



The Voice

of the

*Mennonite Brethren
Bible College*

**XIII: 1
JANUARY-FEBRUARY
1964**

THE VOICE
of the Mennonite Brethren Bible College

Vol. XIII

January - February, 1964

No. 1

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

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

Editor: DAVID EWERT

No Articles May be Re-printed Without Permission.

Authorized as second class mail, Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ALTES UND NEUES	1
A BRIEF HISTORY OF TITHING	4
MAN'S TEMPTATION AND FALL — HISTORY OR MYTH	7
SOME COMMENTS ON CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS AND ITS LITERATURE (II)	10
C. S. LEWIS, A CHRISTIAN APOLOGIST	17
A SERMON ON THE NECESSITY OF LOVE	14
BOOK REVIEW	

Altes und Neues

Mit dieser Herausgabe des **The Voice** haben wir den 13. Jahrgang unsres Blattes eingeleitet. Weil wir uns bei der Herstellung des Materials davon leiten ließen, daß wir einen Leserkreis von reifen Gotteskindern hatten, haben wir uns auch nicht bis dahin vornehmlich darum bemüht, den Lesestoff so 'populär' zu machen wie möglich. Vielmehr sollte das Blatt eine Handreichung sein für solche die in verschiedenen Diensten der Gemeinde stehen. Voraussichtlich soll in dieser Hinsicht auch keine große Veränderung vorgenommen werden.

Andrerseits, waren wir uns schon lange davon überzeugt, daß sich unser Blatt einer Revision würde unterziehen müssen. Dabei soll aber doch so viel wie möglich von dem Alten festgehalten werden, wenn sich auch einige neue Züge bemerkbar machen.

Sag's auf Deutsch?

Einmal, wollen wir uns bemühen, in jeder Ausgabe, unsren deutschsprechenden Freunden Rechnung zu tragen. In unsren Gemeinden wird ja die Zahl derer, die sich noch einigermaßen im Deutschen frei bewegen, rapid weniger. Daher steigt auch wiederholt die Frage auf, ob **The Voice** nicht ganz ins Englische übergehen sollte. Jedoch, im Blick darauf, daß wir manche Leser in Süd-Amerika und Europa haben, und auch angesichts dessen, daß manche unsrer treusten Leser, hier zu Lande, zu denen gehören, die noch gerne die deutschen Artikel lesen, wollten wir noch weiter einiges auf Deutsch bringen.

Es ist ja zu bedauern, daß sogar in den Reihen unsrer geistlichen Arbeiter solche sind, welche wenig Wertschätzung für andere Sprachen haben, und die sich dadurch um viel geistige und geistliche Güter bringen. Nicht, daß das geistliche Leben in unsren Gemeinden an irgend einer Sprache gebunden ist, oder auch, daß unser christliches Zeugnis an unsre Umgebung durch das Festhalten einer Fremdsprache leiden sollte, aber als Mittel, durch welches uns die theologischen Schätze eines andern Volkes zugänglich gemacht werden, und auch, hier und da, als Schlüssel zu einem Menschenherzen, dessen Muttersprache eine andere als die englische ist, ist es unsre Pflicht, unsre Sprachkenntnisse zu verbessern. Auf jeden Fall werden wir, als Diener am Wort, unsren Gemeinden besser dienen, wenn wir unsren Geist erweitern, als wenn wir den Sumpf der Unwissenheit kneten.

Schwarz auf weiß!

Es sind bereits 500 Jahre verstrichen, seitdem Johannes Gensfleisch, geboren zu Gutenberg, den europäischen Völkern die Druckerei gab. Keiner hätte damals auch nur zu ahnen gewagt, was für eine Revolution durch diese Erfindung angestiftet werden sollte. Wie wäre wohl die Reformation, ohne das gedruckte Wort, durchgeführt worden? Leider hat Satan durch sündige Menschen, auch diese gute Erfindung — wie auch manche andere — zum Bösen ausgebeutet, und heute fließt von vielen Druckerpressen ein dunkler Strom der Unreinigkeit und Gottlosigkeit in das Völkermeer. Daher sind wir auch für jedes Fließchen, aus dem man noch reines Wasser für den Geist schöpfen kann, dankbar.

Der Druck, wie wir ihn bis dahin in unsrem Blatt hatten, war etwas klein, und daher sind wir auf größeren Druck übergegangen. Als das Bücherdrucken in England eingeführt wurde, wurde das Brilletragen auch Sitte (wenn die Brillen auch nur Fensterglas hatten). Wir wollten unsren Lesern das Lesen unsres Blattes so angenehm machen wie nur möglich; daher, der gößere Druck. Also, dieses gehört zu dem Neuen, in unsrem Blatt.

Auch haben wir die Rubriken (Theological, Denominational, Practical, Historical, usw.), unter welche wir bis dahin die Themen der Artikel stellten, fallen gelassen. Der Grund ist einfach dieser: Es ist fast unmöglich die Verhandlung eines gegebenen Themas so zu klassifizierung, daß jegliche Zweideutigkeit dabei gemieden wird. Unser Blatt soll ja einen theologischen Charakter haben. Wenn sich nun ein Schreiber mit Mission, oder Geschichte, oder Kirchenmusik, oder eine praktische Lebensfrage beschäftigt, dann soll auch solcher Artikel theologisch sein. Da mag jemand sagen: Uns fehlt das Praktische viel mehr als das Theologische. Aber wir fragen: Ist das Theologische im letzten Grunde nicht recht praktisch? Belehrung geht doch der Ermahnung voraus. Es hilft wenig Menschen zum Guten aufzufordern wenn sie sich über das was gut ist nicht klar sind. Alles was zu einem besseren Verständnis der Schrift, unsres Glaubens, unsrer christlichen Weltanschauung beiträgt, hat einen durchaus praktischen Wert. Wir alle wissen davon zu erzählen, wie schwer es ist ethische Fragen mit solchen zu besprechen, die keinen theologischen (biblischen) Rahmen für ihr Denken haben. Darum, wer nur immer was 'Praktisches' haben will (gemeint ist jedenfalls, oft: 'das Leichtverständliche'), sägt den Ast ab auf dem er sitzt.

Predige das Wort!

Es wird in unsren Gemeinden viel gepredigt. Auch wird mitunter recht gut gepredigt (von menschlichen Maßstäben aus zu urteilen). Möchte Gott uns die Gnade geben, daß die Predigt des Wortes im Mittelpunkt unsres Gemeindelebens bleiben möchte! Aber, es ist doch nicht zu übersehen, daß auf diesem Gebiet viele Mängel zu verzeichnen sind. Meines Erachtens, müssen wir es mit der Vorbereitung zur Predigt ernster nehmen. Wäre es nicht für den Prediger des Wortes eine Schande, wenn der Chorleiter sich mehr Mühe geben sollte, um das Evangelium so gut wie möglich durch den Chorgesang zu verkündigen, als der Prediger des Wortes?

Um uns auf dieser Linie Anregung zu geben, wollen wir in jeder Nummer unsres Blattes eine Predigt veröffentlichen. An jeder Predigt wird ja zu mäkeln sein, aber sie kann uns eine Hilfe sein. Jemand überhörte zwei Schwestern, die aus zwei verschiedenen Gemeinden kamen, über ihre Prediger plaudern. Die eine sprach wohlwollend und mit Begeisterung von dem Prediger ihrer Gemeinde, der über einen und denselben Text zwölf Predigten bringen konnte. Die andre wollte im Loben ihres Prediger nicht hintenbleiben, und antwortete: "Unser Prediger kann irgend einen Text nehmen und dieselbe Predigt darüber halten." Ob das Letztere auch bei uns zutreffen könnte? So soll es nicht sein. Wir wollen uns bemühen unsren Geist an guten Predigten

zu nähren, um dadurch einen besseren Tisch für hungrige Seelen vorzubereiten. Möchten die Predigten die in unsrem Blatt erscheinen werden zur Anregung dienen!

Und sollten wir hier und da etwas finden, was wir uns aneignen möchten, dann brauchen wir der Gemeinde nicht fortwährend darüber zu informieren, wo wir eine Wahrheit gefunden haben, oder wer, was wir zu sagen haben, schon vor uns gesagt hat. Das wollen wir tun wenn wir zitieren; dann muß man rechtmäßig Anerkennung geben. Aber wenn wir die Wichtigkeit eines Ausspruchs zu unterstreichen versuchen, indem wir vorausschicken, "Dr. Jones hat einmal gesagt," dann helfen wir der Sache sehr wenig. Wer kennt Dr. Jones? Und wer will wissen was der einmal gesagt hat? Dagegen, wenn eine bedeutende Persönlichkeit, welche der Gemeinde bekannt ist, einmal etwas Wertvolles gesagt oder geschrieben hat, dürfte es von Bedeutung sein, den Autor anzugeben. Natürlich gilt es mit Zitaten sauber umzugehen. Einmal, soll man richtig zitieren; und zweitens, soll man Anerkennung geben. Im letzten Grunde haben wir ja alle nur 'geborgtes' Licht. Der französische Wissenschaftler und Philosoph, Blaise Pascal, bespricht in einem seiner Schriften die Frage nach der Originalität eines Menschen. Unter andrem bekennt er, daß was er zu sagen hat nur insoweit original ist, daß er es sagt, und nicht ein anderer. Er will damit sagen, daß das Was? von andern geborgt ist, aber das Wie? ist sein eigen. Viel mehr Originalität werden wir uns auch nicht zumessen dürfen.

Halte an mit Lesen!

Der Prediger des Wortes kann nicht beständig ausgehen ohne frischen Zufluß zu haben. Als D. L. Moody, der nicht die Gelegenheit gehabt hatte sich die nötige Bildung anzueignen, von seiner ersten Predigtreise aus England zurückkehrte, fühlte er sich so entleert, daß er sich fest entschloß, nicht wieder auf solch eine Reise zu fahren bis er sich vollgelesen habe. Auch reiste er von jetzt an in Amerika nicht ohne eine klein Bibliothek mit sich zu nehmen. Er hatte erkannt, daß wir mit dem Stoff denken, den unser Denken aufnimmt; und wie kann man sein Denken besser befruchten als durch lesen?

Von dem weitbekannten Prediger, Alexander Maclaren, dessen Predigten man noch mit großem Profit lesen kann, wird erzählt, daß er sich nach einigen Jahren des Predigtendienstes, auf zwei Jahre in die Stille zurückgezogen haben soll, um sich durch Lesen für den weiteren Dienst zu stärken. Alle Einladungen zur Predigt lehnte er entschieden ab, um sein Inneres zu bereichern, und dann trat er mit einer kräftigen Botschaft — die bis heute noch zu hören ist — in die Öffentlichkeit. Der gelehrte, pietistische Theologe, Johann Bengel, bemerkt in seinem **Gnomen** zu dem Gesicht des Johannes im Buch der Offenbarung, in welchem der Seher eine Buchrolle verschlingt: "Wer kein Büchlein gegessen hat, kann nicht weissagen."

Diesem Bedürfnis entgegen zu kommen, wollen wir von jetzt ab im **The Voice** der Bücherbesprechung mehr Raum geben. Die Absicht ist nicht notwendigerweise unsern Lesern neue Bücher zu empfehlen, sondern sich mit einiges von dem, was heute auf den Büchermarkt kommt, auseinanderzusetzen. Solche Besprechung dürfte lehrreich sein.

Wir wollen versuchen mit aller Offenheit und Sachlichkeit an jedes Buch hinanzugehen, und wenn scharfe Kritik gefordert wird, dann soll sie im Interesse der Wahrheit gegeben werden (allerdings, im Geiste Jesu Christi).

Möchte der Herr uns allen — Schreiber wie Leser — seine Gnade verleihen, damit sein Name verherrlicht würde. Was Johannes Goßner (Gründer der Goßner Missionsgesellschaft) sich als Ziel seiner Wortverkündigung (in Predigt, und in Schriften) setzte, soll auch die Absicht unsres Blattes sein: "Zu wecken etwas Bleibendes; Gefühle, Empfindungen in den Hörern anzuregen . . . die nie wieder ganz verlöschen; etwas in den horchenden Herzen zu erzeugen, das ein Same zur Unsterblichkeit, zum ewigen Leben wird."

David Ewert

A Brief History Of Tithing

In the broadest sense the meaning of the tithe is the offering of a proportion, most generally the tenth, of one's material goods to God. In the Church Fathers we find repeated reference to the tithe. Tertullian associates the offerings of Cain and Abel with tithing and claims that God rejected Cain's offering because it had not been rightly tithed. He based this interpretation on the Septuagint version of Gen. 4:7: "Hast thou not sinned if thou hast brought it rightly, but not rightly divided it?"

Tithing is not an exclusively Christian practice. It grew up on Hebrew soil and was later transplanted into the early church. The question has often been raised whether this transplanting was in obedience to divine revelation or in response to tradition. Firmly rooted traditions die hard.

The first reference to tithing occurs when Abraham celebrates his victory in battle by offering the tithe of the spoil to Melchizedek, the king and priest of Salem. The author of Hebrews using this O.T. reference infers that this tithe prior to the Levitical tithe was superior because it was offered to a higher one. Levites are mortal but Melchizedek as a type of Christ lives forever. The theme of relationship between the lesser and greater is introduced.

Another reference is found in Genesis 28 where Jacob made a vow that if God would give journeying mercies and sustain him then "of all that thou givest me I will give the tenth to thee." Here the tithe is accepted as an obligation for the receiving of a special blessing. It is in the nature of a thankoffering.

Later the tithe was included in the code of law which governed Israel's conduct before God. Again we notice the two elements mentioned above. In Deuteronomy the tithe became part of the thankoffering. It was a "first-fruits" offering. It was brought before God and eaten there as a feast with servants and Levites. On the third year the tithe was used for charitable purpose to benefit the Levites, the strang-

ers and the poor. Another tithe mentioned in Leviticus was given directly to the Levites who had no inheritance of their own (Numbers 18:24). They being the larger number in turn gave one tenth of this to the priests who had a special ministry to perform.

Later rabbinism established three tithes. The book of Tobit shows that it was expected of a good man to give an annual tenth to the sons of Levi, another tenth for the religious festivals each year in Jerusalem, and a third tenth for the poor (Tobit 1:7-8). The **Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics** (XII, p. 348) suggests that in the rabbinic system the first tithe was collected annually, the second was due in the first, second, fourth, and fifth years, and the third in the third and sixth years. Hence there were two tithes annually except the seventh year in which the land lay fallow.

In the Talmudic period the teaching on tithing became legalistic to the point of absurdity. It was claimed that through the tithe Israelites could escape the twelve months of punishment in Gehenna which was the lot of bad Jews. In Book VII of the **Mishna** on "Maase-roth", chapter five, we read that even the accumulations of ants which may have been acquired from the heaps of tithable produce are liable to the tithe because it is well known that during the night they have been carrying away such produce to their nests (quoted by Henry Lansdell. **The Tithe in Scripture**, Chapter VII).

It was because of such ridiculous fastidiousness that Jesus rebuked the Pharisees and lawyers for tithing mint and cummin (Luke 11:42). This passage and the parable of the Pharisee and Publican (Luke 18) contain the only reference Jesus ever made to tithing.

Since both of the above mentioned passages in Scripture are critical, we must review the whole Jewish system of tithing and examine it anew in the light of the gospel. Paul makes no mention of tithing anywhere in his epistles, and this seems strange, since he had ample cause to do so if he intended to retain tithing as a method of Christian stewardship.

How then did tithing come into the Christian Church? When we examine the early history of the Church we find that although the support of the ministers was recognized from the beginning, the system of tithes was not resorted to for several centuries. Until the fourth century little was heard of tithing. Irenaeus says that Christians, "as those who have received liberty, set aside all their possessions for the Lord's purpose" (**Ante-Nicene Fathers**, I, 484). Origin regards the tithe as something to be far exceeded in Christian giving (**Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics**, XII, p. 349). Epiphanius said that the tithe was no more binding than circumcision (**Ibid.**). Augustine already regarded the tithe as due to God although he appealed to the ideal of freedom as the motivation for giving.

The tithe was slow in getting established even though some eminent churchmen supported it. When it did come into the church, it came on the wings of the analogy between Judaism and Christianity. The Christian ministers or priests were compared with the Jewish Levites and priests and to this was added the teaching of Jesus that a laborer

is worthy of his wages (Luke 10:7). Paul's question was also quoted: "Who tends the flock without getting some of the milk?" (1. Cor. 9:7). But it was not until A.D. 585, at the Council of Macon, that the church ordained its payment and then the priests were to use it for the poor and for redemption of captives. Refusal to pay meant excommunication. In one of his dominions Charlemagne made it a law that the tithe was to be paid to the Church for bishop and clergy, for the poor, and for the upkeep of church property.

The reformation caused a tremendous upheaval in the system of tithes which supported the Church of Rome. The lands and territories which went Protestant were lost to the tithing coffers of the Church. The reformers were not opposed to the exacting of tithes with the exception of the Swiss Anabaptists who considered such a means of gathering monies incompatible with the New Testament injunctions on voluntarism in giving. However, in 1789 the National Assembly of France repealed the tithe and other countries soon followed the example. The legal motivation behind the tithe was now broken.

The nineteenth century saw a revival of tithing. There was a distinct shift from the state to the church as the instigator of the tithe. According to Robert Paul Roth, two things distinguish this movement from anything previous in the history of tithing. First, it was a laymen's movement and, secondly, it was inspired by the conviction that God prospers in temporal affairs those who honour him by the tithe.

In 1876 Thomas Kane wrote a pamphlet on the subject of tithing which he sent to approximately three fourths of our country's evangelical ministers. This began a movement which was later organized as The Layman Company and was dedicated to encourage tithing in America.

Individual churches soon responded to the call of the Layman Movement and in 1895 the Wesley Chapel Methodist Episcopal Church in Cincinnati, Ohio, under the direction of its able treasurer, attorney William G. Roberts, inaugurated a plan to save the congregation from financial collapse. The church had tried everything from suppers to talent shows and was faced with financial ruin. Tithing saved the day and the church was soon financially solvent.

From that day on churches have stressed tithing as God's way in financial matters. Whole denominations such as the Adventists and Mormons have built their spiritual life around tithing. The list of books on stewardship which deal with tithing as a biblical approach to giving in the church is impressive.

It remains to be investigated by Christian scholars to what extent the concept of tithe is actual a New Testament injunction. That it serves the church well cannot be denied. However, pragmatism cannot be the basis on which a matter so important can be decided. If the tithe is but an **expedient**, it should be so taught lest we bind the consciences of men by standards which do not have New Testament authority.

F. C. Peters

Man's Temptation and Fall- History or Myth?

Much controversy was centered around Genesis 1 - 3 in the last 100 years. Earlier readers, both Hebrew and Christian, generally accepted these chapters as a factual account of Creation and of man's subsequent fall into sin. The historicity of these chapters has been seriously challenged in this last century, and because of arguments advanced against such a reading of them, a large number, undoubtedly the majority, of scholars in professing Christendom, have ceased to regard them as history. How general such abandonment is among the rank and file of professing Christians is difficult to say.

The arguments which have been advanced against the historicity of these chapters have been various. One is the alleged testimony of evolution; others, the unreasonableness of certain statements or other "insuperable difficulties in the story. It is generally felt that it is better to regard these chapters as myths. This is not to say that they are without value but rather that they are a mixture of the fictitious and the symbolic. The earlier wholesale rejection of this account in the era of naive liberalism has been replaced by a more serious evaluation of it, but still not as actual history. It will be impossible to review this whole issue within the scope of these few pages. Rather an attempt shall be made to consider the arguments advanced against these chapters, particularly chapter 3, which contains the account of the temptation and fall of man, and to come to some sort of a conclusion as to how this account is to be understood.

Those who reject the historicity of this portion of Genesis, generally do so because they have accepted the theory of man's evolutionary development as fact. They contend that man can therefore never have existed in a state of moral perfection and freedom of choice, but rather that as soon as he emerged from the animal level he was already self-centered and self-willed, corrupted by his ancestry and that which he brought with him. Now we cannot here enter in upon all the pros and cons of the evolutionary theory. However, there is a type of "neo-obscurantism" which considers all evidence in, and the case closed as far as the establishment of this theory as fact is concerned. This is one assumption, at least, which they do not question. To do so is to jeopardize one's intellectual reputation. Notwithstanding this, there is a respectable number — in the minority, it is true — of competent scholars who are far removed from considering the issue closed. Among these are men like Rene Dubois, the eminent microbiologist, Herebert Nilsson, the late director of the Botanical Institute of Lund, in Sweden and Walter E. Lammerts, research director of a horticultural concern in California. These men do not speak out against the certainty of the evolutionary process on religious grounds, but rather because of the evidence and the problems that they have encountered in their fields of study. The whole creation account as we have it in Genesis does therefore not have to be rejected as history, at least, not because the scientist has discovered conclusive evidence that we must do so.

Natural Selection vs. Moral Action

But if there is no conclusive evidence that man is here as the last link of a chain of development, there is still less evidence, that he never existed in a state of moral perfection. That contention follows as a matter of course from the view that man came up through the brute and not from evidence. D. R. G. Owen, in his book **Body and Soul**, sees the origin of man as a long slow ascent through adaptation, variation and natural selection. (G. K. Chesterton has said: "There is something slow and soothing gradual about the word and idea of evolution... yet there runs through all this rationalistic treatment of history, the curious and confused idea that difficulty is avoided, or even mystery eliminated, by dwelling on mere delay or on something dilatory in the process of things.") — This ascent, he says, does not apply only to man's biological development, but also to the characteristically human activities of thinking, willing, acting purposefully and morally. This statement needs to be examined. Take the two phrases, "natural selection" and "acting morally." Owen says specifically that man's capacity to act morally is an evolutionary development out of more rudimentary forms of the same kind of thing. The "natural selection" theory has also sometimes been stated as "the survival of the fittest." But even Prof. Huxley, in one of his lectures (*Evolution and Ethics*) pointed out that the cosmic process of natural selection or "survival of the fittest" is the direct antithesis of the ethical process. Prof Huxley said: "The ethical process is in opposition to the cosmic process and tends to the suppression of the qualities best fitted for success in that struggle." How can the "arrival" of a capacity, such as the ethical, be accounted for by a process that is in direct opposition to it, namely, the survival of the fittest.

Evolution has not presented any argument which forces us to abandon the historicity of the account of man's fall and redemption. The argument presented and dealt with, were not considered to be all that men have said against this account, but rather as being typical of what is being said, and the weight of the evidence or logic that lies behind these arguments. The others that could not be mentioned for lack of space, are no more convincing. We now turn to the account itself. An unbiased reading of it conveys the impression that it purports to be historical. However, "insuperable" difficulties have been found in the story, which forbid us to understand it as a historical narrative. Again, we will have to confine ourselves to a few examples.

Alleged Difficulties in the Story

Owen says there are insuperable objections to taking this story as actual history. These he says are in the story itself (**Op. cit.**, p. 201). When he comes to name these, he actually only names one, and it is not really in the story at all, but rather in his interpretation of the story. He says: "Now the main objection to interpreting the story as history of event, in which perfection (the image of God) is attained first and is then followed by the Fall, is that in the story, the gifts that constitute the image of God are only fully realized in the eating of the forbidden fruit. For in the first place, real freedom is freedom to choose between good and evil, and therefore involves the knowledge of good and evil.

And this knowledge is precisely the forbidden fruit. Thus we would have to say that man becomes fully free and actualizes this aspect of the image of God by disobeying God... Similarly, self-awareness, the other aspect of the image, arises after and a result of the eating of the forbidden fruit. 'The eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked'."

The "Image of God" he says, consists of real freedom to choose (which, he says necessitates the knowledge of good and evil) and self-awareness. The account nowhere says that this is wherein the image consisted; this is Owen's own interpretation. Eve's choice was not, as she saw it, a choice between good and evil, but rather, a choice between obeying God or disobeying Him. The issue, for her, was placed in a more favorable light by also appearing to be a choice between enjoying a limited "good" or entering upon a higher "good", to be like God. Is the knowledge of good and evil really necessary for a free choice at this juncture? The difficulty is of his own making.

The second aspect of the image as he sees it, is still more surprising. Here we have an identification of "self-awareness" and the "awareness of nakedness." Even if you were to take the later in a symbolic sense, i.e. an awareness of one's shortcomings and weaknesses, the identification would still be completely untenable. Is a person then not conscious of self until he sees himself in this way? Surely we have better evidence of the self-consciousness of man in Adam's words before the Fall: "This (Eve) at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh..." (Gen. 2:23).

Surely the fact that they became so painfully aware of their nakedness can be accounted for in a different way. Having pushed God out of His rightful place in their lives, everything else became distorted, and so to speak, out of focus. All other relationships also underwent a radical change. That which had heretofore been natural and pure, now through this distortion became an object of shame. Inordinate desire had found a place and expression in the heart of man, and spread its poisonous influence into every part of his being. The difficulty does therefore, not rest in the story but in the interpretation; the objection is not so "insuperable" after all

Other Objections

Ryder Smith, sees the representation of man as morally perfect not as an historical account of what man was in the dawn of human history but rather of what he is to be. The difficulty of taking this fact of man's moral perfections literally arises, as had already been mentioned, from the problem of visualizing a morally perfect creature arising from an animal ancestry. But apparently this origin must be defended, even if it involves this type of interpretation. Here the writer who, as it appears, is intending to recount history, is actually, so the contention runs, speaking prophetically of the consummation of man. This does not seem like proper exegesis, whatever else it may be.

Brunner too, after an excellent analysis of the account of the Fall and the insights which this account affords, both into the nature of man and the nature of sin, proceeds to ask: "How, where and when did

this take place?" His answer is: "The Creation and the Fall both lie behind the historical visible actuality, as their presuppositions which are always present and are already being expressed in the historical sphere." (Man in Revolt, p. 142 f.) According to Brunner, the main "stumbling block" to accepting the Fall as historical event, is that we are made responsible for a sin which someone else has committed. Brunner, of course is going considerably beyond the story in Genesis 3 when he makes this statements, and yet it is an issue which must be taken seriously, even if we can do this only very briefly here. There is in this chapter no mention of transfer of guilt or responsibility for sin. Therefore the difficulty that he raises is not in the story itself, but rather appears in doctrinal formulations, such as the doctrine of Original Sin and theories of imputation, which have some relationship to this story, but have for their actual basis other statements of Scripture. Some believe that Scripture does teach that God does impute this first sin of disobedience to all who have subsequently been born into this world, others again maintain that the universal sinfulness of man is a result of man's involvement in the solidarity of the race, which shares a corrupted and depraved nature in unbroken descent from the first parents. Whether we now see our connection with this first sin as coming about through divine imputation or organic involvement, two things stand out very clearly. The first, each of us has voluntarily and repeatedly confirmed the sinfulness of our will by deliberate, personal decision. The other, that over against this stand the incarnation, the Atonement and the Resurrection. These acts of God's redemptive love remove any problem of justice that Brunner's statement can raise. In the light of what happened at Calvary, we can accept the story of the fall as history.

From a very superficial review of some of the typical objections raised against this account, we can see that they place no constraint upon us, either by weight of fact or force of logic, to abandon the historical view of Genesis, chapter 3. If a person does so, he must have some other reason or motive, and motives are hard to discover. Reason is a good servant, but a poor master. In the understanding of Revelation, reason must observe its limits "for as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts."

H. H. Voth

Some Comments On Christian Apologetics And It's Literature (II)

One of the more impressive attempts, in our generation, to examine and defend the Christian faith from an apologetic standpoint, in a comprehensive and systematic manner, is Edward J. Carnell's **An Introduction to Christian Apologetics** (Eerdmans, 1948). In this vigorously and confidently argued treatise, Carnell endeavours to demonstrate logically the truth of Christian theism by indicating (first) the basic moral predicament of man, by defining (second) the nature of truth, faith, and apologetic proof, and by drawing out (finally) the "necessary"

implications of Christian theism with regard to such problems as the common ground between believer and unbeliever, of miracles and natural law, of evil, of the "ethical one and many," and of immortality.

The ideal of "systematic coherence", it is plain, has inspired and guided Carnell throughout the development of his case for Christian theism. Carnell explains this ideal and criterion of proof, at one point (see chapter 6), thus: "Truth is the properly construed meaning of all experience. Perfect coherence always involves two elements: the law of contradiction to give **formal validity**, and concrete facts of history to give **material validity**. Without formal validity we have no universality and necessity in truth, and without material validity we have no relevance to the world in which we live. This is proof by coherence..." And he goes on to assert (see page 107) that "the better our propositions stick together, the more truth we have; the more truth we have, the more faith we have. It is in this framework that the Christian offers proof for his system: it sticks together. It can solve the problems of personal happiness, present a rational view of the universe, and give a basis for truth."

In our opinion, Carnell attempts too much in this otherwise able study, and at times betrays as much by consciously or unconsciously retreating from, or else modifying, this ideal in order to make a point. We must confess that, as we see it, Alan Richardson's **Christian Apologetics** (Harper, 1947) represents a more carefully and consistently argued treatment of **most** of the issues treated in Carnell's study. Richardson, it seems, takes much the same position as Carnell on the "fact" of common ground and on the "ideal" of systematic coherence, but is more **discreet** and **cautious** in his explication and application of these assumptions. Richardson's study, however, is vitiated at several points (analysis of Biblical inspiration, of Biblical miracles, etc.) by a moderate liberalism that would prove disquieting for many evangelical Christians.

The remarkable **boldness** and **rational distension** of Carnell's approach, as embodied in **An Introduction to Christian Apologetics** have, indeed, called forth suspicion and anxious fear in evangelical circles, and even angry protest against this particular work. It ought, however, to be remembered by such folk that Carnell has gone on to write other apologetical books that emphasize other approaches (see **Christian Commitment** and **The Kingdom of Love and the Pride of Life**, for instance) — approaches that are not as openly or uniformly "rationalistic", to use a rather strong term. In **The Kingdom of Love and the Pride of Life** (Eerdmans, 1960), for example, Carnell admits in the "Preface" that there "is no official or normative approach to apologetics. At least I have never found one. The approach is governed by the climate of the times. This means, as it were, that an apologist must play it by ear." And in this intriguing work, Carnell carries forward his main argument by often appealing, after the manner of Jesus Himself, to the "beliefs and attitudes of happy children!"

Another more recent work of apologetics, less inclusive in scope and less pretentious in format, but one which has made a profounder personal impression upon this reviewer, is A. C. MacIntyre's **Difficulties in Christian Belief** (Philosophical Library, 1960). MacIntyre is a Britisher who is presently Lecturer in Philosophy at the University of

Leeds. His book is a slender volume that, in concise and cogent fashion, deals with the usual intellectual questions of doubters, whether they be professing Christians or not. What lends this study particular distinction, in our opinion, is its extraordinary **clarity in thought** (despite the terseness of expression!) and extraordinary **honesty in attitude and approach**.

Something of this uncommon clarity and honesty is evident already in these words from MacIntyre's "Foreword" to his book: "How can we know that God is really there, if He is invisible? How can God let pain and death occur? Do miracles happen? The list of such questions is indefinitely long. They present us with two quite different types of problems. First of all, there is the task of providing answers to such questions. In this we may be more or less successful, but the most brilliant of theologians or philosophers is unlikely in a life-time to resolve all such puzzlements. Secondly, there is the question of what attitude we should take to these problems in general. If we cannot solve them, ought we to abandon our religious belief? Or can we safely put them on one side and forget about them? Both these courses seem to me mistaken. Certainly, if we can see no way at all through the intellectual problems raised by the Christian religion, we ought to abandon it. But we do not need more than a limited amount of light to see that what we have here are matters of difficulty, not matters for doubt. A thousand difficulties, as Cardinal Newman pointed out, need not add up to one doubt. And what therefore I am attempting in this essay is to show that we can see enough of a way though such problems to treat them as difficulties, difficulties which the intelligent Christian has a duty to consider honestly but which equally are no occasion for unbelief."

These qualities of intellectual clarity and intellectual candour are evident, too, in MacIntyre's careful consideration of the crucial matter of miracles. "What then is involved in the concept of a miracle?" he asks, and goes on to answer the question in this way: "It is an extraordinary event in which nature serves or answers human purposes in such a way as to make it possible to see a special sign of God's care. I am not of course saying that the inexplicability of miraculous events is an unimportant feature of their miraculous character. If an event is explicable on purely natural grounds then this is sufficient to show that it is not a miracle. And sometimes the believer will have to revise his opinion as to whether or not an event is miraculous in the light of later discoveries and explanations. Moreover, the skeptic will always be able to say: 'Perhaps one day we shall discover how to explain this event and in consequence demonstrate that it was not a miracle'. That is to say, to those who do not **already** believe in God claims about miracles will never provide conclusive evidence. To accept a belief as miraculous is to accept belief in God; but the possibility of future explanations is always there to remove any necessity about accepting an event as miraculous."

They (these qualities) are manifest, also, in his amazingly simple and yet altogether skilful analysis of the fallacies involved in the traditional proofs for God's existence, of the insecurity of the appeal to inner experience **alone**, of the basic necessity of calling for moral trust,

of the folly of supplying inexorable proof for the benefit of insistent skeptics, of Freud's popular interpretation of religious belief, of the integral relationship between religious belief and moral conduct, and, finally, of the weakness of certain arguments for the immortality of the soul.

But all this is not to suggest that MacIntyre is so consistently critical and cautious that he never attains unto any positive affirmations about belief in the Christian faith. Indeed, not! Let the following lines from the concluding chapter of the book serve as resounding proof of the contrary: "God speaks, and we hear and trust or we do not hear or do not trust. But to reject God because there are no valid arguments **which start from the premises of unbelief** and end with the conclusion of belief — this is to reject God because the impossible cannot be achieved or one. And an unbelief which does this passes beyond the greatest absurdities of which theology has ever been guilty."

For many thinking students, especially Christian students plagued by intellectual difficulties, **Difficulties in Christian Belief** could serve, we do believe, as a strong stimulant towards a more securely-held and dearly-cherished faith.

These represent but two of a spate of studies, in recent years, that are concerned with the defense and commendation of the Christian faith by means of intellectual argument and appeal of one sort or another. Other works of an apologetical character that would deserve inclusion in any list of **scholarly** studies are the following: C. S. Lewis' **Miracles: A Preliminary Study**, his **The Problem of Pain**, and **The Case for Christianity**; John Baillie's **Our Knowledge of God**; B. Ramm's **The Christian View of Science and Scripture and Types of Apologetic Systems**; Carl F. Henry's **Remaking the Modern Mind, The Drift of Western Thought and The Protestant Dilemma**; and C. Van Til's **The Defense of the Faith**. And a less scholarly work that ought not to be overlooked is W. E. Sangster's **Give God a Chance. 100 Basic Religious Questions Plainly Answered** (Epworth Press, 1959). Those who know something about this great Methodist preacher's moral integrity and mental acumen will not be inclined to despise this simple manual of Christian apologetics.

But we have already trespassed the limits of this article and must quickly end it, and that upon another note. While such apologetic attempts, as we have sought to emphasize, have a rightful place within the larger context of Christian witness, they may **never** be considered basic or self-sufficient attempts that can induce faith as such. Ultimately, **in every case**, the Christian witness must have recourse to the **Biblical record itself**. The Biblical revelation is the original context, after all, and without ultimate reference to it, all apologetic arguments and appeals are altogether presumptions — even dangerous. For, as Walter Liefeld has reminded students (HIS, June, 1953 issue), "We are in danger of interpolating modern thought and theory if we wander too far from the context. Christianity should be applied to the modern context, not alerted by it... If we are to learn God's truth so that we may obey and apply it, we should be acquainted with the total context in which He chose to reveal it. And this is a challenge for the most brilliant of modern minds."

Herbert Giesbrecht

A Sermon

On The Necessity of Love

"If I speak in the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal. And if I have prophetic powers, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing. If I give away all I have and if I deliver my body to be burned, but have not love, I gain nothing" (I Corinthians 13:-1-3)

First Corinthians 13 constitutes a great poem of love, written to a church which was endowed with many valuable gifts but which at the same time was inwardly torn by divisions and factions because of a manifest absence of the cultivation of a genuine love. This hymn of love contains a very pertinent message for our present age which is similarly marked by bitter wrangling and party strife. It is conveniently and logically divided into three stanzas which treat of the necessity, the nature, and the permanence of love. We want to limit ourselves here to the first stanza and listen to Paul as he shows in a most forceful way that love is indispensable. Without love Christian profession is a pretense. Without love Christian service is fruitless. Without love we signify nothing. Without love we are nothing. Without love we secure nothing. Love is absolutely necessary if life is to be profitable and meaningful.

Eloquence without love is utterly worthless.

It is sadly lacking in helpfulness and persuasiveness. For "If I could speak the languages of men, of angels too, and have no love, I am only a rattling pan or a clashing cymbal" (Williams).

There is no end of speech-making. Promoters of the speech arts festivals encourage the public to come and listen to amateurs as they demonstrate their oratorical skills. This is good. The world needs orators and we trust that the potential of youth will be developed into something useful for the public. But without love the prospects are rather dim.

We have listened to political campaign speeches which were fashioned after the highest models of oratory and delivered with all the graces of that art but utterly destitute of love. What is true of party politics is also true of party theology. Churchmen spend days and weeks preparing discourses on some party theme, which, when delivered have all the marks of eloquence. In form and delivery they are unmatched. They are aglow with a zeal for certain dogmas they hold dear. But they disappoint because they are destitute of love. They breathe the spirit of intolerance. They sneer at dissent. They seek to win an argument but not a soul.

What is the value of eloquence of the highest type without love? Paul says it is worthless. Without love you are as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. It arrests attention and produces a shock but

carries with it no soothing melody or meaning. It does neither satisfy the soul nor refresh the spirit.

Paul does not depreciate the gift of speech, but makes it clear that unless the love to God and man attends this gift and restrains its selfishness and sanctifies it to the welfare of others, it is worthless. It may shed some light on the intellect and correct some errors, but it does not have the power to win. Eloquence without love is as irritating and destructive as the roar of a winter's wind. It fails to warm things into life. It only brings with it the chill of death.

A careful look into many of our own congregations reveals a lack of sympathy and kindness and love. There is culture and refinement, a common courtesy, but not the deep-rooted genuine love that seeks the welfare of others, rather than the advancement of self. Consequently many utterances are meaningless and lacking in helpfulness. No master in oratory can melt the warring factions into a close-knit unity by his eloquence. If this is his only asset he is bound to fail. The clanking of his brass will attract some partisans and win some temporary applause but will fail to win souls, to comfort the distressed, to lift the fallen, and to lead to higher ground.

The call of the multitude is not for ecstatic utterances, for flowery language, for logical demonstration or convincing argument. People want a message from God borne on wings of love. It is the language all people will understand because it is addressed to them.

You may speak with the highest form of earthly language, or emulate the oratory of angels, but unless you are animated by love, your utterances are only a senseless noise. Are you a sounding brass? A tinkling cymbal? Or are you a divine messenger with a message of love that makes sense and brings help to a needy world?

The exercise of gifts without love is unprofitable.

"And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge, and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains and have not love, I am nothing."

Verse two presents a forcible rebuke to intellectual and spiritual pride. It is directed against the man that is endowed with gifts but who does not possess love. Let us take a look at this man. He is a man of Biblical scholarship, of sound theology and of great teaching power. He has a knowledge of the future gleaned from the prophetic Scriptures. His prophetic genius is well recognized. He has delved into the meaning of the revealed mysteries of God and impresses us with a remarkable knowledge of His counsels. Not only does he know his Bible but he is also in possession of much related knowledge. He knows human nature. He masters the facts of history. He speaks the language of science. His abilities afford him opportunity to speak in colleges, at conferences and other special occasions. He has already won the admiration of many.

To his extensive knowledge we must add his startling faith. He has an orthodox, vigorous and earnest faith. His confidence in God has enabled him to remove mountains of difficulties and to move forward where others stood frustrated.

But what if this gifted brother in the church exercises his gifts without love? Of what benefit is he to himself and to others? Let the Scriptures pass judgment on this proclaimed genius: He is **NOTHING**. To himself he may be a great man. In the view of the church he may be a great man, but in reality, and before God, he is nothing. It is love which makes the spiritual and intellectual gifts valuable to the possessor and to others. You must have noticed how differently a man of learning uses his powers when his soul is pervaded by the spirit of brotherly love which has inspired him to consecrate his talents in the interest of others.

We do not disparage learning. The church needs the gifted men to expound the Scriptures and to defend the faith. Our point is that the exercise of the most valuable gifts without the exercise of a true love is not the true exposition of the Christian life. The call of the hour is not merely for men of learning, but for men of love. "If I should have the gift of prophecy, and know all secret truths, and knowledge, in its every form, and have such perfect faith that I could move mountains, but have no love, I am **NOTHING**."

Sacrificial giving of property and life without the exercise of love yields no profit.

There is a great need for charity in the world today. Christianity is known for its precept and practice of charity. Many charitable organizations find it financially profitable to appeal to Christians for contributions to promote worthy causes. We are grateful for men and women who are known for their liberality. In some instances people have impoverished themselves in order to help others. Such sacrificial giving is commendable, provided it proceeds from a spirit of love. There can be no doubt but that much of the so-called charity is uncharitable. It proceeds neither out of love nor out of wisdom. Paul supposes such an extreme case of sacrificial giving and gives his judgment. It is profitless.

The worth of charity lies not only in what we give but in how we give. We may give all we have to such who are in need and still perform no virtuous action. Many a lavish gift is given to gratify a man's vanity and self-importance. His name will be published in a subscription list which will make him stand next to a man of great means. Another may give because it is customary to give. People expect it of him. Others may give out of love of power. People who give generously may obtain a hold upon the dependent and bind them to themselves as slaves. If charity has its source in an expectation of recompense or praise, or in a desire for display, and is not animated by love, it brings no reward. "It profiteth nothing."

But here is a man who goes even beyond the giving of his goods and sacrifices his life on the stake in the interest of truth. Surely there ought to be merit in this. But listen: "If I give my body to be burned, but have not love, it profiteth me nothing." Death on the stake can be faced in mere fanaticism, in ambition for reputed sainthood, and even in stubbornness and pride. As such it secures nothing. It must be motivated by love. There is a story of a Christian of Antioch who, on

his way to martyrdom, refused to forgive and be reconciled to a brother Christian. This is an example of a zeal without love, which is pronounced worthless. Let us note carefully: "The martyr is made, not by the burning of the body, but by the love which binds the truth to the heart, and will not let it go at any cost."

There is a strong desire on the part of a man to say something, to be something, and to secure something. To have their desires fulfilled, people will grasp for the spectacular, the sensational, the daring, only to be disappointed in the end. If you want to say something, **say it in love**. If you want to be something, **do it in love**. If you want to secure a lasting reward, **sacrifice in love**, and the God of love will be with you.

J. H. Quiring

C. S. Lewis, A Christian Apologist

C.S. Lewis, who died on the day of the assassination of President Kennedy of the USA, has been characterized as one of the "most lucid, winsome and powerful writers of Christianity." Since his conversion from atheism, at the age of thirty, a number of books have been produced by him, in which he seeks to give expression to his Christian faith. The message of Lewis is urgent; generally, he speaks to the uncommitted and the skeptical—those who may have intellectual problems which hinder their commitment to the Christian faith. With great brilliance he exposes rival philosophies which clamour for man's allegiance, and asserts the relevance of historical Christianity to the needs of man's restless heart.

C. S. Lewis, an Anglican layman, was a first-class student in philosophy, history, and linguistic studies at Oxford. For many years he remained in Oxford as a tutor in philosophy and English. Later, he became the first occupant of a new chair of Medieval and Renaissance Literature in Cambridge. He has won renown as an English scholar; he is a first-rate literary critic and has contributed a volume to the **Oxford History of English Literature**. As a Christian apologete, he has been a prolific writer using various literary media to set forth the historical Christian faith.

His works include autobiographies, allegories, novels, radio addresses, and books dealing with such problems as suffering in the world (**The Problem of Pain**) and the relationship of the supernatural and scientific philosophy (**Miracles**). One of his most popular works is the imaginative analysis of the wiles of the devil in **The Screwtape Letters**.

Let God Be God in My Life

Lewis' own early restless pilgrimage from atheism to Christian faith is somewhat suggestive of Augustine's quest for the truth by way of Manichaeism, Skepticism, and Platonic thought. In **Surprised by Joy**, Lewis tells us his conversion story. He was born in Belfast, 1890; he was educated under a governess and later in private boarding schools. He had few friends in his youth, nor did he particularly desire them; he read much and lived in his imagination. Although he had read the Bible and prayed, for fear of his soul, he gradually became an apostate from Christianity.

Some of the factors contributing to his apostasy were an interest in the occult, that is in the spirit world, a confrontation with Lucretius' atheism, who denied the existence of God because of the 'undesign' in the world ("Had God designed the world, it would not be so frail and faulty as we are").

Together with his loss of faith came moral degradation and the loss of virtue. At this point, Lewis makes an interesting observation. He was now a materialist; not that being a materialist did not have its disadvantages; it did. The price he had to pay was to accept a world which had no meaning; it was a meaningless dance of the atoms; it was a grim world. But to Lewis, the overriding advantage of atheism or materialism was that he was free from the Christian God; more than anything else, he wanted personal autonomy; he wanted areas in his life where nobody could have admittance. In his own words, "but of course what mattered most of all was my deep-seated hatred of authority, my monstrous individualism, my lawlessness. No word in my vocabulary expressed deeper hatred than the word **interference**. But Christianity placed at the centre what then seemed to me a transcendental interferer . . . There was no region even in the innermost depth of one's soul (nay, there least of all), which one could surround with a barbed-wire fence and guard with a notice 'No admittance' and that was what I wanted; some area, however small, of which I could say to all other beings, 'this is my business and mine alone' (**Surprised by Joy**, p. 172)."

While at Oxford University Lewis realized that he had accepted the intellectual climate of the age uncritically; that which was outdated had been discredited by him. He now began to examine reasons for rejecting the faith in God. He eventually became an idealist; he believed in an impersonal Absolute. It was a God of **eros** not **agape**—an abstract philosopher's god. At Oxford he met Christians in his scholarly circle who began to make an impact on his thinking. Lewis began to realize that the joy that he had in some fashion sought in his life, owed its character to one's object of contemplation. That is to say, man's joy lay in being firmly rooted in the object of joy. These re-

flections caused Lewis to feel that God was closing in on him, knocking down all his defenses which kept him from faith in a personal God. In 1929, at the age of thirty, C.S. Lewis knelt down and surrendered all to God. He writes, "I gave in and admitted that God was God . . . Perhaps that night, the most dejected and reluctant convert in all England, I did not then see what is now the most shining and obvious thing, the divine humility which will accept a convert even on such terms. The Prodigal Son at least walked home on his own feet. But who can duly adore that love which will open high gates to a prodigal who is brought in kicking, struggling, resentful and darting his eyes in every direction for a chance to escape" (*Ibid.* pp. 228-229).

An Apologete of the Christian Faith

The **Broadcast Talks** delivered in 1941-42 are a convenient starting point for the apologetics of C. S. Lewis. Lewis wants to prepare the ground in an unbeliever for a belief in Christianity. His strategy is to meet with any man on common ground, i.e., the ground of the natural man's ability to observe man and various aspects of the universe, and come to some correct conclusion about the existence of a power, mind, or somebody who created the universe and implanted a moral law in man.

On this basis, Lewis argues in the following manner: there is an idea of the law of nature, a right and wrong, or sense of decent behavior known to all men (p. 11); men everywhere know they ought to practice this law (fair play, decency, and selflessness). They also know they are not doing it consistently. The explanation, asserts Lewis, of this law of nature in all men is that there is something or somebody behind the universe who directs it and who appears in man as a law urging him to do right and making him feel responsible (p. 27). That is to say,

God is intensely interested that man live a life in accordance with a certain moral standard. On this basis Lewis seeks to prove that somebody—God, or a mind—must be good. These things the natural man can attain to without reference to the Bible or the church, entirely on "his own steam" (p. 30). But this goodness of God becomes a danger to man because man does not obey the moral law. As a result of his disobedience (frequent selfishness, unfair play, or indecency) he is "in the wrong" with that power of the universe. Thus, man is in a dilemma.

It is at this point that Lewis maintains that Christianity makes sense because it speaks to this very problem, this very dilemma of man. It is Christianity that speaks of repentance and forgiveness; it is Christianity which offers salvation, which explains how man got into his present state, which explains how the demands of the law have been met on our behalf by the God who became man. Thus Lewis wants to get people to face the facts squarely in order that they might understand the questions which Christianity claims to answer.

In his other works, Lewis operates on a similar principle. He points to the principles of nature or human behavior, and uses these as analogies of revealed Christian truth. For example, the principle of descent and re-ascent in various world religions finds its greatest theme and expression in Jesus Christ, in His incarnation, death, and resurrection (**Miracles**). The election of Abraham and Israel ought not to sound too strange to man because this also is what nature habitually does (**Miracles**, p. 141). The principle of vicariousness is also, according to Lewis, a phenomenon of nature; good men suffer for bad men. The bees and flowers live on one another. In this way, Lewis wants to establish a sense of fitness in the mind of the unbeliever

about the great miracle of Jesus Christ in Christian faith.

In his book, **The Problem of Pain**, Lewis speaks to a problem which became real to him when he committed himself to theism. As an atheist, he states that the pain in the universe was no problem for him. The pain and suffering of man and the historical records of crime, war, disease, and terror were sufficient evidence to him of the denial of a benevolent and omnipotent spirit. It was his later commitment to a wise and great Creator which demanded of him an answer to the evil in the universe. In his book, he directs himself to this problem and finds the answer in human wickedness and the fall.

The works we have mentioned and others indicate that Lewis set out to meet head-on some of the problems posed by those uncommitted to the Christian faith. His approach at times is similar to that of Anselm, who believed in order to know, and then attempted to prove rationally what he believed (**Our Deus Homo**). His attempt to lay a foundation on the basis of human observation and interpretation of man and the universe by unaided reason, upon which Christian revelation is to be built, is similar to the apologetics of Thomas Aquinas (**Summa Contra Gentiles**), or of Bishop Butler's **Analogy**. Although the nimble mind of Lewis plays on Christian truths in an interesting and provocative fashion, one senses too strong an attempt to identify or see a continuity in the natural man's subjective notion of a power or Creator with the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, or also, a continuity between the subjectiveness of pragmatic standards of ethics and the objective authority of the Word of God. We believe this does not enable him effectively to confront the natural man with his desperate need of a radical change, regeneration, and commitment to Jesus

Christ and of His revelation in the Word.

This is not to deny that one can glean a great deal by reading his books. He introduces Christian truths to the modern man in popular fashion, forcing him to re-examine his prejudices and consider the claims of the Christian

God. Many have confessed that they have been helped by the books of C. S. Lewis. Certainly, the futility of man in the universe apart from faith in God and His revelation is a theme which Lewis hammers home with great skill and effect.

Victor Adrian

Book Reviews

Wollen wir Kinder taufen?

Did the Early Church Baptize Infants? by Kurt Aland (SCM Press Ltd., Bloomsbury St., London, 1963, 119 pp.). Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray.

In diesem Schreiben setzt sich Kurt Aland, Professor an der Universität Münster, mit Professor Joachim Jeremias, Göttingen, über die Kindertaufe auseinander. Im Jahre 1958 erschien Jeremias Buch, „Die Kindertaufe in den ersten vier Jahrhunderten.“ Zwei Jahre später wurde dieses Werk ins Englische übersetzt. Jeremias hatte in den Augen der Geschichtsforscher, die mit den vorhandenen Quellen, die zu dieser Frage einen Beitrag liefern, bekannt waren, die Frage endgültig beantwortet. Die Forschung bewies: die apostolische und nach-apostolische Kirche taufte Kinder.

Kurt Aland, der, wie Jeremias, der lutherischen Kirche angehört, macht es sich nun zur Aufgabe, dieselben Quellen, die Jeremias zur Hand standen, noch einmal zu überprüfen, und er kommt mit ganz andern Resultaten an die Öffentlichkeit. Daß ein Baptist, Professor Beasley-Murray, vom Spurgeon-College, London, die Übersetzung ins Englische vollzogen hat, dürfte schon den Schluß andeuten, zu dem Aland in seiner Forschung gekommen ist. Daß aber auch Kindertäufer für diese Frage offen sind, zeigt das Vorwort, das ein Presbyterianer aus Amerika, Professor Janzen, geschrieben hat. Weil die Geschichte unsrer Gemeinschaft enge mit

der Frage über die Kindertaufe verbunden ist, hören wir gerne hin, um zu erfahren, was Aland zu sagen hat. Nur noch im Voraus: Wer Jeremias Buch gelesen hat, kann Kurt Aland besser verstehen.

Aland gibt am Anfang das Urteil verschiedener Geschichtler, die sich mit dem Christentum der ersten Jahrhunderte vertraut gemacht haben, wieder. Der berühmte Kirchengeschichtler, Adolf von Harnack, war schon vor 40 Jahren zu dem Schluß gekommen, daß die Kindertaufe vor ca. 200 n. Chr. nicht bekannt war. Wegen seiner liberalen Theologie gab man auf sein Urteil in dieser Frage nicht so viel acht wie man es hätte tun können. Der konservative Theologe, Paul Feine, Harnacks Zeitgenosse, war aber zur selben Überzeugung gekommen. Also muß die Frage geschichtlich und exegetisch beantwortet werden, und dazu dienen die patristischen und biblischen Quellen. Aland wendet sich in den Kapiteln 2-5 dieses Buches den patristischen Quellen zu.

Im 3. Jahrhundert ist die Kindertaufe fest bezeugt. Damit ist nicht gesagt, daß sie allgemein war, denn die Erwachsenentaufe wurde auch gepflegt. Uebrigens ist das Wort ‚Kindertaufe‘ zweideutig (wie auch das Wort ‚Paedobap-

tism‘), denn auch Kinder können auf den Glauben getauft werden, gleichwie Erwachsene. Besser wäre, man spräche von der ‚Säuglingstaufe‘, dann ist es klar, daß man nicht von einer Taufe auf den Glauben spricht.

Aus dem 3. Jahrhundert sind Hippolytus (Rom), Zyprianus (Afrika) und Origenus (Ägypten) Zeugen für die Säuglingstaufe. Zyprianus von Karthago schreibt, daß die Taufe des Säuglings am 2. oder 3. Tage geschehen soll. Mit ihm stimmen die Bischöfe der Provinz (übrigens waren auch solche, die den 8. Tag als Tauftag haben wollten, um die Taufe mit der Beschneidung gleichzuziehen). Abgesehen davon, ob Origenus und Hippolytus für oder gegen die Säuglingstaufe waren, ihre Schriften deuten an, daß diese gepflegt wurde. Also liefert das 3. Jahrhundert unwiderlegbaren Beweis dafür, daß die Kindertaufe gepflegt wurde; wie allgemein sie geübt wurde, bleibt dahingestellt.

Mit dem 2. Jahrhundert rücken wir der apostolischen Zeit näher und die Frage wird akuter. Drei Schriften aus diesem Jahrhundert werden vorübergehend beurteilt: Die Zwölfapostellehre (**Didache**), der Hirt des Hermas, und der Barnabasbrief. Jeremias hat diese Quellen, nach Alands Urteil, nicht richtig abgewertet. Die **Didache** spricht von einem ‚Taufunterricht‘ (also sind Säuglinge ausgeschlossen). Hermas und Barnabas sprechen beide von einer Reinigung von der Sünde durch die Taufe (auch kaum auf die Säuglinge anzuwenden).

Von größerer Bedeutung ist Justinus, der in seiner Apologie die Taufe beschreibt. Nach Justinus dürfen nur solche getauft werden, die von der Wahrheit des Christentums überzeugt sind. Die Taufkandidaten **bereiten sich** durch Fasten und Beten vor, werden nach der Taufe in die Gemeinde durch den Burderkuß aufgenommen und nehmen dann am Abendmahl teil (all dieses schließt Säuglinge aus). Aristides

berichtet in seiner Apologie (15:6), daß die Gläubigen ihre Sklaven und auch ihre Kinder belehren (aus Liebe zu ihnen), und wenn diese sich bekehren, nennen sie diese ‚Brüder‘. Dieser Text ist von größter Bedeutung, denn er spricht nicht von der ‚Säuglingstaufe‘, sondern von der ‚Kindertaufe‘, d.h. von Kindern, die sich zu Gott bekehrt haben und unterrichtet worden sind — für unsere Zeit eine nicht unbedeutende Beobachtung.

Die Stellen in Irenaeus von Lyon und Klemenz von Alexandrien, die von der Taufe handeln, werden von Aland als weiteren Beweis dafür angegeben, daß den Vätern des 2. Jahrhunderts die Säuglingstaufe fremd war.

Aland widmet Tertullianus ein ganzes Kapitel. Tertullianus ist in dieser Frage so bedeutend, weil er uns ein ganzes Werk über die Taufe hinterlassen hat, das **De baptismo**, und weil er gerade auf der Grenze zwischen dem 2. und 3. Jahrhundert steht (ca. 160-220). Die Väter vor ihm kennen die Säuglingstaufe nicht; nach ihm ist sie klar bezeugt. Und wie steht Tertullianus zu der Sache?

Tertullianus bekämpft die Kindertaufe. Ueber die Motivierung zu diesem Kampf und über seine Auffassung von der Taufe als solche mögen wir unsre Bedenken haben, aber diese Fragen sind augenblicklich belanglos. Nach Tertullianus Ansicht fährt man sicherer, wenn man die Taufe aufschiebt. Einmal beugt man dadurch grobes Sündigen nach der Taufe vor und andererseits kann der Taufkandidat sich länger in der Heiligung üben, ehe er sich taufen läßt. Auf jeden Fall, Tertullianus ist der Kindertaufe feindlich gesonnen. Damit wird aber schon klar angedeutet, daß man die Kindertaufe bereits begonnen hatte zu pflegen. Ob Tertullianus Polemik der Praxis irgendwelchen Einhalt gebot, ist schwer festzustellen. Die ‚große Kirche‘ ging den Weg der Säuglingstaufe zu ihrem Schaden.

Im 6. Kapitel wendet Aland sich noch

den Inschriften zu, die von Jeremias ins Blickfeld gerückt wurden, um die Säuglingstaufe zu bezeugen. Nach Aland haben die Inschriften in dieser Frage wenig Bedeutung, weil sie aus der Zeit kommen, als die Säuglingstaufe bereits Gang und Gebe war. Aland besteht darauf, daß vor der Mitte des 3. Jahrhunderts keine zweideutigen Zeugnisse für die Säuglingstaufe zu finden sind, und daß sie erst mit dem Anfang des 3. Jahrhunderts geübt wurde. Wie allgemein diese Praxis verbreitet war, muß unbeantwortet bleiben.

Von den Zeugnissen der Väter und der Inschriften wendet sich Aland in Kapitel 7 den apostolischen Schriften zu, um die Texte, die in dieser Frage kritisch sind, noch einmal zu beschauen und zu erfahren, ob sie dem Zeugnis der Geschichte des 2. Jahrhunderts zuwider sind.

Die Schriftstelle in 1. Kor. 7, 14c: „... sonst wären eure Kinder unrein, nun aber sind sie heilig“, hat Jeremias als unbelanglich in der Frage der Säuglingstaufe bewiesen, und Aland gibt ihm darin recht. Nur geht Aland einen Schritt weiter und weist darauf hin, daß Paulus hier behauptet, daß alle Kinder von Mischehen heilig sind und daß die Taufe als Vorbedingung zu diesem Stand nicht erforderlich ist. Kol. 2, 11 ist für Aland kein Beweis dafür, daß die christliche Taufe die Beschneidung ersetzte, sondern die Beschneidung wird für die Leser des Briefes, also für Erwachsene, als Bild gebraucht für das, was sie in der Taufe erlebt hatten, nämlich eine Reinigung. Auch Apg. 2, 38ff: „Die Verheißung ist für euch und eure Kinder“, ist für Aland für die Entscheidung der Tauffrage unbedeutend.

1. Kor. 1, 16, wo es heißt, daß Paulus das Haus des Stephanas getauft hat, ist schwieriger. Aber wenn man in Betracht zieht, daß dieses ‚Haus‘ sich laut 1. Kor. 16, 15 selbst zum Dienst verordnete, würde es schwerlich Säuglinge einschließen. Aland ist von den Beweisen für die Säuglingstaufe, die

man aus der ‚Oikos-Formel‘ zieht, nicht beeindruckt. Auch kann Aland nicht sehen, wie Jeremias Markus 10, 33ff: „Lasset die Kindlein zu mir kommen“, als Beweis für die Kindertaufe ausbeuten kann. Seines Erachtens wurde diese Stelle erst dann auf die Kindertaufe angewandt, als die Kirche sie zu pflegen begonnen hatte.

Zuletzt (Kap. 10) bewegt Aland die Frage: Wie kam es zur Kindertaufe? Seines Erachtens wurde die Säuglingstaufe auf Grund der zunehmenden Betonung der Sündhaftigkeit aller Menschen von Geburt auf eingeführt. Wo man an die Unschuld der Säuglinge glaubte, sträubte man sich auch gegen die Kindertaufe; wo man ihre Sündhaftigkeit betonte, suchte man in der Kindertaufe einen Ausweg. Natürlich wurde durch auch der Sinn der Taufe verschoben; sie wurde das Mittel zur Reinigung von der Sünde, eine Ansicht, die schon früh bezeugt wird. So allgemein wurde die Säuglingstaufe, daß Augustinus im 4. Jahrhundert seinem Gegner Pelagius etwa so begegnen konnte: „Wenn Kinder nicht von Geburt an sündhaft sind (was Pelagius leugnete), warum werden sie denn getauft?“

Zum Schluß stellt Aland noch die Frage, die aus seiner Untersuchung zu einer Brennfrage wird: Wenn die Säuglingstaufe in der apostolischen und nach-apostolischen Zeit bis ca. 200 n. Chr. nicht bezeugt ist, ist sie dann heute berechtigt? Bei seiner Antwort werden wir enttäuscht. Aland antwortet mit Ja! Unter anderem weist er darauf hin, daß geradeso wie unsre Abendmahlsfeier von der apostolischen Feier abweicht, so dürfen wir es auch bei der Taufe tun. Uns kommen bei solchem Schluß die Worte Jesu in den Sinn: „So ihr solches wisset, selig seid ihr wenn ihr's tut.“

Wenn uns die Schlußbemerkungen Alands auch nicht gefallen, so ist das Buch doch reich an Belehrung und sollte sorgfältig gelesen werden.

David Ewert

Facing Facts in Modern Missions

A symposium edited by Noel Perkin (Mody Press, Chicago, Ill., 1963, 141 pp).

In our fast-changing world the problems of missionary strategy have multiplied and grown to proportions where many engaged in such work have anxiously looked for an answer to their new perplexing problems. How shall a foreigner communicate the gospel message in a context of high-pitched nationalism? How shall a westernized Christianity find its way into Oriental, Latin, and primitive cultures? How shall a missionary from a comparatively rich country promote indigenization in a poverty-stricken area? These and many other questions demand a speedy and pragmatic answer. The answers cannot come from only one source of mere theoretical quality. Theory and experience need to join together to guide the missionary chariot through the jungle-entanglement of modern affairs.

What better way to meet such a need than that twelve outstanding missionary leaders pool their resources and submit their views in a series of papers to a gathering of contemporary missionary strategists and, as I take it, with the benefit of the discussion at the EFMA meeting last October, publish such papers. Such rich results can only fertilize the mind and clarify the issues for any reader who is seeking light in many questions hitherto confusing. The above paper-bound book of 141 pages seeks to make such a contribution and seems quite successful in doing so.

Most of the problems dealt with in symposium fashion have been touched upon by other publications, but usually only one view has been projected. Here you get the opinion of several authorities as they converge on one problem. In the first chapter Merrill C. Tenney from Wheaton College and Paul G. Cully, Director of Division of Missions,

Columbia Bible College, discuss "Motives and Goals of Missions." In doing so, they do not only supplement each other, but, without the slightest evidence of tension, present contrary views. Among other motives Tenney stresses obedience to Christ as a primary motive, making it impossible for any true Christian not to involve himself in missions without disobedience to the very clear imperative of the Great Commission. Cully again insists that, although other forces may also be at work, nothing less than the love of Christ must activate the Christian. He quotes Glover saying, "Only divine love filling the heart and pervading the life is equal to the tests and demands of true missionary service." Mere obedience, Cully contends, may only imply a military relationship to Christ in which disobedience is not tolerated. Love operates on a much higher plane.

One primary motive for missions, however, rarely found in missionary literature and also missing from the pages of this little volume is the burden to restore the glory of God in the lives of those where degradation and shame rules (Romans 1:23; 3:23; Isa. 43:7,2,1; Eph. 1:12,14. This aspect of motivation is generally neglected in missionary promotional programs and needs to be brought into the foreground.

In Chapter II no less than four missionary experts give a most helpful treatment of the much discussed problem of "Missionary Relationships." Milton Baker, President of EFMA and Foreign Secretary of Conservative Baptist Foreign Missionary Society, lays the foundation, showing the relationship of Paul to the sending church and comparing it with the relationship of today's missionary to his home and national

churches. Then he clarifies the lines of authority under which the missionary operates. Baker projects some very potent principles which militate against the missionary joining any national church so that he may continue to play his role in full as a planter of churches and spiritual advisor to all churches on the field.

Baker then proceeds to distinguish between the terms "missionary" and "fraternal worker", applying the first to the Christian worker who is sent out to establish new churches and maintaining that the latter, if used, should be applied to one who strengthens already existing churches.

Melvin L. Hodge, secretary for Latin America, Assemblies of God, concurs with Baker in many respects, but advocates missionary membership in the national organization of the younger churches instead of in the local church, taking every precaution not to dominate, but instead to aid in the program with scriptural counselling.

J. F. Shepherd, Nyack Missionary College, adds an explanation of the term "foreign missions" to this section, showing the missionary as the middleman between the old churches and the younger churches, a position which can cause tension and lead to considerable frustration for the missionary, but one which is necessary for the cause.

Timothy M. Warner, Fort Wayne Bible College, then follows with a discussion of "Cross-Cultural Relationships" and adds considerable strength to the views of his colleagues in this volume in defining the relationship of the missionary to home and younger churches.

In Chapter III, entitled "International Cooperation", Arthur M. Climenhaga, President of Messiah College, and Edwin E. Jacques, Foreign Secretary of Conservative Baptist Missionary Society, join forces to declare the old approach of missionary administration in the national church as obsolete and denounce the dichotomy of mission and

church, advocating "cooperative partnership" in which all participants are equals and labor together in legislation, administration and responsibility. R. B. Buckner, Sr., Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary, shows with remarkable clarity how such a relationship would affect financial policies. Hubert Reynhout, Jr., Barrington College, shows the continued need of human instrumentality and financial aid within the framework of functional missionary organization. All these are imperative in the missionary outreach of the church in the 20th century.

One other valuable contribution of the little volume is the discussion of the relationship of evangelical missionary forces to the overall ecumenical movement. Although the former cannot join forces with the latter because of theological differences, evangelicals can join hands among themselves in a loose fellowship or association of inter-denominational as well as international dimensions to strengthen the cause of missions.

The participants of the EFMA conference must certainly have profited from the deliberations, and by publishing this symposium the beneficial results should spread and enrich the lives of all Christian workers in God's kingdom, whether in the local church, home or foreign missions.

J. J. Toews

For my deceitful heart and crooked thought:
For barbed words spoken deliberately:
For thoughtless words spoken hastily:
For envious and prying eyes:
For ears that rejoice in iniquity and
rejoice not in the truth:
For greedy hands:
For wandering and loitering feet:
For haughty looks:

Have mercy upon me, O God.
If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves. —John Baillie, "A Diary of Privat Prayer."

Church Music for the Glory of God

by Gunnar Urang (Moline: Christian Service Foundation, 1956, — \$2.95)

This book is a compilation of articles which have appeared in *Christlife Magazine* over a period of several years. The author feels that music is an integral part of the work of the church and therefore merits thoughtful consideration and resourceful handling. The author seeks to formulate basic principles underlying and guiding the total musical ministry of the church, with special emphasis on the practical working out of these principles in the small or medium-size evangelical church fellowship.

The book is divided into seven main sections: Worship in Music, Congregational Song, Music in Christian Education, The Choir, "Special" Music, The Place of the Pastor, and Studies in Church Music.

Gunnar Urang begins his first section by listing a number of things that good church music is not, and then goes on to give us a standard whereby we may determine the merits of church music. Although he believes that the standard must be primarily a practical one rather than an artistic, historical or popular one, he continues almost in the next breath to suggest ways and means of raising the musical standard in a small church.

He points out that there shall be a balance between objective and subjective elements in worship music. Too often the small evangelical church has over-emphasized subjective music at the expense of objective. We need both if we want to experience true worship. The author concludes this section by defining ritual, liturgy and sacrament, respectively. According to I Cor. the early church had three strands of worship — charismatic, prophetic and liturgical. What we need today is a balance between Freedom and Form.

For a person who has never studied hymnology, or perhaps has forgotten a

good deal of what he has learned, the first part of the second section will prove very informative. Here the author discusses the hymn and what benefits are derived from the singing of hymns. Urang continues by outlining the task of the song leader, asserting that it is preparation and not pep that determines success. Especially meaningful in this section also is the author's charge to the congregation.

In the third section, which deals with music in Christian education, he maintains that the goal of music in Sunday school is to help the pupil express in suitable music his praise and testimony in response to the knowledge and experience of God. In order to realize this goal the child must be taught expressive as well as impressive hymns. Also in this section there is a brief discussion of the graded choir program, music in the youth work of the church, and music in the Christian home.

Although the author confesses that he is not in the position to give an exhaustive treatment of the technical problems confronting the church choir, I am sure that any conductor would consider his time well spent if he were to read this section.

The last three sections, though somewhat general, do bring into focus some interesting observations. Especially interesting are Mr. Urang's remarks on "special" music in the services of the church.

The book, being a series of articles, tends to be somewhat general and repetitious. However, the author writes in a very easy and interesting style, which makes the reading of this book most enjoyable. I believe the book, *Church Music for the Glory of God*, should be on the shelf of every Christian musician, youth worker and pastor.

Victor Martens