

Christian Dogmatics

A Handbook of Doctrinal Theology

for

Pastors, Teachers, and Laymen

By

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER, TH. D.

Professor of Systematic Theology
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

Εἴ τις λαλεῖ, ὡς λόγια θεοῦ. — 1 Pet. 4, 11.

Copyright 1934
by
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE
St. Louis, Mo.

DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY
OF
DR. FRANCIS PIEPER
(1852–1931)
OF WHOSE DOGMATIC WORK
“CHRISTLICHE DOGMATIK”
THE PRESENT VOLUME IS AN EPITOME

FOREWORD.

For over half a century the outstanding teacher of dogmatics at Concordia Seminary was the late Dr. Francis Pieper, whom the Lord called to his reward in June, 1931. His courses in Christian theology were given in German even to the last, and also his great work on dogmatics, his *Christliche Dogmatik*, was written in that language. It will always remain a standard reference work, which students and pastors who possess an adequate knowledge of German will study with profit and pleasure. Nevertheless, since many students of dogmatics do not understand German, a comprehensive text-book on the subject written in English has been desired for some time. Moved by the requests of many students and encouraged by his esteemed teacher and colleague to undertake the work, the undersigned applied himself to the task of writing this one-volume CHRISTIAN DOGMATICS. His aim was to present the voluminous doctrinal material in Dr. Pieper's *Christliche Dogmatik* as clearly, concisely, and, at the same time, as completely and practically as possible in order that the student of doctrinal theology might have a usable compend to introduce him into this important field of sacred theology and the busy pastor an adequate epitome of the Christian faith to assist him in his review of the subject. The intention was not to render a possible translation of Dr. Pieper's *Christliche Dogmatik* unnecessary, nor was it designed to take the place of a larger original work on systematic theology. It was simply to be a sizable handbook of Christian dogmatics presenting both to the theological student and to the practical pastor the entire subject of doctrinal theology in a brief, yet complete summary according to Dr. F. Pieper's *Christliche Dogmatik*.

While the writer followed Dr. Pieper's standard work rather closely, he did not bind himself to details in form or content. For this reason the book may be used as an independent text-book, complete in itself. Commonly the footnotes were embodied in the text. The purely polemical matter was greatly condensed; but the writer did not deem it advisable to omit it altogether, since confessional Lutheranism cannot assert itself without directing attention to the opposing tendencies of Romanism, Calvinism, synergism, and rationalism, which have always attacked and endangered the Lutheran doctrine.

Dr. Pieper's method of teaching dogmatics was in many ways ideal; nevertheless each instructor in this branch of sacred theology has certain aims in view which will more or less determine his method of presentation. The writer consistently followed Dr. Pieper's custom of quoting Luther and the Lutheran Confessions on the major points

on which they have spoken, since the Lutheran student cannot discard their valuable testimony. In addition, however, he has frequently quoted also our older dogmaticians, using as his source the *Doctrinal Theology of the Ev. Luth. Church* by Heinrich Schmid, translated from the German and Latin by Chas. A. Hay and Hy. E. Jacobs. This popular volume presents to the student many helpful passages from the works of our great dogmaticians in a convenient form and therefore deserves diligent study. The writer indeed does not agree with every statement of either Dr. Schmid or the cited dogmaticians, yet it is both interesting and instructive to consider their doctrinal expositions even in brief excerpts. While a fair knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew will greatly aid the student in understanding this CHRISTIAN DOGMATICS, it may be profitably studied even without the knowledge of these languages. Commonly the Scripture-passages are only indicated, but the reader is expected to compare them carefully, if possible in Greek and Hebrew, since the original often brings out the proof value of a text more distinctly than does the translation. Dr. A. L. Graebner's *Outlines of Doctrinal Theology* may be used for collateral study. The writer has always employed this book in his lectures, both on account of its excellent definitions of the given doctrines and its well-grouped Scripture-passages. However, the greatest profit will be obtained if this volume is used in connection with the more complete treatment of the various heads in Dr. Pieper's *Christliche Dogmatik*.

The writer wishes to thank his esteemed colleagues Dr. E. Engelder, Dr. W. Arndt, and Dr. P. E. Kretzmann for their careful and conscientious reading of the manuscript and their many helpful suggestions. He acknowledges his indebtedness also to Synod's Literature Board, especially to Rev. L. Buchheimer, Rev. A. Doerfler, and Mr. E. Seuel of Concordia Publishing House, to Prof. W. G. Polack and Dr. W. A. Maier for their hearty support and personal interest in the venture, and to his secretary, Rev. F. T. Gabert, for his services in retyping the manuscript.

In view of the fact that this handbook is largely a restatement of Dr. Pieper's *Christliche Dogmatik* the writer has consoled himself with the thought that even the "prince of the theologians of the Augsburg Confession," Martin Chemnitz, was satisfied with publishing a mere commentary on Melancthon's *Loci Communes*, his justly famous *Loci Theologici*, and that this work proved so eminently successful in the Lutheran Church; also that the well-known dogmatics of John William Baier, his *Compendium Theologiae Positivae*, was really a compend of the theology of Musaeus and "many other orthodox theologians"; and finally, that also John Andrew Quenster's *Theologia Didactico-Polemica* followed most closely the outline of John

Frederick Koenig, whose compend of theology, *Theologia Positiva Acroamatica*, was widely used as a text-book. We live by the light of the faith of our fathers.

Since this handbook of doctrinal theology had to be relatively brief, much valuable dogmatic material was omitted. The student will find much additional dogmatic material in *Pastoral Theology* by Dean J. H. C. Fritz, D. D., and in the new *Popular Symbolics* by Drs. Arndt, Engelder, Graebner, and Prof. F. E. Mayer. These three handbooks, supplementing one another, leave hardly any question unanswered that pertains to Christian doctrine and a pure Scriptural practise. It is the writer's privilege to recommend these two important handbooks in connection with the use of this CHRISTIAN DOGMATICS.

We are sure that the readers will appreciate the excellent *Preface* which our esteemed colleague Dr. P. E. Kretzmann has written upon the author's request. This fine conspectus of dogmatic research may be viewed as compensatory since the limited space of the handbook did not permit any adequate treatment of more recent developments in the field of dogmatics. It may also serve the student who is more deeply interested in the modern phases of dogmatic lore as an outline and canon by which to orient his own studies.

May this CHRISTIAN DOGMATICS, then, go forth on its errand of assisting all students of dogmatics who desire to use it in their study of Christian doctrine! Shortcomings though it may have, it is nevertheless a clear and correct testimony of "God's Word and Luther's doctrine pure"; for it was composed with constant consideration of our Lord's command: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God," 1 Pet. 4, 11.

St. Louis, Mo.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER,

PREFACE.

In supplying a preface for the handbook of doctrinal theology which is herewith being offered to the theological world, the undersigned is fully aware that he will add nothing to the intrinsic value of the book. Yet in doing so, he is yielding to the repeated requests of the esteemed author, who desired a special introduction presenting a brief survey of doctrinal theology from the time of Schleiermacher to the present day. The supposition is that a foreword of this kind may serve some little purpose as a kind of foil to set off the beauty of a strictly confessional theology as compared with the frequently false, or at least inadequate, presentation found in the great majority of books on dogmatics which have been issued in the century since the death of Schleiermacher, in 1834. It is with this purpose in mind that this short introduction is written.

We must begin, naturally enough, with SCHLEIERMACHER himself (1768—1834), for his influence has dominated the theological thinking of some of the most prominent dogmaticians since his time. The theology of Schleiermacher is largely, if not entirely, subjectivistic, as his chief writings, his *Reden ueber die christliche Religion* (1799) and his *Christlicher Glaube nach den Grundsuetzen der evangelischen Kirche, im Zusammenhang dargestellt* (1821—22), clearly show. There can be no doubt that he was governed by certain points in the system of Spinoza, and there is evidence also of his being influenced by the philosophy of Kant. His early theology was clearly pantheistic, the ideas of God and of the universe converging in his presentation, while Christ was to him the archetype of a pure consciousness of God and the mediator of genuine piety. His idea of religion was not that of a knowledge based upon the objective revelation of God, but the consciousness of a person's "absolute dependence" upon God. The "overworld" of Schleiermacher is one which man "intuits" by faith, and faith to him is practically nothing but the immediate self-consciousness of man's relationship to this "overworld." His concept of sin and guilt is that of mere inadequacy on the part of man. To him Christ is not Himself the object of faith, but merely the archetype of the proper and ideal condition of soul in the case of every believer. According to Schleiermacher the essence of redemption and reconciliation consists in man's becoming conscious of the eternal unity. His "religion" is thoroughly and entirely a religion of feeling. If a person has reached that state of mind in which he feels that he is in fellowship of life with Christ, regardless of the Gospel revelation, he may be sure of his redemption, of his salvation. Schleiermacher did not permit one Christian doctrine to stand unchallenged, but subverted every

fundamental truth, from the inspiration of the Bible to the doctrine of the last things.

Yet Schleiermacher found many adherents in his own day as well as many followers after his death, so that we may even speak of a school which was, and to some extent is, governed by his religious philosophy. One of the most prominent theologians among the contemporaries of Schleiermacher was DE WETTE (1780—1849), who entered into friendly relations with the older teacher during his sojourn in Berlin. De Wette really denies revelation in the Scriptural sense. His doctrinal system is based upon the Kantian criticism, and he favored the theory of religion as feeling. He is the predecessor of Wellhausen and of the modern higher criticism. He insisted upon the distinction between intelligent, ideal, and esthetic convictions in religious matters, and his insistence upon this intelligent (or intellectual) appreciation of the doctrine of Christ deprived the Gospel of its Christian content, although he usually clothed his dogmatic presentations in the garb of the old orthodox terms. Another man who was first a pupil and then a friend of Schleiermacher was TWESTEN (1789—1876), who made the principles of his teacher his starting-point, but went beyond the idea of dogma as presentations of pious conditions of mind in an effort to establish objective truth. When Twesten, in 1835, became Schleiermacher's successor in Berlin, he maintained a mediating position between Marheinecke and Hengstenberg, *the former being an exponent of Hegelianism*, which excludes redemption and prayer and has no adequate conception of personality and no consciousness of sin, the latter representing a neo-orthodox legalism, although he did splendid service in opposing higher criticism. Twesten's attitude of mediation became so strongly unionistic that he defended the association of all Christians living in one place at the same time, even without doctrinal agreement. A third man whom we must name as a faithful disciple of Schleiermacher is SCHWEIZER of Zuerich (1808—1888). He became the exponent of the Reformed type of his teacher's ideas and may be called a predecessor of K. Barth. His position showed an eminently speculative spirit, and his subjectivism is seen in his insistence that dogmatics must go to the living consciousness of the Christian for its material instead of to the objective certainty of the Word of God alone.

More dangerous to sound confessionism in many respects than Schleiermacher was ALBRECHT RITSCHL (1822—1889), a man who gained some of his ideas from Kant, others from Schleiermacher, of whom he states that he was the only one since the Reformation to employ the scientific method of proof in theology. He subverts the very foundation of truth by referring to the "precarious medium of the theory of inspiration," and he sought the facts of theology in religious consciousness. He rejected the deity of Christ, merely con-

ceding that Jesus was a religious genius, a religious hero, who had progressed so far in moral and spiritual attainments that to the Christian He has "the value of God." On the atonement of Christ he wrote a large monograph, in which he defends a doctrine which leaves out the cardinal points of the vicarious sacrifice of the Savior. The immortality of the soul is treated in his theology as an indifferent matter. The most objectionable feature of Ritschlianism is its two-facedness. It uses the old theological terms with new meanings; the negative liberal thought is clothed in the old orthodox expressions. While Ritschl retained a semblance of Christian theology, he either changed the Christian doctrine substantially or rejected it outright. His favorite expression is "the kingdom of God," by which he means a general organization or fellowship of men, whose chief distinguishing mark is mutual activity on the basis of love, but without the objective truth of the Gospel.

Among the university teachers of Germany who were strongly influenced by Ritschl (in some cases also by Schleiermacher) the following exerted considerable influence: WILHELM HERMANN († 1922), who modified his teacher's "reflections" concerning the historical Jesus by emphasizing intuition to such an extent as to make the term *Christ-mysticism* applicable to his teaching, while the Bible was regarded by him as nothing but a form in which the Christian faith expresses itself, thus making his teaching strongly "modernistic"; HERMANN SCHULTZ († 1903), who also advocated an immediate religious contemplation of Christ, whose historicity he regarded as problematical and whose deity he denied; then J. Gottschick, P. Lobstein, Julius Kaftan, — one of the strongest exponents of the Ritschlian school, although he tried to return to the Confessions, — Th. Haering, who held wrong views concerning the guilt of man, H. H. Wendt, who is farther away from the truth, F. Kattenbusch, who is confessional in his attitude, P. Drews, who faces in the other direction, E. W. Mayer, O. Kirn, who denies the vicarious satisfaction and most other fundamental truths of the Bible, K. Thieme, and others. Among the American clergymen who were strongly influenced by Ritschlianism are W. A. Brown, C. F. Clarke, G. B. Smith, Wm. De Witt Hyde, G. W. Gladden, Rauschenbusch, King, Sellars, Ward, Vedder, and others, most of whom became the exponents of the social gospel with its destruction of the fundamental truths of Scripture.

In Germany other forces beside the theology of Schleiermacher were at work during the first half of the nineteenth century. The last exponent of formal rationalism was PAULUS of Heidelberg († 1851); men who were influenced by the pantheistic philosophy of Schelling and Hegel were J. M. DAUB († 1856), who was very active in the field of religio-historical research, and MARHEINICKE († 1846),

whose doctrinal theology was influenced throughout by Hegel. About this time there was also a revival of Pietism, with a rather romantic coloring, favored by men like Novalis and Tholuck (who, with all his excellencies, could not understand *confessional* Lutherans), the movement stressing in particular the *feeling* of sin and of grace, also a supranaturalism and "Biblicism (a dead literalism)," which differed widely from the attitude taken by Fr. Strauss. In the midst of this turmoil we find certain trends which resulted in three more or less distinct schools of religious or theological thought.

The first of these schools was that which is now known as the extreme *liberal school*, with LUDW. FEUERBACH (†1872) as one of its first great exponents and FERD. CHR. BAUR (1792—1860) as its chief apostle. The latter is the founder of the so-called *Tuebingen Schule*, which became notorious for its attack on practically every tenet of orthodox Biblical introduction and on every Christian doctrine. In his case the statement came true: "A theology that ceases to be a theology of the heart and to make the historical Christ the center of the Christian life will eventually suffer shipwreck with regard to its faith." Yet the evil and detrimental influence of this movement was very great, not only through the work of men like Schwegler, Planck, and others in Germany, but also through the work of British and American theologians, who felt that the false higher criticism introduced by Bauer and carried on by men like Hilgenfeld must contain some elements of truth. These men practically killed the truth in the circles in which they moved.

The liberal Tuebingen school found strong opposition in the *confessional school* centering in Erlangen, but equally powerful in the faculties at Leipzig and Rostock. The most important exponents of this school deserve more than a passing mention because they were strong defenders of the Bible truth and of the Lutheran Confessions, even if they erred in occasional matters. "The Erlangen theology presumed to be genuinely Lutheran, but frequently gave up the principle that Christian theology must be based on Scripture alone." The fact that most of these men were accused of orthodox traditionalism is decidedly in their favor. VON HOFMANN (1810—1877) is the father of the *Ich-theologie*, a man who denied the verbal inspiration. His most notable doctrinal work is his *Schriftbeweis*. His attempt to prove the authenticity and divine origin of Christianity from its records was a mighty attempt, but this very effort caused him to lose sight of the transcendental presuppositions of history, so that his presentation of the doctrine of the Scriptural kenosis, of the vicarious atonement, and of justification is entirely false. HARLESS (1806 to 1879), who "wanted to be more orthodox than the old Lutheran teachers," but sometimes failed in his attempt, was especially active in the fields of catechetics and of church music. His *Theological*

Encyclopædia gives his views of the Church and of many other doctrines, and his *System of Christian Ethics* marks an epoch in Protestant literature. THEODOSIUS HARNACK (1817—1889), who made a special study of Luther's theology, was opposed to the state church and did some excellent work, but erred, for example, in making the Gospel a modification of the Law. HOEFLING (1802—1853) was especially active in the field of liturgics, in which his *magnum opus* was the monograph *Das Sakrament der Taufe*, but in which he also erred in the doctrine of the ministerial office. VON ZEESCHWITZ (1825 to 1886) was particularly prominent in the field of catechetics; his confessional standpoint was soundly Lutheran, opposing both Romanism and the Prussian Union. FRANZ DELITZSCH (1813—1890) is notable on account of his monumental work in the field of exegesis. He was broader in his views than von Hofmann, and his theology was not free from theosophic influences, just as he made certain concessions to the liberal position in the field of Biblical criticism, against which a conservative theologian must be on his guard. GOTTFRIED THOMASIUS (1802—1875) was great both as a writer and as a teacher and preacher, his most notable writing being *Christi Person und Werk*, in which unfortunately he teaches an unscriptural kenosis. FRANZ FRANK (1827—1894) wrote the monumental work *Theologie der Konkordienformel*, a veritable storehouse of the history of dogma in the sixteenth century, and that threefold masterpiece of theological learning, *System der christlichen Gewisshheit — der christlichen Wahrheit — der christlichen Sittlichkeit*. It is unfortunate that Frank, with all his amazing learning, clung to a false subjectivism, so that he did not place the Scriptures in the first place as the objective *principium cognoscendi*. LUTHARDT (1823—1902) was active in the field of exegesis as well as in systematic theology (*Kompendium der Dogmatik*; 13th edition by Jelke, 1933), his chief errors being in the doctrines of inspiration, the office of Christ (kenoticism), and regarding synergism. He was for many years editor of the *Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung*, which tried to uphold the sound Lutheran position. KLIEFOTH (1810—1895), an opponent of von Hofmann in many points, is known for his extensive work in the field of liturgics and of church polity, for his opposition to territorialism and unionism, for his ecclesiasticism and hierarchical tendencies. He was one of the founders of the *Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Konferenz*. KAHNIS (1814—1888) in his earlier career was a subordinationist and even departed radically from the doctrine of the Trinity, but in later years became much more conservative, as his *Lutherische Dogmatik* reveals. Yet he continued to hold false views on inspiration and to dissent in the doctrine of the Trinity and of the Lord's Supper. PHILIPPI (1809—1882) took a very decided stand against modern subjectivism and in his *Kirchliche Glaubenslehre* follows the dogmaticians of the orthodox age more

closely than Thomasius. One of the most important writers is *Wm. Rohnert* († 1902), who stands four-square upon Scripture as the one source and norm of all Christian theology, although he is not correct in his doctrine of the election. Other men who might here be mentioned are *Hase* (*Hutterus Redivivus*), — otherwise rationalistic, — *Schmid* (*Dogmatik der ev.-luth. Kirche* — Lutheran), *Hoppe* (*Dogmatik des deutschen Protestantismus* — Reformed), *Schneckenburger* (*Zur kirchlichen Christologie*), *Martensen* (*Dogmatik*), who denied that Christ was inspired, *Sartorius* (*Die heilige Liebe*), a kenoticist, and *Oettingen* (*Die lutherische Dogmatik*), who wrote in the spirit of the Erlangen school.

The third group, or school, is that of the *compromise theologians* (the Halle school), representatives of which were found at practically all theological schools of Prussia. *Kattenbusch* says that these theologians may well be called the modern Philippists, whose tendencies were fashioned as a result of the "awakening," or second surge of Pietism, as a consequence of which they combined "Biblicism" with a scientific attitude toward the Bible. In this group we may well place *HENGSTENBERG* (1802—1869), who was especially prominent in Old Testament exegesis and exerted a great influence through his editorship of the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*. He was opposed to rationalism, but was himself not always trustworthy in his views, his allegorizing in particular often leading him into the errors of the *Berleburger Bibel*. *NITZSCH* (1787—1868) is another mediating theologian, whose *System der christlichen Lehre* was strongly influenced by *Schleiermacher's* subjectivism, just as he strongly favored the union of Lutherans and Reformed bodies. *THOLUCK* (1799—1877), with all his apparent originality and undoubted brilliancy, was influenced by Pietism, Moravianism, *Schleiermacher*, *Neander*, and even *Hegel*. He assumed the possibility of errors in the Bible. *JUL. MUELLER* (1801 to 1878) is notable in particular for his *Christliche Lehre von der Suende* with its assumption of an intelligible (intellectual) self-decision and for his vacillating position concerning the Prussian union. *LANDERER* (1810—1878) tried to mediate between *Baur* and *Beck* and constructed Christology along anthropocentric lines. *DORNER* (1809—1884) is rightly considered one of the most prominent theologians of the nineteenth century, his chief monograph being his *Lehre von der Person Christi*, in which unfortunately he presented a false kenosis doctrine. His Christology throughout is influenced by philosophy. Other men who may be said to belong to this group are *Koestlin* (*Luthers Theologie*), *Luecke* (*Johannes-Kommentar*), *Gasz* (*Geschichte der protestantischen Dogmatik*), and especially *Rothe* (*Theologische Ethik*), who takes a very critical position over against the Bible.

The newer form of the Erlangen theology is represented by

Ihme's († 1933), who is not adequate in a number of points in his doctrinal position, particularly because of his denying the sacrificial concept of Christ's obedience unto death; *R. Seeberg*, who champions the "modern-positive" attitude toward theology, following Frank in many respects, so that he, like him, does not, *e. g.*, quite accept the Gospel as an actual means of grace; *J. Kunze* († 1927), who was a faithful disciple of Luthardt; *Theodor Kaftan* († 1932), who denied the verbal inspiration; *Beth*, and others. Among the more recent theologians of the compromise or mediating school is Lemme († 1928), a pupil of Dorner, *M. Kaehler* († 1912), *Cremer* († 1903), *Zoeckler* († 1906), known especially for his *Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaft*, and *Schnedermann*. In the more liberal field we have the names of *Lipsius* († 1892), *Pfleiderer* († 1908), and *Luedemann*. German theologians who are at the present time studying the theology of Luther and the Lutheran Confessions with more or less pronounced success are *Elert* (*Morphologie des Luthertums*), *Šommerlath*, *Doerne*, *Jelke*, *K. Schneider*, *Koerberle*, *Holl*, *Kurtz*, and *K. Stange*.

Meanwhile we also have a *religio-historical school* in Germany and elsewhere, with a fairly strong renaissance of the ideas of Schleiermacher and Ritschl. Here we must place *De Lagarde* († 1891), *Overbeck* († 1905), *Ernst Troeltsch* († 1923), *Aulén*, and others. Of a more Ritschlian cast are *Luetzge*, *Mulert*, *Stephan*, *Titius*, *Wehrung*, *Wobbermin*, and *Fabricius*, some of whom have also recast some of Schleiermacher's ideas. *Girgensohn* († 1925) is often called a confessional theologian, but his *Grundriss* is not at all adequate on many questions of Christology and soteriology. — Some of the more prominent writers in *Stange's Zeitschrift fuer systematische Theologie* are *P. Althaus, Jr.*, and *E. Hirsch*. The influence of *A. v. Harnack* († 1930), a follower of Ritschl, and of *R. Sohm* († 1917), is generally acknowledged.

At the present time the following men are most prominent in the field of systematic theology in Germany: *R. OTTO*, whose great monograph *Das Heilige* passed through twenty-two editions in fifteen years and was translated into seven languages; *F. HEILER*, who regards himself as a spiritual disciple of *W. Loehe* and is influencing doctrine through his book *The Spirit of Worship* and his monthly journal *Die Hochkirche*; *KARL HEIM*, a very prolific writer, who operates strongly with the element of introspection; *KARL BARTH*, with his "dialectical theology" (a "combatant theology favoring vehement discussion"), or "theology of crisis," which opposes relativism and represents a pessimism which practically denies the certainty of salvation; *Gogarten*, *Thurneysen*, and *Brunner*, who are closest to Barth, together with *O. Piper*. Among the Ritschlian eclectics of recent years are *Martin Rade* and *Horst Stephan*. The Northern countries have the following theologians: *Goeransson*, *Nygren*, *Lindroth*, *Scharling*;

Madsen, Krarup, Bang, Geismar, Gisle Johnson, Krogh-Touning, and Fredrik Petersen.

In the general field of English theology few outstanding works were produced during the last century. Some of the more prominent writers of England in the field of doctrinal theology were Cobb, Christmas, Stuart, Lyddon, Gore, and Moule, with Sydney Cave as a representative of the extra-Anglican theology in the liberal field. Of American writers in the field the names of the twō Hodges (Presb.), father and son, deserve a prominent place; but the writings of Hopkins (Congr.), Hall, F. J. (Episc.), Shedd (Presb.), Clark (Episc.), Strong (Baptist), Sheldon (Meth. Episc.), Mackenzie (Congr.), and Knudson (Boston Univ.) are often quoted, while the field of social theology has strong exponents, such as Rauschenbusch, Sellars, Brown, De Witt, G. B. Smith, Clarke, Vedder, and others. This latter group may also be designated as Modernists, especially Brown, with men like Fosdick, Grant, and Cadman as other exponents. These men are really the new rationalists, except that they profess an adherence to the forms, and use the terms, of orthodox Christianity, which they have emptied of their real contents.

Within the ranks of the Lutheran theologians of America not a few books in the field of doctrinal theology have appeared. In Latin we have WALTHER's edition of Baier's *Compendium*. In the English field we have the names of C. P. KRAUTH (*The Conservative Reformation*), Weidner (various monographs), Valentine (not soundly Lutheran), Voigt, Jacobs, Gerberding, Lindberg, Hove, Stump, Mellenbruch, and Reu (English and German). The works of HOENECKE (*Ev.-Luth. Dogmatik*, thetical) and of F. PIEPER (*Christliche Dogmatik*, discussional) are soundly confessional and orthodox and are written with constant reference to late developments, especially in Germany.

May the book which is herewith presented to the English-speaking theological world serve to arouse and maintain a new interest in the sound doctrine of Jesus Christ, the God-man and Savior of the world!

St. Louis, Mo., during Holy Week, 1934.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
NATURE AND CONCEPT OF THEOLOGY	1
Introduction to Sacred Theology (<i>Prolegomena</i>)	1
1. The Scriptural Viewpoint of the Christian Theologian	1
2. Of Religion in General	4
3. Of the Number of Religions in the World	6
4. The Two Sources (<i>Principia Cognoscendi</i>) of the Existing Religions	14
5. The Cause of Divisions in Christendom	17
6. Christianity the Absolute Religion	25
7. The Christian Religion and Christian Theology	29
8. Christian Theology	30
9. Theology Further Considered as a Habitude	33
10. Theology Considered as Doctrine	37
11. Divisions of Theology Conceived as Doctrine	43
A. Law and Gospel	44
B. Fundamental and Non-Fundamental Doctrines	47
Primary and Secondary Fundamental Doctrines	52
Non-Fundamental Doctrines	56
C. Open Questions, or Theological Problems	58
12. The Church and Its Dogmas	60
13. The Purpose of Christian Theology	64
14. The External Means by which Sacred Theology Accomplishes Its Purpose of Saving Sinners	66
15. Theology and Science	67
16. Theology and Positive Assurance	72
17. Theology and Doctrinal Progress	74
18. Theology and Academic Freedom	76
19. Theological Systems	79
20. Theological Methods	84
21. The Acquisition of the Theological Habitude	86
 THE DOCTRINE OF HOLY SCRIPTURE	 90
1. Holy Scripture the Only Source and Norm of Faith	90
2. Holy Scripture the Word of God	98
3. The Inspiration of the Bible	101
4. The Relation of the Holy Spirit to the Holy Writers	106
5. Objections to the Doctrine of Inspiration	107
6. The Doctrine of Inspiration and Confessional Lutheranism ..	115
7. The Denial of the Doctrine of Inspiration — Its Cause and Its Consequences	118
8. The Properties of Holy Scripture	120
A. The Divine Authority of Holy Scripture	120
B. The Divine Efficacy of Holy Scripture	133
C. The Divine Perfection, or Sufficiency, of Holy Scripture ..	137
D. The Divine Perspicuity of Holy Scripture	138

	PAGE
THE DOCTRINE OF GOD	143
1. The Natural Knowledge of God	143
2. The Holy Trinity	147
3. The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity in Controversy	150
4. The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity and the Terminology of the Christian Church	153
5. The Holy Trinity Revealed in the Old Testament	158
6. God's Essence and Attributes	160
1. The Doctrine in General	160
2. The Negative Attributes	163
3. Positive Attributes	167
THE DOCTRINE OF THE DIVINE DECREES	176
THE DOCTRINE OF CREATION	179
1. Definition of Creation	179
2. The Order of Creation	179
3. The Hexaemeron	180
4. The Six Days of Creation Considered in Detail	181
5. The Unity of the Human Race	185
6. Special Questions Regarding the Creation Report	186
7. Creation an External Act of God	187
8. The Ultimate End of Creation	188
THE DOCTRINE OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE	189
1. Definition of Divine Providence	189
2. The Objects of Divine Providence	190
3. The Relation of Divine Providence to Secondary Causes	190
4. Divine Concurrence in Good and Evil Actions	191
5. Divine Providence and Free Will	193
THE DOCTRINE OF THE ANGELS	196
1. The Existence of Angels	196
2. The Name "Angel"	196
3. The Nature of the Angels	197
4. The Number and Ranks of Angels	199
5. Good and Evil Angels	199
6. The Holy Service of the Good Angels	201
7. The Evil Work and Eternal Punishment of the Evil Angels	202
THE DOCTRINE OF MAN	205
A. Man Before the Fall	205
1. Man Created in the Image of God	205
2. Definition of "Image of God"	205
3. The Relation of the Divine Image to the Nature of Man	206
4. Immediate Results of the Divine Image	208
5. The Divine Image and Woman	209
6. The Ultimate End of the Image of God in Man	209

	PAGE
B. The State of Corruption	210
a. Of Sin in General	210
1. Definition of Sin	210
2. The Divine Law and Sin	211
3. How the Divine Law can be Known	213
4. The Causes of Sin	214
5. The Consequences of Sin	215
b. Original Sin	216
1. Definition of Original Sin	216
2. The Corrupt Mind and Will of Man	219
3. The Negative and Positive Sides of Original Sin	221
4. The Universality of Original Sin	222
5. The Cause of Original Sin	223
6. The Effects of Original Sin	223
c. Actual Sins	224
1. Definition of Actual Sin	224
2. The Causes of Actual Sin	225
3. The Doctrine of Offense	226
4. The Doctrine of Obduration	227
5. The Scriptural Doctrine of Temptation	228
6. The Classification of Actual Sins	228
THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL	236
THE GRACE OF GOD TOWARD FALLEN MANKIND	242
1. The Necessity of Divine Grace	242
2. Definition of Divine Grace	243
3. Attributes of Justifying Grace	246
4. The Theological Terminology Regarding the Divine Will of Grace	251
THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST	255
A. The Doctrine of the Person of Christ	256
1. Introduction	256
2. The True Deity of Christ	256
3. The True Humanity of Christ	258
4. The Personal Union	263
5. The Communion of Natures	268
6. The Communication of Attributes	272
The First Genus	273
The Second Genus	275
The Third Genus	284
B. The Doctrine of the States of Christ	287
1. Definition of Christ's State of Humiliation	287
2. Erroneous Views Regarding Christ's Humiliation	289
3. The Several Stages of the Humiliation	292
4. The State of Exaltation	295
5. The Several Stages of Christ's Exaltation	296

	PAGE
C. The Doctrine of Christ's Office	301
a. The Prophetic Office of Christ	303
1. The Execution of This Office in the State of Humiliation ..	303
2. The Execution of the Prophetic Office in the State of Exal- tation	304
b. The Sacerdotal Office of Christ	305
1. The Vicarious Atonement	309
2. Objective and Subjective Reconciliation	310
3. Rejection of Errors Pertaining to Christ's Vicarious Atone- ment	311
4. The Priestly Intercession of Christ	313
c. The Kingly Office of Christ	314
Errors Regarding the Kingly Office of Christ	317
THE DOCTRINE OF SOTERIOLOGY	319
THE DOCTRINE OF SAVING FAITH	321
1. The Necessity of Faith	321
2. The Nature of Saving Faith	322
3. Concerning the Terms <i>Knowledge, Assent, and Confidence</i> ..	325
4. Why Saving Faith Justifies	326
5. Faith Viewed as a Passive Act or a Passive Instrument ...	327
6. Concerning the Expressions <i>True Faith</i> and <i>Living Faith</i> ..	329
7. Faith and the Assurance of Salvation ,	329
8. Can the Believer Be Sure of Possessing Saving Faith?	330
9. The Faith of Infants	332
10. The Use of the Term <i>Faith</i> in Scripture	333
CONVERSION, OR THE BESTOWAL OF FAITH	336
1. Scriptural Basis of the Doctrine	336
2. The Scriptural Definition of Conversion	336
3. The Starting-point and the Terminus of Conversion	340
4. The Efficient Cause of Conversion	342
5. The Means of Conversion	346
6. The Internal Motions in Conversion	349
7. Conversion Is Instantaneous	350
8. The Grace of Conversion Is Resistible	352
9. Transitive and Intransitive Conversion	352
10. Continued Conversion	353
11. Reiterated Conversion	354
12. Objections against Divine Monergism in Conversion	355
13. The Pernicious Character of Synergism	360
14. Synonyms of Conversion	362
JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH	367
1. Definition of Justification	367
2. Justification by Faith Alone	369
3. The Doctrine of Justification the Central Doctrine of the Christian Religion	371

	PAGE
4. The Christian Terminology by which the Doctrine of Justification by Faith is Guarded against Error	373
5. Justification on the Basis of Works	379
6. The Effects of Justification	380
THE DOCTRINE OF SANCTIFICATION AND GOOD WORKS	384
1. Definition of Sanctification	384
2. The Efficient Cause of Sanctification	386
3. The Inner Motions of Sanctification	387
4. The Means by which Sanctification is Accomplished	389
5. The Necessity of Sanctification and Good Works	390
6. The Imperfection of Christian Sanctification in This Life ..	396
7. The Doctrine of Good Works	403
A. Definition of Good Works	403
B. The Works of the Heathen	408
C. The Christian's Growth in Good Works	411
8. The Reward of Good Works	415
9. The Great Value of Good Works	417
10. Perversion of the Doctrine of Good Works	420
11. Sanctification and the Christian Life	424
A. The Christian Life and the Cross	424
B. The Christian Life and Prayer	428
C. The Christian Life and the Hope of Eternal Life	434
THE DOCTRINE OF PRESERVATION	436
THE DOCTRINE OF THE MEANS OF GRACE	441
1. Definition of the Term	441
2. The Means of Grace in General	442
3. Erroneous Doctrines Regarding the Means of Grace	448
4. The Importance of the Doctrine of the Means of Grace ..	457
5. The Means of Grace in the Form of Absolution	458
6. The Means of Grace in the Old Testament	465
7. The Means of Grace and Prayer	467
THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL	470
1. Definition of Law and Gospel	470
2. Features that Are Common to Both the Law and the Gospel	471
3. The Law and Gospel Considered as Opposites	473
4. The Close Connection between the Law and the Gospel	477
5. The Art of Distinguishing between the Law and the Gospel	480
6. By whom the Proper Distinction between the Law and the Gospel is Set Aside	484
THE DOCTRINE OF HOLY BAPTISM	486
1. The Divine Institution of Baptism	486
2. What Makes Baptism a Sacrament	488
3. Baptism a True Means of Grace	491

	PAGE
4. The Use of Baptism	496
5. Whom the Church should Baptize	497
6. The Administrants of Baptism	499
7. The Necessity of Baptism	499
8. Regarding Baptismal Customs	500
9. The Baptism of John the Baptist	504
THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER	506
1. The Divine Institution of the Lord's Supper	506
2. The Relation of the Lord's Supper to the Other Means of Grace	507
3. The Scriptural Doctrine of the Lord's Supper	509
4. The Lutheran Doctrine and the Words of Institution	520
5. Different Accounts of the Words of Institution	532
6. The Material Elements in the Lord's Supper	524
7. What Makes the Lord's Supper a Sacrament	528
8. The Purpose of the Lord's Supper	533
9. Who may be Admitted to the Lord's Supper	537
10. The Necessity of the Lord's Supper	540
THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH	541
A. The Church Universal	541
1. Definition of the Term	541
2. Erroneous Doctrines Concerning the Church	543
3. The Properties of the Christian Church	547
4. The Glory of the Christian Church	549
5. How the Church is Founded and Preserved	551
B. Concerning Local Churches	553
1. Definition of the Term	553
2. The Divine Institution of Local Churches	555
3. Orthodox and Heterodox Churches	556
4. Heterodox Churches and True Discipleship	558
5. The Inadmissibility of Spiritual Fellowship with Heterodox Churches	559
6. Separatists, or Schismatics	560
7. The Representative Church	561
THE DOCTRINE OF THE PUBLIC MINISTRY	563
1. Definition of the Term	563
2. The Public Ministry and the Spiritual Priesthood of All Believers	504
3. The Public Ministry is a Divine Appointment or Ordinance	566
4. Is the Public Ministry Necessary?	569
5. The Call into the Ministry	570
6. Of Ordination	574
7. The Christian Ministry does Not Constitute a Spiritual Estate	576
8. The Power of the Public Ministry	578

	PAGE
9. The Relation of Christian Ministers to One Another	579
10. The Public Ministry Is the Supreme Office in the Church ...	580
11. Of Antichrist	580
THE DOCTRINE OF ETERNAL ELECTION	585
1. Definition of the Term	585
2. How Believers are to Consider Their Election	589
3. The Objects of Eternal Election	593
4. The Relation of Faith to Eternal Election	598
5. The Purpose of the Doctrine of Eternal Election	602
6. Holy Scripture Teaches No Election to Damnation	606
7. Why Many Reject the Scriptural Doctrine of Eternal Election	610
THE DOCTRINE OF THE LAST THINGS (ESCHATOLOGY) 613	
1. Temporal Death	613
2. The Condition of the Soul between Death and the Resur- rection	616
3. The Second Advent of Christ	619
4. The Resurrection of the Dead	625
5. The Final Judgment	630
6. The End of the World	631
7. Eternal Damnation	633
8. Eternal Salvation	639

NATURE AND CONCEPT OF THEOLOGY.

(De Natura et Constitutione Theologiae.)

Introduction to Sacred Theology.

(Prolegomena.)

1. THE SCRIPTURAL VIEWPOINT OF THE CHRISTIAN THEOLOGIAN.

Owing to the diverse views and tendencies prevailing among theologians to-day, it is necessary for the Christian theologian, before presenting to his readers his dogmatic treatise, to declare in clear and unmistakable terms from which viewpoint it has been written.

The viewpoint of the present-day *modernistic theologian* is that truth must be determined by human reason in the light of scientific research. The theological Liberalist therefore does not recognize Holy Scripture as the source and norm of faith, but holds that this ancient standard of Christian doctrine has been superseded by the standards of reason and philosophy which he himself has established. From this viewpoint his dogmatic treatise is written, and since this viewpoint is anti-Scriptural and unchristian, it follows that his whole theology is rationalistic, naturalistic, and diametrically opposed to the Word of God.

The viewpoint of the *Roman Catholic theologian* is that truth must be determined by both Holy Scripture and the "infallible" traditions of the Church as these are formally set forth in the papal decretals and decisions. Thus he accepts as a source and norm of faith, in addition to Holy Scripture (to which he falsely adds the Apocrypha), something that is foreign and even opposed to Holy Scripture and ascribes to it the same authority as to the Word of God. This erroneous viewpoint proves the antichristian character of papistical theology; for it, too, is in direct opposition to Holy Scripture.

The viewpoint of the modern rationalizing Protestant theologian is that, while Holy Scripture is indeed a "divine-human record of revealed truths," which contains the doctrines that Christians must believe for their salvation, these saving truths must be determined, not by any authoritative statement of the Scriptures,

but rather by the Christian "faith-consciousness" or the "regenerate and sanctified mind" or the "Christian experience" of the theologian (*das christliche Glaubensbewusstsein, das wiedergeborene Ich, das christliche Erlebnis*). In his opinion not the objective statement of Holy Scripture, but rather the "sanctified self-consciousness of the dogmatizing subject" (*das fromme Selbstbewusstsein des dogmatisierenden Subjekts*) is in the last analysis the norm which decides what is divine truth and what is not. Modern rationalistic theology is therefore a movement away from Holy Scripture (*eine Los-von-der-Schrift-Bewegung*) to a source and norm of faith established by man himself. This movement may differ in degree, but is always the same in kind. It is basically anti-Scriptural and has its source in the unbelief of the corrupt flesh. The viewpoint of the modern rationalistic theologian must therefore likewise be rejected as unchristian and opposed to Holy Scripture.

The viewpoint from which the present dogmatic treatise is written is that *Holy Scripture is the only source and norm of Christian faith and life*, for the simple reason that the Bible is the divinely inspired Word of God, which is absolutely infallible and inerrant, both as a whole and in each individual passage. Hence, whenever it speaks on any point of doctrine or life, the matter is fully decided. *Scriptura locuta, res decisa est*. This viewpoint identifies Holy Scripture with the Word of God; its claim is, not merely that the Bible contains the Word of God, but that it *is*, fully and absolutely, in all its parts, the Word of God.

The fact that *this viewpoint is the only correct one* is proved by the statements and the attitude of both Christ and His inspired apostles. Our divine Savior accepted no other norm than Holy Scripture, and He invariably rejected the traditions of the Pharisees and the "reasonings" of the Sadducees. When He declared His divine doctrines and refuted errors, He constantly based His teachings on the immovable foundation of the written Word of God. Thus at the beginning of His ministry He met the temptations of Satan with the emphatic assertion "It is written," Matt. 4, 4, and He adhered to this principle throughout His ministry. Cp. John 5, 39; Matt. 5, 17—19; John 8, 31. 32; etc.

Also the apostles regarded Holy Scripture, including their own inspired teachings, both oral and written, as the sole source and norm of faith. Cf. Gal. 1, 8; 2 Tim. 3, 15—17; Titus 1, 9; 1 Cor. 14, 37; 2 Pet. 1, 19—21; etc. When in the age of the

THE DOCTRINE OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

(De Scriptura Sacra.)

1. HOLY SCRIPTURE THE ONLY SOURCE AND NORM OF FAITH.

The Christian Church is much older than Holy Scripture, that is, it existed long before God gave His written Word to men; for until the time of Moses God called and preserved His Church by oral teaching (*viva voce*). The Christian Church began immediately after the Fall, when God proclaimed to fallen mankind salvation through faith in the Seed of the Woman, who was to destroy the works of the devil; and Adam and Eve penitently believed the *Protevangelium* (Gen. 3, 15). This method of orally promulgating His Word was retained by God until the time when He called Israel out of Egypt and made it His chosen people, or His Church, Gen. 4, 26; 13, 4; 20, 4; Acts 10, 43; Ex. 17, 14; 24, 4, 7; etc.

However, after God had commanded His prophets to put His Word in writing, His Church was rigidly bound to the written Word, and it was not permitted either to add to the Scriptures or to take anything away from them, Deut. 4, 2; 12, 32; Josh. 1, 7; 23, 6. For the Church of the Old Testament the prophetic Scriptures constituted a fixed canon, to which only God Himself could make additions, John 5, 39; Luke 16, 29. In the time of the New Testament, God added to the existing and acknowledged Scriptures of the prophets the holy writings of the apostles, to form, together with the Scriptures of the Old Testament, the inerrant foundation upon which His Church is built, Eph. 2, 20; 1 Pet. 1, 10—12.

With the revelations of Christ and His holy apostles the Scriptural canon is now complete, and the Christian Church is to look for no more revelations from God, John 17, 20; Eph. 2, 20; Heb. 1, 1—3. Luther writes very aptly: "That we may do: If we, too, are holy and have the Holy Spirit, we may boast of being catechumens and pupils of the prophets, inasmuch as we repeat and preach what we have heard and learned from the prophets and apostles and are sure that the prophets have taught it. In the Old Testament those are called 'the children of the prophets' who did not teach anything of their own or anything new, as did the prophets, but taught what they had received from the prophets." (St. L., III, 1890.)

If the question is asked where the New Testament Church may unerringly find the word of the apostles, they themselves point us to their holy writings and tell us that what they proclaimed orally is the same as that which they recorded in their sacred Scriptures, 1 John 1, 3, 4; 2 Thess. 2, 15. Though the apostles did not put into writing *everything* that they taught orally, nevertheless everything that is required for salvation is found in abundance in their writings, since they record with great diligence God's counsel of salvation through faith in Christ Jesus, John 21, 25; Phil. 3, 1. In addition, the holy apostles insisted upon their written word as the only source and norm of faith against all errorists of their time, demanding that all who regarded themselves as prophets must follow the Lord's commands as these are laid down in their writings, 1 Cor. 14, 37, 38; 2 Thess. 2, 2. St. Paul especially put his own signature to his epistles in order that these might be distinguished from spurious apostolic epistles, 2 Thess. 3, 17. Both the prophets and the apostles thus attest that Holy Scripture, or the written Word of God, is the only source and norm of faith and life, or the true *principium cognoscendi* (*Schriftprinzip*).

This fundamental truth has been denied in various ways. The principle of Scripture, or the fact that Holy Scripture is the only source and norm of faith, has been abrogated by the substitution of something else for God's Word.

a. *Human reason* has been substituted for Scripture. By human reason we mean everything that man knows of God and divine things outside of Holy Scripture, or simply man's natural knowledge of God. This natural knowledge of God, however, cannot be the source of man's faith, since it is limited to the Law and its demands, Rom. 1, 20, 21, 32; 2, 15, and does not include the precious Gospel of Christ, or the message of reconciliation through the vicarious satisfaction of the incarnate Son of God, by which alone sinners can be saved, 1 Cor. 2, 6 ff.; Rom. 1, 16. Any one who makes human reason the norm of faith commits the logical fallacy of *μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος* and excludes himself from the Christian Church, since he substitutes for divine truth his own fallible wisdom, which rejects God's free salvation offered in the Gospel as foolishness, 1 Cor. 1, 21—25. The Christian Church therefore repudiates all forms of rationalism, Unitarianism, and Modernism, which regard human reason, or human science, as the source of faith, and condemns its proponents as being outside the pale of the Church (*extra ecclesiam*).

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD.

(De Deo.)

1. THE NATURAL KNOWLEDGE OF GOD.

(Notitia Dei Naturalis.)

Whatever man knows of God he knows through God's own revelation of Himself either in the realm of nature or in the realm of grace, that is to say, either through God's work of creation and providence or through His holy Book, the Bible. Hence we rightly speak of a natural knowledge of God and of a supernatural or revealed (Christian) knowledge of God. Had God not revealed Himself, man never would have known Him, since God is the absolute, perfect Personality, who dwells "in the light which no man can approach unto," 1 Tim. 6, 16.

By means of his natural knowledge of God, man knows that there is a personal, eternal, omnipotent Divine Being, who has created this world and still preserves and rules all things and who is holy and just, demanding what is good and punishing what is evil. This natural knowledge of God is mediated to man —

a. *By God's created works* (ποιήματα θεοῦ, *creaturae Dei*), which in themselves bear witness to their omnipotent Creator. In Rom. 1, 20 St. Paul attests that, though God Himself is invisible, man nevertheless knows of Him and, in particular, of His personality, eternity, omnipotence, and sovereignty "by the things that are made." That this is true is proved by the testimony of many heathen philosophers, as, for example, by Aristotle and Cicero. Cicero writes (*Tuscul. Disput.*, I, 28): "*Deum non vides; tamen Deum agnoscis ex operibus eius.*" This natural knowledge of God is so certain that the apostle says of all agnostics and atheists, who deny His divine existence and commands, that "they are without excuse." (The cosmological proof of God's existence.)

b. *By God's continued operation in the realm of nature and of human history.* In Acts 14, 15—17 St. Paul asserts that God "left not Himself without witness, in that He did good and gave rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness." The knowledge which man gains from God's continued self-manifestation in human history is described by the apostle in Acts 17, 26—28, where he declares that God has made and governs all men in such a manner "that they should seek the Lord" and that "in Him we live and move and have our being" in

such a way that even the heathen poets have professed: "We are also His offspring." (The historical proof of God's existence.)

c. *By the divine Law written in the heart of man.* By means of this Law, men "know the judgment of God," Rom. 1, 32, and without the revealed Law "do by nature the things contained in the Law," "their conscience also bearing witness and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another," Rom. 2, 14. 15. (The moral proof of God's existence.)

In view of these facts the antitheistic theories held by men are not the results of sound reasoning, but rather the effects of man's perverse, wilful suppression of the natural knowledge of God, which He has implanted into the human heart, Rom. 1, 18. They do not represent progress in human religious thought, but rather spiritual and moral decadence.

Atheism denies God's existence, although by nature man has a distinct knowledge of God, Rom. 1, 19; Ps. 14, 1. *Polytheism* divides God into many divine entities, although the knowledge which man by nature has of God is monotheistic (Rom. 1, 20: "His eternal power"). *Hylozoism* endues matter with life and denies that God is the extramundane and supramundane Ruler and Judge of men, though by nature man knows "the judgment of God," Rom. 1, 32. *Materialism* denies the reality of spirit and ignores the distinction between matter and mind, so that there is in materialism no God and no human soul and no immortality, but only persistence of matter and force. *Pantheism* is the doctrine that God is all and all is God, so that nothing exists outside of God. *Deism* admits that there is a personal God, who has created the world and has impressed upon it the laws that govern it, but it teaches that after this, God withdrew from the world and left it to the reign of natural laws. *Pessimism* regards the world and life as essentially evil and holds that the world, if not the worst that it can be, is at least sufficiently evil to be worse than none at all. *Atheistic evolution* denies the existence of God, asserts the eternity of matter and force, and attributes the development of the cosmos to purely natural forces (Keyser). *Theistic evolution* holds that God created the primordial material and that evolution has since been His *modus operandi* in developing it to its present status. *Agnosticism* maintains that we cannot know whether there is a God or not. *Positivism* teaches that we can know only *phenomena*, but not *noumena*, or the essence of things. Hence it is agnostic in regard to God, the soul, and the substance of things.

All these anti-Biblical theories are in opposition to the natural

THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL.

(De Libero Arbitrio.)

Among the effects of original sin we must enumerate also the loss of the freedom of the will in spiritual matters. The term "free will" (*liberum arbitrium*) is used in a twofold meaning. In the first place it denotes the faculty to will (*facultas volendi*), by which man is distinguished from all irrational creatures. Free will in this sense is called also formal freedom, or freedom from coercion (*libertas a coactione*).

When we use the term in this sense, we say that man through the Fall has not lost his free will; for although corrupt man is so perverted that he cannot do otherwise than sin (*non potest non peccare*), he nevertheless sins not against his will, but of his own free will. In other words, he is never coerced to sin, but commits sin of his own choice, John 8, 44. Hutter writes: "Sometimes the term *will*, or *choice*, is used to designate the faculty of the soul, indeed the very substance of the will itself, whose function is simply that of willing. Thus regarded, scarcely any one will deny free will to man." And Gerhard: "The question is not whether the essence of the will has survived the Fall; for this we emphatically maintain, namely, that man has not lost his will, but the soundness of it." (*Doctr. Theol.*, p. 260.)

However, the term "free will" has been used also in the sense of "spiritual power" by which corrupt man can desire that which is spiritually good, prepare himself for divine grace, fulfil the divine Law out of true love for God, accept and believe the Gospel, and thus either convert himself entirely or at least cooperate in his conversion. To distinguish "free will" in this sense from the mere faculty of willing, dogmaticians have called it spiritual freedom (*libertas spiritualis*) or material freedom.

When the term "free will" is used in this sense, we, on the basis of Scripture, emphatically deny that man after the Fall has a "free will." 1 Cor. 2, 14: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned"; John 6, 44: "No man can come to Me except the Father which hath sent Me draw him"; Rom. 8, 7: "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the Law of God, neither indeed can be"; Eph. 2, 1: "You hath He quickened who were dead in-trespases and sins."

If, then, the natural man does not receive the spiritual things, but regards them as foolishness; indeed, if he is dead in trespasses and sins and is enmity against God, then certainly he is without the power to will that which is spiritually good, to apply himself to divine grace, and to prepare himself for, or to cooperate in, his conversion. Gerhard writes: "Understanding the term *liberty* as describing the free power and faculty of choosing the good and rejecting the evil that was possessed by Adam, we maintain that Luther was perfectly correct in saying: 'Free will is a title without the thing itself, or a thing with nothing but a title.'"

Similarly the *Formula of Concord* says: "In spiritual and divine things, which pertain to the salvation of the soul, man is like a pillar of salt, like Lot's wife, yea, like a log and a stone, like a lifeless statue, which uses neither eyes nor mouth, neither sense nor heart. For man neither sees nor perceives the terrible and fierce wrath of God on account of sin and death, but ever continues in his security, even knowingly and willingly. . . . All teaching and preaching is lost upon him until he is enlightened, converted, and regenerated by the Holy Ghost." (Thor. Decl., II, 20. 21). And again: "Therefore the Scriptures deny to the intellect, heart, and will of the natural man all aptness, skill, capacity, and ability to think, to understand, to be able to do, to begin, to will, to undertake, to act, to work, or to concur in working, anything good and right in spiritual things as of himself, 2 Cor. 3, 5; Rom. 3, 12; John 8, 37; 1, 5; 1 Cor. 2, 14; Rom. 8, 7; John 15, 5; Phil. 2, 13." (Thor. Decl., II, 12—14.)

But while our Confessions thus teach that man in spiritual matters has no free will, it admits on the basis of Scripture that the will of natural man is free in worldly affairs and even to some extent in the exercise of civil righteousness (*iustitia civilis, carnalis, operum*). The *Apology of the Augsburg Confession* affirms: "The human will has liberty in the choice of works and things which reason comprehends by itself. It can to a certain extent (*aliquo modo*) render civil righteousness, or the righteousness of works; it can speak of God, offer to God a certain service by an outward work, obey magistrates, parents; in the choice of an outward work it can restrain the hands from murder, from adultery, from theft. Since there is left in human nature reason and judgment concerning objects subjected to the senses, choice between these things, and the liberty and power to render civil righteousness, are also left." (Art. XVIII, 70.)

1. THE VICARIOUS ATONEMENT.

(Satisfactio Vicaria.)

The Scriptural doctrine of Christ's redemption made for all men is known in ecclesiastical terminology as His vicarious satisfaction (*satisfactio vicaria*), or vicarious atonement (*stellvertretende Genugtuung*). Synonyms of this term used in Scripture are: propitiation (*ἱλασμός*, 1 John 2, 2); mercy-seat (*ἱλαστήριον*, Rom. 3, 25); reconciliation (*καταλλαγή*, Rom. 5, 10; 2 Cor. 5, 18); redemption (*ἀπολύτρωσις*, Eph. 1, 7; Col. 1, 14); ransom (*λύτρον*, Matt. 20, 28), all of which declare that the redemption of Christ was made by the payment of an adequate price for the captives.

The term *vicarious satisfaction* in particular is used to express the following truths: a) God, according to His perfect justice (*iustitia legislatoria, normativa*), demands of all men perfect obedience to His Law, and His wrath is upon all (*iustitia vindicativa*) who do not fulfil it, Gal. 3, 10; b) Christ, by His perfect (active and passive) obedience, has satisfied the demands of divine justice in man's stead, Gal. 4, 4. 5; 3, 13; 1 Pet. 3, 18, and has thus turned the wrath of God into grace, or favor, Rom. 5, 10; c) through Christ's satisfaction all men were reconciled unto God, 2 Cor. 5, 18—21; that is to say, God is no longer angry with sinners and no longer imputes to them their transgressions, but has graciously forgiven them all their sins, Rom. 5, 10. 18. 19.

The *Formula of Concord* thus emphasizes this comforting doctrine: "Since it is the obedience, as above mentioned, . . . of the entire person, it is a complete satisfaction and expiation for the human race, by which the eternal, immutable righteousness of God, revealed in the Law, has been satisfied and is thus our righteousness, which avails before God and is revealed in the Gospel and upon which faith relies before God, which God imputes to faith, as it is written, Rom. 5, 19; 1 John 1, 7; Hab. 2, 4; Rom. 1, 17." (Thor. Decl., III, 57.) So also the *Apology* says: "The Law condemns all men; but Christ, because without sin He has borne the punishment of sin and has been made a victim for us, has removed that right of the Law to accuse and condemn those who believe in Him, because He Himself is the Propitiation for them, for whose sake we now are accounted righteous. But since they are accounted righteous, the Law cannot accuse or condemn them, even though they have not actually satisfied the Law." (Art. III, 58.)

2. OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE RECONCILIATION.

(*Reconciliatio Obiectiva, Subjectiva.*)

The reconciliation which Christ effected through His vicarious suffering and death is fittingly called *objective reconciliation*. This was accomplished over nineteen centuries ago when our divine Substitute died on Calvary, 2 Cor. 5, 18. 19; Rom. 5, 10. For then the demands of divine justice were fully satisfied, God's wrath was turned into grace, and universal pardon was proclaimed to all sinners, John 19, 30; Rom. 5, 16. 18. 19. Reconciliation (justification) was thus secured without any work or merit on the part of sinful man, just as creation was accomplished without man's cooperation. Objective reconciliation is therefore not brought about through man's faith, but rather, just because it exists, man can now be justified by faith.

The objective reconciliation which Christ effected through His death was publicly proclaimed and offered to the world by God through Christ's glorious resurrection; for this is the actual absolution, or justification, of the whole world, Rom. 4, 25. The objective reconciliation, or justification, of the whole world is moreover announced to all sinners in the Gospel, for which reason the Gospel is called the Word of Reconciliation (*λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς*), 2 Cor. 5, 19. Luther: "The Gospel is a proclamation of Christ, true God and man, who by His death and resurrection has atoned for the sins of all men and conquered death and the devil." (St. L., XIV, 88.)

The *objective reconciliation* of Christ, or the absolution or justification of the whole sinful world, is appropriated by the individual believer through faith in the Gospel promises of forgiveness and thus becomes *subjective reconciliation*, 2 Cor. 5, 20. That is to say, the individual sinner obtains for himself through faith the forgiveness which Christ has secured for all men by His suffering and death. Saving, or justifying, faith may therefore be defined as a penitent sinner's personal trust in the reconciliation effected for the entire world. Saving faith does not justify inasmuch as in itself it reconciles God, but inasmuch as it seizes and obtains the reconciliation which already exists and is freely offered in the Gospel to all sinners. The *Apology* says: "Faith properly so called is that which *assents to the promise*." (Art. IV [II], 113.) And the *Formula of Concord*: "Faith does not justify because it is so good a work, so illustrious a virtue, but because it apprehends and

THE DOCTRINE OF SANCTIFICATION AND GOOD WORKS.

(De Sanctificatione et Bonis Operibus.)

1. DEFINITION OF SANCTIFICATION.

The justification of a sinner is immediately followed by his sanctification, or renovation, Rom. 5, 1—5. That is to say, the justified sinner turns from sin and serves God in good works, Rom. 12, 1, 2; 1 Thess. 4, 3—7; 5, 23; 1 Pet. 1, 15; Rom. 13, 13, 14. As many other theological terms, so also that of sanctification (*ἀγιασμός, ἀγιοσύνη*) is used in a wider and a narrower sense.

In its wider sense, sanctification embraces all acts of divine grace by which the Holy Spirit turns a person from sin to holiness and from the service of Satan to the holy, happy service of God, Heb. 13, 12; Acts 26, 18. In other words, sanctification in its wider sense includes every work of God by which He separates a sinner from the lost and condemned world and makes him His own, such as the bestowal of faith, justification, sanctification in its narrower sense, or the inward change in man by which he becomes holy, his preservation in faith to the end, and his final glorification on the day of Judgment, 2 Thess. 2, 13; 1 Pet. 1, 2.

In the wider sense of the term Christians are designated in Scripture *called saints* (*κλητοὶ ἅγιοι*), Rom. 1, 7; 1 Cor. 1, 2, or persons whom God has graciously endowed with faith, justified, and transplanted into His kingdom, in which He purposes to preserve them through faith unto the Day of our Lord Jesus Christ, Phil. 1, 3—6. In its wider sense Luther uses the term *sanctification* in his Large Catechism (Art. III, 40. 41), where he says: "I believe that the Holy Ghost makes me holy, as His name implies. But whereby does He accomplish this, or what are His method and means to this end? Answer: By the Christian Church, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting." So also Quenstedt writes: "Sanctification is sometimes employed in a wider sense (*late*) and includes justification, as Eph. 5, 26; Heb. 10, 10; otherwise, however, it is used in a strict sense (*stricte*), and thus coincides with renovation in its strict sense, as in Rom. 6, 19, 22; 1 Thess. 4, 3. 4. 7."

In its narrower, or strict, sense, sanctification denotes the inward spiritual transformation of the believer, which follows upon, and is inseparably joined with, justification, Rom. 6, 22;

2 Cor. 7, 1. Of the order between justification and sanctification the *Formula of Concord* writes (Thor. Decl., III, 40. 41): "In the same manner the order also between faith and good works must abide and be maintained and likewise between justification and renewal, or sanctification. For good works do not precede faith, neither does sanctification precede justification. But first faith is kindled in us in conversion by the Holy Ghost from the hearing of the Gospel. This lays hold of God's grace in Christ, by which the person is justified. Then, when the person is justified, he is also renewed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost, from which renewal and sanctification the fruits of good works then follow."

To reverse this order and make sanctification in its narrower sense the cause of justification (Papism) means to give up the central article of the Christian faith and to base salvation on work-righteousness, Gal. 5, 4. Justification and sanctification are indeed indissolubly (*nexu indivulso*) joined together; yet the two must not be mingled with each other. *Justification is the source of sanctification.* To teach the reverse means to teach the antichristian doctrine of work-righteousness and thus to thwart both justification and sanctification.

The righteousness of faith (*iustitia imputata*), by which a person becomes a Christian, is outside of man; for God declares the ungodly to be just for Jesus' sake, Rom. 4, 5. Sanctification, however, takes place within man, and by it he is transformed into a holy man (*iustitia inhaerens*), 2 Cor. 7, 1. Inherent righteousness, or the righteousness of life, is not at all a part of imputed righteousness, Phil. 3, 9, but follows justification, Rom. 6, 14; Titus 3, 7. 8.

In ecclesiastical language sanctification and renovation (renewal) are commonly used as synonyms. Sanctification is renewal inasmuch as the believer thereby enters upon a new life; renewal is sanctification inasmuch as the new life of the believer is a holy life. Our Confession at times also distinguishes between sanctification and good works as between cause and effect (*antecedens et consequens*). In that case sanctification is conceived as the principle of holiness from which all good works flow, Gal. 5, 25. 26. 22.

Properly speaking, however, the good works of the believer coincide with his sanctification, since the latter, viewed concretely (*in concreto*), occurs by way of performing individual good works, the believer either suppressing that which is evil or accomplishing that which is praiseworthy. Sanctification, viewed concretely, is never an idle state or quality (*status otiosus; habitus otiosus*),

THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL.

(De Discrimine Legis et Evangelii.)

While the doctrines so far treated necessitated a constant reference to, and discussion of, the Law and the Gospel, so that practically everything has been said on this subject that need^d be said, nevertheless it is not superfluous to set forth the Scriptural teachings concerning the Law and the Gospel under a special head. Modern rationalism, just as Romanism and Zwinglianism (Zwingli: "In itself the Law is nothing else than a Gospel"; cp. *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 161 ff.), has practically abolished the distinction between the Law and the Gospel, so that the two teachings are continually mingled into each other and the Biblical way of salvation is completely obscured (denial of the *sola fide*; salvation by work-righteousness).

Confessional Lutheranism, on the other hand, regards the "distinction between the Law and the Gospel as a special brilliant light (*clarissimum quoddam lumen*), which serves to the end that God's Word may be rightly divided and the Scripture of the holy prophets and apostles may be properly explained and understood" (*Formula of Concord*, Thor. Decl., V, 1), and therefore assigns to the subject a prominent place in every orthodox dogmatic treatise. Despite this fact, however, Antinomianism, which is a perversion of the Scriptural doctrine of the Law and the Gospel, has caused confusion also within Lutheran circles (John Agricola, the Philip-pists, Poach, Otto, etc.), so that it is indeed necessary to give the matter adequate consideration. For these reasons we here treat the subject more fully under a special head.

1. DEFINITION OF LAW AND GOSPEL.

Scripture itself distinguishes very clearly between the Law and the Gospel and likewise our Lutheran Confessions. According to the *Formula of Concord* (Thor. Decl., V, 17) the Law, in its strict or proper sense (*lex proprie accepta*), is "a divine doctrine in which the righteous, immutable will of God is revealed, what is to be the quality of man in his nature, thoughts, words, and works, in order that he may be pleasing and acceptable to God; and it threatens its transgressors with God's wrath and temporal and eternal punishments." More briefly the Epitome of the *Formula of Concord* (V, 3. 4) defines the divine Law in its proper sense as "a divine doctrine which teaches what is right and pleasing to God and reproves everything that is sin and contrary to God's will," so

that "everything that reproves sin is, and belongs to, the preaching of the Law."

On the other hand, the Gospel, in its strict or proper sense (*evangelium proprie acceptum*), is defined by the same Confession as "such a doctrine as teaches what man who has not observed the Law and therefore is condemned by it is to believe, namely, that Christ has expiated, and made satisfaction for, all sins and has obtained and acquired for him, without any merit of his, . . . forgiveness of sins, righteousness that avails before God, and eternal life." (Epitome, V, 5.)

This distinction between the Law and the Gospel is clear and Scriptural, so that we may describe as divine Law everything in Scripture that demands of man perfect obedience to God, Gal. 3, 12, pronounces His curse upon all transgressors, Gal. 3, 10, renders all the world guilty before God, Rom. 3, 19, and mediates knowledge of sin, Rom. 3, 20; and as Gospel everything that offers grace, peace, and salvation to the sinner, Rom. 1, 16, 17; 10, 15; Acts 20, 24; Eph. 6, 15; 1, 13.

It is true, both terms (Law and Gospel) are used in Scripture also in a wider sense, so that the term *Law* denotes the entire revelation of God as this is set forth in His Word, Ps. 1, 2; Is. 2, 3, and the term *Gospel* the entire divine doctrine, Mark 1, 1. This is done by way of synecdoche, so that the whole is named after a part (Gerhard: "*ut ex parte digniori et potiori totum intelligatur*").

This peculiar use of the term *Gospel* is recognized also by our Lutheran Confessions; for we read in the *Formula of Concord* (Thor. Decl., V, 3 ff.): "The term *Gospel* is not always employed and understood in one and the same sense, but in two ways in the Holy Scriptures. . . . For sometimes it is employed so that there is understood by it the entire doctrine of Christ, our Lord. . . . Furthermore the term *Gospel* is employed in another, namely, in its proper sense, by which it comprises . . . only the preaching of the grace of God."

2. FEATURES THAT ARE COMMON TO BOTH THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL.

If we compare the two doctrines with each other, we find that they have several important elements in common. In the first place, both the Law and the Gospel are the divinely inspired Word of God. This point is essential. While the function of the Law is entirely different from that of the Gospel, it is nevertheless just as much God's holy and inspired Word as is the Gospel, Matt.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE PUBLIC MINISTRY.

(De Ministerio Ecclesiastico.)

1. DEFINITION OF THE TERM.

The term *ministry* (*Predigtamt, ministerium*) is used both by Scripture and the Church in a wider and a narrower sense. In its general sense the word denotes every manner of proclaiming the Gospel or of administering the means of grace, no matter whether this is done by Christians in general, to whom the means of grace have been divinely entrusted, or by called and ordained ministers of the Word (*ministri ecclesiae*) in the name of the Christian congregation (*Pfarramt*).

Accordingly we speak of the Christian ministry in the abstract (*in abstracto*), that is, distinct from the persons who administer it, and in the concrete (*in concreto*), or as it is vested in called and ordained pastors, who perform its duties in the name of the local congregations. In this special, or narrow, sense we employ the term *ministry* in this discussion (*Pfarramt; Predigtamt im engeren Sinn*).

The Christian ministry in its narrow sense (*in concreto*) presupposes the existence of local churches, for it certainly can be established only where such congregations exist. In this sense the *Smalcald Articles* (Of the Power and Primacy of the Pope, § 67) aptly say: "Wherever the Church is, there is the authority [command] to administer the Gospel. Therefore it is necessary for the Church [German: *die Kirchen*] to retain the authority to call, elect, and ordain ministers. . . . Wherever there is a true church, the right to elect and ordain ministers necessarily exists."

The *Smalcald Articles* voice the clear doctrine of Holy Scripture on this point. When St. Paul had founded Christian churches on the island of Crete, he commanded Titus (Titus 1, 5) to ordain elders, whom in v. 7 he calls *bishops* (*ἐπισκόπους*), in every city (*κατὰ πόλιν*), that is, in every city where there were local churches. Again, after St. Paul and Barnabas had established local churches in Asia Minor on their first missionary journey, they, on their return trip, "ordained them elders (*πρεσβυτέρους*) in every church (*κατ' ἐκκλησίαν*), commending them to the Lord, on whom they believed," Acts 14, 23. Elders so ordained were expressly commanded to "take care of the church of God," 1 Tim. 3, 5; to "take heed to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made them

overseers," Acts 20, 28; to "feed the Church of God," v. 28b; to "watch . . . and warn every one night and day," v. 31; to be "examples to the flock," 1 Pet. 5, 3; etc. In short, they were to serve as divinely appointed pastors in their congregations.

Hence we rightly say that the office of the Christian ministry (*das christliche Pfarramt*) is of divine appointment or command. So also the *Apology* says (Art. XIII, 11): "The ministry of the Word has *God's command* and glorious promises." Gerhard writes: "The ministry of the Church is a sacred and public office *by divine appointment.*" (XIII, 224.) And Hutter: "The ministry of the Church has been established . . . *by God Himself.*" (*Loc. Th.*, 186.) (Cp. *Doctr. Theol.*, p. 606 ff.)

The Christian ministry is called "public," not in view of the place, where its functions are performed, but rather in view of the fact that its functions are executed in the name and by the authority of the congregation, so that even such functions of the ministerial office as are done in private (private Communion; private admonition; private absolution) belong to the *public ministry* (cp. public service; public servants, etc.). So, then, the divine rule obtains: Wherever true believers are found at one place, they must organize and maintain local churches. And wherever there are local churches, they must also by God's will call official pastors or ministers, who in the name of the congregation preach the Gospel and administer the Sacraments, or who in the name of the congregation execute the Office of the Keys. (Cp. Luther, *St. L.*, III, 723.)

2. THE PUBLIC MINISTRY AND THE SPIRITUAL PRIESTHOOD OF ALL BELIEVERS.

It is self-evident that the public ministry (*das Pfarramt*) does not stand in opposition to the general ministry (spiritual priesthood) of all believers, who as spiritual priests have the duty to proclaim the Gospel throughout the world, 1 Pet. 2, 9. The office of the public ministry rather presupposes the spiritual priesthood of all believers; for, on the one hand, the called ministers of the Word must themselves be spiritual priests, or true believers, 1 Tim. 3, 2—7; Titus 1, 5—9; and, on the other, they publicly, that is, in the name of the believers who have called them, administer the duties and privileges which all Christians have as spiritual priests.

The relation between the public ministry and the spiritual priesthood of all believers is therefore obvious. That the two are

8. ETERNAL SALVATION.

(De Beatitudine Aeterna.)

a. *The fact of eternal salvation.* That there is an everlasting life in glory and bliss for all true believers in Christ Jesus is the culmination of all Gospel revelation in Holy Scripture, Rom. 5, 1. 2; Eph. 2, 4—6. The explanation of the Second Article of the Creed thus says: "I believe that Jesus Christ has redeemed me . . . that I may be His own and live under Him in His kingdom and serve Him in everlasting righteousness, innocence, and blessedness, even as He is risen from the dead, lives, and reigns to all eternity." So also the *Formula of Concord* (Thor. Decl., XI, 14—22): "God in His purpose and counsel [of grace] ordained that finally He will eternally save and glorify in life eternal those whom He has elected, called, and justified."

The blessed doctrine of life eternal through faith in Christ cannot be learned from reason since it belongs to "the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory," 1 Cor. 2, 7—9.

The Christian hope of eternal life (John 17, 3) must therefore not be confounded with the pagan doctrine of the immortality of the soul or of its continued existence after death, which even human reason may excogitate. Concerning the arguments for the immortality of the soul we may note the following: a) "Since the soul is immaterial and simple, it is indissoluble" (Plato, Leibniz; *the metaphysical proof*); b) "The rich capacities of the soul cannot be satisfactorily developed in this life; its destiny must therefore be extended to a future life" (Cicero, Lotze; *teleological proof*); c) "Man strives after virtue as well as after happiness; but this life affords no satisfaction with regard to either" (Kant; *argumentum ethonomicum*); d) "Love for country is inspired only by the promise of life beyond death" (J. G. Fichte; *argumentum iuridicum*); e) "All men by nature believe in the immortality of the soul" (Homer, Vergil, Cicero; *argumentum e consensu gentium*; cp. *Doctr. Theol.*, p. 631f.).

However, all the "heavens" of the heathen (unbelievers) are man-made and are just as much a caricature of the heaven of Scripture as every man-made savior is a caricature of the divine Savior. Though the heathen have always speculated on the immortality of the soul, St. Paul bears witness that despite their eschatological speculations they are "without God," "having no hope . . . in the world," Eph. 2, 12. Karl Hase rightly states that "in the hovel of the poorest peasant there is a stronger faith in an eternal life than

in the lecture halls of the greatest philosophers." (Cf. *Christl. Dogmatik*, III, 619.)

Only he can in reality have the hope of eternal life who truly believes in Christ Jesus, God's only-begotten Son, and in His vicarious death for the sins of the world, John 3, 16; 11, 23—27. Even the "sweetest thoughts" on the future life of the soul are dreadful without faith in Christ, since they can never silence the accusing and condemning voice of conscience, Rom. 2, 15. 16.

b. *What eternal life is (forma beatitudinis aeternae)*. According to Holy Scripture the life eternal which Christ will graciously bestow upon His followers consists in the perpetual beatific vision of God, Job 19, 25—27; Acts 7, 55; Matt. 5, 8; 2 Cor. 5, 1—6; 1 Cor. 13, 12; 1 John 3, 2. In this life Christian believers see God only through faith by means of His Word, and, as it were, in an image, 1 Cor. 13, 12 (*cognitio Dei abstractiva*); but in heaven they will behold Him without an image or veil, face to face (*cognitio Dei intuitiva*).

This beholding of God is beatific, that is, it is joined with supreme bliss, Ps. 17, 15, so that the blessed will never desire any other happiness than that of seeing God, the Supreme Good and Source of all perfect enjoyment. From this it follows that they can never fall away from Him, but they are confirmed in their heavenly glory (Rev. 14, 13; John 10, 27—29; Ps. 16, 11; John 17, 24; Rev. 7, 9—17). There will be no spiritual foe to interfere with their bliss (Rev. 20, 10).

Quenstedt describes the everlasting happiness of the blessed as follows: "The form [of eternal life] consists, generally speaking, in the ineffable, most full, and never-ending reception of incomprehensible blessings. The blessings of eternal life are either privative or positive.

"The *privative blessings* are the absence of sin and of all causes of sin, namely, the flesh inciting, the devil suggesting, the world seducing, and of the punishments of sin, such as various calamities, Is. 25, 8; 49, 10; Rev. 21, 4; temporal death, Hos. 13, 14; 1 Cor. 15, 26. 55—57; Rev. 2, 7, and eternal damnation, Rev. 2, 11; 20, 14. Here also belongs immunity from the affections and actions of the animal body as such, as, for example, hunger, thirst, eating, drinking, the use of marriage, etc., Rev. 7, 16. 17; Matt. 22, 30.

"Some of the *positive blessings* of life eternal are *internal*, while others are *external*. The *internal positive blessings*, among which the beatific and immediate sight of God is preeminent, belong to the entire composite being and affect both body and soul

TOPICAL INDEX.

- A debito ad posse non valet consequentia*, 355.
- A praecepto ad posse non valet consequentia*, 239. 401.
- Abelard denied vicarious atonement, 14.
- Absolution a sacrament, 448; Gospel is —, 458; doctrine of — taught in Scripture, 460; the — of the papistic Church, 460; the Scriptural doctrine of — against errorists, 462; Dr. Spaeth on power of — given to disciples, 462; objections to —, 463; Baptism and Lord's Supper are forms of —, 464; — not to be pronounced conditionally, 464; questions asked in —, 465.
- Academic freedom, 76; true freedom, 77; points to be regarded in connection with —, 77; disastrous consequences of —, 78.
- Actio praevia*, 191.
- Acts, divine, of generation and spiration, 155; internal and external, 156.
- Acts 2, 24, explanation of, 297.
- Acts 13, 48, explanation of, 606.
- Acts 19, 1—6, explanation of, 504.
- Actual sins, definition of, 224.
- Actus personales*, 155.
- Adhortationes, legales, evangelicae*, 239.
- Adiaphora, 212. 561. 578.
- Administrants of Baptism, 499.
- Admonitiones, legales, evangelicae*, 355.
- Adoptionists, 150.
- Advent, the, of our Lord, 434; second — of Christ, 619; signs that precede the —, 620; destruction of Jerusalem sign and beginning of final Judgment, 621; Lutheran Church rejects millennium, 621.
- Agnosticism, 168.
- Agraphos, vox*, 31.
- Aliquid discrimen in homine*, 81.
- Alloiosis*, 274; Zwingli's — applied to absolution, 461.
- Allos*. The Father is another, *allos*, than the Son, 151.
- Amyraldists, 249.
- Analogia fidei*, 139.
- Analytic method, 84. 85.
- Angelus increatus*, 196.
- Angels, doctrine of, 196; name of, 196; nature of, 197; knowledge of, 197; attributes of, 198; — and miracles, 198; marriage of — to man, 198; number and ranks of, 199; good and evil —, 199; originally — positively good, 199; their confirmation in that which is good, 200; their election, 200; service of good angels, 201; their beatific vision of, and love for, God, 201; whom they serve, 201; we should esteem, but not worship —, 202.
- Angels, evil, enemies of God, 198; their miracles, 198; — not predestinated to damnation, 200; why they fell away, 200. 202; their state of misery, 200; why not restored to divine favor, 200; their punishment, 202; how they injure men, 202; — hate the Church, 203; their damnation, 204; purpose of Scripture in revealing the doctrine of evil angels, 204.
- Annihilationists, 638.
- Anselm of Canterbury; his religious philosophy, 13; denied active obedience of Christ, 14.
- Antichrist, 305. 380. 422. 550. 561. 580; the Scriptural doctrine of Antichrist, 580; the twofold use of the term, 580; characteristics of —, 581.
- Antichrists, 78.
- Antigraphos, vox*, 31.
- Antilegomena*, 110. 117. 130. 131.
- Antinomianism, 396. 470. 472.
- Apocrypha, 130.
- Apokalypsis*, 31.
- Apokatastasis*, 638.
- Apollinaris, 258.
- Apologetics, its function, 71.
- Apology*. On works, 15; on divisions, 36; on *sola fide*, 50; on free will, 237; on retaining the Gospel, 246; on Christ's atonement, 309; on faith, 310; on Trinity, 148; on wrong definition of sin by papists, 211; on *opinio legis*, 344; on Romanistic errors regarding repentance, 366; on meaning of justification, 375.