
✠

CHRISTIAN DOGMATICS

✠

by

FRANCIS PIEPER, D. D.

Volume I



Copyright 1950 by
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE
3558 S. Jefferson Ave.
St. Louis, MO 63118-3968

23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 20 19 18 17 16 15 14



Foreword

“HIS lifework was the *Christliche Dogmatik*, a monumental work in three volumes, setting forth the doctrines of Christianity as taught in the Lutheran Church. . . . In the clarity of his style and cogency of argumentation there has not been the equal of Dr. Pieper in the Lutheran Church in America. His literary ability, his eloquence, his deep personal piety, and his endearing traits of humility among his associates and charity towards the erring combined to make him a character rare in the history of a Church which has produced so many noble characters.” So read the obituary which announced the death on June 3, 1931, of the eminent churchman who had been the theological leader of the Missouri Synod for upward of four decades.

Called to a professorship at Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, in 1878, Francis Pieper succeeded Dr. C. F. W. Walther as president of the institution in 1887. The outstanding gifts with which he was endowed led to his prompt recognition as the chief dogmatician of the Synod as well as to the presidency of the general body from 1899 to 1911. Through the years the work of training young men for the Gospel ministry was ever the prime area of his labors. To demonstrate how the whole inspired Word comes to its ultimate focus in the revelation of God’s grace in Christ Jesus was his unflinching delight. How that perception of divine mercy dominated his thinking and teaching is plainly to be seen also in this dogmatics, with its constant, loving reiteration of the truths of universal grace, the vicarious satisfaction, and justification through faith alone.

As the four-hundredth anniversary of the Reformation approached, Dr. Pieper, now relieved of the arduous duties of the synodical presidency, found opportunity to devote himself to preparation of a Christian dogmatics. It was designed to be an expression of thanksgiving for the Lord’s merciful kindness in preserving the full truth of His Word to the Synod Pieper loved so dearly and served so notably. Since the first volume was to appear in the quadricentennial year, the author chose to offer first the *loci* that are the very heart of Scripture’s message and were the fundamentals of Luther’s glorious testimony: the grace of God in Christ, Christ’s person and work, saving faith, conversion, and justification by faith. This volume, issued in 1917, became the second of the whole work. Volume III, treating sanctification, preservation, the means of grace, the Church, the ministry, the election of grace, and eschatology, followed in 1920. With the publication of Volume I, embracing the *loci* on the nature of theology, Holy Scripture, God, creation, divine providence, angels, and man (*anthropologia*), the project was brought to completion in 1924.

The *Dogmatik* was at once hailed as a masterwork. The *Theological*

Monthly commented: "His work will go down to future generations as the dogmatic standard, alongside of the works of Walther and his earlier colleagues, of the Missouri Synod." Theologians of other church bodies characterized it as "monumental," "a veritable treasure house on dogmatic theology," and hastened to emphasize its importance: "Among the newer dogmatical works that are to be warmly commended to our pastors we give first place to this dogmatics of Francis Pieper."

As early as 1924 pastoral conferences and individuals began to voice and to multiply formal requests that this *opus magnum* be made available in an English edition. In 1941 the synodical convention created a committee to formulate plans for a worthy celebration of the centennial of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States — since 1947 The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod. As one of its basic recommendations the Centennial Committee proposed that a translation of the *Christliche Dogmatik* be prepared. The suggestion was enthusiastically adopted, with the hope that the work might be issued in the centennial year — a hope that could not be realized because of a number of delaying factors.

Dr. Theodore Engelder, the successor of Dr. Walther and Dr. Pieper as senior dogmatician of Synod, accepted the commission to serve as chief translator and supervising editor. Under his skilled hand the major part of the work of planning and translation was executed. Prof. Walter W. F. Albrecht of Concordia Seminary, Springfield, Ill., who had prepared the first English translation of the *Dogmatik* in the late thirties, Dr. Fred E. Mayer of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., and Prof. Lorenz F. Blankenbuehler, house editor of Concordia Publishing House, were enlisted as assistants in the project. "Professor Albrecht's translation, prepared in mimeographed form for the use of his students," the chief editor's notes record, "was constantly consulted," and afforded him invaluable aid. Dr. J. T. Mueller's condensation of the Pieper volumes was also used for reference. To all these brethren, as well as to Mr. O. A. Dorn, manager of Concordia Publishing House, the committee and Synod owe thanks for their helpful advice and able collaboration.

In June, 1949, our Lord found it good in His wisdom and grace to call Dr. Engelder home before he could complete the task which had chiefly occupied him during the several past years. We are grateful, however, that time was granted him to carry the translation well into the third volume and that, on the basis of this work, issuance of Volume II and III may be anticipated in the near future.

Explanatory remarks assembled posthumously from the chief editor's notes will, we think, be of interest: "We shall endeavor to offer a passable English translation, preserving as much as possible the inimitable flavor of Pieper's powerful, lucid, and trenchant style. . . . It is not an easy task to make a German theologian speak fluent English (cf. C. T. M., VIII 77). . . . Much of the original beauty of style must inevitably be lost in a translation (cf. Preface to Koeberle)."

"We have condensed some parts, for instance, on the Crypto-Kenotic controversy, on German church conditions at the time of writing, etc., because we feel that they are not of equal interest for the reader today." "But we feel, too, that the constant reiteration of the same truth, from different angles, will prove welcome. That constitutes one of the beauties of the books."

"We had planned to discuss the more recent development in theology, but soon found that it was not feasible without causing an undesirable delay. We therefore give Pieper as he is. Perhaps we can hope that a volume of studies in modern developments will soon be issued."

However, on the general compass of Pieper's *DOGMATICS* and its utility in meeting modern trends thetically and antithetically Dr. Engelder added: "It was a monumental work for its time, and one who has imbibed the principles of this book is well prepared to meet whatever new forms the most modern error takes. In fact, any up-to-date dogmatics must stand on these principles. Pieper did much for his generation. He kept it straight through his classic. He is doing much for the present generation. It is fine that Synod through its Centennial Committee made it available in English translation. It will do much to keep us straight. They that study it will be prepared to deal with recent developments." He jotted down with full approval Dr. L. Fuerbringer's oft-repeated remark that the *DOGMATICS* "must be considered and remain a standard work of Lutheran theology," and joined to it as his own estimate of the work words written some years earlier: "It was a power for orthodoxy in its day. And it has not outlived its usefulness. It is a mighty force today to keep Lutherans reminded of the treasure of pure doctrine which God has bestowed upon them."

It will be noted that a few references to translations of older publications which are not readily accessible now have been added to the original text in brackets. Also in a few instances footnote references to materials no longer available or pertinent have been omitted. Long Latin quotations have been translated.

An index of the entire work is planned upon completion of the third volume.

May the issuance of this classic Scriptural theology in English form be indeed a mighty force to assist us in proclaiming our Savior's Word of truth and grace and in repeating the Psalmist's asseveration: "I have stuck unto Thy testimonies"!

THE SYNODICAL CENTENNIAL COMMITTEE

H. W. ROMOSER
A. H. KRAMER
C. A. FLEISCHER
E. T. LAMS
H. M. ZORN

January, 1950



Preface

THE three volumes of my *CHRISTLICHE DOGMATIK* are now in print. An explanation is in order why the first volume was published last. It had been suggested that the volume containing the doctrines of God's grace in Christ, of Christ's person and work, and of justification be published in 1917, the fourth centennial of the Lutheran Reformation. It was only natural that Volume III, setting forth the results and consequences of justification, should appear next (1920).

More than half of the present volume is devoted to "The Nature and Character of Theology" and "Holy Scripture." This has become necessary because modern Protestant theology has adopted unchristian views regarding the nature and contents of theology. And this again is simply the inevitable consequence when men deny that Holy Scripture is God's own infallible Word. Modern theology has gone the way of Rome. In the Church of Rome, Christian theology has completely broken down, for there the sole authority of Scripture is denied and the subjective opinion of the Pope is made the real authority. Just so modern Protestant theology has abandoned the objective divine authority of Scripture and put in its place "Christian experience," that is, the subjective views of "the theologizing subject," of the theologian. This situation called for the comprehensive treatment given the matter in the first two sections. — In the doctrine of God the difference between the natural and the Christian knowledge of God had to be presented somewhat more fully, because modern theology, represented also by some Lutherans, has become dynamic Unitarianism. — Modern theology has adopted the Romanist-Zwinglian concept of a "guiltless sin." This aberration made it necessary to dwell more extensively on several points of the doctrine of sin in the chapter on "Anthropology."

Considerable space has been given to the charge, raised especially in German dogmatical treatises, that the Missouri Synod teaches a "restitution theology," which must inevitably prove harmful to the Church. The claim is made that by identifying Scripture and the Word of God our theology will lead to an intellectualism which will stifle all true and genuine religion of the heart ("*Herzenschristentum*"). This matter does not properly belong to dogmatics. Nevertheless, I considered it necessary to refute the unwarranted charge and to remove any misgivings concerning the "restitution theology," and have therefore set forth in some detail the religious life of a church body which is definitely committed to the "restitution theology." I also presented the additional historical fact that also other church bodies explicitly adhere to this "restitution theology." I refer to Dr. Hoenecke's exhaustive *Ev.-Luth. Dogmatik* as proof that the doctrinal position of the Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States is exactly the

same as that of the Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. This excursus also contains several quotations from a monograph by Franz Delitzsch, published in 1839 for the 300th anniversary of the Reformation of the city of Leipzig. The purpose of these quotations is to show that what God gave also to Germany a century ago has been perpetuated, further elucidated, and applied in practice by the "strictly confessional wing" of American Lutheranism. Let me here repeat a few statements of Delitzsch: "I confess without shame that in matters of faith I am 300 years behind our time, because I came to see, after wandering a long time in the mazes of error, that truth is *one* and indeed eternal, immutable, and that, since it is revealed by God, it is not in need of any sifting and improvement." "I preach *retrogression* to you: Return to the Word of God, which you have forsaken." "What I have voiced and sought to defend is nothing but the faith of our old Lutheran Church, which our forefathers confessed as their faith 300 years ago on Pentecost with fervent thanksgiving to God." And Delitzsch was not an isolated case. The author of this dogmatics has, as student, as pastor, and as theological professor, read with great interest and true joy several smaller monographs of Ernst Sartorius. They are *Die Religion ausserhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft*, 1822; *Die Unwissenschaftlichkeit und innere Verwandtschaft des Rationalismus und Romanismus*, 1825; *Von dem religioesen Erkenntnisprinzip*, 1826. Dogmatically these essays set forth the true nature of Christian theology even more clearly than Delitzsch. And modern German theology would do well to study these products of the "awakening" which Germany experienced a hundred years ago. It should not be deterred from this study by the fact that the writers of these essays themselves, under the pressure of an unscientific theological science, forsook the truth they had confessed.

Also in this volume I have endeavored to be entirely objective. Occasionally strong terms have been used, but they seemed to be demanded by the importance of the matter under discussion. We must state as emphatically as possible that it is neither Christian nor scientific for theologians to accord equal authority to the Scriptures and their own Ego (subjective experience) as the source of Christian doctrine. This statement, of course, does not deny the possibility that a theologian's personal faith may be at variance with his published views. That I admit such a theological inconsistency is stated repeatedly also in this volume.

We American Lutherans of the "strictly confessional wing" do not have the slightest reason to exalt ourselves above others. We owe everything to God's grace. He has placed us, for instance, in the most favorable religious and theological environment. We — the second and third generation — have received our theological training under the most favorable conditions imaginable. We studied the theology of the Early Church, the Reformation, and the dogmaticians on the basis of the sources; we also learned the method and findings of modern theology from the sources. At the same time our teachers constantly admonished us not to substitute any human

authority – not even Luther or the Lutheran Confessions – for the authority of Scripture. In the graduate year we were exhorted: “Let none of you enter the ministry with doubts as to the Scripturalness of any doctrine contained in our Lutheran Symbols. If anyone is still in doubt, let him frankly discuss his scruples with his teachers.” When we submitted our first sermon in the first seminary year, all high-flown terminology and bombastic rhetoric were mercilessly culled out and eliminated; our professors impressed upon us that the *usus didacticus* of Scripture comes first; that our goal should be so to teach and to preach that through the proclamation of the Law in its full severity the carnally secure would be aroused out of their carnal security, and the terrified consciences would obtain the assurance of the grace of God and of salvation through the preaching of the full and free Gospel (*satisfactio vicaria*). Furthermore, we were constantly engaged in polemics against Rome, the “enthusiastic” [*schwaermerischen*] sects, disloyal Lutherans, Unitarians, and the antichristian lodges. As a result we were compelled to occupy ourselves continually and intensively with the Christian doctrine in our congregations as well as at pastoral conferences and synodical conventions. True, our church body is far, far from being perfect. We are not so blind as not to see our weaknesses and shortcomings. We have been and are encountering difficulties in establishing and maintaining correct practice in some congregations. We have even experienced secessions, which deeply humbled us. On the other hand, by God’s grace we are certain that the doctrine proclaimed among us is the Christian faith, the faith revealed in Scripture, the faith confessed in the Lutheran Symbols, and that this doctrine demands and must be granted exclusive recognition in the Church. From this viewpoint this CHRISTIAN DOGMATICS, too, desires to be judged in both its thetical and its antithetical statements.

Soli Deo Gloria!

F. PIEPER

St. Louis, Missouri, April, 1924



Contents

Prolegomena

The Nature and Character of Theology

	PAGE
1. Our Position	3
2. Religion in General	7
3. The Number of Religions in the World	9
4. The Sources of the Two Existing Religions	19
5. The Cause of the Divisions Within Visible Christendom	21
6. Christianity the Absolute Religion	34
7. Christian Religion and Christian Theology	40
8. Christian Theology	41
9. Theology as Aptitude	46
10. Theology as Doctrine	51
11. Divisions of the Christian Doctrine	76
A. Law and Gospel	76
B. Fundamental and Non-Fundamental Doctrines	80
Primary and Secondary Fundamental Doctrines	85
Non-Fundamental Doctrines	91
C. Open Questions and Theological Problems	93
12. The Church and Its Dogmas	96
13. The Purpose of Christian Theology for Man	103
14. The Means by Which Theology Accomplishes Its Purpose	105
15. Theology and Science	106
16. Theology and Certainty	110
17. Theology and Doctrinal Development	129
18. Theology and Doctrinal Liberty	134
19. Theology and System	138
20. Theology and Method	149
21. The Attainment of Theological Aptitude	186

Holy Scripture

	PAGE
1. Holy Scripture the Only Source and Norm of Christian Doctrine for the Church Today	193
2. Holy Scripture Identical with the Word of God	213
3. The Verbal Inspiration of Holy Scripture	217
4. The Relation of the Holy Ghost to the Holy Writers	228
5. Objections to the Doctrine of Inspiration	232
6. On the History of the Doctrine of Inspiration	265
7. Luther and the Inspiration of Holy Scripture	276
8. A Brief Critique of Modern Theology in So Far as It Denies the Inspiration of Scripture	298
9. The Consequences of the Denial of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture ...	303
10. The Properties of Holy Scripture	307
1. Authority	307
2. Efficacy	315
3. Perfection, or Sufficiency	317
4. Perspicuity	319
11. The Witness of History for Scripture	330
12. The Integrity of the Biblical Text	338
13. The Original Text of Holy Scripture and the Translations	343
14. The Use of Scripture in Deciding Doctrinal Controversies	349
15. The Authority of Scripture and the Confessions	354
16. Holy Scripture and Exegesis	359

The Doctrine of God

1. The Natural Knowledge of God	371
2. The Christian Knowledge of God	376
3. The Trinitarian Controversies	381
4. Objections to the Unity of the Godhead	387
5. The Doctrine of the Trinity in the Old Testament	393
6. The Trinity and Human Reason	398
7. Ecclesiastical Terminology and the Christian Knowledge of God	406
8. God's Essence and Attributes	427
A. The Relation of the Divine Essence to the Divine Attributes and of the Attributes to One Another	428

	PAGE
B. Classifications of the Divine Attributes	434
a. The Negative Attributes	437
Unity, Simplicity, Immutability, Infinity, Omnipresence, Eternity	
b. Positive Attributes	447
Life, Knowledge, Wisdom, Attributes of the Divine Will: Holiness,	
Justice, Truthfulness, Power, Goodness	

The Creation of the World and of Man

1. The Record of Creation	467
2. The Definition of Creation	467
3. The Hexaemeron	468
4. The Order Observed in Creation	469
5. The Work of the Six Days	470

Divine Providence, or the Preservation and Government of the World

1. Definition of Divine Providence	483
2. The Relation of Divine Providence to the <i>Causae Secundae</i>	487
3. Divine Providence and Sin	489
4. Does God Permit Men to Sin?	490
5. Divine Providence and Free Will	491

Angelology

1. The Existence of Angels and the Time of Their Creation	498
2. The Name "Angel"	499
3. The Nature and the Properties of the Angels	500
4. Number and Ranks of the Angels	504
5. Good and Evil Angels	504
6. The Good Angels and Their Activity	506
7. The Evil Angels, Their Activities, and Their Eternal Punishment	508

The Doctrine of Man

A. Man Before the Fall	515
1. Man Created in the Image of God	515
2. What Constituted the Image of God	516

	PAGE
3. Image of God in the Wider and in the Proper Sense	518
4. The Relation of the Divine Image to the Nature of Man	520
5. Immediate Consequences of the Possession of the Divine Image	521
6. The Purpose of the Divine Image	523
7. Woman and the Divine Image	523
B. Man After the Fall	526
a. On Sin in General	528
1. Definition of Sin	528
2. The Divine Law and Sin	529
3. How the Divine Law is Made Known to Man	531
4. The Cause of Sin	533
5. The Consequences of Sin	535
b. Original Sin	538
1. Definition of Original Sin	538
2. The Effect of Hereditary Corruption on the Mind and Will of Man	543
3. The Negative and the Positive Side of Original Corruption	547
4. The Subject of Hereditary Corruption	550
5. The Effects of Original Corruption	551
c. Actual Sin	557
1. Definition of Actual Sin	557
2. The Causes of Actual Sin	559
3. The Scripture Doctrine of Offense	561
4. The Scripture Doctrine of Temptation	563
5. Classification of Actual Sins	564

Prolegomena
The Nature and Character of Theology

(DE NATURA ET CONSTITUTIONE THEOLOGIAE)



1

Our Position

WE take the position that Holy Scripture, in contradistinction to all other books in the world, is God's own infallible Word and therefore the only source and norm of Christian doctrine. Prevailing conditions in the Church make it necessary for the author of a treatise on Christian dogmatics to state clearly and emphatically where he stands on the question of the source and nature of Christian Theology. Until about 1750, Protestant dogmaticians were quite generally agreed that nothing but what Scripture teaches should have a place in Christian dogmatics. But today the situation has changed completely. The representative theologians of modern Protestantism with but a few exceptions deny that Holy Scripture is by inspiration the very Word of God. Accordingly they refuse to regard and employ Holy Scripture as the sole source and standard of theology. A mass movement away from Holy Scripture has set in. The human Ego, euphemistically called the "Christian consciousness," the "regenerate I," "experience," etc., has been made the norm of theology.

This away-from-Scripture movement has created a situation in modern Protestantism which has its counterpart in Romanism. In the Roman Catholic Church the sole source and norm of doctrine is not Holy Scripture but in reality the Ego of the Pope, who "boasts that all rights exist in the shrine of his heart" (Smalc. Art., *Concordia Triglotta*, 495, 4). Modern Protestant theologians do the very same thing when they refuse to derive and determine Christian doctrine from Holy Writ and make "the pious self-consciousness of the theologizing subject"¹ the source and norm of theology. In the Papacy only so much of Scripture is regarded as binding as the Pope approves and confirms; just so modern Protestantism accepts only so much of Scripture as the pious theologizing subject has found acceptable.

This, then, is the sad situation: The overwhelming majority of modern theologians refuses to identify Scripture and the Word of God; and accordingly they do not make Scripture but their own heart the source and judge of Christian doctrine. And this false principle does not merely disturb the order of things in the Christian Church,

¹ A phrase employed by Nitzsch-Stephan, *Lehrbuch der ev. Dogmatik*, 3d ed., 1912, p. 13.

but turns it upside down. It is an outright revolt against the divine order.

We, on our part, stand for the supreme and sole authority of Holy Scripture. We maintain that Scripture, by virtue of the singular divine act of inspiration, is *God's own infallible Word*, "God's Book,"² from which alone, to the end of time, the Christian doctrine, every single part of it, is to be taken and determined. And we do not ask men to bear with us for taking this position; we insist that it is the only position one may take.

In taking this position we are following great exemplars. There is the example of Christ and His holy Apostles. They fully "identified" Scripture with the Word of God: γέγραπται, "It is written," *Scriptura sacra locuta, res decisa est*. Then there is the example of the Reformer, Luther, who faithfully followed the authoritative norm set by Christ and the Apostles. When Luther declares, "The Word they still shall let remain," he is speaking of the Holy Scriptures. Luther admonishes all readers of the Bible — and he does not exclude the theologians —: "When you read the words of Holy Scripture, you must realize that God is speaking them."³ And he tells us theologians in drastic words that we shall become theological "monsters" (*portenta*), monsters like the Scholastics, if we depart from Scripture, for Scripture "alone is the fountain of all wisdom."⁴ True, in our day men assert, at times very emphatically, that Luther took a "rather free," a "more liberal" attitude toward Scripture than did the later Lutheran theologians. This assertion, however, if made *bona fide*, ignores the historical facts. We shall have more to say on this point in the chapter on "Holy Scripture."

Modern theologians substitute their own "Christian consciousness" for Scripture as the source and norm of theology and claim that it is just this Christian consciousness and their highly developed "sense of realities," based on science, which keeps them from identifying Scripture and the Word of God. If they appeal to their "experience" and "sense of realities," so may we. With millions of Christians we experience, by the grace of God, right along that the Holy Scriptures are indeed the Word of God. And this experience is wrought by Holy Scripture itself. It was the Word itself which produced in the hearts of the Corinthian Christians the experience that the oral word

² Luther's term for Scripture, St. L. IX:1071.

³ Sermons on Genesis, St. L. III:21.

⁴ Exeg. opp. Lat. Ed. Erl. IV, 328. St. L. I:1289 f.

of the real situation and again realize on what their faith and the faith of all Christendom is founded (Eph. 2:20) and what they absolutely need in their temptation from within and without, they will again with Christ and His Apostles confidently utter the γέγραπται, "It is written," and repeat, not merely with the mouth, but from the depth of their hearts, the word of Luther: "*Das Wort sie sollen lassen stahn.*" They will then also know how to appraise the "greater confidence" which Kaftan finds in himself and other modern theologians; it is the "confidence" of men who are "puffed up with conceit" (1 Tim. 6:4, R. S. V.), the "confidence" of the Pope and the "enthusiasts" of all times. Luther describes it thus: "All confidence which is not based on the Word of God is vain" (St. L. VI:70. on Is. 7:9). "Solely through His Word, God would declare to us His will and His counsels, not through our notions and imaginations" (St. L. III:1417 on Deut. 4:12).

II

Divisions of the Christian Doctrine

In this chapter we shall discuss: (A) Law and Gospel; (B) Fundamental and Non-fundamental Doctrines; (C) Open Questions and Theological Problems.

A. LAW AND GOSPEL

Fr. H. R. Frank has called attention to the fact that the doctrine of Law and Gospel and in particular of the difference between Law and Gospel — a doctrine which Luther and the old theologians treated most thoroughly — has practically disappeared from modern theology. Modern theologians have no use for it.¹⁰⁹ Frank says: "Ritschl has declared most emphatically that the customary distinction between Law and Gospel with all that it implies is incorrect." And Horst Stephan made a similar statement: "There is no sense, after the manner of the old dogmatics, in dividing the 'Word of God' into Law and Gospel."¹¹⁰ Frank is right in saying: "It characterizes the present state of affairs that men find also this part of the evangelical doctrine objectionable and declare it to be in conflict with the true evangelical spirit" (*loc. cit.*, p. 104). It does not surprise us that modern theology would have no use for the distinction between Law and Gospel. That

¹⁰⁹ *Dogmatische Studien*, Erlangen and Leipzig, 1892, pp. 104–135.

¹¹⁰ *Glaubenslehre*, 1921, p. 183.

idea is the inevitable result of the denial of the *satisfactio Christi vicaria*, which characterizes modern theology. Certainly, if God did not fully reconcile mankind unto Himself through Christ's vicarious satisfaction, if Christ has not, in our stead, fulfilled the requirements of the Law which binds mankind, and suffered its punishment in our stead, it necessarily follows that man must somehow by his own work and his own virtues either effect his reconciliation with God or complete the reconciliation begun by Christ. That is just what modern theologians teach. The "conservatives" among them, too, hold that the Savior's work of reconciliation must be supplemented by man's holiness. One of them states it thus: "We are compelled to make the transformation of man a factor in the work of the atonement."¹¹¹ That does away with the difference between Law and Gospel. What we get, as Frank puts it, is "a veritable hodgepodge" (*Glaubenslehre*, 1921, p. 124).

This "hodgepodge" is not a harmless matter. Scripture warns us that the commingling of Law and Gospel has fatal results. It definitely tells the sinner who is seeking remission of his sins and eternal salvation that he can obtain this in no other way than by completely eliminating the Law from his consideration and placing himself under the Gospel. This is God's method of forgiving sins and bestowing salvation: "without the Law," *χωρίς νόμου* (Rom. 3:21); "by faith . . . without the deeds of the Law," *πίστει . . . χωρίς ἔργων νόμου* (Rom. 3:28); "by faith in Jesus Christ," *διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* (Gal. 2:16; Rom. 3:22); "through faith," *διὰ πίστεως* (Eph. 2:8); "through the Gospel," *διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου* (1 Cor. 4:15). All who refuse to eliminate the Law in the matter of obtaining grace and salvation remain under the curse of the Law, since the Law pronounces the curse on everyone who has not continued in all things which are written in the book of the Law to do them (Gal. 3:10). Luther is therefore right in saying that every Christian must know the art of separating Law and Gospel. "If this is lacking, one cannot tell a Christian from a pagan or a Jew" (St. L. IX:798). There is only one way to be and remain a Christian: Man must silence his conscience against the accusations of the Law with the Gospel, which assures him of the forgiveness of sins "without the Law." And only those men are able to lead a holy life according to the Law who "are not under the Law, but under grace" (Rom. 6:14). All this will be treated in detail in the chapter on the means of grace

¹¹¹ Kirn, R. E., 3d ed., XX, 574; also in his *Ev. Dogm.*, 3d ed., p. 118. Cp. the section "Some Modern Theories of the Atonement Examined" in Vol. II.

Holy Scripture

(DE SCRIPTURA SACRA)



1

*Holy Scripture the Only Source and Norm of
Christian Doctrine for the Church Today*

THE Christian Church is indeed older than Holy Scripture, that is, older than the written Word of God. Until the time of Moses, God called His Church into existence and preserved it by His oral Word (*viva voce*). The Christian Church came into existence immediately after the Fall, when God, having applied the Law to fallen men orally (Gen. 3:8-14), gave mankind the oral promise of the Woman's Seed, who was to destroy the works of the devil, that is, free men from the guilt of sin and all its consequences (Gen. 3:15), and Adam and Eve believed the "first Gospel." Through the oral Word, proclaimed in various ways, God continued to build His Church until the days of Moses.¹

But after God had chosen to transmit His Word in writing, the Church of every age was strictly bound to the written Word of God.²

¹ Gen. 4:26: "Then began men to call upon the name of the Lord," plainly refers to meetings held for the purpose of preaching and hearing the Word of God. Cf. Luther on this passage, St. L. I:398 ff.; likewise J. P. Lange on the passage; Calov, *Bibl. Illustrata*, remarks: "Most exegetes accept this passage as referring to the beginning of public preaching." Lucas Osiander comments: "Worship before the birth of Enos was less solemn and was practiced in a somewhat private manner." Further on Scripture reports that God spoke to Noah (ch. 6 ff.) and to Abraham (ch. 12 ff.), etc. And they spread the Word of God that came to them. Abraham is called "a prophet" (Gen. 20:7), and Gen. 13:4 we are told that he "called on the name of the Lord," i. e., preached the name of the Lord. The "name of the Lord" is primarily that whereby God has made a name for Himself among sinful men: the redemption of mankind from the guilt of sin and its consequences by the Seed of the Woman, Christ. What Peter says Acts 10:43 of all Prophets of the Old Testament includes also the passages Gen. 4:26; 13:4; etc.

² As reasons which may have induced God to substitute the fixed Scriptures for the oral transmission of His Word, Baier gives the following (I, 106): "(1) The growth of the human race; (2) the shortening of man's span of life, it being no longer possible to instruct all men in the same manner, orally and personally, as formerly the patriarchs, who received their instruction by direct revelation of God; but also (3) the infiltration of much corruption of doctrine; in addition (4) the feebleness of the mortals to be instructed and the frailty of their memory required a revelation to which recourse could be had in every case of need, and therefore a written record was considered advantageous." If the objection is raised that the almighty and all-wise God could no doubt have continued to preach to His Church and preserve it without a written

No man was permitted to add anything to the written Word nor to subtract anything from it (Joshua 23:6; Deut. 4:2). The Church of the Old Testament was rigidly bound to the written Word of God as its complete canon, to which only God could add from time to time.³ In the time of the New Testament God added the writings of the Apostles to the books of the Prophets as the foundation of faith. Of the Church of the New Testament Paul says Eph. 2:20: "Ye are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets."⁴ The Scriptures of the Apostles are co-ordinated with those of the Prophets because it is one and the same Spirit of Christ speaking through both. "Not unto themselves, but unto us, they [the Prophets, who had "the Spirit of Christ"] did minister the things which are now [in the days of the New Testament] reported unto you" (1 Pet. 1:10-12). With the Word of the New Testament Apostles, God's revelation of the doctrine to His Church is entirely completed, for when Christ in His high-

transmission of His Word, we answer with Baier: "It has pleased divine Providence that the chief parts of the divine revelation be comprehended in writing" — God willed it so. Moreover, we know that God loves fallen mankind and that therefore, like the gift of His incarnate Son (John 3:16), also the gift of His written Word serves His saving love of sinners (2 Tim. 3:15-17). God's children gratefully acknowledge this love (Ps. 119) and shun the sin of setting aside the written Word or of even denying outright that it is the infallible divine truth. Expressing it according to the causal method: "The internal impelling cause of the reduction to writing, in Holy Scripture, by the divine will, is God's goodness; the external (προκαταρκτική) is the need of mankind to be saved" (Baier I, 105). That, however, no *necessitas absoluta* may be ascribed to Scripture, is maintained also by the old Lutheran theologians and will be brought out more fully when the use to be made of Scripture is treated.

³ Quenstedt, I, 51: "We must distinguish between the time before and the time after Moses, or between the revelation which was given by God to the patriarchs without the recording of any Scriptures through 2,454 years (after the calculation of Calvisius), namely, from the beginning of the world down to Moses, and which was spread by word of mouth, and that revelation which was recorded in books by Moses and the Prophets. The former was the theological principle up to Moses, the latter after Moses. For immediately after the first canon was constituted, which consisted of the Pentateuch, the Book of Job, and the Song of Moses (Psalm 90), the revelation transmitted by word of mouth was no longer the norm and principle of religion, but solely the revelation recorded in books." That the Scriptures of the Old Testament are the complete canon for the Church of the Old Testament is indicated also by Christ, when He says (Luke 16:29): "They have Moses and the Prophets; let them hear them."

⁴ Stoeckhardt's comment on this passage: "The Apostles come into consideration here not as persons, but according to their office, namely, as Apostles, and as such in their relation to the Church of all ages. . . . Though long dead, they live on for us and speak to us in their writings. And so the second genitive, προφητῶν, can mean only the Old Testament Prophets and the writings of the Prophets, which occupy the same rank as the writings of the Apostles and form with them one genus; therefore ἀποστόλων and προφητῶν have but one article."

tion of the *sola gratia* raise as strong a barrier against the obtaining of God's grace as do the Calvinists by their obstruction of the *universalis gratia*. The Christian faith which is counted by God for righteousness is convinced that God "justifieth the ungodly" (Rom. 4:5). Whoever considers himself as being better before God, or less guilty than other men, is *eo ipso* excluding himself from grace (Luke 18:9-14; Rom. 11:22). A synergist can be saved, just like the Calvinist, only if he becomes inconsistent. As the Calvinists must forget their limitation of the *universalis gratia*, so the synergists must forget their limitation of the *sola gratia* if the truth that the Scriptures are God's own Word is to be of any practical value for them. And here, too, this forgetting, no doubt, occurs in many instances. It is solely the grace of God which saves from an error which is fatal in itself.⁹¹

It goes without saying that the Romish theologians, too, completely destroy the practical value of their profession of the inspiration of Scripture by assigning the authoritative interpretation of Scripture to the Pope. The result of this exegetical method is that it is no longer God who through His Word, the Holy Scriptures, speaks to men, instructs, and rules them, but that the Pope — pretending to speak in the name of Scripture — subjects the Church and the State to his papal Ego. Luther is right in declaring that the principle of the "Romanists" that "the interpretation of Scripture belongs to no one except the Pope" is one of the "three walls" behind which the Papacy has entrenched itself and seeks to set up and maintain its rule. (*An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation*, St. L. X:269 f.)

7

Luther and the Inspiration of Holy Scripture

Luther a *particeps criminis* in the denial of the inspiration of Scripture — that is the cry of modern theology. The later dogmaticians, it is quite generally asserted, devised the "artificial theory" of an inspiration according to which Scripture and God's Word were identified outright, but Luther took a more liberal attitude toward Scripture. Cremer calls the dogmaticians' doctrine of inspiration "an absolute *novum*" (R. E., 2d and 3d ed., VI, 755). Because of certain remarks of Luther, Seeberg cannot conceive that Verbal Inspiration was in his

⁹¹ On this point see Vol. I, p. 29; Vol. II: "The Pernicious Character of Synergism"; and Vol. III: "The Synergists on the Means of Grace."

mind (*Dogmengesch.*, 2d ed., II, 289, note 1). In Nitzsch-Stephan there is, on the one hand, the admission that Luther "substituted for the church authority [under the Papacy] the authority of Holy Scripture," and, on the other hand, the assertion that in Luther "pronounced traces" of a more liberal conception of the inspiration of Scripture are found. "In the Lutheran Church the intensification of the concept of inspiration began with Flacius and Chemnitz. This was completed by the Protestant scholastics of the 17th and 18th centuries after the model set by John Gerhard as early as 1610 in his *locus 'De Scriptura'* and completed by him in 1625 in his *Exegesis Ueberior Loci de Scriptura*. It was thought that the battle against the Catholics, Socinians, Arminians, and other parties would prove successful only if the divine authority of Scripture were extended to the letter [the words of Scripture]. The Bible was considered not so much the record of the divine revelation or of the Word as rather a divine textbook of religion. . . . We meet this fully developed theory of inspiration in its most pointed scholastic form in those dogmaticians who sought to uphold the old orthodox system against Calixt and the syncretists" (*Ev. Dogmatik*, 3d ed., p. 249). That Luther took a more liberal attitude toward the doctrine of inspiration has been asserted not only by theologians of Germany, but also by American theologians, e. g., by Dr. Charles A. Briggs.⁹²

But this assertion is void of all historical truth. The alleged difference between Luther and the Lutheran dogmaticians is pure fabrication. The real difference between Luther and the dogmaticians is this, that the dogmaticians but weakly stammer and echo what Luther taught much more powerfully about Scripture from Scripture itself. Recall what Quenstedt, for instance, states concerning Scripture as the inspired Word of God: "The canonical Holy Scriptures in the original text are the infallible truth and are free from every error, or, in other words, in the canonical Holy Scriptures there is found no lie, no falsity, no error, not even the least, whether in subject matter or words, but all things and all the details that are handed down in them are most certainly true whether they pertain to doctrine, or morals, or history, or chronology, or topography, or nomenclature; no ignorance, no thoughtlessness or forgetfulness, no lapse of memory, can and dare be ascribed to the amanuenses of the Holy Ghost in their

⁹² Cp. *Presbytery of New York*. The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America against the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D. D. Argument of the Rev. J. J. Lampe, D. D., a member of the Prosecuting Committee, p. 54 sqq. — Likewise the rebuttal: *The Other Side*, by S. A. Farrand, Ph. D., 1897.

in having the saving doctrine recorded for us by so many divinely appointed witnesses. Having this manifold testimony, the Christians dwell "as in a paradise," and their assurance is mightily strengthened. Paul writes to the Philippians (3:1): "To write the same things to you, to me indeed is not grievous, but for you it is safe."

12

The Integrity of the Biblical Text

In the chapter "Objections to the Doctrine of Inspiration," where we treated the argument that the *variae lectiones* disprove the inspiration of Scripture, we had come to the conclusion that the integrity of the Biblical text is assured both *a priori*, by the promise of Christ, and *a posteriori*, by scientific investigation. This chapter adds some particulars and emphasizes what has already been said.

1. Whether the original Hebrew text contained the vowel points, as most of the older Lutheran dogmaticians assume,¹⁴⁰ or was written only in consonants, as Luther very emphatically asserts,¹⁴¹ is a historical question which does not affect either the inspiration of Scripture or the integrity of the text. It is no ingenious argument when modern theologians quite generally claim that the assumption of Verbal Inspiration necessarily drove the Lutheran dogmaticians to the further assumption of the original writing of the vowel points.¹⁴² Luther, as we have seen, emphatically teaches Verbal Inspiration in the fullest form and still denies just as emphatically that the vowel points were in the original text.

2. We would draw particular attention to the manifest care with which God kept watch over the integrity of the Biblical text of the

¹⁴⁰ Gerhard, *Loci*, locus "De Scriptura Sacra," defends this position at length, § 334–353.

¹⁴¹ Luther says of the *puncta vocalia*: "They are a recent invention . . . therefore I do not bother about these their grammatical superstitions. However, the grammar is on our side if the right vowel points are used." (St. L. VI:195.) In his Genesis Commentary (St. L. II:1838) he says: "I care little for the 'above' and 'below' of the rabbis; it would be better to read the Scriptures according to the 'internal.' And the New Testament gives us that right internal sense, not the 'upper' or the 'lower.'" Previously Luther had said: "At the time of Jerome, it seems, the vowel points were not yet in use, but the entire Bible was read without them." Luther evidently fears that the assumption "that the vowel points are of the same age with the text" might make something outside Scripture the principle of interpretation.

¹⁴² Thus Nitzsch-Stephan, p. 251; Cremer, R. E., 2d ed., VI, 755.

New Testament. Verily, we are face to face with a miracle of divine preservation of the text if only half of that be true which, according to L. Schulze, endangered the transmission of the original text. He writes (*Handbuch der Theol. Wissenschaften* I, 489): "The negligence of the copyists, which Cicero already deplored in his day (*Ad Quint.*, fr. 3, 5), Clemens Alexandrinus (*Str.* 4, 6) and Origen (*In Matt.* 19, 19, t. XV.) also deplore. The variants are: 1) accidental; since the fact that it was literally God's Word was not stressed in those days¹⁴³ and particularly in private use precise exactness was not demanded, the variants occurred partly through the negligence of the copyists (omissions, reduplications, transposition of words, confounding of letters, the latter being favored by the uncials and the *scriptio continua*); partly through the misunderstanding of the dictation (iotacism, e. g., *ιδέ* for *ει δέ*, Rom. 2:17; *πρόσκλησιν* for *πρόσκλησιν*, 1 Tim. 5:21; in enumerations there occurred omissions or transposition or substitution of synonyms; e. g., Rom. 1:30-31 and Gal. 5:18-23); and partly through misunderstanding of what was heard or read, e. g., in the case of abbreviations. Add 2) the variants were intentional. Through the application of scientific methods the attempt was made to improve the language according to definite grammatical rules, or to clarify dark passages by additions or changes (particularly of unfamiliar expressions), or to guard against (dogmatic) misconceptions, or to correct statements held to be erroneous, or to harmonize passages by additions from oral tradition or from a comparison with the parallel passages (particularly in the Gospels and in the case of quotations from the LXX). This was done both by the copyists and often also by the correctors. From these learned transactions there resulted 3) glosses, which, first placed on the margin, later got into the text, either with or instead of the original words; likewise from the liturgical supplements of the lectionaries, where changes became necessary because of the unsuitable beginning or end of the pericopes. And, in addition, the text was 4) arbitrarily altered according to the established translations." Now, if in spite of all this, as L. Schulze himself remarks, the original form of the text, often as it was copied, was not corrupted "in essential points," we see in such preservation, as Philippi pointed out (*Glau-*

¹⁴³ This is historically incorrect. As the Apostles claimed divine authority for the Word which they preached and wrote, so there is also sufficient evidence in the writings of the Church Fathers of the first centuries — and this is acknowledged also by recent theologians, for example Ihmels (*Zentralfragen*, p. 56) — that the "Primitive Church" identified "Scripture with the Word of God." That is the very thing for which the Early Church is criticized. Compare Ihmels, *loc. cit.*

The Doctrine of God

(DE DEO)



THE only source of man's knowledge of God is God's self-revelation. There can be no absolute knowledge of God independent of God's self-revelation, because God dwells in the light which no man can approach, 1 Tim. 6:16, φῶς οὐκ ὄντων ἀπρόσιτον. God has revealed Himself in a twofold manner: a) In creation, or in the realm of nature, and b) in His Word, or in Holy Scripture, the only source and norm of Christian doctrine. Accordingly we distinguish between a natural and a Christian knowledge of God.

1

The Natural Knowledge of God

(Notitia Dei naturalis)

Man knows by nature not only that there is a personal, eternal, and almighty God, the Creator, Preserver, and Ruler of the universe, but also that this God is holy and just, who demands and rewards the good and condemns and punishes the evil. This natural knowledge of God is derived

a. From the divine works of creation (ποιήματα τοῦ θεοῦ, *creaturae Dei*), which bear the unmistakable stamp of being God-made. Rom. 1:20, "The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead." This text states that though God is invisible, He can nevertheless be seen by man. Man need only observe the works of creation (τὰ ποιήματα τοῦ θεοῦ), and he will clearly see (καθορᾶται) God's invisible Being (τὰ ἀόρατα τοῦ θεοῦ), more particularly, His eternal power and Godhead (ἢ τε αἰδιος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θεϊότης).¹ It is noteworthy that heathen philosophers, using their reason (νοῦς), employ almost identical language, as when, for example, Aristotle says of God: "Though God is invisible to every mortal creature, He is visible from His very works."² Likewise Cicero: "You

¹ Concerning the use of ἀπό in ἀπό κτίσεως κόσμου: The New Testament employs ἀπό to denote the cause or source from which something is known, as in Matt. 7:16: "By their fruits (ἀπό τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν) ye shall know them"; and also as a temporal preposition, as in Matt. 19:4: "Which made them at (ἀπό) the beginning." Luther takes ἀπό in the first sense: "*an der Schoepfung der Welt.*" We accept Luther's rendition because it fits well into the context, and classical Greek suggests it, as, for example, Aristotle. The exegetes are not agreed.

² *De Mundo*, cap. VI.

do not see God, and yet you learn to know God from His works.”³ (The cosmological argument for the existence of God.)

b. From God’s continuous operation both in the realm of nature and in human history. From Acts 14:15-17 we learn that although God suffered the heathen to walk in their own ways, He nevertheless gave them abundant witness of Himself in the realm of nature. The manner of this divine self-manifestation is described by St. Paul: “He did good and gave us rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness.” And from Acts 17:26-28 we learn that God manifests Himself also in the history of mankind. God made the human race stem from one progenitor and occupy the entire world according to the chronological and geographical boundaries fixed by Him. The purpose of the history of the human race in both its unity and its diversity is that men should seek (ζητεῖν) the Lord, if they might feel and find Him (ψηλαφεῖν . . . εὐρίσκειν). God’s guiding hand is evident not only in the history of the nations, but also in the life of every individual; for St. Paul adds: “He is not far from every one of us, for in Him we live and move and have our being.” And thus “the history of the world is also the judgment of the world.” (Historico-theological argument for the existence of God.)

c. From the divine Law written into the heart of all men. In the realm of nature and in history God approaches man through things outside man. By writing His Law in the heart of man, however, God confronts man directly from within man’s nature. He manifests Himself as the holy and righteous God, who demands and rewards the good and condemns and punishes the evil. St. Paul says that the Gentiles know the judgment of God, τὸ δίκαιωμα τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom. 1:32), and even without the written Decalog they “show the work of the Law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another” (Rom. 2:14-15). The text states that man’s conscience is God’s tribunal within man and is recognized as such by man. This explains the attempts of the heathen to propitiate God by idol worship, sacrifices, asceticism, etc., and thus to silence their accusing consciences. (Moral argument for the existence of God; the proof from the fact of the Moral Law; proof from “practical reason.”)⁴

It is evident therefore that atheism of all shades – crass atheism,

³ *Deum non vides, tamen Deum agnoscis ex operibus eius. Triscul. Disputt. I, 28.*

⁴ For other proofs for the existence of God see Baier-Walther, I, p. 26 ff.

The Creation of the World and of Man

(DE CREATIONE)



1

The Record of Creation

SINCE no human being observed the creation of the world, we have no other authentic account of the creation than the one given by God Himself in the Scriptures. The statements: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim. 3:16) and "The Scripture cannot be broken" (John 10:35) include, of course, also the report of the creation in Genesis 1 and 2. We human beings can indeed know *a posteriori* (reasoning from effect to cause) that all things were created by God. All creatures bear the divine stamp; God's invisible nature, that is, His eternal power and Godhead, are clearly seen (καθορᾶται) from the creation of the world, from the creatures (Rom. 1:20). But our knowledge of the particular circumstances of the creation (e. g., of the time in which creation was completed and of the order of creation) is derived solely from God's revelation in Scripture. Men who presume to correct God's record of the creation through conclusions drawn from the present condition of the world are playing the role of scientific wiseacres, a procedure unworthy of Christians, as well as of men in general. The discord among professional geologists, for example, as to the age of the earth and of man is so great that only he will speak of "assured results" of geology who has completely renounced the use of what reason is left to man after the Fall.¹

2

The Definition of Creation

While heathen pantheism assumes that the world is an emanation from God and is therefore God Himself, and heathen dualism assumes an eternal matter (ἕλη, ἕλη ἄμορφος, τὸ μὴ ὄν) of which the deity

¹ On the disagreement among the geologists see Luthardt, *Apologie*, I, 68 ff. Luthardt himself makes concessions that are out of place. In our own publications this subject has often been dealt with, e. g., *Lehre und Wehre*, 44, p. 364 ff: "Ueber das Alter der Erde." For Geikie's discussion of "palaeontological problems," which so far have not been solved and whose certain solution cannot be expected in the future, see *Lehre und Wehre*, 59, p. 71.

(ὁ νοῦς, τὸ ὄν) formed the world (κόσμος),² Holy Scripture teaches that the Triune God created everything outside God, the universe, through His mere will, out of nothing. And “nothing” does not mean a *materia ex qua*, a *nihil positivum* (Plato’s μὴ ὄν, chaos), but it means absolutely nothing, *nihil negativum*, *materiam excludens*; for, as Gen. 1:1 tells us, before the creation of the world nothing at all was in existence except God. “In the beginning” means that then the things outside God had their beginning. According to Scripture, God alone, in distinction from all things outside Himself, had no beginning. That is the emphatic declaration of Ps. 90:2: “Before the mountains were brought forth or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting Thou art, God,” and of Col. 1:17: “He is before all things.” Men are bound by the rule: *De nihilo nihil fit*, but not so God. God follows the rule given Rom. 4:17: “God calleth those things which be not as though they were.” Accordingly, only he knows God who knows that He created the world from nothing.³

3

The Hexaemeron

The time in which creation was completed was six days, as Gen. 1:31 and Gen. 2:2 expressly state (*hexaemeron*). These six days are neither to be shortened, for pious reasons (to set forth God’s omnipotence), to a moment (Athanasius, Augustine, Hilary), nor are they to be extended, for impious reasons (to bring Scripture into agreement with the “assured results” of science), to six periods of indefinite length (thus almost all modern theologians). Scripture forbids us to interpret the days as periods, for it divides these days into evening and morning. That forces us to accept the days as days of twenty-four hours.⁴

² Cp. Philippi, *Glaubenslehre*, II, 225 f., quoted in Baier-Walther, II, p. 98.

³ We read in Nitzsch-Stephan, p. 427: “A creation out of nothing is not immediately taught in the canonical books of the Bible, not even Heb. 11:3 (and Rom. 4:17); there only the raising from non-existence to existence is spoken of.” It is clear that the second sentence abolishes the first. Raising from non-existence to existence constitutes creation out of nothing. Compare on the “nothing” Twesten, *Vorlesungen ueber die Dogmatik der ev.-luth. Kirche*, II, *Abteil.* I, 75 f., quoted in Baier-Walther, II, 97 f.

⁴ Luther: “Hilary and Augustine, two great lights in the Church, believed that the world was made of a sudden and all at once (*subito et simul*), not successively during the space of six days. Augustine plays with these six days in a marvelous manner. He considers them to be mystical days of knowledge in the

*Divine Providence, or the Preservation
and Government of the World*

(DE PROVIDENTIA DEI)



1

Definition of Divine Providence

GOD, who created the world, also preserves it. Col. 1:16-17: "All things were created by Him . . . by Him all things consist." We call this act, by common consent, the divine providence (the Greek terms are *πρόνοια* and *διοίκησις*), which means that God actually preserves and governs the universe and all individual creatures through His omnipresence and His omnipotence. The close relation between the creation and the preservation of the world is indicated in Col. 1: 16-17. After creating the world, God did not withdraw from it, neither entirely nor half nor in the least degree, but He remains in contact with the world and sustains everything in it, the greatest and the least, by His divine power. The sustaining power of God, and this alone, insures the continued existence of the world. If God would desert this world, it would at once disappear. If God would withdraw His presence from any part of the world, that part would cease to exist. This is clearly stated in the words: "By Him all things consist."

The clearest exposition of the teaching of Scripture on preservation over against false views is without doubt that of Luther. In support of the thesis that God has entirely or partially withdrawn from the world and put it under the rule of the "laws of nature," men maintain that according to Gen. 2:2 God rested on the seventh day from all the works which He had made. Luther expounds the passage thus: "The Sabbath, or the rest of the Sabbath, means that God so rested that He did not design to create another heaven and another earth. It does not mean that God ceased to preserve and govern the heaven and the earth which He had created. Concerning the manner of creation, Moses has given us the fullest information in the preceding chapter, where he says that God created all things by the Word: 'Let the sea bring forth fishes; let the earth bring forth the green herb, the beasts, etc.' Now, all these words of God remain unto the present day in their full force. We see that creatures multiply without cessation or end. If the world were to last untold years, the power and efficacy of this Word would not cease, but there would still continue to be a perpetual increase, by virtue of the power and efficacy of this Word, or, if I may so express it, of the first creation. The solution of the question is thus plain: 'God rested from all His works' means that

The Doctrine of Man

(ANTHROPOLOGIA)



In conformity with the data we shall consider man (A) before the Fall (*in statu integritatis*) and (B) after the Fall (*in statu peccati*).

A. MAN BEFORE THE FALL

(*De Statu Hominis Ante Lapsam*)

1

Man Created in the Image of God

The original state of man is described in the general term "very good" (Gen. 1:31), a term which covers all creatures. The specific feature of goodness which characterized man in distinction from all other creatures is named in the statement that God created man in His [God's] image. Gen. 1:26-27: "And God said, Let Us make man in Our image, after Our likeness. . . . So God created man in His own image."

"Image" (צֶלֶם) and "likeness" (דְּמוּיָה) are synonyms. Some assume that "image" signifies man's mind and will, and "likeness" a mind which knows God and a will which is in agreement with God's will. This interpretation contradicts Scripture, for in v. 27, which reports the execution of v. 26, only "image" is used. Now, since the divine execution surely agrees with the divine resolution, "image" by itself includes the whole of the divine image and likeness. The two terms are used in v. 26 simply to stress the divine likeness and aptly translated by Luther: "*Ein Bild, das uns gleich sei.*" Baier (II, 143): "*Imago simillima.*" So also Gerhard, *Loci, locus "De Imagine Dei."*¹

Owing to the difference between God the Creator and man the creature, the divine aseity [self-existence] and eternity could not have been communicated to man, and the other divine attributes, for instance, the wisdom, lordship, etc., were only reflected in man. God is wise, and man is wise; God rules, and man rules. But God possesses unlimited, man only limited wisdom, dominion, etc. (See the doctrine of God.)

One more remark on Gen. 1:26-27. This passage gives no support

¹ At one place in his *Commentary on Genesis* (St. L. I:410 ff.) Luther distinguishes between the two terms.

whatever for the thesis that man was created after the image of the human nature of Christ (thus Origen and Andrew Osiander) or after the image of the divine nature of Christ. On the contrary, the plural possessive suffix: "in Our image, after Our likeness," shows that man was created in the image of the Triune God, of the glorious divine essence belonging to the three Persons. In the language of the dogmaticians: *Causa exemplaris imaginis divinae non una divinitatis persona, sed Deus triunus est*. In addition, making the human nature of Christ the pattern for man's nature contradicts clear passages of Scripture. According to 1 Cor. 15:45 f., Christ is "the last Adam" (man) and Adam "the first man." And, according to Heb. 2:14, Christ assumed the flesh and blood of man; men were not patterned after the flesh and blood of Christ.²

2

What Constituted the Image of God

The image of God in man consisted in much more than in his possession of intellect and will, in his personality; it consisted in the right disposition of his intellect and will, in his knowledge of God and

² All erroneous notions on this point, past and present, are refuted by Quenstedt. He says (I, 861 sq.): "The opinion of the Origenists and Osiander, who affirm: 'Adam was created after the likeness of the human nature of Christ, preconceived in the divine mind,' is refuted 1) by Gen. 1:26, where the Father, speaking with the Son and the Holy Spirit, does not say: 'Let Us make men in Thy image,' namely, of the Son, who was to become man, but: 'in Our image'; 2) by 1 Cor. 15:45, where Christ is called 'the second Adam'; but if the idea or form of the human nature of Christ, preconceived in the divine mind, after the likeness of which Adam is supposed to have been created, preceded the creation of Adam in the order of things, Christ should be called the first Adam rather than the second Adam; we need not mention that in this sense we were not made like unto Christ, but Christ was made like unto us, sin excepted, Heb. 2:14. 3) Nowhere in Scripture is it said that man was created *κατὰ τὸν υἱόν*, according to the Son, but *κατὰ τὸν θεόν*, according to God in general. *Per contra*, the Son of God is said to have been *ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας*, in the likeness of sinful flesh, Rom. 8:3, and to have taken upon Him μορφήν δούλου, the form of a servant. 4) The order of the divine decrees is opposed to it. For the decree to make man in the image of God preceded (logically) the decree to send the Son of God into the flesh for the restitution of this image after its loss, and accordingly the Son of God, who was to become incarnate *in posteriori*, could not *in priori* be the pattern of the divine image to be created in man. 5) The very mission of the Son is opposed to it, which took place not for the sake of the likeness, but for the sake of restoring the bliss of man, 1 Tim. 1:15. 6) The image of God consists in the knowledge of God, righteousness, and holiness, as Col. 3:10 and Eph. 4:24 demonstrate; not, however, in the members of the body, in the figure or stature of the body. 7) Through the Fall the image of God was lost, but the bodily members were not lost."