

The Voice

of the Mennonite Brethren Bible College

Vol. XII

March - April, 1963

No. 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DENOMINATIONAL	
Faithful Stewards of the Church of God	1
FAREWELL	
An Elderly Brother's Prayer	3
PRACTICAL	
Wer tut die Seelsorge am Seelsorger?	6
HISTORICAL	
Communal Life Among Medieval	
Evangelicals in the Fifteenth Century	10
THEOLOGICAL	
The Biblical Doctrine of Sanctification	15
Die Wertschätzung des Alten Testaments	17
MISSIONS	
The Missionary: Who Is He?	20
YOUR QUESTION (Music)	23

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

THE VOICE

of the Mennonite Brethren Bible College

Vol. XII

March - April, 1963

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, and for payment of postage in cash.

Ein Gebet am Karfreitag

Gebeugten Geistes treten wir an diesem Tage vor Dich, O Herr. Wir können das Wunder von Golgatha nicht fassen noch erklären. Aber, wir fühlen uns durch Deine Liebe mächtiglich zu Dir gezogen. Wir bekennen: „Das tatst Du für mich“; und unwillkürlich hören wir Dich vom Kreuze her fragen: „Und was tust du für Mich?“ Darauf können wir, leider, nicht viel antworten. Unser Tun ist so mangelhaft; unsere Opfer sind so armselig; unsere Liebe ist oft so kalt.

Erwärme und erweiche uns durch den Anblick Deiner Liebe, der Du unsere Schulden hinaufgetragen hast an das Holz. Vergib uns, Herr, wo wir an Deiner Liebe gezweifelt haben, denn Der seinen einzigen Sohn für uns gegeben, sollte Der uns nicht alles schenken? Deine Liebe kennt nicht Ebbe noch Flut; Deine Liebe wird nie müde; sie ist beständig, jahrein, jahraus. Unsere, dagegen, ist so wandelbar und unbeständig.

Oeffne unsere Augen, Lamm Gottes, für das Meer Deiner Liebe! Laß ihre heilenden Strahlen unsere Herzen durchdringen, damit Leid, Schmerz, Täuschung, Zerschlagenheit und Verzweiflung verschwinden. Vertreibe aus unserem Leben alles was dem Wachstum in der Liebe im Wege steht. Wir bitten nicht um Sentimentalität, welche für Dich zu verströmen versucht, sondern um solche Liebe, die zum Gehorsam treibt, zum Dienst, zum Opfer.

Du umarmtest am Kreuz die ganze Menschheit, O Herr, und vergabst ihr ihre große Schuld. Hilf uns Dir darin nachzuahmen. Lehre uns zu vergeben, wie Du uns vergeben hast. Lehre uns in der Liebe zu wandeln. Denn nur die Liebe gibt uns Freudigkeit am Tage des Gerichts. Laß diesen Tag zum Anfang eines neuen Lebens werden. Erhöre uns um Deiner Liebe willen! Amen!

DENOMINATIONAL

Faithful Stewards of the Church of God

When this article appears in print the citizens of our country will have made their choice of government. At the moment the party leaders waste no time nor effort to win the support of the people at the polls. Many voters are at a painful loss to know to whom they can confidently entrust the great wealth of men and material resources of this country. No doubt, many sincere citizens who have listened to political campaign speeches and tirades, desire, in turn, to address the leaders of the country and impress upon them the tremendous need for good leadership in the interest of all concerned. The feeling is that the times call for competent men.

The church, too, with its great resources, can only prosper when men under God give able and responsible leadership. Church members begin to call earnestly for leadership and direction in order to avoid confusion within its ranks, and to make a positive spiritual impact upon a waiting community. To us has been entrusted more than only time, talent, treasure, and truth. To us has been entrusted the total membership of the church. It is our sacred responsibility to help to convert the church into a powerful working force, into an army of conquest. It remains to be seen what can be done by a revitalized membership, mobilized and organized into action.

I. Revitalization.

Faithful stewardship of this trust requires that we work toward a revitalization of our membership, a renewal of the spiritual life of the church. It has been reported that the United States government has to call up seven men in order to find two who qualify for military service according to present standards. The church likewise, is in a position where many members do not qualify for Christian service. Pastors review the membership lists repeatedly

to consider and reconsider individual members for some type of much needed service, only to reject many of them as spiritually unqualified.

That the church stands in great need of revitalization is evident from various observations. We are painfully aware of the fact that there is a lack of Christians who are really and honestly enjoying the Christian life. They walk about as though they have been denied access to some legitimate source of true joy and are confined to a way of life that can only be tolerated in view of the happier times that will follow our departure from this world. There is not enough of that fullness of joy that will create in others a deep longing to join the happy throng of believers.

We also observe a lack of Christians who have a genuine hunger for the Word of God. Bible study classes register only a select few. Many pews remain empty in regular church services. The discussion of spiritual truths in group gatherings limits participation to the few and leads others to absent themselves from meetings which are termed unprofitable and 'boring.' Entertainment meetings often draw the greater crowds and hold the attention longer. There are not enough church people who will speak with Jeremiah: "Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart . . ." (Jer. 15:16). You can hear church members complain that they are overfed when in reality they are undernourished. They sit through a church service to please men, but refuse to take in spiritual food for their soul.

We cannot help but take note of the lack of zeal for Christian service—I mean happy service that requires self-denial, the renouncing of self, of ease and comfort. Choir directors, Sunday school superintendents, camp directors, Christian Service and Mission Boards constantly call for dedicated workers,

only to have many of their appeals fall on unresponsive ears. Others permit themselves to be enlisted, but they look upon their work as a chore that is imposed upon them. The first opportunity to be relieved of their responsibility is accepted with eagerness. These and other conditions convince us that the church needs a spiritual awakening among its members.

But these people can be revitalized. The Spirit of God is able. He calls for men with a deep concern to pray for revival, to preach true discipleship and to plead for men and women to "present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God." While I read my own words, I pray, "Wilt thou not revive us again that thy people may rejoice in thee" (Ps. 85:6). Church leaders, take heart, and pray, and work for a heaven-born revival for our church!

II. Mobilization.

Faithful stewardship requires that we work toward the mobilization of our resources. To mobilize means to make ready for use where needed. When a nation mobilizes for an all-out war effort, it makes money, factories and men ready for use where needed. It floats victory loans and curtails unnecessary spending to make money available to finance the war. It commands factories to be placed on a war basis. It conscripts men from all walks of life for the armed services. Total war requires total mobilization.

The Christian warfare requires even greater effort. And yet our mission efforts are limited because we have not mobilized our resources. Money is tight and needs to be made available for missions rather than for luxurious living. Our institutions must equip men and women for world conquest. Our men must be made mobile for service. At present we are tied too much to our homes, to our professions, to our families and friends, to our way of life. Apparently we cannot move about freely to the place where we are most needed. Even on the mission fields men refuse to become mobile to expedite the cause of Christ.

God's order for the church is total mobilization for total evangelization.

Let the approximately thirty thousand members of our Mennonite Brethren Churches of North America divert their surplus funds into the mission treasuries; let our schools train hardened soldiers for Jesus Christ for service at home and abroad; let our publication houses pour forth literature to meet the crying needs of the increasingly literate multitudes; let the men and women of our churches be made available for service at any time and wherever they are needed, and we will see what God can do with a revitalized church that is mobilized for immediate action.

III. Organization

Faithful stewardship of our trust requires that we organize our forces under competent leadership. It remains to be said that we have many dear Christians whose heart God has touched, and who are willing to be part of the great missionary force, but whose services have not yet been directed into proper channels. We know that a great potential force can be made practically useless by lack of adequate organization. We often inspire people to work but fail to place them in position. There are always those who can find their own employment, but others need assistance. Unless they are enlisted they will help swell the ranks of the disgruntled unemployed.

Our brotherhood loses valuable service of older members of the church because we do not organize them for service which they can profitably render. We lose the services of promising young men and women, well-trained, for the same reason. The time has come for us as a brotherhood to rethink our total organization and reorganize on local church and conference level for greater efficiency. It is not enough to speak of human need and opportunities for work in general. It is not enough to make repeated general appeals for dedicated servants. Where is the work that needs to be done? Where are the men who can and want to do it? Who will put these men to the task?

As a brotherhood we want to put forth every needed effort to nourish the spiritual life of all our members. We

want to support our schools in their efforts to train workers. We want to provide for leadership that will organize these individuals into effective combat units in the great spiritual conflict. The challenge is ours; so is the

responsibility. With such a revitalized, mobilized and organized working force we should be ready to move courageously into the field of world evangelism and win.

J. H. Quiring

FAREWELL

An Elderly Brother's Prayer

(Brother Cornelius Wall, who for a number of years ministered to our college family, has left us. The Lord has other fields of labor for him. His memory will always be cherished by those who learned to know him. By sheer beauty of character he drew us closer to the God whom he served. The following is his parting address, which was given in the college chapel last May. It has a message for young and old. Ed.)

I come to you as representative of the elderly generation. It seems to me I owe you something in addition to what I have already told you and which you may have forgotten. I must tell you of the contents of the elderly brother's prayer when he thinks of you, the coming generation. It is the prayer of thanksgiving, of confession, of intercession.

I. Thanksgiving

As to thanksgiving, the man of the elderly generation follows the advice of David given in Ps. 103, "Bless the Lord, o my soul, and forget not all his benefits." The man of my generation marvels at the grace of God that has brought him through the years of his life. It seems to him that for the present generation to live is no trick. Even the trouble of having a flat tire is as rare an experience as the bite of a flea. To start a fire, the only serious problem you have is, who will turn the switch. In planning a coffee party, the greatest chore is the trip to the Safeway store. In plowing, the most tiring work is to sit on the tractor.

We, of the older generation, claim to

know something about life in the raw. Bear with us when at times we feel inclined to recount past experiences of hard labour, war, starvation, poverty, lack of friends, emigration from Russia, and so on. The Lord graciously brought us through those days. To Him we bring thanksgiving and adoration for having guided our steps during those perilous times.

II. Confession

The second phase of the prayer is confession. Here I pray with Daniel (9:4-6), confessing the sins of our generation, for we are guilty of failing to live up to the expectations of the Lord, as well as those of our fellow men.

There are certain weaknesses besetting an aging man which bring disgrace upon the church and are detrimental to the cause of Christ.

A. Selfishness. First on the list is selfishness. With advancing age comes the decline of earning power. And with it the fear of becoming dependent on others grips such a man's heart. It is hard for him to trust the Lord in financial matters, much harder than when he was younger. He becomes a penny pincher. By that he disappoints his fellow Christians, for he fails to demonstrate the power of the gospel, the power of God in his life.

I confess to the Lord and to you this sin of an aging man. I recognize the danger in my own case, and am determined to counteract it as vigorously as I can. And if I should have disappointed some of you, I humbly ask for forgiveness.

PRACTICAL

Wer tut die Seelsorge am Seelsorger?

Die Seelsorge ist ein Gebiet, worüber man in den letzten Jahren viel geschrieben hat. Es war vielleicht auch ein vernachlässigtes Gebiet und es tat Not darauf aufmerksam zu machen. In diesem Artikel möchte ich etwas auf die Seelsorge beim Prediger zu sprechen kommen. Wir haben selber tiefe Bedürfnisse, mit denen wir fast nicht fertig werden, und dafür suchen wir oft für unsere eigene Seele Hilfe. Der Bruder in der Gemeinde weiß wo er hingehen kann, er geht zum Seelsorger und spricht sich daselbst aus. Wo soll der Seelsorger hingehen? Oft hört er stundenlang auf die Probleme anderer bis er selbst im Inneren belastet wird. Wo findet er einen Bergungsort für die persönlichen Kämpfe in seinem Leben?

Wohl selten kann er zu einem Bruder in der Gemeinde gehen und sich ihm mitteilen. Oft sind die Fragen derart, daß sie einfach nicht für die Öffentlichkeit sind, und beim Austausch besteht aber immer die Gefahr, daß das Gesprochene an die große Glocke kommt. Mancher würde das Vertrauen sofort mißbrauchen, denn über einen führenden Bruder in der Gemeinde erzählt man gerne.

Etliche Fragen beschäftigen mich in dieser Angelegenheit. Dieser Artikel dürfte vielleicht mehr zur Anregung dienen, als zur endgültigen Beantwortung aller Fragen.

I. Ist die Seelsorge am Seelsorger notwendig?

Mancher würde glauben, daß der Seelsorger auf einer Höhe leben sollte, wo keine Seelsorge notwendig wäre. Er müßte sich doch von allen inneren Kämpfen frei halten können und frisch und froh seine Arbeit tun. Er soll trösten aber nicht trostbedürftig sein. Er soll anderen nachgehen ohne selber auf

Besuch zu hoffen. Teilweise ist dem auch so. Ein Prediger, der immer verlangend dasteht, wird kaum den Auftrag des Meisters erfüllen können. Man sucht nicht bei jeder Gelegenheit die Sympathie der Menschen. Und doch regt sich in seiner Seele ein Verlangen nach Verständnis, und er muß auch dann und wann die Gelegenheit finden sich bei einem andern abzuladen.

A. Warum ist die Seelsorge am Seelsorger eine Notwendigkeit?

1. Einmal, weil er nur in Mensch ist. Sein Nervensystem ist nicht anders als das der andern Gemeindeglieder. Sein Gemüt ist nur das Gemüt eines Menschen, und er kann nur so viel ertragen und nicht mehr. Vor etlichen Jahren erschien im **Readers Digest** ein Artikel über die geistige Gesundheit der Prediger. Man wies daraufhin, daß die Prediger oft nicht helfen konnten, weil sie selber hilfebedürftig waren. Die Statistik, die dort veröffentlicht wurde, schien mir übertrieben zu sein, aber der Schreiber meinte seine Zahlen durch Beobachtung und Forschung bestätigen zu können.

Der Prediger ist Mensch, er wird aber nicht immer als Mensch behandelt. Man macht auf ihn Ansprüche, die man auf andere kaum machen würde. Er soll eine Ausdauer bei der Arbeit besitzen, die über die Kräfte eines gewöhnlichen Menschen geht. Er soll auch nicht klagen; er ist ja Prediger.

Dieses legt sich beim Arbeiter, der sich immer als Mensch weiß, aufs Gemüt. Er fürchtet sich oft vor den Erwartungen anderer. Dieses wird bei ihm zur Spannung, und diese Spannung muß irgendwie behoben werden, denn gespannte Menschen brechen mit der Zeit zusammen.

2. Die Arbeit eines Seelsorgers ist derart, daß er besonderen Prüfungen ausgesetzt ist. Seine Arbeit ist nie getan. Er weiß nur zu gut, daß er noch mehr tun könnte. Die unerledigten Hausbesuche sind immer da, und man hat nie das Gefühl, daß man mit gutem Gewissen ruhen darf. Wenn einmal die Arbeit zurückgeblieben ist, fürchtet man sich an die Arbeit zu gehen, denn man weiß, daß die Beschuldigungen nicht ausbleiben werden. Oft kommen sie sogar in den Gebeten dem Seelsorger zu Ohren. Will er einmal viel beschicken, so wirft man ihm vor, er nehme sich nicht genügend Zeit für den Einzelnen. „Das ist ja kein Besuch!“ Kaum denkt der Betreffende daran, daß der Seelsorger die Besuchszeit, die ihm zur Verfügung steht, auf vierhundert Glieder verteilen muß. Wie viele würde er wohl besuchen, wenn er allen so viel Zeit widmen würde, wie etliche es verlangen? Nicht immer verallgemeinert jeder seine Ansprüche und bewertet sie in dem Lichte.

Aus diesem ergibt sich bei dem Prediger ein Schuldgefühl. Wo soll er damit hingehen?

Die Arbeit in der Gemeinde bringt für den Bruder eine gewisse Einsamkeit mit sich. Man darf sich nicht mit etlichen befreunden, denn das würde andere abstoßen. Also bleibt man mehr allein, und wird innerlich einsam. Aber Einsamkeit bringt Kämpfe mit sich, die der Besorgte zum Seelsorger trägt. Hier darf er sich frei aussprechen und sich in dieser Gemeinschaft Stärke und Trost holen.

Der Arbeiter in der Gemeinde arbeitet auch immer mit persönlichen Fragen. Der Holzarbeiter mag etwas verderben, aber es sind schließlich nur Bretter. Es wird der Fehler keine persönliche Sache. Der Kaufmann verrechnet sich und hat dabei Verlust, aber der Verlust ist sein eigener, und es kommt nicht zu einem Zusammenstoß von Persönlichkeiten, es sei denn er möchte es so haben. Die Fehler der Arbeiter dagegen sind fast immer derart, daß dadurch viele hineingezogen werden, und sie haben es sofort mit persönlichen Beziehungen zu tun. Jakobus warnt, daß wir mannigfaltig fehlen, aber die Fehler des Arbeiters erfassen viel mehr das

persönliche Leben der Menschen. Wenn man sonst ein zartes Gewissen hat — und das sollte ein Prediger haben —, dann legt sich dieses schwer auf seine Seele. Solche Sachen schüttelt man sich nicht so leicht ab.

B. Wie wissen wir, daß die Seelsorge am Seelsorger eine Notwendigkeit ist?

1. Man merkt es sofort in seinem eigenen Leben. Wer sonst ehrlich ist, weiß daß er ohne seelsorgerische Hilfe nicht mit allen Fragen der Seele fertig wird. Manche Nacht wäre anders gewesen, wenn man sich mit einem andern beraten hätte. Sehr oft hat der Prediger Hemmungen, denn er weiß nicht so recht, wo er hingehen soll, um sich einmal mit einem andern auszutauschen.

Andrerseits hat man auch die Erfahrung gemacht, daß es Erleichterung gab, als man sich innerlich von gewissen Sorgen und sonstigen Bedürfnissen befreite. Dann erfuhr man erst, wie notwendig die Seelsorge am Seelsorger ist.

2. Man dürfte auch einmal auf andere schauen, die schwer in der Arbeit gingen und endlich zusammenbrachen. Sie haben es oft ohne Seelsorge versucht. Sie wollten nicht zu einem andern gehen und wurden aber selber mit der Last nicht fertig.

Nicht immer kommt er zu einem Zusammenbruch; das geschieht nur selten, aber man merkt es einem Bruder ab, der schwer unter einer Last geht, und die Arbeit leidet darunter. Es fehlt an Arbeitsfrische, ohne die der Arbeiter kaum sein darf. Menschen kommen zum Seelsorger, um Lebensmut von ihm zu bekommen, aber ein Seelsorger, der selber zerknirscht ist, kann ihnen keinen Lebensmut spenden.

II. Wer sollte die Seelsorge am Seelsorger tun?

Diese zweite Frage ist eine besonders wichtige, denn nicht alles, was im Leben notwendig ist, ist zugleich möglich. Hat Gott für den Seelsorger eine Möglichkeit geschaffen, daß ihm geholfen werden kann?

A. Einmal müßte er selber Seelsorge an sich tun. Ist so etwas denn überhaupt möglich? Ich glaube ja. Er muß einmal mit sich selber ganz aufrichtig

werden und sich vor Gott im Gebet ganz aussprechen. Nicht immer sind wir vor Gott klar und offen. Man kann sich so allgemein verhalten, daß keine bestimmte Schäden mit Gott besprochen werden.

Man lernt im Leben am meisten von seinen Fehlern, wenn man sie als Fehler erkennt und bekennt. Solange man sich verteidigt und entschuldigt, kommt es zu keiner Besserung. Ein berühmter Geschäftsmann sagte einmal zu einem jungen Mann, der bei ihm Geschäftsführer werden sollte: „Du darfst irgend einen Fehler einmal machen.“ Er wollte ihm damit sagen, daß er von seinen Fehlern lernen müßte, und es dürfe keine Wiederholung der Fehler geben. Manches könnte der Seelsorger selber bei sich zurechtstellen, wenn er gemerkt in der Arbeit wäre.

Der große Herr unserer Arbeit schafft uns die Gelegenheit, einmal an uns selber Seelsorge zu tun. Es mag das Krankenlager sein, das uns aus dem Getriebe der Arbeitsroutine herausreißt und uns Muße zum Nachsinnen gibt. Oft ist es eine schlaflose Nacht, in der wir über unsern Dienst ein Urteil sprechen. Auch dürfte man Ferien gebrauchen, um über das Vergangene nachzudenken. Hauptsache ist, daß man einmal aus dem gewohnten Geleise herauskommt. Als Paulus den Ältesten zu Ephesus etwas über ihren Dienst sagen wollte, rief er sie in eine andere Stadt. Hier sagte er ihnen: „Habt acht auf euch selbst.“

Zu der Seelsorge an sich selbst gehört das Empfinden, daß es irgendwo fehlt. Ohne beunruhigende Symptome geht man nicht zum Arzt, noch macht man sich Gedanken. Wenn der Seelsorger in seiner Arbeit über sich ruhig ist, wird er auch nicht die Notwendigkeit einer Beprüfung des Innenlebens u. des Dienstes erkennen. Dann müßte er auch so aufrichtig sein, wie ein Mensch von sich aus sein kann. Wir werden trotzdem viel übersehen, worüber uns andere einmal Klarheit geben müßten.

B. Die Frau des Seelsorgers kann ihrem Mann in vielen Kämpfen helfen, vorausgesetzt, daß das Eheverhältnis es ermöglicht. Es gibt auch ein Nebeneinandergehen, eine Möbelgemeinschaft.

Aber wo Liebe und Verständnis für den andern sich mit einer völligen Hingabe an Gott für den Dienst vereinigen, wird eine Gemeinschaft hergestellt, in der sich die Seele von vielen Banden befreien kann.

Nicht immer wird der Ehepartner das richtige Urteil über den andern treffen können. In manchen Fällen denken sie gleich und erfahren im Leben manches wie in einer Seele. Es fehlt oft an Objektivität. Aber offensichtliche Unarten dürften in dieser zarten Gemeinschaft behoben werden.

Manche Fragen, die das Gemüt des Seelsorgers bewegen, können auch in dieser zarten Gemeinschaft nicht beantwortet werden. Hier müßte sich eine besondere Gelegenheit bieten, durch die der Seelsorger zu einem inneren Durchbruch kommen könnte.

C. Eine große Arbeit an den Seelsorgern tun ihre Arbeitsbrüder. Gott schenkt dem David den Jonathan. Oft ist der Jonathan ein älterer Bruder, zu dem der jüngere Vertrauen hat. Es mag auch ein Arbeitsgenosse sein, von dem man weiß, daß er sich als Arzt der Seele brauchen läßt.

Wenn Brüder Gemeinden bereisen, sollten sie sich immer um die arbeitenden Brüder bemühen. Oft wollen sich bei der Ankunft des Evangelisten sofort die Kranken und Gekränkten anmelden und sich über den Arbeiter beklagen. Hier müßte er weise handeln. Gewisse Zeit gehört dem Diener in der Gemeinde, und der Evangelist oder Besuchsprediger sollte mit ihm eine kleine Reise machen oder sonst die Stille suchen. Hier bietet sich dann Gelegenheit zu einem seelsorgerischen Austausch, wo sich der Seelsorger einem andern anvertrauen kann.

Es mag auch sein, daß der Prediger einen Bruder aus einer andern Konfession hat, dem er sich ohne Vorbehalt anvertrauen kann. Auf diese Weise kann einer dem andern einen Liebesdienst tun.

Die Frage, warum solches nicht öfter geschieht, wäre hier auch zu erwägen. Ich glaube bestimmt, daß das Bruderverhältnis unter den Arbeitern nicht so herzlich ist, wie es sein sollte. Die Frage, wer von uns wohl der Größte sei,

ist noch nicht aus dem Kreis der Jünger entfernt worden. Offen gesprochen, einer fürchtet sich vor dem andern. Die Verleumdung und die Klatscherei unter den Arbeitern sind Sünden, die die Kanäle des Verkehrs von Herz zu Herzen verstopfen. Auf dem Boden gedeiht die edle Pflanze der Bruderliebe nicht.

III. Wie sollte die Seelsorge am Seelsorger getan werden?

Das Wie ist oft gerade so wichtig wie das Was. Die Seelsorge mag ganz verkehrt ausgeführt werden, und somit gelingt es dem Bruder nicht, sein Ziel zu erreichen. Die Seelsorge erfaßt immer ein zartes Gebiet des Menschen, deshalb kann sie nicht ohne Rücksicht auf die Gefühle des andern betrieben werden.

A. Womit müßte man in der Seelsorge am Prediger oder Arbeiter rechnen?

1. Bei vielen müßte man bestimmt mit innerer Verslossenheit rechnen. Die Erfahrung hat es gelehrt, daß Arbeiter bei andern Offenheit wünschen, selber zuweilen aber sehr verschlossen sind. Die Verslossenheit begründet sich auf Erfahrungen in der Arbeit. Der Arbeiter ist oft der Gegenstand der Plauderei gewesen. Ihm werden auch manche Dinge über andere Arbeiter vorgeworfen. Aus diesem ergibt sich eine innere Furcht sich einem andern zu offenbaren. Er könnte es mißbrauchen und die Arbeit des betreffenden Bruders wäre gelähmt.

Wie ich schon andeutete, wirft man sich gerne mit den Sünden der Arbeiter herum. Man braucht sie als Entschuldigung für eigene Schuld. Paulus warnt den Seelsorger, sich nicht anderer Sünden teilhaftig zu machen. Kein Mensch kann es mit dem Abfall im Leben anderer zu tun haben, ohne sich selber zu besudeln. Wir wollen uns nicht mit den Sünden anderer beschäftigen, sonst werden wir an der Seele Schaden leiden.

Ein Bruder erzählte, daß er sich habe einem andern Bruder anvertrauen wollen, aber als er gemerkt habe, wie dieser über andere sprach und sie verurteilte, habe er schon gerne von jeglicher persönlichen Unterredung abgestanden. Vielleicht trägt er sein Problem noch heute auf dem Herzen.

2. Auch fällt es dem Arbeiter schwer, über sich selber ohne jegliche Verteidigung zu sprechen. Man möchte immer Gründe und Ursachen angeben. Man erwartet, daß andere sich ohne jeglichen Vorbehalt zu ihren Schäden bekennen sollen, aber über sich ein wahres Wort zu sagen, fällt einem schwer.

Seit Adams Fall hat der Mensch sich entschuldigen wollen. „Das Weib gab mir.“ Heute haben andere an unsern Problemen schuld. Es mag sich auch teilweise so verhalten, aber durch Beschuldigung ist noch keiner vorwärts gekommen. Die meisten Probleme werden bei uns behoben.

3. Die Erfahrung hat auch gelehrt, daß manche Arbeiter mit Bitterkeit zu kämpfen haben. Im Leben hat man vieles erfahren und manches ist uns auf ungerechter Weise zugekommen. Durch die Jahre will sich eine innere Verbitterung gegen Gemeinde und Brüder festsetzen. Mit diesem müßte wohl ein jeder, der am Seelsorger Seelsorge tut, rechnen.

Diese innere Verbitterung raubt dem Arbeiter die Freude an der Arbeit. Dann und wann bringt er sie durch gewisse Aussprüche und den Ton seiner Rede zum Ausdruck. Man merkt es ihm ab, daß er beleidigt oder verwundet ist.

B. Wie sollte man in der Seelsorge am Seelsorger vorgehen?

1. Man sucht in der Seelsorge immer Verständnis bei dem andern. Der Arbeiter will auch verstanden sein. Man braucht ihm nicht immer Recht zu geben, aber verständnisvoll zuhören ist ein Bruderdienst. Das Horchen ist immer ein wesentlicher Teil der Seelsorge, und horchen kann ein jeder.

Es liegt auch viel daran, wie man horcht. Man kann horchen und dabei den andern richten. Dieses wird sich immer auf den Besorgten übertragen, und er bekommt es zu fühlen, daß er nicht verstanden wird. Oft ist es der Blick oder die Haltung des Seelsorgers, die dem andern klar anmelden, daß er nicht Verständnis findet.

Seelsorge, wie Paul Tournier sie erklärt, beruht auf Aufrichtigkeit. Wenn sie zum Scheinmanöver herabsinkt, ist sie kraftlos.

2. Seelsorge am Seelsorger muß immer im strengsten Vertrauen getan

werden. Wenn sich der kleinste Gedanke an ein Mißbrauchen des Gesagten einschleicht, ist der Hauptnerv bei der Seelsorge durchschnitten worden. Nur zu oft blieb man nicht sauber, und der Schaden war unaussprechlich groß.

Viel liegt daran, wie man sich später zum Besorgten verhält. Gewöhnlich wollen sich später noch besondere Kämpfe einschleichen. Was wird er nun von mir denken? Wie wird er sich zu mir stellen? Solche Sorgen können durch eine offene Haltung zum Bruder behoben werden. Somit bleibt das Vertrauen gesichert.

3. In der Seelsorge am Seelsorger müßte man auch brüderlich vorgehen. Nirgends ist es so wichtig, dieses Verhältnis zu wahren. Einer darf dem andern nicht das Empfinden des Niedrigerstehens stärken. Beide stehen vor Gott und haben sich von gemeinsamen

Kämpfen zu erzählen. Hier geht es um Dienstbürden, nicht um ein Verhältnis zwischen Arzt und Patient. Wunderbar heilend wirkt sich solches Verhältnis auf beide aus.

Wir brauchen Seelsorger, die auch an ihren Dienstbrüdern nicht vorbeigehen. Nur wenn wir das brüderliche Verhältnis unter den Arbeitern bewahren werden, wird es zu einer innigen und erfolgreichen Seelsorge unter den Arbeitern kommen. Zu oft läßt man einen Bruder abirren und wartet bis er sich auf seiner Dienststelle festgelaufen hat. Dann wird er von allen Seiten besprochen und verurteilt. Er fühlt sich manchmal, wie Paulus unter den falschen Brüdern. Möge Gott uns in der Brüdergemeinde ein besseres Verhältnis unter den Arbeitern schenken. Bei uns soll es einmal anfangen!

F. C. Peters

HISTORICAL

Communal Life Among Medieval Evangelicals in the Fifteenth Century

(A study of the economic and social ethics of the Brethren of the Common Life, the Taborites, the Bohemian Brethren and the Waldenses.)

I. Introduction

Francis Parkman once wrote that it was in "the nature of great events to obscure the great events that came before them."¹ This is certainly applicable to the great religious movements of the fifteenth century, which have not only been obscured, but almost totally eclipsed by the tremendous religious upheavals of the sixteenth century, generally known as the Reformation. The onward march of time and events, however, has given to historical studies new perspectives, and the significance of the "Christian Renaissance" is increasingly recognized, not only as preparatory to the Protestant movement of the sixteenth century, but also as a "New De-

votion" and a "rebirth of Christianity" in its own right.

The need for reform was widely recognized in the Western Church at the beginning of the fifteenth century as is evidenced by the Councils of Pisa, Constance and Basel. But the "rebirth of Christianity" did not come from 'above'; it was largely brought about by dynamic lay movements. Although differing in several significant aspects, these new-life movements were characterized by a common desire to re-establish a true *communio sanctorum* according to the apostolic pattern. Religion in the church had become almost completely externalized and institutionalized, and was sadly lacking in those elements of spontaneous fellowship and piety which truly constitute a "living congregation of the living Lord Jesus Christ."² The secret of the dynamic of the "Christian Renaissance" of the

fifteenth century is to be found in the revival of the great truth that Christianity means a "common life," and that nobody could be a Christian by himself, as an isolated individual, but only together with "the brethren." That this was the central emphasis in the religious movements, whose communal life will be considered in this article, can be gathered from the very names by which they were commonly known. In the Netherlands these Christians were known as the "Brothers of the Common Life (or "Common Lot"); in Bohemia they came to be known as "Unity Brethren" (*unitas fratrum*). The term "Brethren" was the popular designation for members among the "Taborites," and the Waldensians of Southern France and Northern Italy also regarded themselves simply as "Brethren." In discussing the nature of the Apostolic Church, George Florovsky describes it in these terms: "Christianity is a community, a corporation, a fellowship, a brotherhood . . ."³ The religious "sectarians" of the fifteenth century sought diligently to recapture this spirit and to restore such communal life in their time. To what extent these religious groups were successful in the realization of this objective is the subject of the following pages.

No attempt will be made to establish exhaustively the general relationship among these groups. Although the Bohemian Brethren vigorously denied any connection with the Taborites,⁴ because of the military and political aspirations and activities of the latter, they have been rightly regarded as the spiritual successors of the early followers of Hus.⁵ Kautsky simply states: "The successors of the Taborites were the Bohemian Brethren."⁶ The relationship between the Bohemian Brethren and the Waldenses is somewhat obscure. The great mystic and reformer, Peter Chelcicky, seems to constitute the spiritual link between these two movements. According to the "national historian" of Bohemia, F. Palacky, the beliefs of Chelcicky showed him to be as much an offshoot of the Waldensian as of the Hussite tendency. Palacky writes: "I no longer doubt now but that

Peter Chelcicky was acquainted with the doctrine of the Waldenses, from an early age, and found pleasure in it . . ."⁷ M. Goll agrees in admitting "that, when Chelcicky came to Prague from the South of France, he adhered to the views of the Waldenses, and that he continued therein . . ."⁸ That there were a number of direct contacts between the Bohemian Brethren and the Waldenses, and that even the thought of a complete "merger" was entertained at one time, has more recently been established by Peter Brock.⁹ With regard to the relation or connection of these groups to the Brethren of the Common Life, very little, if any, evidence has been discovered thus far.

The communal life of the religious groups under consideration will be discussed from two points of view: first, various aspects of their collective life will be briefly described; and secondly, an attempt will be made to discover the underlying assumptions or principles of their communal life.

II. Important Aspects of Religious

Communal Life

1) **Collective Ownership.** From the existing records it appears that among the various groups that held to the doctrine of "community of goods," various levels or gradations were recognized in practice. According to a decree issued by a Synod of the Unity Brethren in 1464, members of the brotherhood fell into three categories. In the first group came the priests and teachers and those laymen who had voluntarily renounced all worldly wealth. Then came the ordinary Brothers and Sisters, described as 'those who live from handicraft or from the land.' These formed the overwhelming majority of the membership. To the third group belonged the "penitent probationers" not yet admitted into full membership of the unity.¹⁰ Although a high standard of social and moral behavior was expected of all members, the complete fulfilment of the injunctions of apostolic Christianity was demanded only of the first category. Community of goods, the renunciation of all private property, was the mark of the "perfect," as they were also called, for instance, by the Waldenses.¹¹ This

distinction between priests and laity is also expressed in the Third Article of the famous "Four Articles of Prague."¹² Of the Four Articles, the third had a stronger social effectiveness than the rest since it attacked what had become, in Bohemia as elsewhere, an enormous vested interest. The Article reads:

Whereas many priests and monks, by force of temporal law, command great earthly possessions, this being against the orders of Christ, to the detriment of their priestly office, and to the great disadvantage to the lords of the temporal estates; that those priests be deprived of such unlawful power, and that according to the Scripture they live exemplary lives and be led back to the ways of Christ and the Apostles.¹³

The people of the Tabor community, however, were willing to go beyond this rather negative demand, which expressed the views of the dominant Utraquist party of Bohemia and of the University of Prague prior to 1420. The attack against the riches and luxury of the church was, of course, quite common all through the Middle Ages. The Taborites, although they never tried to abolish caste differences in their communities, did practice a certain "collective ownership" for a short time. Kautsky gives the following description of this practice among the Taborites:

Each community had a common box called 'coop,' to which everyone brought what he called his own. There were three such boxes, one in each of the towns of Pisek, Tabor, and Wonian. The brothers and sisters sold all their possessions and laid them at the feet of the comptrollers of these coops.¹⁴

Their "communism" was always a chief target in the attacks of their opponents. Jan Pibram writes in his work against this group (1429): "The Taborites contrived another monstrous trick, in that they enjoined and commanded all the people of Pisek, who had betaken themselves to the hill, to bring each one all he possessed . . . This dastardly proceeding shows, how disgracefully the people were robbed of their

possessions and earnings . . ."¹⁵

Although there may have been some compulsion in the Tabor communities with regard to the renunciation of private property in the early phases of their development, historians are now generally agreed that the practice of community of goods was carried on a voluntary basis. Heymann thinks that the significance of the "primitive socialism" at Tabor has been greatly exaggerated, both by contemporary as well as by later critics.¹⁶

Practically, the communism in the Tabor communities fashioned itself as follows: Each family worked for itself in its own private house and private field, with its own means of production, and kept for itself all that was necessary for its own wants. The superfluity alone belonged to the community.¹⁷ This is the view of Kautsky, who can certainly not be accused of being biased in favor of private property.

Among the Bohemian Brethren, as has already been indicated, renunciation of all private property was obligatory only for those who aspired to "perfection." Instructions were given to those who wished to renounce their property in order to join the "perfect" in their practice of Christian communism.¹⁸ They were, in the first instance, to carry out the distribution themselves, giving to the poor, the needy, the sick as well as the orphans and widows. In no case was pressure to be put on a Brother to join the "perfect"; the latter's total renunciation, it was stressed, was to be an entirely voluntary act. Although the ordinary Brethren were permitted to have personal possessions which they could pass on by will, they were still obliged to assist those in need out of their property, as well as to offer hospitality to those Brethren travelling on lawful business. In the synodal decree of 1464, the following injunction is given:

If anyone sees that a Christian of like faith is in want, he should out of love give him from his own estate according to need. Thus all believing Christians should strive to fulfil the law of Christ, carrying one another's burdens . . . If anyone fails to care for fellow Chris-

tians who think alike with him, then he has denied the faith and is lacking in love, and is worse even than the heathen.¹⁹

Rudolf Rican defines this sort of community of goods as a kind of "Consumer's Communism." In his book, *Das Reich Gottes in den Boehmischen Laendern*, he describes the Tabor variety of Christian communism in these words:

Nach dem Vorbild der apostolischen Gemeinde in Jerusalem . . . führte man eine Art von Konsum-Kommunismus ein. Die ersten Bewohner der Stadt legten ihre Habe und Geld in auf den Hauptplatz aufgestellte Bottiche zur gemeinsamen Benutzung aller. Ähnlich geschah es in andern südböhmischen Städten.²⁰

Among the Waldenses community of goods also appears to have been practiced on a voluntary basis. It might be perhaps more appropriate to speak of their arrangement as a common treasury rather than as a collective ownership.

A. Muston describes the practice of the "Israel of the Alps" as follows: "They (the servants of the 'Brethren') were supported by the voluntary contributions of the people. These were divided annually in a general synod: one part was given to the ministers, one to the poor, and the third was reserved for the missionaries of the church . . ."²¹

That the common treasury among the Waldenses served primarily the needs of the ministers or "Barbes" (designation for chief ministers) is clearly stated by Barbe Morel in his description of Waldensian practices at the beginning of the sixteenth century. He writes:

Our temporal goods . . . are managed in common . . . All we receive from our people in the way of money is handed over to this same general council, and placed in the common treasury, in the hands of our leaders. It is destined in part, to cover the expenses of travelling

. . . sometimes a portion is reserved for the poor.²²

Religious communal life achieved its most positive and most comprehensive expression in the movement known as "the Brethren of the Common Life." The Brother and Sister Houses in Deventer and Zwolle, became famous throughout Europe, and many eminent scholars, such as Erasmus, for instance, received part of their training in the schools of the Brethren of the Common Life. Gerard Groote, who is generally regarded as the founder and spiritual father of the movement, found the communal life of monasticism wanting in many respects, and it was his desire to establish religious communities according to "the rule of all rules, namely, the blessed gospel . . ."²³ Groote never was a friend of the mendicant monks who sustained their "consumer communism" by constant begging. Poverty was a boon to the Christian pilgrim, but not indolence. "It is well for a true Christian," he would say, "to cede his possessions to the poor. This will compel him to work for his daily bread."²⁴ Groote himself spent all his possessions for the extension of the "Kingdom of God." So little had he reserved for himself that sometimes he had to ask one of his friends for a small loan.²⁵ His house he ceded to the use of some poor women (in September, 1374), and thereby he laid the actual foundation for the establishment of the common life of the Brethren and Sisters.

In later years, regular procedures were laid down for admission into the Brotherhood. An applicant was usually examined as to his physical and mental health, as well as to his ability to read and write and to his interest in books. Before he could become a bonafide Brother of the Common Life, however, he had to swear before a notary public and in the presence of some witnesses, that he renounced all claims to any property of his own.²⁶ After having voluntarily ceded his property to the Brotherhouses, the individual member was not to acquire any private possessions. According to the provisions of the constitutions of Zwolle, Deventer and Hil-desheim, cited by Hyma, "they were to

spend a part of their income to meet current expenses, and the remainder for the relief of the poor." 27

Whereas the Taborites, the Bohemian Brethren and the Waldenses retained, with some exceptions, the institution of the family in their communal life, the Brethren of the Common Life believed that the ideal could be best realized in the unmarried state, and hence they established separate Brotherhouses and Sisterhouses. This greatly simplified the problem of "collective ownership" and consequently also gave a greater permanence to the movement. It is not proper, however, to equate this movement with some kind of reformed monasticism. Here is how two eminent contemporaries, Abbot Arnold of the Benedictine Abbey of Dickninge (393), and Matthias Grabow of the law faculty of the new University of Cologne, characterize the Brethren of the Common Life:

1) They wished to live a common life 'extra-religionem,' that is, without taking the ordinary monastic vows.

2) They lived by their work, rejecting mendicancy.

3) They lived in 'communi,' men and women separately and thus without marriage, sharing freely with each other, so as to gain the advantage of mutual influence and brotherly exhortations . . . 28

That their living in common was the most characteristic feature of the new movement, which primarily struck people in general, is proved by the name by which they became popularly known. The controlling assumptions that led to some form of collective ownership in these various groups will be examined later.

FOOTNOTES

1) Quoted by Dale Peterson in paper on "Francis Parkmen," p. 2.

2) Definition of the idea of "Church" as given by Karl Barth in *The Universal Church in God's Design*, London, 1948, Vol. 1, p. 67.

3) George Florovsky, *Ibid.*, p. 46.

4) See Peter Brock. *The Political and Social Doctrines of the Unity of Czech*

Brethren. 'S-Gravenhage (Holland), 1957, pp. 95, 96.

5) *Ibid.*

6) Karl Kautsky, *Communism in Central Europe in the Time of the Reformation*. Translated by J. and E. Mulliken. London, 1897, p. 78.

7) F. Palacgy, quoted by Emilio Comba, *History of the Waldenses of Italy*, London, 1889. Footnote, 269, p. 313.

8) *Ibid.*

9) Brock, pp. 77-78.

10) Brock, p. 80.

11) *Ibid.*

12) See Frederick G. Heymann, *John Zizka and the Hussite Revolution*. Princeton, 1955, Ch. 10.

13) *Ibid.*, p. 154.

14) Kautsky, p. 60.

15) Quoted in Kautsky, *Ibid.*

16) Heymann, p. 79.

17) Kautsky, p. 61.

18) See Heymann, p. 81.

19) Quoted by Heymann, *Ibid.*

(To be continued)

J. A. Toews

The Reformed Pastor

Richard Baxter (1615-1691)

"Be not proud and lordly if you would have them to be lowly. There is no virtue wherein your example will do more, at least abate men's prejudice, than humility, and meekness, and self-denial. Forgive injuries, and be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good; do as our Lord, who when He was reviled, reviled not again. If sinners be stubborn, and stout, and contemptuous, flesh and blood will persuade you to take up their weapons, and master them by their carnal means; but that's not the way, but overcome them with kindness, and patience, and gentleness. The former may shew that you have more worldly power than they; but it's the latter only that will tell them that you overtop them in spiritual excellency, and in the true qualifications of a saint. If you believe that Christ was more imitable than Caesar or Alexander, and that it is more glory to be a Christian than to be a conqueror, yea to be a man than a beast (who oft exceed us in strength), contend then with charity, and not with violence." p. 36.

THEOLOGICAL

The Biblical Doctrine of Sanctification

(Continued from last issue)

VIII. The New Man.

By virtue of the new Lordship the believer is best characterized in a positive way as a servant of righteousness or a servant of God (Rom. 6:18, 22). The new Lordship of God penetrates into the very heart of the believer. Central to the concept of servanthood is the aspect of obedience. The believer is never mechanical in his obedience; he has become a willing servant who obeys from the heart: "But thanks be to God, that, whereas ye were servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching whereunto ye were delivered" (Rom. 6:17). Paul emphasizes the decisive aspect of the new obedience to God. By a definitive sanctifying act of God the believers had been changed from servants to sin to servants to God; from disobedience to obedience to God; from a life of no real fruit, of which they were ashamed (6:21), to a life of fruit unto holiness (6:22).

The new Lordship issues forth in a fruit-bearing life of devotion to God. In this new walk of life the purpose of Christ's death is being realized: "And he died for all that they that live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again" (II Cor. 5:15).

What then are some of the new attitudes and acts of the new man. John depicts them with very distinct strokes. The child of God keeps the commandments of God (I John 2:3; cf. 3:23); he confesses Jesus as the Son of God (4:15); he loves his brethren (4:7) in deed and truth (3:18); he confesses his sins (1:9). On the other hand, he who does not love and obey God does not know God (4:8), that is, he never attained to a true knowledge of God. It is, therefore, the initial encounter with God which has caused the decisive

change in his life; it is the definitive sanctification which has brought the new practical life into being. Union and communion with God from its earliest moment effects a decisive practical conformity to His will as a basis for growth in holiness. The believer has become one who habitually, as that which is now the sphere of his existence, does righteousness (2:29). **This new life is the badge of his new status!**

The comprehensive term for the believer under the new Lordship is, "the new man." He is the new man who "after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth" (Eph. 4:24); he is the new creature in Christ of whom it is said that "old things are passed away: behold they are become new" (II Cor. 5:17, cf. Gal. 6:15; Eph. 2:10).

The fact that the regenerate person is a new man is not in the slightest prejudiced by the fact that the new man is not yet perfect. The new man is something completely different from the old man in that he possesses a knowledge, a righteousness, and a holiness which were not present in the old man; he is therefore completely new. But the new man is not yet perfect; he "is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him who created him" (Col. 3:10); this is a continuous process until the coming of Christ. The Christian's hope is that at the appearance of Christ he will be like Him who is pure and sinless (I John 3:2,3). In the meantime, as he beholds the glory of the Lord, he is "transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord, the Spirit" (II Cor. 3:18).

There is still sin and flesh in the new man, which cause a continual struggle in the believer, but sin and flesh no longer rule over him; their dominion has been replaced once-for-all by the

Lordship of God. The new man in Christ is placed in a position of victory over the dominion of sin, the flesh, the world and the devil; he is empowered with power from on high, which enables him to fight against the encroachment of sin, and to engage in the process of cleansing himself from the sin and defilement still adhering to him. This is the new man created through the experience of union with Christ through faith.

This, then, is what we have been trying to set forth as the teaching of Scripture: the moment the believer places his trust in Christ for his salvation, that moment he experienced a definitive sanctification; he was freed from the dominion of sin, of the world, and of Satan; and was placed under the Lordship of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The latter now rule his life. Through this radical change he became the new man, though not yet perfect because of indwelling sin. The new man, because of the new Lordship, is empowered to seek after righteousness in his life and in the world in which he lives; he is empowered to fight against sin in himself and in the world in which he lives. **This biblical doctrine and the reality it depicts is to penetrate our consciousness from day to day.**

IX. Union with Christ

We cannot speak of the experience of sanctification in the believer apart from his union with Christ. Whenever Scripture points to the decisive sanctifying act which has taken place in the Christian, it speaks of those who are: "in Christ;" "of God;" "begotten of God;" "abiding in Christ." It is this effectual union with Christ which is the basis of definitive sanctification.

But the efficacy of a subjective union of the believer with Christ is based on a particular objective historical event in the life of Christ. The death and resurrection of Christ are viewed in Scripture, not only as being redemptive acts on behalf of the believer, but also as acts in which the believer participated in a most intimate union with Christ. Central to sanctification is the predominant note of the death, burial, and re-

surrection of Christ, and our death, burial, and resurrection with him (Rom. 6:3-5,8,9; II Cor. 5:14,15; Gal. 2:20; 6:19; Eph. 2:5; Col. 2:12,20; 3:1-3; I Peter 4:1,2). It is this union to which Paul appeals as the basis of the believer's death to sin. The believer's baptism into Jesus Christ signified pre-eminently his union with Christ's death, burial, and resurrection (Rom. 6:3-5).

The death and resurrection of the believer is not, however, identical with the death and resurrection of Christ. Our death and resurrection is in the "likeness" of Christ's death and resurrection. His death was a physical death; ours was a death to sin, a crucifixion of the old man, a putting away of the body of sin, and a resurrection to a newness of life; the newness of life is a spiritual life. The believer's union with Christ is therefore a spiritual union.

The historical death and resurrection of Christ at Golgotha cannot be viewed in abstraction from those for whom He died. The death of the believer, and his resurrection with Christ, occurred in the historic past when Christ died. In the realm of the objective historical, the once-for-all conquest of sin by Christ was a once-for-all death to sin for the believer (Rom. 6:9-11). This participation in the redemptive acts of Christ at Golgotha was a participation in a full and perfect salvation including sanctification. Christ was made unto us, not only wisdom from God, righteousness and redemption, but also sanctification (I Cor. 1:30).

In one sense, therefore, the believer was wholly sanctified in the historical death and resurrection of Christ. In Him a perfect sanctification was accomplished once for all. In the book of Hebrews there is a repeated emphasis on the entire sanctification performed for God's people in the death of Christ: "By the which will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (Heb. 10:10. "For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. 10:14; cf. 9:13; 13:12).

The question is, how is the sanctification accomplished for the believer in the objective historical event at Gol-

gotha (when he died with Christ) made his own possession in his experiential life on earth? The evidence of Scripture points to three stages in the application of the perfect sanctification accomplished in Christ:

1) The believer experiences a definitive sanctification at the moment of his effectual union with Christ. What this consists of has been developed in the preceding articles. It is to be noted that such a definitive sanctification does not exclude the indwelling of sin in the believer and the influence of the flesh.

2) From the moment of definitive sanctification, the process of progressive sanctification sets in. The renewal of the **new man**, the mortification of the members on this earth and the struggle against sin continues until the coming of Christ and the putting on of the resurrection body.

3) The believer will be perfectly and wholly sanctified at the coming of Christ. (I John 3:3-5; I Thess. 5:23).

The historical death and resurrection

of Christ **for the believer** brings into focus the propitiatory, reconciliatory, and redemptive aspects of the death of Christ. The substitutionary character of the death of Christ is here particularly relevant. But we must also include the biblical formula of the **believer's union with Christ** in His death and resurrection. Here definitive sanctification—our decisive breach with sin and its power and defilement—comes into view. The union of the believer with Christ at Golgotha is the foundation of his practical and existential life now. When the believer repents, the sanctification accomplished for him (because of his union with Christ) in the historical event of Golgotha, is applied to him. Only in virtue of what happened in the past does sanctification come to pass in the sphere of the practical and existential in the life of the believer. There is tension here between the past event of the believer's death and the application of it; there is mystery; but this must not tone down its reality.

V. Adrian

Die Wertschätzung des Alten Testaments

Die Lehrer der apostolischen Gemeinde hatten dieselbe Bibel als die Lehrer der Synagoge, nämlich, das Alte Testament. (Daß die Bezeichnung 'Altes Testament' erst später entstand, brauchte hier nicht besprochen zu werden.) Jedoch, die apostolischen Prediger verstanden das Alte Testament anders als die Rabbiner. Im Lichte des großen historischen Ereignisses — des Todes und der Auferstehung Jesu —, hatten sie ein neues Verständnis für die Heilige Schrift gewonnen. Ohne diesen Wandel in der Hermeneutik (Auslegung der Schrift), hätten sie sich, als sie sich vom Judentum trennten, auch von dem Alten Testament trennen müssen. Das konnten sie aber nicht tun. Sonst hätte ihr Evangelium, daß Jesus der Messias war, der der Menschheit das Heil gebracht hatte, keine geschichtliche Grundlage gehabt. Auf die Frage nach einem Beweis für die Glaubwürdigkeit ihrer Messiasbotschaft, antworteten die

Apostel: Es steht geschrieben. Damit bekannten sie sich zum Alten Testament und machten es somit zu einem den Christen gehörigen Buch. So sind dann auch die neutestamentlichen Schriften zum großen Teil eine Harmonie zwischen dem Leben, Sterben und Auferstehen Jesu, und dem Alten Testament. Die Apostel bestanden darauf, daß das Alte Testament Eigentum der neutestamentlichen Gemeinde sei — daß es ein 'christliches' Buch sei.

Und was wollen wir mit dem Alten Testament machen? Wir haben nicht nur das Alte Testament, wie die ersten Christen, sondern wir haben noch eine inspirierte Auslegung des Alten Testaments — eine Auslegung gegeben im Blick auf das was am Karfreitag, Ostern und am Pfingsttage geschah, nämlich, das Neue Testament. (Daß das Neue Testament mehr als nur eine Auslegung des Alten ist, brauchte hier nicht erörtert zu werden.) Wir, die wir in der

nach-apostolischen Zeit leben, haben also einen anderen Standort als die Apostel. Sie suchten die geschichtlichen Wurzeln für die Erlösung, die Gott in Christo vollbracht hatte, im Alten Testament; wir finden sie im Neuen Testament. Wozu dann das Alte Testament? Das ist die heikle Frage, auf die schon manche Antworten gegeben worden sind. In der vorigen Ausgabe des **The Voice** gaben wir drei dieser Antworten wieder: die christologische, typologische, und allegorische Auslegungen des Alten Testaments. Das sind alles Versuche, die Wertschätzung des Alten Testaments für die neutestamentliche Gemeinde zu unterstreichen. Es sind Versuche, die Einheit der Bibel zu erklären, damit die Botschaft des Alten, wie auch des Neuen Testaments, in ihrer vollen Gültigkeit erfaßt werde. Einige dieser Versuche sind leider mißlungen und haben mehr Vernachlässigung als Wertschätzung des Alten Testaments bewirkt. Dazu gehört auch das sogenannte ‚Gesetz-Evangelium‘ Prinzip der Auslegung der Heiligen Schrift.

I. Gesetz/Evangelium.

In manchen Kreisen hat man das Alte Testament in das Zeitalter des Gesetzes hineingeschoben. Das Neue Testament, dagegen, gehört zum Zeitalter der Gnade. Man beruft sich bei solch einer Erklärung auf Schriftworte, wie z.B. „Das Gesetz ist durch Mose geworden, die Gnade und Wahrheit aber durch Jesus Christus.“ Auch findet man für solch eine Scheidung der Testamente gute Anhaltspunkte in dem Kampf Jesu und der Apostel mit Gesetzlichkeit im Judentum — ein Kampf, der sich in den Evangelien und den paulinischen Briefen besonders klar widerspiegelt.

Jedoch, wenn wir durch das Lesen des Neuen Testaments zu dem Schluß kommen, daß Jesus und seine Apostel das Alte Testament mit seinen Gesetzen verurteilt haben, haben wir das Neue Testament falsch verstanden. Die neutestamentliche Gemeinde setzte sich nicht mit dem Gesetz des Alten Testaments auseinander, sondern mit der Gesetzlichkeit, wie sie im Judentum zu finden war — eine Gesetzlichkeit, die eine

Entstellung des Alten Testaments darstellte.

Zudem ist es eben ganz verkehrt, wenn man das Alte Testament als ‚Gesetz‘, dem Neuen Testament als ‚Evangelium‘ gegenüberstellt. Es gibt schon manche Gesetze im Alten Testament, z.B. das ganze Zeremonialgesetz, die ihre Dienstbarkeit mit dem Kommen Jesu verloren. Sie waren nur ein Schatten der von der Wirklichkeit ersetzt wurde. Aber die moralischen Grundsätze des Alten Testaments bleiben stehen, ja sie werden im Neuen Testament geradezu verschärft. Auch soll man nicht vergessen, daß das Neue Testament auch Gesetz hat. Denken wir nur an all die ethischen ‚Gebote‘ Jesu und der Apostel! Zudem darf man den Blick für das Evangelium der Gnade, das im Alten Testament zu finden ist, nicht verschließen. Die alttestamentlichen Frommen kannten auch die vergebende, erlösende und befreiende Gnade Gottes.

Man hat die Gesetz/Evangelium-Auslegung so weit getrieben, daß manche sogar einen anderen Heilsboden im Alten Testament finden, als im Neuen. Haben wir es nicht alle schon einmal gehört — sogar von der Kanzel — daß man im Alten Testament durchs Gesetz selig wurde, während im Neuen, durchs Evangelium? Liegt hinter solcher Meinung nicht der Gedanke, daß Gott lange versucht hat, Menschen auf dem Boden des Gesetzes selig zu machen, daß der Versuch mißlang, und daher der neue Weg, der Glaubensweg? Aber so dürfen wir doch nicht von Gott sprechen. Zudem, wenn das Neue Testament Beispiele anführt, von solchen, die durch den Glauben, ohne Werke gerecht wurden, dann sind das lauter alttestamentliche Beispiele. Jemand soll über die Überschwinglichkeit des Neuen Testaments, im Gegensatz zum Alten, gepredigt haben und dabei Hebräer 11 als Textwort gebraucht haben. Hebräer 11 zeigt uns wohl die rettende, siegende, wirkende Macht des Glaubens, aber im Leben alttestamentlicher Gläubigen. Gott hat immer nur einen Weg zum Heil gehabt: Buße, Vergebung, Glaube, freie Gnade.

Die Gesetze des Alten Testaments sind ja nicht gegeben worden, damit der Mensch sich durch sie einen Weg zu Gott bahnen sollte, sondern um den,

der durch den Glauben gerecht geworden war, den Weg der Heiligung zu führen. Gerade so ist es mit den Geboten des Neuen Testaments. Und es dürfte noch hinzugefügt werden, daß manche der neutestamentlichen Gebote aus dem Alten Testament genommen werden. Selbstverständlich gehen die ethischen Forderungen des Neuen Testaments tiefer als die des Alten, aber das größte Gebot, „Du sollst Gott deinen Herrn lieben von ganzem Herzen . . . und deinen Nächsten als dich selbst“, wurde schon im Alten Testament gegeben und wird dort von den Gläubigen gefordert.

Wenn die Zeit des Alten Testaments als Zeit des Gesetzes geschildert wird, bekommt man den Eindruck, als sei die Frömmigkeit in Israel ein rechtes Jammerleben gewesen. Aber dem Glaubensmann des alten Bundes waren die Gebote Gottes süßer als Honigseim, seine Freude und Wonne, denn sie führten ihn tiefer in die Gemeinschaft mit seinem Gott. Ähnlich wie Johannes von den Geboten Gottes im Neuen Testament sagt: „Und seine Gebote sind nicht schwer.“ Der wahrhaft Gläubige in Israel rühmte sich auch der vergebenden Gnade Gottes, und freute sich über die Gebote Gottes, die für den Glaubensweg Licht gaben. Auch rühmte er sich der vergebenden Gnade Gottes, wenn er merkte, daß er oft fehlte. Aber auf keinen Fall war das Gesetz des Alten Testaments gegeben worden, um dadurch selig zu werden, sondern vielmehr, damit ein erlöstes Volk heilig leben sollte.

Hätten die Apostel das Alte Testament als Gesetz angesehen, hätten sie es fallen gelassen. Nun aber hielten sie an diesem Buch mit aller Gewalt fest und machten es zu einem ‚christlichen‘ Buch, das für die Gemeinde Jesu eine Botschaft hatte. Wenn es wirklich eine Botschaft hat, wollen wir sie finden und verkündigen.

II. Verheißung/Erfüllung.

Es darf darüber kein Zweifel bestehen, daß die neutestamentlichen Schreiber das Kommen Jesu als Erfüllung der alttestamentlichen Verheißungen beschauten. Wir sind uns dessen überzeugt, daß derselbe Geist, durch den Gottes Diener im alten Bunde redeten, die Augen der neutestamentlichen Apostel öff-

nete und ihnen die inneren Zusammenhänge zwischen Verheißung und Erfüllung zeigte. Jesus selbst, in seinen Aussagen über seine Person, gab die Veranlassung, in ihm die Erfüllung der Verheißungen des Alten Testaments zu sehen. Die Predigten der Apostel (man beachte dieses in der Apostelgeschichte und in den Briefen) zeugen davon, daß ihre Begegnung mit dem lebendigen Christus ihnen die Augen für die Verheißungen des Alten Testaments öffnete. In diesem Stück wollen wir ihnen folgen. Gott ist ja der Herr der Geschichte; er sah das Ende der Zeit voraus und legte schon den alttestamentlichen Propheten Worte in den Mund, die in seinen großen heilsgeschichtlichen Plan hineinpaßten.

Nun müssen wir aber doch auf eine Gefahr aufmerksam machen. Wenn das Alte Testament in der Hauptsache als Verheißung angesehen wird, wird das Betrachten des Alten Testaments sehr leicht zu einem akademischen Studium, anstatt zu einem erbaulichen Forschen. Man sagt sich, es gilt das Alte Testament zu lesen, um das Neue verstehen zu können, aber man ist sich nicht davon überzeugt, daß das Alte Testament eine bleibende Botschaft für unser Zeit hat. Dabei vergißt man, daß die Propheten mit beiden Füßen in ihrer Zeit standen, aus ihren Verhältnissen heraus sprachen und ihrem Volk Gnade und Gericht verkündigten. Wenn z.B. Jesaja dem König Ahas ein Zeichen gibt: „Eine Jungfrau ist schwanger und wird einen Sohn gebären, den wird sie heißen Immanuel“ (Jes. 7, 14), dann genügt es nicht zu sagen: Das ist ein messianisches Wort. Das ist es wohl, und wir staunen über Gottes Vorsehung. Aber es bleibt die Frage, was es für Jesaja und Ahas bedeutete, als es gesprochen wurde. Aus dem Zusammenhang wird ersichtlich, daß Gott zur Ermutigung des zagenden Königs, der sich vor seinen Feinden nicht zu schützen wußte, ein Trostwort reden läßt; denn ehe das Kind, das geboren werden soll, zwischen Gut und Böse zu unterscheiden gelernt haben wird, wird Gott mit den Feinden Judahs aufgeräumt haben. Das war die Botschaft für Gottes Volk, zur Zeit des Königs Ahas. Heute bedeutet das Wort für Gottes Volk, für uns, daß wenn die

Wolken des Gerichts und des Übels auch noch so schwarz sein mögen, Gott mit uns ist — Immanuel; wir brauchen uns nicht zu fürchten. Auf dem Wege kann ein alttestamentliches Wort zu uns reden, ohne daß wir es aus dem Rahmen der Geschichte herausreißen. Dagegen, wenn man durchs Alte Testament geht und nur Verheißungen auf Christus heraus sucht, dann macht man eine akademische Studie, aber man findet nicht den Weg, die alttestamentliche Botschaft auf unser Leben und unsere Zeit anzuwenden.

Wenn das Alte Testament nur als Verheißung und das Neue als Erfüllung angesehen wird, begnügt man sich oft nur mit den Teilen des Alten Testaments die messianisch sind. Es ist aber einem jeden Bibelleser klar, daß das Alte Testament große Kapitel hat, in denen

man schwerlich messianische Verheißungen finden würde. Auch vergißt man dabei, daß auch das Neue Testament zum großen Teil Verheißung ist, nicht nur Erfüllung. Wir denken nur einmal an all die Kapitel, die es mit der lebendigen Hoffnung der Gläubigen zu tun haben! Gott sei dank, unser Herz lehrt uns oft besser als der Kopf!

Also, wenn wir unsern Hörern wirklich den Wert des Alten Testaments nahelegen wollen, müssen wir über den Rahmen von ‚Verheißung/Erfüllung‘ hinaus. Wir müssen nach der Botschaft der alttestamentlichen Schreiber für ihre Zeit fragen und sie auf unsere Zeit anwenden. Das tun wir mit der tiefen Überzeugung, daß der Gott Abrahams, Isaaks und Jakobs der Gott und Vater unseres Herrn Jesu Christi ist.

D. Ewert

MISSIONS

The Missionary — Who Is He?

For many the answer to the above question is too obvious to require an explanation. The dictionary simply says, "A person sent on a mission; particularly one sent to propagate religion." But Stephen Neil says, "It is a word which can no longer be used in decent society."¹ What has brought the term into disrepute? If the word has the connotation which Neil suggests, what about the person who is a missionary? Has he, too, fallen from the pedestal which he traditionally held? It is true that the word "missionary" cannot even be found in our English Bible. In the original the word "apostle" probably comes closest in meaning to our concept of a missionary. In II Cor. 8:23 the phrase "apostoloi ekklesion" has been translated "messengers of the churches," or one could say, "missionaries of the churches."

Nevertheless, in some churches the word "missionary" has been crowned with a sacred halo. The designation "missionary" lifts a person far above

other occupations, and even above other ministries of the church. On the foreign field, with the rise of nationalism, the missionary no longer enjoys the same unclouded welcome of some decades ago. It may be profitable, therefore, to re-examine the question: Who is the missionary historically, biblically, and ecclesiastically?

1) **Who is the missionary historically?** Where did the name or the office have its beginning? In studying church history, one cannot but be amazed at the expansion of the church in the early centuries. When the home constituency, Jerusalem, could no longer bear its mighty witness, the persecution began, and "they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word" (Acts 8:4). The gospel was carried from land to land, and the witness of the church leaped across the waters to take root in various continents. All across North Africa and the major part of Europe the message of Jesus Christ and His salvation was heard. As this

mighty witness spread to new lands, people realized that resistance to this on-march of truth was futile. The only hope for the opposition was to contaminate the church with worldly ideals and practices. This proved to be quite successful. Courtship with the world led to the insoluble matrimonial relations between church and state. At the other extreme there were people in the church who became so 'other-worldly' that they, so to speak, hid the light under the bushel, as they locked themselves in monasteries. Often the church followed the state in its expansion program carried out by means of the sword. Non-Christian countries came to fear the colonial system of the West, in which political and economic interests were followed up by the coming of the church. This mode of expansion on the part of the church was often at the expense of the state, but the gospel message of salvation by grace was sadly wanting. The world came to interpret the expansion program of the church as part of the expansion of political and cultural influences. After the Reformation the emerging state churches of Protestantism had little interest beyond their own political and colonial boundaries.

But a new missionary era dawned. God laid His hands on individuals. Philip Spener and August Francke received a new vision of the lost world that needed to be won for Christ. A similar prayer came to burn in the hearts of such men as Carey, Marshman and Ward, giving them a strong determination to carry the gospel to the Far East. The church, however, did not share this vision; and when men such as these were ready to go out, who should sponsor them; who would stand behind them? Mission societies were born in England, Germany, Holland and Switzerland. Because the church in general lacked missionary zeal and fervor, God had to raise up these institutions whereby His program of gospel expansion could be revived. When these mission societies presented their candidates, who were ready to go into the foreign fields, to the church for ordination, the church refused. It was not within the framework of their pro-

gram. What could the mission societies do but begin to ordain their own candidates for the assignment abroad. To ordain was prerogative of the church, but necessity forced the societies to authorize these men, by an appropriate ceremony, to go out as ambassadors for Christ. But what should they call the newly-ordained men? They were not officers of the church. Thus they came to be designated as 'missionaries.' These missionaries went forth and were mightily used of God to spread the light of the glorious gospel. We ask, "Who is the 'missionary' historically?" A messenger authorized by an organization other than the church, born out of the failure of the church. These 'missionaries' were sent abroad to do the work that should have been done by the church.

2) **Who is the missionary biblically?** The term "missionary" is not found in Scripture unless we are ready to equate the word "apostle" with it. Although that might be permissible etymologically, it would do considerable violence to our traditional understanding of the term "apostle." It may be better if we understand this term in the restricted sense as referring to the twelve apostles. But let us re-orient ourselves from Scripture and see what picture the Bible gives us.

From what we know of the ministry of the Apostle Paul, he would certainly be entitled to speak of himself as a missionary. However, he introduced himself as 'servant' of Jesus Christ and as 'apostle' of Jesus Christ, not as missionary as we have come to use the word. Nevertheless, even though Paul may not be a missionary by name, he was one by example. We can possibly recapture the correct biblical meaning of the term by studying the life and work of Paul. At the time of his conversion he was told that he was "a chosen vessel unto me to bear my name before the Gentiles and kings and the children of Israel" (Acts 9:15). After conversion he was prepared in Arabia and in his home community. Then he came to work within the framework of the church at Antioch, as part of the working force of this church (Acts 13:1-3). "As they ministered to the Lord and

fasted, the Holy Ghost said, separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." So he was a man who had received a divine call but the Holy Spirit did not give him a specific assignment until he had learned to work within the framework of a church.

Having been thoroughly integrated into the church, the Holy Ghost separated Barnabas and Saul for a specific work which Paul later recognized as preaching the gospel "not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation" (Romans 15:20). He was called out of a church setting to give himself to the specific ministry of gospel expansion, to enter new territories and establish new churches. "As a wise masterbuilder I have laid the foundation and another buildeth thereon" (I Cor. 3:10), is his testimony. After establishing new churches, he remained only long enough until others took over responsibility and then he went into new territories, where Christ was not named. He was not so occupied with building up individual churches as with establishing new ones. In fact, we recognize a reluctance to participate in local church affairs. He only baptized as few people as was necessary to get a church started. This seems to be the implication of I Cor. 1:14-17. A missionary is not one sent by Christ to baptize but to preach the gospel. He would return to a church to help the believers orient themselves, but as far as we know the longest he ever stayed in one place was three years (Acts 20:31) and then he moved on. He would help the local churches find leadership in its own midst (Acts 14:23; Titus 1:5) and then pray and "commend them to the Lord on whom they believed" and go on to new places. Paul saw his main responsibility in starting a work and refused to be settled in any one place. He began a witness in certain population centres and then made the newly-established churches responsible to reach others. How else can we understand his words when he says, "So that from Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum I have fully preached the gospel of Christ" (Romans 15:19). This did not mean

that everyone had been saved, but had delivered the gospel in all its fulness in these regions so that the local converts could carry on the work. At Ephesus he preached for a space of "two years so that all they that dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks" (Acts 19:10). Does this mean that he had talked to all the people in Asia? He says that they all heard. It seems much more likely that he worked together with the local church in the spreading of the gospel, and when the church was strong enough he had discharged his responsibility. They had all heard, as far as he was concerned. The local church was responsible to carry forth the Word. Only in this sense can we understand what he means when he says, "I am pure from the blood of all men" (Acts 20:26).

Who is the missionary biblically? One who has a definite call from God and is trained within the framework of the church and separated by the Holy Spirit and the church for an expansion career of the gospel. He always seeks new frontiers. He is not located in one spot, but he has one consuming passion: To establish new churches and help them become indigenous as soon as possible and then move on, if need be, even to Spain. A missionary, then, is one sent from the home church, but he never becomes a stationary officer of any church abroad. His duty is to lay the foundation of new churches.

3) **Who is the missionary ecclesiastically?** Now we ask ourselves, how is the missionary concept understood in our churches today? Of necessity we will have to divide this section into two parts.

First, who is the missionary in the context of the home church? He comes from the ranks of the workers of the home church, according to Acts 13. The home church forfeits the benefit of his ministry for the sake of its expansion program. It is the church to which the missionary returns from time to time and which he re-enters to participate in the teaching and preaching ministry of the church (Acts 15:35). It is also the church from which he goes again to the regions beyond, not only to cover the old ground for a second time, as

Paul's intentions were according to Acts 16, but to be directed by the Spirit into new fields. This time it was to Macedonia. The church at Antioch identified itself with Paul and his labors by the laying on of hands (Acts 13:2), and so the church and Paul labored together. They were one in spirit. Only geographic distance separated them. We must remember, therefore, that as far as the home church is concerned, the missionary is one sent on their behalf, doing the work with which the church is identified, but which because of geographic distance can only be done by specifically designated people.

Second, who is the missionary as far as the young or foreign church—or should we say the "new church"—is concerned? He must be more than just a paid agent of a foreign organization. Only too soon will the nationals view him in this light, as a paid ambassador of a foreign power who seeks to dominate. Stephen Neil has a point when he insists that "it seems clear to me that a missionary ceases to be a missionary on the day he sets foot on the shores of the land in which he has been called to work."² To them he comes from the context of a brotherhood to establish a brotherhood, or better, a church, and then becomes a servant of the church in that place, thus identifying himself with its needs and working among the national believers as one of them until they are sufficiently grounded to continue by themselves. After this the missionary moves on. Who is the missionary as far as the young church is concerned? He must not be associated with western dominance, but

he must be associated with the gospel of Jesus Christ, and must be in his own heart and in the eyes of the nationals a man who is "free from all men, yet have I made myself a servant unto all, that I might gain the more . . . I am made all things to all men that I might by all means save some, and this I do for the gospel's sake" (I Cor. 9:19-23). Thus, looking at himself through the eyes of the nationals, the missionary has come to learn their ways and customs, their religious background and their mode of communication. All this for one purpose, to relate the gospel to their hearts in their cultural setting. A missionary has not only come to teach. He has first of all come to learn from the nationals. He has not come to change their ways but to be a servant to the nationals himself. The missionary has come to identify himself as much as possible and become to them in their frame of reference "a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting" (I Tim. 1:16). Thus, ecclesiastically, he may be a sent one as far as the old church is concerned, but he comes and works and goes as a servant of the new church. This is in keeping with the biblical pattern which we have sought to establish above. May this be the pattern into which we seek to integrate our thinking when we speak of "the missionary."

1) Stephen Neil, **Creative Tension** (London: Edinburgh House Press, 1959), p. 110.

2) *Ibid.*, p. 92.

J. J. Toews

YOUR QUESTION

Why has there been such a heavy emphasis on the music of Bach at the College in recent years. Is this the kind of music we ought to have in the M. B. Conference?

Well, that is an interesting question, in any case, and I don't know if I can

answer it to anybody's satisfaction. Perhaps what I have to say should be considered as an explanation rather than as an "answer."

In the first place, it must be admitted that we do emphasize Bach at the College, but we use the music of many

other composers as well. It is doubtful if Bach has received undue emphasis, however. It is true that a number of the public programs presented by the Oratorio Choir in recent years have featured some of the major choral works of Bach. But one must not make the error of assuming that we are neglecting other (to some people's way of thinking, better) works.

In the field of religious oratorio the major works can be listed quite readily: *The Messiah*, *The Elijah*, *The Creation*, *The St. Matthew Passion*, *The St. John Passion*, *The Christmas Oratorio*, *Brahms' Requiem*. After these come a host of others which are more on the level of cantatas, such as *Stainer's Crucifixion*, *The Seven Last Words*, *Christ and His Soldiers*, the *Magnificat*, and the like. Of the major works listed, the College has performed all except the *Creation*.

The A Cappella choir has sung a few cantatas and motets of Bach, but a good deal of other music is sung as well, in any given year. In trying to make a judgment about the type of music used at the College it would be necessary to consider all the music that has been used in the last decade or so, before any significant trend would perhaps be noticed. Even then, one still has to decide whether the trend is in fact good or bad in itself.

It stands to reason that we cannot keep singing the same works year after year. All our religious institutions and even our churches have shown rather significant changes in curriculum and general up-grading of the program, as well as in practice.

Some people say that a strong emphasis on Bach and composers of the Baroque period is not in keeping with standard musical practice in most of our churches at the present time. That may be so in some churches, but it is generally true that wherever the church choirs are able to sing this music, they are in fact doing so and finding the music rewarding. I believe that most of the music coming from these early periods can be used in a church context at some time or other. In any case, this music is worthy of serious consideration.

In the past we Mennonites have often been blissfully ignorant of important contributions made to the Christian church by other confessions. We have failed to enter into our heritage out of sheer neglect, or for other reasons, such as lack of training. The Christian church possesses a rich heritage in its religious music, most of it written for congregations or choirs to sing. One of the richest periods in church music was the Baroque period, with Bach representing its crowning glory. The reason why many people feel this sort of music has no "message" today is that the musical idiom of that period is still rather foreign to them. Our present age is so used to the sugared harmonies and the romantic appeal of the music of the previous century that we have spoiled our taste for "solid" food. One of the great benefits of this general interest in the music of pre-classical periods (and this is a very definite interest in music circles today) is that much music of the church is being re-discovered—music that often has a more vital message than much of that being used today from more recent periods.

A study of English literature entails a thorough knowledge of the works of Shakespeare. A student of German literature could not possibly by-pass Goethe and Schiller. And the serious student of church music very soon must come to grips with the masterpieces of Schütz, Bach, and Handel. And so it is natural that at an educational institution such as ours we should give proper attention to the works of these and other composers. Peter Klassen

The Reformed Pastor

"Most ministers will not so much as put out their voice and stir up themselves to an earnest utterance. But if they do speak loud and earnestly, how few do answer it with earnestness of matter! And then the voice doth little good; the people will take it but as mere bawling when the matter doth not correspond. It would grieve one to the heart to hear what excellent doctrine some ministers have in hand and let it die in their hands for want of close and lively application." p. 97

Wesley's "Small Advices" on Preaching

1) "Be sure never to disappoint a congregation unless in case of life or death."

2) "Begin and end precisely at the time appointed . . ."

3) "Always suit your subject to your audience."

4) "Choose the plainest texts you can."

5) "Take care not to ramble, but keep to your text, and make out what you take in hand."

6) "Be sparing in allegorizing or spiritualizing. Do not suffer the people to sing too low."

7) "Take care of anything awkward or affected either in your gesture, phrase, or pronunciation."

8) "Sing no hymns of your own composing . . ."

9) "Exhort everyone in the congregation to sing, not one in ten only . . ."

10) "Beware of clownishness either in speech or dress. Wear no slouched hat."

11) "Be merciful to your beast. Not only ride moderately, but see with your own eyes that your horse be rubbed, fed, and bedded."

12) "After preaching take a little lemonade, mild ale, or candid orange peel." p. 93

Wesley's Advice to Preachers on the Use of the Voice

"They must not scream. It is disgusting to the hearers; it gives them pain not pleasure. Scream no more at the peril of your soul. It was said of our Lord, 'He shall not cry'; the word properly means, 'He shall not scream.'"

"The chief faults of speaking, after speaking too loud, is speaking in a thick, clattering manner, speaking too fast, too slow, or speaking with an irregular, uneven voice. But the greatest and most common fault of all is the speaking with a tone. Some have a womanish, squeaking tone, some a singing or canting one; some a high, swelling theatrical tone, laying too much emphasis on every sentence; some have an awful solemn tone, others an odd, whimsical, whining one, not to be expressed in words.

"To avoid all kinds of unnatural tones, the only rule is this: endeavor to speak in public just as you do in common conversation. Attend to your subject, and deliver it in the same manner as if you were talking of it to a friend . . ."

"If you would be heard with pleasure, first study to render your voice as soft and sweet as possible and the more if it be naturally harsh, hoarse, or obstreperous, which may be cured by constant exercise.

"Secondly, labor to avoid the odious custom of coughing and spitting while you are speaking.

"Above all, take care, thirdly, to vary your voice according to the matter on which you speak. Nothing more grates the ear than a voice still in the same key.

"The best way to learn how to vary the voice is to observe common discourse. Take notice how you speak yourself in ordinary conversation and how others speak on various occasions.

"Never clap your hands nor thump the pulpit . . . Your hands are not to be in perpetual motion; this the ancients called the babbling of hands."

pp. 93, 94

Sherwin, Oscar, *John Wesley, Friend of the People*

The Grave in the Garden

In the quiet Easter morning you are standing in front of a grave in a garden, and you see a stone in the doorway, but the stone is moving . . . is moving!

And before you are aware of it, you will realize suddenly that Someone is standing beside you, and your eyes are fixed on His hand, and you see a mark in the palm of it, like the print of a nail.

And as a great realization dawns over you, you hear His voice:

“Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.”

“Whosoever believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live,

“Because I live, ye shall live also.”

Because we can't stand it any longer, in the secret places of our hearts, we cry out to God for help. And then it comes, the supreme miracle for which we have been seeking.

It is so tremendous a thing that we can't describe it.

It is so delicate a thing that we can't even bring it into view for anybody else to look at.

We can never explain it to anybody else.

We know only that it is true.

The Voice has said: “Because I live, ye shall live also.”

Our hearts knew all along it must be so.

It was what we wanted to hear, and now that we have heard it, we feel that we have solved the mystery of life.

—Peter Marshall