



The Voice

of the

*Mennonite Brethren
Bible College*

**XIII: 3
MAY - JUNE
1964**

THE VOICE
of the Mennonite Brethren Bible College

Vol. XIII

May - June, 1964

No. 3

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 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg. Subscription price: \$1.00 per year. Send your subscription to:

THE VOICE, 77 Henderson Hwy., 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
EDITORIAL	
HERE COMES THE BAND WAGON — F. C. Peters	1
ARTICLES	
SEI EHRlich MIT DIR SELBST — J. H. Quiring	4
DER HEILIGE GEIST ALS PERSON — H. Voth	6
A SERMON	
CHRISTIAN CONTENTMENT — J. J. Toews	10
BOOK REVIEW	
A HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN PREACHING: A BIBLIOGRAPHIC SURVEY — H. Giesbrecht	14
FROM STATE CHURCH TO PLURALISM — J. A. Toews	17
"BUT I SAY UNTO YOU..." — D. Ewert	19
LISTENING TO MUSIC — V. Martens	21
Bible College Distinctives	23
Graduating Class of 1964	24

EDITORIAL

Here Comes the Band Wagon

We all remember the story of the Pied Piper of Hamelin. This persuasive character was able by the strains of his irresistible music to entice children by the scores to follow him into oblivion.

Group pressure has a strange effect on most of us. It sometimes leads us into peculiar situations and coerces us to say strange things. It takes stamina and "inner buttresses" to withstand the pressures of the band wagon.

Every generation has its band wagons and its pied pipers. They produce their catchy tunes and we are encouraged to dance as they pipe. Everyone does it, is the basic motif of these strange scores and, if everyone does it, then I, in the name of adjustment, ought to fall in line. Fifty-thousand Frenchmen can't be wrong.

Or can they?

Let me turn up the music of this mythical flute just a bit so that we can discern the themes which are piped.

Hurrah for Statistics!

I understand that whenever you can convert a human value into a statistic, you have really accomplished much, you have pushed back the frontiers of science. You can count, divide multiply, correlate, and perhaps juggle figures. I must admit that I am afraid of some human values but statistics make me feel secure. I can handle them, they do what I want them to do, and when I have given some value a number the situation becomes less frightening.

So, hurrah for statistics!

I used to feel so guilty about certain aspects of my behavior until I heard this delightful strain of soothing statistics. I was told that 75% of people in my "category" had the same problem. My "cosmic loneliness" disappeared for a while and I rose from the bleachers and shouted: "Three cheers for statistics!"

In this statistical symphony I heard of colossal projects financed by the Ford Foundation. Human values and morals went into complicated IBM machines to come out anemic and innocuous because people thought that the **average** was always **advisable**.

Just a minute! Stop the band!

I find that I cannot think with this music blaring at me from all sides. Before I get on the band wagon I want to ask a few pertinent questions.

Could it be that many of the conclusions drawn from our "statistical studies" are based on a false premise? Is man different from the animal only in degree and not in kind? Animals respond to drives and thrives best when basic instincts are not tampered with. What happens to people who follow their natural inclinations, do they end up happier and more productive? Perhaps I

should come to some understanding on the nature of man before I get on the band wagon?

The inference that if the "average" person lives in a certain way then it must be advisable, is to be questioned. S. I. McMillen in his book, **None of these Diseases**, gives this illustration. The **average** Hindu drinks filthy water on his pilgrimages, but is this advisable? Thousands of Indians die of cholera each year.

Permit me another question. Let's talk a little about authority, — now, I did not say authoritarianism — this necessary quest for a final court of appeal in matters of personal and social ethics. Who says the final word on these matters, God or man? Do our statistics reflect the human or the divine?

Excuse me please, I've just decided not to get on this band wagon.

II. Down with Tradition!

While I was busy making up my mind whether I liked the statistical tune, the music changed. I had scarcely noticed it. This band wagon must be equipped with versatile musicians who can play more than one tune.

The new tune is: "down with tradition." It has catchy phrases about capitalistic ethics, Americanisms, Victorian inhibitions, Mennonitisms, and "Schinkeflesh and blumemoos." I like this. I think I'll get on this band wagon.

The alluring tune which is piped now tells me that the past has failed me. Some of the traditional values of the past must be discarded because they just don't square up with our modern life situations. We are living in a new day in which we must think aggressively and boldly in new categories of thought. Why accept something which even our parents accepted? This is our world and one cannot live vicariously. Each one of us must begin from rock bottom and build his own set of values. Have we not been taught that the basic element of the scientific method is to begin by doubting everything? Only what we personally can prove ought to be accepted.

Actually, taking "pot-shots" at the values of the past gives one a strange feeling of liberation. It almost resembles a feeling of self-actualization. I suddenly become an **individual** as I shake off the shackles of the past. This tune is exciting. Perhaps I will find myself with new and more meaningful dimensions if I climb on this band wagon.

One thing really bothers me. Some of the people on this band wagon have beards and black turtleneck sweaters. They recite poetry and talk jive. Their inhibitions certainly are not over-worked. It is clear, they have broken with tradition, but is this liberation perhaps just another form of bondage? Are these people happy and useful?

Perhaps I should again use my cerebral centers rather than to respond emotionally. The matter of authority keeps looming high in my consciousness and demands consideration. Is it tradition,

per se, or the mere abolition of tradition which says the final word in this? Must we not find those principles which are abiding and which must be applied in each generation? Not everything that is new is right nor is everything that is old wrong, and the opposite is true as well.

Some things have been tested in the past and found wanting. Must we always repeat the experiment in order to persuade ourselves to believe? The past has shown us that people who expose themselves to certain toxic drugs die. One would be ill-advised to ignore this.

Although tradition is not a final norm for truth it is a most useful guide in man's search for meaningful living. To disregard it is folly. But let us not forget that both past and present stand under the Word of God.

III. Don't be legalistic!

This band certainly has a variety of tunes. There was a brief pause and then came a new tune. I find this tune a little depressing, it has some gay scores but in general it is somewhat morose and melancholy.

The tune decries the awful abyss of legalism. The soul shrivels up under the blight of this lethal disease. Joy and happiness are almost gone and one can hear the thunder of Mt. Sinai. "Don't do this," is followed by "Don't do that" until the tempo by which the "don't" move across the stage of life almost frighten us.

At last we hear the "clank" of the symbols and a trumpet announces a new movement. "Don't be legalistic" is now the oft-repeated refrain.

I breathe more easily and feel less tense. Legalism is bad and should be avoided at all costs. The tune reassures me that whenever I am confronted with a demand which interferes with my comforts and personal ambitions, it is best to examine it carefully for possible legalism. The gospel desires to make people happy and happiness is to be placed above duty and obedience.

I read a book some years ago about the tyranny of words. Some concepts which are used are not properly understood. Are we perhaps confusing discipleship and legalism? Legalism could be a convenient defense mechanism for those who would cater to the flesh. That is, if they substitute legalism for discipleship.

Legalism is impersonal dogma. It is self-effort based on the assumption that man can do good in and of himself. Discipleship constitutes a response of love in a personal relationship with Christ and is expressed in following. "If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments."

I have decided not to get on this band wagon either because it is a misleading tune. I find that most of the people perched high on this wagon are not disciples, or followers of Christ. Too many seek this as a safety feature which aids them in their desire to live their own lives as they please.

IV. Its my Nerves!

When I was a boy my parents often talked to me about sin and its consequences. As a result my conscience now responds to Christian teaching. I feel guilty when I have done something which violates an ethical precept which I hold.

There is a tune which tells me that this is a pre-Freudian phenomenon which characterizes an immature person. It is a neurotic tendency which has been determined. Since man has no freedom he is not really to be held responsible for such inner reactions of anxiety and guilt.

It's all in the nerves. If you hit your wife it is because you're tense and you are tense because your mother failed you at one-and-a-half years. You smoke because you have still some unfulfilled feeding urges. Too bad you were bottle-fed and then weaned at an earlier age than was psychologically advisable.

Above all, watch those people who would introduce the problem of the human will and who persist in their use of archaic theological vocabulary. Whenever a word becomes emotionally-toned it should be discarded. Rather than speaking of sin we should speak of inadequate adjustment.

Man has always sought to excuse himself. Adam began this approach to moral responsibility and his children have carried on in the same tradition. More sophistication in psychology provided a better rationale and a necessary vocabulary for this task of relieving man of his personal guilt.

Finally it is not man but God who says whether man is guilty or not. Man is "without excuse." God has provided the "therapy" and it cost God His Son.

Here comes the band wagon. I suggest we let it pass us by and we'll continue to walk against stream. This will not be easy but God has promised that it will be amply rewarded by a sense of purpose here and eternal bliss in His presence in the end.

F. C. Peters

ARTICLES

Sei ehrlich mit dir selbst

Man braucht nicht notwendigerweise Prophet zu werden, um feststellen zu können, daß ein gewisser Teil unserer Leute in die Rubrik der chronisch Unzufriedenen gestellt werden müßten. Manche glauben ihre Aufgabe darin zu sehen, daß sie ihre gute Meinung von sich selbst beständig rechtfertigen müssen, indem sie andere Menschen und Umstände für jegliches Mißlingen in ihrem Leben beschuldigen.

Es ist natürlich nicht schwer die Schuld bei anderen zu suchen. Der Nachbar, die Regierung, die Gemeinde, der Kollege oder sogar die Naturereignisse haben es für uns unmöglich gemacht auf ge-

wünschten Linien Fortschritt zu machen. Ich verirre auf dem Wege; doch daran bin ich nicht schuld. Andere haben den Weg nicht richtig oder genügend gekennzeichnet. An dem Autounglück hatte unbedingt der andere Fahrer schuld. Jemand leidet an Übergewicht, doch die Ursache ist nicht bei dem Mangel an Selbstkontrolle, sondern bei den Drüsen zu suchen. Solch eine Schlußfolgerung ändert nichts an dem Gewicht, hilft aber wohl den Selbstrespekt zu schonen. Der Student besteht seine Examen nicht. Was ist leichter, als andere beschuldigen? Das Textbuch war unverständlich geschrieben; der Lehrer hatte sein Material nicht entsprechend organisiert; es war nicht genügend Zeit die Fragen zu beantworten; zuletzt, der Lehrer war mit Vorurteilen erfüllt und hat die Note zu niedrig gestellt. Aber ich war nicht schuld an dem Mißlingen.

Solche und ähnliche Beschuldigungen hört man nicht nur in der Schule, sondern auch in der Gemeinde. Warum wählt man mich nicht wieder als Chorleiter? Die Gemeinde hat eben keine richtige Wertschätzung für gute Musik. Man will mich nicht mehr gerne als Prediger hören. Die Ursache ist leicht festzustellen — man will die Wahrheit nicht mehr hören. Klingen diese Aussagen bekannt?

Geben wir es nur zu, wir lesen lieber das positive Urteil, welches wir selbst oder unsere Freunde über unsere Leistung verfaßt haben, als die negative Kritik der vorurteilsfreien Beobachter. Wir untersuchen nicht gerne, ob die negative Kritik in Wirklichkeit Berechtigung findet. Entweder ist der Kritiker nicht genügend informiert, oder er ist mit Vorurteilen erfüllt. Vielleicht hat er aber doch recht! Womöglich kann ich doch etwas von seinem Urteil lernen um mich zu bessern!

Wer da glaubt, daß der Schlüssel zum Erfolg im Leben nur außerhalb sich selbst zu suchen ist, und er nicht auch schuld hat an den Erfolgen und Mißerfolgen seines Lebens, wird sehr bald den Erfolgreichen gegenüber einen starken Neid offenbaren. Er urteilt so: Diejenigen welche in der Gesellschaft nach oben rücken sind solche denen das Glück auf Schritt und Tritt nachfolgt, während er nie solche Gelegenheiten gehabt hat.

Wir sind unterrichtet worden, mit anderen ehrlich umzugehen. Ist es womöglich angebracht uns selbst darauf aufmerksam zu machen, daß wir ernstlich um eine grundsätzliche Ehrlichkeit mit uns selbst benötigt sind? Solche Ehrlichkeit verursacht Schmerzen. Es braucht großen Mut alle unsere Entschuldigungen einmal klar und offen ins Auge zu schauen. Unser Fortschritt im Leben beginnt zum großen Teil mit der Fähigkeit uns selbst ins Auge zu schauen und zu sagen, "Ich bin selber schuld." Natürlich meine ich, daß wir lernen die Schuld die uns trifft auf uns zu nehmen.

Ich stolpere und falle. Das ist keine Ehre. Wer ist schuld? Die Brille? Derjenige der das Loch gegraben hat? Tatsache ist — ich bin unvorsichtig gewandelt. Ich komme spät zum Gottesdienst und merke schon wie die Schamröte steigt. Wie rechtfertige ich mich vor der großen Versammlung? Wie helfe ich so einem Umstand ab? Am ehrlichsten wäre es wohl, wenn ich sagen

würde, daß ich zu lange geschlafen habe und zu spät losgefahren bin. Ich habe meine Examen nicht bestanden. Wer ist Schuld daran? Ich muß ehrlich mit mir selber sein und sagen, ich war nicht aufmerksam genug; ich war nicht fleißig genug; ich habe meine Zeit verschwendet. Ich verliere mein Amt. Warum? Weil andere mich untergraben haben, oder weil ich nicht zufriedenstellende Dienste leistete? Ich fühle einsam und verlassen. Darf ich in aller Aufrichtigkeit sagen, daß andere sich mutwillig von mir abgewandt haben oder, daß ich mich von ihnen entzogen habe?

Solche und ähnliche Entschuldigungen mögen uns zeitweilig zufrieden stellen und unser Ehrgefühl schützen. Im tiefen Inneren wissen wir aber, daß wir uns selber betrügen und, daß unsere Rettung nicht in der Beschuldigung der Mit- und Nebenmenschen zu finden ist, sondern in einer ehrlichen Selbstabwertung. Beten allein genügt hier nicht. Finde einmal aus, wo deine Schwächen sind und ersetze was da fehlt. Die Wirklichkeit erfordert es. Nur dann kannst du damit rechnen, daß dir geholfen wird.

Das Leben ist nicht einem 'escalator' gleich, auf dem man mühelos zur Höhe fahren kann. Das Leben ist mehr einer Treppe gleich auf der man oft mit großer und langer Mühe empor steigt. Wir bauen die Leiter auf welcher wir empor steigen. Wer nicht baut, der steigt nicht. Du willst vorwärts schreiten und erfolgreich wirken in deinem Beruf. Darum sei ehrlich mit dir selbst und der große Haufe der Selbstenschuldigungen auf dem du deine Ehre gegründet hast, wird in kurzer Zeit in den Staub zerfallen. Sei unbarmherzig in der Selbstabwertung und du wirst gewisse Schwächen entdecken, die du niemals zum Vorschein kommen lassen wolltest. Dieses wird dir die Gelegenheit geben da zu bauen wo es hilft. Mache nicht Entschuldigungen, mache GUT!

J. H. Quiring

Der Heilige Geist als Person

Im Neuen Testament bildet das Zeugnis vom Heiligen Geist einen sehr wesentlichen Teil der Offenbarung. Die Apostel zeugten in der Kraft des Geistes; sie wurden voll des Heiligen Geistes; man sprach von der Frucht des Geistes, die Einigkeit im Geiste, usw. In der späteren Entwicklung der Kirche wurde die Lehre vom Heiligen Geist mehr an die Peripherie geschoben. Mit Glaubensleidenschaft rang man um die rechte Erkenntnis über die Lehre von der Gottheit Jesu Christi, die Dreieinigkeit Gottes, das rechte Verhältnis zwischen dem Göttlichen und dem Menschlichen in Jesum Christum. Nur selten und wenig hat man über den Heiligen Geist gesprochen und geschrieben.

Es waren ja auch schon in jener Zeit solche, die einen Angriff machten auf die orthodoxe Lehre vom Heiligen Geist. Im zweiten Jahrhundert waren es die Monarchianer, später in der Zeit der Reformation, die Sozianer, und in unserer Zeit, die Unitarier. Diese Angriffe aber haben den Bau des Reiches Gottes nicht so geschadet als die praktische Vernachlässigung der Lehre vom Heiligen Geist

in den Kreisen wo man rechte, biblische Lehre zu haben meinte. Deshalb ist auch oft aus dem Organismus eine bloße Organisation geworden, die Gemeinde zu einer Kirche, der Leib Christi zu einer Körperschaft.

Wenn wir auch sagen müssen, daß für uns das Wirken des Heiligen Geistes im persönlichen Leben von größter Bedeutung ist, so müssen wir aber doch hinzufügen, das die rechte Erkenntnis, die biblische Lehre vom Wesen und vom Werk des Heiligen Geistes, auch sehr wesentlich für uns ist. Lehrsätze beeinflussen unsere Einstellung und unsere Erwartungen. Weil nun etliche die Persönlichkeit des Heiligen Geistes in Frage stellen, und behaupten wollen, daß man in dieser Bezeichnung vielmehr eine Kraft oder ein Prinzip zu verstehen habe, möchte ich kurz darstellen was die Schrift über das Wesen des Heiligen Geistes lehrt.

I.

Verschiedene Gründe dürften vorliegen warum man geneigt ist zu sagen, daß der Heilige Geist nicht Person, sondern Kraft oder Einfluß sei. Einmal könnte es ein falsches Verständnis sein über das was eigentlich zum Wesen einer Persönlichkeit gehört. Da handelt es sich um zwei Eigenschaften: Selbstbewußtsein und Selbstbestimmung. Diese Eigenschaften schließen Vernunft, Intelligenz, Wille und anderes mehr in sich, aber ein Leib oder eine bestimmte Form gehört nicht zum Wesen einer Person. Wir lehren auf Grund göttlicher Offenbarung das Gott eine Person ist, trotzdem daß wir auf Grund derselben Offenbarung lehren, daß Er nicht einen Leib hat. Gelegentliche Ausdrücke, so wie zum Beispiel: "Mund Gottes", "Hand Gottes", "sein Auge" sind anthropomorphisierte Darstellungen und sind nicht im buchstäblichen Sinn zu verstehen. Durch unsere Erfahrungen, in denen wir die Person des Menschen nur durch den Leib erkennen, sind wir geneigt zu glauben, daß der Leib ein Teil des Wesens einer Person bildet. Deshalb könnte es sein, daß wir Schwierigkeit haben uns den Heiligen Geist als eine Person zu denken.

Dann aber könnte es auch an der Benennung liegen. "Vater" und "Sohn" sind Bezeichnungen, die wir in unserm denken unzertrennlich mit "Person" verbinden. So ist es verhältnismäßig leicht für uns Gott, den Vater, und Jesus Christus, den Sohn, als Personen vorzustellen. Ganz anders ist es mit der Benennung des Heiligen Geistes. Schon das Wort "Geist" steht bei uns für etwas unsichtbares, formloses, unpersönliches. In den Ursprachen der Heiligen Schrift, wird dasselbe Wort, welches oft mit "Geist" übersetzt wird, auch oft mit "Hauch", "Odem", oder auch sogar "Wind", übersetzt. In der griechischen Sprache ist dieses Wort sächlichen Geschlechts.

Zudem finden wir, daß die sichtbaren Begleiterscheinungen des Wirkens des Heiligen Geistes, unpersönlich sind. Einmal war es eine Taube bei der Taufe Jesu (Matth. 3, 16), dann am Pfingstfest waren es "Zungen, zerteilt wie von Feuer" (Apg. 2, 3). Die Schrift spricht auch von "Ausgießung" des Heiligen Geistes (Apg. 2, 17),

oder auch von der "Salbung" des Geistes (1 Joh. 2, 20. 27). In den meisten Fällen, wo die Schrift vom Heiligen Geist spricht, finden wir den Sinn von Kraft auch enthalten.

Wenn wir nun einseitig auf Bezeichnungen wie die oben erwähnten schauen, dann könnten wir dahin kommen, daß wir den Heiligen Geist nur als Kraft oder Einfluß betrachten. Nehmen wir aber das gesammte Zeugnis der Schrift, dann zeigt uns die Schrift wie wir solche Ausdrücke zu verstehen haben. Unzweideutig lehrt die Schrift, daß der Heilige Geist eine Person ist, Ausdrücke die anders lauten beziehen sich auf einzelne Wirkungen oder Offenbarung des Geistes, die nicht das Wesen des Geistes darstellen.

II.

Wir haben gesagt, daß eine Person "Selbsterkenntnis" besitzt, und was dieses alles in sich schließt. Die Schrift sagt uns, daß der Geist "die Tiefen der Gottheit" erforscht (1. Kor. 2, 10). Der Heilige Geist ist Gott, und kennt die Tiefen der Gottheit. Auch kann er die Person des Menschen erforschen (Röm. 8, 27); solch ein Erforschen kann nur eine Person. Der Geist hat einen Willen (1. Kor. 12, 11); das gehört zur "Selbstbestimmung." In 2. Tim. 1, 7 wird Er als Geist der Liebe und der Zucht (Besonnenheit) bezeichnet, wieder Eigenschaften die nur eine Person besitzt.

III.

Der Heilige Geist handelt und wirkt wie eine Person. Jesus nennt Ihn den "Tröster" (Joh. 14, 26 u.a.m.). Dieser Tröster lehrt und erinnert. Nicht wie ein Buch lehrt oder ein Signal oder Zeichen erinnert, sondern wie eine Person mit der andern umgeht. Er zeugt von Christus und dieses Zeugnis ist in Worten gesprochen (Joh. 16, 13). Was Er hört das wird Er reden, verkündigen. Er spricht zu Philippus (Apg. 8, 26. 29), zu der Gemeinde in Antiochien (Apg. 13, 2). Er sendet Diener aus (Apg. 13, 4) und überwacht ihre Arbeit im Felde (Apg. 16, 6-7). Die gesamte Zahl solcher Handlungen stellen uns unmittelbar unter den Eindruck, daß der Heilige Geist eine Person ist; Er arbeitet eben wie eine Person arbeitet.

IV.

Man kann den Heiligen Geist auch wie eine Person behandeln. Apg. 5, 3 sagt uns, daß Ihm gelogen wurde; auch daß Er versucht wurde (v. 9). Stephanus (Apg. 7, 51) spricht von einem Widerstehen des Heiligen Geistes. Nach Eph. 4, 30, kann der Geist betrübt werden. Eigentlich kann man nur den betrüben von dem geliebt wird. Andere kann man ärgern, abstoßen. Nur eine Person hat Gefühle die man betrüben kann. Der Heilige Geist kann aber auch geschmäht werden (Hebr. 10, 29), gelästert werden (Matth. 12, 31). Wiederum, wenn wir das gesamte Zeugnis dieser erwähnten Schriftabschnitte nehmen, dann vertieft sich in uns der Eindruck, daß der Heilige Geist in Wahrheit eine Person ist.

Im Evangelium Johannes wird der Heilige Geist viermal als "Tröster" bezeichnet. Allgemein sind Bibelausleger nicht ganz zufrieden mit dem Wort **Tröster** als Übersetzung für das griechische Wort **Paraclete**. In der englischen Übersetzung, wo das Wort "Comforter", welches dem Worte "Tröster" sehr nahe steht, vorkommt, finden wir auch nicht eine zufriedenstellende Übersetzung. Es ist im Worte "Paraclete" doch mehr enthalten als nur, daß der Geist Trost spendet. Er vertritt die Person die ihn anruft. Er ist der Advokat, der zur gleichen Zeit auch tröstet. Dasselbe Wort wird auf den Herrn Jesus angewandt (1. Joh. 2, 1), und wird dort mit "Fürsprecher" übersetzt. Die Dienste die der Tröster, der Fürsprecher, der Advokat ausführen soll, kann nur eine Person ausführen. So ist auch diese Benennung ein Hinweis auf die Tatsache, daß der Heilige Geist eine Person ist. Zudem wird im Evangelium Johannes, immer wieder das Fürwort "Er" im männlichen Geschlecht gebraucht in Beziehung auf den Heiligen Geist, trotzdem das Wort "Geist" eigentlich sächlichen Geschlechts ist. Von Ihm wird nicht als von einem "es", sondern von einem "er" gesprochen.

V.

In manchen Schriftstellen werden Vater, Sohn und Heiliger Geist zusammen erwähnt, ohne die kleinste Andeutung, daß da ein Unterschied in ihrem Wesen ist. So haben wir den Missionsbefehl, Matth. 28, 19, "...und taufet sie im Namen des Vaters, des Sohnes und des Heiligen Geistes..." Eine ähnliche Gleichstellung finden wir im Segensspruch, 2. Kor. 13, 13 "Die Gnade unseres Herrn Jesu Christi und die Liebe Gottes und die Gemeinschaft des Heiligen Geistes sei mit euch allen." So erwähnt auch Judas alle drei Personen der Gottheit, ohne jeglichen Unterschied, "Ihr aber meine Lieben, erbaut euch auf euren allerheiligsten Glauben durch den Heiligen Geist, und betet und erhaltet euch in der Liebe Gottes, und wartet auf die Barmherzigkeit unseres Herrn Jesu Christi" (V. 20. 21).

In der Schrift finden wir auch manche Verse in denen der Heilige Geist von seiner Kraft unterschieden wird. Wenn wir in diesen das Wort "Geist" oder "Heiliger Geist", mit dem Worte "Kraft ersetzen würden, dann würden die Verse so lauten: (In Klammern, die rechte Worte.)

Apg. 4, 14 — Wie Gott diesen Jesus gesalbt hat mit (dem Heiligen Geist) Kraft und Kraft.

Lukas 4, 14 — Und Jesus kam wieder in des (Geistes) Kraftes Kraft.

Römer 15, 13 — Daß ihr völlige Hoffnung habt durch die Kraft (des Heiligen Geistes) der Kraft.

1. Kor. 2, 4 — Und mein Wort und meine Predigt war nicht in vernünftigen Reden menschlicher Weisheit, sondern in Beweissung (des Geistes) der Kraft und der Kraft.

Nur etliche der vielen Schriftstellen die uns Licht über das Wesen des Heiligen Geistes geben, sind hervorgehoben worden.

Mancher würde vielleicht wünschen, daß die Bibel uns mehr ausführlich die Einzelheiten seines Wesen dargestellt hätte. Aber die Schrift ist ja geschrieben worden von Männern, "getrieben durch den Heiligen Geist." In dieser Arbeit, so wie in seinem Wirken, überhaupt, hat der Heilige Geist das Ziel, welches wir in den Worten Jesu ausgedrückt finden: "Derselbe wird mich verklären, denn von dem Meinen wird er's nehmen und euch verkündigen" (Joh. 16, 14). Er ist da, nicht um von Sich selbst zu zeugen, sondern von Dem, in welchem wir die Erlösung haben. Aber dennoch sagt uns die Schrift vom Geist das was wir zu wissen brauchen. Er steht da als Person, gleich mit dem Vater und dem Sohn — der dreieinige Gott.

H. Voth

A SERMON

Christian Contentment

Philippians 4:10 - 13

Contentment is one of the most desirable virtues of human personality. It is to be valued much more than outer appearance. People with expensive garments and much glittering of gold and precious stones, yet discontent, are not most attractive.. On the other hand, again, men and women in modest attire, such as even may betray poverty within a given cultural context, yet with contentment in their heart, are the most beautiful people to behold. In Scripture, contentment is fittingly coupled with godliness. According to Weymouth's translation we read in I Timothy 6:6, "Godliness is needed great when accompanied by contentment." Paul seems to imply that godliness without contentment is hardly possible. No matter what degree of godliness we have attained to, if contentment is lacking, it distorts godliness. One can hardly help but ask, "Is godliness without contentment at all possible?" Paul wrote the words of our text while in prison in Rome to the church that meant so much to him, the church at Philippi. If any one would have had reason to complain and to manifest discontent, his condition would no doubt have justified this more than the environmental conditions of our generation. But, out of prison Paul writes, "For I have learned in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content." Such an attitude of heart and mind is coveted for each and everyone, and we want to learn today from the example of Paul, "What is the nature of Christian contentment?" "How can we acquire it?" "How is it made possible?"

I. The Nature of Christian Contentment

Looking upon Paul himself we immediately learn that:

1. Christian contentment is not a lack of zeal and ambition. Paul was not the type of person that was satisfied with past ac-

complishments, congratulating himself on how well he had served. We only need to reflect upon Philippians 3:12 and the following verses, where the same Paul writes: "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect, but I follow after if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus. Brethren I count not myself to have apprehended, but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind and reaching forth to those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." These words Paul spoke after he had accomplished a great deal in the Kingdom of God. As far as we know his three missionary journies were finished. He had established a number of churches. God had used him to bring the name of Christ to the Jews and Gentiles, to poor and rich, to the common and to the great. With such a record of achievements many a modern Christian would have been content to retire and to say, I have done more than they all, now let my spirit rest. But here is Paul the aged (Philemon 9), not satisfied with what he had done in the past, nor satisfied with himself. He was continually pressing on to know Christ better and to experience the power of the resurrection and to enter in upon the fellowship of Christ's sufferings. He did not feel that he had already attained. He was moving on. He refused to be classified with the Laodiceans who said, "I am rich and increased with goods and have need of nothing" and yet were described by Christ as "wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked" (Rev. 3:17). This would have been false contentment. This is the contentment that one seems to sense on the part of so many of God's people today. The heart of true Christian contentment still sings, "I'm pressing on the upward way, new heights I'm gaining every day, still praying as I onward bound, Lord plant my feet on higher ground."

2. Christian contentment means to be content with divine Providence. No matter which way God led, Paul refused to complain. Whether he was in the midst of a gracious revival in the churches of Asia Minor, where souls were added to the church daily (Acts 16:5), or whether the Holy Spirit conducted him across the Aegean Sea to Philippi where he was flogged with many stripes and cast into the inner prison with his feet made fast in the stocks, he still, at midnight, "prayed and sang praises unto God and the prisoners heard them" (Acts 16:23-35). He knew how to be abased and how to abound and how to be full and how to be hungry, and how to abound, and to suffer need, and all of this without complaint.. Even here in Rome he could have charged the Jewish people of having falsely accused him; he could have spoken about the raw hands of the soldiers that mistreated him, and could have criticized the legal system of Rome for the unjust treatment of its own citizens. Instead he calls himself a prisoner of Jesus Christ and glows with a radiance that comes from a heart that overflows with a deep-rooted conviction that all things work together for good to them that love God (Romans 8:28). He therefore never found a just cause for discontent. He does not say here, "I have

learned in whatsoever state I wish to be, therewith to be content", but rather "in whatsoever state I am." Christian contentment, therefore, does not mean a lack of zeal or ambition, but rather a grateful acceptance of circumstances and associates that surround us. In the last analysis, we are really always surrounded with better circumstances and friends than we have deserved.

II. The Acquisition of Christian Contentment.

A goodly number of us will have to confess that such contentment has not always been ours. Did Paul always possess it? No! It didn't come natural to him. Notice how he acquired it. He does not say that he always had it, but "I have learned in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content." This is something we have to learn.

1. It is not a natural disposition. By nature dissatisfaction is much more universal. Who needs to learn how to murmur, or how to be covetous, how to complain, how to accuse and blame circumstances and others for the conditions in which we are. These all are weeds that grow in a garden which has not been attended to.

2. Contentment is something we must learn. This implies, first of all, a desire to have it. Learning requires definite motivation. Some people face reality with the unconditional demand: "I want circumstances to change." By such demands they continue to be unhappy and make everyone else unhappy. They just refuse to recognize that here is something they can learn, that is, to be content.

Furthermore, to learn implies determination and willpower. Acquisition of contentment requires the desire: regardless of what effort may be required, right where I am, I want to learn to be content. We may set our hearts to learn many things and yet refuse to learn this lesson: How to be content.

This also implies surrender. A student does not choose his lesson. In order to reach a goal in our studies, there usually is a prescribed course. These lessons may not always be of our own choosing. Were it so, then our selfish heart would have no lesson to learn. Even of Jesus, the Son of God, we read in Hebrews 5:8 "Tough he was a son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered." Our old nature rebels against learning this lesson. In our stubborn resistance we rather proclaim "I have been born that way and now let all things and all persons adjust accordingly." This is not how Paul approached the acquisition of contentment. Whether full or hungry, abounding or suffering, one thing he was determined to learn, to be able to say from the heart "in whatever state I am, therewith to be content." A bride-to-be followed her fiance who had gone to Africa as a missionary, to be married to him. When she arrived, they escorted her to the graveyard and showed her where her loved one had been buried — a victim of a fever. After a few moments of tearful reflection, she sat down to write the words, "Take Thou my Hand oh Father, and lead Thou me, until my journey endeth, eternally. Alone I will not wander,

one single day. Be thou my true companion and with me stay. Oh cover with thy mercy, my poor weak heart, that every heart rebellious from me depart. Permit thy child to linger here at thy feet and blindly trust thy goodness, with faith complete."

III. The Possibility of Christian Contentment.

When we ask Paul, where do you find the resources to be content in such circumstances, as the Roman prison, he would immediately tell us:

1. The potential is not in oneself. It takes tremendous power to be content. The required resources are far more than we possess. Therefore, let us never attempt it in our own strength.

2. The all-sufficient resource is our relationship to Christ. From the pen of Paul we read (vs. 13), "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." This verse is usually applied when we attempt something out of the ordinary for Christ in Christian service: Some public ministry, or something that is rather evident before the eyes of men. But the context brings this verse clearly into relation with contentment. He that will endeavor to be content in his own strength is bound to experience defeat. But the right relationship to Christ makes it possible for us to do all things through Him "who strengtheneth me." There is a reservoir of power which never fails. One thing we need to say to ourselves, regardless of what our circumstances may be: It is always possible to be content if we are in the right relationship to Jesus. Let us not say with complaint: "This is more than I can take." He that is in us is greater than he that is in the world. The resources that are open to us through Christ Jesus are more abundant than the circumstances around us require, whether we be full or hungry, whether we abound or suffer need: "I can do all things through Christ, which strengtheneth me."

Having recognized the nature of Christian contentment, as not being the absence of zeal or ambition, but an acceptance of divine providence, and having been taught by Paul that contentment is something that we can learn, let us be grateful for the possibility of being content, not of ourselves, but through Christ who strengtheneth us.

J. J. Toews

EARNESTNESS IN THE PULPIT — "It is not to be mimicked. We have seen it counterfeited, but every person with a grain of sense should detect the imposition. To stamp the foot, to smite the desk, to perspire, to shout, to bawl, to quote the pathetic portions of other people's sermons, or to pour out voluntary tears from a watery eye will never make up for true agony of soul and real tenderness of spirit. The best piece of acting is but acting; those who only look at appearances may be pleased by it, but lovers of reality will be disgusted. . . . We must be earnest in the pulpit because we are earnest everywhere; we must blaze in our discourses because we are continually on fire. . . . Be earnest, and you will seem to be earnest. A burning heart will soon find for itself a flaming tongue. To sham earnestness is one of the most contemptible of dodges for counting popularity; let us abhor the very thought. Go and be listless in the pulpit if you are so in your heart. Be slow in speech, drawling in tone, and monotonous in voice, if so you can best express your soul; even that would be infinitely better than to make your ministry a masquerade and yourself an actor." —Spurgeon, in *Lectures to My Students*

BOOK REVIEW

The History of Christian Preaching: A Bibliographic Survey

Dr. W. Smith, now of Trinity College, once ventured the opinion that "an area in which few ministers... have done much reading, but one of the most interesting and profitable lines of investigation for anyone holding a high view of this holy task, is the history of preaching." This situation — if it is the actual situation amongst preachers today, and we fear it is — is surely an ironic one, and that for two reasons. First, who but preachers themselves ought to be more genuinely interested in the history of preaching practice and achievement generally? And, second, who but preachers of today have more literature on the subject available to them for their personal study and profit?

It is a curious fact that, despite now almost two millenniums of Christian preaching in many parts of the world, historical accounts that report and interpret this form of Christian witness have appeared in print (with but few exceptions) only within the last 100 years or so. While the story of foreign missions, for example, — as we conceive of it today — is not nearly as old a story as that of Christian preaching, literature about the former appeared much earlier in time, and is much more extensive today.

One may contend, with some justification, that the pioneer survey of the history of preachers and preaching, in the U.S.A., was John A. Broadus' *The History of Preaching*, which was first published in 1876. In England, again, the first notable work in this area was John Ker's *Lectures on the History of Preach-*

ing, issued in 1888. Ker's study, we may say, is especially valuable for its extended treatment of German preaching. It may interest Mennonite readers in particular to know that considerable space is devoted in this work to a discussion of Ludwig Hofacker, of whose sermons over 100,000 copies were sold, and also of Klaus Harms of Kiel, whose sermons attacking contemporary rationalism were so potent that as a result of them and of his famous "ninety-five theses" in defense of the evangelical faith, more than 200 pamphlets by rationalists were written in order to question or confute his conservative views.

Certain other English studies of preachers and preaching did appear before Broadus' or Ker's works' true, it is limited, but these were much more limited in scope and more narrowly biographical or even anecdotal in treatment. E. C. Dargan cites such early studies in the bibliography appended to his *A History of Preaching* (1905-1912), and these include the following: H. C. Fish's *History and Repository of Pulpit Eloquence* (1856); J. C. Ryle's *The Christian Leaders of the Last Century* (1869); F. Arnold's *Our Bishops and Deans* (1875); *Great Modern Preachers* (1875); J. E. Kempe's *Classic Preachers of the English Church* (1877-78); E. Evans and W. Hurndall's *Pulpit Memorials* (1878); J. J. Davies' *Successful Preachers* (1884); A. Whyte's *The Evangelical Succession* (1882-84); E. P. Hood's *The Throne of Eloquence: Great Preachers Ancient and Modern* (1885); O. Jones' *Some of*

the Great Preachers of Wales (1885); W. M. Taylor's *The Scottish Pulpit from the Reformation to the Present Day* (1887).

Several other such early accounts not included in Dargan's bibliography but cited in F. R. Webber's *A History of Preaching in Britain and America* are these: E. Middleton's *Biographia Evangelica* (1810); J. Dix's *Pen Portraits of Popular English Preachers* (1852); J. B. Waterbury's *Sketches of Eloquent Preachers* (1864) and H. Scott's *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae* (1866-71).

E. Dargan's bibliography also includes references to early histories of preaching in other languages — in Dutch, French, German, and Italian. Of those listed under "German Authors," a surprisingly large number — the following — constitute pioneer studies: P. H. Schuler's *Geschichte der Veränderungen des Geschmacks im Predigen* (1792-94); J. M. Doering's *Die Deutschen Kanzelredner des 18ten und 19ten Jahrhunderts* (1830); J. Kehrein's *Geschichte der Katholischen Kanzelberedsamkeit der Deutschen von der Ältesten bis zur Neuesten Zeit* (1839); C. G. Schenk's *Geschichte der Deutsch-Protestantischen Kanzelberedsamkeit* (1841); W. Beste's *Die Bedeutendsten Kanzelredner der Älteren Lutherischen Kirche von Luther bis Spener* (1856-86); K. H. Sack's *Geschichte der Predigt in der Deutschen Evangelischen Kirche von Mosheim bis auf die Letzten Jahre von Schleiermacher und Menken* (1866); J. N. Brischer's *Die Katholischen Kanzelredner Deutschlands seit den drei letzten Jahrhunderten* (1868-1871); C. G. Schmidt's *Geschichte der Predigt in der Evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands von Luther bis Spener* (1872); L. Stiebritz's *Zur Geschichte der Predigt in der Evangelischen Kirche von Mosheim bis auf die Gegenwart* (1875); A.

Nebe's *Zur Geschichte der Predigt* (1879); R. Rothe's *Geschichte der Predigt von Anfängen bis auf Schleiermacher* (1881); Christlieb's *Geschichte der Christlichen Predigt* (1888) and H. Hering's *Geschichte der Predigt* (1897).

Since these initial studies, other treatments (English) have appeared which carry on the fine tradition first established by such writers as J. Broadus, J. Ker, and E. P. Hood, and bring the story of the "preaching ministry" more nearly up to date. Between 1905 and 1912 was published Edwin C. Dargan's very comprehensive (extending to some 1160 pp.) and altogether superb survey, *A History of Preaching*, which soon became very scarce. Fortunately, Baker Book House has made it available again (since 1954), and that in a one-volume edition. J. B. Weather- spoon (of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary) has commended Dargan's work, especially for its "illuminating presentation in every instance of the political, social, literary, and general cultural conditions of a period in their relation to preaching," and its "careful critical analysis of the qualities of preaching that affected its creativity in both the periods of decline and those of spiritual advance in the church." This study provides, for any interested preacher who will do a bit of digging, many illustrations of the beneficent influence of the Word of God upon the lives of people when proclaimed in apostolic power.

Dargan's survey, however, did not reach much beyond the nineteenth century, and so the task of bringing a general account of preaching well into the twentieth century remained for others. F. F. Webber's three-volume study, *A History of Preaching in Britain and America Including the Men Who Influenced Them* (Northwestern Publishing House, 1952

-1957) now fills this void fairly adequately, with respect to Protestant preaching in Britain and America at any rate. It takes some account of such recent American preachers as Robert E. Speer, Henry A. Ironside, J. G. Machen, and Walter A. Maier, and of such recent English preachers as G. A. Smith, James Denney, J. T. Forbes, W. M. Macgregor, J. A. Hutton, and H. Black, but omits any reference to other more recent preachers (American or English) such as H. S. Coffin, G. A. Buttrick, C. E. Macartney, H. E. Fosdick, R. W. Sockman, John Cairns, J. Moffatt, John Ker, Marcus Dods, G. Campbell Morgan, or Archbishop Temple. For brief sketches, at least, of preachers omitted in Webber's survey, one may turn to Edgar D. Jones' *The Royalty of the Pulpit* (Harper, 1951) and his *American Preachers of Today* (Bobbs-Merrill, 1933), and also to Alexander Gammie's *Preachers I Have Heard* (Pickering and Inglis, 1946).

Although Webber's monumental survey may be less perceptive than Dargen's in suggesting or exhibiting connections between the cultural milieu of a period and the characteristic preaching of that period, it does have distinct merits of its own. One of these is its much fuller treatment of the extent and power of evangelical preaching in the early Celtic Church in England. Another is its provision of clear evidence that the earliest Christianity in England derived, not from the Catholicism of Rome, as often asserted, but from Gaul. Also, its treatment of Puritan preachers in England is much more inclusive and intriguing. Of course, the list of recent preachers (both English and American) discussed in Webber's survey is much more extensive than that in E. Dargen's *A History of Preaching*. Then, too, Webber's discussion of such preach-

ers involves more critical evaluation, in many instances, of the degree or extent of evangelical orthodoxy manifested in their preaching.

Another very recent work which is not, however, a history of "preaching" in the commonly accepted sense of the term but is related to our subject of concern is *The Ministry in Historical Perspective*, edited by H. R. Niebuhr and D. D. Williams, and published by Harper & Brothers, in 1956. It is one of a series of publications that are concerned (generally) with theological education in the United States and Canada, and that appeared in connection with a project undertaken in 1954 under the sponsorship of the American Association of Theological Schools. This collection of essays really constitutes an historical study of the varying forms, functions, and practices of the Christian ministry, as these have developed in response to diverse social, intellectual, economic and moral forces, from ancient (early Christian) to modern times.

The Ministry in Historical Perspective is an amazingly well-informed and discerning study that serves to show, most emphatically, the remarkable "power of the Church to preserve its worship and witness while it discovers new forms through which it can cope with a shifting and perplexing world." All of the essays of this work are supplemented by brief listings of related studies.

Other more or less recent histories of preaching that are deliberately restricted to a brief period in history or to a given geographical area are the following: H. T. Kerr's *Preaching in the Early Church* (1942); G. W. Owst's *Preaching in Medieval England* (1926) and his *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England* (1939); C. F. Richardson's *English Pulpit Oratory, from Andrews to Tillotson* (1932); and B. M. Levy's

Preaching in the First Half Century of New England History (1945).

The most recent work in this group, however, we have reserved for the last in this brief bibliographic survey. It is Horton Davies' *Varieties of English Preaching, 1900-1960* (Prentice-Hall, 1963), and is, as yet, the only available account devoted entirely to twentieth-century preaching in England. In this carefully written work, Davies first outlines some of the recent changes in English preaching with respect to both preaching style and theological emphasis, and then skilfully analyzes the characteristic preaching of fourteen contemporary preachers.

Without either forcing or distorting the whole matter of "preaching modes," Davies effectively links the preaching of these fourteen eminent preachers to one or other of eight distinctive "modes". These "preaching modes", and the preachers linked with them in each case, are as follows: (1) devotional preaching: J. H. Jowett; (2) reasonable preaching: Bishop H. Henson and Dean W. R.

Inge; (3) preaching of truth through personality: Dick Sheppard and Studert Kennedy; (4) liturgical preaching: Monsignor Ronald Knox; (5) psychological preaching: Leslie D. Weatherhead; (6) distinguished lay preaching: B. L. Manning and C. S. Lewis; (7) expository preaching: Campbell Morgan, W. E. Sangster, and J. S. Stewart; and (8) apologetical and theological preaching: Archbishop W. Temple and Professor H. H. Farmer.

H. Davies' study, then, is not so much a comprehensive historical survey of contemporary English preaching as it is a study in depth of selected yet somehow representative specimens of such preaching. It is the author's remarkably perceptive and revealing analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of each preacher and of the essential content and characteristic approach embodied in his best preaching, we predict, that will grant this work a place of special distinction, finally, in the whole area of the history of preaching. H. Giesbrecht

From State Church to Pluralism

A Protestant Interpretation of Religion in American History. By F. H. Littell (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1962), pp. 169.

The winds of change are blowing across the fields of American historiography. In the traditionally conservative field of church history these new and refreshing breezes are especially welcome, although they may be quite disturbing to people whose mind is made up, and who refuse to accept the facts of scholarly research. In this book Dr. Littell makes an attempt to achieve a new self-understanding or "consciousness of calling" among American churches. The attainment of such a new sense of mission, according to Littell, is only possible on the basis of a radical but

necessary change in historical perspective.

The author begins his re-construction of a more realistic concept of American Christianity by exploding several popular myths. One of these is the generally accepted view that the United States began her national life as a "Christian nation", which in the course of time has forsaken the faith of the fathers. "The whole image of early America as a 'Christian nation' (i.e. Protestant controlled)", Littell argues, "is a lie which must be struck down... in the early years as a nation she was over-

whelmingly unchurched and heathen, regardless of pretensions and public claims" (p. XVIII). According to the author, America has never been a Christian nation except in the nominal sense. In terms of church membership America is more "Christian" today than ever before in her history. The fact that most American church members are first-generation, or at best second-generation Christians, has great significance for a proper approach to the problems faced by American Christianity. The problems of American Churches are the problems of "Younger Churches" who have but recently come out of a "baptized heathenism", and hence are not the problems of a Christendom in which the faith has been reduced to a "post-Constantinian" status.

Another myth which Littell explodes rather effectively is the view that the founding fathers were champions of religious liberty. Among partiotic church leaders there has been a marked tendency to read into the colonial state churches views of religious liberty and "voluntaryism" (a term apparently coined by Littell) which only a few isolated prophets in fact possessed. "Not Roger Williams and William Penn dominated the colonial churches, but John Endicott and Sir William Berkeley" (p. 4). For over half of American history, church life was modeled on European lines. Confessional orthodoxy in the state churches of early America was as zealous in the suppression of heretical movements as the established churches of Europe. The seeds of religious pluralism — with its by-product of religious liberty — were taking root in American soil for the first time during the Great Awakening. Later the Methodists and Baptists carried the free-church pattern westward to the Mississippi Valley and

the Great Plains. Littell points out, however, that in the old states, and particularly in the Southeast—where industrialization and mobility of population came only with the Second World War—there has been a marked carry-over of state-church mentality to the present day.

The history of religion in America cannot be understood if it is merely treated as a "footnote" to European church history, Littell contends. Christianity in America developed along distinctive lines. The traditional distinction between "church" and "sect" is completely irrelevant to the American religious scene, since the principle of all religious association in the new world is the principle of "voluntaryism". However, in this area another legend has developed among American Christians which calls for corrective insights.

The principle of separation of church and state, so clearly laid down in the United States Constitution, is more practice nominal than real. That in practice church and state are often inseparably linked, Littell proves rather convincingly by describing the attitude of the American churches during the Civil War. In this terrible conflict, which tore the nation apart, the churches identified themselves with sectional interests. Unfortunately, the break-down of communication between the North and the South had its beginnings within the Protestant churches such as the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Baptist denominations. Both sides proclaimed their cause as the cause of Christ. "The uncritical identification of northern piety with the Union cause was matched by the pathos of religion in the Confederate forces" (p. 65). This trend of identifying national interests with the interests of God's kingdom has continued to the present day, resulting in what Littell describes as a "Protestant Cul-

ture-religion". In his last chapter entitled, "Mid-Century Encounter", the author warns against the dangers of "Protestant nativism," an American version of the late discredited **deutsches Christentum** of the Third Reich. Here is his closing note: "The worst enemy of the evangelical understanding of the Gospel in the U.S.A. — far more serious an adversary than Catholicism or Judaism, far more heretical than any of the cults or prophetic movements like Christian Science or Mormonism or Jehovah's Witnesses — is Protestant nativism" (p. 168).

The problem of the Protestant nativists is that they have lost sight of the Lord of history, and hence they are also unable to minister redemptively to the needs of the pres-

ent-day world. Although the reader may not always be able to agree with the author's conclusions, he will certainly feel compelled to re-think and re-appraise the nature and mission of the Protestant churches in America.

F. H. Littell is professor of church History at Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University. Dr. Littell is well-known to Mennonite scholars for his excellent contributions to Anabaptist historiography. His book, **The Anabaptist View of the Church** (1958), is certainly one of the classics in the field. Littell deserves a sympathetic hearing in our Brotherhood also on the crucial issues he discusses in such a thought-provoking manner in this book.

J. A. Toews

"But I Say Unto You . . ."

Joachim Jeremias, **The Sermon on the Mount** (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963). Translated by Norman Perrin, 38 pp.

This is a Facet Book in the Biblical Series edited by John Reumann. It is a translation of **Die Bergpredigt** which appeared in "Calwer Hefte", in 1959. Professor Jeremias' pen has been rather prolific ever since he became professor at Goettingen. Having specialized in his early years in rabbinic sources and in the Palestinian environment of the time of Christ, he has enriched the field of New Testament studies greatly. English readers of theology will recall such titles as: **The Parables of Jesus, Unknown Sayings of Jesus, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries,** and others.

In this brief but incisive study of the Sermon on the Mount, Jeremias brings the 'problem' of understanding

the Sermon into focus by examining the basic approaches that have been taken to the Sermon in the past.

(a) First there is the 'perfectionist' conception, which holds that the commands of Jesus are to be taken literally and very seriously, for it is only by obeying them that eternal life can be received. This approach, concludes Hans Windisch, in his book, **The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount**, is Old Testament morality: Obey, then you will live! Jeremias agrees that there is an element of validity in this position. He fully realizes, too, that the Sermon has much in common with ethics in Judaism, but he sees at least four differences: (1) Much of what we have in the Sermon is found in the Talmud, but the Talmud has "a great deal more" (mostly chaff); (2) There are no parallels in Jewish teaching to the most decisive sayings of the Sermon; (3) The Sermon as a whole stands in contrast to Jewish piety; (4) The

Sermon goes even farther than the Torah.

Therefore, in Jeremias' view, the Sermon cannot be explained merely by putting it into the context of the late Judaism, not even 'refined' Judaism.

(b) The second basic approach to the Sermon which Jeremias discusses is that of the 'impossible ideal' theory. Jesus' commands cannot be fulfilled by anyone; they are given for the awakening of sin consciousness, to show man his impotence. It is, then, a kind of *praeparatio evangelica*; it is Moses in the highest degree.

Jeremias will not accept this theory, although, again, he admits that there is an element of truth in it. But where, he asks, is there a single suggestion in the Sermon that man cannot do what Christ commands? Throughout the Sermon it is assumed that these teachings are to be carried out. 'The impossible ideal' theory is an example, he says, of what consequences follow upon interpreting Jesus in the light of Paul (who stresses man's impotence to fulfill the demands of the 'law', when 'law' is viewed as a way to life).

(c) A third understanding of the Sermon is that of an 'interim ethic'. This interpretation was first developed by Johannes Weiss (1892), and followed by Albert Schweitzer. They viewed the Sermon as God's last call to repentance before the crisis, the judgment, the End. Because the situation is so critical, Jesus demands of his disciples that they burn all bridges behind them; sever all ties with the world; count all possessions as valueless; love the enemy; make unheard-of sacrifices. It is an 'interim-ethic' for the short period prior to the End, but it has no abiding, binding validity.

Again Jeremias admits the element

of truth in this position, for the dynamic of eschatology lies behind all that Jesus said. But, what Jesus taught, has validity not only up to the end, but always (Mk. 13:31).

In all three positions discussed by Jeremias, the Sermon is understood as law, and when so understood, the Sermon stands in the realm of late Judaism.

In the second chapter, Jeremias discusses the problem of the origins of the Sermon. He does not view the Lucan or Matthean form of the Sermon as a unity, but rather as a collection of sayings spoken at different occasions, in Aramaic, out of which the two accounts developed. Through the discipline known as 'literary criticism' Jeremias seeks to isolate the 'bricks' but of which the Sermon was built.

In the following chapter he looks at the 'edifice' of the Sermon as a whole, and asks the question: How was the collection of sayings arrived at? This is the question that concerns the student of 'form criticism'. Jeremias begins to answer the question by distinguishing between *kerygma*, preaching directed outward, and *didache*, teaching directed inward. To the *didache* of the Early Church belonged instruction in Christian living, in ethics, and the writer suggests that what we have in the Sermon on the Mount took shape and form (two forms to be exact) when those who had responded to the *kerygma*, and had been converted, were prepared for the Christian life by catechetical instruction. He would look upon the 'form' of the Sermon as representing an early Christian catechism. This approach does not deny that the teachings of the Sermon go back to Jesus; it is, rather, an attempt to find the *Sitz im Leben* which caused the collection of these authentic sayings into the present form (or forms).

From here Jeremias goes on, in chapter four, to establish the form-critical categories to which the independent *logia* of Jesus belong. This is probably the most technical chapter of the book, and so the reader may be tempted to give up just before the 'conclusion', in chapter five.

And what is the conclusion of the matter? Jeremias has shown that the Sermon is not law, but Gospel. 'For this is indeed the difference between law and gospel. The law leaves man to rely upon his own strength and challenges him to do his utmost. The gospel, on the other hand, brings man before the gift of God and challenges him really to make the inexpressible gift of God the basis of his life' (p. 34). The Sermon is not a legal yoke for disciples, nor is it legalism in the sense: 'Do this and you will live' (perfectionist conception); nor is the Sermon a reminder for man of what he ought to have one, so that he might see what a poor creature his is (theory of impossible ideal); nor is it a charge to Jesus' hearers to pull themselves together, for the End is near — the judgment and the victory (interim ethic). Rather the Sermon addresses itself to the one who has received God's forgiveness, who is God's child, who belongs to the kingdom, and shows him how the one

who has come out of the darkness may live the new life in the light of God's grace.

By now some of my good Anabaptist readers will be wondering about what Jeremias has said which they did not know before. Perhaps we can count ourselves fortunate that the Sermon on the Mount was taken so seriously by our Anabaptist forefathers and, although most of us have failed rather miserably in living up to its standards, we have, as a rule, not tried to "reason away" its demands. That Dispensationalism also has undermined the relevancy of the Sermon for the Church of Jesus Christ, does not interest Jeremias — I suspect he would not consider that approach to the Sermon a 'basic' one, but rather an ephemeral theological scheme.

If the conclusion of Jeremias is not new, the manner in which he arrives at it is — too new for most readers (for it is by the methods of literary- and form-criticism). At the same time it is refreshing to hear from a scholar who stands in a church tradition where the Sermon on the Mount has been given too little honor, to confront the churches of the Reformation — and you and me — with the high cost of Christian discipleship.

D. Ewert

Listening to Music

WHAT TO LISTEN FOR IN MUSIC.

By Aaron Copland (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.), 160 pages.

Man has been created with ultimate and immediate needs. Some of these immediate needs could be listed as physical, social and aesthetic. In order to sustain life man needs food and shelter. God in his divine

providence has placed us into an environment where we rarely sense this need. Yet there are those in underdeveloped countries for whom this need is very real. Furthermore, we are created social beings. We need to belong socially, to feel part of a group. Here, too, we need not complain, for the society into which we have been placed gives ample opportunity for social intercourse. Lastly,

man is created an aesthetic being. Through the centuries man has found in nature, in poetry and in music a source of inspiration. Paul in writing to the Philippians says, "Finally brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things."

Music, in the best sense of the word, is pure, lovely and of good report. I believe the Apostle Paul, if he were with us today, would encourage us, as good stewards of our time, to devote some of our moments simply to listen to good music. Many great men, theologians and laymen, have found in music a great source of inner fortitude. This source of strength and inspiration, although available to all, can be appropriated most fully by people who have learned to listen to music intelligently. People, for whom the mere sound appeal of music merely engenders a kind of brainless but attractive state of mind, benefit little. On the other hand, for those who have developed an understanding for music, the reward of listening is great.

"To put down as clearly as possible the fundamentals of intelligent music listening is the object of this book," says Aaron Copland in the preface to **What to Listen for in Music**. In other words, this book is a preparation for listening. To begin with, Copland breaks up the whole listening process into its component parts. He feels that in a sense we all listen to music on three separate planes: (1) the sensuous plane, (2) the expressive plane, (3) the sheerly musical plane. On the first plane we listen for the sheer pleasure of the musical sound itself. On the second plane we become conscious of the

meaning of music expressed in moods such as, serenity or exuberance, regret and triumph. On the third plane we become aware of notes themselves and of their manipulation.

From the listener Copland turns to the composer. Having analyzed the listening process he now explains the creative process in music. Of interest in this section is the author's view of inspiration as it relates to composing. Copland feels that the layman will find it well-nigh impossible to have a fuller concept of music content without in some degree delving into the intricacies of rhythm, melody, harmony and tone color. The author, however, has a way of discussing these elements so that they are easily understood by the layman.

The most important section of this book deals with musical structure. Copland feels that all music is based on one of two structural principles: (1) the principle of repetition, and (2) the principle of non-repetition. With the exception of a few free forms, all music is based on the former principle, namely, that of repetition. This principle is illustrated as it relates to all the various forms of music, from the simplest Song-form to the more complex Sonata-allegro form.

Throughout the whole book Copland never forgets the layman for whom the book is intended. The style is simple and unobstructed by technical detail. With a few exceptions, all the musical examples used in this book have been recorded and in this way are available to the reader, even though he may not play a musical instrument himself.

Undoubtedly, this book is one of the best of its kind and should be a 'must' in the library of every music lover. God has given us good music to enjoy. Let us learn to appropriate this treasure more fully.

Victor Martens

Bible College Distinctives

God created man a bi-world creature. He was given feet of clay to walk the earth and a spiritual nature to converse with God. Re-birth by faith in Christ confers upon him citizenship in the spiritual world, grants him the privilege of fellowship with God, makes him alive to spiritual reality.

But it is merely a starting point for his spiritual growth—just as physical birth is only the starting point for physical growth.

Education for the Christian, therefore, takes on entirely new dimensions. It embraces knowledge of, orientation in, and adjustment to the kingdom of spiritual reality.

In other words, to know how to pray, to live by faith, to love what God loves, to submit to Him, to "walk in the Spirit" are essentials of a Christian's education.

Bible college education is based upon this wider dimension of education. It seeks to orient the student to his spiritual environment; to adjust his thinking, his aspirations and his affections to the kingdom of God. It is education for the complete man, providing for his spiritual, intellectual, social and moral development.

If Joe Brown, college-age Christian, has not yet come under the influence of life lived on this plane, it is urgent that he spend time in such an atmosphere while completing his formal education.

The Bible is a manual on spiritual orientation.

For this reason—among others—a Bible school requires a substantial amount of Bible in every program. The Christian student must know the Word if he is to become a Christlike servant, skilled in living within and responding to the spiritual realm.

But is Bible the only major of the Bible college? By no means.

There are two other sides to the triangle of Christ-centered education. With the Bible at the base and Christ at the center, the other sides are general education and communication.

General education provides Joe understanding and appreciation for the more obvious spheres of his environment. It covers a wide range of courses in the natural sciences, the social sciences, literature, history, music, physical education, philosophy and language.

Some Bible colleges offer majors in these areas. How much place is given to general education depends upon the length of the program. Here arises the one difference between the three-year Bible institute and the four-year Bible college. Both are Bible-centered. Both major in preparing young people for Christian service. But the latter gives one more year to general education.

The third side of the triangle communication, is the Bible college's greatest distinctive. Bible colleges specialize in the many media for communicating the gospel message: preaching, teaching, witnessing, counseling, writing, singing, broadcasting, etc.

Most Christian schools of college-age level have departments of Christian education, missions, sacred music and pastoral training. All stress basic skill in the use of English, both written and oral.

To supplement such classroom instruction, the Bible schools conduct extensive Christian service programs by which students find an outlet for witnessing and gain valuable practical training.

Finally, Bible institutes and Bible colleges were founded to train men and women to become effective witnesses to the whole world. This continues to be their major mission.

The need for competent, spiritfilled, Bible-informed witnesses has never been greater. When much of the higher education offered Joe Brown is absorbed with the technology of the space age, its arid moon and lifeless planets, the crucified, risen Christ continues to point to the perishing millions on this planet for whom He died, and repeats His commission: "Go ye!"

From an article by the late S. A. Witmer, on **How To Live In Two Environments . . .**

GRADUATING CLASS OF 1964

BACHELOR OF DIVINITY

KONRAD, A. J. Edmonton, Alberta
Coaldale Bible School and M.B. Bible College, B.R.E.
University of Alberta, B.A.

BACHELOR OF THEOLOGY

DUGARD, GEORGE Winnipeg, Manitoba
Winnipeg Bible Institute and University of Manitoba

DYCK, HARRY Virgil, Ontario
Waterloo University College

FALK, JAKE Winnipeg, Manitoba
Winkler Bible School and Waterloo University College

GOOSEN, LEONARD Hillsboro, Kansas
Hepburn Bible School and Tabor College

HEIDEBRECHT, WERNER Sawyer, North Dakota
Minot State College

ISAAC, ERNEST Winnipeg, Manitoba
Waterloo University College

KLASSEN, JACOB Winnipeg, Manitoba
Waterloo University College

NEUFELD, KEN Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
University of Saskatchewan

NEUFELD, RONALD Yarrow, B.C.
Waterloo University College

REGIER, JOHN Coaldale, Alberta
Coaldale Bible School and Waterloo University College

SCHMIDT, HENRY Calgary, Alberta
Coaldale Bible School; Hepburn Bible School and
Waterloo University College

SCHROEDER, HARTMUT Winnipeg, Manitoba
Waterloo University College

SCHROEDER, SIEGFRIED Winnipeg, Manitoba
University of Manitoba, B.Sc.

VOTH, HERMANN Winnipeg, Manitoba
Winkler Bible School and University of Manitoba

WENGER, ANDRE Harrisonburg, Virginia
Eastern Mennonite College

WIENS, NICK Huntingdon, B.C.
M.B. Bible Institute, Clearbrook and Waterloo University College

BACHELOR OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

ANDRES, MARGARET Hepburn, Saskatchewan
Hepburn Bible School

ANDRES, SUSAN Steinbach, Manitoba
University of Manitoba and Manitoba Teachers College

DICK, OLGA Virgil, Ontario
Stratford Normal School; McMaster University and
Waterloo University College

ENS, WALTER Winnipeg, Manitoba
Ontario Bible School

FALK, ELFRIEDA Niverville, Manitoba

FRIESEN, ELEANOR Clearbrook, B.C.
Waterloo University College

FROESE, JAKE Winnipeg, Manitoba
Manitoba Teachers College and Waterloo University College

ISAAC, HERTHA Beamsville, Ontario
Ontario Bible School

JANZEN, MONICA Vineland, Ontario
Ontario Bible School and Hamilton Teachers College

KONRAD, MARGARETE Yarrow, B.C.
M.B. Bible Inst., Clearbrook and School of Nursing, Vancouver, R.N.

LOEWEN, ARTHUR Yarrow, B.C.
University of British Columbia (education)

MARTENS, ELEANOR Winnipeg, Manitoba
Manitoba Teachers College and University of Manitoba

NIKKEL, ANNE Coaldale, Alberta
Coaldale Bible School

REIMER, GEORGE Brandon, Manitoba
Winkler Bible School

REMPEL, ANNA Boissevain, Manitoba
University of Manitoba and Manitoba Teachers College

REMPEL, ELSIE Calgary, Alberta
Gem Bible School and University of Alberta (education)

SCHMIDT, LILLIAN Coaldale, Alberta
Coaldale Bible School and University of Alberta (education)

SCHROEDER, SALLY Steinbach, Manitoba
Manitoba Teachers College and Tabor College, B.A.

THIESSEN, SELMA Virgil, Ontario
School of Nursing, Manitoba, R.N.

TOEWS, MILDRED Winnipeg, Manitoba
University of Manitoba and Manitoba Teachers College

TOEWS, SUSAN JEAN Terrace, B.C.
University of British Columbia (education)

WARKENTIN, FRIEDA Tofield, Alberta
Coaldale Bible School and University of Alberta (education)

WIEBE, LOIS La Riviere, Manitoba
Manitoba Teachers College and University of Manitoba

WILLMS, ELIZABETH Chilliwack, B.C.
Chilliwack Bible School

SACRED MUSIC COURSE

DRIEDIGER, ELVERA Abbotsford, B.C.

HARDER, GLEN Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

MARTENS, ELEANOR (see B.R.E.) Winnipeg, Manitoba

MARTENS, NANCY Yarrow, B.C.
University of British Columbia (education)

REMPEL, ELSIE (see B.R.E.) Calgary, Alberta