsuniversalismus als Ziel hatte. Von Golgatha kommt die Freudenbotschaft, daß uns alle Sünden vergeben sind in seinem Namen, aber Golgatha verbietet uns auch diesen geistlichen Schatz für uns zu behalten. “Nicht für unsere Sünden allein,” sagt Johannes, “sondern auch für die der ganzen Welt.” Es soll nun allen Völkern die Botschaft von der Vergebung gepredigt werden.

“Und anheben zu Jerusalem,” sagt der Evangelist. Dadurch soll nicht nur der geschichtliche Gang des Evangeliums angedeutet werden — von Jerusalem bis an das Ende der Erde, sondern, dadurch wird auch die Erfahrung eines jeden einzelnen Zeugen vorgebildet. Ein jeder muß in seinem Jerusalem anfangen. Es will dadurch aber vielleicht auch angedeutet werden, daß wenn die Heimatfront zu Jerusalem nicht befestigt wird, daß die Front in den ferneren Grenzen nicht stehen wird. Wenn wir zu Hause versagen, können wir nicht auf die Länge große Feldzüge im Auslande machen.

In der Stärkung der Heimatfront haben unsere Schulen einen bedeutenden Platz. Ohne Schulen können wir uns weder die innere noch die äußere Mission denken. Diese Tatsache verpflichtet auch unser College zu intensiver, treuer Arbeit. Wir dürfen nie zufrieden sein mit dem Schonerreichten. Das fordert Opfer von Studenten und Lehrern. Die Weltmission findet in der Passion Jesu ihren Grund, aber sie wird auch nur durch die Passion treuer Zeugen weitergeführt. Das fordert auch, daß Lehrer immer wieder neu schöpfen müssen. Aus dem Grund hat uns auch unser Präsident, Br. J. A. Toews, bis zur Mitte des Juni-

(Frotsetzung auf Umschlagseite 3)

DEVOTIONAL

Gott der Vater, und das Kreuz.

Das Verhältnis zwischen Gott dem Vater und Gott dem Sohn wird in der Heiligen Schrift als ein sehr intimes hingestellt. In der ganzen Bibel merkt man auch nicht die geringste Spannung in dem gegenseitigen Verhalten dieser Zwei. Vielmehr redet die Schrift von einer unzertrennlichen Einheit zwischen Vater und Sohn. Der Sohn hat nur ein Verlangen: “Meine Speise ist die, daß ich tue den Willen des, der mich gesandt hat, und vollende sein Werk” (Joh. 4, 34). Der Vater dagegen zeigt reges Interesse am Ergehen des Sohnes hier auf Erden. Bei der Taufe, als auch bei der Verklärung, schallt es von oben her: “Dies ist mein lieber Sohn an welchem ich Wohlgefallen habe.” Doch in dem Denken der Bibelleser bleibt dieses Verhältnis nicht frei von Spannungen.

Unsere menschliche Natur fragt: Hat Gott der Vater nicht etwas zu viel von seinem Sohn verlangt, daß er ans Kreuz gehen mußte? Es gibt Menschen die so weit gehen, daß sie den Vater als einen harten und fordernden Richter ansehen, und in dem Sohn einen dem Vater Unterordneten, der alles drangeben muß um dem Verlangen des Vaters Genüge zu tun. Selbst unter den Gläubigen will man das Kreuz, und die bitteren Leiden die damit verbunden sind, von dem Vater trennen, und sich nur in tiefer Dankbarkeit dem Sohne gegenüber für die Leiden ausdrücken. Man kommt unwillkürlich auf den Gedanken, daß der Vater mit dem Leiden am Kreuze eigentlich nichts zu tun hatte. Der Vater verlangte die Leiden; der Sohn allein hat gelitten. Da dürfe es wohl wertvoll sein, wenn wir uns mit dem Beantworten folgender Fragen beschäftigen würden:

1. Welchen Anteil hatte Gott der Vater an dem Werk, daß auf Golgatha für uns vollbracht wurde?

2. Wie beschaute der Sohn den Anteil des Vaters an dem Werk auf Golgatha?

3. Welche Schlußfolgerungen gehen

aus diesen Tatsachen hervor?

I. Welchen Anteil hatte Gott der Vater an dem großen Werk auf Golgatha, wo der Sohn die bitteren Leiden für unsere Sünden erduldet? Auf Golgatha hat Gott der Vater ja Gericht geübt über unsere Sünden. Unsere Sünden hatten den Tod verdient und nun mußte dieses Urteil vollstreckt werden. Da konnte sich Gott der Vater nicht gänzlich zurückziehen. Man mag schon von der Geißel der Römer, und von den Fäusten seiner Feinde reden, aber der Prophet sagt: “Aber der Herr wollte ihn also zerschlagen mit Krankheit” (Is. 53, 10). Und gehen wir zurück zum Psalmisten, so scheint er prophetisch zu sagen: “Du hast mich in die Grube hinunter gelegt, in die Finsternis und in die Tiefe” (Ps. 88, 7). Ja der Herr Jesus spricht noch weiter durch den Psalmisten zu seinem Vater, wenn er sagt: “Warum verstößt du Herr meine Seele, und verbirgst dein Antlitz von mir? Ich bin elend und ohnmächtig, daß ich so verstoßen bin; ich leide deine Schrecken, daß ich schier verzage. Dein Grim geht über mich; dein Schrecken drückt mich” (Ps. 88, 15-17). Jesus sagt, “Du legst mich in des Todes Staub” (Ps. 22, 16). Solche Stellen zeugen von einem sehr aktiven Anteil des Vaters an den Leiden des Sohnes am Kreuze. Jemand mag einwenden, daß dieses alt-testamentlich sei, doch im Neuen Testament ist die Sprache dieser ähnlich. Jesus selbst sagt im Blick auf das Kreuz, “Soll ich den Kelch nicht trinken, den mir mein Vater gegeben hat” (Joh. 18, 11). Von wem spricht der Herr Jesus, wenn er zu Pilatus sagt, “Du hättest keine Macht, wenn sie dir nicht wäre von oben herab gegeben?” (Joh. 19, 11). Pilatus noch die Juden hätten keine Macht gehabt, sie sei ihnen denn vom Vater gegeben. Sogar Paulus spricht von Gott, “Welcher auch seines eigenen Sohnes nicht hat verschont, sondern hat ihn für uns

alle dahingegeben" (Römer 8, 32). Die Ursache des Leidens am Kreuz lag in unserer Sünde. Die Durchführung dieser Leiden jedoch geht nicht von Gott dem Vater zu trennen. Er selbst erstreckte das Urteil unserer Sünden über seinen Sohn. "Was dem Gesetz unmöglich war (sintemal es durch das Fleisch geschwächt war), das tat Gott und sandte seinen Sohn in der Gestalt des sündlichen Fleisches und der Sünde halben und verdammt die Sünde im Fleisch" (Römer 8, 3).

Dies hat Gott selbst getan. Gott war in Christo und versöhnte die Welt mit ihm selber.

II. Wie stellte sich der Sohn zu diesem Anteil des Vaters an den Leiden auf Golgatha? Erkennen wir es schon aus der Heiligen Schrift, daß Gott der Vater das Gericht der Sünde an seinem Sohne ausübte, wieviel mehr muß sich Gottes Sohn dessen bewußt gewesen sein. Verursachte dieses die geringste Einstellung des Sohnes gegen den Vater? Im Gegenteil. Der Sohn nahm sie in tiefster Ergebenheit entgegen. Die Worte Jesu aus Gethsemane klingen uns ans Ohr, "Mein Vater, ist's möglich, so gehe dieser Kelch von mir. Doch nicht wie ich will, sondern wie du willst" (Matth. 26, 39). Paulus sagt uns, daß Jesus "erniedrigte sich selbst und ward gehorsam bis zum Tod, ja zum Tode am Kreuz" (Phil. 2, 8). Wem war er gehorsam gegenüber? Nicht dem Satan, noch menschlicher Macht, sondern dem, dessen Willen er so gerne tat. Gehorsam dem Vater! Diese seine Entschlossenheit dem Vater gehorsam zu leisten, strahlte dermaßen aus seinem Wesen heraus, daß sie eine bestimmte Einwirkung auf seine Jünger machte. "Sie waren aber auf dem Wege und gingen hinauf gen Jerusalem und Jesus ging vor ihnen. Sie entsetzten sich, folgten ihm nach und fürchteten sich." Mit solcher Entschlossenheit ging er der Aufgabe, die ihm sein Vater gestellt hatte entgegen. Ja der Herr Jesus ging diesen Leidensweg aus Liebe zum Vater. Wenn er sagt, "Aber auf daß die Welt erkenne, daß ich den Vater liebe und ich also tue wie mir der Vater geboten hat, stehet auf, und lasset uns von

dannen gehen" (Joh. 14, 31). So ging er dem Leidenswege entgegen. Den Willen des Vaters zu tun war für den Sohn die größte Befriedigung seines Herzens, "Meine Speise ist die, daß ich tue den Willen des, der mich gesandt hat, und vollende sein Werk" (Joh. 4, 34), und dieses sagte er in vollem Bewußtsein, daß der Kreuzesweg ihm bevorstand. Durch den Psalmisten sagt der Sohn zu dem Vater, "Deinen Willen mein Gott, tue ich gern" (Ps. 40, 9). In keinem Fall war der Sohn gezwungen sich dieser Leiden zu unterwerfen. Er erkannte in den Leiden beides, den Willen, wie auch die Hand, seines Vaters, und er duldet das Kreuz ohne Murren, oder Widerwillen. Das Kreuz brachte keine Spannung in das Verhältnis zwischen Gott den Vater und Gott den Sohn.

III. Welche Schlußfolgerungen gehen aus diesen Tatsachen hervor? Zuerst bedeutete das Kreuz gleichsam eine Verarmung des Vaterherzens. Paulus deutet dieses an wenn er sagt, "Welcher auch seines eignen Sohnes nicht hat verschonet, sondern hat ihn für uns alle dahin gegeben" (Röm. 8, 32). Am Kreuze gab Gott nicht aus seinem Überfluß, noch vom Minderwerten, sondern "Also hat Gott die Welt geliebt, daß er seinen eingebornen Sohn gab", und zwar gab er ihn in die Hände der Sünder. Gott hatte nicht mehr zu geben. Er gab sein Bestes und sein Letztes. Gerade in welcher Weise der ewige Gott an dem Geschehen am Kreuz teilnahm, können wir in menschlichen Worten nicht ausdrücken. Wir können nicht anders als an ein tiefes Mitleiden des Vaters mit seinem Sohne zu denken. Kann Mitleiden nicht sogar tiefer gehen als das Leiden selbst? Wer hat größere Schmerzen im Herzen, das fieberbehaftete Kind, oder die schluchzende Mutter, die neben dem Bette steht? Wessen Herz blutet mehr, das des jungen Verbrechers der vor dem Richter steht, oder des Vaters der im Gerichtssaal hören muß, wie sein Sohn von einer, und noch einer, Übeltat angeklagt wird? Wer will dann den Schmerz des himmlischen Vaters ermessen, als sein Sohn verlassen, durstig, verraten, ver-

leugnet, verspottet, mit Dornen gekrönt, am Kreuzesstamme starb?

Seine Möglichkeit den Sohn von den Leiden zu befreien stand ihm unwiderstehlich zur Verfügung. Warum hat er's nicht getan? Das Kreuz verrät die Liebe des Vaters der verlorne Menschheit gegenüber. All seine Allmacht wurde zurückgehalten. Sein blutendes Herz wandte sich gleichsam von seinem Geliebten, und sein Sohn erduldet die Höllenschmach, die unsere Sünde verursacht hatte. Können wir Gott den

Vater und das Kreuz trennen? Ist das Kreuz nur Erleben des Sohnes? War es Nebensache für den Vater? Nimmermehr! Am Kreuze vollzog der Vater das Urteil über die Sünde. Am Kreuz offenbarte sein Sohn ein gehorsames Herz. Am Kreuz muß Gottes Herz den tiefen Schmerz erfahren haben als er seinen Sohn im Leiden sah. Am Kreuz offenbarte Gott der Vater seine Liebe für die verlorene Welt.

J. J. Toews

DENOMINATIONAL

Christ's Challenge to Re-orientation and Restoration

(Continued from last issue)

From a re-examination of our concept of salvation we turn now to

II. A Re-Examination of our Concept of Separation

1. The Separation-Concept of the Early Brethren.

The religious controversy in the Mennonite Colonies of South Russia a century ago centered largely in conflicting views as to the true nature of the Church. The struggle of the early Brethren was a struggle for the "pure Church" — a Church that would be separated from a sinful and worldly society and devoted to God and his service.

This is evident from the "Document of Secession." The Brethren protest against the participation at the communion table of those, who are living in sin. In support of their conviction they quote such well-known passages as Matt. 6:24, II. Cor. 6:14-18 and Rev. 18:4. The Brethren apparently found little fault with the confession of faith of the existing Church; but they have sharp and pointed criticisms concerning

the life and ethic of the Mennonite Church of their day.

That the new movement was governed by ethical ideals and that the scriptural principles of separation were considered normative is also evident from the uncompromising position taken against the "false freedom" (as H. Huebert preferred to call it) movement. Those members who fell into sin were severely disciplined and in many cases excommunicated.

In general we note a return to the biblical and Anabaptist principles of discipleship. The doctrine and practice of nonconformity to the world, so dynamic in the early Anabaptist movement, experienced a genuine revival among the early members of the M.B. Church. The return to New Testament discipleship was closely linked with a return to the teachings of Menno Simons. In the Document of Secession the Brethren refer four times to specific teachings of Menno and they conclude their "Confession of Faith" with this significant statement: "In all other Articles of our Confession we are also in accord with Menno Simon." The em-

phasis on holiness and purity of life was one of the strongest influences in the growth of the Church in its earlier period.

2. The Separation-Concept under changing historical conditions.

In reviewing our history, I believe we will have to admit, that our doctrine of separation has often been conceived of in terms of isolation. This emphasis has given to separation from the world a static and perhaps even "dated" aspect. Our concept of separation was formulated to meet the problems of a rural agricultural community. Hence we have developed an ethic which I have sometimes defined as "Bauer-nethik." Since 1860 great changes have taken place—not only in the world, but also in our Brotherhood. These changes have a direct bearing on our concept of separation and nonconformity. Changing social, economic, cultural and political conditions demand a new formulation and expression of our scriptural principles. Let us consider some of the more important changes in our Brotherhood.

1) **Changes in Language.** During the first fifty years of our history the German language was used almost exclusively in our homes and churches. In North America there has been a gradual—and obviously a very rapid—transition from German to English during the past few decades. In South America the younger generation is beginning to adopt either the Spanish or the Portuguese as a popular medium of communication. What effects does this change have on our church-life?

The restraining influence of a language barrier does not any more exist. With the disappearance of this barrier we have not only lost our sheltered isolation, but in many cases also our emphasis on biblical separation. A new barrier, however has been erected between young and old by this transition from one language to another. Because of language difficulties, the positive influence of our older brethren on the youth of our church has largely been lost. In ethics this influence has

always acted as a brake on radical departures from tried and proven patterns of family and church life. This change in language also has a tendency to separate the present generation from our historic past. With no roots in the historic past of our Brotherhood, our young people easily fall prey to the various religious and theological movements to which they are exposed here in America. It is very unfortunate, that the loss of a spiritual heritage is often closely connected with language change. This problem puts a special responsibility upon the present leadership of our church.

2) **Changes in Vocation.** During the first 75 years of our history as an M.B. Church, our Brethren were mainly found in three occupations: farmers, teachers, and craftsmen (Handwerker). The "Bible and Plow" was the symbol of our faith. A code of ethics was developed which was definitely related to these professions. Woman's place was in the home as a rule—and there were few exceptions.

A study of our present-day churches and communities will reveal radical changes in the vocational pattern. Today our church members, both men and women, are found in all the professions of a modern industrial society. On the one hand the wider range of vocational opportunities is a great blessing, and they certainly present new avenues for an effective outreach and witness. On the other hand these new vocations constitute in many instances a grave threat to our family and church life. Our people are exposed to unprecedented temptations to compromise their faith and to conform to a secularized society. As a Brotherhood we have not kept pace with changing trends in our educational, cultural, and economic life. We have not provided proper guidance in the choice of a profession from the viewpoint of an effective Christian witness. We have failed to give to our young people principles of a Christian ethic which could guide them in their new professions. There is a great need for developing a "brotherhood ethic" in relation to such problems as membership in labor unions and political organiza-

tions, and in the matter of business practices. If these new vocations, into which our young people enter more and more, are to be effective channels for spreading the gospel, then these professions must be made truly "Christian" in principle and practice.

3) **Changes in Community Pattern.** In the early years of our history most of our church members lived in closed rural settlements. Here again we observe a rapidly changing pattern. Today a considerable part of our membership lives in large metropolitan areas, where the "community feeling" has been lost. If we include the churches in the larger towns, we have approximately one half of our members in Canada living in an urban environment.

With the three changes mentioned above, two constant threats to the spirituality of the church of Christ have received some new dimensions. One grave danger to our faith and life is materialism. Piety gives rise to prosperity, but then prosperity turns around and devours piety. In his book, **The Affluent Society** J. K. Galbraith points out that the problems of prosperity may be more difficult to solve than the problems of poverty. If this applies to the American people as a whole, it certainly applies in a special way to the churches of America, including the M.B. Church. Another grave danger is **secularism**. By various media such as education, the press, radio, and television the world makes its inroads into our families and churches. We notice an increasing involvement of many members "in the affairs of this life." Church history clearly teaches, however, that a growing influence in the world often has been connected with a waning influence in the Kingdom of God.

As we stand before God at this Centennial we hear the Saviour's call to separation: "Wherefore come ye out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord..." (II. Cor. 6:17). The church must be against the world to save the world. Do we still have the spiritual and moral courage to take a stand against worldliness, and to hold back the floodtides of materialism and

secularism? We have little difficulty after one hundred years to agree on basic doctrines of the Scriptures. Can we also take a united stand on fundamental principles of Christian ethics? Here is the chief battleground in our Brotherhood today.

III. A Re-Examination of our Concept of Scripture-Authority

1. The Concept of our Early Brethren

The revival of 1860 was to a large extent a revival of the authority of the Scriptures for Christian faith and life. In this respect the Brethren returned to the position of Menno and the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century. The Bible, and especially the New Testament, became for them the final court of appeal in all matters of doctrine and practice. This is evident from the following:

1) Their defense against the accusations of the elders. In the Document of Secession as well as in their correspondence with the elders the Brethren quote scripture in support of every argument which they present. There is a strange absence of scripture quotations in the letters and documents that were presented by the "Kirchenkonvent," whether addressed to the "Gebietsamt" or to the Brethren.

2) Their victory over the hyper-emotional Movement (Fröhliche Richtung). Daniel Fast, who became the spokesman for the large positive element in the M.B. Church early in 1865, refutes the wrong practices of the fanatical brethren with arguments from Scripture on the basis of a sound exegesis. This can also be said of the "June Protocol" of 1865, which clearly established the scriptural basis for church action and church discipline.

3) Their Confession of Faith. That the brethren respected the Word of God as the ultimate authority is evident from their confession of faith. This confession, which we have kept with some modifications to the present day, is rather unique in that biblical terms, rather than dogmatic formulations, are used to express the fundamentals of our faith.

The early M.B. Church could well be called a "Congregation of radical Bible readers" as C. A. Cornelius describes the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century. Their whole theology was characterized by a "Radical Biblicism." The Word of God was applied to all areas of life. "Bibelstunden" were very popular among our early Brethren and biblical teaching was the subject of their conversation whenever they met. They read the Scriptures as true disciples—to be believed and obeyed!

2. Theological Movements that pose a threat to our concept of Scripture-Authority.

Interdenominational movements and theological institutions of Pedo-baptist and Baptist denominations in which many of our young men have studied have during the last 30 years seriously weakened the "naive" Biblicism of our forefathers. Theological systems are often the greatest threat to Scripture-Authority. Our theological views of God and man have been influenced to a greater or lesser degree by the following:

1) Hyper-Calvinism. Extreme Calvinism has emphasized the sovereignty of God at the expense of human freedom. It has preached the promises of God but neglected the warnings of Scripture. It has exalted God's grace in salvation and preservation, but has failed to point out man's responsibility. A dangerous complacency, and a spiritual indifference have often been the results of such influence.

2) Hyper - Fundamentalism. This movement of protest against liberalism in theology has been built on premises which are too narrow. A rather arbitrary selection of biblical fundamentals has been incorporated in a "confession of faith" which is the standard of orthodoxy. "Fundamentalism" is a term which has been related almost exclusively to doctrine, rather than to ethics. Thus it often happens, that those who hold to "fundamentalism" in doctrine, are often very "liberal" in Christian ethics. This "lop-sidedness" of Fundamentalism has also had its harmful

effects in our circles. Carl F. Henry's book, *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*, is an attempt to correct this wrong emphasis.

3) Hyper - Dispensationalism. This teaching also threatens our concept of Scripture-Authority, in that it advocates a dissection of Scripture which destroys the essential unity of redemptive history. Especially dangerous is its abdication of responsibility for the evangelization of the World. By an ingenious method of Scripture interpretation the missionary responsibility of the Church is delegated to the Jews during Christ's millennial reign. Certain portions of the New Testament are assigned to the Jews, as for instance the Sermon on the Mount, the epistle to the Hebrews, and other parts that cannot be fitted into the "system." Such Scripture interpretation was foreign to the early Anabaptists as well as to our forefathers, and it is certainly contrary to the scriptural principle of "rightly handling the word of truth" (II. Tim. 2:15).

As we re-examine our concepts of salvation, separation and scripture-authority at this Centennial Conference, we hear our Saviour's call to repentance: "Remember therefore how thou hast received and heard." If we want to remain a New Testament Church we must return to the Bible as the supreme authority for faith and practice. If our Brotherhood is to radiate the purity and power of the Holy Spirit in life and service, then we must return to the Biblicism of our fathers. We must find the answers to all questions of 1960 in the Word of God, as the early Brethren found them for the questions of 1860. In his efforts to lead his disobedient people back to God, the prophet Jeremiah extends this loving call to them in Jer. 22:29: "O earth, earth, earth, hear the Word of the Lord." Today we would like to paraphrase this call, as we appeal to our whole Brotherhood: O Brotherhood, Brotherhood, Brotherhood, hear the word of the Lord! May the Lord's call to repentance and restoration find a positive response in all of our hearts.

J. A. Toews

The Principal Functions of a Board

As a group expands in terms of numbers and functions, it becomes necessary to delegate certain responsibilities to smaller groups chosen, of course, from the larger fellowship. These smaller units of administration have then been charged with the responsibility of supervision in the best interests of the total fellowship. The work has never been transferred to the smaller group; it is not their work. The change has occurred for administrative purposes only.

In our Mennonite Brethren fellowship we have experienced this phenomenon of administration. When we numbered eighteen or twenty-five members, there was no need for a committee or a board. The entire fellowship was in a position to discuss and supervise all the activities of the group. Then time brought with it numerical growth and an expansion of service possibilities. No longer was it possible to discuss all the details of the program of the church with the entire brotherhood and so committees and boards appeared.

Someone has suggested a committee to end all committees. This would probably also end our fellowship in service in that it would make collective service impossible. Since committees must be, it is so important that brethren understand the functions of a committee. To be a committee member brings with it many duties and responsibilities often accepted too superficially by members. To be a member of a board or committee involves more than a free trip to the conference.

This article is written from a more academic, technical point of view. I think we must face the facts squarely and thus build upon a solid administrative basis. If brother Smith allows his name to stand as a candidate for a board position, he should know what is commonly expected of board members. He should know that there are four major functions of boards and that he must be aware of these as an individual member.

I. Policy Determination

A policy, in the sense used in this paper, is a definite course of action adopted by a board of directors. It defines what shall be done, what purposes shall be pursued, what principles shall govern, what program shall be followed, what financial practices shall operate, what the personnel practices shall be, and what courses of action shall be taken. Policies are absolutely necessary for the effective operation of a work since they are the guides to everybody in the organization.¹

There is a significant difference between policy and day-by-day operating decisions. Most of the decisions made from day to day by staff and administrators represent policy in action. Lack of policy burdens staff and operation with many repetitive decisions. Policy-making includes the clarification of long- and short-range objectives.

That the functions of a board lie in the area of policy-making rather than management is generally accepted by church and school people. The Association of American School Administrators in the 1952 *Yearbook on the Superintendency* declares that, "a century of experience was required for board members generally to see the dividing line between policy and management and to accept the larger policy-making aspects of their responsibilities." However, these same people go on to say that, "the same century of experience was necessary to orient the superintendents to the larger implications of school administration and his relationship to the board of education."²

Good administrative procedure makes board action responsible for the validity of policies. In all its policy-making actions, the board of a church-related project must be governed by the constitution and the confession of faith of the church it represents. This, says Pittenger, is the board's most frequent regular duty, arising in some form at nearly every meeting. "In a sense, legislation covers nearly every duty and

function of the board, most of the other duties being special forms or situations in which this activity arises."³

The American School Board Journal issued a special creed for school board members in which the following was included: "I will deal in terms of general educational patterns." Furthermore, "I will function in meeting the legal responsibility that is mine, as a part of a legislative policy-making body—not as an administrative officer."⁴

In order to be competent to legislate policies each member of the board should make some study of his job. Each member is elected by his fellow church-members to serve as representative for them in the work which they have developed. He is expected to have integrity, intelligence, and high purpose. He is expected to make decisions which will result in good for the constituency. If he is to do these things, the board members cannot be ignorant of the affairs directly related to his work. He must know what has been proven to be good practise in his work. He must know how to direct highly trained persons by wisely drawn policies. To do this he must in some measure at least understand their work. He must understand ways of making board membership an effective and desirable force for good in the church.⁵

Since all policies must be in line with the thinking of the constituency it becomes the duty of each board member to discover what the community thinks about and expects from its institutions or service agencies. To accomplish this, a good board will use the staff as a source of information and advice. As Mark Jones puts it, "the professional may be and should be consulted during the stage represented by policy forming, but he should have no direct part in or responsibility for the final determination of policy."⁶ This simply means that **no employee of the board is a member of the board**, nor is he a **determining** factor in policy-making. Policies are made in the best interest of the work and the constituency.

The policies which are determined will always be in line with certain goals and objectives. In order to make pol-

icies adequate and functional, the board must re-define its goals continuously after careful study, and keep the whole community aware of the improved goals. As indicated, this involves two principles, that the business of evaluation must be continuous, and that institutions or service agencies must work diligently to keep their constituency aware of what is taking place.⁷ A board can get too far ahead of its constituency and thus be accused of autocratic dealings. On the other hand, a board can be behind the times and thus render itself ineffective in terms of leadership.

Policy determination, then, would be the major function of the board. By virtue of this function they control the institution or the service agency. So important is their task that Charles Thwing lists as the foremost quality of a good trustee "intellectual comprehensiveness." This, he says, stands "not only for intellectual breadth but also for intellectual height and depth. It embodies the cubical relations of the mind."⁸ Closely related to this trait, says Thwing, is "institutional mindness."

II. Supervision of Policy Execution

Actually, policy **determination** is the responsibility of the board alone. This derives from the board's legal status and its relationship to the church or constituency. However, policy execution is the responsibility of the executive officer and his staff. Once policies are established, it is the task of the professional to see that they are carried out. It is the task of the board to hold the chief executive, president, house-father, field-director, responsible for the carrying out of legislated policies and actually supervises the carrying-out through the chief administrator.

Since members of boards are usually non-professionals who ordinarily devote only a portion of their time to church matters, some delegation of power is inevitable. This delegation of power creates the hierarchical pattern of organization that is practically universal among American institutions and ser-

vice agencies. The usual plan provides for a staff responsible to an administrator, who, in turn, is responsible to the governing board.

Boards should legislate and administrators should execute. In accordance with this concept, says Beck, the burden of the school administration, for example, is cared for by the president or principal, the deans and various other members of the school staff.⁹

In order to have its policies administered effectively the board is responsible both for the selection of the chief administrator and for his retention in office. Through the type and quality of administrator chosen, they are in a position to influence the entire outlook, trend, and tenor of the institution or agency.¹⁰

The power to select the administrator is a power frequently exercised, for the turnover of administrators is high. Archie M. Palmer states that few college presidents remain in office for more than 8 or 10 years. The average term of office is about 5 years.¹¹ In analyzing the rapid turnover of topflight administrators, Palmer points out that "conflicts between the administrator and his board of trustees over fundamental administrative policies and practices are not infrequently found to be contributing factors." He goes on to say that "these conflicts in most instances are caused by the absence of a clear-cut definition and the interference of conscientious but overzealous trustees in administrative matters belonging within the province of the executive office."¹²

A good board member defines the task of the administrator by establishing special criteria, particularly when a new executive is chosen. There have been various attempts made to distinguish between the work of the board and that of the administrator. Such attempts usually result in an enumeration of the duties of each. A better approach seems to be the one suggested by Hagman¹³ who states that the duties of the administrator and the board could be clearly defined by simply indicating under which circumstances the board will abandon its customary

role as a **policy-making** body and assume **executive** functions. For example, a board might want to assume executive functions in such matters as:

- 1) the selection of an administrator,
- 2) the selection and purchase of school property, and
- 3) the selection of an architect and of building plans.

Executive functions not specifically reserved by a board would be expected to devolve upon the administrator.¹⁴ Again, much time can be saved and many misunderstandings prevented if each board will adopt written regulations governing its own conduct. They should surely include a statement of the executive functions assumed by the board.

There might be a question as to how a board may know which administrative functions it should retain and which it should delegate to the administrator. Although such a question cannot be answered adequately by a general statement, the board should base its assignment of duties upon two considerations, according to Hagman: 1) the resources of its own membership; 2) the ways by which it can best use the abilities of the administrator. Administration is a cooperative enterprise of the board and the professional staff.¹⁵

Using the school situation as an example, I would refer again to the creed which was published for school board members. The following statements referring to the work of the administrator adopted by board members are significant:

I will hold the superintendent of schools responsible for the administration of the schools.

I will give the superintendent of schools authority commensurate with his responsibilities.

I will expect the school to be administered by the best trained technical and professional people it is possible to procure.

I will elect employees only on the recommendations of the superintendent.

I will participate in board legislation

only after considering the recommendations of the superintendent and only after he has furnished complete information supporting his recommendations.

I will expect the superintendent of schools to keep the board of education adequately informed at all times through both oral and written reports.

I will expect to spend more times in board meetings on educational problems and procedures than on business detail.¹⁶

In order to supervise the enacting of its accepted policies the board can discharge its responsibilities most efficiently by:

- 1) retaining control over the making of general policies and the authorization of the large activities of the work.
- 2) placing responsibility upon the administration for the carrying out of the details of management, the implementing of general board policies, supervision of the work, and general institutional leadership.
- 3) requiring full report and appraisal of the carrying out of its delegated duties;
- 4) using its leadership to the fullest degree in institutional activity and by subordinating all other activities of the program to the promotion of the service for which the work was organized.
- 5) insisting that trained administration handle executive detail.¹⁷

III. Financial Responsibility

One of the large responsibilities of the board is to make certain that finances are properly administered. This involves seeing that sufficient revenue is obtained, that funds are spent without waste, and that accounting and auditing are sufficient.

Church boards cannot compare their task of providing funds with that of industry or the public schools. The latter boards are subject to rather stringent external limitations and controls. State laws and regulations tend to be detailed and specific and voters of the district or corporation members

very commonly have direct powers to control in addition to the indirect ones exerted on election days. The board governing a church-related work has very often more freedom in the soliciting of funds but usually must work much harder and be more ingenious in order to obtain sufficient funds.

Boards cannot continuously spend more money than they receive. However, the object of all expenditure is service and, therefore, the efficiency of a board's financial management can be truly measured **only by the amount and quality of the services** that are provided at a given cost. The danger exists that a board in planning its budget considers first its revenue, then its expenditure, and finally decides what service plan it can afford to adopt in the light of available funds. Very seldom does such a plan create additional drive to procure more finances to insure greater progress in the work. The proper procedure would be to set up the service plan which meets the needs of the constituency. To do this much planning and thought will go into the preparation and various groups will be consulted to ascertain that the needs of the constituency have been taken into account. When such a plan has been completed, the board calculates the total amount of expenditure that the plan will call for. Then follows the task of attaining that much revenue to meet the expenses. The latter plan would motivate the board to work at its best to meet the demands of its accepted plan for the adequate carrying out of its service functions.

In periods of rising costs, a board faces a financial stringency. In such a situation Sorenson suggests three courses of action:

- 1) Make all possible and reasonable economies. Here the board depends upon the creativity of the executive, who is close to the everyday operations.
- 2) See that all obtainable monies are secured. Fees and charges should be re-examined. Planning of special drives would be the rule.
- 3) If these steps do not balance the budget, curtail expenses, starting on

items which contribute least to direct service.¹⁸

IV. Good Business Procedures

Much could be said about a board member's duty to maintain good business procedure while serving his constituency as their representative. Several things would be very pertinent because they are often forgotten.

A board is a board only when it is in session. As a board member, he is, individually, nothing but a church member. There is no board except in meetings duly called and convened, and then only after roll-call and before adjournment. Not even in board meetings has a member any authority, he has only his voice and his vote. The control of the work is in the vote. The resolutions that are **regularly adopted** govern the work.¹⁹ Every church or conference must guard against possible "power methods" exerted by certain influential people. Board members may convince and persuade but never coerce.

Legally, then, the board member has no authority outside of session of the board except when such authority has been delegated to him by the board. Much trouble can be saved the board, if the individual members will confine their exercise of prerogatives to board sessions. Board members must be careful not to appear to commit the board to any stand in **private or public statement** which the board as a whole might be unwilling to take. No one person ever speaks for the entire board.

It is equally important that members should avoid interfering with efficient operations of the work they represent. Their interest, suggestions, and helpfulness should be freely given but in a manner that does not appear dictatorial or does not cut across lines of authority and responsibility. It is very important that individual board members do not attempt to supervise the executive administratively. Full accounting for his actions and his management should be made in board meetings, and critical questions are not out of order there. Not only should each member have the right to ask of the administrator con-

cerning any matter about which he might wish to know, but also any interested church member should be permitted to ask **through proper channels.**²⁰

If good procedures are to be followed during a board session, a properly prepared agenda should be in the hands of each member. The member should have been informed in advance of the items which are to be discussed at the next session. The agenda could have the same pattern from meeting to meeting and the following might be a suggestion:

- 1) General Information — News which would be of interest and is needed for an adequate picture of the work.
- 2) Problems needing Board Action —
- 3) Needs of the work —
- 4) Financial Matters —

Board members should be reminded as often as is necessary that professional decorum is essential in a session. Board sessions may not degenerate into a discussion group or a social meeting. Board meetings are called for the exercise of corporate responsibilities.

Conclusion: Paul's admonition in 1 Cor. 14:40 would certainly be in place here: "Let everything be done decently and in order." Order comes when all understand their function, when lines of responsibilities are clear and in keeping with the work to be done, and when all realize that organization does not exist for its own sake but for the sake of the service to be rendered. As in other areas of Christian service, it is so important to be able to forget oneself, not to be inflated with the importance of oneself as a member of a board, but to have the humble mind of a servant.

F. C. Peters

¹Roy Sorenson, *The Art of Board Membership* (New York: Association Press, 1950), p. 29.

²Alex Jardine, "School Boards Administer Responsibilities," *American School Board Journal*, 129 (Aug., 1953), p. 17.

³B. J. Pittenger, *Local Public School Administration* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951), p. 78.

⁴ "A Creed for School Board Members," 127 (July, 1953), 19.

⁵ Harlan L. Hagman, *A Handbook for School Board Members*, (Topeka: School Activities Publishing Co., 1941), p. 3.

⁶ Mark M. Jones, "The Place of the Layman in Public Education," *Vital Speeches*, 7 (Mar 15, 1941), 334.

⁷ Alex Jardine, "How Boards Evaluate Themselves," *American School Board Journal*, 128 (Feb. 1954), 40.

⁸ Charles F. Thwing, "Some Qualities of a Good College Trustee," *School and Society*, 40, (Aug. 4, 1934), 38.

⁹ Hugh Park Beck, *Men Who Control Our Universities* (New York: Kings Crown Press, 1947), p. 31.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

¹¹ "The College Presidency Under Scrutiny," *School and Society*, 36 (Aug. 1936), 230.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 231.

¹³ Hagman, *Op. Cit.*, p. 21.

¹⁴ *Loc. Cit.*

¹⁵ Hagman, *Op. Cit.*, p. 122.

¹⁶ "A Creed for Board Members," *Op. Cit.*, p. 19.

¹⁷ Hagman, *Op. Cit.*, p. 119.

¹⁸ Sorenson, *Op. Cit.*, p. 41.

¹⁹ W. N. Anderson, *A Manual for School Officers* (New York: The Century Co., 1925), p. 37.

²⁰ Albert J. Huggett, *Practical School Administration* (Champaign: The Garrard Press, 1950), p. 67.

MUSIC

Music For Weddings

Now that the spring season is upon us once more it may not be out of place to discuss the matter of finding suitable music for the weddings that are sure to follow. It has become somewhat of a custom to have the bridal party choose most of the music for the occasion — why this is so is not immediately clear. For other services the choir leader and the minister or church leader choose the music. There is nothing wrong with having the bridal couple request certain musical selections, should they have a preference, but what should one do if their choice of music is most unwise — as it so often is? Is there not some acceptable standard that one could expect all wedding music to meet? Surely it is not necessary to have to listen to so-called wedding music such as "Because", "I Love You Truly", or "Still wie die Nacht."

One of the reasons why the music at weddings is not always acceptable is that the wrong people make the choices. Somehow people seem to have the general impression that weddings are

planned by the families concerned, or more specifically, by the bridal couple. I think this is erroneous. One of the reasons why weddings frequently have a strong secular or worldly spirit is that the whole thing has been conceived from the wrong point of view. The wedding ceremony is to be a *service* — and the bride is not the most important part of that service. It is important that the minister clarify this point with the bridal couple and the families concerned. The marriage ceremony is a spiritual ceremony, whose center is Christ.

Many of our weddings are worldly in spirit because we have modelled them on the traditional wedding ceremonies of the world. It is true that most weddings take place in a church, but that in itself does not make them properly spiritual. Why do so many people feel that they are not really married unless they come in to Wagner's "Bridal Chorus" from his opera *Lohengrin*? Why is it necessary to have a march at all? Marches are for soldiers. Certainly

the flavour of such music is definitely non-Christian. The minister and the organist (or pianist) are in a much better position than the bride to choose proper music. Furthermore, the "Bridal Chorus" has become so trite with constant use that it is completely worn out — and it wasn't very good music in the first place.

One of the more objectionable features during the marriage ceremony is, frequently, the solo. The trouble usually consists in the fact that the bride wants her favourite tunes, and they are more likely than not to be sentimental ones, completely irrelevant to the service. The lovesong type of ballad should be completely taboo, as well. A song at a wedding should be about the love of God for mankind or for the church, not about the love of one man for a girl. Nor should the solo place the singer in the limelight — as for instance, the setting by Malotte of "The Lord's Prayer" does. A basic requirement of all good religious music is its impersonality.

It is true that there is a lack of good music for weddings, but there are suitable selections nevertheless. Songs such as "Praise My Soul the King of Heaven," "The King of Love My Shepherd Is" (Thiman), Bach's "My Heart Ever Faithful," or "O Perfect Love, All Human Thoughts Transcending," are

among many that are suitable to the occasion. Why is it necessary to have something "special" when a suitable hymn is all that may be required?

As Mennonites we can make use of a number of songs in the German language which are well-suited for the occasion. Some very fine music for choir is available, but it is becoming increasingly more difficult to have the choir sing at the wedding service. In any case, the minister and the organist should decide on definite standards to be met by all requests for special music for the wedding service, and should not hesitate to carry their decision through.

It is time something were done about this whole matter. Perhaps a united effort could be made at once — no year could be more suitable than the first year after our Centennial. Let us make a new beginning. We are not alone in this problem; I was stimulated to write this article after re-reading an article along similar lines published in the *Free Press* entitled "Here Comes the Bride and There Goes The Organist." If we are not satisfied with the form of our wedding ceremonies or the music accompanying them surely we can take proper steps to rectify matters. It is time to bring this whole ceremony back to biblical principles wherever it has been allowed to stray from them.

Peter Klassen.

THEOLOGICAL

Die Lehre von der Demut

Die Lehre von der Demut erhält in der Predigt Jesu und der Apostellehre nähere Prägung und wahren Inhalt. Das Heil in Christo kommt in solch einer Weise zu uns "daß sich vor Gott kein Fleisch rühme" (1. Kor. 1, 29). Nicht durch Machtoffenbarungen, wie es die Apokalyptiker sich dachten, sondern durch Erniedrigung, Leiden und Tod, rettet Gott die Welt. Das ist das

"Ärgernis" des Kreuzes, daß die Erlösung in Christo alle menschlichen Größen abbaut.

Für die Gläubigen aller Zeiten bleibt das Beispiel Jesu in seiner großen Erniedrigung feste Norm, und auch Ansporn, dem Herrn in seiner Demut zu folgen. Es darf uns daher auch nicht zu wundern, wenn die neutestamentliche Verkündigung stark am Gerüst

der heidnischen Tugendlehre rüttelt.

Die Demut als Tugend ist der antiken Ethik fremd. Erst das Christentum hat die Demut zu Ehren gebracht. Im Neuen Testament ist Demut nicht nur eine Tugend, sondern gleichsam ein Juwelnkästchen, worin alle andern Tugenden enthalten sind. Daher tun wir wohl, wenn wir uns ernstlich über die Lehre von der Demut besinnen. Der Begriff "Demut" wird für uns verständlicher wenn wir in die nichtchristliche Umwelt schauen um zu sehen was Demut da bedeutete.

1. Die Demut im nichtchristlichen Denken.

Hätte das Christentum nach den Grundbegriffen griechischen Geisteslebens, und griechischer Weltanschauung, reden müssen, dann wäre die "Demut" in Unehre stecken geblieben. Denn, im weltlichen Griechisch wird das Wort "Demut" (*tapeinos*) sehr häufig im sittlich-verwerflichen Sinne gebraucht, also in der Bedeutung "kriechend, servil, niedrig, gemein." "Niemals verbindet sich mit den Wörtern *tapeinos*, *humilis* und ihren Derivaten, ein positives Urteil über eine bescheidene, angemessene Haltung des Menschen als sittliche Persönlichkeit" (A. Dihle, *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*). Damit soll nicht gesagt sein, daß die Antike keine ehrfurchtsvolle Selbstbescheidung kannte, aber sie kannte nur die Demut, welche aus der Erkenntnis der eigenen Schwäche und Fehlerhaftigkeit kommt.

Aber das bedeutet letztlich nichts als die eigenen Grenzen erkannt zu haben, und solche Demut ist der neutestamentlichen Lehre noch weit entfernt. Im Allgemeinen verschmähten Griechen und Römer grundsätzlich jede Haltung oder Gebärde die zu einer Minderung der Persönlichkeit führt. Die vorchristliche Literatur betont die hohe Würde des Menschen, und die Wertschätzung für den Nächsten. Wo solche zu finden war, kam sie aus dem Bewußtsein des eigenen Wertes.

Der biblische Sprachgebrauch kennt die verächtliche Bedeutung des Begriffs "Demut" nicht. Vielmehr wird der Begriff zur Bezeichnung der edelsten und

notwendigsten aller Tugenden erhoben. Hier hat das Urchristentum wieder — wie so oft — in der Wortbildung eine große, begriffsschaffende Kraft gezeigt.

2. Die Demut im hebräischen Denken.

Die göttliche Offenbarung schuf einen neuen Boden auf dem die Lehre von der Demut zu Ehren kommen konnte. Die Anfänge für die neutestamentliche Lehre von der Demut finden wir im Alten Testament. Das "Jahwe", der Gott der Elenden und Armen ist, ist dem ganzen Alten Testament geläufig. Dabei darf nicht übersehen werden, daß Gott den Seinen auch Wohlstand und Ansehen verschafft. Armut kann sogar ein Zeichen dafür sein, daß Gott sein Angesicht von den Seinen gewandt hat. Aber das "Armsein" erfährt eine Verinnerlichung, und das "Kleinsein" vor Gott wird laut manchen Aussagen des Alten Testamentes die einzige legitime Haltung des Menschen, ganz getrennt von äußerer Armut und Niedrigkeit (z.B. Jes. 57:15). Jedoch in der späteren Geschichte Israels zeigte sich der Adel, die Reichen und Mächtigen, besonders fremden Kultureinflüssen zugänglich, während die Frommen vielfach unter den Armen in Israel zu finden waren. So kommt es dazu, daß "armsein" und "frommsein" fast identisch sind. Der Unterdrückte, der Niedrige, dem alle Hoffnung für diese Welt genommen worden ist, und der nur noch den Blick nach oben gehalten hat, ist der Fromme. Als Jesus die selig pries, welche arm im Geiste waren, bediente er sich wohl der Sprache der jüdischen Frömmigkeit, aber er zog eine klare Linie zwischen äußerer Armut und der Armut des Herzens, welche zum Vertrauen auf Gott und seine Gnade führt.

3. Die Demut im neutestamentlichen Wortschatz.

A. Der Gebrauch von Demut und Derivaten. Im engeren Sinn wird "Demut" im Neuen Testament durch *tapeinos* (niedrig, gering, armselig, unbedeutend) und seinen Verwandten dargestellt. Das Eigenschaftswort *tapeinos* kommt im Neuen Testament 8 mal vor. Das Dingwort *tapeinophrosyne* (zusam-

mengesetzt aus *tapeinos* — niedrig, und *phren* — Gesinnung) erscheint 7 mal und wird fast ausschließlich von Paulus gebraucht. Ein anderes Dingwort *tapeinosos* (Erniedrigtwerden, Erniedrigung) erscheint 4 mal. Das Zeitwort *tapeinoun* (niedrig machen, erniedrigen, klein machen, demütig machen) kommt 11 mal vor.

Im Allgemeinen dürfte von dem neutestamentlichen Wortschatz für Demut gesagt werden, daß die einzelnen Begriffe im positiven Sinn gebraucht werden. Im Gegensatz zum Gebrauch dieses Wortschatzes in der nichtchristlichen Literatur, trägt der Wortschatz für Demut im Neuen Testament einen edlen Charakter. Vornehmlich geht es ja bei der Demut um einen religiös-sittlichen Begriff.

B. Demut und sinnverwandte Wörter. Es muß noch hinzugefügt werden das *tapeinos* und seine Derivaten den neutestamentlichen Wortschatz für die Lehre von der Demut nicht erschöpfen. Sehr enge verbunden mit Demut ist *praus*, *prautes* (Sanftmut). Hier gilt es zu beachten was Barclay sagt: "One of the best ways of discovering the real meaning of any word is to examine the company it keeps. A word's meaning, and its inward flavor, will best be found by examining the words in whose company it is usually found" (*A New Testament Word Book*). Im Profangriechischen bezeichnete Sanftmut das was das Gefühl sanft und wohlthuend berührte. Von Dingen sagte man, daß sie mild, lindernd, besänftigend waren; von Tieren, daß sie zutraulich waren; von Personen, daß sie freundlich, sanftmütig, wohlwollend, leutselig waren. Sanftmut war die freundliche Gelassenheit, die sich nicht erbitterte. Sie zeichnete den Hoch- und Edelgesinnten aus und war im hohen Rang als soziale Tugend (s. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch*). Dieses Wort brauchte nicht, wie "Demut", ganz neu geformt werden um in der göttlichen Offenbarung einen Platz zu gewinnen, aber auch die Sanftmut mußte aus dem Rahmen der Tugendlehre herausgehoben werden und auf ein neues Fundament — Gottes Gnadenwerk am Menschen — gebracht werden (s. Trench, *Synonyms*).

In der Septuaginta (Gr. Übersetzung des Alten Testaments) wird "Sanftmut" oft für den gebraucht, der sich in einem verkümmerten Zustand befindet. Aber nicht nur in diesem wirtschaftlich-soziologischen Sinn wird es gebraucht, sondern auch im religiösen Sinn. Die sich Gott unterordnen, und geduldig ihr Schicksal tragen, sind wirklich sanftmütig — fromm. Schließlich hat nur der Sanftmütige Gottes Verheißungen auf seiner Seite.

Der Heiland knüpft in seinen Seligpreisungen hier an und verheißt den Sanftmütigen, die sich unter Gottes Willen beugen, das Land — Inbegriff aller messianischen Segnungen (Matth. 5, 5; vgl. Ps. 37, 9). Auch Jesu Leben wird gekennzeichnet durch Sanftmut (Matth. 11, 29), und dadurch schon wird die Sanftmut aus der griechisch-römischen Tugendlehre herausgehoben, und wurzelt fortan in Jesu Werk. So ist Sanftmut, laut Pauli Lehre (Gal. 5, 22), eine Gabe des Geistes.

Sanftmut und Demut erscheinen immer wieder als Wortpaar (z.B. Matth. 11, 29; Kol. 3, 12; Eph. 4, 2). Nur der Demütige kann wirklich sanft sein. Im demütigen Bewußtsein der eigenen Unzulänglichkeit ist es möglich dem Irrenen zu helfen mit "sanftmütigem Geist" (Gal. 6:1). Tief gebeugt müssen wir an das Dunkel unserer Vergangenheit denken (Tit. 3, 2), und dadurch bekommen wir den Ansporn gegen die Gottlosen sanftmütig zu sein. Der Sanftmütige ist der, welcher ohne Widerstreben den untersten Weg geht. Das kann er aber nur dann, wenn er recht demütig ist.

Auch ist die Demut mit Lindigkeit (*epieikeia*) verwandt. Das Eigenschaftswort (*epieikes*) kommt nur 5 mal vor (Phil. 4, 5; 1. Tim. 3, 3; Tit. 3, 2; Jak. 3, 17; 1. Pet. 2, 18); das Dingwort 2 mal (Apg. 24, 4; 2. Kor. 10, 1). Bei der Lindigkeit geht es um die Nachgibigkeit, die Milde, die nicht unter allen Umständen auf ihre Rechte besteht. Nur der Demütige kann es sich erlauben auf die Verteidigung seiner Rechte und seiner Würde zu verzichten, denn "der Herr ist nahe" (Phil. 4, 5).

Dieser neutestamentliche Wortschatz für Demut erhält seinen Inhalt und sei-

ne Tiefe aus dem Beispiel und der Lehre Jesu, unseres Heilandes.

4. Die Demut im Leben Jesu.

A. Sein Beispiel. — Jesus hat nicht nur die Demut gelehrt, sondern er ist auch den Weg der Demut gegangen. Schon seine Geburt will uns die Nichtigkeit und Schändlichkeit alles menschlichen Größenwahns lehren. Aber auch sein Leben war ein Leben in der Demut. Wir denken da an seine völlige Anspruchslosigkeit, trotz seiner messianischen Sendung. Er hatte stets einen Blick für das "Kleine" — denken wir nur an seine Einstellung zu den Kindern. Er verstieß nie das Niedrige — wir erinnern an das samaritanische Weib, Levi, Zachäus, u.a.m. Seine Demut trat besonders in seiner Dienstbereitschaft hervor, denn Demut ist nicht nur ein Geringsein vor Gott, sondern zeigt sich auch in der Uneigennützigkeit dem Nächsten gegenüber. Noch am Schlusse seines Lebens gab Jesus seinen Jüngern in der Fußwaschung ein hervorragendes Beispiel seiner Demut. In seiner Passion stieg er zu den tiefsten Stufen der Demut hinab. "Er erniedrigte sich selbst und war gehorsam bis zum Tode, ja zum Tode am Kreuz" (Phil. 2, 8).

B. Seine Lehre. — Hier muß erstens auf Jesu Aussagen über seine eigene Demut hingewiesen werden. Als sündige Menschen sind wir geneigt die Echtheit der Demut, die von sich selber spricht, zu bezweifeln. Ganz anders ist es wenn Jesus von sich sagt: "Ich bin sanftmütig und von Herzen demütig" (Matth. 11, 29). Er der nie Auflehnung gegen Gott in seinem Inneren trug, der seine ganze Kraft in den Dienst der Menschheit stellte, der freudig Spott und Schande trug, um anderen zu helfen, der darf so sprechen. Als er seine Jünger lehrte, daß die wahre Größe im Reiche Gottes im Dienst und nicht in der Herrschsucht zu finden sei, konnte er unbefangen sagen: "Ich bin unter euch wie ein Diener" (Lukas 22, 24-30). Wir können nicht anders als die Majestät der Worte Jesu über seine Demut bewundern, und gerade seine Demut wird für uns die Ermutung die Kosten der Nachfolge auf uns zu nehmen.

"Nehmet auf euch mein Joch, denn ich bin sanftmütig und von Herzen demütig" (Matth. 11, 29).

So bedeutend ist die Demut in der Lehre Jesu, daß sie als Eintrittsbedingung für sein Reich niedergelegt wird. Anteil an der anhebenden Herrschaft Gottes (Reich Gottes) ist nur dem verheißenen der demütig ist wie ein Kind. Jesus warnt seine Hörer in Matth. 18 daß der Mangel an Kindessinn, Menschen aus dem Reiche Gottes ausschließt. Diese Warnung wurde durch den Rangstreit der Jünger hervorgehoben. Der Heiland mußte diesen "Großen" einen Verweis geben, und er tat es dadurch, daß er ein Kind in seiner ganzen Anspruchslosigkeit in ihre Mitte stellte als Vorbild der kindlichen Einfachheit. Prahlerei und Großseinwollen versperrt den Weg zum Eingang in Gottes Reich. "Wer sich selbst erhöht, wird erniedrigt werden; wer sich selbst erniedrigt, wird erhöht werden."

Nicht nur ist die Demut die Eintrittsbedingung in Gottes Reich, sondern sie ist auch Forderung der rechten Jüngerschaft. Durch Buße und Beugung kommt man ins Reich Gottes, und diese Gesinnung kennzeichnet auch den rechten Jünger. In dem Lasterkatalog in Markus 7, 21-22, stellt Jesus die "Erhebung" in eine Reihe mit den schlimmsten Verfehlungen des Menschen. Der Heiland verbot das Streben nach Rang und Titeln, denn solche Ruhmessucht gehört zu der Ordnung dieser Welt (Matth. 23, 5-10). Im Reiche Gottes gelten andere Normen. Hier ist der groß, der da dient (Maath. 20, 25-26).

Die Apostel haben die Lehre von der Demut im Einklang mit dem Beispiel und der Lehre Jesu weiter ausgebaut. Darauf dürfen wir hier schon nicht eingehen. Es fehlt nun aber, daß wir noch auf die praktische Nutzenwendung etwas eingehen.

5. Die Demut in praktischer Außerung.

Wie zeigt sich die demütige Gesinnung? Woran merkt man, daß man von Herzen demütig ist? Bestimmt nicht im ständigen Sich-Vorhalten eigener Sünden, oder überhaupt der eigenen

Sündhaftigkeit. Demut ist nicht tatloses Gefühl, nicht müde Selbstverachtung, aus der kein Weg zum Wollen führt (Rienicker, **Epheser** S. 292). Demut ist nicht die Verzagttheit über den eigenen Zustand. Sie ist auch nicht Selbstverachtung. Im Gegenteil, Demut ist ein geheiligtes Selbstbewußtsein von dem, was Gott mir geschenkt. Sie bringt uns aber eine Wertschätzung für andere, die ebenfalls von Gott beschenkt worden sind. Um sie höher zu achten als mich selbst (Phil. 2), brauch ich nicht unwahr zu werden. Ich brauch nicht in schmeichlerischer und gekünstelter Weise behaupten, daß der Nächste es besser kann als ich, daß er mehr weiß als ich. Aber ich kann den Schwächeren, dem Unbegabteren mit tiefer Wertschätzung, Achtung und Höflichkeit begegnen. Manche maskierte Demut ist nur ein Deckel unter dem man Verantwortung scheut, oder persönliche Vorzüge durch Schmeichelei zu erlangen versucht.

"Demütig kann nur der sein, dem der Sinn nicht für sich selbst aufgegangen ist, sondern für etwas anderes, für etwas ganz Großes. Demütig ist der, dem

eine große Persönlichkeit begegnet ist, durch die seine ganze Seele hingenommen und zu völliger, liebender Hingabe entflammt wird, wobei der eigenen Seele alles andere, auch ihr eigenes Selbst völlig fremd geworden ist. Demut ist überhaupt das einzige Mittel, um von sich selbst loszukommen... So entsteht alle Zeit 'Demut' im Vollsinn dort, wo ein Mensch den ewigen Gott in seiner Allmacht und unendlichen Größe kennengelernt hat. Wer die Weite und die Höhe und die Tiefe des wunderbaren Erlösungswerkes Christi erlebt und empfunden hat, muß im Herzensverlangen entbrennen, fortan nur dieser Sache zu leben und zu dienen und nicht mehr den erbärmlich kleinen, persönlichen Interessen, Stimmungen und Gefühlen des eigenen Ichs... Demut ist ein geheiligtes Selbstbewußtsein und dann die Fähigkeit, von sich loszukommen, sich selbst mit allen seinen Sorgen, Gewohnheiten und Nöten vergessen und seine volle Freude finden an Jesus Christus und seiner Kraft" (Rienicker, **Epheser**, S. 292). Der Herr schenke uns die rechte Demut!

D. Ewert

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Biography of Johann Amos Comenius (The Prophet of Modern Education)

John Amos Comenius—the name was originally spelled Komensky—was born at the Moravian village of Niwnic (Nivnitz), in 1592. His people were Slavs, and belonged to the Moravian Brethren who were followers of the reformer John Huss. Doctrinally, they were related to the Wycliffites of England and the Waldensians of central Europe; their religious faith was marked by simplicity, warm-hearted love, evangelical zeal, deep personal piety, self sacrifice, and humility. They were exponents of the simple life based upon

the return to the original Gospel of Christ. Their only desire in this world was to live quietly and read the Bible in peace. Furthermore, interest in education was an outstanding characteristic of these people. They made Prague for a time the most aggressive university in northern Europe; they established elementary and secondary schools, and taught catechism in their homes long before Luther entered upon the work of reforming the church in Germany.

Comenius grew up in this small pacifist community. He became so imbued

with the local religious attitudes that he remained a pious, quiet, simple man all his life. He was indeed the product and the representative of the deep stirring of the Moravian spirit for the enlightenment and uplift of the common people. His views, his simplicity and naivete caused him to be misunderstood by the more sophisticated. As a pastor, and later bishop (the last bishop of the Moravian church), and a follower of John Huss, he suffered greatly in the Catholic-Protestant warfare which ravaged his native land during the period of the Thirty Years' War.

Both his father and his mother died when Comenius was a young child. Although his father had been a well-to-do miller, his guardians misappropriated his inheritance; as a consequence, Comenius received only a meager education. In the small village school he learned to read and write Czech, his native language. Also, he was instructed in the Catechism, in hymn-singing and arithmetic. He was not a brilliant student, but he was thoughtful, serious-minded and observant. Not until sixteen years of age did he enter a school which taught Latin, in preparation for a scholarly career. There may have been some advantage in this circumstance, for the sixteen-year-old lad was able to perceive the serious defects in the method of teaching Latin to his fellow victims, who were at least ten years younger than he. He himself tells of his early life:

Losing both parents while I was yet a child, I began, through the neglect of my guardians but at sixteen years of age to taste of the Latin tongue. Yet by the goodness of God, that taste bred such a thirst in me, that I ceased not from that time, by all means and endeavours, to labour for the repairing of my lost years; and now not only for myself, but for the good of others also. For I could not but pity others also in this respect, especially in my own nation, which is too slothful and careless in matter of learning. Thereupon I was continually full of thoughts for the finding out of some means whereby more might be inflamed with the love of learning, and whereby learning itself

might be made more compendious, both in matter of the charge and cost, and of the labor belonging thereto, that so the youth might be brought by a more easy method, unto some notable proficiency in learning (Quick, **Educational Reformers**, p. 120).

His torturing experience of trying to learn Latin without understanding it led him to undertake his educational work and devise a method which would facilitate the learning process. His thesis was, "the teacher must teach less and the pupil must learn more."

From grammar school he went to the University of Herbron and Heidelberg where he completed the theological studies necessary for becoming a Moravian minister. He spent a total of four years at his studies and in travel. During this time he did much reading in works on education. He then returned to Moravia. He was only twenty-two years old, too young to be ordained a minister, so he was put in charge of a small local church. In addition to shepherding this little flock, he was appointed teacher at the Brethren school at Prerau. When he reached the age of twenty-four he was called into the service of the church through ordination.

Through his teaching experience he was for the first time in direct contact with actual teaching problems. He began devising textbooks for his subjects. He continued to carry on this dual service of teaching and ministering to his flock. After four years experience in his first charge, he was sent to another community as pastor and superintendent of schools. This latter charge was at Fulneck, the headquarters of the Brethren. For several years after the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War he continued his work unmolested. However, in 1621, at the Battle of Prag, some Spanish troops came to his town and plundered and molested the people particularly the Moravians. On this occasion Comenius lost his library and manuscripts, escaping with only the clothes on his back. The next year his wife and two children perished in an epidemic that raged through Moravia. In 1624 all Protestant ministers were ban-

ished, and in 1627 a new decree called for the banishment of Protestants of every description.

For a time he found a hiding-place with the family of a Bohemian nobleman, Baron Sadowsky, at Slaupna, in the Bohimian mountains. Here he tutored the children of his protector for nearly seven years. The Baron had engaged Stadius, one of the "proscribed" to educate his three sons, and, at Stadius' request, Comenius now wrote some "Canons of a Better Method" for Stadius' use.

In 1627, however, the persecutions waxed so hot, that Comenius with most of his Brethren, had to flee their country, never to return. On crossing the border, Comenius and the exiles who accompanied him knelt down, and prayed that God would not suffer His truth to fail in their native land. It has been said, "Comenius now lost his country and found his country, which was the world." Many of the banished, and Comenius among them, settled at the Polish town of Leszna, or as the Germans call it, Lissa, near the Silesian frontier. Here was an old established school of the Brethren, in which Comenius found employment. He remained in Lissa for thirteen years as rector of the Gymnasium. Once more engaged in education, he earnestly set about improving traditional methods. It was here that he produced most of his educational writings. It was also here that he came to be elected the chief Bishop of the Moravian church.

Comenius now planned a scheme of "Universal Wisdom" or, as he called it **Pansophia**. This venture would require a great deal of writing and expense. At Lissa there appeared little prospect of obtaining the aid required, he therefore looked to other sources to sponsor his venture. First he received a call to improve the schools of Sweden. After declining this he was induced by an English friend, Hartlib, to come to England and present his interest in education to the English parliament. With the consent of his people, he undertook the journey to London arriving there September 22, 1641. Shortly after he arrived parliament was dismissed due

to the king's visit to Scotland. When parliament reassembled after three months, they had other pressing business, so Comenius was forced to stay until August of 1642. It appeared that there was widespread interest in opening somewhere a "Universal College." However, the massacre of many English and the rumor of a general Insurrection in Ireland disturbed the plans and caused Comenius to return to his people.

Thereupon, Comenius received a communication from a rich Dutch merchant, Lewis de Geer, who offered him a home and some means to carry out his plans. His hopes for any aid from England had completely vanished, so he went to Sweden. Upon his arrival in Sweden he was sent by his sponsor to Stockholm and there was examined by the Chancellor, John Skyte, of Upsula University. After four days of examination he was given the following advice:

"Into no one's mind do I think such things have come before. Stand upon these grounds of yours; so shall we some time come to agreement, or there will be no way left. My advice however,' added he, 'is that you first do something for the schools, and bring the study of the Latin tongue to a greater facility; thus you will prepare the way for those greater matters'" (Quick, p. 129).

This was also the view of his sponsors. So with considerable reluctance, but because he found no other means of support, he worked at this task for five years. He agreed to settle at Elbing, in Prussia, and there write a work on teaching, in which the principles of the **Didactica Magna** would be worked out with special reference to teaching languages. After a journey to Lissa to fetch his family, for he had married again, Comenius now settled in West Prussia, thirty-six miles south-east of Danzig.

The relation between Comenius and his patron naturally proved a difficult one. His sponsor thought that since he was supporting Comenius and even contributing support for the assistants, he might expect of him that he would devote all his time to the scholastic treatise he had undertaken. Comenius, how-

ever, was a man of immense energy and of widely extended sympathies and connections. In addition to writing, he also engaged in church work, and engaged in religious conferences. Due to dissatisfaction, De Geer did not send his subsidies regularly. In 1647 Comenius wrote to his friend Hartlib that he was almost overwhelmed with cares and sick to death of writing begging letters. In 1647 he was also elected senior bishop of the Moravian Brethren, a position which put him at the head of the church. In order to be nearer his flock, the bulk of whom resided in Poland, he returned to Lissa. As head of the church, due provisions were made for him by the Brethren, his pecuniary difficulties were now over.

1648 brought the downfall of all of Comenius' hopes of returning to his native land. The Peace of Westphalia was concluded without any provision being made for the restoration of the exiles. Comenius was thus doomed to spend the remainder of his life in banishment. As head of the Moravian Church, he now devoted considerable time to care for his exiled Brethren. His new appointment, however, did not prevent him from continuing his connection with the science of education. In 1650 he received a call from the town of Saros-Patak, Transylvania, Hungary, to come and reform their educational system. Since there was a settlement of the banished Brethren there, he went to labor among them from 1650 to 1654. Here he also wrote his *Orbis Pictus*

which, however, was not published until 1657.

Full of trouble as Comenius' life had hitherto been, its greatest calamity was still before him. After he was again settled in Lissa, Poland, the Swedes invaded that territory. Comenius' sympathies were with his fellow-Protestants, consequently he sent a congratulatory note to the Swedish king. However, when peace ensued, and that territory was returned to the Poles, they again took up arms against the Protestants. Lissa, the headquarters of the Protestants, received the main thrust of their attack due to the fact that they had welcomed and congratulated the erstwhile enemy. Comenius and his family escaped but his house was marked for special violence and nothing was preserved. All his books and manuscripts including his valued work on Pansophia and his Dictionaries—books on which he had labored for forty years—were burned. "This lose," he writes, "I shall cease to lament only when I cease to breathe."

After wandering for some time about Germany, he finally received asylum with Lawrence De Geer, the son of his deceased patron, in Amsterdam, Holland. Here he spent the remaining years of his life. He earned his livelihood by instructing children of wealthy families. He also published several of his books at this time. He died in 1671 at the advanced age of eighty.

H. R. Baerg

YOUR QUESTION

"Wie schaffen wir eine Ethik, die später nicht Konflikte verursacht? Einmal schließen wir wegen Haarschneiden aus, und jetzt nicht? Dann war Television eine große Frage. Viele Gemeinden haben damit gearbeitet. Heute geht es vielleicht besonders um das Färben der Mädchen, die Ohrringe, und

dergleichen. Wenn wir heute damit arbeiten, werden wir uns nach etlichen Jahren erklären müssen?"

Wie ersichtlich, läßt sich die Frage nicht mit einem Federstrich beantworten. Sie fordert eigentlich eine doppelte Antwort. Die Frage nach einer Ethik, die imstande wäre, spätere Konflikte

vorzubeugen, muß erst geklärt werden. Dann darf auch der zweite Teil der Frage zur Sprache kommen.

Die Frage, die uns nun augenblicklich beschäftigen soll, lautet: "Wie schaffen wir eine Ethik, die später nicht Konflikte verursacht?" Hier begegnen wir eigentlich einem Suchen nach einer Ethik, die alles Fragen nach Recht und Unrecht erübrigen würde. Unter Ethik versteht man, wie C. F. Paulus es in seinem Buch *The Christian Life* darstellt, "die Wissenschaft, die das Sittliche als Lebensaufgabe des Menschen behandelt" (S. 14). Daraus ergibt sich, daß die christliche Ethik sich mit der Darstellung des sittlichen Lebens befaßt, das sich an den Lehren Jesu und der Schrift im allgemeinen orientiert.

Die heilige Schrift gibt uns jedoch keine vollständige, geschlossene Darstellung des Sittlichen. Sie zeichnet wohl Gebiete ab, in denen die Handlungsweise unzweideutig verurteilt oder befürwortet wird. Auf andern Gebieten wieder hat der Einzelne sowohl als auch die Gemeinde Schwierigkeit, die Anweisung der Schrift für den gegebenen Fall zu erfassen. Man dürfte wohl das sittliche Leben des Christen mit einem Zirkel vergleichen. Den Zentralpunkt bildet der Herr Jesus Christus. Das Feld des Zirkels, das durch die geschlossene Linie abgegrenzt wird, ist das allgemein anerkannte sittliche Leben, darüber die Schrift klare Anweisungen hat, und das daher auch keine Fragen aufwirft. In Gal. 5, 19-21 gibt uns Paulus eine Liste der sittlichen Vergehungen, bei denen niemand fragt, ob sie mit dem christlichen Leben zu vereinbaren wären. Die Gegenstücke der genannten Unsittlichkeiten die Paulus uns vielleicht im 22. Vers desselben Kapitels aufzählen wollte, sind die anerkannten sittlichen Eigenschaften des Christen, in dessen Leben Christus im Zentrum steht. Das ist der unumstrittene Teil der christlichen Ethik.

Doch die Angelegenheiten des Lebens, über die in der Schrift keine festen Anweisungen zu finden sind, verursachen auch beim ersten Christen Besorgnis. Diese können als am Rande liegend bezeichnet werden. Hierher gehörte z.B. bei den Römern die Sabbatfeier, bei den

Korinthern der *Fleischeinkauf*. Jede Periode der christlichen Gemeinde weiß von Angelegenheiten, von denen man sich unwillkürlich fragt: "Gehört dies noch innerhalb des Zirkels oder liegt es außerhalb desselben und müßte folglich zum Weltlichen und Unerlaubten gezählt werden?" Zur Lösung solcher Fragen hat uns der Herr in der Schrift Grundsätze niederlegen lassen, die als Richtlinien zu dienen haben. Sie sind aber keine unzweideutigen Anweisungen für das entsprechende Handeln im gegebenen Einzelfall. Da ist es äußerst notwendig, daß sich der Einzelne, sowohl als auch die Gemeinde zu einer Überzeugung durchringt. Diese schmerzliche Arbeit bleibt niemandem erspart, dem es um das Erkennen des göttlichen Willens zu tun ist. Daher sagt Paulus: "Ein jeglicher sei sich seiner Meinung gewiß." Röm. 14, 5. Erst wenn der Einzelne, sowohl als auch die Gemeinde sich über Randangelegenheiten zu fester Überzeugung durchgerungen hat, ist eine entschiedene Stellungnahme ratsam. Paulus legt großes Gewicht auf das christliche Gewissen, wenn es zu Grenzfällen kommt, wie aus folgenden Stellen ersichtlich ist: Röm. 13, 15; 1. Kor. 8, 7-8; 1. Pet. 2, 19.

Der Einzelne hat aber nicht nur sein eigenes Gewissen, sondern auch das der Gemeinde zu befragen. Dieses findet seinen Ausdruck in den Verordnungen und Beschlüssen der Gemeinde, die als Deutung der göttlichen Grundsätze der Ethik anzusehen sind. Das Glied, das sich anschließt, erklärt mit dem Anschluß, daß es die Auslegung der Grundsätze bejaht und im Sinne derselben zu handeln beabsichtigt. Wer nicht der Einstellung ist, soll sich nicht der Gemeinde anschließen; denn sie wird ihm Schwierigkeiten bereiten, und er der Gemeinde. Hat die Gemeinde einmal ihre Einstellung bekundet, ist das Glied unter Verpflichtung, diese zu beachten, auch wenn sich seine persönliche Überzeugung mit der Einstellung der Gemeinde auseinandergelt. Der Individualismus, der vom Standpunkt ausgeht: Ich tue was ich will und was ich für richtig halte, hat in der Gemeinde keine Existenzberechtigung. Es ist ehrenhaft, sich von der Gemeinde

zurückzuziehen, weil man die Gesinnung der Gemeinde nicht zu teilen vermag. Es ist jedoch unter der Würde des ernstesten Christen, als Glied der Gemeinde die persönliche Überzeugung vor die Gesinnung der Gemeinde zu stellen und zum Anstoß der Gemeinde darnach zu handeln, ohne die Einstellung der Gemeinde zu beherzigen.

Ist es möglich, angesichts dieser Tatsachen, eine Ethik herzustellen, die Konflikte auszuschalten vermag? Wie wir oben sahen, gibt es sittliche Ansprüche, über die die christliche Ethik aus der Schrift endgültige Anweisung hat, Ansprüche, die unter allen Umständen gelten und keine Ausnahme dulden. Dazu kommen jedoch auch noch die Randfälle, bei denen man fragend stehen bleibt und um Licht und Anweisung ringt. Es wäre schön, wenn diesem Ringen einmal ein Ende gemacht werden könnte. Unser Fragesteller ringt um eine absolute Lösung auch für die Randfälle.

Der Christ darf nicht vergessen, daß er sein Dasein in dieser Welt zu fristen hat. Er darf nicht hinaus, bis der Herr ihn ruft. Hier soll er den Willen des Vaters zur Richtlinie seines Lebens machen und alles demensprechend einstellen. Das Leben ist aber sehr veränderlich. Sitten und Gebräuche wechseln, die Lebensweise wird von den ändernden Umständen beeinflusst. Der Christ steht inmitten der fortwährend wechselnden Kultur. Daher steht er sowohl als auch die Gemeinde beständig vor der Frage: Wie muß ich mich unter den gegebenen Umständen verhalten? Angesichts des beständigen Wechsels muß es beständig zur Stellungnahme kommen, wie die Neuerscheinungen in der Kultur im Lichte der sittlichen Grundsätze der Schrift zu beurteilen wäre. Gerade die Neuerscheinungen im Leben und in der Kultur, in der der Christ lebt, machen es unmöglich, eine konfliktlose Ethik zu schaffen.

Die Geschichte weiß ja von Fällen, wo Gemeinschaften versuchten, die Ethik festzulegen. Das Resultat war aber nie ein erfreuliches; denn die Ethik artete in eine herzlose Gesetzlichkeit aus, die an der Deutung der Grundsätze festhielt, die während einer bestimmten

Zeitperiode festgelegt wurde und den Veränderungen in der Kultur der nachfolgenden Jahre nicht Rechenschaft trug. Solches Festlegen der Ethik ist ein Versuch, das Rad der Zeit aufzuhalten, und das geht nicht. Der Christ ist dem Wechsel der Zeit ausgesetzt, und dieser bringt die Notwendigkeit mit sich, fortwährend die Neuerscheinungen der Kultur im Lichte der Schrift überprüfen zu müssen. Diese Mühe bleibt weder dem Einzelnen noch der Gemeinde irgendeiner Zeitperiode erspart.

Somit wird man zu dem Schluß gezwungen, daß es dem Christen sowohl als auch der christlichen Gemeinde nie vergönnt sein wird, sich einer ethischen Auseinandersetzung zu erfreuen, die allem Fragen nach der Verwirklichung des sittlichen Lebens und allen Konflikten darin ein Ende machen wird.

C. Wall.

(Darüber wie diese sittlichen Grundsätze in ganz konkreten Lebensverhältnissen zu verwirklichen sind, darf ein anderes mal geschrieben werden.—Ed.)

CHRISTIAN WORKER'S LIBRARY

Illustrating the Sermon (I)

"The impotence of many modern sermons is not that they are too concerned with facts but that there is far too little illumination of the facts. The mind is informed, but the heart and will are not touched." There is surely enough truth in this charge of Dawson C. Bryan to make us stop and think seriously about the whole matter of illustrating divine truth more fitly and adequately. A basic reason for this sorry situation, in the case of many, undoubtedly lies in the fact that the presentation of the truths in the sermon no longer derives from a personal appropriation, and overwhelming conviction about the staggering significance of these truths for human life and destiny. But another, and admittedly less important reason for it may well be that

there has been insufficient mental and imaginative grappling with the truths in question. The preacher himself has failed to grasp the facts or truths so distinctly, surely, and vividly that he could not but speak of them in a very concrete and perhaps even visual manner. John Ruskin exaggerated, we may feel, when he said that the "greatest thing a human soul ever does in this world is to see something, and tell what he saw in a plain way," but the general import and thrust of his assertion is acceptable enough, and highly relevant to our present subject. Every preacher must, in some measure, distinctly "see" the given fact or truth, if he wishes to transmit it to others in a "plain" and telling way.

One test of, and possible aid towards a clearer and more concrete "seeing" of the particular truth to be presented, by the preacher, is the use which he makes of sermon illustrations. There are other tests and aids, to be sure, but this is one, and one that, it seems to me, has not received the attention which it deserves, in our own circles. At any rate, it will not do us any harm, and may do us some good, by suggesting, to one or another, other facets of the whole subject of 'preaching the Gospel' more effectively, if we ponder this matter of the "art of illustrating sermons." We propose, therefore, to discuss this topic (in this and succeeding issues), in as plain and direct a manner as we can manage, under the following heads: A. Their General Importance; B. Some Distinctive Kinds — — —; C. Their Functions and Purposes; D. Their Sources; E. Their Use — — —; and F. Ways and Means of Gathering and Preserving Them.

A. The Importance of Illustrations for the Sermon:

Illustrations and illustrative matter, we admit at the outset, are not the most important thing in any sermon. C. H. Spurgeon has expressed our own sentiments well when he remarks (in his *Lectures to His Students*) that "the sermon itself is the main thing: its matter, its aim, and the spirit in which it

is brought before the people, the sacred anointing upon the preacher, and the divine power applying the truth to the hearer — these are infinitely more important than any details of manner." Moreover, some preachers, it is true, do (and have done) well enough without them — the late Campbell Morgan of London, for example to mention only one familiar instance. But even here, we suggest, one reason for the effectiveness of their preaching is that these same preachers have been able to present spiritual truth so vividly and inspiringly, by the use of apt words or telling phrases, by the fuller portrayal of the historical or social context of the truth (or text), or by the pointed application of the truth to life, that while they didn't make explicit use of "sermon illustrations" (in the more restricted sense), they nevertheless did make more use of illustrative devices or means (in the wider sense) than a superficial analysis would reveal. Preaching of this sort, in which the truth is presented so convincingly, clearly, and poignantly that it "catches fire" and faintly glows within the hearts of the hearers, has been called "imaginative preaching" by Halford Luccock (in his *In the Minister's Workshop*), and while we may not be prepared to accept, willy-nilly, all that he says about it in his discussion, we can duly appreciate the essential import of this designation, or description, of it.

And yet several factors remind us that the more explicit and conventional use of illustrations (in the narrower sense) in the sermon is not without real importance for the ordinary preacher.

1. There is, first of all, the fact of its large role in the Scriptures themselves. The striking images and pictures that fairly crowd the pages of *Job*, and of *Amos*, *Hosea*, and *Micah*, are obvious examples from the Old Testament. But it is the wide and important use of parable and picture by Christ in His own teaching ministry, as seen in the Gospels, that particularly impresses us. His "Sermon on the Mount" alone, it is said, contains some 56 metaphors which He (Christ) used in order to render

divine truth more concrete and therefore more acute.

L. B. Mathewson, in his his booklet, **The Illustration in Sermon, Address, Conversation and Teaching**, discusses the purposes, sources, and characteristics of Christ's use of "illustrations" in a concise and pithy chapter (22) that deserves fuller study on our part. Among the several purposes which he attributes to Christ, in His use of picture and parable, are these: (1) to silence captious objectors to the truth ("The Good Samaritan"); (2) to explain spiritual realities to sincere seekers (Spirit is like the wind, in discussion with Nicodemus); and (3) to unfold the nature of the spiritual life and its development to His disciples (Vine and the branches). The one simple and obvious fact which is emphasized by any such analysis of His use of "illustrations" is that Christ saw fit to use them with all sorts of hearers in all sorts of situations. And so, recalling his words that "the servant is not greater than his Master," let us not be slow in learning from Him the "art of illustrating and illuminating divine truth by means of human pictures."

The fact that the Scriptures contain a great deal of illustrative and pictorial matter is strikingly confirmed by a consideration of the expressions and phrases which have passed from them into the speech of our everyday life. It is not likely that any exhaustive list of such has ever been compiled but a representative collection, at any rate, is to be found, for example, in a pamphlet, **The Influence of the English Bible upon the English Language and upon English and American Literatures** (published by the American Bible Society). Here are a few of them: "cast thy bread upon the waters," "miserable comforters", "apple of his eye", "the little foxes that spoil the vines", "as a drop in a bucket", "the salt of the earth," "the burden and heat of the day", "the fashion of this world", "a thorn in the flesh", "prisoners of hope", "the handwriting on the wall", "a mess of pottage", "the mantle of Elijah", "a pearl of great price," "clear shining after rain," "clear as crystal", "the fat of the land", "whited sepul-

chres," "not gather figs of thistles," "a howling wilderness", "the wings of the morning."

2. But there is also the fact of the large role of explicit illustration in the ministry of preachers of the past — preachers who, insofar as we can judge of this, have been truly influential and blessed of God. Some effective preachers, as we have intimated earlier, as F. W. Robertson of Brighton and G. C. Morgan of London, for example, did not make much use of formal illustrations in their preaching, but they seem to be the exception rather than the rule. Medieval preachers, we know, made much use of moral tales, allegories, and "exempla" in their endeavour to illumine moral and spiritual truths. The great Puritan and Anglican divines of England, during Reformation and post-Reformation days, though the style of their sermons was often too rhetorical and high-flown and the substance of them too weighty, nevertheless made felicitous use of striking images and anecdotes, some of which seem rather quaint to us today, but which must have served well then to illustrate and reinforce divine truths for the hearers. Jeremy Taylor, to cite one example, whose **Holy Living** and **Holy Dying** are still appreciated as religious classics, has been described as "a brilliant author-preacher, who is as prodigal with his wealth of anecdote 'as an Asiatic queen with her pearls'." Again, John Donne, of whom it is said that when "his sermons were delivered in neighborhood church, court chapel, or cathedral there was no greater attraction in London's public life," made repeated use of dramatic, and even startling metaphors and figurative comparisons. (See, for example, T. A. Gill's selection of his sermons, **The Sermons of John Donne**, in the Meridian Books edition).

As we come closer to our own day we recognize that many of the influential preachers of Great Britain and American during the nineteenth century were obviously adept in the use of illustration: Henry Drummond, Joseph Parker, George W. Truett, D. L. Moody, C. H. Spurgeon, T. DeWitt Talmage, and Henry W. Beecher, to mention only sev-

eral of them. Philip Brooks, another one of this bright cluster of great preachers, used very few illustrations in the early years of his ministry, it is true, but came to appreciate their value in due course, and, as he tells us himself, used fifty of them as against one (in earlier years) in the sermons of his later preaching ministry.

We are told of Thomas Guthrie, a Scottish preacher of the nineteenth century, that he once carried out an experiment in his own church in Edinburgh in order to determine for himself whether the use of explicit illustrations in the sermon did, or not make a difference as far as the comprehension of, and decisive response to the truths presented, on the part of the members of his congregation, was concerned. The result of the experiment was, in brief, that Guthrie became one of the greatest illustrators of spiritual truth. T. H. Pattison (in his **The History of Christian Preaching**) has said of him that "few men understood as well as did he the power of a fitting illustration, and

no preacher of all time has told stories in sermons with greater effect. His world was full of pictures, and every truth to him was concrete or it was nothing."

Preachers of an even more recent period who have become noted for their fit and skilful use of various kinds of illustrations are Paul Rader (of the Christian and Missionary Alliance Church), Walter A. Maier (of the Lutheran Church) and Clarence Macartney (of the Presbyterian Church). Among the "pulpit masters" of today whose widely influential ministry quite astonishes us still are Martyn Lloyd-Jones and W. E. Sangster, of London, James S. Stewart of Edinburgh, and Helmut Thielicke of Hamburg, and all of them (the last three more so than Lloyd-Jones, however) are both liberal and adept in the use of explicit illustration in their preaching.

(To be continued)

H. Giesbrecht.

(Schluß von Umschlagseite 2) —

Monats verlassen, um an der Minneapolis Universität sich weitere Kenntnisse anzueignen. Solch ein Bemühen steht in direkter Verbindung mit der Missionsaufgabe der Gemeinde. Es geht darum, dem Herrn besser dienen zu können. Unsere Leser möchten seiner Gedenken!

Wir hoffen auch, daß die Reise des Chores, den Gemeinden in B.C. und anderen Provinzen, zum reichen Segen sein wird. Wenn dieses Blatt unsere Leser in die Hände kommt, sind wir wieder alle zu Hause und fleißig an der Arbeit.

Noch einen herzlichen Dank allen Lesern die ihr Lesegeld eingesandt haben. Möchte auch diese Nummer unseres Blattes Euch allen zum Segen sein!

D. Ewert

Commencement Exercises

Baccalaureate Service	May 25, Thursday
Graduation Banquet	May 26, Friday
Senior Class Programme	May 27, Saturday
Graduation Exercises	May 28, Sunday

In Evil Long I Took Delight

In evil long I took delight,
Unawed by shame or fear,
Till a new object struck my sight,
And stopp'd my wild career:
I saw One hanging on a Tree
In agony and blood,
Who fix'd His languid eyes on me,
As near His Cross I stood.

Sure never till my latest breath
Can I forget that look:
It seem'd to charge me with His death,
Though not a word He spoke:
My conscience felt and own'd the guilt,
And plunged me in despair:
I saw my sins His Blood had spilt,
And help'd to nail Him there.

Alas! I knew not what I did!
But now my tears are vain:
Where shall my trembling soul be hid?
For I the Lord have slain!
—A second look He gave, which said,
"I freely all forgive;
This blood is for thy ransom paid;
I die that thou may'st live."

Thus, while His death my sin displays
In all its blackest hue,
Such is the mystery of grace,
It seals my pardon too.
With pleasing grief, and mournful joy,
My spirit now is fill'd,
That I should such a life destroy, —
Yet live by Him I kill'd!

John Newton, 1725-1807