REFORMED DOGMATICS

VOLUME FOUR:

HOLY SPIRIT, CHURCH, AND NEW CREATION

HERMAN BAVINCK

Reformed Dogmatics

Vol. 4. Holy Spirit, Church, New Creation

Herman Bavinck

Monergism Books

The following work was fully transcribed in Dutch by Project Gutenberg and auto-translated verbatim into English utilizing OpenAI/5.2 API. If anything is found to be amiss, please contact us and we will work to remedy it as soon as possible. G.B.

Copyright © 2026

Published by Monergism Books

P.O. Box 491

West Linn Oregon 97068

www.monergism.com

All rights reserved.

No portion of this book may be reproduced in any form without written permission from the publisher or author, except as permitted by U.S. copyright law.

Contents

MONERGISM EDITOR'S NOTE.

CHAPTER IX. On the Church.

1. § 47. The Essence of the Church.
2. § 48. The Government of the Church.
3. § 49. The Power of the Church.

CHAPTER X. On the Means of Grace.

4. § 50. The Word.
5. § 51. The Sacraments.
6. § 52. Baptism.
7. § 53. The Lord's Supper.

CHAPTER XI. On the Last Things.

8. § 54. The Intermediate State.

9. § 55. The Second Coming of Christ.

10. § 56. The Consummation of the Ages.

BROADER TABLE OF CONTENTS.

11. FIRST PART.

12. SECOND PART.

13. THIRD PART.

14. FOURTH PART.

15. REGISTER OF MORE OR LESS EXPLAINED SCRIPTURE PASSAGES.

16. REGISTER OF NAMES.

17. REGISTER OF AFFAIRS.

18. PROJECT GUTENBERG EDITOR'S REMARKS.

MONERGISM EDITOR'S NOTE.

Here is presented an AI auto-translated edition of Herman Bavinck's "Reformed Dogmatics." The Dutch Edition transcriptions were taken from the open-source ebook repository Project Gutenberg, which are listed under the title "Gereformeerde dogmatiek." There were no editorial alterations of these ebooks. The translation process consisted of taking the transcribed ebooks from Project Gutenberg, and processing them through automated translation via OpenAI/5.2 API.

Within the books you will see "[1], [2]," etc. These are page number indicators from the original text. There may also be hyperlink, footnote, or endnote indicators in the text. None of these are live in this translation but were live in the Project Gutenberg edition. While of course this will not be on the same level of quality as the professionally translated edition of this work now on the market; the hope with this effort, is to offer an edition that is completely free for those who by regional or financial constraints may not be able to acquire that set. Being that Project Gutenberg has several levels of proofing before publishing a text, we have left the Greek and

Hebrew as is. Also, one of the main distinctions between the original Dutch edition (and this edition) and the contemporary professional translation, is that in the original Dutch edition, it appears all references were included in the text body. Also, there is a lot of Latin and German that will remain untranslated. Lastly, some of the Bible Abbreviations within the text may not have converted to English properly, especially as it relates to so many different languages used in a single text.

At the end of each book is a Project Gutenberg Editor's Remarks section. This will indicate where the Editor's from Project Gutenberg adjusted the original Dutch text before publishing their ebooks. Again, these books are exactly like Project Gutenberg produced them, except auto-translated into English via AI/API.

May these books bless you to the glory of God.

S.D.G.

Monergism.

Chapter IX. On the Church.

Monergism Books

§ 47. The Essence of the Church.

1. The community of those who partake of Christ and his benefits bears the name of the church. In the strict sense, therefore, there is talk of this only within the boundaries of Christianity. But that nevertheless does not take away that, just as there are analogies of priesthood and sacrifice and altar and all kinds of other elements in dogma and cult, so also there are analogies of the church in the religions of the peoples. By nature man is already a social being, a ζωον πολιτικον; he is born out of and in and to the community and cannot exist a moment without it. Household, society, state, associations of every kind and for every purpose bind men together and cause them to live and act in community with one another. Stronger still than all these institutions and corporations is the bond that unites men in religion. There lies in religion a mighty social element, Schleiermacher, Chr. Gl. § 6. A. Dorner, Kirche und Reich Gottes, Gotha 1883 S. 11-17. The reason for that is not far to seek; deeper than anything else religion is rooted in the heart of man. It is immediately given with his creation in God's image and therefore ineradicably proper to his nature. In that religion man

regulates his relation to God, and this is central and principial. As our relation to God is, so is that to our fellow men and to all creatures. At the bottom of all questions lies that of religion. He who in religion agrees with us, agrees with us [2] in the deepest, holiest, and all-governing convictions and sooner or later also comes to the same insight on derivative points; but difference of religious conviction, upon serious reflection, causes one to diverge ever further in all subordinate questions. What in religion binds men is stronger than material interest, natural love, or enthusiasm for science and for art; for religion man has everything, he also has his life forfeit. For if he loses this, then he loses himself; in religion, according to each one's conviction, man's soul and salvation are at stake. Therefore every religion also seeks to propagate itself and to act in a missionary manner. Religion is never a private matter, a subjective opinion, a question of taste; it always includes the pretension to be the true and saving one, and therefore seeks entry with others, expansion if possible over the whole of humanity. It is never a matter of the individual alone, but always also of the family, the kin, the people, and the state. It therefore always produces a common dogma and a common cult, as it were borne by the consciousness that not the single man but humanity is the completed image of God, his temple and body. Outside the terrain of special revelation, however, the consciousness has generally been lost of the unity of God as well as of the unity of humanity. The unity of religion is limited to the tribal or national fellows; civil and religious community coincide; the state is itself also a Cultusgemeinschaft. To be sure, religion also reveals itself in part in independent organization of priesthood, sacrifices, ceremonies, religious associations and secret societies; the Buddhist religion in Tibet shows so much agreement with that of Rome that the Jesuit fathers, when they first

came to know it, saw in it a play of the devil. But yet none of the pagan religions brought it to such an independent organization as that which we encounter under Christianity in the church. Mohammedanism founded nothing other than a kind of theocratic state, in which the Arabs are the lords of the subjected peoples and the Koran is the lawbook also for civil law. And Buddhism formed only associations of world-fleeing monks, who exercised a paralyzing [3] pressure on civil society and over against the state never became independent. Cf. Saussaye, Religionsgesch. I 132. Pfleiderer, Religionsphilos.3 727 f. Rauwenhoff, Wijsb. v. d. godsd. 835v. Tiele, Inl. tot de godsdienstwet. Tweede reeks 1899 bl. 132-154. Falke, Buddha, Mohammed, Christus II 155 f.

However, the Christian church was prepared in the days of the O. Testament. In the patriarchal period the households of the believers were the religious congregations and the heads of households the priests; a regulated, common cult did not yet exist, although in Gen. 4:26 it is already implied that the Sethites, over against the Cainites, began to call upon and to proclaim the name of God, and although after the flood a separation came about between Semites, Japhethites, and Hamites. With Abraham this separation even received its settlement for centuries. God henceforth let the Heathen walk in their own ways and established with Abraham and his seed a covenant, which also outwardly by the sign of circumcision separated the church from the world and at the foot of Sinai was confirmed and raised to a national covenant. Under Israel church and state were not one and the same; there was distinction between priest and king, temple and palace, religious and civil laws. But both were nevertheless so closely united, that citizen and believer, nation and people of God coincided and it was the one Divine law that governed the whole life of Israel. Israel as a people was an

יהוה עֵדָה or a יהוה קְהָל. Both these words are used in the O. T. for the assembly or the congregation of Israel, without difference of meaning. But after the exile Israel's national existence underwent a remarkable change; the Jews ceased to be a people like the other peoples of the earth and became a religious congregation. In all places in and outside Palestine there arose gatherings of the believers on the sabbath, Ps. 74:8, Hd. 15:21, in order to read the law and to be instructed in it; teaching was the principal component of the worship practiced therein, Mk. 1:21, 6:2 etc. These assemblies, כְּנֶסֶת, συναγωγη, became for the Jews more and more the center of their religious life and in places with mixed or predominantly Greek population received an independent organization. The temple at Jerusalem did indeed continue to exist and was still always honored as the place of [4] the special presence of God. But the Jews outside Jerusalem nevertheless gradually obtained a religious service that proceeded apart from temple and altar, apart from priesthood and sacrifice, and consisted wholly and entirely in preaching and in prayer. Thereby, already in the days of the O. T., the Christian congregation was prepared. Just as the two Hebrew, so the Greek words, συναγωγη and ἐκκλησια, were originally used interchangeably for these religious gatherings of the Jews; the LXX renders עדה as a rule by συναγωγη, and קהל by ἐκκλησια, except in Ex. Lev. Num. Jos., where also קהל is usually translated by συναγωγη. But gradually there nevertheless already arose among the Jews this distinction, that συναγωγη more denotes the empirical, factual gathering (congregatio, assembly), and ἐκκλησια becomes the word for the ideal congregation, as it comprises those called by God to his salvation (convocatio, congregation). Cf. Schürer, Gesch. des jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi II3 428-433.

2. From this it is explained that Christian usage of speech continued to employ the word συναγωγη only of the religious assemblies of the Jews and of the buildings in which they took place, Mt. 4:23, Hd. 13:43, Op. 2:9, 3:9, but otherwise began to make use of the word ἐκκλησια. To be sure, this word occurs in the N. T. a few times still of popular assemblies, Hd. 7:38, 19:32, 39, 41; but generally it has a religious character and denotes the N. Testament congregation. In the patristic literature and especially among the Ebionites the Christian congregation is still sometimes designated by συναγωγη, but soon this word nevertheless makes way entirely for ἐκκλησια, Schürer t. a. p. 432. Sohm, Kirchenrecht 16 f. Cremer s. v. It was, moreover, Christ himself who first applied the word קהל, ἐκκλησια to the congregation which He gathered around himself, Mt. 16:18, 18:17. Many more recent critics are of the opinion that this word was later put into Jesus' mouth, Holtzmann, Neut. Theol. I 210. But there is no ground for this, and there is nothing surprising in it that Jesus used that word in that sense. For indeed Jesus appeared with the preaching of the kingdom of heaven. But He at once presented a wholly different conception of it than his contemporaries and at first absolutely did not live in the expectation that the whole [5] people would convert and follow Him. John already separated the true Israelites from the mass of the people by the baptism of repentance. And Jesus was not only conscious from the beginning of his sonship, his messianity and his future suffering, part III 235v.; but He also chose a number of young men and gathered them around himself; He sent them out to preach and to win disciples; He gave to his followers other laws than those that were valid in the circles of the Jewish people, Mt. 5-7, 18:15-35, 20, 28 etc. Thus there gradually came to stand around Him a crowd of disciples, which distinguished itself and separated itself from the people of

the Jews. And to this crowd Jesus now applied the word קהל, ἐκκλησια. They were the true ἐκκλησια, the genuine people of God, as Israel ought to have been but now in the rejection of the Messiah showed itself not to be. For Jesus indeed did not come to create something absolutely new, but to bring the law and prophets to fulfillment and to restore the true, essential קהל. If Jesus therefore uses this word in Mt. 16:18 and 18:17 of his congregation, He therefore also uses it still in a wholly general sense. He does not say that that קהל, ἐκκλησια, will be local or will extend over the whole earth; the later distinction of local and general church is not yet to be found here. But Jesus says quite in general that He will build his ἐκκλησια, in contrast with that of the Jews, not on the law, but on Peter's confession of his messianity, and that He will therefore also arrange it independently and cause it to live according to its own laws. In the disciples whom Jesus himself gathered around himself, the beginnings of the N.-Test. congregation are already present. But as long as Jesus was on earth, He himself remained the personal center and the community of the young men still receded. They were not yet independent and had to be taught and led daily by Him. And the Holy Spirit was not yet, because Christ was not yet glorified. But after Jesus' departure they at once join together more closely, Hd. 1:14, and receive on the day of Pentecost in the H. Spirit a principle of life of their own, which makes them independent over against the people of the Jews and binds them among themselves most closely. Then the congregation of Christ is in principle detached from Israel's national existence, from priest and law, from temple and altar; it becomes an own, independent, [6] religious assembly; it takes the place of old Israel as the people, as the congregation of God.

This ἐκκλησια at first existed only at Jerusalem. But soon there came also believers in Samaria, in Antioch, and in many other places among Jews and Gentiles; and their assemblies too were designated by the name ἐκκλησια; they too were there on the spot the people, the congregation of God. Thus the word gradually acquired distinct meanings. Jesus still uses the word in a general sense, without thinking of the later distinctions. But after his departure it is applied to the circle of believers in a particular place, because these there constitute the people of God. And then it is applied to them, whether or not they have come together in a particular assembly. In Hd. 5:11, 11:26, 1 Cor. 11:18, 14:19, 28, 35 the word ἐκκλησια clearly refers to the assembly or gathering of the congregation; but elsewhere it occurs repeatedly of the congregation itself, even if it is not assembled, and thus one can speak of ἐκκλησιαι in plurali, Rom. 16:4, 1 Cor. 16:1, Gal. 1:2, 1 Thess. 2:14 etc. The word receives an even narrower meaning when it is used of a portion of the believers that gathers in a private dwelling at a particular place. In cities namely, where the number of Christians became very great, one necessarily had to come to so-called house congregations. The Jews had in various places, e.g. in Rome, more than one synagogue; and the Christians were all the more compelled to divide themselves at the gathering, because in the first period they had no church buildings but assembled in the dwelling of one of the members of the congregation. According to Hd. 19:9 the Christians at Ephesus for a time came together in the perhaps for that purpose rented hall of a certain Tyrannus, but as a rule they had their meeting place in a private dwelling. With a somewhat considerable expansion of the congregation they therefore had to come together in different dwellings and form a kind of house congregations. This was the case in Jerusalem, where the congregation soon was thousands of

souls strong, Hd. 2:41, 46, 47, 4:4, 5:14, 8:3, 11:21, 12:12, 17, 21:8, and so also in Rome, Rom. 16:23, Corinth, 1 Cor. 16:19, Colossae, Philem. 2, Laodicea, Col. 4:15. These house congregations were each by itself called an ἐκκλησια. But in doing so the unity is not [7] lost sight of for a moment. For although the believers in the same city sometimes, because of their great number, come together in different dwellings, they nevertheless form there on the spot with one another the one ἐκκλησια, Hd. 5:11, 8:1 etc. If the reading of Tischendorf in Hd. 9:31 is correct, all the congregations of Judea, Galilee, and Samaria are there comprehended under the one name of ἐκκλησια in singulari. And in Rom. 12:5, 1 Cor. 12:12-28, 15:9, Gal. 1:13, Phil. 3:6, Ef. 1:22, 5:32, Col. 1:18, 24, 25 in the same way all congregations are taken together as one ἐκκλησια and described as the body, the bride, the pleroma of Christ. This unity of all congregations also does not first come about aposteriori through confession, church order, and synodal connection; the church is no association of persons, who first have come to faith outside of it and thereafter have united themselves. But it is an organism, in which the whole precedes the parts; its unity precedes the multiplicity of the local congregations and lies in Christ. He is the one who, in the state of exaltation continuing his mediatorial work, unites and builds up his congregations out of himself as the head, Ef. 1:23, 4:16, 5:23, Col. 1:18, 2:19, who gathers and governs it, Joh. 10:16, 11:52, 17:20, 21, Hd. 2:33, 47, 9:3v., always remains with it, Mt. 18:20, 28:20, is most closely united with it, Joh. 15:1v., 17:21, 23, 1 Cor. 6:15, 12:12-27, Gal. 2:20, and by his Spirit dwells in it, Rom. 6:5, 8:9-11, 1 Cor. 6:15v., Ef. 3:17 etc. In so far the assertion of Sohm, Kirchenrecht S. 20 is correct, that the general ἐκκλησια precedes the local congregations; it is indeed not the historical, but yet the logical prius, Holtzmann, Neut. Theol. II 177; every local congregation is the people of

God, the body of Christ, built on the foundation of Christ, 1 Cor. 3:11, 16, 12:27, because it there on the spot is the same as what the congregation in its entirety is, and Christ for it is what he is for the whole congregation, Zahn, Einl. in das Neue Test. I 355 f. In the different local assemblies of the believers the one congregation of Christ comes to manifestation. Its essence lies, both for the whole and for each of the parts in particular, in this, that it is the people of God, Rom. 9:25, 2 Cor. 6:16, 18, Tit. 2:14, Hebr. 8:10, 13:12, 1 Petr. 2:9, 10, consisting of people who are devoted to the Lord [8] and converted to him, Hd. 5:14, 14:15, who bear the name of disciples, brethren, elect, called, saints, believers, Hd. 1:15, 6:1, 9:1, 32, Rom. 1:7, 1 Cor. 1:2 etc. In the widest sense ἐκκλησια is the assembly of all the people of God, on earth not only but also in heaven, Hebr. 12:23, in the past and present not only but also in the future, Joh. 10:16, 17:20.

3. This spiritual unity of the congregation of Christ also continually comes to the foreground in the post-apostolic period. The Christians are the saints, the elect; they have one God, one Christ, one Spirit of grace, one calling, Clem. 1 Cor. 46. The church is a tower, which with the rock Christ forms one stone, Herm. Sim. IX 13. 18, from which the stones that are unclean and black and do not fit are removed, ib. 6. 7; the generation of the righteous, from which the godless are separated, ib. 17. 18. The Christians are the soul of the world, Ep. ad Diogn. 6, the true Israel, the blessed people of God, Just. Dial. c. Tryph. 116. 123. 135; they are all priests, Iren. adv. haer. IV 8, 3. Tert. de exh. cast. 7, have all received the H. Spirit, Iren. ib. IV 36, 2 and together form a communicatio pacis et appellatio fraternitatis et contesseratio hospitalitatis, Tert. de praescr. 20 etc. In addition, one then, just like Hermas, makes a distinction between true and false members of the church. With a view to the excommunicated Origen said: ita fit ut interdum

qui foras mittitur intus sit et ille foris, qui intus videtur retineri. And elsewhere he repeatedly expresses that many are called and few are chosen, that there are spiritual and fleshly members, that there is tares among the wheat and the walk of many conflicts with their confession, Seeberg, Der Begriff der christl. Kirche, Erl. 1885 S. 29. But soon there came in this conception of the church as communio sanctorum a great change. When in the second century all kinds of sects and heresies arose, the question naturally arose, which was the true church. And to that the answer was given: that which remains with the whole and maintains communion with the catholic church. Catholic was the church already called by Ignatius, Smyrn. 8, cf. Murat. and Mart. Polyc. 5. 16. 19, because it encompasses all believers over the whole earth, in all times and places, and outside it [9] there is no salvation, Clem. 1 Cor. 57. Ign. Ef. 16. Trall. 7. Phil. 3. Herm. IX 16. This catholicity of the church, however, was no longer conceived spiritually over against heresy, but was externalized and embodied in a visible institute. The bishop, descending in a straight line from the apostles and in possession of the pure tradition, became the criterion of the true church. The universal church ceased to be a logical prius and was conceived as a historical prius of all local churches. Thus there came in the concept of the church a complete reversal. It is not the local churches that together form a unity, but the catholic church with the episcopate precedes, and the local churches are parts of the whole and only so long true churches as they keep to that whole and submit themselves to it. The development of this catholic concept of the church was promoted by the resistance that it encountered from the side of heretics. Gnosticism made of the church a school, in which the πνευματικοι were far exalted above the popular representations of historical Christianity. Montanism wanted to establish the

church on the foundation of alleged inspiration and prophecy, with denial of all office and authority; ecclesia proprie et principaliter ipse est spiritus, Tert. de pudic. 21. Novatianism and Donatism strove for the holiness of the church at the expense of its catholicity. Against all these errors the church fathers came forward and laid more and more emphasis on the episcopal church institute. The church, which is led by the bishops, is the only preserver and preacher of the truth, Iren. adv. haer. I 10, 2. Tert. de praescr. 28, and therefore the indispensable institute of salvation, the mother of all believers, the dispenser of grace, the mediatrix of salvation, scala ascensionis ad Deum. Ubi enim ecclesia, ibi et spiritus Dei, et ubi spiritus Dei, ibi ecclesia et omnis gratia, spiritus autem gratia, Iren. ib. III 24, 1. Tert. de or. 2. Clemens, Paed. I 6. Strom. VIII 17. Just as there is only one God and one Lord, so there is also only one church, one flock, one mother, from which all believers are born and outside which there is no salvation. The ray of light cannot be separated from the sun, the branch not from the tree, the brook not from the spring, Cypr. de unit. ecll. 5. 7. Augustine also moves in the same circle of thoughts. Although the church by its unity, catholicity, and majesty had already earlier made a deep impression on him, [10] he was nevertheless first compelled by his struggle against Donatism 393-411 to reflect more deliberately on its essence. Even then, however, it is not the doctrine of the church, but the doctrine of grace that remains the center of his thinking and life, and the doctrine of the church comes to stand alongside it to a certain extent detached, independent, and unreconciled. For if God is the sole and absolute cause of grace, as Augustine teaches, then the church cannot be this. Therefore he at once distinguishes between the church as corpus verum and the church as corpus permixtum, de doctr. chr. III 32. There are members of the true church outside the visible church,

such as the angels, Enchir. 29, the murderer on the cross, who received only the baptism of blood, de bapt. IV 22 and all non-Israelites who before Christ's coming have been saved, de civ. XVIII 23. 47, for the Christian religion is as old as the world, Ep. 102. To the true church also belong those who even now live godlessly or are entangled in superstition and heresy and yet are known by God. Namque in illa ineffabili praescientia Dei multi qui foris videntur intus sunt, et multi qui intus videntur foris sunt. Ex illis ergo omnibus, qui ut ita dicam intrinsecus et in occulto intus sunt, constat ille hortus conclusus, fons signatus, puteus aquae vivae, paradisus cum fructu pomorum, de bapt. V 27. Conversely there are many within the visible church who do not belong to the electi. There is chaff among the wheat, there are bad fish among the good, there are plurimae oves foris, plurimi lupi intus, hom. in Joann. 45. c. lit. Petul. III 3. de bapt. I 10. Multi sunt in communione sacramentorum cum ecclesia, qui tamen non sunt in ecclesia, de unit. eccl. 74. Because of this distinction Augustine was accused by the Donatists that he taught two churches; but he gave in reply that he did not separate the two, any more than one who in man distinguishes soul and body, and that according to the word of Christ tares and wheat had to grow up together. For Augustine the church is not the dispenser of grace, but nevertheless the circle within which God as a rule dispenses his grace. And thus he defends it against the Donatists. The church is the mediatrix of salvation, because in it alone the Spirit, love, perseverance are present. Outside it there is no salvation. For heretics and schismatics can indeed take along the word and sacrament, but not regeneration and love, [11] which through the H. Spirit are bestowed only within the church; hunc spiritum, quod illi non habeant, qui sunt ab ecclesia segregati, Judas apostolus 1:10 apertissime declaravit. They have the form but lack the essence, just as

severed body parts are indeed a hand, finger, ear etc. but have no life. He who does not have the church as mother does not have God as father, de bapt. VII 44. de unit. eccl. 1. c. lit. Petul. III 9. The church is pia mater, sponsa sine macula et ruga, unica columba, sancta ecclesia; and the church remains holy, even if the godless in it have the majority, for its holiness, like its unity and catholicity, lies for Augustine much more in the objective institute of doctrine, means of grace, and cultus, than in the members of the church; separation is therefore always unlawful, a proof of pride and disobedience, exchanging the universal church for a particularistic or even a national one, c. Cresc. II 37. de unit. eccl. 12. 14. And precisely through this strong emphasis that Augustine against the Donatists lays on the institute of the church, he has to no small extent contributed to the development of the Roman concept of the church. Cf. besides the dogma-historical works of Harnack, Schwane etc., Seeberg, Der Begriff der chr. Kirche 1-56. Köstlin, Die Kath. Auffassung v. d. Kirche in ihrer ersten Entw., Deutsche Zeits. für chr. Wiss. u. chr. Leben 1856. H. Schmidt, Aug. Lehre v. d. Kirche, Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol. 1861 S. 197-250. Reuter, August. Studien 1887 S. 4-105. Dorner, Augustinus S. 276-295. Specht, Die Lehre v. d. Kirche nach dem h. Aug. Paderborn 1892.

In the Middle Ages this concept of the church was worked out practically in the development of the hierarchy, in the mighty organization of the ecclesiastical institute, in the struggle of the church with and its elevation above the state. All the more remarkable is it, that it was treated theoretically almost not at all. Not theology but jurisprudence then led the development, Harnack, D. G. III 400. Concerning the doctrine of the church we find something only in Hugo Vict., de sacr. II 2. Halesius, Summa IV qu. 4. Thomas, c. Gent. IV 76. S. Theol. I 2 qu. 101 art. 2. II 2 qu. 10 art.

10. qu. 88 art. 12. III qu. 8 art. 3. 4. qu. 68 art. 9. Only after the combating by Wiclef, Hus, the Reformers etc. is the concept of the church on the Roman side more broadly developed and defended, especially by Torquemada 1468, Catech. Rom. I c. 10. [12] Canus, Loci theol. IV-VI, Bellarminus, Disp. de controv. Tom. I and II. Becanus, de ecclesia Christi itemque de ecclesia Romana 1615. Id. Manuale controv. I 1-5. Bossuet, Exposition de la doctrine de l'église cath. sur les matières de controverse 1671 etc. In this concept of the church the visible institute stands in the foreground. Christ namely has founded on earth a church, to which the visible and the invisible side are inseparably connected. Just as in Christ a divine and a human nature, in every human being a soul and body, in the sacrament a sign and a signified thing are united, so there are in the church a visible and an invisible side. The visibility of the church rests on the incarnation of the Word. Christ is the causa efficiens, exemplaris and finalis of the church; He himself lives on in it as prophet, priest and king through the H. Spirit, and pours out into it all the gifts of his grace. He communicates these exclusively by means of office and sacrament; the institute thus precedes the organism; the church is a mother of the believers, before it is an assembly; the ecclesia docens with its hierarchical constitution and its grace-effecting sacraments precedes the ecclesia audiens and stands high above it. To this ecclesia docens then in the first place all those properties are applicable, which the Roman Christian ascribes to his church. It is the one, only, solely-Christian, catholic, by regular succession descending from the apostles, imperishable, infallible church, which disputes the right of existence of all other so-called churches, is intolerant by virtue of its nature, tolerates or recognizes no other churches alongside itself, from which to deviate in doctrine or to separate in life is always sin

and never permitted. For because Christ communicates all grace only through office and sacrament, therefore the ecclesia docens, the Roman ecclesiastical institute, is the only mediatrix of salvation, the guardian and dispenser of all grace for all human beings, the only ark of preservation for the whole human race. It alone leads the human being to Scripture, to the person of Christ, to communion with God. The order of salvation is not this, that God through his Word leads the human being to the church, but conversely it proceeds from the church and then leads to Scripture and to Christ. Therefore the church ought to be knowable, pointable-out and even provable [13] for all; by its properties and marks it must stand out so clearly to view, that with respect to it no doubt is possible and only willful and culpable unbelief can fail to recognize and reject it. It is the very first and principal source of knowledge of the truth and for this reason is treated by many Roman theologians in the doctrine of the principia. On this ecclesia docens the ecclesia audiens is completely dependent; it has only a passive share in all the glorious properties of the church; its only task is, to accept the supernatural grace from the hand of the priest in the sacrament; faith in what the church believes, obedience to the hierarchy, submission to the pope is its greatest virtue and necessary to salvation. Ubi papa, ibi ecclesia. On the quality of this ecclesia audiens therefore the essence of the church does not depend. Indeed it is good and useful, that the members of the church are believers; decor ecclesiae principaliter in interioribus consistit, Thomas, Sent. IV dist. 15 qu. 3 ad 1. But the ecclesia docens, the objective institute of salvation remains just as well the true church for that, even if its members are unbelievers and ungodly. No members of the church of Christ are all those, who find themselves outside the Roman church, such as the catechumeni, the excommunicati, the schismatici etc. Their Christian faith,

their pious walk does not benefit them; they are outside the exclusively saving church. But members of the church are indeed all, who remain in communion with Rome, even if they are also public unbelievers and ungodly. These are not actu but potentia de ecclesia; they do not belong to the soul but to the body of the church; they are not so perfectissime de ecclesia, as those who believe and live in the Roman church; but they are nevertheless members of the church and belong to it just as much as the body belongs to the human being's essence. In order in any way, more or less perfectly, to belong to the church, no interna virtus of faith or love is necessary, but only externa professio fidei et sacramentorum communio. For the church is even visibilis et palpabilis, ut est coetus populi Romani vel regnum Galliae aut respublica Venetorum. It is in one word coetus hominum ejusdem Christianae fidei professione et eorundem sacramentorum communione colligatus, sub regimine legitimorum pastorum ac praecipue Christi in terris vicarii Romani pontificis, Bellarminus, de eccl. mil. III 2. cf. Heinrich, Dogm. Theol. II 163 f. Perrone, [14] Prael. theol. I 1838 p. 207 sq. Möhler, Symbolik § 36 f. Simar, Dogm. 576-592. Scheeben-Atzberger, Dogm. IV 279-377. Jansen, Prael. I 325 sq. Concil. Vatic. ed. Lacensis VII Frib. p. 269 sq. 567 sq. enz.

4. To the same extent as this Roman concept of the church was practically realized in the Middle Ages, it encountered resistance and opposition from various sides. The catholicizing of the church-idea had in the first centuries not taken place except under vigorous and persistent protest. Greek Christendom, although otherwise agreeing with Rome in the doctrine of the church, never acknowledged the primacy of the pope and thereby resisted the striving after absolute unity and catholicity. And thus also in the Middle Ages various sects rose in opposition to the development of the Roman

church-idea. The opposition proceeded from different principles. Among Cathars, Albigensians, Bulgarians, the followers of Amalric of Bena, the sects of the new and of the free spirit, it was the fruit of dualistic-Manichaean or gnostic-pantheistic errors. Among others such as the Waldensians, Bradwardina, Wiclef, Hus etc., the view of Augustine continued to operate, according to which the church was an assembly of praedestinati. But the knowability of this true church was then sought not objectively in the administration of word and sacrament, but in the holy life, in life according to the law of Christ, in love, poverty etc.; hence the transition from the idea of the church to reality was lacking and the attempt at reformation could not work through or also ended in disappointment, Harnack, D. G. III 392-419. Only in the sixteenth century was, through the Reformation, a concept of the church placed over against that of Rome that was different in principle. Luther found peace for his soul, not in the sacrament working ex opere operato nor also in good works, but in the forgiveness of sins through faith alone. And from this standpoint he attacked the Roman church, rejected priest, sacrifice, monasticism, infallible church-institute and magically working sacrament, proclaimed the freedom of the Christian man and conceived the church as an assembly of believers, as a communio sanctorum, as it was confessed as an object of faith in the twelve articles. It cost Luther severe struggle to break with the [15] Roman church and its concept of the church; he had no program of reformation; at first he was concerned only to oppose the abuses. But he found and retained his firmness in the justification of the sinner by faith alone and from there came much further than he had originally thought or intended. This principle also led him to another conception of the church, to that which he found in Scripture. The church was not an assembly of

praedestinati without more, nor also of such as walk according to a few precepts of the sermon on the mount. But it was an assembly of believers, of people who through faith had received forgiveness of sins and thus were all children of God, prophets and priests. Of itself it therefore had an invisible and a visible side. This distinction is according to Seeberg, Der Begriff der christl. Kirche 91, first made not by Zwingli but by Luther. But by it he understood not two churches, but two sides of one and the same church. For Luther the church is no Platonic ideal, no idea without reality, but for him it exists concretely in people who live and through faith partake of the forgiveness of sins. On the one side it is invisible, an object of faith, for what one believes one does not see; on the other side it is visible, for it becomes manifest and is knowable, not by papacy, bishops, mass vestments and other externals, but by the pure administration of word and sacrament. Where this is, one can be certain that there is a church; there are true believers, even if only among the children in the cradle; Gottes Wort kann nicht ohne Gottes Volk sein. For there can indeed be unbelievers in a church, just as there can be foreign constituents in a body, but the essence of the church is determined by the believers, the whole is named after the principal part, cf. Köstlin, Luthers Theol. I 317 f. II 534 f. Seeberg t. a. p. 84 f. Gottschick, Hus', Luthers und Zwingli's Lehre von der Kirche, Zeits. f. Kirchengesch. 1886. Accordingly, in the Lutheran symbols the church was defined as a communio or congregatio sanctorum et vere credentium, in qua evangelium recte docetur et recte administrantur sacramenta. It is indeed visible, has offices and institutions, but ecclesia non est tantum societas externarum rerum ac rituum [16] sed principaliter est societas fidei et Spiritus Sancti in cordibus, Conf. Aug. en Apol. 7. 8. Smalc. art. 12. Cat. maj. II 3. The distinction of visible and invisible church thus originally

served only to express over against Rome that the essence of the church lay in the invisible, in faith, in communion with Christ and his benefits through the H. Geest, but absolutely not to detract in any way from the visibility, from the reality of the church. Soon, however, it was used in another sense. For one could not close one's eyes to the fact that in the church in hac vita multi mali et hypocritae admixti sunt, who indeed are socii verae ecclesiae secundum externos ritus but nevertheless do not form the church and rather belong to the regnum diaboli, Symb. B. ed. Müller 153. 154. 155. The church could thus be taken more narrowly or more broadly as ecclesia stricte et large dicta, ib. 153. Luther sometimes spoke of zwei Kirchen and Melanchton called this a discrimen duorum corporum ecclesiae, C. R. 21, 507, and later theologians, such as Heerbrand, Chemniz, Hutter, Gerhard etc. applied to that the distinction of invisible and visible church. Invisible was the church now called, not because it had a spiritual side and therefore was an object of faith, but because the circle of believers could not be known by us; and visible church became the name, not for the manifestation of the believers in confession and walk, but for the unbelievers, who earlier by Luther and the confessional writings were reckoned not to the church but to the regum diaboli. Idea and reality, essence and appearance were thereby set loosely alongside one another. The believers formed an invisible ecclesiola in the visible ecclesia. Cf. Gerhard, Loc. XXII 69 sq. Quenstedt, Theol. IV 493 sq. Hollaz, Examen theol. 1278 sq. Buddeus, Instit. theol. 1207 sq. Schmid, Dogm. der ev. luth. K. 434. 440 f. Schultz. Das protest. Dogma v. d. unsichtbaren Kirche, Jahrb. f. prot. Theol. 1876 S. 673-690. Krauss, Das prot. Dogma v. d. uns. Kirche, Gotha 1876 S. 80 f. Seeberg, t. a. p. 104 f. 141 f. Nitzsch, Ev. Dogm. 529 f.

With the Lutheran doctrine of the church the Reformed agrees in the main, but it nevertheless exhibits some not unimportant peculiarities. In the first place, the institute of the church occupies in it a somewhat different place. Luther did indeed understand by [17] the church the communio sanctorum, but still sought its unity and holiness more in the objective institutions of office, word, and sacrament than in the subjective community of the believers, which often left so much to be desired. Thus the church became more and more a divine institute, which had to realize the unity and holiness of the believers. In the same spirit Melanchthon in the Loci of 1543 defined the church as coetus vocatorum and said that we nec alibi electos ullos somniemus, nisi in hoc ipso coetu visibili. And later Lutheran dogmaticians found in it a point of difference, that according to their doctrine the elect are not to be sought extra coetum vocatorum and according to the Reformed they could also occur outside it. And in fact it is Reformed doctrine, that God does indeed ordinarily bestow the benefits of Christ by means of word and sacrament, but nevertheless is not bound to them and, be it then also rarissime, grants salvation outside the institute of the church, Calvijn, Inst. IV 16, 19. Ursinus, Expl. catech. qu. 21. Bucanus, Inst. theol. 400. Gomarus, Theses 30, 29. In the second place, the Reformed brought the church into the closest connection with election and therefore often conceived its invisibility differently than the Lutherans. Zwingli at first did indeed let the invisibility bear upon the ecclesia universalis, which was spread over the whole earth and therefore could be empirically perceived by no one, in contrast with the ecclesia particularis, which is present and visible in a definite place. But later he understood by the ecclesia invisibilis the collective elect, as it is in the twelve articles an object of faith and will first at the parousie become visible. And in

distinction from that he called the ecclesia universalis and the ecclesia particularis a visible (visibilis, sensibilis) assembly of believers, in which hypocrites can also be, Fidei ratio, Op. IV 8. In his Christianae fidei expositio of the year 1531 he then again speaks somewhat differently and says that the church of the believers on earth is invisible, insofar as it includes only the true believers, and visible, insofar as all belong to it, quotquot per universum orbem Christo nomen dederunt, Op. IV 58. Calvin aligns himself with this usage. When he for the first time includes the expression ecclesia invisibilis in the Institutie of 1543, he understands by it the collective [18] elect, who are known to God alone, and then distinguishes the church as universa hominum multitudo in orbe diffusa, which is visible and also contains hypocrites within itself, but nevertheless also insofar again is invisible and an object of faith, as we cannot know who in it are the true believers, Inst. IV 1, 1-9. Invisible, therefore, the church could already be called in a threefold respect: 1o as ecclesia universalis, because a particular person cannot perceive the church in other places and in other times; 2o as coetus electorum, which will first at the parousie be completed and be visible; 3o as coetus electorum vocatorum, because we in the church on earth cannot distinguish the true believers. To that there later still came other points of view, under which the church could be called invisible, because it is not of this world, because its head Christ and thus also it itself as his body is invisible, because its greatest part is in heaven, because it can be temporarily and locally deprived of the administration of the means of grace, because in times of persecution it hides in deserts and caves, because it is perceptible indeed in its outward confession but not in the inward faith of the heart, because the church is never present in one place and in one time but through the centuries and peoples extends itself,

Polanus, Synt. theol. 531. And visible was then called the church over against that, because it becomes manifest in confession and walk, or appears as institute with offices and administrations, or contains not only true believers but also hypocrites. Confession and dogmatics among the Reformed now proceeded from this and then from that conception. Some placed the church as the community of all elect in the foreground and called this the ecclesia invisibilis, Cat. Genev. bij Niemeyer 135. Scot. I 16. Westm. Conf. 25. Alsted, Theol. did. schol. 590. But because the elect, who do not yet live or are not yet called, can be called members of the church only potentia, others let this idea of the church rest and proceeded from the church as assembly of all electi et vocati, Basil. I 5. Helv. I 15. Heid. Catech. 54. Belg. 27. Helv. II 17. Gomarus, Theses theol. disp. 30. Polanus, Synt. 530. Martyr, Loci 390. Then, however, one had to distinguish therewith immediately between true believers and hypocrites and therefore began to speak of ecclesia stricte and latius dicta, of the esse de ecclesia and the esse in [19] ecclesia, or also of ecclesia invisibilis and visibilis, Ursinus on qu. 54. Alsted, Theol. did. schol. 598. Heidegger, Corpus theol. XXVI 29 etc. This led in connection with the corruption that entered into the church, to the distinction of two circles or groups of people in the one church, Turretinus, Theol. El. XVIII 3, 3. 24. and brought Janssonius, van der Eerde and others in the previous century to it, to place an outward and an inward covenant alongside each other, to separate the forma externa and interna of the church and to proclaim the doctrine that also the unregenerate, if they lived without giving offense, could be true members of the church and had a lawful claim to its goods and benefits, cf. part III 227. In vain, over against that, others attempted to maintain the unity of the church, by saying that invisible and visible church were two sides of the same thing, Synopsis pur.

theol. 40, 34. Turretinus, Theol. El. XVIII 7, 4. Mastricht, Theol. VII 1, 11. 13. Appelius, De Herformde Leer 1769 p. 300v.; the doctrine corresponded less and less with life. And this was all the more serious for the Reformed doctrine concerning the church, because it saw the essence of the church much less than the Lutherans in the institute. For, and that is a third distinction, which will later come more clearly to light, the Reformed sought the mark of the true church indeed also in the pure administration of word and sacrament, but they usually added to that also church discipline and the Christian walk; election was the foundation of the church but became manifest only in faith and good works. Cf. further also concerning the Reformed doctrine of the church: Beza, Tract. theol. 1582 I 32. Hyperius, Meth. theol. 529. Bullinger, Huysboeck 1612 fol. 204. Bucanus, Inst. theol. 455. Gomarus, Op. II 97. 202. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. I p. 1 sq. Moor, Comm. VI 1-179. M. Vitringa, Doctr. chr. relig. IX etc., cf. Seeberg t. a. p. 159 f.

5. The change which the Reformation introduced into the Roman concept of the church also had practical consequences. Uniformity made way once and for all for pluriformity; different churches appeared after and alongside one another and gave to religion and church a wholly different form. The Reformation still tried to keep invisible and visible church in good connection; but history proved how difficult that was. And in other [20] churches outside the Reformed and Lutheran the connection was often completely broken, and the invisible church was sacrificed to the visible or this to that. Socinianism did indeed still accept the distinction, but nevertheless spoke almost only of the visible church, because it conceived the Christian religion as a doctrine fairly acceptable to all, Fock, Der Socin. 690 f. Remonstrantism not only walked in the same track, but also deprived

the church of all independence and left nothing to it but the right of preaching and admonition, Conf. en Apol. conf. 21. 22. Limborch, Theol. Christ. VII. With Rationalism the church became an association of men for the exercise of religion and for the improvement of morals, Wegscheider, Instit. § 188. Bretschneider, Syst. Entw. 760. Doederlein, Instit. theol. christ. 1787 S. 716. Kant indicated with the names invisible and visible church the people of God according to his idea and according to its empirical appearance; the latter, that is, the church with its statutory faith is destined to pass over more and more into the rational and moral religion, into a Kingdom of God on earth, Religion ed. Rosenkranz 119 f. 146 f. With Hegel the church likewise had only a temporal, transitory significance, for the state is the true realization of the moral idea, the vernünftlich-sittliche Substanz. The church has a right to exist only so long as the state does not yet fully correspond to its idea, Philos. der Rel. Werke XII 279. For the church as an institution of Christ, from the standpoint of rationalism no place remains. And from another principle mysticism came to the same result. Anabaptism proceeded from the absolute antithesis of creation and re-creation, nature and grace, world and Kingdom of God and therefore regarded believers as men who in regeneration had become something wholly different and therefore had to live separated from the world. Its program was: not reformation but separation; it wanted a separated church, Menno Simons, Werken 262. For centuries there had been no church, but only Babel, and Babel had to be left and avoided, ib. 33 v. 289 v. 295. 409 v. In Münster one said that in 1400 years there had been no true Christian, Goebel, Gesch. d. christl. Lebens I 179. The true church was a church of saints, who after personal confession had been baptized and by abstention from oath, war, [21] governmental office and all kinds of other worldly

practices in food and drink, in clothing and intercourse distinguished themselves from others, De Bres, De wortel, den oorspronck ende het fundament der Wederd. 1589 bl. 39-45. Cloppenburg, Op. II 233. Goebel t. a. p. 134 f. The same dualistic principle lies at the foundation of all kinds of sects that later have appeared within the circle of Protestantism. Labadie called into being at Middelburg in 1666, just as earlier at Geneva and at Amiens, conventicles, to which he gave the name of prophecies and in 1669 founded an "evangelical congregation", which was allowed to consist only of true believers, and later at Herford distinguished itself by a domestic family life, by a questionable marriage practice and by community of goods, Goebel t. a. p. II 181-273. Ritschl, Gesch. d. Piet. I 194-268. Pietism, both here and in Germany, drew the whole of life together into the narrow circle of religion, became indifferent to church and office, sacrament and formulary, gathered the believers in separated societies and promoted separatism, Ritschl, ib. II 135 f. Zinzendorf organized on 12 Aug. 1729 an apostolic congregation, which in various traits corresponded with the congregation of Labadie, Goebel, ib. II 271. In England under anabaptist influence with Robert Browne and John Robinson there arose Independentism, which lets the church arise wholly and entirely from the joining together of individual believers, Weingarten, Die Revolutionskinderen Englands 24 f. After Cromwell's revolution, tempered in its enthusiasm, it passed over, as Anabaptism in Mennonitism, into the religion of the Quakers, who formed a congregation separated from the world and distinguished in all kinds of externalities. Detached from all the historical and objective, the church with them became the community of all who were partakers of the illumination of the H. Spirit, and further the name for those who gathered together in one place, as it were formed one

family and by virtue of the inner light also outwardly agreed in confession and life, Barclay, Verantwoording 1757 bl. 212 v. Weingarten ib. 185. 186. Methodism too is governed by the same antithesis. To be sure, Wesley at first tried to reform the church itself, but in 1784 he nevertheless proceeded to separation from the established church; he ordained preachers, placed them under protection of the Tolerantie-acte and joined [22] the converts together in societies, which came together daily for prayer, from time to time held love-feasts, fast-days, watch-nights, prayermeetings etc. and received as principal task to labor for the conversion of others, Schneckenburger, Kleinere prot. Kirchenparteien 1863 S. 103 f. The salvation army of General Booth is the consequence of this Methodism; the converts no longer form a church but a standing army of Christ, a corps of evangelists under an officer, separated from the world by special clothing and manner of life, Kolde, Die Heilsarmee 1885 S. 49 f. No wonder that under all such phenomena John Darby came to reject openly and decidedly every church and church form. In his opinion the N. T. dispensation of the covenant of grace was indeed at first endowed by God with church and office, but these have already in the apostolic time degenerated through men's unfaithfulness and been rejected on God's part. Therefore all churches since that time are nothing but Babel, preparations of the antichrist, wholly and entirely corrupted, to be rejected altogether by the believers. These must now do nothing else than withdraw from the world, edify one another in their meetings with their different gifts and in silence await the return of Christ, Dr. G. J. v. d. Flier, Het Darbisme 's Grav. 1879. Art. Plymouthbrüder in Herzog2.

Thus everything seems to point to a dissolution of the church and to a radical modification of the concept of the church. Yet, over against that,

there is no lack of a powerful reaction. The Russian church, whose supreme administration rests with the Holy Synod and is bound to the emperor by means of the procurator, maintains its claim to the name of the only true, orthodox church and, with suppression of the sects, strives after unity of faith in the whole empire; Pobedonoszew, the present procurator, is an advocate of the absolute monarchy and of the state church and defends the doctrine that the masses find in power the standard of truth, see his Streitfragen, autor. Uebersetzung, Berlin Deubner 1897. The Roman church is still the same as it previously was, when it had heretics and schismatics persecuted and put to death, and in principle can recognize and tolerate no churches alongside itself; if Roman Catholics speak in the interest of religious freedom and separation of church and state, they are to be regarded as friends of both out of calculation, [23] but as enemies of both out of principle, cf. e.g. Stöckl, Lehrb. d. Philos. III 474. Cathrein, Moralphilos. II3 555 f. Hettinger, Apol. des Christ. IV2 407 f. In England, Irvingism first appeared, which wished to reform the church by restoration of the apostleship, J. N. Köhler, Het Irvingisme, 's Grav. 1876, and at present ritualism is spreading in the Anglican church, which more and more reshapes offices, sacraments, worship, ceremonies according to Roman doctrine and practice, art. Tractarianismus in Herzog1. Mr. Walter Wash, Secret History of the Oxford movement 1897. Williams, The crisis in the church of England. Presb. and Ref. Rev. July 1899 p. 389-412. Even among the Lutherans many confessionals went back to the objective institute of church, office, and sacrament and bound to that all communication of grace, Löhe, Drei Bücher von der Kirche 1845. Kliefoth, Acht Bücher v. d. Kirche 1854. Münchmeyer, Das Dogma v. d. uns. u. sichtb. Kirche 1854. Vilmar, Theol. der Thatsachen 1876 S. 48 f. Id. Dogmatik II 212. Stahl, Die

Kirchenverfassung nach Lehre u. Recht der Prot. 2e Ausg. 1862 S. 67 f. But despite all this the church, the longer the more, loses its uniform character. Not only in the Protestant countries, especially in England and America, but also in Russia the number of sects is expanding, J. Gehring, Die Sekten der Russischen Kirche 1003-1897. Nach ihrem Ursprunge und inneren Zusammenhange dargestellt. Leipzig Richter 1898. Even in the Roman church, which so gladly takes pleasure in the division of Protestantism, in many respects the unity is more appearance than reality. Believers and unbelievers stand within its walls just as far from one another as in many churches of the Reformation. The different orders often stand with one another on anything but friendly terms. Dieselben Motive besonderer Frömmigkeit, welche auf katholischem Boden zu neuen Ordensstiftungen führen, wirken auf protestantischen Boden zur Bildung von Sekten, Ritschl, Gesch. des Piet. III 303. And Reform-katholicismus and the "Los-van-Rome" movement show how much discontent in many a heart is hidden beneath the outward splendor of unity. Faith in the one, infallible, alone-salvific church is, over against the existence and the flourishing of so many other churches, no longer to be maintained; the doctrine is contradicted as strongly as possible by life and by history. [24]

While Rome closes its eyes to this development of Christianity and church, Protestant theology runs the danger, for the sake of history, of overlooking the divine institution of the church. According to Schleiermacher the church arose durch das Zusammentreten der einzelnen Wiedergeborenen zu einem geordneten Auf- und Miteinanderwirken, Chr. Gl. § 115. Since, however, regeneration is not a magical change but an ethical renewal, there still always remains in the regenerate a piece of world, and thus in the church a distinction must be made between the

abiding and the changing and vanishing, ib. 125. 126. To this distinction Schleiermacher applies the earlier names of invisible and visible church. Their earlier use was incorrect, for of the invisible church most is not invisible, since regeneration becomes manifest outwardly in confession and life, and of the visible church most is not church, since it belongs to the world. Invisible church indicates not so much persons as workings of the Spirit in the persons, and visible church makes known that these workings of the Spirit in all believers still go together with after-workings of sin, ib. 148. The two thus stand to each other in relation as essence and appearance, as idea and reality, and are in that same sense also conceived by many other theologians, Nitzsch, Syst. d. chr. Lehre § 186-188. Lange, Dogm. II 1090 f. Martensen, Dogm. § 191. Müller, Dogm. Abh. 332 f. Thomasius, Christi Person und Werk II3 505. Frank, Chr. Wahrheit II2 369 f. Kaftan, Dogm. 573. 585. Some in doing so abandon the old names and prefer to speak of kingdom of God and church, A. Dorner, Kirche und Reich Gottes, Gotha 1883. Krauss, Das prot. Dogma v. d. uns. K. 1876, or also of congregation and church, Stahl, Kirchenverfassung 67. De la Saussaye in my Theol. van Ch. d. l. S. 61. Van Oosterzee § 129. One can then still, with Stahl, hold this visible church to be a foundation of Christ; but most nevertheless think of it as a product, a necessary form of existence of the congregation, Lipsius, Dogm. § 859 f. Tiele, Inl. tot de godsdienstwet. II 1899 bl. 141v., or even judge that the institutional church has had its time, and must pass over into the state, Strauss, Dogm. II 618. Rothe, Ethik § 124 f. 440 f. 1167 f., or into the confessing congregation, Rauwenhoff, Wijsb. v. d. godsd. 843. Pfleiderer, Religionsphilos. 1896 S. 745. Sohm, [25] Kirchenrecht passim. Chavannes, Qu’est ce qu’une église, Paris Fischbacher 1897.

6. The name קָהָל, ἐκκλησια, already by virtue of its derivation from verbs which mean to call together, denotes an assembly of people who, for one purpose or another, especially a political or religious purpose, have come together, or, even if at a particular moment they are not assembled, are nevertheless mutually united for such a purpose. Under the Old Testament Israel was the people that had been called together and gathered by God for his service; and in the New Testament this people of Israel has been replaced by the congregation of Christ, which is now the holy people, the chosen race, the royal priesthood of God. The word church, church, kirk, kirche, chiesa, by which ἐκκλησια has been translated, does not express this character of the congregation of Christ as clearly as the original does. Probably it is derived from κυριακη, scil. οἰκια, or κυριακον, scil. οἰκον and thus originally meant, not the congregation itself, but the place of its gathering, the church building, Suicerus s. v. Herzog2 7, 685. At present we use this word in the same sense of the church building, or in that of religious worship (e.g. church begins at ten o'clock), or in that of an instituted group of congregations (the Roman, the Anglican church etc.). The meaning of the New-Testament word ἐκκλησια stands in the background with the word church; in some times the consciousness that church is the designation of the people of God was almost entirely worn away. This is also the reason why the word ἐκκλησια in the Statenvertaling has been translated not by church, but by congregation; for this word did bring out again that the essence of the church lies in the communion of saints. If there were no objections against it, it would deserve consideration to replace the word church by that of congregation. But society and state have appropriated this word in the civil sphere, speak of municipality, municipal council, municipal school, town hall, and have thereby in many

respects made this word unusable for ecclesiastical life. Congregation can and may indeed be used in the ecclesiastical sphere, but then has a definite sense and is not as pliable as the word church, which can assume manifold meanings. For although this word originally [26] indicated the church building and then also the religious worship and the ecclesiastical institute, yet the meaning of people of God, of assembly of Christian believers, is not foreign to it. In that sense it occurs in the twelve articles, in the Ned. Geloofsbel. art. 27-29, in the Dordsche kerkenorde passim. It only depends on revivifying this meaning in consciousness. The words congregation and church can then be used alongside one another but they are never to be distinguished from one another in such a way that the word congregation denotes the assembly of believers in a particular place, and the word church denotes the combining of the congregations into one whole. For church and congregation are both translations of the same word ἐκκλησια and therefore have the same meaning. Both words are names for the assembly of believers, whether in a particular place, whether in a country, whether over the whole earth. It is therefore wholly wrong to think, with congregation, of the true believers, with church, of the apparent believers, to identify both concepts with those of invisible and visible church, or also to understand by congregation the assembly of believers and by church the institute. At most they differ in this, that congregation makes one think more of the communion of believers among one another, and church more of those same believers, as they are organized in an institutional way, under office and ministry of the word. In both cases, however, it is nevertheless the same assembly of believers that is denoted by it; only the point of view differs from which it is regarded. While these two words thus possess citizenship on ecclesiastical terrain, it is quite otherwise with the word

kerkgenootschap. This name has a collegialist aftertaste. It came into use in this country in 1773 through the first versification of the twelve articles of faith, was then in the sense of local or general church taken up in the state regulation of 1798, 1801 and 1805, was in the constitution of 1814 and 1815 replaced by the word religions and religious denominations and thereafter in the constitution of 1848 and 1887 and also again in the law on the churchgenootschappen of 10 Sept. 1853 introduced alongside the name of religious denominations, Heraut 627. The combining of church and association is a mesalliance and mother of many errors. A church is precisely not an association, for it does not arise through [27] voluntary accession of adult persons but out of regeneration by the H. Spirit. Finally it also deserves no recommendation to replace the word church in the sense of the people of God by that of kingdom of God. For between the two there is a not unimportant difference. The kingdom of God, with which Jesus' preaching begins, is in the first place an eschatological concept for the approaching Messianic kingdom with all its goods. And also, insofar as this kingdom is already present here on earth in the hearts through regeneration, forgiveness and renewal, it consists much more in spiritual goods than in a community of persons. The kingdom of heaven is or becomes precisely a possession of the poor in spirit, the pure in heart, the little children and itself consists in peace, joy, gladness through the H. Spirit. Therefore it is, at least here on earth, not organized; it is in principle everywhere where the spiritual benefits of Christ have been bestowed, and is nowhere on earth rounded off and completed, deel III 233v. But the church is especially a diesseitig concept, a community of persons, equipped with offices and ministries and appearing in the visible as the gathered people of God. The church is thus the means by which Christ distributes the benefits of the

Godsrijk and prepares its completion. And on its way, to cause the Godsrijk to come, it takes up all kinds of elements that are impure and in fact do not belong to it (hypocrites and also the old man in the believers), while the kingdom of God, consisting in goods, is pure and unmixed and includes only the regenerate. Christ has been given to the congregation as a head, precisely so that God at the end may appear as King of his people and may be all in all. Cf. Philippi, Kirchl. Gl. V 3, 203. Frank, Chr. Wahrheit II 375. Kaftan, Dogm. 584.

Now there is no doubt that, according to Holy Scripture, the essence of the church lies in this, that it is the people of God. For the church is a realization of election, and this is an election in Christ unto calling, justification, glorification, Rom. 8:28, unto conformity to the Son of God, Rom. 8:29, unto holiness and salvation, Ef. 1:4v. The blessings which are bestowed upon the church are in the first place inward and spiritual in nature and consist in calling and regeneration, in faith and justification, in sanctification and glorification. [28] They are goods of the kingdom of heaven, benefits of the covenant of grace, promises for this but above all for the life to come. On that ground the church is called the body of Christ, 1 Cor. 12:27, Ef. 5:23, Col. 1:18, the bride of Christ, 2 Cor. 11:2, Ef. 5:32, Op. 19:7, 21:2, the sheepfold of Christ, who lays down his life for the sheep and is known by them, Joh. 10, the building, the temple, the house of God, Mt. 16:18, Ef. 2:20, 1 Petr. 2:5, built up of living stones, 1 Petr. 2:5, upon the cornerstone Christ and upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, 1 Cor. 3:17, 2 Cor. 6:16, 17, Ef. 2:22, Op. 21:2-4, the people, the possession, the Israel of God, Rom. 9:25, 2 Cor. 6:16, Hebr. 8:10, 1 Petr. 2:9, 10. The members of the church are called branches on the vine, Joh. 15, living stones, 1 Petr. 2:5, elect, called, believers, beloved, brothers and sisters,

children of God, etc., and they who are not this in truth are in Scripture regarded as chaff with the grain, Mt. 3:12, as weeds among the wheat, Mt. 13:13, as bad fish in the net, Mt. 13:47, as a man without a wedding garment at the wedding, Mt. 22:11, as called but not chosen, Mt. 22:14, as bad branches on the vine, Joh. 15:2, as not Israel, though being from Israel, Rom. 2:28, 9:6, as evil persons, who must be put away, 1 Cor. 5:12, as vessels unto dishonor, 2 Tim. 2:20, as such as have gone out from us but were not of us, 1 Joh. 2:19 etc. All this raises it above all doubt, that the church according to her essence is an assembly of true believers. They who do not partake of sincere faith may outwardly belong to the church; yet they do not constitute her essence, her forma, they are in, but not the ecclesia.

This is further confirmed by the manner in which Scripture speaks of the communion of saints. The believers have one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, and so also they have one Spirit, Ef. 4:4-6, in whose communion they live, by whom they are born again, baptized into one body and united with Christ, Joh. 3:5, 14:17, Rom. 8:9, 14, 16, 1 Cor. 12:3, 13, 2 Cor. 1:22, 5:5, Ef. 1:13, 4:30, 1 Joh. 2:20. And this Spirit does not annul, in the unity, the diversity which exists among the believers, but He maintains and confirms it. Just as He in creation and preservation adorned and perfected all things in their [29] manner, part II 295, and among Israel bestowed all kinds of natural and spiritual gifts, part II 230; so on the day of Pentecost He communicated Himself with all His charismata to the church of Christ. These charismata in a broader sense also include the benefits of grace, which are the portion of all believers, Rom. 5:15, 16, 6:23; but in a narrower sense they denote those special gifts which in different measure and degree have been bestowed upon believers for one another’s benefit, Rom. 1:11, 1 Cor. 1:7, 2 Cor. 1:11, 1 Tim. 4:14, 2 Tim.

1:6 and especially Rom. 12:6-9 and 1 Cor. 12:12 v. Of all these gifts the H. Spirit, who takes them all from Christ, Joh. 16:13, 14, Ef. 4:7, is the distributor; He distributes them to each one, as He likewise wills, yet not arbitrarily, but in connection with the measure of faith, with the place which someone occupies in the church, and with the task to which he is called, Rom 12:3, 6, 2 Cor. 10:13, Ef. 4:7, 1 Petr. 4:10, so that each gift is a φανερωσις του πνευματος, 1 Cor. 12:7. These gifts are very many in number. Paul mentions several of them, and by no means intends to give a complete list. The Roman Catholics speak, just as of seven capital sins, seven virtues, seven beatitudes, so also gladly, with appeal to Jes. 11:2, 3, of seven dona Spiritus Sancti, Lombardus, Sent. III dist. 34. Thomas, S. Theol. I 2 qu. 68. II 2 qu. 8. Bonaventura, Brevil. V 5. Meschler, Die Gabe des h. Pfingstfestes, 3te Aufl. Freiburg 1896 S. 233 f. Simar, Dogm. 554. Heinrich-Gutberlet, Dogm. VIII 631. But this set of seven does not include the proper charismata, which are enumerated by Paul and which in Roman theology are rather discussed under the name of gratiae gratis datae, Simar ib. 486. And these are not to be limited to a set of seven. To those counted up by Paul may also still be added those of prayer and thanksgiving, of admonition and consolation, of liberality and hospitality, etc. A classification is therefore also difficult to give. Some clearly bear a supernatural character or were bestowed only in or after conversion, others display more the nature of natural gifts, which have been heightened and sanctified by the H. Spirit. The former came especially strongly to the foreground in the first period, the latter are more proper to the church in its historical, normal development. But whatever those gifts may be, they all serve for the benefit of the church. The [30] communio sanctorum is a sanctorum communicatio, Calvin, Inst. IV 1, 3. The H. Spirit does not

distribute the charismata to the members of the church for the benefit of themselves, but for the benefit of others. They may not be buried or neglected, but must be employed willingly and with joy for the benefit and unto the salvation of the other members, Heid. Cat. 55; they serve for οἰκοδομη, 1 Cor. 14:12, Ef. 4:12, and are subordinate to love, which is the most excellent gift. For this love is yet another than general love of neighbor; it is the love for the brethren, for the household members of the faith. Jesus calls this love a new commandment, Joh. 13:34, 35, 15:12, 17:26, because love in Israel did not bear a purely spiritual character but was interwoven with the bonds of blood, and the love which He now brings about among His disciples is first completely pure, unmixed, and independent of earthly relations. The members of Jesus' church are brothers and sisters among one another, Mt. 12:48, 18:15, 23:8, 25:40, 28:10, Joh. 15:14, 15, 20:17, Rom. 8:29, Hebr. 2:11 etc. They are children of one family; God is their Father, Ef. 4:6, Christ their firstborn brother, Rom. 8:29, Jerusalem, which is above, their mother, Gal. 4:26. And thus they have to serve one another with all their spiritual and natural gifts. The church is a communion of saints. Cf. concerning these spiritual gifts the explanations on the article of faith of the communion of saints and further, Amesius, Med. Theol. II 2 § 19-23. Voetius, Disp. II 1086-1100. Neander, Pflanzung u. Leitung d. christl. Kirche5 S. 180 f. Pfleiderer, Der Paulinismus 242. Holtzmann, Neut. Theol. II 143. 175. Art. Geistesgaben of Cremer in Herzog3. Lauterburg, Der Begriff des Charisma u. seine Bedeutung für die prakt. Theol. Gütersloh 1898.

7. So long as we hold fast to this essence of the church, its concept gives birth to no excessive difficulty. The church is then always, in a broader or in a narrower sense, the assembly of believers. In the broadest sense it

includes all who through faith in Christ have become saved or will also still become so. Adam and Eve before the fall do then indeed not yet belong to it, for they then had no need of a mediator. And the angels also cannot be reckoned to it, although this was done by many; [31] for Christ is indeed the Lord of the angels and has through his cross placed all things, also angels and men, in the right relation to God and to one another; but angels are nevertheless not created after God's image, have not fallen and have not been redeemed by Christ and are thus also no members of the church, which Christ gathers unto eternal life. The believers do according to Hebr. 12:22 indeed come to the fellowship with the thousands of angels, but these are clearly distinguished from the πανηγυρις και ἐκκλησια πρωτοτοκων, vs. 23, cf. deel II 442-445. III 405-408. Members of the church are only men who through faith in Christ have been preserved. To it therefore belong all believers who from the paradise promise up to this moment have lived on earth and have been taken up not into the limbus patrum or into purgatory but into heaven, Hebr. 12:23. To it belong all believers who now still live on earth. And to it belong in a certain sense also all those who later still, up to the end of the ages, will believe in Christ. For the church, also when it is taken in this broadest sense, is no Platonic state, which exists only in the imagination and never becomes reality, but it has the guarantee of its existence now or in the future in the decree of God, in the firmness of the covenant of grace, in the mediatorship of Christ, in the promise of the H. Spirit. The greatest part of the members of this church is then, however, at a given moment not on earth; for from paradise up to the present there have already been many thousands and millions taken up into heaven and their number is daily, from moment to moment, increased (ecclesia triumphans), and there are many who now still do not believe or are even not yet born

and yet infallibly certainly will come to faith. The church, as assembly of the believers who at a given moment live on earth (ecclesia militans), is thus only a small part of the church, taken in its broadest sense. Yet it is good and necessary, to hold fast to the connection of the church on earth with that in the past and in the future. For it is one assembly, one ἐκκλησια of those who are written up in the heavens and who once as a bride without spot or wrinkle will stand before God's countenance. And the maintaining of this unity of the whole church increases the sense of community, steels the courage and spurs to the struggle. [32] If we further limit ourselves to that part of the church that is on earth (ecclesia militans), then this can again be taken more broadly or more narrowly. We can in that case think of all the believers together, who now in all churches, among all peoples, in all lands are present (ecclesia universalis), of the believers in one land or in a province, Hd. 9:31 (ecclesia nationalis, provincialis) or also of the believers in a particular place, whether city or village (ecclesia particularis, localis). In that connection it then deserves remark, that the ecclesia universalis (nationalis) precedes the ecclesia particularis. The church of Christ is an organism, in which the whole goes before the parts; it has its origin in paradise, Gen. 3:15, or also before the days of the N. Test. in Jerusalem, Hd. 1:8; the church at Jerusalem was, so long as it alone existed, the ecclesia universalis, the church of Christ on earth, and the churches, which soon appeared alongside it, came into being not autochthonously but from Jerusalem through the preaching of the apostles and evangelists.

Up to this point the concept of the church is clear and plain. But now a double difficulty arises. The first consists in this, that this concept of church in Scripture is applied to concrete, historically existing, closed groups of persons, among whom there are also always unbelievers. In the O. Test. the

whole people was called the people of God, although by no means everything was Israel that was from Israel. In the churches of the N. Test. there was also, though to a much lesser degree, chaff among the wheat and weeds among the grain. And after the apostolic time the churches have repeatedly become secularized, degenerated, divided, and yet we still all call them by the name of churches. Theology, like Scripture, has at all times acknowledged this fact and, following it, has always declared that the essence of the church was determined not by the unbelievers but by the believers, above p. 8 f. Augustine clarified this presence of unbelievers in the church by the scriptural image of chaff and wheat, or also by that of body and soul, outer and inner man, evil humors in the body; the unbelievers are in the body of Christ quomodo humores mali, in Seeberg t. a. p. 45. And thus also spoke the scholastic and Roman theologians. Bellarmine, e.g., does indeed attempt to show that unbelievers are also members of the church, but he does not get beyond the assertion that they are it aliquo [33] modo, de eccles. mil. III 2; they are only de corpore, not de anima ecclesiae; the boni are pars interior, the mali are pars exterior of the church; the unbelievers are membra mortua, arida, who are connected with the church only externa conjunctione; they do not belong to the kingdom of Christ, quoad fidei professionem, but to the kingdom of the devil, quantum ad morum perversitatem; they are filii propter formam pietatis, alieni propter amissionem virtutum; there may not be two churches, yet there are two partes in the church, ib. III 9. And the Catech. Rom. says that in the church militant there are duo hominum genera and that according to Scripture there are bad fish in the net and weeds in the field and chaff on the threshing floor, foolish among the wise virgins and unclean animals in the ark, I 10 qu. 6. 7. In theory this does not differ much from the doctrine

of the Reformation; but in practice the situation with the church toward the end of the Middle Ages looked quite different, and Rome also continually fosters the idea that outward membership, historical faith, observance of the commandments of the church and submission to the pope constitute the essence of the church. Against that the Reformation raised protest and adopted the distinction between visible and invisible church. Augustine had already said of the nominal Christians, quum intus videntur, ab illa invisibili caritatis compage separati sunt, de bapt. III 19 in Seeberg t. a. p. 42; and actually Rome can have no objection to this distinction and also itself accepts it, insofar as it distinguishes in the one church duo hominum genera, duas partes. Bellarmine treats, de eccl. mil. III 10, of the infideles occulti, and Möhler, Symb. § 49, praises Luther, when he conceives the church as a community of saints and says that the believers, the Unsichtbaren, are the bearers of the visible church. But the distinction between visible and invisible church can be understood differently, above p. 18. Most of these conceptions, however, are to be rejected or at least do not come under discussion in dogmatics. The church is not to be called invisible because Christ, because the ecclesia triumphans, because the church completed at the end of the ages cannot now be observed by us; nor also because the church on earth in many places and countries is not seen by us or in times of persecution is hidden or is sometimes deprived of the ministry of word and sacrament. The distinction between visible and invisible church is applicable only to the ecclesia [34] militans and then indicates that the church according to its spiritual side or in its true members is invisible. Both these meanings have flowed together among Lutherans and Reformed and also cannot be kept apart from one another. The church is an object of faith. The inward faith of the heart, regeneration, true conversion, the

hidden communion with Christ, etc., are spiritual goods which are not perceptible with the natural eye, and which nevertheless bestow upon the church its proper forma. And to no single human being has God given the infallible standard into his hands by which he can judge the spiritual life of others. De intimis non judicat ecclesia. The Lord alone knows those who are his. Thus it is possible, and it has also always been a fact in the Christian church, that chaff lay hidden among the wheat and hypocrites were concealed among the true believers. The name church, used of the ecclesia militans, of the assembly of believers on earth, therefore has among all Christians, both Roman and Protestant, always had a figurative sense. It is so called, not according to the unbelievers who are found in it, but according to the believers, who form its essential constituent part and give it its essence. The whole is named after the part. A church is and remains an assembly of true Christian believers.

8. So understood, the distinction between the visible and invisible church can be impugned by no one and must rather be acknowledged by all. But there is still another difficulty connected with the concept of the church. The assembly of believers on earth is not only charismatic but also instituted. It is not only itself the property of Christ, but also serves to win others for Christ. It is coetus, but also mater fidelium; organism but also institute; end and means at the same time. The relation of the church as organism to the church as institute is first discussed in the following paragraph, on the government of the church. For just as the concept of the state is difficult to define and then only becomes clear when people and government are distinguished and treated separately within it, so a good definition of the concept of the church can be given only if one guards against identifying the assembly of believers [35] with its organization in

the institute, Turretinus, Theol. El. XVIII 3, 10. Stahl, Kirchenverfassung 46. Many, however, connect the distinction of the church as organism and as institute with that of invisible and visible and thereby imperceptibly give to the latter a sense that does not belong to it. On the one side stand those who define not only the church according to its idea or the ecclesia triumphans but also the ecclesia militans on earth as an assembly of the praedestinati or electi (Wiclef), or of the perfecti (Pelagius according to August., de haer. 88, the Anabaptists according to Calvin, Inst. IV 1, 8 and many others), or of those, qui nunquam lapsi sunt (Novatianus), or also of those members of the church who go to the Lord's Supper (communicants, as many in America conceive the church). On the other side are the Roman Catholics, who shift the center of gravity of the church from the assembly of believers to the hierarchical institute, to the monarchia externa et suprema totius orbis and seek its essence much more in the ecclesia docens than in the ecclesia audiens. And in that direction also go all who, in order to retain the unbelievers and hypocrites at least to some extent as true members, define the church as an assembly of the called (Melanchthon, Löhe, Kliefoth etc.) or of the baptized (Münchmeyer, Delitzsch, Vilmar etc.). Both these views are one-sided and fall short of the essence of the church. On the first standpoint the church becomes wholly invisible, remains an idea, and does not appear in reality. Election as such does not yet make someone a member of the church on earth. Indeed the elect, who have not yet come to faith, belong to the church as it exists in the thought and decree of God; they can even be said, potentia, to belong to the church, but they are nevertheless actu not yet members of it. And the church also cannot be defined as an assembly of the perfect, of the non-fallen, or of communicants, for believers do not attain perfection in this life, are not

guaranteed by the promises of God against every fall, and are not limited to the number of those who go to the Lord's Supper. Nor is the second, above-mentioned definition in accordance with the essence of the church. For outward membership, calling, and baptism are no proof of true faith; many are called who are not elect; many are baptized who do not believe; [36] not all are Israel who are of Israel. While the former thus do not arrive at any visible church, the latter neglect the invisible church. Only then do these two both come into their own, when the church is conceived as an assembly of believers. For it is sincere, true faith that saves, receives forgiveness of sins and eternal life. That faith is a matter of the heart, yet it does not remain shut up within man but reveals itself outwardly in confession and walk, Rom. 10:10, and confession and walk are signs of the inward faith of the heart, Mt. 7:17, 10:32, 1 Joh. 4:2. It is true that faith and confession are by no means always in agreement; there is faith, e.g. in the children of believers, that is not made manifest in deeds, and there is a confessing that consists in the crying Lord, Lord and is not born from true faith. But nevertheless the conception of the church as an assembly of believers has this advantage over its definition as an assembly of the called and baptized, that it maintains that on which it depends for every person and for the whole church. Not being called and being baptized decides, but he who shall have believed and shall have been baptized shall be saved, whereas he who shall not have believed, even if he was called and baptized, shall be condemned, Mk. 16:16.

From this it follows that the distinction of the church as institute and organism is a wholly different one than that between visible and invisible church, and may not be identified with this. For institute and organism are both designations of the church according to its visible side. In this

connection one must not forget that also institute and organism of the church, appearing in the visible, have an invisible, spiritual background. For office and gift, ministry of word and sacrament, brotherly love and communion of saints all rest on operations that proceed from the glorified Head of the congregation through the H. Spirit. Rejection therefore is deserved by the representation as if the institute, as something accidental and external, had been added in a mechanical manner to the church as assembly of believers. But yet, when we think of the church as institute and as organism, we think in the first place of the church according to its visible side, that is, of the offices and ministries with which it is equipped and of the communion of saints, as that is manifested in brotherly love. And precisely in these two the church appears outwardly in visible fashion. Incorrect therefore is also the opinion that the church becomes visible only in the institute, in office and ministry, in word and sacrament, in some form of church government. Even when all this is thought away, the church is nevertheless visible. For every believer manifests his faith in confession and walk in every sphere of life and all believers together stand with their faith and life over against the world. In heaven there is no office and ministry, no word and sacrament any more and yet the church will be fully visible. Visibility and invisibility thus distinguish the church from a wholly different point of view than institute and organism. The latter distinction tells us in what the church becomes visible and knowable for us; the former teaches that that visible appearance has an invisible, spiritual side, which is known with certainty to God alone. Therewith it is now of itself also given that visible and invisible church are not two churches. This objection was already raised by the Donatists against Augustine and was later repeated by the Romanists against the Protestants. But the accusation rests on

misunderstanding. Rome itself acknowledges, as has been shown above, that there are duo hominum genera in the church, that it has duas partes, and now indeed tries to show that the unbelievers aliquo modo belong to the church but yet does not dare to say that they constitute the essence of the church. In fact it thus stands before the same difficulty as the Reformation. For that the hypocrites aliquo modo belong to the church is no point of difference. The Protestants also acknowledge that they are in ecclesia and belong to the church, as the evil branches belong to the vine and the chaff to the grain. Only they deny that these give to the church its forma, for sincere faith is it and nothing else that saves and incorporates into Christ. The unbelievers therefore are not the essence of the church, they are not the ecclesia. Invisible and visible church are thus also absolutely not designations for the group of unbelievers and of believers that are in a church. In the church discipline over doctrine and life is to be maintained according to the Lord's command; but every attempt to separate the believers and the unbelievers, and to set up an ecclesiola in ecclesia, is likewise in conflict with the Lord's command; Mt. 13:30 does not forbid this, for the field meant there is not the church but [38] the world, vs. 38, but it follows from it that we are bound to confession and walk and cannot or may not judge over the heart. Unbelievers therefore no more constitute the essence of the visible than of the invisible church; they belong to the church in neither of the two respects, although the right and the competence are lacking to us to separate them from the believers and to cast them out. Indeed it can be said still more strongly that also the old man, who remains in the believers, does not belong to the church. Therewith Schleiermacher is not yet right when he deems the essence of the church to be situated in operations of the H. Spirit, for the church is no assembly of operations but

of persons; it is human beings who are reborn by the H. Spirit and brought to faith and who as such, as new human beings, form the essence of the church. But yet, the church is an assembly of believers, and all that does not arise from faith, from the new but from the old man, does not belong to the church and is therefore once cast out. Visible and invisible church are for this reason two sides of one and the same church; they are the same believers, who are considered the one time from the side of faith, which dwells in the heart and is certainly known to God alone, and the other time from the side of confession and of life, which is turned toward us and is perceptible for us. Because the church here on earth is becoming, these two sides are never, even in the purest church, equal to one another. There are always unbelievers within, and believers outside the church; multi lupi intus, multae oves foris. The latter was e.g. under the O. Test. the case with Naäman the Syrian and still applies now to all who for one reason or another live outside the communion of the instituted churches and yet partake of the true faith. But all this nevertheless detracts nothing from the fact that the essence of the church lies only in the believers.

9. If the church according to its essence is an assembly of true Christian believers and these are known only to God, the question becomes important by what the church can be known by us. The Roman Christian therefore has above all an objection to the Reformation concept of the church, because it undermines the certainty of the church and thus of the salvation of his soul and opens the door to doubt, division, [39] indifference. Bellarmine says it as clearly as possible: necesse est, ut nobis certitudine infallibili constet, qui coetus hominum sit vera Christi ecclesia, nam cum Scripturae traditiones et omnia plane dogmata ex testimonio ecclesiae pendeant, nisi certissimi simus, quae sit vera ecclesia, incerta erunt prorsus omnia. This now is

impossible, if sincere faith alone truly makes someone a member of the church, for this can never be known by us with certainty, and a cognitio conjecturalis is insufficient; we have need here of a certitudo infallibilis, de eccl. mil. III c. 10, for tenemur omnes sub periculo mortis aeternae verae ecclesiae nos adjungere et in illa perseverare, ib. c. 12. The true church must therefore be so visibilis and palpabilis, ut est coetus populi Romani, vel regnum Galliae aut respublica Venetorum, ib. c. 2. Hence Bellarmine exerts all his powers to prove the truth of the Roman church. He enumerates no fewer than 15 notae, namely ipsum catholicae ecclesiae nomen, antiquitas, duratio diuturna, multitudo et varietas credentium, successio episcoporum, conspiratio in doctrina cum ecclesia antiqua, unio membrorum inter se et cum capite, sanctitas doctrinae, efficacia doctrinae, sanctitas vitae primorum patrum, gloria miraculorum, lumen propheticum, confessio adversariorum, infelix exitus eorum qui ecclesiam oppugnant, felicitas temporalis, de eccl. mil. IV c. 4-18. The Roman theologians follow this example, but usually reduce the fifteen notae to the four which are mentioned in the symbolum Nic.-Const., namely the unitas, sanctitas, catholicitas and apostolicitas, Perrone, Prael. I 248. Liebermann, Instit. theol. I 255. Scheeben-Atzberger, Dogm. IV 372. Jansen, Prael. I 659. Hettinger, Apol. 7te Aufl. IV 411, V 106. In addition, it still deserves attention that Rome in the proper sense has no notae or criteria by which the true church can be known. For these presuppose a standard that lies above the church and according to which it may be judged by everyone. And such a standard Rome does not have, for Scripture is dependent on the church, and the church itself is the highest standard for doctrine and life. Notae ecclesiae in Rome are therefore nothing other than indicia, properties, in which the church comes to expression and reveals itself. Proofs for the

church are the same as those for Christianity, for both are one in Rome. And these proofs do not make the proposition that the [40] Roman church is the true church evidenter veram but nevertheless evidenter credibilem, ib. IV c. 3. Likewise the Vaticanum speaks, III c. 3: Deus per Filium suum unigenitum Ecclesiam instituit, suaeque institutionis manifestis notis instruxit, ut ea tamquam custos et magistra verbi revelati ab omnibus posset agnosci. Ad solam enim catholicam Ecclesiam ea pertinent omnia, quae ad evidentem fidei christianae credibilitatem tam multa et tam mira divinitus sunt disposita. Quin etiam Ecclesia per se ipsa, ob suam nempe admirabilem propagationem, eximiam sanctitatem et inexhaustam in omnibus bonis foecunditatem, ob catholicam unitatem invictamque stabilitatem, magnum quoddam et perpetuum est motivum credibilitatis et divinae suae legationis testimonium irrefragabile. The truth of the church is therefore not absolutely provable for everyone; for then the church would not be an articulus fidei and faith would not be free and meritorious. According to the Vaticanum, there must, alongside the testimony that proceeds from the church, be added an efficax subsidium ex superna virtute. In fact Rome thereby adopts the same subjective standpoint as the Reformation. The motives, however strong, cannot in actual fact move to faith. It is God's Spirit alone who can inwardly convince someone firmly and certainly of the truth of divine revelation. The deepest ground for faith is also in Rome not Scripture or the church, but the lumen interius. Rome with its infallible church and its infallible pope has in principle nothing more than the churches of the Reformation, for church and pope are, however visible, nevertheless articuli fidei, cf. dl. I 425. 426. 486-489.

The marks which Rome gives for the true church are therefore in no respect clearer and stronger than the pure administration of the word, which

was acknowledged by the Reformation as a mark of the church. Some of the marks named by Bellarmine are of very subordinate value. The gift of miracles is absolutely no conclusive proof for the truth of the doctrine which someone proclaims, Deut. 13:1, 2, Mt. 7:22, 23, 24:24 etc. cf. part I 429v.; the unhappy end of the enemies and persecutors of the church is for the most part only a legend, as Roman Catholics now also acknowledge, Nik. Paulus, Luthers Lebensende, Freiburg 1898; and the earthly prosperity of the church is always temporary, alternates with persecution and [41] oppression, and can just as well be adduced as a proof against the truth of the church, Mt. 5:10, 16:24, Joh. 16:33, Hd. 14:22, 2 Tim. 3:12. With other marks everything depends on the sense in which they are understood; the name catholic is also adopted by Protestant churches and is in itself no more a proof for the truth of the Roman church than the name Christ, which the false Christs appropriate to themselves, Mt. 24:24, or the name Israel or seed of Abraham, in which the Jews boasted, Joh. 8:33, Rom. 9:6; antiquity, historical continuity, and unbroken succession belong not only to Rome but also to other churches, e.g. the Greek, and in themselves prove no more anything for the truth of the Roman church than they did for that of the Jewish community in Jesus' days; unity and catholicity are pretensions of Rome, which cannot nullify the fact that millions of Christians live outside her; there is not only one church, there are many churches, and there is not a single one that includes all believers. The remaining marks, agreement with the doctrine of the apostles, holiness of doctrine, renewing power which proceeds from it, holy life of many of its confessors, by no means belong only to Rome but also to many other churches, and are subject to the same objections as those which are raised by the Roman Catholics against the Protestant marks and will presently be discussed. Cf. Beza, de eccl. cath.

notis, Tract. theol. III 132. Polanus, Synt. p. 532 sq. Amesius, Bellarminus enervatus II 56-72. Maresius, Syst. theol. XVI 23 sq. Turretinus, Theol. El. XVIII qu. 13. Mastricht, Theol. VII 1, 34. Moor VI 50. M. Vitringa IX 1 p. 98. Gerhard, Loc. XXII c. 10. 11. Quenstedt, Theol. IV 503.

The Roman church indeed rejoices in her unity and points with self-satisfaction to the division of Protestantism. But she pays for this joy at a dear price. In the first place she is compelled to transfer the essence of the church more and more from the assembly of believers to the institute of the hierarchy, i.e. in the end to the pope. With more right than Louis XIV could say: l'état c'est moi, the pope can declare: the church is I. Ubi papa, ibi ecclesia. If then, as is proper, in the case of the church one thinks not even of the institute but of the assembly of believers, the division in the Roman [42] church is not so much less than in the Protestant churches. The difference is only that Rome, seeking her strength in the celibate hierarchy, quietly allows all directions and opinions to exist side by side in the church and deprives her members, even the most unbelieving, of the energy, the sense of freedom and the sense of truth, to break with the church and their own untrue position. In the second place Rome pays for that joy with the dear price of the extra ecclesiam nulla salus. The doctrine of Scripture, that salvation is bound to faith in Christ, was soon, over against schism and heresy, so understood that everyone who wished to become partaker of salvation in Christ had to be connected with the bishop, Ign. ad Eph. 4. 5. Phil. 3. Trall. 7. Those who wish to be saved must flee into the holy churches of God, Theoph. ad Autol. II 14. Sola catholica ecclesia est, quae verum cultum retinet. Hic est fons veritatis, hoc domicilium fidei, hoc templum Dei; quo si quis non intraverit vel a quo si quis exiverit, a spe vitae ac salutis aeternae alienus est, Lact., Inst. div. IV 30. The church

fathers often used for the church the image of the ark, and Cyprian in particular made use of it in order to raise the extra ecclesiam nulla salus above all doubt, e.g. de unit. eccl. 6 Ep. 69, 2. 74, 11. Augustine had no other opinion: manifestum est, eum qui non est in membris Christi, christianam salutem habere non posse, de unit. eccl. 2. Outside the church someone can take everything with him, sed nunquam nisi in ecclesia catholica salutem potest invenire, Super gestis e. Emerito. Councils and popes have confirmed this doctrine. The fourth Lateran council declared in c. 1 that there is one catholic church of believers, outside which absolutely no one is saved. Trent said that without the catholic faith it is impossible to please God, Sess. 5. Boniface VIII pronounced that submission to the pope was de necessitate salutis. Eugenius IV taught that no one outside the catholic church can become partaker of eternal life. And Pius IX declared in the allocution of 9 Dec. 1854: tenendum ex fide est, extra apostolicam Romanam ecclesiam salvum fieri neminem posse. Rome must therefore be intolerant; she can recognize no churches alongside herself; she herself is the only church, the bride of Christ, the temple of the H. Spirit. Yet the facts have also become too powerful for Rome. Thousands and millions in the course of the centuries have broken the [43] communion with the Roman church, Novatians, Donatists, Greek Christians, Arians, Monophysites, Monothelites, many sects in the Middle Ages and then in the sixteenth century more than half of Christendom. And although Rome by the Counter-Reformation has regained much, yet she now counts of the 500 million Christians scarcely half and in numerical strength is going rather backward than forward. In the face of these facts it is not maintainable that there is no salvation outside the Roman church. It is difficult for Roman Catholics themselves to remain faithful to this doctrine; many are inclined

to concessions. They make a distinction between those who consciously, intentionally, pertinaciter and therefore culpabiliter leave the church, and those who are carried along and misled, bona fide are outside the church and voto, desiderio, animo still belong to the church, ad animam ecclesiae. In that same spirit the thesis of Baius was rejected by the Roman see; infidelitas pure negativa in his, quibus Christus non est praedicatus, peccatum est, and Pius IX in the allocution of 9 Dec. 1854 pronounced: pro certo habendum esse, eos qui verae religionis ignorantia laborant, si ea invincibilis set. nulla posse hujus rei culpa obstringi. Bellarminus, de eccl. mil. III c. 3. 6. Perrone, Prael. I 331. Klee, Dogm. I 141. Jansen, Prael. I 344. Schanz, Apol. III 188. Dublanchy, De axiomate: extra ecclesiam nulla salus, dissertatio theologica. Bar-le-Duc, Contant-Laguerre 1895.

10. For Protestantism the doctrine of the marks of the true church had an entirely different significance. Through the Reformation the unity of Western Christendom was broken once and for all, and different churches came to stand alongside and over against one another. The Reformers had to demonstrate that the church of Rome was not the true one, and that the churches of the Reformation corresponded to the essence of the church, as Scripture defined it. Their reforming act presupposed that the church was not αὐτοπιστος, that it could err and deviate, and that there was a higher authority to which it too had to submit. And that could be nothing other than Holy Scripture, the Word of God. Unanimously, therefore, all the Reformers went back to Scripture, saw in it also the standard of the church, and accordingly determined the marks by which the true church was to be distinguished from the false. In [44] the enumeration of those notae there was indeed some difference. In his writing Von den Concilien und Kirchen Luther counted seven: pure administration of the word, of baptism, of the

Lord's Supper, of the keys, lawful election of the ministers, the public prayer and instruction, and the cross; but elsewhere he named only two, pure administration of word and sacrament. And so did Melanchthon in the Conf. Aug. art. 8 and in the Loci, and later Lutheran theologians, Gerhard, Loc. XXII § 131. Quenstedt, Theol. IV 503; only Melanchthon in the Examen ordinandorum added to these two yet a third rather hierarchical mark: obedientia ministerio debita juxta evangelium. Of the Reformed, some, such as Beza, Sohnius, Alsted, Amesius, Heidanus, Maresius, gave one mark, the pure administration of the word; others, such as Calvin, Bullinger, Zanchius, Junius, Gomarus, Mastricht, Marck e. a. two, namely pure administration of word and sacrament; many, such as Conf. Gall., Belg, Scot. I, Hyperius, Martyr, Ursinus, Trelcatius, Walaeus, Amyraldus, Heidegger, Wendelinus, added as a third yet the right administration of discipline or the holiness of life. But rightly Alsted, Alting, Maresius, Hottinger, Heidanus, Turretinus, Mastricht e. a. observed that this was more a difference in name than in the matter, and that there is actually only one mark, namely the one and the same word, which is then in various ways, in preaching, instruction, confession, sacrament, life, etc., administered and confessed, M. Vitringa IX 1 p. 101-109. That the Reformation rightly sought the mark of the church in the Word of God is, with Scripture in hand, beyond any doubt. For, without the word of God there is no church, Spr. 29:18, Jes. 8:20, Jer. 8:9, Hos. 4:6; by word and sacrament Christ gathers his church, Mt. 28:19, which is built on the doctrine of apostles and prophets, Mt. 16:18, Ef. 2:20; by the word he regenerates, 1 Petr. 1:23, Jak. 1:18, he works faith, Rom. 10:14, 1 Cor. 4:15, he cleanses and sanctifies, Joh. 15:3, Ef. 5:26. And they who have thus been regenerated and renewed by the word of God have the calling to confess Christ, Mt. 10:32, Rom.

10:9, hear his voice, Joh. 10:27, keep his word, Joh. 8:31, 32, 14:23, test the spirits, 1 Joh. 4:1, avoid whoever does not bring this doctrine, Gal. 1:8, Tit. 3:10, 2 Joh. 9. The word is indeed the soul of the church, Calvin, [45] Inst. IV 12, 1. All service in the church is a service of the word. God gives his word to the church, and this one receives it, preserves it, administers it, teaches it, confesses it before God, before one another, before the world in word and in deed. In the one mark of the word the others are included as further applications. Where God's word is rightly preached, there the sacrament is also purely administered, the truth of God confessed according to the intention of the Spirit, conduct and walk ordered according to God's testimony. Even Rome cannot deny that God's word is the mark of the church. Gerhard, Loc. XXII § 138 cites many church fathers who clearly and distinctly express this. Thus Tertullian says: those are true churches which hold what they have received from the apostles, de praescr. 21. Formerly, says Chrysostom on Mt. 24:15, it could in many ways be shown which was the church of Christ, but since the heresies have crept in, this cannot be indicated otherwise than by the Scriptures; for those Scriptures, he declares, hom. 33 in Act. Ap., are simple and true, so that it is easy to judge by them which doctrine is the true one. Repeatedly Augustine speaks in this spirit: Between us and the Donatists the question is, where the church is. What then shall we do? Shall we seek it in the words of Donatus or in the words of its head, the Lord Jesus Christ? I think that we ought to seek it in the words of him who is truth and knows his body best, for he knows who are his, de unit. eccl. 2. Bellarmine himself defines the church as an assembly of men bound together by the profession of the same Christian faith and by the communion of the same sacraments etc., includes the sanctitas doctrinae among the marks of the church, ib. IV 11, and

concedes that in some cases, if Scripture is accepted as God's word, Scripture is better known than the church and proves its truth, ib. IV 2. In answering the question which are the distinguishing marks of the church, Rome too must use Scripture as ground of proof, if it does not wish to remain standing with a sic volo, sic jubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas, cf. others also in Gerhard ib. § 139. Turretinus, Theol. El. XVIII 12, 16. Scheeben-Atzberger, Dogm. IV 375.

Yet Rome rejects the marks which the Reformation indicated for the true church. Bellarmine objects to them, in the first place, that the pure administration of the word at most only points out, [46] where, but not which the true church is, i.e. who the true believers are, who yet alone according to the Protestant definition constitute the essence of the church, the eccl. IV 2. This objection is to a certain extent correct, but in fact also without difficulty. For it is absolutely not necessary for us to know with infallible certainty who true believers are; for that, e.g. with J. Müller, Dogm. Abh. 346 f. to seek out infallible marks, leads onto the false track of the Donatists. The pure administration of the word is not a mark of the sincere faith of the individual members but of the church as an assembly of believers. The promise of God, namely, Jes. 55:11, 2 Cor. 2:15, 16 etc. stands surety for us for the fact that the word of God everywhere, where it is preached, will do its work and will not return empty. Gottes Wort kann nicht ohne Gottes Volk sein, wiederum Gottes Volk kann nicht ohne Gottes Wort sein (Luther). Therefore the Reformers named as the first and principal mark of the church not the confession and the life of the believers, but the administration of word and sacrament. The believers, after all, who constitute the essence of the church, become manifest in a twofold way, in the administration of word and sacrament, which takes place among them,

and in confession and walk, by which they distinguish themselves from the world and also from other churches, i.e. in the church as institute and in the church as organism. The nature of the matter entails that the mark which is derived from the administration of word and sacrament, from the church as institute, bears a more unerring, firmer, more constant, more durable character than that which is found in the confession and life of the believers. Much can be lacking in the latter, without therefore the former ceasing to exist. The Roman church proves this to a very strong degree, but it nevertheless also applies to the Protestant churches. However important a pure confession and a holy walk of the believers may be, the main thing for each and every one remains the pure administration of word and sacrament. Therefore this ought to count as the first and principal mark of the church. But the Reformed nevertheless rightly laid emphasis on the fact that the church as an assembly of believers becomes manifest not only in the institute, but also in faith, in fleeing sins, in pursuing righteousness, in love to God and the neighbour, in the crucifixion of the flesh. Ned. Gel. 29. The [47] pure administration of the word also includes the application of ecclesiastical discipline.

Another objection of Bellarmine is that the pure administration of the Word is far too general and too unclear a mark for the true church to be judged by it. For the administration of the Word, on the one hand, in true churches, such as e.g. at Corinth and in Galatia, often still leaves far too much to be desired as to purity, and, on the other hand, it has not entirely perished in heretical and sectarian churches. Socinians and Remonstrants reasoned in the same way and contested the necessity and the usefulness of marks by which the true church was to be recognized, Cat. Rac. qu. 489. Episcopius, Disp. III 28 Op. II 2 p. 459. And although Lutherans and

Reformed in the first period very emphatically maintained that they were the true church, the increasing impurity of their own churches and the appearance of other churches alongside theirs made it more and more difficult to maintain this assertion in all its strictness. Yes, from the beginning the attitude which the Protestant churches adopted toward the Roman church was quite different than the reverse. Rome can recognize sects but no churches alongside itself, Hettinger, Apol. d. Christ. V7 118. But the Protestants, although decisively rejecting the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Rome, continued fully to recognize the Christian element in Rome's church. However corrupt Rome may be, there are nevertheless vestigia ecclesiae, ruinae dissipatae ecclesiae in, there is still aliqua ecclesia, licet semirupta, remaining in the papacy, Calvin, Inst. IV 2, 11, cf. Op. ed. Schippers VIII 111. 309. IX Epist. 51. 57. Beza, Tract. theol. III 145. 192. Bullinger, Huijsboeck 1612 p. 206. 207. Zanchius, Op. II in the praef. before the natura Dei. Polanus, Synt. 535. cf. 496. Polanus a Polansdorf. Part. Theol. p. 196. Junius, Op. II 1018-1023. Alsted, Theol. schol. 696. Voetius, Desp. causa papatus 699-703. Mastricht, Theol. VII 1, 25. Turretinus XVIII 14, 24. 27. The Reformation was a separation ab ecclesia Romana et Papali, but not a vera ecclesia, Turretinus, XVIII 15, 8. Id. de necessaria secessione nostra ab ecclesia Romana, et impossibili cum ea syncretismo, after his Disp. de satisf. Christi 1691 and other anti-Roman writings in Vitringa IX 1 p. 116. Moor VI 58. Furthermore, the Reformers were, or at least soon became, aware of it, that [48] the pure administration of Word and sacrament could not count as an absolute mark. Calvin warns most strongly against all arbitrary separation. Even if something is lacking in the purity of doctrine or of the sacraments, even if the holiness of life and the faithfulness of the ministers leave far too much to be desired, one may

therefore not at once leave the church. Only when the summa necessariae doctrinae, the praecipua religionis doctrina is exchanged for falsehood, is separation a duty, Inst. IV 2, 12-16. 2, 1. Comm. on Mt. 13:40, 41. 2 Thess. 3:6. When later the corruption in the state churches increased and many felt compelled to separation, most teachers, on the same grounds, resisted separatism, Voetius, Pol. Eccl. IV 488. Brakel, Red. Godsd. c. 25. V. d. Waeyen and Witsius, Ernstige betuiginge der Geref. kercke aan hare afdwalende kinderen 1670. Koelman, Hist. Verhaal nopende der Labadisten scheuring en velerleye dwalingen met de wederlegging derzelver, 2 parts, Amst. 1683-84, cf. Hoe oordeelt de H. S. en hoe oordeelen de Geref. vaderen over Scheiding en Doleantie bij J. Campen te Sneek. All saw themselves compelled, with Calvin, to acknowledge that in the true church much impurity in doctrine and life can occur, without this giving a right to separation, and that in the separated churches much good is often found. Thus the concept of true and false church underwent an important change. On the one side one had to concede that a true church in an absolute sense is impossible here on earth; there is not a single church that absolutely and in all parts, in doctrine and life, in administration of Word and sacrament, answers to the demand of God. And on the other side it became clear that a false church in an absolute sense also cannot exist, because then it would no longer be a church; even if Rome was a false church, insofar as it was papal, there were nevertheless still many remnants of the true church in it. There was thus a distinction between vera and pura ecclesia, Polanus, Synt. p. 532. Alsted, Theol. schol. 601 sq. Synopsis 40, 37. Maresius XVI 20, Vitringa IX 1. 79. True church became the name, not for one church to the exclusion of all others, but for manifold churches, which still held fast the principal truths of Christianity, the fundamental articles, cf. part I 520v. but

otherwise differed very far from one another in degrees of purity; and false church became the name of the hierarchical power of superstition or unbelief, which in the [49] local churches set itself up and ascribed to itself and its ordinances more power and authority than to the Word of God, Ned. Gel. 29.

11. This development of the concept of the church, which can be observed in history itself, has its unmistakable shadow-side; the idea of a single church institute embracing all believers has thereby been disturbed for good. Nor can it be denied that the endless division of the confessors of Christ offers the world a cause of joy and mockery, and gives it a reason for its unbelief in the One Sent by the Father, because it does not see the unity of the believers in Christ, Joh. 17:21. We as Christians cannot humble ourselves deeply enough over the schism and discord that has existed throughout all centuries in the church of Christ; it is a sin against God, in conflict with the prayer of Christ, and caused by the darkness of our understanding and the lovelessness of our heart, cf. Gunning, The unity of the church 1896. Higher than the church 1897. Account 1898. And it is understandable that many Christians have again and again allowed themselves to be seduced into the attempt to bring about or maintain that fervently desired unity of the church of Christ, either by violent means, especially by the strong arm of the government, or in an artificial way, by syncretism and fusion, cf. e.g. J. von Döllinger, Ueber die Wiedervereinigung der christl. Kirchen, Leipzig Mohr 1897. But on the other hand we must nevertheless also not forget that the failure of all these attempts has something to teach us. History is, like nature, a work of God; it does not proceed outside his providence; Christ by his resurrection and ascension has been exalted to King at the Father’s right hand and will

remain so until all his enemies have been laid under his feet. He reigns, also over the divisions and schisms of his church on earth. And his prayer for her unity did not flow from unfamiliarity with her history nor from inability to govern her; in and through the division it is daily heard and is being led toward its complete fulfillment. The deep, spiritual sense in which the unity of his disciples is conceived by Jesus excludes precisely every violent or artificial attempt at its introduction. Christ, who prayed for it [50], can also alone bring it about; his prayer is a guarantee that it already exists in him and in his time will also become manifest from him in all believers. Therefore, for a right understanding of the division of the church of Christ, we have to consider the following: 1o All separation and schism that now exists in the church of Christ dates in principle already from the apostolic time. In spite of the fact that the churches for all kinds of reasons then felt themselves much more spiritually one than is now the case even between churches of the same confession, they were distinct in many respects. The apostles at Jerusalem and Paul, the congregations from the Jews and from the Gentiles, diverged on many and even important points; it came between Peter and Paul, Gal. 2:11, between Paul and Barnabas, Hd. 15:39, to a serious difference; heresies and schisms of all kinds already occurred then as well, 1 Cor. 1:10, 11:18, 19 etc.; the congregation of Corinth was divided into parties, silently looked on at the shameful life of one of the brethren, and for a part did not even believe in so significant a fact as the bodily resurrection of Christ and the believers; and the congregations of Asia Minor, a few decades after they were founded by Paul, had sunk far below the standpoint first taken by them in doctrine and life. 2o These separations and schisms in the apostolic time therefore do not make so deep an impression, because in the N. T. we always have to do in the first place with

local churches. There was as yet nothing other than a spiritual bond that connected all congregations. But when in the church of Christ the hierarchy developed and this regarded itself as the essence of the church, then it is this false, unchristian church-idea that throughout all centuries has provoked the schisms and heresies and has alienated many true believers from itself. Everywhere where and in the same measure as the hierarchy has developed, in the Roman, the Greek, the Anglican church, there the sects have again and again arisen and, if they were not violently suppressed and exterminated, have pushed back the official church and have many times grown over her head. The hierarchical church-idea, which is first of all intent on the unity of Christendom, has precisely throughout all centuries promoted division and caused schism. And Protestantism denies its principle if it seeks to maintain the unity of Christendom by any hierarchical coercion. 3o Precisely because the word is the mark of the church and there exists no infallible interpretation of that word, to every human being by Christ himself the freedom has been given to understand that word for himself, as he sees it. Morally he is thereby of course bound to Christ, and each will have to answer for himself how he has understood and practiced the word of Christ. But over against his fellow human beings and fellow Christians he stands completely free. Rome fears this freedom, and throws at Protestantism its individualism, subjectivism, and sectarianism. But what is the weakness of Rome, because it must maintain itself by hierarchical means, that is the strength of Protestantism, because no creature but Christ himself governs his church. It is completely true that, if the word is the mark of the church and is given into the hands of all human beings, each thereby receives the right to judge concerning the church and, if he thinks good, to separate from her. But this freedom is completely to be

respected and by no state or church to be hindered. Even the dreadful misuse that can be made of it and has been made may not for a moment entice to abolition of the use. 4o The division of the church of Christ has without doubt in sin its cause; in heaven there is no place for it any more. But nevertheless not everything is thereby said. God loves diversity in unity. Diversity existed among all creatures, also when there was as yet no sin. Through sin it has degenerated and been corrupted, but in itself it is good and also of significance for the church of Christ. Difference of sex and age, of character and disposition, of understanding and heart, of gifts and goods, of place and of century also benefits the truth that is in Christ. He takes them all into his service and adorns his church with them. Yes, even though the division of human beings into peoples and languages has had its occasion in sin, it contains something good that is carried into the congregation and thus preserved for eternity. Out of many tribes and languages and peoples and nations Christ gathers his church on earth. 5o If therefore we again, according to N. T. usage, understand by churches the local churches in the whole of Christendom, then there are no true and no false churches in an absolute sense. A church is an assembly of true Christian believers in a particular place. If somewhere there is no single believer any more, neither actu nor potentia, then the word of God is also unknown there, and there is no church any more. And conversely, if the word of God in a particular place is still known to some extent, it will certainly do its work and there is a church of Christ, however impure and mixed it may be. By that no indifferentism and syncretism is meant. Nothing is indifferent, least of all in the truth that is according to godliness. It is not so that we can calmly give up and deny the so-called articuli non fundamentales, if we only accept the articuli fundamentales. While,

however, in relation to others we have to bring into application the word of Jesus: he who is not against me is for me, we ought for ourselves to hold to that other word: he who is not for me is against me. There is great difference in the purity of the confessions and the churches. And toward the purest we have to take our stand and to strive. Whoever therefore comes to the conviction that the Protestant church is better than the Roman, and the Reformed is purer than the Lutheran or Remonstrant or Mennonite, has, without thereby judging his church as a false one, to leave it and to join himself to the other. And to remain in one's own church, in spite of much impurity in doctrine and life, is duty so long as she does not hinder us from being faithful to the own confession and she also indirectly does not compel us to obey human beings more than God. For a church that compels her members to that would in that same moment reveal herself to the conscience of her members, insofar as she did that, as a false one, which ascribes to herself and her ordinances more power and authority than to the word of God. 6o One ought therefore to be cautious with the names schisma and haeresie. Without doubt both are great sins; of schisma they are guilty who, although leaving the foundation of doctrine intact, nevertheless separate from the church over subordinate points of worship or church government; haeretici are they who err in the substance of the truth; the former break the communion of the church, the latter the communion of doctrine. Yet it is difficult, in practice, to indicate the boundary that separates lawful and obligatory breaking of communion with some church or doctrine from unlawful breach. For Rome this is indeed easy, because it recognizes only one church and one confession and pronounces the anathema over all that is outside it. But Protestantism can at most indicate some general rules and must leave the application of them in each concrete

case to the conscience of the believers. The concept of haeresie and schisma has thereby obtained an elasticity which in usage admonishes to caution. Since the Reformation the church has passed over into the period of pluriformity; and this fact compels us to seek the unity of the church much more in the spiritual bond of faith than in the outward form of government. Cf. Gladstone, The place of heresy and schism in the modern Christian Church, Nineteenth Century Aug. 1894 p. 157-194. Kuyper, Encycl. II 607v.

12. In accordance herewith, the so-called properties (attributa, proprietates, adjuncta, affectiones, epitheta, elogia) of the church, from a Protestant standpoint, also receive an entirely different meaning than at Rome. Rome has an absolute and exclusive concept of the church; it cannot acknowledge the ministry of word and sacrament as a mark of the church, because this also occurs outside the Roman church, albeit in an impure form; it therefore also cannot make a distinction between marks and properties of the church, for the properties are precisely the indicia, which point out the only true church; and finally it must conceive those properties so sensibly, tangibly, and outwardly, that they apply only to the Roman church and make this, as the alone saving one, spring to everyone's eye. The first property, the unity of the church, does indeed indicate that the congregation has one Lord, one faith, one baptism, but yet according to Rome it comes to expression especially in this, that the church founded by Christ has one visible head in the pope (unitas hierarchica, regiminis) and can never have another church alongside itself (unitas simultanea) or after itself (unitas successiva); properly speaking, the pope is the one, sufficient mark of the true church, cf. Cat. Rom. I 10, 10. Schema const. dogm. de eccl. Christi and the adnotationes belonging thereto at the Vatican council,

Collectio Lacensis VII 569. 586-588. Bellarminus, de eccl. mil. IV 9. 10. Scheeben-Atzberger [54] IV 340. Schanz, Apol. d. Chr. III § 6. By this unity of the church, thus conceived, Rome is obliged, at present, to pronounce the anathema over half of the whole of Christendom. Even the thought of Pusey in his Eirenikon and of Palmer, de doctrina christ. I c. 5, that the Roman, Eastern, and Anglican church together constitute the one church, cannot be admitted. Outside communion with the pope there is no salvation. But Protestantism, in the unity of the church, thinks first of all of the unity of the Head of the congregation, Ef. 1:10, 5:22, of the communion of all believers through one and the same Spirit, 1 Cor. 6:17, 12:13, 2 Cor. 12:11, Ef. 4:4 with Christ and with one another, Joh. 10:16, 15:1, Rom. 12:5, 1 Cor. 12:12, 13, Ef. 1:22, and then further of the unity of faith, of love, of hope, of baptism, etc. Ef. 4:3-5. This unity is indeed in the first place spiritual in nature, but it nevertheless exists objectively and really and also does not remain wholly invisible. It manifests itself, even if in a very imperfect manner, outwardly and comes to light, at least to some extent, in that which all Christian churches have in common with one another. There is no Christianity above or below, but there is indeed a Christianity present in the division of faith. Because our eye is directed most to the differences and schisms in Christendom, we constantly run the danger of failing to recognize this unity, which nevertheless truly exists. What binds all true Christians is always still more than what separates them. Under the holiness of the church Rome understands in the first place the liturgical, ceremonial holiness, consisting therein that the church as institute possesses the lawful sacrificial service and the salutary use of the sacraments, through which God, as by powerful instruments of divine grace, works true holiness in the believers, and then in the second place the personal holiness, which in the

church is indeed not the portion of all or even of the most, nor need be, but is nevertheless always found in some, and then again in very different degrees, Cat. Rom. I 10, 12. Bellarminus, ib. c. 11-15. Scheeben-Atzberger IV 347. Schanz, Apol. III c. 10. Jansen, Prael. I 452. Because the Reformation again made the church known as the communion of saints, it sought holiness not first of all in the supernatural character of the institute of salvation but in the spiritual renewal of the members [55] of the church. Holy is the church, because it is a communion of saints. But in doing so the Reformation nevertheless did not fall into the evil of Donatism, and has rather in practice neglected this property of the church all too much. Yet that does not take away that, according to the principle of the Reformation, the church is holy, because it is a communion of saints. And the believers are called holy, first of all because they are objectively in Christ, by virtue of the imputation of his righteousness, reckoned by God as holy, and in the second place because they, born again of water and Spirit and renewed according to the inner man, have a desire and longing to walk in sincerity not only according to some but according to all the commandments of God, Joh. 17:19, Ef. 5:25-27, Tit. 2:14, 1 Thess. 4:3, Hebr. 12:14, 1 Petr. 2:9. This property of the church also is spiritual, yet not wholly and entirely invisible; although the most holy, so long as they are in this life, still have only a small beginning of perfect obedience, they nevertheless walk according to the Spirit and not according to the flesh.

The third property is catholicity. In Rome the church bears this name in the first place, because it, although forming one whole and a perfect unity, nevertheless extends over the whole earth, whereas the sects always remain limited to some country, or part of the world. In the second place it is catholic, because it, although formerly existing in a less perfect form,

nevertheless has always been on earth from the beginning of the world and has included within itself all believers from the days of Adam, whereas the sects always come and go. And in the third place it is so called, because it is fully partaker of, preserves, and dispenses all truth and grace destined by God for communication to men, and therefore for all men is the only and necessary institute unto salvation, whereas the sects always possess only a part of the truth. Because catholicity in Rome must be a clearly visible mark of the church, it is especially to be understood in the sense that the church among all peoples where it exists counts a conspicuous multitude of members. In the first time this was indeed not yet the case, but soon the church nevertheless came to great expansion. And now it is the requirement of catholicity, that the number of members of the true church be indeed not greater than that of all men living outside it, but nevertheless greater than the number of members of every [56] sect separately and probably also of all sects together. Cf. Cat. Rom. I 10, 13. Bellarminus, de notis eccl. c. 4. 7. Scheeben-Atzberger, Dogm. IV 351. Schanz, Apol. d. Chr. III § 7. Söder, Der Begriff der Katholicität der Kirche und des Glaubens nach seiner gesch. Entw. Würzburg 1881. In outward splendour and glory, in spatial extension and in numerical strength of the members, the Roman Christian thus seeks an essential mark of the true church. Church fathers, such as Tertullian, Origen, Augustine, have already begun to exaggerate the spread of Christianity among the peoples. And still their example is followed by many Roman Catholics, e.g. in the mission statistics. Yet nowadays one could not as formerly close one’s eyes to the fact that there are still almost a thousand million non-Christians and scarcely five hundred million Christians, that these latter are again divided into about 112 million Greek, 225 million Roman, and 160 million Protestant Christians, and that the

Roman Christians in this century almost everywhere regularly decline in numerical strength and are being overtaken by the Protestant Christians. According to this mark of catholicity, which the Roman church itself indicates, the state of its truth is becoming ever more lamentable. The name catholic belongs ever less to the Roman church. Roman and catholic are also in contradiction with one another; just as under the O. T. the dispensation of grace had Jerusalem as its centre and bound all believers to that place, so the Roman church in the days of the N. T. makes the faith and salvation of men dependent on a particular place and on a particular person and thereby detracts from the catholicity of Christianity. The name of Roman or Papal church therefore expresses its essence much better than that of catholic. A catholic church is believed and confessed in the apostolic symbol and sometimes also in their own confessions by all Protestants, Ned. Gel. 27. Apol. Conf. Aug. art. 7. 8. One commonly understood by it the ecclesia universalis, which encompassed all true believers and came to manifestation more or less purely in the different churches, or also the church of the N. T., which in distinction from that of the O. T., was destined for all peoples and places of the earth. The word catholic does not occur in Scripture. But the texts on which the church fathers [57] appeal for the catholicity of the church, such as Gen. 12:3, Ps. 2:8, Jes. 2:2, Jer. 3:17, Mal. 1:11, Mt. 8:11, 28:19, Joh. 10:16, Rom. 1:8, 10:18, Ef. 2:14, Col. 1:6, Op. 7:9 etc. prove that its meaning lies especially herein, that Christianity is a world religion, destined and suited for every people and age, for every estate and rank, for every place and time. Most catholic is that church which has expressed this international and cosmopolitan character of the Christian religion most clearly in its confession and has applied it in practice. The Reformed have had an eye for it, when they in the different countries and

churches confessed the truth in their own, free, independent way and at the Synod of Dordrecht invited delegates from the whole Reformed Christendom, cf. my address on the Catholicity of Christ. and Church, Kampen 1888. The fourth property of the church is its apostolicity. According to Rome this belongs to it, because it was founded by the apostles, corresponds in doctrine, constitution and service with that of the apostles, but especially because its office-bearers in unbroken line are successors of the apostles and have received their power and authority from such as had themselves in their turn received them in lawful succession from the apostles. The first meaning is thereby wholly subordinate to the second. The word of the apostles, i.e. Holy Scripture, does not determine which church is apostolic, i.e. corresponds with the doctrine of the apostles; but conversely the church descending from the apostles in unbroken succession decides what is apostolic, what the doctrine of the apostles is. Yes, even after the promulgation of the dogma of infallibility the apostolic succession of the office-bearers is wholly and entirely determined by their communion with the pope. Even if a bishop is partaker of the apostolic succession, this nevertheless at once becomes void if he breaks communion with the pope. Conversely kann der Papst vermöge seiner kirchlichen Vollgewalt jeden Mangel heben, der etwa der formalen Apostolicität irgend eines Kirchenvorstehers anhaftet. So ist die Einheit mit den Papste nothwendig, damit ein Vorsteher rechtmässiger Nachfolger der Apostel werden oder sein kann, es ist aber jene Einheit auch sofort hinreichend, um die wahre Apostolicität des letztern zu erkennen, Scheeben-Atzberger IV 1 S. 356. The pope makes everything good. Where the pope is, there is the true church, the pure doctrine, [58] the apostolic succession. Now such an apostolic succession is not to be found with a single word in Scripture and

in itself no more a guarantee for the purity of doctrine than the hereditary high-priestly dignity in Caiaphas was a proof for the rightness of his pronouncements and deeds. And therefore the Protestants rightly said that not the successio locorum et personarum but the successio doctrinae was a distinguishing property of the true church. If this latter was lacking, the former could not make any church into a true church; and if it was present, the former was of very subordinate significance.

Among the properties of the church there finally also belong the indefectibilitas and the infallibilitas. Jesus has promised to his church, that the gates of hell would not be able to prevail against her and that He would preserve her until the end of the world, Mt. 16:18, 28:20, Ef. 4:11-13, 1 Tim. 3:15. The Romanists infer from this, that their church, the papal, will remain until the end of the world, and not only that, but also that that papal church will always remain the catholic, which by the multitude of her members and by her outward splendor will be visible and knowable to everyone, Bellarminus, de eccl. milit. c. 11. 13. 16. De notis eccl. c. 5. 6. Scheeben-Atzberger, Dogm. IV 1 S. 359. But for this assertion sufficient ground is lacking. Not only has the church in different times, e.g. of Noah, Abraham, Elijah, Christ etc. been limited to a few persons, but time and again also particular churches in particular countries, e.g. in Asia Minor, have perished. Yes, the N. T. says clearly, that in the last of the days the corruption will increase and the church will be exposed to all kinds of seduction and persecution, Mt. 24:21, 22, Luk. 18:8, 2 Tim. 3:1. Jesus' promise therefore does indeed guarantee, that there will always be an assembly of believers on earth, which Socinians and Remonstrants wrongly deny, Moor IV 122, but it does not in the least imply, that a particular church in a particular country will always remain and by her size and glory

will be knowable to everyone. And likewise it is with the infallibility of the church. The Roman church has long hesitated, to give an answer to the question, in whom finally the infallibility rests and has finally decided it at the Vatican council in favor of the pope. The pope guarantees, that the ecclesia docens cannot err in docendo. But the [59] H. Scripture nowhere connects infallibility to a particular person or to a particular, local church. There is indeed an infallibility of the church, which the Protestants also gladly acknowledge, but this infallibility belongs to the church as an assembly of true believers and consists in this, that Christ as King of his church will see to it, that there will always on earth be an assembly of believers, however small and inconspicuous then also, which will confess his name. Cf. on the properties of the church from the Prot. side: Martyr, Loci Comm. p. 226. Turretinus, Theol. El. XVIII qu. 5 sq. Heidegger, Corp. Theol. XXVI 16 sq. Maresius, Exeg. conf. Belg. art. 27. Witsius, Exerc. in Symb. 24. Vitringa IX 1 p. 81. Mastricht, Theol. VII 1, 9. Quenstedt, Theol. IV 482. 497. Thomasius, Christi Person u. Werk II 543. Philippi, Kirchl. Gl. V 3 S. 16 f. Hase, Handb. d. prot. Polemik I c. 1. Van Oosterzee, Dogm. § 130.

§ 48. The Government of the Church.

1. With the church as an assembly of believers, a government is indispensable. Just as with the temple a master builder, with the field a sower, with the vineyard a husbandman, with the net a fisherman, with the flock a shepherd, with the body a head, with the family a father, with the kingdom a king belongs, so also the church is not to be conceived without an authority that bears and leads her, cares for and protects her. In an even more special sense than in the political sphere, this authority rests with God, who is not only the Creator of all things but also the Saviour of the congregation; the congregation is as the people of God, both under the New and under the Old Covenant, a theocracy, the Lord is her judge, lawgiver, and king, Jes. 33:22. But just as God in the civil sphere has transferred sovereignty to the government, so He has appointed Christ as king in the church. Designated from eternity already as mediator, this one has exercised his prophetic, priestly, and kingly office from paradise onward, continued it in the days of the O. Test. and during his walk on earth, and now completes it in heaven, where He is seated [60] at the right hand of the Father, part III

408-424. And this activity of Christ does not presuppose the congregation, unless then as conceived and willed in God's eternal counsel, but precedes her and has her as product; the congregation is built as a temple on Christ as the rock, born as a body out of Him as the head; the king is here before his people. But also in another sense the church is not conceivable without government. True, Christ could have exercised his office without any service of men; if it pleased Him, He could distribute his spiritual and heavenly blessings without help of institutions and persons. But this has not thus seemed good to Him. It has been his good pleasure, without transferring his sovereignty in the least to men, nevertheless in its exercise to make use of their service and through them to preach the gospel to all creatures. And also in this sense the church has never been without government; she was always in one way or another organized and institutionally arranged. That was necessitate hypothetica necessary, because the congregation here on earth is a becoming congregation. In heaven every office and every means of grace falls away, because the kingdom of God is completed and God is all in all. But on earth this is different; the church as an assembly of believers is itself used by Christ as an instrument to bring others into his congregation; through her Christ administers his mediatorial office in the midst of the world. Thus the church from the beginning appears in a twofold form; she is an assembly of the people of God in passive and active sense, is at the same time a coetus and a mater fidelium, or by another designation at the same moment organism and institute. As already said above p. 36, this distinction is a wholly different one than that between invisible and visible church. It is a distinction in the visible church and says that the church as an assembly of believers becomes manifest to us in a twofold way, in offices and means of grace as institute,

and in communion of faith and of life as organism. With this distinction the question is always raised concerning the priority. Some represent it thus, that the institute of the church with office and ministry always precedes the church as an assembly of believers and thus lay the emphasis on the mater fidelium. Others judge that [61] the church as an assembly of believers takes the first place and then itself, by the pressure of circumstances, arranges itself institutionally in one way or another. Indeed, in this the principled difference between Protestantism and Romanism is then sought. Confusing the distinction of the church as institute and organism with that in visible and invisible church, Schleiermacher says that Protestantism das Verhältniss des Einzelnen zur Kirche abhängig macht von seinem Verhältniss zu Christo, while Romanism conversely das Verhältniss des Einzelnen zu Christo abhängig macht von seinem Verhältniss zur Kirche, Chr. Gl. § 24. And according to Möhler, with Rome the visible church precedes the invisible, but with the Lutherans this precedes that, Symbolik § 48. But this whole representation is far from to be regarded as complete and correct. For 1o from the days of Tertullianus onward, de orat. 2. de monog. 7. adv. Marc. V 4 the church has been called by all Christians not only a coetus but also a mater fidelium. The Protestants are in this in agreement with the Roman Catholics, and Calvin even lays very strong emphasis on it, Inst. IV 1, 4. And that was the church according to their conviction, not because she freely and independently organized herself into an institute and gave herself a government of her own, but because Christ had thus arranged her. The institute of the church is absolutely not, at least not according to the Reformed confession, a product of the congregation, but an institution of Christ. And that this conviction rests on good, scriptural grounds, will become clear in what follows. 2o The church as an assembly of believers

does not come into being, as Schleiermacher, Chr. Gl. § 115 says, durch das Zusammentreten der einzelnen Wiedergeborenen. For the question remains unanswered here, whence those regenerate ones are. For these do not come about because the H. Spirit regenerates men atomistically and unvermittelt (not: unmittelbar) and then joins them together. But the H. Spirit is in all his workings, also in that of regeneration, bound to Christ, from whom He takes everything. And Christ is on earth only there where his word is. God's word and God's people belong together. True, little children are many times regenerated without their having been able personally to hear the preaching of the word. But these are then little children who are born in the covenant of grace, who live in the communion of the church and who receive inward [62] calling, which proceeds from Christ through the H. Spirit. 3o The difference between Rome and the Reformation on this point does not consist in the priority of visible or invisible church, of institute or organism, of communion with the church or communion with Christ; at least it does not consist in that without sharper determination; but it lies herein, that Rome binds salvation to priest and sacrament and the Reformation to the preaching of the word. According to Rome the gratia infusa is communicated only through baptism and this is thus absolutely necessary. According to the Reformation the word is the first and principal means of grace and faith therefore sufficient unto salvation. And that word works as means of grace absolutely not only when it is ministered officially in the assembly of believers, but also when it is brought to us in family and school, through upbringing and instruction. God's people are where God's word is, but that people and that word can be and are also many times where there is no priest and no pope, no pastor and no presbyter. 4o Also according to the Reformation the church as an assembly of believers does

not come into being unvermittelt, out of a working of the Spirit detached from the word. Between Christ and the individual man there certainly does not stand, as with Rome, the priest and the sacrament, the ecclesia docens, but yet indeed the word of Christ, for communion with Christ is according to the testimony of Scripture bound to communion with the word of the apostles, Joh. 17:3, 1 Joh. 1:3. As it is in the natural, so it is also in the spiritual. Every man is a product of the community and the individual believer is born out of the bosom of the congregation. The ecclesia universalis precedes the ecclesia particularis and the individual fideles, just as in every organism the whole precedes the parts. A mother is therefore indeed the church of Christ, but she is this absolutely not only as institute but also as organism. The believers together are at the same time producer and product; in visibili ecclesia invisibilis colligitur et formatur; invisibilis in visibili haeret ac continetur, Synopsis pur. theol. 40, 34; through the church Christ gathers his church. 5o By taking this standpoint, the Reformation avoided both the hierarchy of the Roman Catholics and the enthusiasm of the Anabaptists, and caused the truth, which is present in both, to come into its right. On the one hand [63] no binding of the working of the H. Spirit to priest and sacrament and on the other hand no working of the H. Spirit outside Christ and his word! The church as assembly becomes manifest in both, institute and organism; she has as mark the pure administration of the word and the confession and the walk of the believers; she is arranged institutionally and charismatically. The office does not suppress the gifts but organizes them and keeps them in the right track, and the gifts do not set the office aside but make it powerful and fruitful. Irvingianism and Darbyism both contain a truth that ought to be acknowledged. Offices and gifts are together bestowed by Christ on his

congregation unto the perfecting of the saints and unto the building up of his body, Rom. 12:5-8, 1 Cor. 12:25, 28, Ef. 4:11, 12. Therefore 6o the question concerning the priority of the institute or the organism of the church itself already testifies of one-sidedness. Both are given with one another and continually work upon one another. In the state people and government are always most closely connected with one another; one can indeed conduct investigation into the origin in some people of one or another form of government; one can indeed show that the political government was first instituted on account of sin, but everywhere where men are, there is also a certain form of government; Adam was at once created as head of humanity. And so also the form of government of the church has by no means always been the same, but a government has never been lacking to her, neither in the invisible, in which Christ is her head, nor also in the visible, in which she always partook of a certain organization.

2. Holy Scripture sets this in a clear light. When Adam has fallen and hides himself from the face of the Lord, it is God himself who seeks out the man and calls him, preaches to him the promise of the gospel and thereby founds his church. With Noah he establishes his covenant, imparts to him a treasure of blessings in it, and seals it with the bow in the clouds. Abram he calls out of Ur of the Chaldeans, makes him his covenant-partner and gives him the sign of circumcision. In the patriarchal period the households were the churches of the believers; the heads of households were the priests, who communicated the promises to their children and brought to God offerings of worship and thanks. The people of [64] Israel received at Sinai not only a civil but also a religious organization and was made manifest as the people of God in priesthood and sacrifice, in tabernacle and altar, in all kinds of laws and institutions. When at the beginning of the N. Test. John the Baptist

appears, he preaches the baptism of repentance unto forgiveness of sins, and thereby separates the people of God from sinful Israel. Jesus takes over this preaching and this baptism of John, later adds the Lord's Supper to it, gathers an ἐκκλησια around himself, governs it himself directly, as long as he is on earth, and appoints a number of twelve apostles, who presently will appear as his witnesses. The institution of the apostleship is especially a powerful proof for the institutional character which Christ gave to his church on earth. Christ is himself the ἀποστολος, Hebr. 3:1, and continues this ἀποστολη in the twelve, Joh. 20:21. This number of twelve did not form itself gradually of itself, but was expressly called and appointed by Jesus himself. With them, although Jesus from the beginning knew whom he would choose as apostles and therefore could already at once say to them that he would make them ἀλεεις ἀνθρωπων, Mk. 1:17, nevertheless a clear distinction is to be made between their first calling to discipleship, and their second calling to apostleship, Mt. 4:18-22 and 10:1, Mk. 1:16 and 3:14, Luk. 6:1 and 13-16. By many, such as Schleiermacher, Volkmar, Harnack, Seufert, Holtzmann etc., this special calling to the apostolic office by Jesus is indeed denied. But the facts are in conflict with this assertion. The number of twelve apostles was nevertheless already established in the Christian churches long before the appearance of Paul, Mt. 26:33, 28:18, Luk. 24:47, Joh. 20:19, 21, 1 Cor. 15:5, 7, Op. 21:14. Also the name of apostle, שָׁלוּחַ, was given to them by Jesus, Luk. 6:13, cf. 11:49, Mt. 23:34, 10:2, Mk. 6:30, Luk. 9:10, 17:5, 22:14, 24:10, because they were sent out by him to preach, Mk. 3:14. Jesus was himself the one sent by the Father, Joh. 3:34, Hebr. 3:1 and for the execution of his work had need of witnesses, who made known among the whole people of Israel the gospel that appeared in him, Mt. 10:6. This naming by Jesus is confirmed by the

fact that the word apostle from the beginning has been an official title, so much so even that the word ψευδαποστολος [65] could be formed, 2 Cor. 11:13. The word שָׁלוּחַ occurs, moreover, in LXX only once, 1 Kon. 14:6, and the word ἀποστολος occurs rarely in profane Greek. Yet these facts of Scripture concerning the apostleship seem to be contradicted by other data. In the first place it is uncertain who must be reckoned to this number of twelve apostles. Even if the difference between the four apostolic lists, Mt. 10:2, Mk. 3:16, Luk. 6:14, Hd. 1:13 is resolved in the sense that Lebbeus Thaddeus and Judas Jacobi are identified, then there still remains that Judas fell away and was replaced by Matthias, Hd. 1:15-26, and later Paul was still added to the number of twelve. The relation of Paul to the twelve is in that respect far from clear. Paul indeed repeatedly makes this distinction, that the apostles at Jerusalem would proclaim the gospel among Israel and he himself among the Gentiles, Hd. 9:15, 13:47, 22:21, Rom. 11:13, Gal. 1:16, 2:7-9, Ef. 3:8, 1 Tim. 2:7, 2 Tim. 1:11. But this distinction is nevertheless very relative; for Paul in his proclamation of the gospel always turned first to the Jews, Hd. 13:5, 14, 46 etc. and the twelve apostles received from Christ after his resurrection the express commission to preach the gospel to all nations, Mt. 28:19, Hd. 10:42, and have also fulfilled that commission in greater or lesser measure. Not only the church from the Jews, but the whole New-Testament church rests on the foundation of apostles and prophets, Ef. 2:20, Op. 21:14 and through their word has fellowship with Christ, Joh. 17:20, 1 Joh. 1:3. The apostleship of Paul, however, bears a character very distinct from that of the twelve. Paul indeed maintains with all power the divine origin, the independence and the genuineness of his apostolic office over against all opponents, Gal. 1-2, 1 Cor. 1:10-4:21, 2 Cor. 10:13. But nevertheless, he did not associate with

Jesus during his walk on earth, he persecuted the church of God, he was called by the exalted Christ in an extraordinary way and at an unusual time, he was the foremost of sinners and the least of the apostles, 1 Cor. 15:9, Ef. 3:8, 1 Tim. 1:15. His apostleship, however independent and excellent, has been a means to lay the apostleship of the twelve as the foundation of the whole church. Paul by his apostleship did not limit or undermine the [66] apostleship of the twelve but on the contrary confirmed and extended it. He paved the way in the Gentile world for the apostleship of the twelve, removed from it on the one hand all the Jewish element that still continued to cling to its bearers and on the other hand grafted the Gentiles as wild branches into the tame olive tree of Israel, Rom. 11:24. Upon Christ as cornerstone and the apostles as foundation Paul built the one church, the one people of God, the spiritual Israel. Therewith in principle a second objection is also already resolved, which is raised against the appointment and naming of the twelve apostles by Jesus. It is namely a fact that the word apostle, probably already in Jerusalem, H. 14:4, 14, 2 Cor. 11:13, Op. 2:2, but then especially by Paul, has been used in a broader sense and has also been applied to others than the number of twelve. Paul had to do that for that reason, because he knew himself to be a called servant of Jesus Christ, equal in office and honor to the other apostles. He was apostle in another sense than the apostles in Jerusalem, called in another way and at a later time and charged with a special task. But one thing he had in common with the apostles in Jerusalem; he was a called apostle of Jesus Christ, who had to thank a special revelation of Christ and not men for his calling, his gospel, even specifically also the peculiar content of his gospel, namely that the Gentiles are his co-heirs, 1 Cor. 9:1, 15:8, Gal. 1:1, 12, 15, 2:2, Ef. 3:3. But for his missionary labor he had need of help. Besides the apostles Jesus

had already also sent out another seventy, in order in the cities and villages where he would come to prepare his coming, Luk. 10. When the church in Jerusalem was scattered by the persecution, Philip, one of the seven men chosen in Hd. 6, went to preach the gospel among the Samaritans, Hd. 8:5, to the eunuch of the queen Candace, 8:26, cf. 11:20, and further as far as Caesarea, 8:40, 21:8. And so Paul in his missionary labor made use of men such as Barnabas, Mark, Luke, Silas, Tychicus, Aristarchus, Epaphras, Apollos, Timothy, Titus and others, who as his συνεργοι, 1 Thess. 3:2 stood at his side. These assistant missionaries of the apostles were now by Paul sometimes also called apostles, because they, although not directly by Jesus [67] Christ, yet under the guidance of the H. Spirit were sent by the church to proclaim the gospel in other places, Hd. 13:2, 3, cf. 2 Cor. 8:23, ἀποστολοι ἐκκλησιων. The word apostle thus alongside the narrower also received a broader sense, Hd. 14:4, 14, Rom. 16:7, 1 Cor. 4:6, 9, 9:5, 15:7, 2 Cor. 11:5, 13, 12:11, Gal. 1:19, 1 Thess. 2:6, Op. 2:2 and thus also lived on later in the post-apostolic period, e.g. in the Didache c. 11. Elsewhere these apostolic helpers bear the name of evangelists, Hd. 21:8, Ef. 4:11, 2 Tim. 4:5, because they, just as Christ by the Father, Luk. 4:18, and the apostles by Christ, Luk. 9:1, 6, thus in their turn under the guidance of the Spirit were set apart by the church for the proclamation of the gospel, Hd. 8:5, 12, 40, 11:19, 20, 22, 13:2, 2 Cor. 8:18, 19, 23, Phil. 2:25, 1 Tim. 4:14. They therefore correspond with the apostles in the narrower sense in three respects, 1o in that they also are servants of God or of Christ, 1 Thess. 3:2, 1 Tim. 4:6, 6:11, 2 Tim. 2:24 and have not merely received a charisma, 1 Tim. 4:14, 2 Tim. 1:6, but truly by virtue of a special calling and appointment bear an office, under a definite name, Hd. 21:8, with a rank and place of their own, Ef. 4:11, and with a special task, 2 Tim. 4:5; 2o that

their office is not limited to a local church, but extends to all churches, to the ecclesia universalis, Hd. 13:4v., so that according to the ancient-church explanation πανταχου περιιοντες ἐκηρυττον and they had power and authority over all churches, Tit. 1:5, and 3o that they participate in the foundational and church-founding labor of the apostles; they are their συνεργοι, 1 Thess. 3:2, συνεκδημοι, Hd. 19:29, συνστρατιωται, Phil. 2:25, συνδουλοι, Col. 1:7, 4:7, who water what the apostles have planted, 1 Cor. 3:6, and with relative independence nevertheless were subject to the apostles, Hd. 19:22, 1 Cor. 4:17, 1 Tim. 1:3, Tit. 1:5 etc. and in part worked alone, in part also in company with the apostles, ib. and Hd. 11:30, 12:25, 13:2 etc. In the post-apostolic period the office disappears entirely and the name since Tertullian, Origen and Eusebius becomes customary for the writers of the four gospels, who as it were make the persons of the evangelists superfluous. Cf. concerning the evangelists: Suicerus s. v. Witsius, Misc. Sacra I 315 II 564. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. III 364-369. [68] Mastricht, Theol. VII 2, 18. Lechler, Die neut. Lehre v. h. Amte 1857 S. 220 f. Philippi, Kirchl. Gl. V 3, 277. Sohm, Kirchenrecht 42. Zöckler, Diakonen und Evangelisten, München Beck 1893.

Besides the evangelists, prophets also appear in the N. T., who are even mentioned before them, Rom. 12:6, 1 Cor. 12:28, 29, Ef. 4:11, sometimes without being connected with the apostles, Ef. 2:20, 3:5, and thus stand above them in rank and honour. They had been promised by Jesus, Mt. 23:34, Luk. 11: 49, were brought forth by the H. Spirit, who had been poured out on the day of Pentecost, Hd. 2:17, 18, 1 Cor. 12:10, Op. 1:10 and then occur in great numbers and in almost all congregations, in Jerusalem, Hd. 6:5, 8, 11:27, Antioch, 11:27, 13:1, Caesarea 21:9, 10, Corinth, 1 Cor. 12, and everywhere, as appears from their mention in Rom.

12:6, 1 Cor. 12:28, Ef. 2:20, 3:5, 4:11, 1 Thess. 5:20. They are concluded with John, the apostle, Op. 1:1, and then disappear entirely from the congregation as an estate. To be sure, the apostolic fathers still speak of prophets, Hermas, Mand. 11 Vis. 3. Didache 11. 15, but in doing so they think of such men, who travelled about and spoke in various congregations about the Christian truth but in doing so had to be carefully examined and distinguished from the false prophets; the time for prophecy was past. Montanism and other enthusiastic tendencies of earlier and later times did indeed attempt to revive prophecy; Rome asserts that the prophetic gift still continues, Bellarminus, de notis eccl. c. 15; Zwingli and many after him introduced so-called prophecies, in which Scripture was explained for the people, art. Prophezei in Herzog2 and Dr. H. H. Kuyper, De opleiding tot den dienst des Woords bij de Gereformeerden 1891 bl. 104v. But all that is essentially distinct from the prophecy as it existed in the first Christian churches. This is distinguished by the following: 1o the N. T. prophets can indeed be called office-bearers, but their office is nevertheless much more charismatic than that of prophets and apostles. They are not called and appointed immediately by Christ nor also by his congregation, but receive a special charisma from the H. Spirit, and are consequently called to fulfil a special task in the congregation of Christ. 2o With the apostles and evangelists [69] they have in common that they hold an office which applies to the whole church of Christ on earth and thus also cooperate in the founding of the congregation, Ef. 2:20, but while the evangelists especially help the apostles in their missionary and instituting work, the prophets stand at their side in their edifying, building up, teaching activity. 3o N. T. prophecy is indeed conscious and therefore highly to be esteemed above glossolalia, 1 Cor. 14:5, 32, but it is nevertheless momentary and

extraordinary, fruit of ἀποκαλυψις, 1 Cor. 14:30; it extends the natural measure of knowing and understanding, comprises both the form and the content of speech, Mt. 10:19, 20, proves itself as truth by its inner, convincing power, 2 Cor. 2:14-17, and served especially to procure acceptance for the gospel, which was proclaimed by the apostles, which to the Jews was an offence and to the Greeks a folly, and was not yet accessible in the written Word for the whole church, among believers and unbelievers, and thus to build up the congregation through teaching, admonition, consolation, 1 Cor. 14:3, in the grace and knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ. Cf. on the N. T. prophets: Voetius, Pol. Eccl. III 369 cf. Disp. Sel. II 1036 sq. Witsius, Misc. Sacra I 282 sq. Neander, Geseh. d. Pflanzung u. Leitung der chr. K5. 182 f. Bonwetsch, Die Prophetie im ap. u. nachap. Zeitalter, Zeits. f. k. Wiss. u. k. Leben 1884 S. 408 f. Burger, art. in Herzog2 12, 265. Zöckler, t. a. p. 71 f. Weiszäcker, Das apost. Zeitalter, 584 f. enz.

But however closely prophets and evangelists are related to the actual apostles, they are nevertheless essentially distinct from them. The apostles form a circle of their own, their office bears an altogether special character, and is recognizable by the following features. 1o The apostles are given to Christ by the Father, Joh. 17:6, chosen and called by Himself, Joh. 6:70, 13:18, 15:16, 19, 1 Cor. 1:17, 2 Cor. 5:20, Gal. 1:1, chosen by God to their office, Hd. 10:41. 2o They have been trained and qualified by Jesus Himself for their task, have been ear- and eyewitnesses of His words and deeds, have beheld the Word of life with the eyes and touched it with the hands, and have received their gospel not from any man but from Christ Himself, Luk. 24:48, Joh. 1:4, 15:27, Hd. 1:21, 22, 26:16, 1 Cor. 9:1, 15:8, 2 Cor. 12:1v., Gal. 1:12, Ef. 3:2-8, [70] 1 Tim. 1:12, 1 Joh. 1:1-3 etc. 3o They

partake of the H. Spirit in a special measure, who instructs them and leads them into all truth, Mt. 10:20, Joh. 14:26, 15:26, 16:7, 13, 14, 20:22, 1 Cor. 2:10-13, 7:40, 1 Petr. 1:12. 4o Equipped with that Spirit, Joh. 20:22, Hd. 1:8, Ef. 3:5, they appear publicly as witnesses of Jesus, specifically of His resurrection, Hd. 1:8, 21, 22, 2:14, 32, 3:15, 4:8 etc., are reliable witnesses, Luk. 1:2, Joh. 19:35, 21:24, 1 Cor. 7:25, 1 Petr. 5:1,2 Petr. 1:16, Hebr. 2:3, Op. 1:3, 22:18, 19, and proclaim God's Word, Joh. 1:14, 20:31, 1 Cor. 2:13, 2 Cor. 2:17, Gal. 1:7, 1 Thess. 2:13, 1 Joh. 1:1-4, Op. 22:18, 19. 5o Their testimony is sealed by God with signs and wonders and rich spiritual blessing, Mt. 10:1, 9, Mk. 16:15v., Hd. 2:43, 3:2, 5:12-16, 6:8 etc., Rom. 12:4-8, 15:18, 19, 1 Cor. 12:10, 28, 15:10, 2 Cor. 11:5, 23, Gal. 3:5, Hebr. 2:4. 6o To this their testimony the church of all ages is bound. There is no communion with Christ except through communion with the word and the persons of the apostles, Joh. 17:20, Gal. 1:7-9, 1 Joh. 1:3; they are the foundation of the church, Mt. 16:18, 1 Cor. 3:10, Ef. 2:20, Op. 21:14; their word, preserved for us in the Scriptures of the N. T., is medium gratiae, Joh. 20:31, 1 Cor. 1:18v., 15:2, 1 Joh. 1:1-4. 7o Their office is therefore not limited to a time and not to a local congregation, but it remains and extends to the whole church. It is the only one that is instituted directly by Christ and includes within itself all competencies and activities that are distributed in the later offices, the pastoral, presbyteral, diaconal, even also the evangelizing and prophetic activity. From the outset the apostles therefore also enjoy in the church of Christ a generally recognized authority. They are not only the overseers of the congregation at Jerusalem, but they are the founders, the fathers, 1 Cor. 4:15 and leaders of the whole church, have oversight over the believers at Samaria, Hd. 8:14, visit the congregations, Hd. 9:32, 11:22, institute offices, Hd. 6:2, take decisions in the H. Spirit,

Hd. 15:22, 28, appear with apostolic authority, 1 Cor. 4:21, 5:2, 2 Cor. 2:9, give binding commands, 1 Cor. 7:40, 1 Thess. 4:2, 11, 2 Thess. 2:15, 3:6, 14 etc. and are still authoritative with their word for the whole of Christendom; [71] apostolicity is a property and characteristic of the church of Christ. Cf. part I 334v. and further Voetius, Pol. Eccl. III 351-363. Burmannus, Exerc. Acad. II 104 sq. Spanheim, Op. II 289 sq. Moor VI 250 e. a. bij Walch, Bibl. theol. III 444. Philippi, Kirchl. Cl. V 3, 258. Gloël, Der H. Geist in der Heilsverkündigung des Paulus, Halle 1888 S. 325 f. W. Seufert, Der Ursprung u. die Bedeutung des Apostolates in de chr. K. der ersten 2 Jahrh. Leiden 1887. Köppel, Der Ursprung des Apost., Stud. u. Krit. 1889 S. 257-331. Erich Haupt, Zum Verständniss des Apost. Halle Niemeijer 1896. Art. Apostel van Schmidt in Herzog3.

Among the apostles Peter stands at the top. Simon or Simeon, son of John or Jonas, brother of Andrew, originating from Bethsaida, Joh. 1:45, but probably since his marriage living in Capernaum, Mk. 1:29, already at his first meeting received from Jesus the promise that he would later be called Κηφας, gr. form for the hebr. word כֵּף with the aram. article, the rock, ἡ πετρα, as masc. proper name Πετρος, Joh. 1:43. Without doubt Jesus thereby alluded to his faithful character, which in spite of his sanguine, mobile nature was proper to him and came out most clearly at Caesarea Philippi, when, over against the people, who with their earthly-minded expectations saw themselves disappointed in Jesus and left Him, he held fast the confession of Jesus' Messiahship and openly uttered it in the name of his fellow-disciples, Mt. 16:13 to 20, Mk. 8:27-29, Luk. 9:18-20, Joh. 6:66-69. On this occasion Jesus then also reminded him of the name which He had already given him earlier, Mt. 16:18. By his bold and steadfast confession of Jesus as the Christ Peter showed himself to be the rock, on

which Christ would build his church so firmly and solidly that the gates of Hades would not surpass it in power. According to Launoi 17 church fathers thought of Peter in connection with the rock, 8 of the apostles, 44 of Peter's faith and 16 of Christ, in Scheeben-Atzberger, Dogm. IV 411; later the Roman Catholics have for the most part made the rock refer to Peter and the Protestants to his confession. But there is here no dilemma. The words "this petra" cannot refer to anything other than the person of Peter, but a rock he is and has proved himself to be by his confession of Jesus as the Christ, a confession which he owes not [72] to himself but to the revelation of the Father. Precisely for that reason Jesus promises him that He will build his church on him as confessor of his Sonship and Messiahship. Christ thus presents himself as the builder of his church and Peter the confessor as the rock on which his church will rest. In Mt. 21:42, Hd. 4:11, 1 Cor. 3:10, Ef. 2:20, Op. 21:14, cf. 1 Petr. 2:4-6 the same image is used, but it is applied in another way. There, namely, the apostles are thought of as the builders, who by their preaching have founded the church on Christ as the foundation. But here in Mt. 16:18 Christ is the builder, who builds his church on the confessing Peter. And this promise Christ has fulfilled; Peter is the first among the apostles, the principal founder of the church, the leader and commander of all the confessors of Christ through the centuries. Therefore he is always named first in the apostolic lists, Mt. 10:2, Mk. 3:16, Luk. 6:14, Hd. 1:13, he belongs with John and James to the intimate circle of friends of Jesus, who may follow him when the others must remain behind, Mt. 17:1, Mk. 5:37, 13:3, 14:33, is the spokesman and representative of the disciples, Mt. 16:17, 17:24, 18:21, 26:40, after Jesus' ascension comes to the fore as first witness among the apostles, Hd. 1:15, 2:14, 3:1v., 4:8, 5:3,

29, 8:14, 10:5v., 12:3v., 15:7v., and is honored as primus inter pares also by Paul, Gal. 1:18, 2:7-9. Cf. art. Petrus in Herzog2 and the litt. cited there.

3. Thus the church has never lacked a government; and she has not procured it for herself but has received it from God. Institute and organism of the church have time and again been called into being by God simultaneously and in connection with one another. Of the apostolate it can even be said that it preceded the church of the N. T.; the apostles were the founders of the congregation, as it were the patriarchs of the people of God in the days of the N. T. But this apostolate has not been continued and, as an office for the building of the church, was by the nature of the case not susceptible of any continuation; it lives on for us only in the apostolic word, which remains the foundation of the church and brings into fellowship with the Father and with his [73] Son Jesus Christ, 1 Joh. 1:3. As soon as the apostles had founded congregations in various places, they instituted in those congregations offices which differed essentially from theirs and did not come into being without the cooperation of the congregations themselves. There is a great difference between the extraordinary offices of apostles, evangelists, and prophets, which were instituted temporarily for the founding of the church, and the ordinary offices of presbyters and deacons, which arose from the churches themselves under apostolic guidance. These latter offices presuppose the churches, in the same way as the government presupposes the people. They therefore could not be instituted directly and immediately by Christ, like the apostolic office, but could arise only when the congregations had been founded and had need of a regular leadership. This took place already quite soon in the church of Jerusalem. This, through the extraordinary Pentecost blessing, soon received a very great expansion and was thousands of souls strong, Hd.

2:41, 47, 4:4, 21, 32, 5:14, 6:1. This naturally made organization urgently necessary, which also came into being under the guidance of the apostles. In the first place, this congregation of thousands of souls, in spite of its unity, was in one way or another subdivided. For it could not assemble in one building but had to meet in parts in private dwellings. Without doubt the first house-congregations arose in Jerusalem, such as we also encounter elsewhere in the apostolic time, above bl. 6. For we read that the believers assembled not only in the temple, but also κατ' οἶκον (not: from house to house, but: at home, in different houses), Hd. 2:46, 5:42, among others in the house of Mary and of James, Hd. 12:12, 17. In order that everything might take place decently and in order, all kinds of regulation were needed for these gatherings; and perhaps in that connection the example of the Jewish synagogues with their elders, officials, and servants and also with their Scripture reading, preaching, prayer, and blessing had some, although certainly not very strong, influence, Schürer, Gesch. des jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter J. Chr. 3te Aufl. II 437-459. The designation of οἱ νεωτεροι, which occurs in Hd. 5:6, 10, already points to such a regulation; the article indicates that the younger members of the congregation, just like the הַזָּנִים, ὑπηρεται, Luk. 4:20 in the synagogues, were the self-evidently designated ones to perform some subordinate services [74]. It is not improbable that, as such, they stood over against the older members of the congregation, οἱ πρεσβυτεροι. Under Israel the old of days were honored for their grayness and wisdom. From their midst the governing persons of the civil community and in later time also the caretakers and overseers of the synagogues were appointed. Thus there were also from the outset elders in the Christian congregation, that is, men and women who were not only older in age, but who had personally known or met Jesus, who had heard

his words and had been witnesses of his miracles, who already before the day of Pentecost had confessed Him as the Messiah or perhaps had even belonged to the seventy, sent out by Jesus to the cities and villages of Palestine, Luk. 10:1, and who for all this quite naturally stood in high esteem among those who later were added to the congregations. They held no office but nevertheless by their knowledge and godliness occupied a considerable place in the congregation of Christ. Between πρεσβυτεροι and ἐπιστοποι therefore a distinction must be made. Proofs for that are: 1o that the name πρεσβυτερος, to designate the office of overseer, is gradually more closely defined and replaced by that of ἐπισκοπος, Hd. 20:28, Phil. 1:1, 1 Tim. 3:2, Tit. 1:7, 1 Petr. 2:25; 2o that Paul, after having spoken in 1 Tim. 3 about the offices, nevertheless still in 1 Tim. 5 indicates the attitude which Timothy is to adopt toward various members of the congregation, older and younger, men and women, cf. 1 Petr. 5:5; 3o that the apostolic fathers, Clemens, 1 Cor. 1, 3. 3, 3. 21, 6. 47, 6. 57, 1. 63, 3, 4 and Hermas, Vis. II 4. III 1 clearly speak of an order of elders, which continues to exist in the congregation alongside the actual office-bearers and lays claim to respectful obedience; and that 4o the well-known text, 1 Tim. 5:17, without assuming this distinction, as will appear presently, yields no good sense. Probably, therefore, we must represent it to ourselves thus, that the twelve apostles could by no means get through the work in the great congregation at Jerusalem, and therefore quite soon, just as they made use of the νεωτεροι for lower services, so they made use of some of the πρεσβυτεροι for higher services in the congregation. When and how this happened is not reported to us in Acts. The first time we find the πρεσβυτεροι [75] mentioned is Hd. 11:30, 14:23, 15:2, 6, 22, 16:4, 20:17, 28, 21:18, Jak. 5:14, without anything being related about their origin. It is not impossible

that such a taking into service of the πρεσβυτεροι by the apostles already took place before Hd. 6, i.e. before the institution of the diaconal office; οἱ νεωτεροι in Hand. 5:6, 10 points to a distinction from οἱ πρεσβυτεροι. But in any case the book of Acts teaches us that soon in various congregations under the guidance of the H. Spirit men were appointed who had to keep oversight over the congregation, and who at first indeed, because they as a rule were chosen from the elders, bore the name of οἱ πρεσβυτεροι but later with a view to their sphere of work received that of ἐπισκοποι. Episcopi are thus such presbyteri as were designated for a particular service in the congregation; all episcopi are thus presbyteri, but by no means all presbyteri were episcopi; presbyteri formed an order, episcopi bore an office. When, however, as at first happened many times, the episcopi were called presbyteri, then there was no difference in the name; presbyteri and episcopi were then the same persons and bearers of one and the same office, Hd. 20:17, 28, 1 Tim. 3:1, 4:14, 5:17, 19, Tit. 1:5, 7, 1 Petr. 5:1, 2. This presbyterial or episcopal office was first instituted in Jerusalem and in the congregations from the Jews, Hebr. 13:7, 17, 24, Jak. 5:14, but then also in those from the Gentiles. According to Hd. 14:23 Paul and Barnabas appointed elders in every congregation. Now in the letters to Rome and Corinth Paul indeed does not mention this office in so many words. But various passages, Hd. 20:17, 28, Rom. 12:8, 16:5, 10, 11, 14, 15, 1 Cor. 14-16, 16:15, 16, Phil. 1:1, 1 Thess. 5:12-14, 1 Tim. 3:1-7, Tit. 1:5-9, 1 Petr. 5:1, Op. 4:4, 10, 5:6, 8v. prove that the office of elder was a known, generally occurring, apostolic institution. And for reinforcement there is added to that the testimony of Clemens Romanus, 1 Cor. 42, that the apostles, preaching in the country and in the cities, appointed the first

converts as overseers and deacons over those who thereafter would become believers.

The task that had been entrusted to these elders becomes clear from the description of their office. The name of presbyters sheds no light on it, and therefore gives way to another, [76] especially to that of overseers, Hd. 20:28, Phil. 1:1, 1 Tim. 3:2, Tit. 1:7, just as Christ himself also, 1 Petr. 2:25, bears that name. And furthermore they are called προισταμενοι, Rom. 12:8, 1 Thess. 5:12, κυβερνησεις, 1 Cor. 12:28, ἡγουμενοι, Hebr. 13:7, 17, 24, ποιμενες, Ef. 4:11, who are to care for the congregation not for filthy gain nor with domination but with a willing mind, are to govern it as the flock of the Lord, and therefore must meet various requirements, specifically also the requirement that they rule their own house well, Hd. 20:28, 1 Tim. 3:1-7, Tit. 1:5-9, 1 Petr. 5:1-3. From this description it appears that the office of elder was in the first place charged with the oversight, the government, and the leadership of the congregation. Naturally, for that some knowledge of the truth was also necessary; according to Hd. 15:4, 22, 23 they even had to judge and decide together with the apostles at the assembly in Jerusalem concerning the weighty question that was brought onto the agenda by the conversion of the Gentiles regarding the relation to the Mosaic law. But the office of overseer was nevertheless originally not a teaching office, but a governing office. Besides, in the first time there was as yet no urgent need for a separate teaching office. Apostles, evangelists, and prophets first appeared as teachers, Hand. 13:1, 1 Cor. 14:3, 1 Tim. 2:7, 2 Tim. 1:11, and furthermore the charisma of teaching was granted to many who held no office in the congregation of Christ, Rom. 12:7, 1 Cor. 12:8, 28, 29, 14:26. The διδασκαλια was at first free, just as in the synagogue it was permitted to everyone to explain a portion of Scripture, Luk. 4:16. But gradually it

was brought into a closer relation with the episcopal office. When the congregations expanded, the need for word and sacrament could no longer be met by apostles, evangelists, and prophets; there was need of a local and permanent office that was charged with the care for that. Nor in the long run was it acceptable to leave the didaskalie entirely free, for this freedom gave rise to all kinds of abuses. Thus everything pressed toward entrusting the didaskalie to the office of overseer and thus securing a permanent place in the congregation. From Hebr. 13:7 we learn that ἡγουμενοι are at the same time the proclaimers of the word of God. When Paul in Ef. 4:11 [77] says that Christ has given some as apostles and some as evangelists and then furthermore also some as shepherds and teachers, then by that he teaches clearly that these two last-mentioned persons do not hold an essentially distinct office but perform activities in the congregation that are closely connected and yet mutually differ. Probably in the first time more than one or even all elders were authorized for the administration of word and sacrament. But in that too a change soon had to come. Indeed the requirement remained for all overseers that they must be διδακτικοι, capable of teaching, 1 Tim. 2:2. But especially two circumstances brought it about that among the overseers a distinction arose between those who were charged only with the government, and others who were also charged with the teaching. In the first place the requirements became heavier and heavier for those who had to proclaim the word of truth in the congregation; the apostles and evangelists died off; the extraordinary gifts ceased; all kinds of errors and heresies arose within and outside the congregation; the capability to teach consisted not only in instruction and admonition, but also in refutation of the opponents, 2 Tim. 3:16, Tit. 1:9; training, preparation, study became necessary for the exercise of this office in the congregation.

Besides, the Jewish scribes already had their schools; Jesus had himself trained his disciples and made them fit for their service; Paul had instructed Timothy and charged him to hand on this teaching as a precious treasure to trustworthy men, who in their turn would again be capable of teaching others, 2 Tim. 2:2. And in addition there came now in the second place still the precept of Jesus, that the laborer in the service of the word is worthy of his wages, Mt. 10:10, Luk. 10:7; a precept that in the Christian congregations was generally recognized and followed, Rom. 15:27, 1 Cor. 9:6, 11, 14, 2 Cor. 11:7-9, Gal. 6:6, 1 Thess. 2:6, 1 Tim. 5:17, 18, 2 Tim. 2:6. Indeed this had first of all reference to the apostles and evangelists, but it nevertheless further applied also to those who labored in the word and the teaching and devoted their life to it. Necessity of training and provision for livelihood were the cause that the service of the word was entrusted not to all but only to some overseers. The famous passage, [78] 1 Tim. 5:17, 18 raises this above all doubt. The πρεσβυτεροι there, cf. verse 1, are not overseers, for then Paul would make a contrast between such overseers as rule poorly and others who rule well and would consider the former still worthy of some honor but the latter worthy of a double honor. But πρεσβυτεροι are older members of the congregation in general, who as such have a claim to honor. From them Paul distinguishes the καλως προεστωτες πρεσβυτεροι, such elders who at the same time rule well, who are προισταμενοι, Rom. 12:8, 1 Thess. 5:12, i.e. who hold the office of overseers; and these now, because they belong to the older members of the congregation and at the same time are overseers, are worthy of a double honor. And from them are then again distinguished οἱ κοπιωντες ἐν λογῳ και διδασκαλιᾳ, those overseers who specifically labor in the word and the teaching and for that according to Scripture have a claim to wages. Thus

according to this passage there is therefore clearly a distinction between overseers to whom only the government, and others to whom at the same time the teaching and as a consequence of that also the administration of the sacrament is entrusted. And still within the limits of the N. T. we then encounter in the Asia Minor congregations this situation, that among the overseers only a single one is charged with the service of the word; he is the ἄγγελος, the envoy, who on Christ's behalf has to teach and lead the congregation and is responsible for its spiritual and moral condition, Op. 1:20v.

Besides this office of overseer, distinguished into that of ruling and teaching elder, a second was soon instituted. In Jerusalem, namely, according to Hd. 6, there was soon dissatisfaction among the Christians converted from the Greek proselytes, that their widows, in the private charity already being practiced at that time, were being set back and neglected by the Christians brought in from the Jews. Thereupon the apostles called the whole congregation together, and declared there that they did not think it good, with a reduction of the labor in the word itself, to devote themselves to the care for the poor. The congregation therefore had to look out for seven men and elect them, and the apostles would then appoint them to this service of mercy and, after prayer, lay hands on them. Clearly it appears from this that the apostles, although they indicate the number and the requirements of the διακονοι, assign the right and the authority to choose these [79] men to the congregation. The apostles themselves were indeed expressly appointed by Christ; but Matthias was nevertheless already designated as twelfth apostle by lot from a pair that had been drawn up by the 120 assembled believers. According to Hd. 13:1-3, Paul and Barnabas were set apart for the work of evangelists by the

prophets and teachers present in the congregation at Antioch. Timothy was chosen for this same service by prophetic indication, in the presence of many witnesses and with laying on of hands by Paul and the presbyterium, 1 Tim. 1:18, 4:14, 6:12, 2 Tim. 1:6, 2:2. In 2 Cor. 8:19 cf. vs. 23 there is mention of an evangelist who has been appointed by the congregations. The prophets and teachers were naturally not chosen by the congregations, because they appeared freely, and had more a gift than an office; but they were judged by the congregations in a wholly different way than the apostles and were subject to them, 1 Cor. 2:15, 12:10, 14:29, 1 Thess. 5:19-21, 1 Joh. 2:20, 27, Op. 2:2, 6, 14, 15, 20, 3:1v. The supposition is therefore not venturesome, that the election of the overseers, still much less than that of the evangelists, took place outside the congregation. The words in Hd. 14:23, χειροτονησαντες δε αὐτοις κατ' ἐκκλησιαν πρεσβυτερους, say only that the apostles appointed certain persons in each congregation as elders, but do not indicate how they did this; and Tit. 1:5 cf. 2 Tim. 2:2 sheds no light on that either. But from post-apostolic writings we know that in the choice of an episcopus the congregation was consulted directly or indirectly, Did. 15. Clemens, 1 Cor. 44. Polycarpus, Phil. 11. cf. Ign. Philad. 10. Const. Apost. VIII 4. And concerning the deacons the N. T. reports to us in Hd. 6 very clearly that they were designated by the congregation. There is, however, great difference of opinion about the nature of the office that was instituted here by the apostles. Some think that it was an extraordinary office, which soon ceased to exist; others judge that it included within itself the later office of elders and deacons, and still others hold that in Hd. 6 the institution of the presbyterial office is narrated. All these opinions are based on the fact that some of those chosen in Hd. 6, such as Philippus, also appear as preachers of the gospel, Hd. 8:5, 26v., 21:8, and that the

presbyters in Jerusalem also receive gifts from the [80] congregation at Antioch in the service of the brethren in Judea, Hd. 11:30. This latter proof, however, has little force; in Hd. 11:30 there is mention of an entirely exceptional case, namely, not of the distributing of the naturalia, which were laid on the tables by the congregation at Jerusalem itself for its poor, but of the remitting of monies, which in Antioch on a special occasion were brought together for the brethren in Judea and were now handed over by the hand of Barnabas and Saulus to the presbyters. But, as appears from Gal. 2:1, nothing came of this journey; we therefore do not know how and where those monies were remitted, nor also by whom they were actually received and distributed. And as for Philippus, he was in Jerusalem one of the seven, but, after the persecution broke out and the congregation was scattered, he appeared in Samaria and elsewhere as an evangelist and remained so; he did not later return to Jerusalem but settled in Caesarea, Hd. 21:8. By contrast, everything argues for the view that in Hd. 6 we have the institution of the later so-called diaconate. In the first place, the name comes into consideration; διακονια in the N. T. denotes every office and gift which, bestowed by the Lord, is employed in the service and for the benefit of the congregation; every member of the congregation is a δουλος of Christ and with all that he is and has a διακονος of the brethren; there are therefore various διακονιαι, 1 Cor. 12:5, especially ministry of the word, Hd. 6:4, 20:24, 1 Tim. 1:12, and ministry of mercy to the poor, the sick, strangers, etc., Rom. 12:7, 1 Cor. 12:28, 1 Petr. 4:11. Without doubt there was now in the congregation at Jerusalem from the beginning such a service of mercy; there was a διακονια καθημερινη, Hd. 6:1, which perhaps did stand under the supervision of the apostles but was nevertheless left to private persons. But the apostles introduced order here by the institution of a special office.

There must now be a reason why the later diaconate was designated in particular by the name of διακονια. That reason is to be found nowhere else than in Hd. 6. There it is declared that the service of mercy in a special sense is a διακονια, because it is a service of the tables, διακονειν τραπεζαις. In the second place, precisely that which elsewhere in the N. Test. is more specifically designated by the name of διακονια is assigned to the seven men. For in the διακονια in Hd. 11:29, Rom. 12:7, 1 Cor. 12:5, 2 Cor. 8:4, 9:1, 12, 13, Op. 2:19 and further everywhere where there is mention of the office of deacons and deaconesses, we have to think especially of the service of mercy. And this is entrusted in Hd. 6 to the seven men. They must see to it that the widows of the Greek Christians are no longer passed over, and are therefore in general charged with the service of the tables. By these tables are to be understood not the tables in the houses of the widows nor also the exchange tables of the bankers, Mt. 21:12, but simply the tables of the Lord. In every meeting place of the congregation there was a table or there were several tables, at which one sat down, in order together as members of the congregation to use the love-feast, ἀγαπη, and the Lord's Supper. On those tables the richer members of the congregation laid down their gifts, mostly consisting in naturalia, so that the poorer members might also enjoy them and later still be served. Those tables were tables of the Lord; what was laid on them belonged to the Lord; what one used at those tables was the Lord's food and drink; and what remained of it and was distributed was the Lord's gift. The seven men in Jerusalem were now designated to serve those tables, i.e. to be helpful at the meals and further to distribute the gifts of the Lord honestly among the saints according to their needs. In the third place, the proposition that Hd. 6 relates the origin of the diaconate is supported by the fact that the

requirements set for it are so high and in this respect correspond with those in 1 Tim. 3:8-10, 12. Why precisely seven men were elected in Jerusalem, we do not know; perhaps because the large congregation met in seven meeting places and in each of these needed a deacon. But in any case they had to be men who had the testimony in the congregation that they were πληρεις πνευματος και σοφιας; and therefore the congregation first had to look out for them in an investigating and electing manner. So Paul also wants the deacons first to be tested and to meet the many requirements which largely correspond with those for the overseers. Hatch and Sohm go too far when they infer from this that the requirements for presbyter and deacon are scarcely to be distinguished. For while, e.g., for the elder the emphasis falls on the διδακτικον είναι, for the deacon purity of conscience [82] in relation to the content of the faith is required, 1 Tim. 3:9. But otherwise the religious and moral requirements for elder and deacon are virtually the same. Presbytery and diaconate stand, as appears from Hd. 6 and 1 Tim. 3, in close connection. In the fourth place, there is little ground for the assertion that the diaconate arose only later approximately simultaneously with the episcopal office. From the διακονια, Rom. 12:7 and the ἀντιληψεις, 1 Cor. 12:28 little may be inferred. But everything argues for the view that with the presbytery the diaconate also was transplanted by the apostles from the Jerusalem congregation into other congregations. Just as elders were needed, so elsewhere also there soon had to arise a need for deacons for the service of the tables. In Phil. 1:1 they are therefore mentioned in passing as something quite ordinary alongside and after the elders; in 1 Tim. 3 Paul enumerates their requirements, and in Rom. 16:1, 2, 1 Tim. 3:11, 5:9, 10 there is mention of deaconesses. The apostolate may thus, as an extraordinary office, precede the church as an assembly of

believers; the offices of teacher, elder, and deacon presuppose the congregation, which has the right to designate and elect their bearers. Cf. on the organization of the church in the days of the N. T. Rothe, Die Anfänge der christl. Kirche 1837. Lechler, Die neut. Lehre vom h. Amte 1857. Neander, Gesch. der Pflanzung u. Leitung d. christl. Kirche durch die Apostel5, Gotha 1862. Hatch, Die Gesellschaftsverfassung d. chr. Kirche im Alt. Aus d. Engl. von A. Harnack, Giessen 1883. Harnack, Lehre der 12 Apostel, Texte und Unters. II 1. 2. 1884. Sohm, Kirchenrecht, Leipzig 1892. Loening, Die Gemeindeverfassung des Urchrist. Halle 1888. Loofs, Die urchr. Gemeindeverfassung mit spez. Bez. auf Loening u. Harnack, Stud. u. Krit. 1890 S. 619. Weiszäcker, Das apost. Zeitalter d. chr. K2. 1890. Lechler, Das apost. und nachapost. Zeitalter3 1885. Zöckler, Diakonen und Evangelisten, München 1893. Moeller-v. Schubert, Lehrb. d. Kirchengesch. I2 1897 S. 88. Kurtz, Lehrb. der Kirchengesch. 13te Aufl. 1899 § 31.

4. This aristocratic-presbyterial church polity did not continue to exist for long, but soon passed over into a monarchical-episcopal one. How that came about, we do not know; for conjectures and suppositions there is therefore a wide field here, cf. Karl Sell, [83] Forschungen der Gegenwart über Begriff und Entstehung der Kirche, Zeits. f. Theol. u. Kirche v. Gottschick, 1894 S. 347-417. But certainly various circumstances directed the church in this direction. In the first place, it lay at hand that the churches at the beginning could not yet strictly distinguish between the extraordinary (apostles, evangelists, prophets) and the ordinary (episcopi, diaconi) offices. The offices resting on a charisma of apostle (in the broader sense of evangelist), prophet, and teacher continued, even after the twelve apostles and Paul had died, still on in the congregations, Did. 11 sq. Hermas, Mand. 11. Euseb. H. E. III 37. But when these ceased and degenerated more and

more, so that between true and false it became ever more difficult to distinguish, then the evangelizing, prophetic, and didaskalic activity was bound to the office of the episcopi; they became the true evangelists, prophets, and teachers, Did. 15. As always, so also then, little by little the stream of free life was led into the bed of a fixed organization. In the second place, the conditions which, according to the N. T. and the apostolic fathers, existed in the congregations, teach us clearly that the first Christians were far from being able to take up into themselves the truth of the gospel in all its richness and purity. Especially the ideas of Paul were mixed with all kinds of foreign, Jewish and heathen constituents. Justification by faith was nowhere taught purely. Faith in God's revelation in Christ retained significance only as a motive for a moral life, often already ascetically colored; the gospel became a new law, the observance of which bestowed eternal life, the ἀφθαρσια. This whole moral, legalistic direction worked to the advantage of the elevation of the office as organ of the divine revelation, stamped obedience and submission to the ecclesiastical authority (μαθετε ὑποτασσεσθαι, Clem. 1 Cor. 57) as the first Christian duty, and heresy and schism as the most dreadful of all sins. In the third place, the appearance of all kinds of heretical and sectarian directions made organization and consolidation of the Christian congregations urgently necessary. The question of the true church acquired practical importance. And the answer to that ran: the true church is that which holds to the whole, to the catholica ecclesia, and this is where the bishop is, Ign. Smyrn. 8. This [84] change in the government did not come about in all churches at the same time. The Didache does not yet know it; it does not speak of presbyteri, but only of episcopi and diaconi, who must be men worthy of the Lord and must fulfill the service of the prophets and teachers, c. 15. Hermas names apostles,

episcopi, teachers and deacons alongside one another, without making mention of presbyteri, Vis. III 5, but seems to presuppose at the head of each congregation a college composed of presbyteri, II 4, and thus still makes no official distinction between presbyteri and episcopi. About the time in which the Shepherd of Hermas was written, that is in any case in the first half of the second century, the monarchical episcopate therefore did not yet exist in Rome. It has, moreover, also not arisen in Rome, as Sohm S. 157-179 asserts, and also not in the West but in the East. The first letter of Clement, written from Rome at the end of the first century, does indeed say that the apostles appointed the first converts as episcopi and diaconi and that it is sin to dismiss them when they fulfill their service in an irreproachable manner, but does not yet know the distinction of episcopi and presbyteri and uses both names interchangeably, c. 42. 44. 47. On the other hand, the monarchical episcopate developed very quickly in the East; the letters of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, who under Trajan about 110-115 died in Rome as a martyr, are for that an unimpeachable witness, and would remain so even in the case of inauthenticity, since they then nevertheless cannot be younger than the years 130-140. Ignatius speaks repeatedly, up to 13 times, of episcopi, presbyteri and deacons as of three distinct office-bearers; he sees in the episcopus a messenger of Christ, Ef. 6, a χαρις θεου, Magn. 2, a likeness of God or of Christ, Magn. 7. Trall. 2. 3. Smyrn. 8; and he urges unceasingly, in the interest of the unity of the church, that the members of the congregation unite with the bishop according to God's command, do nothing ecclesiastical outside him, and avoid all heresy and schism most strictly. Yet the episcopal idea in Ignatius still stands only at the beginning of its development; the bishop is no bearer of the tradition, no priest of the N. Testament, no successor of the apostles, he is always

surrounded by the council of presbyters and deacons, as Christ by [85] his apostles, he bears an office in a local church and has no authority outside it. In the congregations of Asia Minor, in Paul's days, Acts 14:23, 20:17, Phil. 1:1, Tit. 1:5 and also later still, Clement, 1 Cor. 42, 4. 44, 2. 4. 6, not one but several episcopi stood at the head. According to 1 Tim. 4:14 they already together formed a college, a presbyterium. And one among them stepped, according to Rev. 1:20v., so much into the foreground that he could be designated as ἄγγελος and be regarded as representative of the whole congregation. Probably the development of the monarchical episcopate attached itself to that. The presbyter who was charged with the leadership of the assemblies and perhaps also, in distinction from all fellow office-bearers, alone with the ministry of the word, was little by little regarded as bearer of a special office. He alone was episcopus, while all others were only presbyters. In this way it would also be explainable that Ignatius presupposes the monarchical episcopate already as long existing, that Clement of Alexandria in Eusebius, Hist. eccl. III 23, 6 speaks of John as ὀπου μεν ἐπισκοπους καταστησων, and that this episcopate was already soon, about the middle of the second century, introduced everywhere. If one had not thought to rest in it on an apostolic tradition, the rapid spread would be almost inexplicable. The new thing that meets us in Ignatius then consists in this, that he uses the name episcopus exclusively for him who at first was only primus inter pares, that he indeed still always holds this episcopus in connection with but yet also already far elevates him above the presbyteri and deacons, that he repeatedly compares him with God or with Christ, and that he demands for him from the members of the congregation an almost unlimited obedience. In this direction the development of that episcopate continued. If in a congregation only one bishop might be, then it

spoke for itself that in a great congregation, with many church buildings, that church obtained a certain precedence, to which the bishop was bound; that the rural congregations founded from the cities became branches of the mother congregation and a διοικησις (dioecesis, only since the 9th century; before that time παροικια), of the bishop; that he alone could perform the actual ecclesiastical acts, e.g. the eucharist, the ordination, the absolution, etc. Therewith in [86] principle the whole earlier relation was reversed; in the apostolic time there were first congregations, assemblies of believers, in which by the apostles episcopi and deacons were appointed, who were chosen with the consent of the congregations and were subject to their judgment. But now it was reversed; the true church, doctrine, baptism, eucharist, communion with God is there where the bishop is, as Ignatius says time and again and Irenaeus, Cyprian and others after him work out. The struggle against the gnosis, which appealed to the tradition and thereby sought to prove its right and truth, made it therewith necessary to set the genuine, apostolic tradition over against it. And this was found in the bishops as successors of the apostles and bearers of the tradition. They had been appointed by the apostles in the congregations, had succeeded one another in regular succession and therefore were bearers of the charisma veritatis certum, Iren. adv. haer. III 2, 2. 3, 1, 2. IV 26, 2, cf. 1 Clem. 42, 2. 44, 2. Cypr. Ep. 66, 4. 75, 16. de unit. 4. This wholly new conception of the episcopate as continuation of the apostolate and of its inviolable authority in the church was completed in that since the second half of the second century the distinction of clergy and laity was introduced. Clerus, κληρος, lot, inheritance, property, originally designated the congregation of Christ as the inheritance or property of God, Deut. 4:20, 9:29, 1 Petr. 2:5, Ignat. Eph. 11, 2. Trall. 12, 3. Phil. 5, 1. But gradually the use of this word was

restricted, and first applied only to the presbyters, Tert. de monog. 12. de exhort. cast. 7. Cypr. Ep. 15, 1, then also to the deacons, Clem. Alex. Quis dives 42, Tert. de fuga 11. 12. Hippol. Philos. IX 12 and finally also to all the ordines minores (acoluthi, exercistae, lectores, ostiarii), which arose at the beginning of the third century, Cypr. Ep. 29. 34, 4. 59, 9. All these servants of the church nevertheless gradually became more and more independent of the congregation and were made into officials of the bishop and then with him as clergy, as ecclesia docens set over against the laity, the ecclesia audiens, which had nothing more to say but only still to listen and to obey, cf. Cremer s. v. Harnack D. G. I 383 Sohm, Kirchenrecht I 157-247. Thus arose the episcopal system of church government, which sees in the bishop the lawful successor of the apostles and the spiritual prince of the [87] believers. According to that system various Christian churches are constituted, the Greek church and many other Eastern churches and sects, Hofmann, Symbolik § 44. 55. 62v.; further the Roman church, which however has advanced from the episcopal system to the papal and therefore was always opposed by the adherents of the pure episcopal system, such as the men of the reforming councils, the Gallicans, the Jansenists, the Febronians, the Old Catholics, Conc. Trid. sess. 23 c. 4 and can. 6. Bellarminus, de membris ecclesiae militantis, Controv. II 2. Petavius, de eccl. hierarchia, in 5 books, Theol. dogm. Paris. 1870 VIII 97-406. C. Pesch, Prael. dogm. I prop. 33. Scheeben-Atzberger, Dogm. IV 1 S. 480. Simar, Dogm. 624. Conc. Vatic. sess. 4 prooem.; and finally the Anglican church, which in the first period by the mouth of Cranmer, Parkington, Whitgift, Usher and others still defended the episcopal system only as a permissible and useful jus ecclesiasticum, but later, especially after the archbishops Bancroft and Laud, defended it as a jus divinum, Richard

Hooker, The laws of ecclesiastical polity 1593 etc., reprinted several times, best ed. by Keble, Oxford 1845. Joseph Hall, Episcopacy by divine right asserted 1640. Makower, Die Verfassung der Kirche von England, Berlin 1894. Art. Anglik. Kirche in Herzog3.

But the Roman church did not remain standing with the episcopal system but developed it further into the papal system. Rome had already for centuries been the world-city and also immediately assumed an important place in the Christian church. Paul was indeed not the founder of the congregation there, but nevertheless very much desired to see her, and addressed to her his greatest and most important letter, Rom. 1:9v., 15:22v. Later he spent there a time, as did Peter likewise, and both found there martyrdom. Because of her beneficence and helpfulness with respect to other, weak congregations she soon became famous, Ign. Rom. Euseb. H. E. IV 23, 10. VII 5, 2. According to the first letter of Clement she bore a motherly care for the congregation of Corinth. With all the great questions which in the second and third century were brought to the order of the day by Gnosticism and Montanism, she was involved and laid the greatest weight in the scale. There, about the middle of the second century, the first list of bishops was drawn up; there the idea of the succession [88] of the bishops and of their apostolic dignity arose. Roman and catholic were from the outset connected with one another and developed hand in hand, Harnack, D. G. I 400 f. The congregation of the world-city became the centre of the Christian church. The central significance which Rome had in the pagan empire was transferred to the congregation and raised her to head of all Christendom. This principate of the congregation at Rome, however, in the first period still bore no ecclesiastical-legal, but only a moral-religious character. Rome was prima inter pares; all other congregations

stood equal with her; all bishops had with that of Rome equal rank. Irenaeus indeed says in the famous passage, adv. haer. III 3, that every church and all believers must agree with the church of Rome propter potiorem principalitatem, because in her the apostolic tradition has been preserved pure, but he nevertheless adduces the church of Rome by way of example, ascribes principalitas to all churches founded by the apostles, and says only that Rome possesses a potior principalitas, because she is the greatest, the oldest, the best-known church, founded by the apostles Paul and Peter. Nor does he speak with a word of the primacy of Peter nor also of the bishop of Rome; all emphasis he lays on the church of Rome. Later he also contested the excommunication which Victor I had pronounced over the Asia Minor Quartodecimans, with the result that this one had to revoke it, Euseb. H. E. V 24. This opposition may have concerned a matter of discipline, it nevertheless proves the frankness and independence of Irenaeus and others over against the bishop of Rome. Likewise Tertullian places all churches founded by the apostles, Ephesus, Corinth, Philippi etc. on one line, even though he also says that Carthage has in Rome her authority and that the apostles in Rome totam doctrinam cum sanguine suo profuderunt, de praescr. 36, cf. 20. de virg. vel. 2; in his Montanist period he contested the edict of Calixtus concerning the readmission of the lapsed, called him mockingly pontifex maximus, episcopus episcoporum, and saw in that a far-reaching presumption, de pudic. 1. 13. 21. Cyprian also still stands on the same standpoint; all bishops are equal, partake of one and the same episcopal dignity, are as it were one bishop, stand at the head of the church and must mutually [89] preserve caritas animi, collegii honor, vinculum fidei et concordia sacerdotii, Ep. 43, 5. 49, 2. 55, 24. 73, 26. de unit. eccl. 5. Therefore in the conflict over heretical baptism he still resisted the bishop

of Rome, Stephen, Ep. 71-74; preserving unity, each bishop is nevertheless to a certain extent independent and responsible to God alone, Ep. 72, 3. But the above-mentioned new conception of the episcopate had by the nature of the case to benefit Rome. The centre of gravity had been shifted from the congregation to the bishop. This one was regarded as successor of the apostles, as bearer of the treasure of truth and of apostolic power. If this was so, which bishop could then make more claims and assert more rights than the bishop of Rome? No church stood equal with that of Rome in power and esteem; she left them all behind her and strove past them all, the churches of Palestine and Asia Minor, soon also those of Antioch and Alexandria. And the bishops of Rome knew how to make use of their position and gradually began to vindicate what at first was moral influence as a right. Yet it did not come so quickly to recognition of this right. Tertullian still denied that Mt. 16:18 gave the bishop of Rome any power over other churches, because it contained only a promise to Peter, de pudic. 21. Cyprian indeed laid strong emphasis on the unity of the church and also made it rest on the identity of episcopal power, but in the cathedra Petri at Rome he nevertheless saw of that power no more than a symbolic unity, de unit. 4. The Synod at Nicaea in canon 6 still placed the bishops of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch equal, granted to the latter two in their provinces the same ἐξουσια as the bishop of Rome already possessed in Italy, ἐπειδη και τῳ ἐν τῃ Ῥωμῃ ἐπισκοπῳ τουτο συνηθες ἐστιν and maintained for these and also still for other churches the primacy belonging to her, τα πρεσβεια or τα πρωτεια. After the development of episcopal power in the third century followed that of archiepiscopal or metropolitan dignity in the fourth century; not Rome alone, but many churches alongside her had a certain precedence or primacy in their provinces; the bishops in the course

of the fourth century were subjected to the archbishops. The East always continued to resist the all-dominating primacy of the bishop of Rome. [90] Alongside Alexandria and Antioch, since the middle of the fourth century Constantinople rose more and more in ecclesiastical power. The council of Constantinople in 381 can. 2 says that the bishop of Alexandria possesses ecclesiastical power only in Egypt, that Antioch retains the rights which according to Nicaea belong to it and that the bishops of the East will govern only the East. And after it has thus limited the power of the bishop of Alexandria to Egypt, it adds in can. 3, τον Κονσταντινου πολεως ἐχειν τα πρεσβεια της τιμης μετα τον της Ῥωμης ἐπισκοπον, δια το εἰναι αὐτην νεαν Ῥωμην. After the bishop of Rome, not that of Alexandria, even though he also has the oldest rights and the oldest letters, but that of Constantinople shall have the precedence of honour, not on the ground of any ecclesiastical or spiritual prerogative, but only for the political consideration that Constantinople is the new Rome. The West was left to the bishop of Rome, but the East refused to bow before him and came more and more to stand under the jurisdiction of Constantinople. The council of Chalcedon 451 can. 28 recognized the precedence, τα πρεσβεια, of the older Rome, because it was the imperial city, δια το βασιλευειν την πολιν ἐκεινην, but ascribed equal precedence, τα ἱσα πρεσβεια, to the holy see of the new Rome. In spite of the protests of Rome, Constantinople maintained its rights. The papal power of the bishop of Rome rested for a great part on the political prestige of the city; these same claims could therefore Constantinople as second Rome assert. The bishop of Rome has therefore never been shepherd of all Christendom; he became the head only of Western, Latin Christendom. And this he became by right only in the fourth century. Already the later by the church not recognized synod of Sardica 343

charged the bishop of Rome with the decision whether, in case a bishop had been deposed by a synod, a new synod would or would not be convened. In the year 380 emperor Theodosius issued the famous edict, whereby he commanded, cunctos populos, quos clementiae nostrae regit temperamentum, in tali volumus religione versari, quam divinum Petrum apostolum tradidisse Romanis religio usque nunc ab ipso insinuata declarat. With the church fathers of the fourth and fifth century there is no doubt [91] any more that they consider communion with and subjection to Rome necessary for the essence of the church. From the church at Rome all rights of ecclesiastical communion proceed, inde enim in omnes venerandae communionis jura dimanant, Ambros. Ep. cl. 2 ep 2. Ecclesiae salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet, Hier. c. Lucif. 9. With him rests the unadulterated tradition of the fathers, he is lux mundi, sal terrae, aurea vasa et argentea, Hier. Ep. 15 ad Dam. Roman is the standard of the catholic; if Rufinus holds to the faith of Rome, he is catholic; si Romanam responderit, ergo catholici sumus, Hier. c. Ruf. 1, 4. When Innocentius I has confirmed the decisions of the synod of Carthage and Milevis against Pelagianism and has condemned Pelagius and Coelestius, Augustine says: causa finita est, utinam aliquando finiatur et error! Ep. 132 de script. Clearly and consciously Leo I 440-461 then develops this primacy of the Roman see in various letters and raises it to the rank and value of a religious dogma, which in Mt. 16:18 possessed its scriptural ground, cf. bij Heinrich, Dogm. Theol. II 325 f.

When development had progressed so far, the question naturally had to arise, to what the pope owed so eminent a place and such a high authority. In the Old Catholic period, even after the introduction of the monarchical episcopate, the emphasis always fell on the local church; the church at

Rome had been founded by Peter and Paul, and therefore had the purest tradition; all churches, in order to be Christian and catholic, had to agree with it in faith, Iren. adv. haer. III 3. The bishop was therefore dependent on his congregation; he was chosen by it and in all weighty matters, especially in excommunication, took counsel with it. Cyprian expressly says in his letters to the Carthaginian presbyterium, that he wishes to do nothing sine consilio vestro et sine consensu plebis, Ep. 14, 4. 17, 1. 3. 19, 2 etc. In difficult cases the counsel and help of delegates from neighboring congregations were invoked, Hd. 15:2, Const. Apost. c. 1, Clemens, 1 Cor. 63. Cypr. Ep. 17, 3; the oldest ecclesiastical assemblies were congregational assemblies, at most assisted by delegates from neighboring congregations. But when the bishop was regarded as successor of the apostles and precisely thereby was distinguished from all, then he could no longer [92] be chosen by the congregation nor be dependent on it; he had to receive his office from above in the way of succession, and thus be appointed and ordained by a synod of bishops or by a chapter; he no longer had to consult with the congregation but was sovereign and determined everything alone, at most after consultation with the chapter gradually developing out of the presbyterate. And what thus since the fourth century took place in the local or diocesan churches, repeated itself on a larger scale in the universal church. Out of the episcopate there arose in the course of time the papal system, and the old congregational assemblies expanded into synods and councils, which at first also still were composed of presbyters, deacons, lectores but then subsequently only of bishops as representatives of the congregations. These synods did not regard themselves as infallible; in the fourth century a subsequent synod repeatedly annuls what the previous one had established; and from that time until the 9th century they also bore a

political character, were imperial synods and were convoked by the emperor, officially or unofficially led and confirmed. But the pope rose in power; as bishop of Rome and archbishop of Italy he already had power to convoke and lead provincial and national synods, just as other bishops possessed that right elsewhere; since the 12th century he knew how to expand these provincial and national synods, just as the bishop of Constantinople had already done that with his συνοδοι ἐνδημουσαι for the Greek church, into ecumenical synods of the whole Western church. The ecumenical councils of Western Christendom thus developed out of the Roman synods, and were therefore convoked, led, and confirmed by the pope. To be sure, the reforming councils in the 15th century, under the influence of the humanistic theory of the superiority of the people, attempted to make themselves, as assemblies of delegates of the whole church, independent of the pope and to place themselves as infallible above him. But the pope knew how to maintain himself also over against and above the ecumenical synods and therefore had to be partaker of a prerogative that was granted to no other bishop. After from the days of Irenaeus onward for a long time agreement in faith with the church at Rome was already regarded as necessary for the essence of the Christian churches, because there with the [93] lawful succession the charisma veritatis certum rested, it was gradually expressed ever more clearly that this indefectibilitas of the church of Rome had its ground in a special gift, which was bestowed by the Holy Spirit upon the bishop of Rome, as successor of Peter. At first the emphasis was still placed on the church at Rome; this could not fall away, because it had been founded by the apostles Peter and Paul and was continually led by their lawful successors. Thus Irenaeus says of the presbyteri, that they cum episcopatus successione charisma veritatis certum

secundum placitum Patris acceperunt, adv. haer. IV 26. But this gave no sufficient guarantee, especially when many churches in spite of their apostolic foundation fell away with their lawfully succeeding bishops and wholly disappeared. Therefore, ever more the ground for the indefectibilitas of the church at Rome was sought in this, that at its head stood a bishop who, as successor of Peter, who also among the apostles occupied an altogether special place, was partaker of a special gift and guidance of the Holy Spirit. Augustine derived the unshakableness of Peter's faith from the intercession of Christ, Luk. 22:32, de corr. et gr. 8. Ephraem Syrus said in his panegyric on Peter, Paul and Andrew: lucerna Christus, candelabrum est Petrus, oleum autem subministratio S. Spiritus. Leo the Great spoke in his letter to the bishops of the ecclesiastical province of Vienna of a mirabile munus gratiae, by which the building of the eternal temple is confirmed upon the firmness of Peter, and declared elsewhere, that the chair of Peter tanta divinitus soliditate munita est, ut eam neque haeretica unquam perrumpere pravitas, nec pagana potuerit superare perfidia. Pope Hormisdas testified in his libellus of the year 516, that the truth of the promise of Christ to Peter is confirmed by the facts, quia in sede apostolica immaculata est semper catholica servata religio. Likewise Pope Agatho declared in a writing to the emperors of the year 680, that the church at Rome by the grace of God and the protection of Christ has never deviated from the way of truth and also by virtue of the promise of the Lord will never deviate from it. It was therefore no longer a novelty, when Gregory VII in his Dictatus Papae pronounced: Romana ecclesia nunquam erravit, nec in perpetuum Scriptura testante errabit, and [94] Boniface VIII in the bull Unam Sanctam 1302 decreed: subesse Romano Pontifici omni humanae creaturae declaramus, definimus et pronunciamus esse de necessitate

salutis, cf. bij Heinrich, Dogm. Theol. II 357 f. With this practice and theory of the popes the theologians agreed. Some, such as Bede, Alcuin, Paschasius, Radbertus, Damiani, Anselmus, Lombardus, Sent. IV dist. 24 etc. still speak only in passing and with a few words about the authority of the pope; indeed that is still the case with Thomas, C. Gent. IV 76. S. Theol. II 2 qu. 1 art. 10. qu. 11 art. 2. Sent. IV dist. 7 qu. 3 art. 1. dist. 20 qu. 1 art. 4 etc. (cf. Leitner, Der h. Thomas v. Aq. über das unfehlbare Lehramt des Papstes 1872) and Bonaventura, Breviloquium adjectis illustrationibus ex aliis operibus ejusdem S. Doct. depromptis opera et studio Ant. Mar. de Vicetia, Frib. 1881 VI c. 12. But the various attempts that from the 14th to the 16th century were employed for reformation of the church brought Rome to self-consciousness. Papalism proper or curialism emerged, expressed the plenitudo potestatis and the infallibility of the pope clearly and developed it many times to its ultimate consequences. Canus, Loci theol. lib. 6. Bellarminus, de summo pontifice, in Tom. I zijner Controv. p. 188-255. Becanus, Manuale Controv. I c. 4. Theol. Wirceb. ed. 3 Paris. 1880 I 267 sq. Joseph de Maistre, Du pape 1819. Perrone, Prael. Theol. 1843 VIII 295-536. Heinrich, Dogm. Theol. II 163-476. Scheeben, I 220 f. IV 397-458. Simar, Dogm. 598 f. Jansen, Prael. Theol. I 512-658. Ermann, De Paus, Utrecht 1899 etc. On 18 July 1870 the constitutio dogmatica de ecclesia Christi was adopted at the Vatican council, and thereby determined: 1o that the primatus jurisdictionis in universam Dei ecclesiam was promised and entrusted immediately and directly by Christ to Peter; 2o that this primacy of Peter continues in the bishop of Rome as his successor; 3o that this primacy of the pope consists in plena et suprema potestas jurisdictionis in universam ecclesiam, non solum in rebus, quae ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quae ad disciplinam et regimen ecclesiae per totum

orbem diffusae pertinent, so that he is judex supremus fidelium, in all matters that concern the churches has the highest decision, raised above everyone's judgment and subject to no council; 4o that in this primacy is also included suprema [95] magisterii potestas, so that the pope indeed receives no new revelations and only under the guidance of the Holy Spirit purely preserves and explains the transmitted revelation, but nevertheless does this in such a way that he, when he speaks ex cathedra and as Shepherd and Teacher of all Christians establishes a doctrine concerning faith or morals, by divine support is partaker of infallibility, from himself and not first as a consequence of the consent of the church. Cf. Acta et decreta sacr. conc. rec. Collectio Lacensis VII Friburg 1890 p. 262-498.

5. Although this hierarchical church government in its origin is much older than earlier Protestants were inclined to acknowledge and even goes back to the beginning of the second century; although by the logical course of its development and by the imposing character of its appearance it never fails to make an impression; it is nevertheless in principle and essence in direct conflict with the government which Christ has bestowed upon his church. For, in the first place, the distinction between clergy and laity, which lies at the foundation of this hierarchy, is nowhere taught in the N. T. and is most decisively contradicted by the organization of the church of the first century. Rome does indeed appeal, besides to the convenientia, to the priesthood of the N. T., to the offices which Christ has instituted in his church, and to the power which He has entrusted to it. But this does not prove what must be proved. Scripture very certainly distinguishes between shepherds and flock, builders and temple, planters and fieldwork, teachers and disciples, leaders and followers, etc.; if by the names clergy and laity no other than this distinction were meant, they could be used without harm.

But usage has attached to them a wholly different sense. Clergy has in the Roman church become the name of a special class of ecclesiastical persons, who by tonsure and ordination are separated from all others, form a distinct estate of "clergy," are in a wholly special sense the property of God, are equipped with an absolute sovereign power over the people, and for the laity serve as necessary and indispensable mediators of salvation, Cat. Rom. II 7, 13. Now such an estate Scripture does not know. Even to the Old Testament the antithesis of clergy and laity is not applicable; [96] the whole people was clergy, property and inheritance of the Lord, a priestly kingdom, a holy people, Ex. 19:5, 6, Deut. 7:6, 14:2, 26:18, 32:9, 1 Kon. 8:51, 53, Ps. 135:4, Jes. 19:25, 41:8, Jer. 12:7, 8, Joel 2:17 etc.; the priesthood, which was not appointed but by virtue of descent from Aaron was called to this service, was nevertheless most strictly bound to the law of God, Lev. 10:11 and subjected to the judgment of the prophets, Jes. 28:7, Jer. 1:18, 2:26, 6:13, Ezech. 22:26, Hos. 4:9 etc.; Israel was a theocracy but no hierarchy. Much less is there in the N. T. still any mention of a clergy: the H. Spirit has been poured out upon all, Hd. 2:17, and now all are πνευματικοι, Rom. 8:14, 1 Cor. 2:15, 3:1, Gal. 5:25, 6:1, partakers of the anointing, 1 Joh. 2:27, a royal priesthood, 1 Petr. 2:5, 9, a congregation of saints and called ones, Rom. 1:7, a people and property of God, 2 Cor. 6:16, 1 Petr. 2:10, Hebr. 12:22-24. Nowhere does the N. T. make mention of a special priestly office, to be exercised by the ministers of the church, or of a special offering, to be offered by them; the office in the church of Christ is no magisterium but a ministerium, no ἱεραρχια but a ἱεροδουλεια, a διακονια, οἰκονομια, which all entirely excludes dominion over the inheritance of the Lord (των κληρων, 1 Petr 5:3, i.e. the congregations entrusted to the presbyters for care) altogether, Mt. 20:25, 26, 1 Cor. 3:5, 4:1, 2 Cor. 4:1, 2, Ef. 4:12. Cf.

Luther's doctrine of the general priesthood of believers in Köstlin, Luthers Theol. I 316. 376. II 538. Gerhard, Loci Theol. Loc. 23 § 37. Calvijn, Inst. IV 4, 9. 12, 1. Comm. on 1 Petr. 5:3. Junius, Op. II 1181. Amesius, Bellarminus enervatus III c. 1. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. III p. 2. Cappellus, Synt. thesium theol. in Acad. Salmur. III p. 272-279. M. Vitringa IX 1 p. 423-437. Art. Geistliche by Caspari in Herzog3.

Secondly, nevertheless, Holy Scripture teaches very clearly that Christ in his church not only distributes gifts, but has also instituted definite offices, extraordinary ones such as those of apostle, prophet, and evangelist, and ordinary ones such as those of elder and deacon. Concerning the episcopate there is in addition the greatest difference. Greeks, Roman Catholics (also Gallicans and Old Catholics) and Anglicans hold this to be an office which is essentially and jure divino distinct from the presbyterate, by lawful and uninterrupted [97] succession descends from the apostleship and specifically possesses the potestas magisterii, jurisdictionis and ordinis; the bishops properly have only the teaching office, the power to preach and to administer the sacraments, and in doing so they make use of the priests (pastors) as their vicarii, and have the exclusive right of mission and ordination; patriarchs, metropolitans, archbishops bear no other office but are distinguished from the bishops only by an accidental power, by jurisdiction over a larger territory, etc. Proofs from Holy Scripture for this distinction are to be derived only from the offices which were held by Timothy, Titus, and others, and from the ἀγγελος in the seven Asia Minor churches, Op. 1:20. But Timothy and many others were in that first time called by the apostles to the extraordinary office of evangelist, above p. 66; and the angels of the churches were no others than the first among their equals, as the pastores now, so that the singularis in Openb. 2:10, 23, 24

also alternates with the pluralis. Bellarminus, de membris eccl. milit. I c. 14, Petavius, de eccl. hierarchia I c. 2 and others therefore also do not mention Scriptural arguments, but appeal to the tradition in Irenaeus, Tertullianus, Eusebius etc., who say that the apostles appointed a bishop in various churches and provide the bishop-lists of some churches. But even if the monarchical episcopate also arose very soon in the church, there is nevertheless clearly to be seen in it a deviation from the ordinances of the apostles. For the N. T. still knows nothing of an official distinction between ἐπισκοπος, and πρεσβυτερος. Although the name πρεσβυτεροι in the first time probably had a broader meaning, and sometimes also indicated the old and venerable members of the church, as an official name it was nevertheless identical with that of the ἐπισκοποι. For there were in the churches many ἐπισκοποι, Hd. 20:17, 28, Phil. 1:1; and this επισκοπειν was precisely entrusted to πρεσβυτεροι, Hd. 20:17, 28, 1 Tim. 3:1-7, 5:17, Tit. 1:5, 7, 1 Petr. 5:1-3; Peter therefore also calls himself a πρεσβυτερος, 1 Petr. 5:1; of a special institution of the episcopate alongside the presbyterate the N. T. therefore also knows nothing; apart from the extraordinary offices of apostle, prophet and evangelist, there are only two ordinary offices, that of deacons and that of πρεσβυτεροι, Phil. 1:1, 1 Tim. 3:1, 8, [98] ποιμενες και διδασκαλοι, Ef. 4:11, 1 Tim. 5:17, κυβερνησεις, 1 Cor. 12:28, προισταμενοι, Rom. 12:8, 1 Thess. 5:12, ἡγουμενοι, Hebr. 13:7, 17. These testimonies of Scripture are so strong that not only Aerius in the 4th century, the Waldensians, Wycliffe, the Reformers etc., called the presbyteral and episcopal office identical, but also many church fathers, such as Theodoretus, Chrysostomus, Epiphanius and others, saw themselves compelled to the acknowledgment that in the N. T. the names of presbyter and episcopus were used interchangeably; and Hieronymus, Ep. 65 ad

Evagrium and Comm. on Tit. 1:5 even says that presbyteri and episcopi were originally equal, but that later one from among them was set over the others, in schismatis remedium, in Petavius, Dissert. eccles. I c. 1-3, cf. also Lombardus, Sent. IV dist. 24, 9. The Roman Catholics cannot come to terms with Scripture on this point. According to Hd. 20:17, 28, Phil. 1:1 there were undoubtedly several episcopi in one church; but the Roman Catholics cannot acknowledge this and therefore say that the apostles sometimes at the same time gave the presbyteri the episcopal ordination (Petavius) or that under that term the episcopi of the neighboring churches are at the same time included (Franzelin), or that the names of presbyteri and episcopi were not yet distinguished, Scheeben, Dogm. IV 395. Ermann, de Paus, 2e ged. 96. In the last case, however, the alleged difference between the presbyteral and episcopal office is not maintainable. To this testimony of Scripture there then still comes the lesson of history, that the Roman episcopate is the root of the hierarchy, opens the way to the papacy, brings with it the inequality of the churches and makes the believers slavishly dependent on the offices. Also all this is utterly in conflict with Scripture. A hierarchy does not exist in the church of Christ, Luk. 22:25, 26, 2 Cor. 1:24, 1 Petr. 5:3; a diocesan, cathedral, patriarchal or metropolitan church does not exist, for all churches are in the N. T. equal and each has its own ἐπισκοποι; and nowhere are the believers commanded to investigate the legitima successio of their ministers but to examine the Scripture, to remain in the doctrine etc., Joh. 5:39, Hd. 17:11, 1 Tim. 4:13-16, 2 Tim. 1:13, 14, 3:14-17; lawful succession does not guarantee the purity of doctrine, Joh. 8:39, Rom. 2:28, 9:6, and would make salvation dependent on certain [99] persons and on an impractical, fallible and often even impossible historical investigation. For these reasons the episcopate was

unanimously rejected by the Reformers. The Lutherans indeed were prepared to recognize the right that it had acquired secundum ecclesiasticam politiam, if only the essential thing in the episcopal office remained the ministerium verbi et sacramentorum resting on divine right, Symb. Bücher ed. Müller p. 62. 205. 286. 340. The name of bishop was also sometimes retained and transferred to the territorial lord, or also in some both Reformed and Lutheran churches one from a circle of ministers was charged under the name of bishop or superintendent with the inspection over a group of churches. Calvin and many others, Knox, a Lasco, Saravia, Tilenus, Scultetus, Bochartus, Spanheim etc. had no overriding objection to that, M. Vitringa IX p. 210 sq. But this was nevertheless something essentially different from the episcopal office in the Roman church, which according to the council of Trent differs essentially from the presbyterate, rests on divine right and in the 17th century was also introduced and defended in the Anglican church. Cf. Calvijn, Inst. IV 3, 8. 4, 2 sq. 5, 1 sq. Beza, Responsio ad tractationem de ministrorum evangelii gradibus ab Hadriano Saravia editam, 1592. Thomas Cartwright, † 1603, A directory for church government 1644. William Bradshaw, † 1618, English Puritanism, containing the main opinions of the rigidest sort of those called Puritans in the realm of England 1604. David Calderwood, Altare Damascenum seu politica ecclesiastica obtrusa ecclesiae Scoticanae 1621. Robert Parker, De politica ecclesiastica Christi 1616. Smectymnus, an answer to Hall's Episcopacy by Stephen Marshal, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen and William Spurstow 1641. Blondel, Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi de episcopis et presbyteris, 1646. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. III 832-869. Maresius, Examen quaestionis de episcoporum origine 1657.

Cappellus, Synt. thes. theol. in acad. Salm. III 296. Buddeus, de origine et potestate episcoporum, Misc. Saera I 131. M. Vitringa IX 1 p. 141-229.

Thirdly, according to Holy Scripture it is established that the apostleship was an exceptional, temporary, and unrenewable office in the church of the N. T. Even if the episcopate were an office different from the presbyterate, it would nevertheless absolutely not follow from this, [100] that it was identical with the apostleship and was its continuation. Naturally it can indeed in a good sense be said that the episcopi or presbyteri are successors of the apostles, for these appointed them in all the churches which they founded, and entrusted the care of those churches to them. But that does not remove the great and essential distinction between the two. Even from the Roman side this distinction cannot be erased. For the apostles shared in a wholly special guidance of the H. Spirit, and bore an office that extended to the whole church, indeed to the whole world, Mt. 28:20. But their successors, even if they should have been bishops in the Roman sense, by no means have such an office; they are also according to Rome not infallible and they have care only over a small part of the church, over a dioecese, Schwane D. G. IV 267. 285. 294. Simar, Dogm. 612. Heinrich, Dogm. II 247. Ermann, De Paus, 2e gedeelte 89v. Yet the distinction is still stronger; the apostles were ear- and eyewitnesses of Jesus' words and deeds, they were called immediately by Christ himself to their office, received the H. Spirit in a special measure, had an entirely unique task, namely to lay the foundation of the church and in their word to offer the abiding means of communion between Christ and his church. In all this they are distinguished from all others, they stand high above all their successors, and they occupy an office that is intransferable and unrenewable. The extraordinary gifts in which they were permitted to share are bestowed on no other ministers in

the church. As apostles in the proper sense they have no successors, even though it is also the case that the guidance of the church, to which they were called, is also in another way and in a more limited circle entrusted to others after them.

Fourthly, in Scripture no proof is to be found that the primacy of Peter was again essentially distinguished from the apostleship which he had in common with the same. Roman theologians also acknowledge that all that Scripture relates of the precedence of Peter above the other apostles is still not able to prove his primatus jurisdictionis over the other apostles, Scheeben-Atzberger, Dogm. IV 405. The sedes doctrinae for this doctrine are only Mt. 16:18, Luk. 22:32 and Joh. 21:15-17. But these also do not contain what Rome derives from them. Mt. 16:18 teaches that Peter by his confession is the rock, [101] upon which Christ builds his church. This is of course figurative language and, without the figure, nevertheless indicates no less but also no otherwise than that Christ would make use of the person of Peter as the faithful confessor, in order to gather his church. In the church as the building of God the believers are the living stones, which are built up upon the apostles as the foundation stones. That place Peter occupies in the building of God, and he not alone, but all the apostles with him. For Peter made the confession of Jesus' Messiahship in the name of all, Mt. 16:15, 16; even if he uttered it first and most clearly, he nevertheless gave expression to what unconsciously lived in the heart of all; and not only Peter but all the apostles by this confession, which they soon proclaimed in the midst of the world, laid the foundation of the church of Christ; in figurative speech, therefore, they all with Peter were the rock on which Christ built his church, or also is, with another application of the same figure, Christ the rock, which the apostles together by their proclamation

laid as foundation of the congregation, Hd. 4:11, Rom. 9:33, 1 Cor. 3:10, 11, Ef. 2:20, 1 Petr. 2:5, 6, Op. 21:14. The power of the keys, which Peter already receives because of his stout confession in Mt. 16:19, is granted to all the apostles in 18:18, Joh. 20:23. The special enabling and guidance of the H. Spirit was not only the portion of Peter but likewise of all the apostles, Mt. 10:20, Joh. 14:26, 15:26, 16:13, 20:22, Hd. 1:8, Ef. 3:5. By the maintenance of the apostleship as an exceptional and non-transferable office the Reformation does far more justice to all these texts, also to Mt. 16:18, than Rome. The apostles are and remain the founders of the church; they are by their confession the rock of the congregation; no communion with Christ except through communion with their testimony! As to the other passage, Luk. 22:32, Jesus says there to his disciples that Satan will try to bring them all, ὑμας in plur., to denial of their Master, but that He will pray specifically for Peter, περι σου in sing., that his faith may not cease. Peter would need this before all, because he would deny his Master first and most strongly. That his faith then does not cease, he will have to thank solely to a wholly special intercession of Jesus. And if he then by that prayer of Jesus will be preserved [102] and will rise again from his fall, then he, taught by the trial and confirmed in his faith, will be able precisely to strengthen his brethren, if these later perhaps should once waver in their faith. Just as of Paul with the same word, στηριζω, it is said that he strengthened the disciples, Hd. 18:23, cf. Rom. 1:11, 16:25, 1 Thess. 3:2, 13, 2 Thess. 3:3, 1 Petr. 5:10, so here it is promised to Peter that he later will serve his brethren for encouragement, perseverance, confirmation. Of this glorious, spiritual support legalistic Rome makes a primatus jurisdictionis! In Joh. 21:15-17 finally Peter is restored to the rank which he formerly had occupied with and under the apostles. He receives no new office, proceeding above that

which he formerly possessed. For the address with the name of Simon, son of Jonah, the threefold question and the circumstances in which this event took place, prove irrefutably that Peter is only restored to the rank which he had forfeited by his denial of Jesus, thus to the apostleship and to the primatus honoris, which had already been bestowed upon him earlier. And thus also, when Jesus again entrusts to him the care and guidance of his flock in general and of the sheep in particular, no other activity is assigned to him than that which lay enclosed in the apostleship as such and thus also belonged to all the other apostles, Mt. 28:19, Mk. 16:15, 2 Cor. 11:28. The precedence which Peter enjoyed among the apostles therefore also in no way at all removed the fact that he is rebuffed by Jesus, whom he wished to keep back from his impending suffering, as a satan and stumbling-block, Mt. 16:23, is humbled for his self-exaltation above the other apostles, Joh. 21:15, is rebuked by Paul for his insincerity in Antioch, Gal. 2:11, is sent with John by the other apostles to Samaria, Hd. 8:14, had absolutely no jurisdiction over Paul, Gal. 2:6, 9, is never in Scripture mentioned separately as head and prince of the apostles, 1 Cor. 12:28, Ef. 2:20, 4:11, Op. 21:14, and himself ascribes the preservation of the believers solely to the power of God, calls himself a συμπρεσβυτερος and warns against exercising dominion over the congregations, 1 Petr. 1:5, 5:1, 3.

Fifthly. But even if Scripture were to ascribe to Peter a primacy in the Roman sense, which, however, is by no means the case, [103] then nothing would thereby yet be gained for the primacy of the bishop of Rome. For to this end a great deal more still has to be proved, namely 1o that Peter was in Rome, 2o that he there held the office of bishop and primate, and 3o that he, with awareness and intent, transferred these two offices to one definite successor. Now it has, in recent times by Baur and Lipsius, been contested

without right, that Peter was in Rome. If 1 Petr. 5:13 does not already decide, where according to many by Babylon Rome must be meant, then the testimony of tradition, from the earliest time on, with Clemens Rom., Ignatius, Marcion, Dionysius of Corinth, Irenaeus, Canon Murat., Cajus, Tertullianus, Hippolytus, Origenes, Lactantius etc. is so established and unanimous, that its truth reasonably cannot be doubted. Also it may be considered established, that Peter in the year 64 under Nero died as a martyr, whether in the same year with or a couple of years before Paul. Op. 18:20, cf. 17:6, 19:2 points to it, that Rome has shed the blood of apostles, and the named early-Christian writers all say unanimously, that Peter and Paul in Rome, sometimes with the more precise determination of time, under Nero, underwent martyrdom. But absolutely unprovable is, that Peter stayed 20 to 25 years in Rome, that he was bishop of the congregation there and primate of the whole church, and that Linus succeeded him in episcopate and primacy. For, 1o Acts 12:17 reports, that Peter left Jerusalem, not long before the death of Herod, vs. 23, who died in the year 44. That he then went to Rome is nothing but a supposition and lacks all ground. But if this were also so, then thereby nothing other than a short visit to Rome could be thought of, just as he then according to Harnack perhaps also was in Corinth, 1 Cor. 1-3, 9:5; in any case Peter at the synod in Hd. 15, that is in the year 47, was back in Jerusalem. 2o In the letter which Paul from Corinth about the year 54-58 wrote to the congregation at Rome, not a single word is made mention of Peter’s stay and work at Rome; likewise this does not happen in the letters to Philemon, Colossae, Ephesus, which Paul probably, nor in that to Philippi, which he certainly wrote from Rome in the years 57-58 or 61-63; and Peter too in his first letter, [104] which he from Babylon, 1 Petr. 5:13, that is perhaps Rome, wrote, makes with no

word mention of Paul, so that Zahn supposes, that Peter was precisely in Rome between the first and second imprisonment of Paul, when this one was on a journey to Spain, and there in the year 64 under Nero and a couple of years before Paul underwent martyrdom. No longer than half a year or a year, therefore, did Peter stay in Rome. 3o In agreement with these facts the oldest tradition always names Peter and Paul alongside each other and says, that not Peter alone, but Peter and Paul founded and confirmed the congregation at Rome, Clemens 1 Cor. 5. Cajus and Dionysius of Corinth with Euseb. Hist. eccl. II 25, 7. 8. Ignatius, ad Rom. 4. Iren. adv. haer. III 1, 1. 3, 1-3. Tert. de praescr. 36. Of a stay of many years and of an episcopate of Peter at Rome these old histories know nothing. On the contrary, according to the letter of Clemens from the years 93-95, the Pastor of Hermas written in Rome about 100 or 135-145, and the letter of Ignatius to the Romans, at that time, that is in any case about the end of the first century, in Rome the monarchic episcopate did not yet exist, but the congregation was led by a college of presbyters or episcopi. From the bishop lists with Hegesippus, Irenaeus, the Murat. fragment, Hippolytus, Tertullianus, Epiphanius it appears, that at the end of the second and even at the beginning of the third century one still did not regard Peter as bishop of Rome. The usual representation then was still this, that Peter and Paul had founded the congregation and had entrusted to Linus the service of the episcopate, Iren. adv. haer. III 3. And from Linus as first bishop the following are then indicated as second, third etc., in such a way, that the apostles Peter and Paul as εὐαγγελιζομενοι και θεμελιουντες την ἐκκλησιαν, ib. III 1, 1 preceded them all, and the bishops after them came and succeeded one another ἀπο των ἀποστολων, i.e. from the time of the apostles on, Iren. I 27, 1. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. V praef., 28, 3. Epiph. haer. 42,

1. 4o Only in the time of Victor or Zephyrinus, 180-217, is this old tradition so altered, that Paul more and more lost his share in the founding and confirming of the congregation at Rome and Peter was presented exclusively as the institutor of the episcopate and thereafter also as the first bishop of [105] Rome. According to Tertullianus, de pudic. 21 Calixtus already called himself bishop on the chair of Peter. Stephanus asserted, per successionem cathedram Petri habere, Cypr. Ep. 71, 3. 75, 17. And Cyprianus designated the chair of the bishop at Rome continuously as the cathedra Petri, Ep. 55, 8. 59, 14. About that same time there also first arose the legend, that Peter had labored 20 or 25 years long in Rome and had been bishop there for so long. Eusebius in his church history still does not speak of Peter as bishop and still names Peter and Paul alongside each other, III 2, but names III 4, 9 Peter alone and says II 14, 6, that Peter already under emperor Claudius came to Rome, in order to combat Simon Magus. Here at the same time the origin of the legend is discovered. Already before the middle of the second century it was held in Rome as a fact, that Simon Magus under Claudius had come to Rome. The Acta Petri, which arose about 160, taught in connection with Hd. 8, that Peter and Simon Magus had fought much with each other. These traditions were combined and thus gave birth to the legend, that Peter under Claudius had come to Rome and there until his death in 64, thus about twenty years, had lived. And Eusebius and Hieronymus made it into a constituent part of the Roman tradition. Cf. Herzog2 11, 375 f. Hase, Protest. Polemik5 S. 150 f. Kattenbusch, Vergl. Conf. 90 f. Harnack, Die Chronologie der altchristl. Litteratur bis Eusebius I 1897 passim, especially S. 171 f. 240 f. 703 f. Th. Zahn, Einl. in das N. T. I 1897 II 1899 passim, especially II 17-27. Erbes, Die Todestage der Apostel Paulus und Petrus und ihre röm. Denkmäler,

Leipzig Hinrichs 1899, who thinks, that Paul on 22 Febr. 63 was put to death, that Peter, having heard of that, came to Rome and in the following year there died as a martyr.

Sixthly, the Roman Catholics, although finding support in the tradition after Irenaeus, are in no small embarrassment in face of the oldest testimonies originating from the first and second century. But even if these testimonies were more favorable and more to their advantage, they must nevertheless all acknowledge that the primacy of the bishop of Rome is built on a historical presupposition, namely on this, that Peter was in Rome, that he there held the office of bishop and primate and [106] transferred this to his successor. Now this tradition, even supposing that it confirmed all this, is nevertheless only a historical testimony, which, also according to Rome, can lay claim not to infallible certainty but only to high probability. The primacy of the bishop of Rome, the ecclesiastical dignity of the pope, and thus the truth of the Roman church and the salvation of the Roman church members is built on a historical probability, which can at any moment be nullified by new testimonies. Eternity here hangs by a spider's web. But besides that, for Rome yet another difficulty presents itself. The tradition in Julius Africanus, Origen, Eusebius, etc. relates that Peter, before his journey to Rome, in the second year of the emperor Claudius was in Antioch and there instituted the episcopate, Harnack, t. a. p. 118. 705. Let this tradition now in itself be unreliable, for the Roman Catholics it is nevertheless difficult to deny its truth, because they would then assume the appearance of measuring with two measures. But even apart from this tradition, it is most probable that, just as the other apostles, so also Peter instituted the episcopate in various congregations. Why then is specifically the bishop of Rome the successor of Peter and the heir of the primacy?

Peter was according to Rome nevertheless also primate when he stayed at Jerusalem, at Antioch and elsewhere. With him, therefore, in any case there existed no indissoluble bond between his primacy and the episcopate of the congregation at Rome. He could therefore just as well have transferred that primacy to another bishop than that of Rome. Did he, if he, which is very probable, also elsewhere appointed episcopi in congregations, indeed transfer the episcopate but expressly reserve the primacy, until he could pass this on to the bishop of Rome? And why then did he do so? On what authority did he act thus? What proof is there that Linus is the successor of Peter, not only in the apostleship but also in the primacy? A historical, ecclesiastical right, that it has always been understood thus, is not sufficient for this, for it concerns precisely the foundation on which the whole Roman church rests. There must be a divine right for it. But this is not there; Christ has not spoken a word of Peter's episcopate at Rome nor of his successor there; Peter himself has, neither according to Scripture nor according to tradition [107] even in the remotest degree indicated that the episcopus at Rome was his only, true successor. The connection of the primacy with the Roman episcopate thus rests only on the fact that Peter was in Rome and on the unhistorical presupposition that he there held the office of bishop and primate. Even if this latter were historically correct, then it still did not give what it must give. For then the strictly necessary proof was still lacking, that Peter consciously, intentionally, by virtue of apostolic authority and divine commission, wished to transfer and actually transferred this episcopate and this primacy to his successor at Rome. That is, the primacy of the Roman bishop over the whole church hangs in the air; it can point to no jus divinum on which it rests; and it does not even have a reliable, historical foundation. The Roman theologians must therefore, in spite of

themselves, acknowledge that the primacy of the Roman bishop neben einer unmittelbar göttlichen Grundlage, nämlich der Einsetzung des Primates als einer dauernden Institution (which however is also unprovable), auch eine menschlich vermittelte Grundlage von geschichtlicher Natur possesses, Scheeben-Atzberger, Kath. Dogm. IV 1 S. 425. Therefore finally the Roman theologians among themselves are also not unanimous about the nature of the connection of primacy and Roman episcopate. Some, such as Dominicus Soto, Banner, Mendoza e. a. are of the opinion that that connection is only ex jure ecclesiastico and that the primacy of the Roman episcopal see can be transferred to another. Ballerini, Veith e. a. leave the question undecided and consider it most difficult to answer. But Cajetanus, Canus, Suarez etc. are of the judgment that Peter, after he had instituted the episcopate in Antioch, received a special divine revelation and by virtue of this bound the primacy inseparably to the episcopate at Rome, Schwane, D. G. IV 300. 303. 311. 341 and further Bellarminus, de Rom. pontif. lib. II. Theol. Wirceb. ed. Paris. 1880 I 267-306. Perrone, Prael. theol. Lov. 1843 VIII 295-419. Scheeben-Atzberger, Dogm. IV 424-435. Jansen, Prael. I 512-582. Hettinger, Apol. des Christ. IV 1897 S. 499-618. W. Esser, Des h. Petrus Aufenthalt, Episkopat und Tod zu Rom., Breslau 1889. Joseph Hollweck, Der apost. Stuhl und Rom, Mainz 1895. Although this dispute has not yet been formally brought to a decision, [108] popes, councils, theologians speak mostly in favor of the latter opinion; involuntarily they always proceed from the insoluble connection of both. By the Syllabus of Pius IX prop. 35 it has been decided that those entitled to vote may not transfer the primacy from the city of Rome and its bishop to another city and bishop. Only the question remains whether the pope himself would be allowed to do this; and this is naturally to be decided only by the infallible

one himself. The Roman Christian is therefore obliged to believe that communion with the local church at Rome is necessary to salvation. The so-called catholic church is in truth Roman church; that is its name and its essence.

6. The Roman hierarchy, the further it developed, provoked all the more serious resistance and opposition. In the Middle Ages various sects arose, which rejected Rome as Babylon and the pope as the antichrist. And in the century of the Reformation this opposition spread over the whole of Western Christendom. By an understandable reaction many came to reject every church institute, or to see in it only a free, arbitrary creation of the congregation, or also silently to concede all government of the church to the Christian civil authority, above p. 20v. Even among the Lutherans the independent government of the church did not come into its own. To be sure, Luther originally proceeded from the general priesthood of believers and from the church as communion of saints. But his standpoint was also here too anthropological for him to be able to derive, from the confession of the kingship of Christ, a government of his own for his church. The form of church government he regarded to a certain extent as an external, indifferent matter; if need be, a papal or episcopal government was good for him, provided only that it did not place any hindrance in the way of the proclamation of the gospel, Art. Smalc. II 4. The church becomes visible only in word and sacrament but absolutely not in any way of organization or form of government; Christ rules in his church only through the preaching office. This conviction, joined to his view of the civil authority as praecipuum membrum ecclesiae, brought Luther to call upon the civil authority already in his writing An den christl. Adel deutscher Nation 1520 to undertake the work of reformation. In 1526 he even requested the Elector

of Saxony to take the work of visitation in hand. On 27 Aug. 1526 at Speyer the reformation was placed under the protection of princes and estates. And from 1527 onward the government of the church rested in the hands of the territorial civil authority. The ordo ecclesiasticus (the pastores) did indeed retain the administration of word and sacrament, the ordo oeconomicus (the congregation) received the right of consensus and approbatio; but the ordo politicus (the civil authority) obtained the whole externa gubernatio, that is, the right to appointment, maintenance, dismissal of the pastores, to the founding of churches and schools, to regulation of religious exercises, to reformation of doctrine etc., and exercised this power under Melanchthon's inspiration since 1529 through consistoria. The grounds on which the Lutherans conceded this extensive right over the church to the civil authority were various. But whether the civil authority was regarded as substitute of the bishops, or it was supposed that it had silently received this power from the church, or it was honored as the principal member of the church, it always nevertheless came down to this, that the church was almost deprived of all government of its own. But all these systems of church government, which during and after the Reformation have arisen in many Protestant churches, do not correspond to what Scripture teaches concerning this. For, 1o however closely under Israel the religious and the civil life was connected, there was nevertheless already then also distinction; alongside the kings there existed the priests, who assumed an independent position and were called to a task of their own. Much more independent has the congregation as the people of God still become in the days of the N. Test. For not only was it then detached from the national relations of Israel but it also received on the day of Pentecost in the H. Spirit an independent principle of life, which grants it, over against state

and society, a character of its own and an independent existence. 2o The essence of the church consists in this, that it is an assembly of believers in Christ. As such it is not and cannot be a foundation of men. It arises not by the will of the flesh nor by the will of man, but by birth from God. It is no product of human association nor of the good pleasure of the state, but is in its origin and essence a miracle, fruit of a special, gracious [110] activity of God and therefore also by virtue of its nature independent, autonomous, free over against all favor or disfavor of men. 3o Already from this it follows that the congregation must have a government of its own. It has a life of its own, bears in that life a special law of life, which God has laid in it, and for that naturally also demands a free, independent expression. It is not correct to say that the manner of organization and the form of government for the church of Christ is an indifferent matter. So loose and indifferent do essence and form, the invisible and the visible, the internal and the external never stand alongside or over against each other. It is true that the church first of all comes to expression in the administration of word and sacrament, in the purity of doctrine and of life, but the government of the church does not bypass all this, but stands in very close connection with it. Precisely in order that word and sacrament may be administered purely and doctrine and life may be ordered accordingly, a good government is needed. The confession is the main thing but the church order is the means to maintain the confession. And just as an impure confession also falsifies the government, so from a bad government there proceeds a corrupting influence upon the confession. 4o Christ has therefore bestowed upon his congregation a government of its own. He himself called, equipped, and ordained the apostles, who are the foundation of the church. And these apostles in their turn under his guidance instituted the ordinary offices of

overseers and deacons, so that the congregations of Christ in their absence and after their death would not be deprived of government. These ordinary offices too have their origin in God, Hd. 20:28, 1 Cor. 12:28, Ef. 4:11 and have not ended in the apostolic time but have been instituted for the purpose that they would remain until the end of this dispensation, Hd. 14:23, 1 Tim. 3, Tit. 1:5. Scripture is not a church order but it nevertheless contains principles of church government, which cannot be neglected without harm to the spiritual life. 5o Therefore it is also not good to say that the congregation of Christ itself can give itself a government according to the demand of circumstances or can silently or intentionally assign this to the Christian civil authority. For although in a certain sense it can be said that the congregation itself gives itself its government and establishes the institute of the church, because the apostles in instituting the ordinary offices consulted the congregations [111] and these designated the persons for those offices, yet that is only in a certain sense the case. It is always Christ who calls to the offices and equips; the congregations can and may designate the persons, but in doing so they are not independent and autonomous but bound to the ordinances of the Lord; they may not proceed arbitrarily and according to their own insight in the establishment of the institute, but in that too they have to ask what the Lord wills that they shall do. Therefore it is also not free to the congregations to abolish the offices or to assign the government to the Christian civil authority. For even if it is true that under a Christian civil authority and in a Christian society there will come more and more agreement and cooperation with the church in the standard, in the assessment, and in the maintenance of doctrine and life, yet even then the task of church and state remains essentially distinct. The same sin is punished differently in the church than in the state; the discipline

which the former exercises differs as heaven from the punishment which the latter imposes. The care of the poor, the oversight over the flock, the administration of word and sacrament, the calling and election of the ministers remains the inalienable right and the precious duty of the congregation.

The Reformed have seen this, thanks to their deep sense of the sovereignty of God. He who proceeds one-sidedly from the goodness or the love or the fatherhood of God does not arrive at that. But he who places not one of God's virtues but all those virtues together in the foreground and proceeds from God as God, cannot do otherwise than place every creature in dependence and humility under Him. God is sovereign, always and everywhere, in nature and grace, in creation and re-creation, in world and church. His ordinances and rights are the rule of our life, for man is His creature, subject to Him and obligated to absolute obedience. In the church this naturally led to the glorious confession of the kingship of Christ. For just as God in civil life, on account of sin, had instituted the government, so He has anointed His Son as king over Zion, the mountain of His holiness, and has given Him to the church as a Head over all things, Ps, 2:6, Ef. 1:20, Phil. 2:9-11. Christ is not only prophet, who instructs by His word and example; not only priest, who reconciles by His [112] offering, but He is also king, who preserves and protects His own, who to that end is clothed with power in heaven and on earth, and in a far truer sense is king than any worldly prince. He is that not only according to His divine but equally according to His human nature; the man Christ Jesus has been exalted at the Father's right hand. And He was all this not only from eternity and in the days of the O. Test., and during His stay on earth, but He is all this still today and unto the end of the ages; He is yesterday and today the same and

into eternity. Yes, He is it now in the state of exaltation in a much richer sense than He was in the state of humiliation and in the time that preceded it. For indeed He was from eternity anointed as king and exercised this office together with that of prophet and priest immediately after the fall and unto the death of the cross. But on account of His humiliation God has highly exalted Him and given Him a name above every name. By the resurrection He has been ordained and appointed as Son of God in power, has He κυριος become, has He received all power in heaven and on earth, and now reigns, until He shall have completed the kingdom and shall have laid all enemies under His feet, deel III 415v. This kingship of Christ falls into two parts. It is on the one hand a regnum potentiae, Ps. 2:8, 9, 72:8, 110:1-3, Mt. 28:18, 1 Cor. 15:27, Ef. 1:21, Phil. 2:9-11, Hebr. 1:6, 1 Petr. 3:22, Op. 17:14. In order that Christ may in truth be king over His people, whom He redeems, protects, and preserves, He must have power in heaven and on earth, over Satan and world. It is a kingship of power, subordinate to and means for His kingship of grace. It does not lie in it that the Father has relinquished the government of the world, and that all authority in creation now descends from Christ and is exercised in His name. But God has granted to the Mediator Christ, on the ground of His perfect obedience, the right and the power to gather His people together out of the world, to protect them against all enemies, and to subject those enemies themselves completely to Himself. God governs the world in such a way that Christ may claim the Gentiles as His inheritance and the ends of the earth as His possession. In the exaltation the Father has acknowledged and appointed His Son as a κληρονομος παντων, Hebr. 1:2. But [113] on the other hand the kingship of Christ is a regnum gratiae, Ps. 2:6, Jes. 9:5, 6, Jer. 30:9, Ezech. 37:24, Luk. 1:33, Joh. 18:33, Ef. 1:22, 4:15, 5:23, Col. 1:18, 2:19.

And because this kingship bears an entirely different character than that of the princes of the earth, Christ in the N. T. is called much more head than king of the church, deel III 421. For it is indeed a kingdom of grace, in which Christ rules through His Word and Spirit. His Word comes to us out of the past, binds us to the historical person and the work of Christ accomplished in time, and asks of us faith in the sense of assensus, cognitio. But He who descended is the same also who ascended far above all heavens, who is seated at God's right hand and with His Godhead, majesty, grace, and Spirit dwells in us and never departs from us. It is the living Christ, exalted at the right hand of God, who with consciousness and freedom gathers His church, conquers His enemies, and leads world history toward the day of His parousie. He is still in heaven active as mediator, and through His Spirit on earth present in church and office, in word and sacrament. Also the application of salvation is His work. He is the acting one, and offices and ministries are nothing but means in His almighty hand. It is therefore absurd to think that He would have transferred the government of His church to any man, to a bishop or pope, to an institute or sacrament. He is and remains the Lord from heaven, who precisely to that end has been exalted to head of the church, in order that He Himself might rule and fill all things, deel III 409. 449. This kingship of Christ was the Materialprinzip of Reformed church government. It was already expressed by Zwingli, and developed and maintained by Calvin; it found a place in almost all confessional writings and from the 16th century on to the present day was the driving force for combating all human dominion in the church of Christ and for the recovery and preservation of her freedom and independence. Cf. Helv. I 18. Helv. II 17. Gall. 30. Belq. 31. Scot. 16. Westm. 25. 30. Calvijn, Inst. II 15, 3-5. Martyr, Loci 403. Bucanus, Inst.

theol. 464. Synopsis pur. theol. disp. 41. M. Vitringa IX 125 enz. cf. Rieker, Grundsätze ref. Kirchenverf. Leipzig 1899 S. 105 f. [114]

7. The kingship of Christ over his church consists in this, that He gathers and governs his own by Word and Spirit and shelters and preserves them in the salvation acquired, Heid. Cat. 31. 54. The church has its foundation and unity in the counsel of God, in the covenant of grace, in the person of Christ, but it must, as consisting of human beings, be gathered and brought in by Word and by Spirit. This gathering takes place through Christ and proceeds from Him. Even though He makes use therein of offices and means of grace, He is nevertheless the one who distributes the benefits of the covenant and thereby founds his congregation. He himself builds the congregation upon the rock of the confessing apostles, Mt. 16:19 and these are the ones who, as instruments in his hand, build the congregation upon Him as the foundation, 1 Cor. 3:11. Christ is the vine, and the believers are the branches, which proceed from Him, draw sap, and bear fruit, Joh. 15. Christ is the head, and the congregation is the body, which is joined together out of Him and obtains its growth, Ef. 4:16, Col. 2:19. Christ is the Shepherd, and the believers are the sheep, who are brought in by Him and joined together into one flock, Joh. 10:16. Christ is the Lord, who adds those who are being saved to the congregation, Hd. 2:47. Because the congregation is an organism, the head precedes the members and the ecclesia universalis precedes the ecclesia particularis. The church in its entirety does not come into being through the atomistic joining together of different parts. But the ecclesia catholica is there first, it has its subsistence in Christ, came in the days of the N. T. first to manifestation in the church at Jerusalem and then spread from there to other places. Every ecclesia particularis (localis) is, in the place where it appears, a manifestation of the

ecclesia catholica, of the people of God. Already by virtue of its origin it stands with this in indissoluble connection. For no single local church arises autochthonously out of the unconscious, but was planted by the seed of the word, which another church caused to be sown there in that place. Indeed, according to the doctrine of Holy Scripture every local church is independent, an ecclesia completa, however small and insignificant it may be. There are no mother churches in the sense that the one church would be permitted to rule over the other; neither Jerusalem nor Rome has any claim to such a government. [115] All churches stand equal, because they all, even if the one was also founded by the other in a mediate way, in the same way, i.e. directly and absolutely, are dependent on Christ and bound to his word. Therefore the Reformed have not only broken the connection of their churches with those at Rome but have also put an end to the diocese and the parish. A diocese, for its part, is the ecclesiastical territory of a bishop, who, connected to the principal church, from there governs the whole circle of believers. And a parish designates the group of believers in a certain place only as object of the activity of the parochus. Both concepts point to the fact that bishop and parochus are sent to the believers from outside, and stand high above them as regents. But this is not the case. Every church is independent, chooses and calls its ministers and stands in the church federation, into which it was received, completely equal with all other churches. Sometimes, e.g. with the churches of the Huguenots in France, it has the appearance as if the federation has arisen wholly freely by confederation. But that is nevertheless not the Reformed view, which on this point decidedly stands over against that of the Independents. In the description of the essence of the church all Reformed theologians proceeded from the ecclesia universalis and thus descended to the ecclesiae

particulares, M. Vitringa IX 60. These latter are local manifestations of the one mystical body of Christ, are therefore spiritually one, stand by virtue of their historical origin in connection with one another and are obliged, on the Lord's part, to maintain fellowship with all who partake of the same faith. Every local church is therefore at the same time an independent manifestation of the body of Christ and a part of a greater whole; an ecclesia particularis, which arises out of and stands spiritually and historically in connection with the ecclesia catholica, cf. Rieker, Grundsätze ref. Kirchenverf. 80 f. And what holds for every local church is also applicable to each of its members in particular. No single church and no single living member owes his origin to his own will or to the work of human beings. Christ has called and gathered him, be it also by means of the ministry of the word, and him not only but all who are members of the congregation. Thus it is then not we, but it is Christ alone, [116] who determines who are members of the congregation and with whom we have to live in fellowship. It does not stand at our pleasure whether or not to join this or that church; but it is a due duty of all believers, to join themselves to that church which comes to manifestation most purely as the church of Christ, Ned. Gel. 28. Here too the Reformed stand over against the Independents. The believers do not divide themselves arbitrarily into conventicles and congregations and do not themselves select with whom they wish to gather together. But in a certain place all believers belong together and are there together the people of God and the congregation of Christ. Just as it is God who ordains the times and the determinations of each one's dwelling, Hd. 17:26, so it is also Christ who, joining himself to this ordinance of the Father, gathers the believers locally and causes them to appear as an independent ecclesia. Nature and grace were also on this point

not torn apart by the Reformed, nor set hostilely over against one another, for grace restores nature and the gospel is the fulfillment of the law. Yet with this unity of the local church the so-called parish formation is not in conflict. Various congregations in the N. T., Jerusalem, Rome, Corinth etc., were each in itself a unity; that at Jerusalem stood under the same college of apostles and appointed in its entirety seven deacons, and those at Rome, Corinth, Colossae received from Paul letters, in which all believers in the same place are by him comprehended as a unity. But that nevertheless did not take away that those congregations at their gatherings came together in different buildings and thus again formed distinct house congregations. And to that every church must come, which expands to a membership of thousands of souls. Just as then it is permitted and obligatory to come together in different buildings, so it is also, in the interest of the spiritual well-being, the government and the care of the believers, commanded, to connect to each group of believers, which gathers in a certain building, a certain number of ministers, elders and deacons. To the unity of the church this need do no harm, since that can express itself in the consistory, in the administration, in the calling of ministers etc. And sometimes, with the great expansion of many cities in the present time, parts of cities are more different from one another in character [117] than nearby villages or hamlets and the churches that have been formed there.

In these local churches Christ pours out all kinds of gifts, not only saving gifts of regeneration, conversion, faith, etc., but also spiritual gifts, which are known under the name of charismata, above p. 29. In the apostolic time there was a rich distribution of them; but although they have in part changed in nature and operation, they are also now still bestowed by the H. Spirit upon the believers, in order that with them they might serve one

another and manifest themselves as one body. The congregation is not immature, it is no ecclesia audiens or ordo oeconomicus, which has only to listen and to be silent. But it partakes of the anointing of the Holy One, consists of many members, who all have need of one another, and may not neglect the gifts bestowed upon it. Every congregation is and must be an army of salvation, which under Christ wages war against devil, world, and flesh and knows no soldiers at rest or in non-activity; a communion of saints, in which all suffer and rejoice with one another and willingly and with joy employ their special gifts for the benefit and unto the salvation of the other members. And just as all believers have a gift, so they also all stand in the office. They have not only in the church as organism but also in the church as institute a calling and task, which is imposed upon them on the Lord's behalf. The apostles do indeed precede the church, are its founders and bind it to them, i.e. to God's word. But they do not appoint office-bearers beforehand and not arbitrarily, but first found congregations and then have elders and deacons elected by those congregations themselves. Therefore the general office of believers precedes the special office of overseer and caretaker of the poor. For Christ is in the midst, where two or three are gathered in his name, Mt. 18:19, 20. He has acquired the H. Spirit for all, who dwells in all believers as his temple, Hd. 2:17, 1 Cor. 6:19, Ef. 2:22 etc., so that they, anointed with that Spirit, are a holy, royal priesthood, 1 Petr. 2:5, 9; prophets, who proclaim the virtues of God, confess his name, and know all things, Mt. 8:38, 10:32, 1 Joh. 2:20, 27; priests, who present their bodies as a living, holy, to God well-pleasing sacrifice, Rom. 12:1, 1 Petr. 2:5, 9, Hebr. 13:16, [118] Op. 1:6, 5:10; kings, who fight the good fight, overcome sin and world and death and shall one day reign with Christ, Rom. 6:12, 13, 1 Tim. 1:18, 19, 2 Tim. 2:12, 4:7, 1

Joh. 2:13, 14, Op. 1:6, 2:26, 3:21, 20:6, and therefore bear the name of Christians, anointed ones, Hd. 11:26, 26:28, 1 Petr. 4:16, cf. Heid. Cat. vr. 32. This prophetic, priestly, and kingly activity of the believers may be called the exercise of an office. For already in general man is not there for himself, but for God's will. God created him after his image, in order that he might know, love, and glorify Him, and thus as prophet, priest, and king might serve Him. But specifically Christ has been appointed by the Father as mediator, as servant of the Lord, as prophet, priest, and king, in order to bring about again and to complete this work, which man had neglected and disrupted. And to that end the believers are now also called. As anointed ones, who partake of communion with Christ, they are called to the same work, service, and struggle, Joh. 12:26, 14:12. From the moment of their calling the believers are no longer even their own but belong to Christ; they are his servants, have to do his will and to accomplish his work. They are the salt of the earth, the light of the world and have in and with respect to the church specifically a threefold task. In the first place they are obliged to join the church. They do not stand on their own, but are members of the body of Christ and thus have to seek and maintain communion with it. In the second place they are in that congregation called to all kinds of activity, to the application of the gifts for the benefit of others, to suffering with and rejoicing with the brethren, to visiting the assemblies of the believers, to proclaiming the Lord's death, to having oversight over one another, to serving and distributing in mercy etc. And finally they are each in his own way and in his own measure also obliged to the formation and reformation of the church. If there are believers anywhere in the world, and there exists no opportunity for ministers from elsewhere to lead the election to the offices instituted by Christ and to lay hands on the elected, then they

themselves have the right, to elect and ordain office-bearers together in the name of the Lord. Thus it happened in fact at Mainz and at Paris in 1555, cf. Lechler, [119] Gesch. d. Synodal- und Presb. Verfassung, 1854 S. 65. 66. Doumergue, Jean Calvin 1899 I 232; thus the Reformed judged, Voetius, Desp. Causa Papatus p. 268 sq., and thus was also the opinion of Luther, Köstlin, Luthers Theol. I 327. The office does not, after all, depend on any succession, it does not arise by transfer; it rests on the gift and the calling of Christ and on the designation of his congregation. And that congregation is itself mature and partakes of the gifts of the H. Spirit; the gifts necessary for the office are not essentially different from those which are bestowed upon all believers; therefore it can designate from its midst those who are adorned in special measure with official gifts and call and elect them in Christ's name to the office. But from that it also follows that the believers themselves, if need be, may proceed to the reformation of the church. If a church in its offices and ministries shows that it ascribes more authority to itself and its ordinances than to the word of God and clearly manifests itself as a false church, then the believers have the holy office and the guilty duty, to separate themselves and again to live ecclesiastically according to the Lord's word, Ned. Gel. art. 28. 29.

8. On the basis of these gifts and this office of all believers Christ has also instituted special offices in the church. The apostles indeed rendered ministerial service in this, but it is nevertheless Christ who gives these offices, and makes the persons fit for them and chooses them. In the Roman church, however, Richer maintained, de ecclesiastica et politica potestate 1611, that Christ had entrusted all power primarie, proprie et essentialiter to the church and then instrumentaliter, ministerialiter et quoad exsecutionem to pope and bishops, Scheeben-Atzberger, Dogm. IV 404. Luther in the first

period inferred from the general priesthood of believers that the administration of word and sacrament had actually been granted to all but was exercised, for the sake of order, by one of them, Köstlin, Luthers Theol. I 327. Reformed writers sometimes express themselves as if the power of the ministers actually belongs to the congregation and is exercised by them in its name, Amesius, Med. I 35, 6. Turretinus, Theol. El. XVIII qu. 24, 7. 8. 19. 26. More than once the image is used that, just as the human being sees through the eye and hears through the ear, so the [120] congregation performs the instituted activities through the offices. And in more recent times the conception is general that the office is an organ of the congregation. All this is only partly correct. In Mt. 18:17 Jesus does indeed give the power of the keys to the whole congregation, but He uses this word there still in an entirely general sense, without making mention of the organization that would later be introduced. As soon as this is there, we see that the power of the keys rests with the apostles and then with the overseers. The power can also in general be called bestowed on the church, because it serves to its salvation and welfare, and thus, if not formaliter, then at least finaliter has been bestowed on it. It is toti quidem ecclesiae ad illius ædificationem destinata, but proprie a solis ejus ministris tractanda, Maresius, Syst. Theol. XVI 70, cf. against Richer Petavius, de eccl. hier. III c. 14-16. The offices in the church of Christ are not a ruling but a serving power; they exist for the sake of the congregation, 1 Cor. 3:22, Ef. 4:12; Paul even calls himself with his fellow-servants δουλους ὑμων δια Ιησουν, 2 Cor. 4:5. The goal of the church as institute lies in the gathering of the elect, in the building up of the body of Christ, in the perfecting of the saints and thus in the glorification of God, Ef. 4:11. God certainly could also have led his people to salvation without any means of church or office, word or

sacrament. But his good pleasure has been to gather his elect through the service of men; the church has the salus electorum as its goal; the offices are necessitate hypothetica necessary, Gall. 25. Belg. 30. Helv. II 18. Voetius, Pol. I 17. III 213. Vitringa, IX 131 sq. Turretinus, Theol. El. XVIII qu. 22. But nevertheless, although the offices in that sense exist for the congregation, they are nevertheless not its organ, and have not received their power from it. For in the O. T. Moses and Aaron, priests and prophets were called and appointed by the Lord; in the N. T. the apostles, Paul included, were chosen and made fit directly by Christ himself. False prophets and apostles precisely have no mission from God's side and come only in their own name, Jer. 32:21, 32, Joh. 5:43, but the true servants appeal to their mission from God's side and derive from that their power and authority, Jes. 6:8, Jer. 1:4, Hos. 1:1, Rom. 1:1, Gal. 1:1 etc. Therefore, although they are also in the service of the [121] congregation, they are nevertheless called διακονοι Χριστου, Col. 1:7, Hd. 20:24, 1 Tim. 1:12, δουλοι Χριστου, Rom. 1:1, Gal. 1:10, 2 Petr. 1:1, ὑπηρεται Χριστου, Hd. 26:16, 1 Cor. 4:1, δουλοι θεου, Hd. 16:17, συνεργοι θεου, 1 Cor. 3:9, who, being the mouth of God and envoys on behalf of Christ, on Christ's behalf beseech that one let oneself be reconciled with God, 2 Cor. 5:20, and without pleasing men, proclaim the gospel that has been entrusted to them, 1 Thess., 2:4 and dispense the mysteries of Christ, 1 Cor. 4:1. Therefore as overseers and caretakers they also stand above the congregation, are its ἐπισκοποι, προισταμενοι, ἡγουμενοι, are responsible for its spiritual welfare, and have a claim to its esteem and obedience. And this holds not only for the extraordinary but also for the ordinary offices. These too are given by Christ, Mt. 9:38, 23:34, Hd. 20:28, 1 Cor. 12:5, 28, Ef. 4:11. There is no preaching without sending, Rom. 10:15. No one may take this honor

to himself, except he who is called by God, Joh. 10:1, 2, Hebr. 5:4. Even if it is the case that all believers are called to proclamation of the gospel, Hd. 8:4, 13:15, 1 Cor. 14:26; to do this with power and authority in the Lord's name, as an odor of life unto life or an odor of death unto death, requires a special sending and commission.

The way by which Christ places his servants in office runs through vocation, examination, and ordination. Since the calling no longer, as to prophets and apostles, comes to someone in an extraordinary manner, it is knowable only from the concurrence of the inward and the outward calling. The inward calling, which therefore is indeed to be distinguished from the supernatural and extraordinary, consists 1o in the bestowal of the gifts which are required for the office, 2o in the pure, sincere, and steadfast desire which makes someone strive after the office, and 3o in the clearing of the ways which lead to the office, Gerhard Loc. XXIII cap. 3, Voetius Pol. Eccl. III 529. Moor VI 282. Alting, Theol. probl. nova I 15. Brakel, Red. Godsd. XVII 12. Vitringa IX 298. This inward, subjective calling must receive its mark and seal in the outward calling by the congregation, since also in this sphere error and deception are not excluded, Ned. Gel. art. 31. Therefore this outward calling does not stand over against the inward, but it proceeds just as much as this does from [122] Christ. He alone can call and calls in truth. But this outward calling is mediate and takes place through the congregation in Jesus' name. Scripture leaves no doubt about this, Hd. 1:23, 6:2-6, 2 Cor. 8:19, cf. above bl. 79. In the first centuries the congregation also exercised this right in fact; even the bishop was chosen by the congregation, cf. Sohm, Kirchenrecht 59. 229. 271. 275. 282. 285, Achelis, Lehrb. d. prakt. Theol. 12 S. 147 and older litt. with Vitringa IX 308-310. The election of the pope, the bishop of Rome, by the cardinals, i.e.

originally the presbytery of the local congregation there, is still a remnant of the former usage. But gradually the right of the congregation was restricted and finally in the Roman hierarchy was assigned to the pope, and under the influence of a humanistic constitutional law by Erastians and Remonstrants to the government. Even in the Reformed churches there was great difference about this. Although in theory one maintained that the right to call ministers of the word rested with the congregation, in practice this was often very restricted and ceded to the consistory or to patrons or to the government or to mixed colleges, Calvijn, Inst. IV 3, 11-15. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. III 557 sq. 580 sq. Turretinus, Theol. El. XVIII qu. 24. M. Vitringa IX 311-321. Moor VI 288-298. On the other hand, however, the error of Grotius, Pufendorf e. a. is also to be avoided, as if the choice of church ministers were a natural right of the believers, just as the right to elect an administration rests with the members of an association, cf. M. Vitringa IX 310. For the church is not an association that comes into being by the will of men, but a foundation of Christ. All power which accrues to the congregation has therefore been bestowed upon it by Christ; it is not a right but a gift. The congregation is not a democracy, in which the people govern themselves. But Christ governs in it, and the choice of the congregation has no other significance than that it observes the gifts and points out the persons whom Christ has destined for the office. Hence the congregation does indeed choose, but that choice stands under the guidance of those who are already in their office, of apostles, evangelists etc., Hd. 1:15, 6:2, 14:23, Tit. 1:5, and later of neighboring bishops, Sohm, t. a. p. Furthermore, the choice is not absolutely free, but bound to conditions and requirements, [123] which have been indicated by Christ for the office, Hd. 1:21, 6:3, 1 Tim. 3. And finally someone is not yet in the office when he has been

chosen by the congregation, but thereafter hands must be laid upon him, Hd. 6:6 etc. Choice by the congregation and guidance by the consistory therefore ought to go together in the calling to an office in the congregation of Christ, whether the consistory in the calling bind itself to a nomination by the congregation or to a choice by the congregation from a nomination of the consistory.

But with the choice by the congregation and the calling by the consistory (vocatio stricte sic dicta), the external calling is not yet finished. It continues in the testing, the investigation or examination. Naturally this is not absolutely necessary; if the congregation knows with certainty that he whom it calls possesses the required gifts, further investigation is superfluous. But the congregation is not infallible and can be mistaken; it does not itself distribute the gifts but can only observe to whom Christ has bestowed gifts for his service. In order now to proceed in this as safely as possible, after the calling it still institutes a testing, intended to provide the congregation with the certainty that the one called possesses the required gifts. Already Paul therefore required, 1 Tim. 3:30, that the deacons —and the και οὐτοι δε proves that this was also already customary among the presbyters— should be tested in some way unknown to us and thereafter, if they proved blameless in doctrine and life, should serve. On that rested the right, of which the church later made use, to set a probationary period before the acceptance of the office or also to administer an examination, Bingham, Origines eccles. or the Antiq. of the Christ. Church, London 1843 II 225. In this country the Reformed churches, after the university at Leiden had been founded, ceded the right of administering the (peremptory) examination to the professors and contented themselves with their testimonium academicum, Syn. Midd. vr. 3. ’s Gr. art. 18. But gradually

they succeeded everywhere, except in Groningen, in taking away from the professors the right to administer the peremptory and the praeparatoir examination, with great difficulty and not without much resistance, even from Voetius and Maccovius, and in retaining it for themselves. Leaving aside the question whether the churches do not do well, when in administering the examinations in the classes they make use of the [124] assistance of the professors, the right to institute such an investigation belongs, according to Holy Scripture, the Reformed confession, and also according to the nature of the case, to the churches. Let the school administer its examinations, but the churches retain the right to call, to test, to send, to give authority for the administration of word and sacrament. The proper, ecclesiastical examination is therefore the peremptory examination; the praeparatoir, although already mentioned 's Grav. art. 18, is of subordinate significance, was only introduced gradually especially as a result of the Remonstrant disputes, and according to Voetius' testimony, Pol. Eccl. III 517, was only in 1669 generally in use. It served only to allow those examined provisionally to practise for a time in delivering propositions under the guidance of a minister and consistory.

With the vocation and examination there finally comes also the ordination, which takes place especially through the laying on of hands. This was in use among Israel in blessing, Gen. 48:14, Lev. 9:22, offering, Ex. 29:10, Lev. 1:4, accusation, Lev. 24:14, in the consecration of Levites, Num. 8:10, in appointment to an office, Num. 27:18-23, later also in the installation of judges and the promotion of teachers, Schürer, Gesch. des jüd. Volkes II3 199. Jesus laid hands on, in order to heal, Mt. 8:15, 9:18, Mk. 5:23 cf. 2 Kon. 4:34, 5:11 and to bless, Mt. 19:15, (Luk. 24:50), and the people attached great value to that, Mt. 9:18, Mk. 5:23, 7:32, but

nowhere do we read that He thus also did so in the appointment to an office. His apostles He appointed only with the word, without any ceremony, Mt. 10:1v., 28:19. In the appointment of Matthias, Paul, Barnabas, Silas, Luke etc. there is nowhere any mention made of a laying on of hands; a general usage in the introduction to an ecclesiastical office it certainly was not. But the laying on of hands took place in healing, Hd. 9:12, 17, in the communication of the gift of the Spirit, Hd. 8:17-19, in the appointment of deacons, 1 Tim. 4:14, 2 Tim. 1:6; according to 1 Tim. 5:22 it was generally in use in the ordination to an ecclesiastical office and according to Hebr. 6:2 it belongs to the first principles of the doctrine of Christ. Yet it was not a real communication of the spiritual gifts of office. For Hd. 6:3 teaches that the deacons, who were chosen, beforehand already had to be full of the H. Spirit and of wisdom. [125] In Hd. 13:3 the laying on of hands does not take place in the ordination, but in the sending out of Barnabas and Paul, who beforehand already stood in office. According to 1 Tim. 1:18, 4:14 the appointment of Timothy as evangelist was confirmed by prophetic testimonies and by laying on of hands of the presbyterium. And indeed in 2 Tim. 1:6 the gift of office is thought of as having taken place δι ἐπιθεσεως, but 1 Tim. 4:14 says that it was bestowed δια προφετειας and μετα ἐπιθεσεως; a proof of that, that prophecy and laying on of hands were not the origin of the gifts, but the means by which they were transferred into the service of the congregation and destined for that. From the apostles this usage of laying on of hands passed over into the Christian church, which applied it in baptism, in healing, in the readmission of the fallen and heretics, in marriage, in penance and in ordination. In the last case the right to apply it was in later time granted only to the bishop and understood as the conferral of a special gift of office. Over against Gnosticism and

Montanism, indeed, the truth of the church was thereby demonstrated, that the bishops in the congregations, which were founded by the apostles, were the guardians of the pure tradition. They had received this themselves from the apostles and handed it on uninjured to their successors. The successio ab initio decurrens, demonstrated with 2 Tim. 2:2, provided the guarantee for that, for the office included the communication of a special spirit of office, which the office-bearer retains even if he is personally ever so godless. The laying on of hands was in the ancient church certainly customary in the ordination to presbyter, deacon and the lower offices, always went together with prayer and was still for a long time understood as a symbolic sign of the communication of the gift of office. Manus impositio, quid est aliud nisi oratio super hominem? Aug. de bapt. 3, 16. But gradually it was regarded as a sacrament, which ex opere operato imparted a character indelebilis, Trid. 23 c. 7. de ref. c. 3. 10. Cat. Rom. II 7, 29. Bellarminus, de clericis I 14. The Lutherans rejected it at first, but later took it up again and sometimes attached great value to it, Apol. Conf. art. 13, cf. Herzog2 11, 80. The Reformed judged unanimously that the laying on of hands was no command of Christ and thus not absolutely necessary. But while some considered it useful, venerable and worthy of imitation, [126] Calvin, Inst. IV 3, 16. 14, 20. 19, 31, Aretius, Spanheim, Koelman, Pligt der ouderl. en diakenen 1889 bl. 53v., others held it to be an adiaphoron and discouraged its use out of fear of superstition, Syn. Emden art. 16. Dordr. 1574 art. 24 Midd. 1581 art. 4. Dordr. 1578 art. 5. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. III 452. 579. Moor V 352-356. VI 327-331. M. Vitringa IX 209. 353-357. It is not an essential element of the ordination, for neither with Jesus himself, nor with the apostles, nor also with the elders, Hd. 14:23, 20:28, is any mention made of it. Nor can and may it be understood as a mechanical communication of a special spirit of

office. For it does not bestow but presupposes according to Scripture the charismata required for the office. It is also not identical with the election or calling to the office but follows upon it and therefore cannot be anything other than a public designation of the one who is called to an office, and a solemn introduction and appointment to that office. Just as marrying before the government is not the essence of marriage and the coronation does not make the king, so also the ordinatio, with or without laying on of hands, is no communication of the office or of a spirit of office. It is only the solemn, public declaration before God and his congregation, that the one called is sent by lawful way and consequently from God's side, that he possesses the required gifts and as such must be received, acknowledged and honored by the congregation. Cf. Sohm, Kirchenrecht 56 f. Art. Handauflegung en Ordination in Herzog. Zahn, Einl. in das N. T. I 465. Achelis, Lehrb. der prakt. Theol. Leipzig 1898 I 139-173.

9. On the number of offices which Christ has instituted in his church, there exists in the Christian church great difference. In the apostolic time, from the nature of the case, the boundary between extraordinary and ordinary offices, and thus also between offices and gifts, was not yet sharply drawn. But the hierarchical development, which with the rise of the episcopate made a beginning, robbed the congregation of all freedom and independence and separated the offices from it by a broad gulf. The members of the congregation became the laici, who, excluded from all government and for their salvation absolutely dependent on priest and sacrament, have nothing to do but to listen and to obey. [127] And separated from them by a special character and a particular official spirit, high above them stand the clerici, who form a separate estate, propagate themselves by succession, and can also belong to the class of the clergy even without a

definite service in the congregation. These clerici are divided into two ranks, ordines minores (non sacri) and ordines majores (sacri). The ordines minores, to which the acoluthi, exorcistae, lectores and ostiarii belong, were at first voluntary services of members of the congregation but were in the first half of the third century in Rome organized into lower offices, because they stood in relation to the holy and had a share in it in lesser or greater degree; although often only in name, they are also now still preparation for the higher offices, Sohm, Kirchenrecht 128. Moeller-von Schubert, Kirchengesch. I 370. Wieland, Die genet. Entw. der sogen. ordines minores in den 3 ersten Jahrh., Freiburg Herder 1897 en daarbij Schürer's Theol. Lit. Z. 1898 n. 1. Already with the ordines minores the striving comes to light, to detach them from the congregation and to incorporate them into the ecclesiastical hierarchy. But much stronger is this the case with the ordines majores. These comprise the three offices of bishop, presbyter and deacon, but of these three actually only the episcopal office has remained. In this episcopate indeed all kinds of distinctions of jurisdiction and dignity have been introduced, so that one speaks of archbishops, patriarchs, metropolitans etc., but these distinctions make no infringement on the unity and the essence of the episcopal office. Even the papal office is essentially a bishop's office, only extended to the whole church and thereto equipped with special gifts, differing from the ordinary bishop's office not hieratically but only hierarchically. This episcopal office is in the Roman church actually the one, true office. After it in the second century had developed out of the presbyterate, it drew doctrine, tradition, jurisdiction to itself, separated itself from the congregation by succession, tonsure, celibacy, and gradually made presbyters and deacons into its organs. Still within the circle of the N. Test. we find at the head of the congregation a

council of presbyters, a presbyterium, 1 Tim. 4:14, and such a council remained, even after one of them had raised himself to bishop, for a long time still existing around him. But this council lost more and more [128] every bond with the congregation, became a chapter of the bishop and served, in order under him by virtue of an authorization granted by him to act as ministers of the holy, especially of the sacrament. Likewise the diaconate soon changed wholly in character. When the priest- and sacrifice-idea found entrance, the διακονειν τραπεζαις, Hd. 6:2, was no longer understood of the care of the needy but of auxiliary service at the eucharist. The bishop became high priest, the presbyters became priests and the deacons became levites, who, leaving the care of the poor to private persons and monastic orders, stood at the bishop's side in the administration of the mass. While in this way presbyters and deacons were wholly and entirely separated from the congregation and made into organs of the bishop, he himself is specifically distinguished from all others by one power. The episcopal office is a priestly office, but connected with the power to propagate it, with the vis generativa sacerdotii; it guarantees the continuance of the sacerdotium and thus the propagation of the church. The bishop is the punctum saliens in the church; laymen, deacons, presbyters can be temporarily lacking but the bishop cannot; where he is, there is the church, for he is the bearer of the doctrine, the propagator of the priesthood. The presbyters are also priests, authorized to administer the sacraments, but they may not ordain, they lack the vis generativa sacerdotii, their priesthood is unfruitful, they are servants and helpers of the bishop, because he cannot be everywhere and cannot do everything. Presbytery and diaconate are at Rome extensions of the episcopate; they are three degrees in the one sacerdotium, not co- but subordinated. The presbyter is also deacon, the

bishop is also presbyter; each time the official gift rises one step higher, until it culminates in the bishop, or, as the following paragraph will indicate, in the pope. Cf. Thomas, S. Theol. suppl. qu. 34-40. Lombardus e. a. op Sent. IV dist. 24. Bonav., Brevil. VI 12. Conc. Trid. sess. 23. Cat. Rom. II c. 7. Bellarminus, de clericis I c. 11 sq. Dens, Theol. VII 50 sq. Oswald, Die dogm. Lehre v. d. h. Sakr. II2 315-335. Seydl, Der Diakonat, Regensburg 1884. Vering, Lehrb. des kath. orient. und prot. Kirchenrechts3, Freiburg 1893 S. 558 f., enz.

Over against this hierarchy Luther contented himself with the restoration of the original preaching office. Indeed he deemed [129] for the exercise of discipline a council of elders and for the care of the poor a council of deacons necessary. But these offices were nevertheless, on account of the inopportuneness of the times, not restored; they were also not so necessary as the episcopal, clerical preaching office, the Pfarramt, which is the principal office and through which Christ in particular governs his church. The office of elders and of deacons were therefore in the Lutheran church replaced by consistory and churchwardenship; the Roman ordines made room for the ordo ecclesiasticus, politicus and oeconomicus. Cf. Köstlin, Luthers Theol. II 538 f. Conf. Aug. and Apol. art. 5. 14. 28. Gerhard, Loc. XXIII especially § 232. 233. Sohm, Kirchenrecht 460-542. Achelis, Lehrb. d. prakt. Theol. I2 60 f. By contrast, presbyterial church government is due to Calvin. Indeed there were already before him, inter alia by Oecolampadius at Basel in 1530, attempts tried, in order for the benefit of ecclesiastical discipline to institute the office of elders, but Calvin nevertheless was the first to carry this out and to make the office of elders a mark of Reformed church government, Lechler, Gesch. der Presb. u. Syn. Verfassung, Leiden 1854 and art. Presbyter in Herzog2. In doing so he

proceeded from the word of God. For even if it is also the case that Calvin's character and circumstances opened his eye for the significance of the offices in Holy Scripture, yet presbyterial church government was by him not derived from any abstract principle but from the word of God and introduced into the church on its authority. In more recent times one has indeed begun to speak of a Gemeindeprinzip and has built up from it a kind of presbyterial and diaconal offices; a congregation had a right to govern itself, just as in the political sphere the people little by little obtain more influence on the government, thus Stahl and many younger church ordinances in Rieker, Grundsätze ref. Kirchenverf. 130 f., and likewise a congregation had organs, i.e. deacons and deaconesses, necessary for the exercise of the work of the inner Mission, Paul Wurster, Die Lehre v. d. inneren Mission, Berlin 1895 S. 128 f. But this is an entirely different conception than that which one finds in Calvin and the Reformed. Even if it is also the case that they urge the government of the church with this, that it otherwise no more than a people or a society can exist, Calvin, Inst. IV 11, 1. a Lasco, Op. II 45; yet they derive the offices not from the congregation but from the [130] institution of Christ. The church as communion of the saints is not autonomous; it is not free, to arrange itself or not, thus or otherwise, but it is also on this point bound to the word of God and finds therein the principles indicated and the lines drawn, which it has to follow in the government of the church. It was a general conviction that the government of the church in substance had to rest on a jus divinum, Calvin, Inst. IV 3, 1. 4, 1. Conf. Gall. 25. 29. Belg. 30. Helv. II 18, especially the Westm. synod in Neal, Historie der Purit. II 1 bl. 182v. But in doing so one nevertheless did not lose from sight that Scripture was no lawbook, nor descended into all sorts of particulars and left very much to the freedom of

the churches, Syn. Wezel I 9. 10. Emden 19-21. Westm. I 6. Even about the offices which Christ had instituted in his church there was no small difference. In the first place there were those who had no objection against an episcopate in the sense of a superintendency, a Lasco, Op. II 51. 57. Knox, First Book of Discipline, cf. Saravia, Scultetus, Bochartus, Spanheim Jr., Tilenus, Forbesius a Corse e. a. in M. Vitringa IX 210 sq. Then there was difference over whether the office of doctor, conceived as a professorship in theology, formed a separate, ecclesiastical office or whether it, because of no apostolic institution, could only in a broader sense be so called, cf. my address on the Doctorenambt, Kampen 1899. Next, apart from the doctorate, some spoke rather of three offices pastor, presbyter and deacon, Calvin, Ordonn. eccl. Syn. Wezel c. 2. 4. 5. Emden 13. 14. Dordr. 12v. Midd. 2. 's Grav. 2. Dordr. 2; others named two offices, presbyter and deacon and then divided the first into teaching- and ruling-eldership, a Lasco Op. II 51 and many Scottish and American church orders, in Rieker, Grundsätze ref. Kirchenverf. 104; there were even those who found presbyterial church government indeed useful but not necessary by virtue of a jus divinum and rejected the distinction of teaching- and ruling-elders, Cappellus, Theses Salm. III 330. Burmannus, Synopsis VIII 7, 41v. e. a. in M. Vitringa IX 235 sq. Further, the distinction of deacons into those for poor and for sick was indeed introduced by Calvin, Inst. IV 3, 9 but only seldom adopted, Zanchius, Op. IV 767. Syn. Wezel. c. 5; and by others the office of deaconesses restored, Junius, Op. I 1567. [131] Walaeus, Op. I 466. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. II 508 sq. 529; and also according to some in Hd. 6 the institution of the diaconate was not reported and this office therefore not of divine origin, Cappellus e. a. in M. Vitringa IX 277 sq. And finally there was still difference over the manner of election, over

holding an office without a definite service in the congregation, Heidegger, Corpus Theol. II 571, over the usefulness of the laying on of hands, both in general and especially at the confirmation of elders and deacons, Voetius, Pol. Eccl. III 466, over the repetition of the confirmation upon reappointment of elders and deacons, Moor VI 329, M. Vitringa IX 361, over the duration of the eldership, Rutgers in de Heraut 944-948 etc. The treatment of all these subjects belongs in church law. But so much may safely be said, that the Reformed, by the restoration of the office of elders and the office of deacons alongside that of the minister of the word, have most purely grasped the thought of Scripture and have most powerfully recognized the rights of the congregation. Over the church Christ alone is king; its government in the invisible is strictly monarchical. And king was he not only in the past, but he is it still. From heaven he governs his congregation on earth by his Word and his Spirit, by his prophetic, priestly and kingly activity. These three offices he continues on earth, not exclusively but nevertheless also by means of the offices which he has instituted. In the visible his government is not democratic nor monarchical nor oligarchical, but aristocratic-presbyterial. It is the ἄριστοι, the best, not in money and goods but in spiritual gifts, whom he himself qualifies and has the congregation designate for his service. Through them he provides for the spiritual and for the material interests of his congregation. Through the teaching office he instructs, through the office of elders he leads, through the diaconal office he cares for his flock; and through all three he proves himself to be our highest prophet, our eternal king and our merciful high priest. [132]

§ 49. The Power of the Church.

1. The church, no less than the state, does not belong to the original institutions of the human race. The oldest form of society was the family, in which civil and religious life still lay interwoven and stood under the leadership of the father or patriarch, who was prophet, priest, and king in his household. Sin, however, made the institution of church and state necessary for the preservation of the human race. In the command of the death penalty for murder of a human being, Gen. 9:6, God in principle establishes the civil authority; and this, too, soon appears after the tower-building under the guidance of God's providence among all peoples into which humanity is divided. As soon as a civil authority arises, there comes of itself also a certain distinction and separation between civil and religious life; alongside the princes there appear priests. Therewith the possibility of conflict is then of itself given; the boundaries are among the peoples each time drawn differently and the bonds laid in diverse ways. While in the East in general the power of the princes is subject to the priesthood, in the West, among Greeks and Romans, religion is a political interest and the priests are

officials of the state. A complete separation occurred nowhere in antiquity; a neutral state is there entirely unknown. The state maintains and protects religion, if need be with banishment and the death penalty (Socrates), for this is the foundation and guarantee of its own existence. Israel, too, was from the outset arranged patriarchally and divided into households, families, clans, and tribes. Under the kings the genealogical division continued to exist and gave to the state constitution a democratic stamp, so that the heads of the tribes etc. in the popular assemblies had to decide on weighty matters. Already under this patriarchal form of government there was distinction between civil and religious interests, between Moses and Aaron, between scribes, שֹׁטְרִים and judges, שֹׁפְתִים, on the one side, and priests and Levites on the other side. Only in the supreme court, which was established at Jerusalem and had to judge very difficult cases, did priests also have a seat, Deut. 17:8-13, [133] 19:17, 18. It is therefore incorrect to say that under Israel church and state were one. Both were in laws, institutions, offices, office-bearers, and in part even in members clearly distinguished from each other, cf. Hoedemaker, Church and State in Israel, in the journal Troffel en Zwaard 1898 pp. 208-237. The priests had to serve in the temple, approach God with the offerings of the people, distribute God's grace and blessing to the people, and instruct it in the law, Lev. 9:22, 10:11, 21:8, Num. 6:22, 16:5, Ezech. 44:23, but they also had to offer for themselves, Lev. 9:7, 16:6, were bound to the law, Deut. 33:10, Jer. 18:18 and for their livelihood dependent on the people, Lev. 23:10, Num. 18:8-32 etc. Also they had no secret doctrine or art, no political or civil power, no hierarchical dominion; Israel has never been a priest-state, the freedom of the people was in every way guaranteed over against the priestly estate. The prophets appeared freely, had to proclaim the word of God, had without

sparing to make Israel's sins known and announce to people and civil authority God's judgments, but they had no other power than the power of the word. Foreigners could through circumcision be incorporated into Israel, Ex. 12:48, and the unclean and lepers remained citizens, even though they were temporarily set apart. Despite the schism the religious unity of the people could in itself very well have remained in existence. But the distinctive feature of Israel's constitution consisted now in this, that all these laws, offices, and institutions were given and maintained by God; Israel was a theocracy; God was its lawgiver, judge, and king, Jes. 33:22. There was therefore in no single sphere in Israel place for an independent sovereignty; the king too was not allowed to be a despot, but had to be chosen by God, taken from the midst of the brethren, and bound to God's law, Deut. 17:14-20, 1 Sam. 10:25. Above all offices, institutions, and persons stood the law of God, which regulated the whole life of Israel and had to be kept by all without distinction; Israel had to be a holy people and a priestly kingdom, Ex. 19:3, Deut. 7:6. From that it follows that, without the distinction between civil and religious life being erased, the civil authority nevertheless also on its own terrain had to maintain the law of God. Idolatry, image-worship, [134] sorcery, blasphemy, Sabbath-breaking etc., all sins against the first table, were therefore many times punished with death, Ex. 22:18, 20, Lev. 20:2, 6, 27, 24:11-16, Num. 25:5, 7, Deut. 13:1-5, 17:2-7, 18:9-12, 20, 1 Kon. 15:12, 18:40, 2 Kon. 9:7, 24, 33, 10:6, 11, 17, 18v., 11:15, 12:2, 18:4, 2 Chr. 15:13, 17:6, 29:10, 31:1, 34:5, 33. Religion was a national matter, sin was crime, transgression of the first table of the law was breach of the covenant. But in addition it must nevertheless be borne in mind that the law gave only very few, general rules, and often left the execution of the punishment to God himself; that the killing of the

Canaanites, of Agag, of Ahab's house were isolated cases, that Jehu's zeal went much further than God's command, that the reformation of the kings mostly limited itself to the extirpation of the idols and to restoration of the public service of Jahveh, that unbelief and heresy in Israel were not tracked down by any inquisition and occurred frequently, that coercion of conscience was entirely unknown, that foreigners, on condition of refraining from public profanation of Israel's religion, were not only tolerated but also treated with courtesy, that priests and prophets never incited to persecution of the godless but only admonished them to repentance, e.g. also in Ps. 2:10, and from God himself expected the political and religious victory of Israel over all its enemies. Therefore also, when Israel more and more lost its political independence, the religious congregation could continue to exist and organize itself in its own way. Although the power of priests and high priest after the exile gradually expanded, soon they got in Pharisees and scribes dangerous competitors; in the synagogue religious life became independent, not only over against the state, but also over against temple and priesthood; and that whole life was more and more concentrated around the law, whose instruction was the chief purpose of the synagogue, Mt. 4:23, Mk. 1:21 etc. Hd. 15:21, 2 Tim. 3:15. That law, or taken more broadly, the Old Test. Scripture was foundation, center, source of Israel's religious life; it possessed no other power than that which lay in that Word. Hence it clung to it with anxious meticulousness and all who did not want to live according to it, by the ban גְּדוּי, חֵרֶם, שַׁמַּתָא removed from its midst and without or with anathemas, for a time or for good excluded outside the congregation, Luk. 6:22, Joh. 9:22, 12:42, 16:2. Cf. Schürer, Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter J. C. II3 passim, especially 428 f.

2. When Jesus, coming to his own, was not received by his own, he organized his disciples into an ἐκκλησια, which, hoping and suffering, had to await his second coming and the victory over all his enemies. This congregation shows in organization and cultus indeed some agreement with the synagogue, but is nevertheless a still freer and more independent organization of the new life which Christ had brought to light. For there can be no doubt about it, that Christ founded such a congregation and entrusted to it a certain power. For he himself speaks of it as built so firmly upon a rock that the gates of hell will be able to do nothing against it, Mt. 16:18, and furthermore he gives to that congregation offices, ministries, institutions, gifts, Rom. 12:6v., 1 Cor. 12-14, Ef. 4:11, which all point to the fact that it has an own, free, independent existence and a self-standing organization. But this power, which Christ grants to his congregation, bears a special character. It consists in nothing else but also in nothing less than in the power of the keys, which was first allotted by Christ to Peter, Mt. 16:19. After Peter had first, on account of his confession of Jesus' Messiahship, been called a rock, upon which Christ would build his congregation, he then in verse 19 appointed him as οἰκονομος of the kingdom of heaven and transferred to him the keys of that kingdom. Keys are a sign of dominion, Jes. 22:22, Luk. 11:52, Openb. 1:8, 3:7, 9:1, 20:1, and here indicate the power of Peter to open and to close the kingdom of heaven, i.e. to determine who will enter it and who not. For his judgment will also be valid in heaven; what he will bind or loose (make loose, set free) will also be reckoned thus by God. In these words no legislative power is bestowed upon Peter, but indeed a judging or judicial one; because he is confessor of Jesus as the Christ, he has in that confession a standard to determine what does or does not belong to the congregation and thus will or will not enter

into the kingdom of heaven. In Mt. 18:18 the congregation in general receives the power to regard an impenitent person as a heathen and tax collector, for its judgment is of force in the heavens. And in Joh. 20:24 all the apostles, on the ground of the gift of the Spirit granted to them in verse 22, receive the power to loose or to retain the sins of men. From this it appears clearly that the power of the congregation and specifically of Peter and the apostles consists in pronouncing a judicial judgment concerning men's relation to the kingdom of heaven according to the standard of the confession of Jesus as the Christ and the gift of the H. Spirit. This power is in the N. T. repeatedly further described. It is no authoritarian, independent, sovereign dominion, Mt. 20:25, 26, 23:8, 10, 2 Cor. 10:4, 5, 1 Petr. 5:3, but a διακονια, λειτουργια. Hd. 4:29, 20:24, Rom. 1:1 etc., bound to Christ, who has all power in heaven and on earth, Mt. 28:18, who is the only head of the congregation, Ef. 1:22 and who as such distributes all gifts and offices, Ef. 4:11; bound to his Word and Spirit, through which Christ himself governs his congregation, Rom. 10:14, 15, Ef. 5:26, and exercised in his name and power, 1 Cor. 5:4. It is therefore indeed a power, an essential all-embracing power, consisting in the ministry of word and sacrament, Mt. 28:19, in the opening and closing of the kingdom of heaven, Mt. 16:19, in the forgiving or retaining of sins, Joh. 20:20, in the exercise of discipline over the members of the congregation, Mt. 16:18, Rom. 16:17, 1 Cor. 5:4, 2 Thess. 3:6, Tit. 3:10, 2 Joh. 10, 2 Tim. 2:17, Hebr. 12:15-17, Op. 2:14, in the discerning of all things, 1 Cor. 2:15, in the teaching, comforting, admonishing etc. of the brethren, Col. 3:16, in the application of the gifts for the benefit of others, Rom. 12:4-8, 1 Cor. 12:12v., in the doing of miracles, Mk. 16:17, 18 etc. But all this power is spiritual, moral in nature, essentially distinct from all other power which God has granted to men over

men or over other creatures in family, society, state, art, science. For Jesus has appeared in no other way than as Christ, as prophet, priest and king; no other office has he held, no other relation has he assumed. He was no [137] housefather, no scholar, no artist, no statesman; he has honored all ordinances and works of the Father and came only to break the works of the devil, 1 Joh. 3:8. His kingdom did not have its origin in this world, Joh. 18:36. And therefore he acknowledges all authority, high priest, sanhedrin, Herod, Pilate etc., he pays the tax, Mt. 17:24, refuses to be an arbitrator between two brothers who quarrel over an inheritance, Luk. 12:14, commands to give to the emperor what is his, Mt. 22:21, rebukes John, who wants to make fire descend from heaven, Luk. 9:55, and Peter, who cuts off Malchus' ear, Joh. 18:10, forbids that his young men fight for his name and cause with the sword, Mt. 26:52. The gospel of Christ never binds the struggle against nature as such, it did not come to condemn the world but to save it, Joh. 3:16, 17; it leaves family, marriage, the relation of parents and children, of masters and servants, of government and people untouched; it finds nothing reprehensible in itself and every creature good, if it is taken with thanksgiving and sanctified by the word of God and by prayer, 1 Tim. 4:4; it lets each one remain in the calling in which he was called, 1 Cor. 7:12-24, 1 Thess. 4:11, teaches to respect the government, Rom. 13:1, 1 Tim. 2:2, 1 Petr. 2:13, and even lets slavery continue, 1 Cor. 7:22, Philem. 11. Even when it commands to obey God more than men, it preaches only passive resistance, Hd. 4:19, 5:29. But nevertheless, though averse to all revolution, it is all the more set on reformation. It never binds against nature as such, but indeed everywhere and always, on every terrain and down into the most hidden corners, it undertakes the struggle against sin and the lie. And thus it preaches principles which, not by a revolutionary but by a moral

and spiritual way, work through everywhere and reform and renew everything. While it, according to Jesus' command, must be preached to all creatures, Mk. 16:15, it is a power of God unto salvation for each one who believes, Rom. 1:16; a two-edged sharp sword, which penetrates to the division of soul and spirit, Hebr. 4:12; a leaven, which leavens everything, Mt. 13:33; a principle that recreates everything; a power that conquers the world, 1 Joh. 5:4. [138]

3. This apostolic doctrine of ecclesiastical power remained recognized for a considerable time in the Christian church. It did not at first occur to anyone that the poor, small congregation would one day become a world-church, which would prescribe laws to princes and peoples. All that was desired was to be able, under the pagan government, to lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. But when the church came to esteem and dominion, its power too was conceived in a wholly different way. The development of episcopate and tradition, of the priest- and sacrifice-idea, brought with it that ordination was regarded as a sacramental act, which, performed by the bishop, communicated the spirit of office and granted right and competence to perform the ecclesiastical ceremonies. And although the power of the keys, bestowed upon Peter in Mt. 16:18, by combination with Mt. 18:18 and Joh. 20:23 was in the first period understood of the forgiveness of sins, Cypr. de unit. eccl. 4. Ep. 75, 16, it gradually acquired, especially through the sacrament of penance, a juridical character. The power of the church is therefore according to Rome twofold: potestas ordinis and potestas jurisdictionis, of which the latter is then again distinguished into jurisdictio fori interni (sacramentalis) and fori externi (legifera, judiciaria en coactiva), Thomas, S. Theol. II 2 qu. 39 art. 3. Catech. Rom. II 7, 6. Conc. Vat. ed. Lacensis col. 570. Klee, Kath. Dogm.

I2 162. Dieringer, Kath. Dogm.4 619. 715. Liebermann, Inst. Theol. I8 290. Simar, Dogm. 593. Scheeben-Atzberger, Dogm. IV 1 S. 317 f. Schell, Kath. Dogm. III 1 S. 396. Jansen, Prael. theol. I 380 sq. enz. For a correct understanding of this power ascribed by Rome to the church, the following must be taken into account. 1o The potestas docendi is sometimes treated separately by later theologians and naturally, according to Rome, also belongs to the church. But properly it is a part of the potestas jurisdictionis. The Catech. Rom. II 7, 7 could give rise to the supposition that the potestas docendi belongs under the potestas ordinis, because it says that this not only contains the power to administer the eucharist, sed ad eam accipiendam hominum animos praeparat et idoneos reddit; but the Conc. Vatic. IV c. 3. 4 expressly brings the magisterium under the potestas jurisdictionis. The ministry of the word is with Rome jurisprudence, culminating in the infallible decisions of the pope; it is not preaching [139] but a proclamation of dogmata, which as such bind the conscience, oblige to faith, i.e. to assensus, and, if need be, can be imposed with coercion, Richter-Dove-Kahl, Kirchenrecht 305. Achelis, Prakt. Theol. I2 79. 2o The potestas ordinis, the power to administer the sacraments, is obtainable only through the sacramentum ordinis conferred by the bishop, which communicates the spirit of office and impresses a character indelebilis, and is therefore inalienable, Thomas, S. Theol. II 2 qu. 39 art. 3; even heretics and schismatics, who were once ordained in Rome by the bishop, retain this power; it therefore also stands by itself, and is wholly independent of the ministry of the word. The sacerdotium can with Rome also exist without preaching of the gospel. Si quis dixerit..., sacerdotium... non esse potestatem aliquam consecrandi et offerendi verum corpus et sanguinem Domini et peccata remittendi et retinendi, sed officium tantum et nudum

ministerium praedicandi evangelium, vel eos, qui non praedicant, prorsus non esse sacerdotes, anathema sit, Conc. Trid. sess. 23 de sacr. ordinis can. 1. 3o In accordance herewith, with Rome the forgiveness of sins is not bestowed in the preaching of the word, which has only praeparatory significance, but in the sacrament, which contains grace in itself and pours it into the recipient ex opere operato. Specifically it is communicated in baptism and, for the sins committed after baptism, in the sacrament of penance. Discipline was namely in the first Christian church very strict. When experience taught that by no means all who had become Christians walked worthily of their calling and often fell into carnal sins and, during the persecutions, especially also into denial of the gospel, the admonitions increased to make confession of sins in the midst of the congregation, especially before the use of the Lord's Supper, Did. 4:14, Clemens, 1 and 2 Cor. passim. Over the return of such fallen and excluded persons into the bosom of the church a long struggle arose. Montanism, Novatianism and Donatism wanted, for such fallen persons, specifically for those who had made themselves guilty of denial, murder or fornication, to close the door of the church and to leave them to God's grace, cf. Hebr. 6:4-6, 10:26, 1 Joh. 5:16. But Hermas, Mand. IV 1, already said in the case of adultery that one repentance was possible. In [140] Tertullian's time a distinction was already made between venial and mortal sins; the perpetrators of the former underwent, even if they were temporarily excluded from the congregation, only a castigatio, no damnatio, Tert. de pudic. 7; those who made themselves guilty of the latter, especially of idolatry, adultery or murder, were, in case of repentance, nevertheless as it were again admitted into the forecourt of the church. The development of the catholic church-idea (as institute of salvation), the concentration of all ecclesiastical power in the

bishop, the doctrine of the meritoriousness of good works (satisfactio, meritum) benefited the readmission of fallen and banished persons by means of penance. The bishop of Rome, Callistus, proclaimed in 217 that he also forgave the sins of fornication in those who repented. A council at Carthage 252 granted to all fallen persons, in case of penitence, the reconciliatio or absolutio, Cypr. ep. 57, although the returning person also had to pass through various stages before he was received into the full communion of the church (προσκλαυσις, ἀκροασις, ὑποπτωσις, συστασις). And in 316 the Donatists were condemned, who asserted that no one excommunicated or worthy of excommunication could administer the sacrament, Moeller-v. Schubert, Kirchengesch. I 96. 133. 278. 298. 358. 415 and the literature cited there. In the penance, which gradually was conceived as a sacrament and consisted of three parts (confessio oris, contritio cordis en satisfactio operis), the church created for itself the possibility of receiving again into its full communion all who after baptism had fallen into lesser or greater sins. It was a secunda post naufragium tabula after baptism, Trid. IV c. 2. The whole discipline with Rome was absorbed into this systematized penance, and this penance became an actus judicialis, a court of law, in which the priests sit as praesides and judices, hear the confession of the mortalia crimina, determine the punishment in a casuistic manner according to the standard of the libri poenitentiarii, and in the name of Christ grant the forgiveness of sins (absolution) not conditionally and declaratorily but absolutely, categorically and peremptorily. This juridical character of penance is also expressed in this, that this sacrament may be administered only to those who are baptized, because the church possesses jurisdiction over no one except those who by baptism stand under its power; that the believers may receive this sacrament

only from the hand [141] of that priest whose subditi they are according to ecclesiastical, i.e. papal, disposition; and that higher clergy, bishops etc. and especially the pope, reserve to themselves certain, scandalous cases, in which they alone can judge and decide, as e.g. in the application of ban and interdict over princes and lands in the Middle Ages by the popes, Conc. Trid. XIV. Cat. Rom. II 5, 32 sq. 4o In order to be able to exercise this jurisdiction in foro interno, the Roman church further claims to possess the potestas jurisdictionis in foro externo (potestas regiminis), distinguished into potestas legislativa, judiciaria and coactiva. Christ indeed gave to the church, in order that it might be faithful to its calling, first of all a legislative power; it may bind and loose, forbid or permit, impose moral obligations or annul them; and whatever it determines is valid in heaven; it is just as much as if God himself commands it; it therefore binds the consciences and obliges to unconditional obedience, Mt. 16:19, 18:18, Joh. 20:21, 23, Hd. 15:27-29, 41, 1 Cor. 11:4-7, 14:26, 2 Cor. 8, 10:6, 8, 1 Tim. 3, Tit. 1:5, Hebr. 13:7, 17. This legislative power of itself includes the judicial, since the former could not exist without the latter; Christ gave this power to the congregation in Mt. 18:15-17 and the apostles exercised it, Hd. 5:1-10, 1 Cor. 5:3, 11-13, 1 Tim. 5:19, 20. And finally the church also has an executive and coercive power, and can impose not only spiritual punishments, as Donatists, Waldensians, Albigensians etc. asserted, but also temporal and bodily ones, and that not only on the authority of or by means of the state, but also itself from its own authority and directly. Rome grounds this power on Mt. 16:19, 18:18, 28:19, 1 Cor. 4:18-21, 5:4-5, 2 Cor. 10:6, 8, 13:2, 3, 1 Tim. 1:20, has taught it many times expressly, Denzinger, Enchir. symb. et defin. n. 1367. 1546. 1572. Conc. Vatic. coll. Lac. VII 570. 577, and also applied it frequently, cf. Perrone, Prael. Theol. Lov. 1843 VII

275. Scheeben-Atzberger, Dogm. IV 1 S. 322. Jansen, Prael. theol. I 390 enz. 5o Finally Rome teaches that this ecclesiastical power, essentially distinct from all earthly power, is fully independent and sovereign. To be sure it says that this power with respect to Christ is a ministering one, a ministerium; but over against all earthly authority and power it is completely autonomous. With this doctrine of [142] the independence of ecclesiastical power it struck a wholly different path than the church of the East. There, through Constantine, Theodosius and Justinian I, the church became more and more an organ in the state; the emperor therefore could indeed not do with the church whatever he wished, for he was bound to the dogma, and no αρχιερευς but only εὐσεβης, protector of orthodoxy, yet he was nevertheless just as much as of the state the ruling head of the church. In the Russian church this view still prevails today. In 1721 Peter the Great placed the supreme administration over the church in the hands of a permanent Holy Synod, which through the intermediary of the procurator is bound to the Czar. However much the power of the Czar in comparison with that of the Byzantine emperors is in many respects limited and weakened, it is nevertheless he who through the Synod governs the church, regulates the religious affairs of his people, determines the measure of freedom for his Roman Catholic and Protestant subjects; the orthodox dogma in Russia is still always in a formal sense constitutional law and heresy a state crime, cf. Pobedonoszew, Streitfragen der Gegenwart. Autor. Uebersetzung. Berlin 1897. Herzog2 5, 425 f. Kattenbusch, Vergl. Confessionskunde I 374-393. While thus in the East Caesaropapism came to development, the church in the West, organized in the pope, knew not only to maintain its autonomy against but many times also to extend its supremacy over the state. The emperorship became in Charlemagne a

Christian, a Roman institution, and from that time on was many times subordinate to the pope. And this was not only practice but also became more and more theory. State, (family, society, art, science, all the earthly) and church relate according to Rome as nature and grace, flesh and spirit, bonum naturale and bonum supernaturale, the temporal and the eternal, the earthly and the heavenly. As the moon receives its light from the sun, so princes have their worldly power to thank the pope for, who indeed as vicar of Christ has all power in heaven and on earth, (Alvarus, Pelagius e. a.); or in any case the pope as head of Christendom also has summa potestas disponendi de rebus temporalibus omnium Christianorum, Bellarminus, de Rom. Pontif. V 6. 7. Indeed a worldly territory for the exercise of his sovereign power is for him decidedly necessary. [143] Even if the state is within its own domain free and autonomous, it is nevertheless less than the church, bound to its pronouncement and, everywhere where the spiritual intervenes in the natural, subject to the church. The state must be Christian, i.e. Roman, may recognize no other as the true one than the Roman, and is obliged, if the church demands it and it does not itself do so, to persecute and punish heretics. Cf. Augustine's letter to Vincentius contra Donat. et Rogat. de vi corrigendis haereticis, id. to Bonifacius de moderate coercendis haereticis, further c. Epist. Parmeniani I 16. Contra literas Petiliani, especially lib. II. Contra Gaudentii Denatistarum episcopi epistolam I 20 II 17. Thomas, de regimine principum. Bellarminus, de Rom. Pontif. V. de membris eccl. III. Hergenröther, Kath. Kirche und Christl. Staat in ihrer geschichtl. Entw. 1872. Hammerstein, Kirche und Staat, Freiburg 1883. Stöckl, Lehrb. d. Philos. III6 451-480. Cathrein, Moralphilosophie II3 529 f. Hansjakob, Die Toleranz und die Intoleranz der Kath. Kirche 2e Aufl. Freiburg 1899 enz.

4. This power, granted by Rome to the church, culminates and also finds the guarantee for its stability and continuance in the power of the pope. For according to the Conc. Vatic. IV c. 3. 4 he bears the following properties: 1o It is not merely a primatus honoris nor also only an office of supervision and guidance, but an authority of legislation, government, and jurisdiction independent of the bishops, a potestas jurisdictionis. 2o It is not an extraordinary, temporary, but an ordinary, enduring power, which God gives him and which he can exercise always and not only in some extraordinary cases. 3o It is an immediate power, both as to origin, since Christ gives it, and as to its use, since the pope can exercise it not only through the bishops but also through himself or his legates, without asking permission or authorization from anyone, and thus can have immediate, free intercourse with all bishops and believers. 4o It is not a limited, but a plena et suprema potestas, extending itself extensively over the whole church, containing intensively all power which is necessary for the guidance and government of the church, and absolutely sovereign, subject to no laymen, bishops, council, but only to God. 5o All members of the church, whether individually or together, all bishops, [144] each for himself or assembled in synod and council, owe absolute obedience to the pope, not only in matters of faith and morals, but also in those of discipline and government of the church. Haec est catholicae veritatis doctrina, a qua deviare, salva fide atque salute, nemo potest. 6o A part of this power is the teaching office, concerning which it is determined that the pope, when he speaks ex cathedra, is infallible by divine assistance.

After all that was previously said about the doctrine of Scripture and the oldest ecclesiastical testimonies, it needs no further demonstration that this entire papal system rests on an unscriptural foundation. The consensus

patrum, namely after Irenaeus, the doctrine and practice of popes and councils, the agreement of the later theologians, as they are more broadly set forth in Roman dogmatics, e.g. in Heinrich, Dogm. II 323 f., cannot make good this defect. However much this papal edifice, by its strict unity, often also charms many Protestants, yet it is to the same degree religiously and ethically weak as it politically and juridically impresses. For 1o the nature and character of infallibility are insufficiently determined. Rome has not dared to go so far as to ascribe to the pope the same infallibility as to the apostles. This lay and lies indeed on the line. One would expect that the apostles had communicated the apostolic authority to the episcopi whom they appointed, and Peter in particular to the bishop at Rome. But this is not so. The pope is infallible, yet not by inspiration, but by assistance of the H. Spirit, by a special care of God, whereby the church is guarded from error and preserved in the truth. And his infallibility does not consist in this, that he receives new revelations and can present a new doctrine, but it consists only herein, that he can faithfully preserve and explain the revelation handed down by the apostles. And also it is not to be understood in the sense that the words spoken by the pope ex cathedra are, in a literal sense, God's Word, but only that they contain this materially, Heinrich, Dogm. II 220-245. Jansen, Prael. theol. I 616. 2o Although infallibility is a special gift, it is nevertheless not always proper to the pope, and not in his person, nor also as writer, as orator, as judge, as legislator, as administrator, nor also as secular prince, bishop of Rome, metropolitan of the ecclesiastical province of Rome or [145] as patriarch of the West, but only as pope, as head of the whole church. However, there is no unanimity about this. Especially with a view to the case of Pope Honorius, earlier theologians and even Innocentius III, in Schwane D. G. III 535, conceded that the pope

privatim could fall into heresy, and then jure divino ex ipso facto was deposed as pope (Paludanus, Turrecremata, Alphonsus de Castro, Sylvester e. a.) or could be deposed by a judicial sentence of a council (Cajetanus, Canus e. a.) This, however, had its questionable side and endangered the unlimited sovereignty and inviolability of the pope. Therefore others, such as Pighius, Bellarminus, Suarez e. a., could better reconcile themselves to the probable and pious opinion that divine providence will also preserve the pope personally from heresy, Heinrich, Dogm, II 257. Scheeben-Atzberger, Dogm. IV 1 S. 450. 3o The Vaticanum says, with an expression perhaps first used by Melchior Canus, in Schwane D. G. IV 302, that the pope is infallible when he speaks ex cathedra. This seems to draw a boundary, but is in practice a very unusable criterion. For the system requires that no one can determine whether a pope has spoken ex cathedra, except the pope himself alone. And thus a pope always has it in his hand to reject his own pronouncements or those of other popes, by saying that they are not, or also, in order to declare them binding, by saying that they are indeed spoken ex cathedra. And he can even later say that he or a predecessor, thinking to have spoken ex cathedra, nevertheless in fact did not do so. 4o The infallible teaching office is a component of the plena et suprema potestas jurisdictionis in universam ecclesiam. It is true that the Vaticanum, sess. IV c. 3, does not expressly declare that the pope, in exercising this entire power, is at all times infallible. But it nevertheless says that, with respect to it, cujuscumque ritus et dignitatis pastores atque fideles, tam seorsim singuli quam simul omnes, officio hierarchicae subordinationis veraeque obedientiae obstringuntur, non solum in rebus, quae ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quae ad disciplinam et regimen ecclesiae pertinent. Whether the pope in all this is therefore fallible or infallible, all, without distinction,

without any right of criticism, (neque cuiquam de ejus licere judicare judicio) must obey the pope unconditionally, and that on pain of not [146] less than the salvation of their souls. 5o In the Conc. Vatic. sess. IV c. 4, infallibility is indeed expressly ascribed only to the pope, when he speaks ex cathedra and as shepherd and teacher of all Christians defines doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa ecclesia tenendam. But absolutely nothing can be inferred from this, that otherwise he is not. For how could, otherwise, in c. 3, even in matters of discipline, government, jurisdiction, absolute and unconditional obedience to the pope be demanded? But however this may be, in matters of faith and morals the pope is certainly infallible. And what belongs thereto, the Roman theologians further elaborate. The pope is infallible when he deals with the truths of revelation in Scripture, with the truths of tradition, with the truths of the divine institutions, sacraments, church, ecclesiastical constitution and government, with the truths of natural revelation. But even with this the boundary of his infallibility is still far from being reached. In order to be infallible in all this, he must also be so, say the theologians, in judging the sources of the truths of faith and in the interpretation thereof, that is, in the determination of the authority of Scripture, of tradition, of the councils, of the popes, of the patres, of the theologians; in making use of and applying natural truths, representations, concepts and expressions; in judging and rejecting errors and heresies, in ascertaining even the facta dogmatica; in the prohibition of books, in matters of discipline, in the approbation of orders, in the canonization of saints, etc. Faith and morals encompass almost everything, and all that the pope says about them is infallible. The term ex cathedra in fact draws no boundary at all. For this expression does not indicate that only those pronouncements are infallible in which ex cathedra is literally

mentioned, for then all earlier papal determinations would be excluded from it. It therefore indicates only something material. But who then determines whether the pope speaks ex cathedra? Practically and by the people his pronouncement will always be understood as infallible, even if only out of fear that one might possibly once reject an infallible pronouncement. And theoretically only the pope can infallibly say when he ex cathedra, infallibly speaks, Heinrich, Dogm. II 554-654. Moreover, why is the pope infallible? Because he himself declares it? But that is a circulus [147] vitiosus. Because the council declares it? But the council is fallible, also in this declaration. Where then is, for the Roman Christian, the so highly praised certainty? 6o The Vaticanum has drawn up the result of a long historical process. In the first Christian time all apostles, all congregations, and also all episcopi were equal to one another in rank; at most there was a primatus homoris but in no respect a primatus jurisdictionis. But gradually the church and the bishop at Rome knew how to subject all other churches and bishops to itself. Yet the independence of the latter within their own sphere remained for a long time still preserved to a certain extent. Toward the end of the 13th century the controversy arises about the relation of the episcopal and the papal power, Schwane D. G. III 549. Some then still attempt to maintain the independence of the former in the sense that the bishop, though subordinate to the pope, nevertheless has received the power belonging to him within his sphere from God, ex jure divino, and is only designated by the pope as bearer of that power; thus Henricus of Ghent, Alphonsus de Castro, bishop of Bruges † 1558, Vitoria, 1480-1544, father of neo-scholasticism at the university at Salamanca, Petrus Guerrero, bishop of Granada, and many other Spanish and French bishops at the council at Trent, who in the 7th canon of the 23rd session wanted the words to be

included: episcopos jure divino institutos presbyteris esse superiores, Schwane, D. G. IV 292 f. There arose at the council over this quaestie the most vehement debates, which lasted the whole winter of the year 1562 and until beyond the middle of the following year. On 15 July 1563, in can. 6-8, the episcopal power was indeed more closely described, but the question whether it was ex jure divino or ex jure ecclesiastico was intentionally left undecided. There stood, moreover, on the other side a strong party, with Lainez, the Jesuit general, at the head, who asserted that the bishop received the potestas ordinis indeed immediately from God, but obtained the potestas jurisdictionis only by free transfer from the side of the pope; the latter was thus in so far de jure ecclesiastico, and could by the pope at pleasure be limited, altered, or taken away, for the pope had his full power over the whole church alone and immediately from God. This opinion, after Trent, through the influence of the Jesuits, gained more and more ground, it achieved victory over Gallicanism and was elevated to a dogma at the Vatican council. It is true that in sess. IV c. 3 it is said that the power of the pope makes absolutely no infringement on the ordinaria ac immediata potestas jurisdictionis of the bishops but rather confirms, strengthens, and maintains it; yet the pope has the full, entire legislative, governing, and judicial power over the whole church, he can without anyone's interposition or mediation freely communicate (communicare) with all the shepherds and flocks of the whole church, and all are without distinction and unconditionally subject to him. Bishops, councils, the whole church, all believers are fallible of themselves and only infallible with and through him. The pope is the root, the firmness, the foundation of the unity, authority, and infallibility of bishops, councils, church fathers, theologians, of all believers and of the whole church. He alone receives all power and

authority and infallibility directly from God. A single expression still recalls the old, catholic conception; thus e.g. when in the Conc. Vatic. IV c. 4 it is said that the pope ea infallibilitate pollere, qua divinus Redemptor ecclesiam suam in definienda doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam voluit, but immediately it is precisely inferred from that that the definitiones of the pope are infallible ex sese and not ex consensu ecclesiae. 7o Still further goes this power of the pope. Although the popes up to the 8th century were subjects of the Roman empire and their spiritual office did not at all include the possession of secular power, yet very soon in the Roman church the thought arose that the pope, in order to be able to be independent in the spiritual sphere, must also be sovereign in the secular. And after the abolition of the ecclesiastical state in 1870 this thought has come still more to the foreground and has been expressed with stronger emphasis. Pius IX and Leo XIII have not failed repeatedly to declare that the pope as universal bishop cannot be subject of a particular prince nor bear a certain nationality, Jansen, Prael. theol. I 657, Hase, Prot. Polem. 254; and their pronouncements bind the Roman believers. Even if the idea of an ecclesiastical, of a priestly state, is entirely out of date; even if the existence of such a state detracts from the unity of Italy; even if the pope cannot [149] be ecclesiastical head and secular sovereign at the same time without church or state or both suffering damage thereby; even if the spiritual power absolutely does not need political sovereignty; even if the pope for centuries had no political territory and even if he after the otherwise in itself unlawful robbery of the ecclesiastical state in 1870 has not lost influence, no more than the German bishops since they have ceased to be imperial princes; even if the independence of the pope vis-à-vis the king of Italy is more than sufficiently guaranteed by the guarantee of 13 May 1871 and by the power

of the Roman princes and peoples; all this matters little, Rome does not abandon the demand that the pope again become a secular prince. This, however, is still only a small part of the whole demand. With appeal to Mt. 28:18 and Luk. 22:38 and in imitation of Bonifacius VIII in the bull Unam Sanctam many Romans have gone much further and have said that the pope is the actual sovereign of the whole world and transfers the secular power at his pleasure to princes and kings as his ministri and vicarii. This was, however, too extreme for many. They contested the opinion that the pope is sovereign over the unbelieving part of the world, for Christ entrusted to Peter only the care over the sheep, and those who are outside, God judges; nor was the pope a secular prince over the Christian peoples, for nowhere was such a political power entrusted to the pope, and Christ gave to Peter only the keys of the kingdom of heaven; the pope has even no temporalis jurisdictio nor secular power directe or jure divino, for Christ is a spiritual king and has a spiritual kingdom. But even if these thus rejected the direct secular power, they nevertheless continued to speak of a potestas indirecta and ascribed to the pope not merely a potestas directiva in secular matters, but also in the interest of the kingdom of God a summa potestas disponendi de rebus temporalibus omnium Christianorum; for the feeding of the sheep also requires power over the wolves. The secular power is, after all, subject to the church as the body to the spirit; unbelieving princes who seduce their subjects to heresy may be resisted and deposed; Christian princes as such are subject to Christ, must promote the faith and protect the church; as also many kings in the days [150] of the O. Test. and in the history of the church have acted, Bellarminus, de Rom. Pontif. lib. V. But even with this theory of the potestas indirecta the pope retains the right to demand, in the interest of the kingdom of God, indefinite obedience from all princes, in case of

disobedience to depose them and to release the subjects from their oath of obedience, to assign non-Roman peoples and lands to Roman princes, to declare political laws and rights powerless, etc. Even if many Romans nowadays give the appearance as if all these rights belonged to the popes only temporarily and accidentally in the Middle Ages, the Syllabus of 1864 declares in n. 23 expressly that the popes and councils never overstepped the boundaries of their power nor usurped rights of the princes nor ever erred in decision in matters of faith and morals. The exercise of the rights may be suspended by the circumstances, there is no doubt that the rights themselves are inalienable. Rome does not change. Cf. Fr. v. Schulte, Die Macht der römischen Päpste über Fürsten, Länder, Völker und Individuen 3te Aufl. Giessen 1896. 8o From all this the all-dominating place appears which the pope occupies in the life of the Roman Christian. The Roman church is a monarchy, a realm, a state with a spiritual prince at the head. From the days of Augustine onward the church is by preference presented as a state and a realm, in which all dogmata count as laws and rights, which bind men upon the salvation of their soul. Bonifacius VIII therefore said of the pope that he jura omnia in scrinio pectoris sui censetur habere, in Schulte t. a. p. 66. The government in this state is absolutely monarchical; after the council of 1870 it is even no longer, as one formerly said, tempered by the aristocracy of the bishops; for the bishops are fallible, and derive their power from him; indeed, according to the express determination of the Vaticanum the pope can communicate immediately with all shepherds and flocks and thus, with complete bypassing of the bishop, directly appoint or dismiss every priest, every chaplain, decide every process, immediately chastise every layman, etc., the bishops are in principle entirely deprived of sovereignty in their own sphere. Nor is this monarchical government of the

pope in principle any longer constitutional, [151] for Scripture and tradition are subject to his infallible interpretation; la tradizione son io, therefore Pius IX said to Cardinal Guidi, in Schulte t. a. p. 80; the pope determines, if necessary, what doctrine of Scripture and tradition is. By his infallibility the pope in the Roman church is the sole, absolute sovereign, source of all ecclesiastical and even directly or indirectly of all secular power. Therefore since the 9th century, in distinction from all other bishops, he is called Papa, Schwane D. G. I 543, not merely successor and substitute of Peter but vicarius Christi, vicarius Dei, Schwane III 536. 538, pater spiritualis omnium patrum, imo omnium fidelium, hierarcha praecipuus, sponsus unicus, caput indivisum, pontifex summus, fons et origo, regula cunctorum principatuum ecclesiasticorum, Bonav. Brevil. VI 12. The pope is the church, is Christianity, is the kingdom of God itself. Le pape et l'église, c'est tout un, said Fr. de Sales. Ubi papa, ibi ecclesia. The primacy of the pope is summa rei christianae, Bellarminus, de Rom. Pontif. in the preface. Without pope no church, no Christianity, Veuillot in Hase, Prot. Polemik5 187. Submission to the pope is for all men necessary unto salvation, (Bonifacius VIII). The pope is mediator of salvation, the way, the truth, and the life. There is lacking only that he is worshipped, but that too is a quaestie of time, Harnack D. G. III 652. Indeed, Scheeben-Atzberger, Dogm. IV 1 S. 427 says it rightly, if the primacy of the pope is not God's work, then it is a blasphemische und diabolische Usurpation. Cf. Luther, von dem Papstthum zu Rom. 1520, cf. Köstlin, Luthers Theol. I 317. Art. Smalc. 4 and Tract. de potestate et primatu papae, in Müller, Symb. B. 306. 328. Calvijn, Inst. IV c. 4-11. Amesius, Bellarminus enervatus, I lib. 3. Chamier, Panstr. Cath. II lib. 2. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. III 775 sq. Id. Disp. II 684-882. Id. Desperata Causa Papatus, Amst. 1635. Heidegger, Corp. Theol.

Loc. 72, 2. Turretinus, Theol. El. XVIII qu. 16-20. Id. de necessaria secessione nostra ab eccl. rom. especially disp. 5: de tyrannide romana. Moor, Comm. VI 195 sq. J. von Döllinger, Das Papstthum. Neubearbeitung von Janus, Der Papst und das Concil, von J. Friedrich, München Beck 1894. Langen, Das Vatik. Dogma von dem Universalepisc. u. der Unfehlb. des Papstes, 3 Theile, Bonn 1871-73. Dr. W. Joos, Die Bulle [152] Unam Sanctam und das Vatik. Autoritätsprinzip, 2e Aufl. Schaffh. 1897. Bungener, Pape et concile au 19e siècle, Paris 1870. Gladstone, Rome and the newest fashion in religion 1875. Hase, Handbuch der Prot. Polemik5, Leipzig 1891. Tschackert, Evang. Polemik gegen die röm. Kirche, Gotha 1885. D. Snijder, Rome's principal doctrines and intentions explained for the protestant. Gor. 1890. The dogma of the infallibility of the pope etc., from the German by D. Snijder, Rott. 1899.

5. Against this degeneration of ecclesiastical power the Reformation rose in opposition. It again confessed that the church was a communio sanctorum, and that it had received from Christ a power which was essentially distinct from that in the state. Christi Reich is nicht ein leiblich oder weltlich, irdisch Regiment, wie andere Herren und Könige auf Erden regieren, sondern ein geistlich, himmlisch Regiment, das da gehet nicht über zeitlich Gut, noch was dies Leben betrifft, sondern über Herzen und Gewissen, wie man vor Gott leben soll, seine Gnade erlangen, Luther bij Sohm, Kirchenrecht 464, 488, cf. further Köstlin, Luthers Theol. II 486 f. 553 f. Likewise Calvin made a distinction between church and state as between soul and body, the future and the present life, and ascribed to the church its own offices, power, and jurisdiction, Inst. IV 1-11. 20, cf. Lobstein, Die Ethik Calvins 1877 S. 115 f. The power of the church therefore did not consist in any corpus juris canonici, which was publicly

burned by Luther at Wittenberg on 10 December 1520, but solely and alone in the ministry of God's word. Because Christ is the only head of the church, in the church only the word of God can and may rule, not by coercion but only by love and free obedience, Luther bij Sohm, Kirchenrecht 464. 468; the ministry of word and sacrament is the only form of church government, the sum total of all ecclesiastical power, the entire power of the keys, which then, however, according to the Lutherans also included lawful calling, obedience to the overseers, judgment of doctrine and life, exercise of discipline, exclusion of the ungodly from the congregation, etc., Conf. en Apol. Aug. art. 14. 20. 28 Smalc. art. de potestate et primatu papae. Sohm has clearly brought to light this distinction in the power which is ascribed to the church by Rome and by [153] Luther. It is true that he goes too far when he, in the opinion that all law is coercion, human dominion and earthly power, deems all church law to be in conflict with the essence of the church, cf. Rutgers, Het kerkrecht, inzoover het de kerk met het recht in verband brengt, Amst. 1894. But nevertheless he shows clearly that the great difference concerning the power of the church between Rome and Protestantism is connected with the political, juridical, or the spiritual, ethical conception of Christianity. And he himself often acknowledges that the congregation of Christ, although a community of saints, nevertheless demands order, already in the earliest time possessed a certain order, 51 f., and also according to Luther and the Lutherans cannot exist without office, lawful calling, care of souls, discipline, ban, government, 471. 476. 486. 494. 519 f. All power in the church is directly or indirectly ministry of the word; every regulation that it makes is subordinate and serviceable to that. Thus the Reformed also understood it; all power in the church rests originally with Christ, who by God has been

anointed as king over Zion, and therefore bears a spiritual character, for his kingdom is not of this world. Insofar as Christ in the exercise of that power makes use of organs, these are not autonomous, independent, sovereign, but bound to Him, i.e. to his word. Every office in the congregation of Christ is a διακονια, ministerium, without legislative, judicial, and executive power in itself, but only able to minister what lies contained and enclosed in the word of Christ. In fact, therefore, there is in the church no other power than the power of the keys, the ministry of word and sacrament, which then, however, was usually again distinguished into potestas doctrinae, potestas disciplinae and potestas ordinis or regiminis, Calvijn, Inst. IV c. 8-12. Martyr, Loci Comm. 405 sq. Polanus, Synt. Theol. VII 10 sq. Junius, theses theol. 46. Turretinus, Theol. El. XVIII 29 sq. etc.

Although there was such agreement in the fundamental ideas, yet in the elaboration and application an important difference between Lutherans and the Reformed soon came to light. In the first place, Luther took over from the Roman church the official ministry of the word to the individual and was thus set on maintaining confession. Although he conceived the preaching of the gospel [154] as forgiveness of sins, also dass ein christlicher Prediger nimmer das Maul aufthun kann, er muss eine Absolution sprechen, Sohm t. a. p. 488, yet this was not enough for him; absolution also had to be applied individually by the pastor in the confession, not indeed necessary but nevertheless highly useful, Köstlin, Luthers Theol. II 528. Caspari, art. Beichte in Herzog3. Conf. Aug. 11. 25 en Apol. Conf. Catech. minor I 5. Appendix I ad Catech. maj. Art. Smalc. III 8. Gerhard, Loc. XV 97-117. Quenstedt, Theol. III 584. 598. Harnack, Prakt. Theol. II 463 f. en daar aangeh. litt. Gandert, Zur Revision des Beichtwesens in der ev. Kirche, Wittenberg 1898. But this private

confession ran up against insurmountable difficulties, against the insufficient number of pastors, against the confession fee, against the uncertain meaning of absolution, etc., and gradually fell into disuse. Although now the Reformed found the mutual confession of misdeeds useful, they let the official ministry of the word and thus also the proclamation of the forgiveness of sins, i.e. absolution, take place only in the public assembly of the believers, retained from confession as an ecclesiastical institution only the regular, or sometimes in preparation for the Lord's Supper customary, confession of sins, and otherwise replaced private confession by the personal house visitation, Zwingli bij Zeller, Das theol. System Zwingli's 153. Calvijn, Inst. III 4. IV 1, 22. Martyr, L. C. 274. Amesius, Bellarminus enervatus III 481. Rivetus, Op. III 316. M. Vitringa III 127 sq. Biesterveld, Het Huisbezoek, Kampen 1900.

In the second place, discipline in the Lutheran church had a different course than in the Reformed. Luther himself indeed desired application of discipline in the congregation of Christ; although he rejected the Roman ban and removed all civil punishment from ecclesiastical discipline, yet such a congregation was his ideal, which after repeated admonition removed the evil from its midst, Köstlin, Luthers Theol. II 530 f. 560 f. Herzog2 8, 14. 13, 588. Th. Harnack, Prakt. Theol. II 497 f. Dieckhoff, Luthers Lehre v. d. kirchl. Gewalt, Berlin 1865, de Luthersche belijdenisschriften bij Müller, S. 64. 152. 165. 288. 323. 340. 342. But the absence of the presbyterial office and the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline only by the pastor led to such abuses that it soon completely came to nothing and, insofar as it remained, was left to the mixed consistories [155]. Practically this yielded the same result as the doctrine of Zwingli, Erastus, the Remonstrants, the Rationalists, and many newer

theologians, according to which the congregation has transferred its power to exercise discipline, since the government has become Christian, to that government. In contrast, for Calvin ecclesiastical discipline was a matter of life; for the right of the church to remove the evil from its midst he fought in Geneva for twenty years; he first obtained it in the year 1555, Choisy, La théocratie à Genève 166. Discipline was not allowed to be the soul of the church, yet it was its nerve. And this view of the obligatoriness, necessity, and usefulness of ecclesiastical discipline became the property of the Reformed, and distinguished them from Roman Catholics and Lutherans on the one side, but on the other side also from Anabaptists and Mennonites, who by their antithesis of nature and grace sometimes applied the ban excessively strictly and deprived it of its spiritual character. Cf. Calvijn, Inst. IV 12. Martyr, L. C. 411. Zanchius, Op. IV 736. Junius, Theses Theol. 47. Bucanus, Instit. theol. 581. Mastricht, Theol. VII 6. Synopsis pur. theol. 48. Turretinus, Theol. El. XVIII qu. 32. Maresius, Syst. Theol. XVI 79-87. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. IV 841 sq. Conf. Gall. 27. Belg. 29. Cat. Heid. 83-85. Helv. II 18 enz.

In the third place, the relation of Christianity to natural life was determined differently by Luther than by Calvin. All Reformers agreed in this, that they freed natural life from the pressure and power of the church, which at Rome coincides with Christianity, as a supranatural addition to nature, yet otherwise grants to that natural life a large scope. Protestantism set over against that the confession that the whole world, although lying in evil, is nevertheless in itself holy and good, a work of God, the Almighty, the Creator of heaven and earth; it exchanged the quantitative antithesis of natural and supernatural for the qualitative, ethical antithesis of sin and grace. But in that there was nevertheless a great difference among the

Reformers. Zwingli never wholly overcame the medieval dualism of flesh and spirit, of humana and divina justitia. Luther often limited the work of Christ so much to the religious-ethical domain that the natural came to stand alongside it as detached; the gospel changed only the outward, the disposition, the heart, but did not work renewing and reforming upon the whole natural life. Hence the contempt with which Luther often spoke about reason, philosophy, jurisprudence; hence the harsh judgment that the Formula Concordiae pronounced over the natural man as lapis, truncus aut limus; hence the Lutheran distinction and separation between the sensuous and the spiritual as duo hemisphaeria, quorum unum inferius, alterum superius, cf. mijne rede over de Kathol. van Christ. en Kerk 1888 bl. 28v., en over de Algemeene Genade 1894 bl. 24v. From that it is also to be explained that the Lutheran church, provided it only had the pure ministry of word and sacrament, was fairly indifferent to every other power bestowed by Christ upon the church. It knew better and confessed that the church must have its own overseers and deacons, its own government and discipline. But in practice it at once and almost without struggle ceded all that to the government. If need be it could concede a monarchical (papal) and episcopal government, recognize many ceremonies as adiaphora, leave discipline to the consistories, and entrust the whole external government of the church to the government. The church kept for itself only the preaching office, the ministry of word and sacrament, but otherwise became a territorial and a state church, in which the government as substitute of the Roman episcopate, or as praecipuum membrum ecclesiae, or as plenipotentiary of the church had almost everything to say, cf. above bl. 108. Köstlin, Luthers Theol. II 555 f. Lechler, Die neut. Lehre v. h. Amte 1857 S. 223 f. 230 f. Sohm, Kirchenrecht 542 f. en voorts Melanchton, Loci

Comm. de magistr. civil. Gerhard, Loc. XXIV. Quenstedt, Theol. IV 420-450. Hollaz, Ex. 1352-1366. Baier, Comp. 639-649. Buddeus, Inst. Theol. 1267-1286. In substance this again entirely corresponded with the power which Zwingli, Erastus, the Remonstrants etc. assigned to the government in relation to the church. But the Reformed set themselves in principle against this. Just as God had appointed the government in the state as sovereign, so He anointed Christ as King of his church. Both, state and church, were thus in origin, nature, government, essentially distinct from one another; to transfer the power of the church to the government was an assault on the kingship of Christ. But this [157] distinction was nevertheless never meant by the Reformed as a separation. On the contrary, just as the church distributes its spiritual goods for the salvation of the whole natural life in family and society, in art and science, so also the government in a Christian land has the precious calling to protect the true church, to support it in its expansion and propagation, to ward off and eradicate all idolatry and false religion and to overthrow the kingdom of the antichrist. They could not teach otherwise, because they believed that the government was instituted by God himself on account of sin, for its restraint; that as such it was bound to God's law and word; that not only the second but also the first table of the law had to be maintained on its terrain and in its manner; that Holy Scripture was a book not exclusively with religious-ethical content, valid only for the church, but a word of God, going out to all men and spreading light over all creature and life; that the government under the O. Test. was charged by God with such a task in a special way; that Christian truth was universal and catholic, clear and plain, and thus also knowable for the government. Cf. De Geref. belijdenisschriften bij Niemeyer 9. 32. 54. 55. 82. 98. 114. 122. 326. 355. 387. 534. 610. 765. 810. Calvijn, Inst. IV 20;

over ketterstraf, Op. ed. Amst. VIII 510-567, cf. Choisy, La théocratie à Genève au temps de Calvin, 1898. Bloesch, Gesch. d. Schweiz.-ref. Kirchen, Bern 1899 I 227 s. Beza, de haereticis a civili magistratu puniendis, Tract. Theol. I 85-169. Zanchius, Op. IV 580-587. Martyr, L. C. 473. Bullinger, Huisboek II 7. Junius, Op. I 544. Bogerman, in de diss. van der Tuuk 1868 bl. 32v. Trigland, Antapol. c. 29. Kerckel. Gesch. passim, vooral bl. 440v. Rhetorford, Examen Arminianismi c. 19. Revius, in de diss. van Posthumus Meyjes, 1895 bl. 151-171. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. I 124 sq. en passim. Disp. sel. II 692-809. III 206. Synopsis pur. theol. 50. Mastricht, Theol. VII 7, 14. Turretinus, Theol. El. XVIII qu. 34. Moor VI 470-518. Vitringa IX 1. 700 sq.

But life proved stronger than doctrine; the absolute standpoint was gradually weakened. Already in the 16th century some Anabaptists and Socinians demanded that the government should refrain from all interference in matters of religion and specifically from the punishment of heresy [158]. The Reformed doctrine, accordingly, also ran up against many practical objections. In theory, to be sure, state and church were indeed distinct, but in fact the state was often subject to the pronouncements of the church, and bound to its confession. By virtue of the close union with the church and the obligation which it had assumed, the government came to acts of violence and coercion, for which it itself usually had an aversion, which gave it a bad name among many noble-minded persons, loaded upon it the appearance of Roman tyranny, and were in conflict with the Protestant demand for freedom of conscience and of religion. So long as in a country one confession bound all citizens or at least the great majority, the union of church and state was still maintainable; but when gradually the Roman church revived and in Protestantism all manner of churches and confessions

arose, to whom one could not deny the Christian character, then it became impossible even for the strictest, to maintain the confessional character of the state and the demand for the punishment of heresy. In England this first came clearly to light in the 17th century. Not only Roman Catholics and Episcopalians there contended with one another for precedence, but soon the Presbyterians, Independents, Quakers, Levellers, and Deists appeared one after another. Thus one advanced, led by the facts, gradually from the confessional to the general Christian and from there to the deistic character of the state, and tolerance and moderation became the watchword of the eighteenth century. Roger Williams, the "arch-individualist," was the first who in the 17th century expressed the demand for separation in church and state and desired absolute freedom of religion for everyone, also for heretics and Jews, and put these principles into practice in his colony in Rhode Island. On the Christian side and on the revolutionary side this theory found more and more assent. Some states in America applied it since 1776, the French Revolution carried it through in many countries. Nevertheless it exists nowhere purely and consistently, and everyone in practice shrinks back from its consequences.

6. That Christ has granted to his church on earth a certain power is scarcely open to any doubt. In general already it is an undeniable truth that nothing can exist without order [159] and rule, that being without form is unthinkable, that a proper ὑλη everywhere and in every domain is nothing but a philosophical abstraction. A family cannot exist without a head, a people not without government, an association not without administration, an army not without a general, etc.; anarchy is impossible. To say that Christ founded a church without any organization, government, or power is an assertion that arises from mystical-philosophical principles but takes

account neither of the teaching of Scripture nor of the reality of life. The question that divides, then, is actually not this, whether the church of Christ, in order to exist, needs a certain power and government, for all agree to that, whether they let the congregation give this government to itself or assign it to the civil government. But the difference runs over this, whether Christ himself in his word, of course not in all sorts of particulars but in principles and main matters, has granted to his church a power and government, which therefore also constitutes and may constitute an article of our faith and a part of our confession, Ned. Gel. art. 30-32. Yet this difference too is decided by Holy Scripture as strongly and clearly as possible. Christ has indeed said that his kingdom is not of this world, but he is not in that sense a spiritual king, that he absolutely does not concern himself with the outward and earthly. On the contrary, he has assumed full human nature and has come into the world, not to condemn it, but to save it; he has planted his kingdom in that world and ensured that it can exist in it and, as a leaven, can work renewingly in all spheres of life. His work was to break the works of the devil everywhere, and to bring the right and the honor of God to recognition; insofar as sin has destroyed and corrupted everything, his reconciling and redeeming activity extends intensively. Therefore he does not merely bring some people individually by his Spirit to faith, so that they would then freely unite and serve one another with the received gifts of the Spirit. But he founds a congregation, a church, and arranges it from the outset in such a way that it can exist, propagate and expand, and accomplish its task on earth. For clarification one may and must distinguish between the essence and the government of the church. But this distinction [160] must never be understood as if the believers had originally been deprived of all government and power. On the contrary, the

previous paragraph has brought to light that the church from the first moment of its existence after the fall onward has had a certain organization, first in the patriarchal families, then in the people of Israel, and since Christ's coming to earth in the various extraordinary and ordinary offices which he instituted in his congregation, Mk. 3:14, Luk. 10:1, Hd. 20:28, 1 Cor. 12:28, Ef. 4:11. Every office, however, includes a power, a right, a competence. It is true that there are many gifts in the congregation, which, bestowed by the H. Spirit, manifest themselves as διακονιαι of Christ and as ἐνεργηματα of God the Father and serve the congregation mutually for edification, 1 Cor. 12:4v. But nevertheless Christ attached to the offices which he instituted in his congregation a special power, ἐξουσια, consisting in the preaching of the gospel, Mt. 10:7, Mk. 3:14, 16:15, Luk. 9:2, etc., in the administration of the sacraments, Mt. 28:19, Mk. 16:15, Luk. 22:19, 1 Cor. 11:24-26, in the doing of all kinds of miracles, Mt. 10:1, 8, Mk. 3:15, 16:18, Luk. 9:1, 10:9, 19 etc., in the retaining or forgiving of sins, Mt. 16:19, 18:18, Joh. 20:23, in the shepherding of the flock, Joh. 21:15-17, Hd. 20:28, in the exercise of discipline, Mt. 18:17, 1 Cor. 5:4, in the serving of the tables, Hd. 6:2, in the right to live from the gospel, Mt. 10:10, 9:4v., 2 Thess. 3:9, 1 Tim. 5:18. This description, which Scripture gives of the power of the church, indicates not only its indubitable existence, but also its complete independence and distinctiveness over against all other power in the world. There is manifold power and authority on earth, in family, society, state, art, science, etc. But ecclesiastical power is in essence distinct from all these and over against them completely autonomous. For all that other power is derived from God as Creator of heaven and earth, Rom. 13:1, but this ecclesiastical power has its origin directly in God as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, 1 Cor. 12:28, Ef. 4:11, Hd. 20:28, and is

therefore with respect to all other earthly power completely free and independent. Whoever with Caesareopapism or Erastianism curtails this power of the church, restricts it and assigns it to the civil government, infringes the honor of Christ [161] and falls short with respect to the rights and freedoms granted to the church. Independent must this power of the church remain over against all other earthly power, because it is wholly of its own kind, cannot be taken over or exercised by any other power, and thus by such a transfer is deprived of its nature and destroyed. For all the power that Christ has granted to his church, ministry of word and sacrament, exercise of discipline, service of the tables, etc., has besides its own origin also its own organ, its own nature, its own goal. It is bound to offices which Christ alone has instituted in his congregation, to which he alone grants and can grant the gifts, whom he alone calls and sends; no one takes this honor to himself except he who is called by God, Rom. 10:15, Hebr. 5:4. Further, this power is spiritual. That does not mean that it is invisible and wholly inward, for Christ is indeed a spiritual king but rules over soul and body both, his word and sacrament address the whole human being, the service of mercy even has chiefly to relieve bodily needs. But when the power of the church is called spiritual, thereby it is made known that it is bestowed by the H. Spirit of God, Hd. 20:28, can be exercised only in the name of Christ and the power of the H. Spirit, Joh. 20:22, 23, 1 Cor. 5:4, concerns exclusively people as believers, 1 Cor. 5:12, and only in a spiritual, moral way, not with coercion and punishment in money, goods, or life, but through conviction, faith, willingness, freedom, love and thus only with spiritual weapons, 2 Cor. 10:4, works and can work, Mk. 16:16, Joh. 8:32, 2 Cor. 3:17, Ef. 6:7 etc. Finally this power also has its own goal; it tends, although for unbelievers it also brings an aggravation of judgment, to

salvation, to edification and not to overthrow, to the perfecting of the saints and the building up of the body of Christ, Mt. 10:13, Mk. 16:16, Luk. 2:34, 2 Cor. 2:16, 10:4, 8, 13:10, Ef. 4:12, 6:11-18 etc. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. IV 783. By all this ecclesiastical power is generically distinct from all political power. Already under the O. Test. state and church, though closely connected, were nevertheless not one and the same. Much more clearly, however, Christ has expressed the distinction between his kingdom and the kingdoms of the world, Mt. 22:21, Joh. 18:36; he himself [162] refused all earthly power, Luk. 12:13, 14, Joh. 6:15, and forbade to his disciples everything that savored of worldly dominion, Mt. 20:25, 26, 1 Petr. 5:3. Between church and state and the power of both there is therefore all manner of difference; in origin not only, as was already remarked above, but further also in organs, for the offices in the congregation of Christ are all διαχονιαι, but the political government is sovereign, and has, though a servant of God, nevertheless right and power to issue laws and to demand submission to them; in kind and nature, for the power of the church is spiritual, but the power of the political government is natural, earthly, worldly, extends over all subjects, without any other quality than that they are subjects, and regulates only their earthly interests; in goal, for ecclesiastical power tends to the building up of the body of Christ, but political power has its destination in this life and strives after the bonum naturale et commune; in means, for the church has no other than spiritual weapons, but the government bears the sword, has the right over life and death and may demand obedience with coercion and violence. As unlawful therefore on the one side it is to assign ecclesiastical power to the civil government, so sinful it is also on the other side to change ecclesiastical power into a political one. Romanism and Anabaptism are both guilty of

that, because both proceed from the antithesis of nature and grace. Only Anabaptism makes that antithesis absolute and thereby destroys nature; Rome takes it relatively and suppresses nature. In the Middle Ages, when the Roman church possessed sole dominion, this striving came to light more clearly; but in principle it has not changed, and still it is driven by the same desire, to make the clergy as much as possible free from political subordination, to draw all kinds of civil matters within its circle and subject them to its judgment; to shine through outward splendor and pomp, to expand possession of capital and real property, to exercise political influence at courts; to demand on the ground of Mt. 28:18 and according to the theory of the two swords for the pope, if not the direct then at least the indirect power over the whole world, etc., cf. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. I 115. Not only, however, is the Roman church always out to [163] make all earthly, political power subservient to itself; worse still is that it deprives ecclesiastical power itself of its spiritual character and changes it into a political dominion. First, this becomes manifest in this, that the Roman church ascribes to itself, i.e. to the pope, the highest legislative power. Formerly this power was still limited by Scripture and tradition, by bishops and councils; the government was a monarchy tempered by aristocracy. But since the promulgation of the dogma of infallibility this relation has been reversed. The pope is in a formal sense absolute monarch. By virtue of the alleged assistance of the H. Spirit he determines infallibly what must be believed and done. There is no higher appeal; what he binds or looses is bound or loosed in heaven; what he says has as much authority as if it were spoken by Christ himself. The dogmas and laws which he promulgates bind the conscience, and oblige to faith and obedience on forfeiture of eternal salvation. From the civil government there is appeal to God, but the

sovereignty of the pope is the very highest; God himself speaks through his mouth. Second, the Roman church ascribes to itself, i.e. to the pope, the highest judicial power. Ecclesiastical power is twofold, potestas ordinis and potestas jurisdictionis; the potestas docendi, even if it is mentioned separately, properly belongs to the potestas jurisdictionis. Therein is included that the administration of word and sacrament in Rome is not proclamation of the gospel, but a legal transaction and a pronouncement. All the baptized belong not in a moral, spiritual sense but by right, in a juridical sense, with an unchangeable and inalienable right to the pope; they are his sheep, whom he may, if necessary, bring back into the sheepfold by force, even if perhaps he cannot do it because of the circumstances of time. Nach dem Rechte der katholischen Kirche gehören eigentlich alle Getauften zur Kirche, also auch zur Parochie, aber in Ermangelung von Zwangsmitteln fehlt gegenüber Andersgläubigen die Durchführbarkeit dieses Anspruchs, Vering, Lehrb. des kath. orient, u. prot. Kirchenrechts3 603. And all the Roman church members come under the preaching and to the sacrament of penance, in order to hear their judgment. The confessional is a court, the priest a judge; after having heard the accusations which the penitent brings against himself, [164] he pronounces the sentence; he binds and looses, not deprecatively and conditionally, but by virtue of the spirit of office that dwells in him, peremptorily and absolutely; as he judges, God judges in heaven. Third, Rome, i.e. the pope, lays claim to the highest executive and coercive power. The distinction between ecclesiastical and civil punishment has no value for Rome. If the church judges it useful and is able to do so, it applies the latter just as well as the former. It is true, it did not carry out the death penalty, for ecclesia non sitit sanguinem. But otherwise it left no means untried to compel disobedient children to

submission. And Rome was inventive. Monetary penalty, penance, prison, inquisition, rack, assassination, ban, interdict, release of subjects from obedience to the prince, etc. have all served. That was and is in principle still the conception of ecclesiastical power in Rome.

The Reformers, over against that, again conceived the potestas ecclesiastica in the sense of Scripture as a spiritual power. Thus the potestas docendi, the ministry of word and sacrament, naturally came to stand in the foreground. The Lutherans even let, at least in practice, the whole ecclesiastical power be absorbed in it; they had only pastores, no presbyters and deacons. But the Reformed also restored these offices and therefore, alongside the potestas docendi, also adopted the potestas jurisdictionis. The word jurisdictio, however, although Calvin, Inst. IV 11 adopted it, found no general approval. Coccejus on 1 Cor. 5 rejected it; Maresius, Syst. Theol. 15, 75 f. 16, 70 a said that there was, purely and correctly speaking, no jurisdictio in the church and that the word in the ecclesiastical sphere might only be conceived analogice; all acknowledged that the jurisdictio in the church was of an entirely different nature than in the state and bore a spiritual character, Voetius, Pol. IV 798, and many avoided the word and preferred rather to speak of potestas gubernans, ordinans, disciplinaris etc. Furthermore, some distinguished a twofold, but others a threefold power. The power of the church, namely, was not exhausted in the ministry of word and sacrament and in the exercise of discipline; it also had the right and the competence, in the interest of order, to make laws and to take measures of all kinds. Thus, alongside and often between the potestas docendi (doctrinae, scientiae, dogmatica, ordinis) and the potestas disciplinae [165] (critica, jurisdictionis, correptionis) there also came to stand the potestas directionis (regiminis, ordinis, diatactica, legislativa,) Calvin, Inst. IV 8, 1.

Bucanus, Inst. 519. Maresius, Syst. Theol. 16, 70. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. I 118. Vitringa IX 1 p. 457. Remarkable is that, with this power of the church, the diaconate was never brought up for discussion. Yet Christ has also bestowed in that a power upon his church, which is of the greatest significance. A threefold power therefore exists, in connection with the offices of pastor, presbyter, and deacon and further in connection with the threefold office of Christ, the prophetic, kingly, and priestly office, to be distinguished in his church: the potestas docendi, the potestas gubernans (of which the potestas disciplinae is a component part), and the potestas misericordiae.

7. The potestas docendi has its origin and ground in the prophetic office, to which Christ has been anointed and which He Himself still always exercises through His Word and Spirit. He has not transferred it to any man, and has appointed no pope or bishop, no pastor or teacher as His agent and substitute; but He is still always our highest prophet, who from heaven teaches His church through Word and Spirit. Yet in doing so He, as a rule, makes use of men as His organs, not only of the office-bearers in the narrower sense but of all believers and of each one of them according to the grace that has been given to him. The church itself is prophetess, and all Christians are partakers of the anointing of Christ and called to confession of the Lord's name. The office does not suppress the gifts but only guides them. There are many charismata, which belong to the potestas docendi of the church, wisdom, knowledge, prophecy etc. 1 Cor. 12:8v. Christ instructs and teaches through the father in the family, through the teacher at the school, through the presbyter at the house visitation, through all the believers in their mutual intercourse and in their dealings with others. But He does it especially in a distinct manner, officially, with expressly granted charge and authority, in the public assemblies of the people of God, through

the minister of the Word. Under the potestas docendi this official ministry of the Word is now chiefly to be understood. In two respects this service must be maintained in its independence. First, with respect to the [166] Roman church, which makes the word subordinate to the sacrament, the homilist to the liturgist, the preaching to the cultus, the potestas docendi to the potestas jurisdictionis. According to Scripture, however, the word takes precedence, and the sacrament is added to it as an appendage and seal; there is no sacrament without word, but there is a word without sacrament. The sacrament follows the word; he who administers the word therefore need not always, 1 Cor. 1:14-17, but can and may nevertheless administer the sacrament, and is also then a minister of the word, of the visible word, which is added to the audible. Second, this official ministry of the word is independent over against all instruction of the word that takes place by the believers among one another or outwardly, and even essentially distinct from the application which the presbyter has to make of the word at the visitation of the members of the church. Certainly the official ministry of the word in the assemblies of the church can and may also be conceived as a feeding of the flock. Scripture leads us in this. The Lord is the shepherd of His people, Ps. 23:1, 80:2, Isa. 40:11, 49:10, Jer. 31:10, Ezek. 34:15; Christ is called the shepherd of the flock, Ezek. 34:23, John 10:11, 14, Heb. 13:20, 1 Pet. 2:25, 5:4, Rev. 7:17. And under Him as the ἀρχιποιμην, 1 Pet. 5:4, His ministers also bear the name of shepherds, ποιμενες, pastores, Isa. 44:28, Jer. 2:8, 3:15, 23:1v., Ezek. 34:2v. etc., John 10:2, John 21:15-17, Acts 20:28, 1 Cor. 9:7, Eph. 4:11, 1 Pet. 5:2, cf. the Form. of the Reformed churches for the confirmation of ministers of the word. But since the two activities of feeding and teaching, of governing and laboring in the word and the doctrine, were separated and each received its own organ, Eph.

4:11, 1 Tim. 5:17, the name of teacher has become the characteristic title of the minister of the word. By his preparation and training, by his entire devotion to labor in the word, by the power to live from the gospel, by his official ministry of word and sacrament in the assembly of the believers he is distinguished from the overseer, the ruling elder, who is specially charged with the ποιμαινειν, Acts 20:28, 1 Pet. 5:2. Yet this teaching must not be understood in an intellectualistic sense; rather, with the above-mentioned Formulary it is thus to be interpreted, that the ministers of the Lord will set forth the word thoroughly and sincerely to [167] their people and appropriate it, both in general and in particular, to the profit of the hearers, with instructing, admonishing, comforting and rebuking, according to each one's need, proclaiming conversion to God and reconciliation with Him through faith in Jesus Christ and refuting with Holy Scripture all errors and heresies that strive against this pure doctrine. More closely, there is enclosed in this potestas docendi the right and duty of the church, 1º to care for the training of her future ministers or to supervise that training accurately, to call, to examine, to send, to confirm, to maintain her ministers, through their service to have the word of God preached both to believers and unbelievers, and thus to confirm, to extend and to propagate the church of God among the human race; 2º to administer the word of God by means of the office in different form according to each one's need, specifically in the form of milk to the young, and in that of solid food to the adult members of the church, but further always in such a way that the full counsel of God, the whole richness of His word is unfolded and, in accordance with the needs of each people and land, of each century and time, of each church and of all believers in particular, developed and applied, Isa. 3:10, 11, 2 Cor. 5:20, 1 Tim. 4:13, 2 Tim. 2:15, 4:2; 3º to

preserve the word of God, to translate it, to explain it according to the rule of faith, to defend it against all combating of the lie, 1 Tim. 1:3, 4, 2 Tim. 1:13, Tit. 1:9-11, 13, 14 and thus to build up the church on the foundation of apostles and prophets, Eph. 2:20 and to cause it to be a στυλος και ἑδραιωμα της ἀληθειας, 1 Tim. 3:15, i.e. a pillar and foundation, which bears the truth, displays it before everyone's eye and makes it known to all.

Directly from this flows the competence of the churches to confess the truth which it believes and to maintain it in its midst as confession. From the side of the Remonstrants in the preface to their Confession and Apology, of the Baptists, Congregationalists, Quakers, cf. Schaff, Creeds I 834. 852. 864. and of many others, it has been objected against this that the drawing up of binding confessions is in conflict with the all-sufficiency of Scripture, destroys Christian freedom, introduces an unbearable tyranny, cuts off further investigation and continuing development [168]. Scripture, however, clearly imposes upon the churches the duty to be a pillar and ground of the truth and to confess it before all men, to avoid such as deviate from the doctrine of the truth, and to maintain the word of God over against all opponents. The church has almost from the beginning, i.e. from the beginning of the second century onward, been a confessional church, which had its unity in the rule of faith common to all, i.e. in the baptismal confession, in the original, later somewhat expanded, apostolic symbol, and furthermore was repeatedly in the course of the centuries compelled by heresy and slander to a broader development of the truth, cf. Zahn, Glaubensregel und Taufbekenntniss in der alten Kirche, in zijne Skizzen aus dem Leben der alten Kirche 1898 S. 238-270. Id. Das apost. Symbolum 1893. Kattenbusch, Das apost. Symbol I 1894. Kunze, Glaubensregel, H. Schrift und Taufbekenntniss, Leipzig 1899. A church also cannot exist in a

world full of lies and deceit without a rule of faith, becomes, as history especially in this century teaches, without a firm confession a prey to all kinds of error and confusion and subject to the tyranny of prevailing directions and opinions. With such a confession the church also does not detract from the perfection of Holy Scripture, but expresses nothing other than what is contained in that Scripture; the confession does not stand alongside, much less above, but deep beneath Holy Scripture; this alone is αὐτοπιστος, unconditionally binding to faith and obedience, unchangeable, but the confession is and remains always examinable and revisable by Scripture; it is no norma normans, but at most norma normata, no norma veritatis, but norma doctrinae in aliqua ecclesia receptae, subordinate, fallible, a work of men, an imperfect expression of what the church has taken up from Scripture as divine truth into its consciousness and now on the authority of God's word confesses over against all error and falsehood. Nor does the church with this confession compel anyone nor does it bind investigation, for it leaves everyone free to confess otherwise and to conceive the truth of God in another sense; it listens attentively to the objections which may possibly be raised against its confession on the ground of God's word and examines them according to the requirement of its confession itself; only it refuses and must refuse to lower itself to a debating society or philosophical [169] association, in which today counts as truth what yesterday was a lie, for it is not like a wave of the sea, but like a rock, pillar and ground of the truth. Cf. deel I 25 and furthermore still (Dunlop) A collection of confessions of faiths, cathechisms, directories, books of discipline etc. of publick authority in the church of Scotland, I Edinb. 1719 preface p. V-CXLIV.

8. Christ is not only prophet, He is also king, who still continually from heaven personally governs His church. But in doing so He nevertheless makes use of men and thus to that extent gave to His church a potestas gubernationis. In a broader sense, under that is to be understood all the guidance and care which the believers together exercise with respect to one another. In the church the word of Esau does not apply: am I my brother's keeper? All are one another's members, suffer and rejoice with one another, have the ability and the calling, also mutually to teach, to admonish, to comfort, to edify one another, Rom. 15:14, Col. 3:16, 1 Thess. 5:11. There are gifts of guidance, of government, which Christ through the H. Spirit distributes to the church and which He does not nullify by the offices but keeps in the right track, Rom. 12:8, 1 Cor. 12:28. And among those gifts love stands at the top, which causes the one to go before the other in appreciation and esteem, Rom. 12:10, Phil. 2:3, 1 Petr. 5:5. But nevertheless Christ as king of His church in the presbyterate has also instituted a definite office, through which He governs His church. This governing, however, bears a spiritual character, because Christ is king in the kingdom of grace, and is in Scripture called a ποιμαινειν, Joh. 21:15-17, Hd. 20:28, 1 Petr. 5:2; everything that makes one think of earthly power and political dominion is excluded from it, 2 Cor. 1:24, 1 Petr. 5:2, 3. In a broader sense this ποιμαινειν also includes the work of the teacher, but there is nevertheless a great difference between the public proclamation and the personal, individual application of the word, between the tending of the flock in general and the caring for each of the sheep in particular. The believers are indeed called, to take heed to one another, unto the sharpening of love and of good works, Hebr. 10:24, but in order that not a single sheep of the flock remain uncared for, Christ has nevertheless entrusted to a definite office the

[170] feeding of the sheep. That He has thereby provided for an essential need of His church appears from this, that, when the presbyterate gradually disappeared, in confession a human surrogate for this official service was instituted. Undoubtedly therefore confession contains something good, Jak. 5:16, Calvin, Inst. III 1, 13, but it cannot weigh up against the well-ordered service of the presbyterate. For it introduces an unlawful coercion of conscience, makes the believers dependent on the absolution of the priest, imposes in the confession of all special sins, particularly of the mortal sins, a duty impossible to fulfil, makes grace and salvation at every moment uncertain and unstable, compels to a casuistic and quantitative treatment of sin and punishment, and gives occasion to all kinds of immoral practices. Scripture therefore nowhere speaks of such a forced confession. But what it says to us in example and precept is this, that Nathan goes to David and Elijah to Ahab and Isaiah to Hezekiah, to speak with them personally about their sins; that Christ goes through the land preaching and blessing, that He knows all His sheep by name and lets none be lost, Joh. 10:3, 28, that He charges Peter and all the apostles not only with the feeding of the flock but also with the feeding of the sheep, Joh. 21:15-17, that He commands His disciples, to preach the gospel in cities, villages, and houses, Mt. 10:11, 12, that Paul visits the brethren in every city, Hd. 15:36, strengthens the churches, Hd. 15:41 in public and from house to house, δημοσιᾳ και κατ' οἰκους, preaches conversion to God and faith in Christ, Hd. 20:20, 21, cf. Calvin, Inst. IV 1, 22. Moreover, the need for such a continual spiritual care lies of itself enclosed in the condition of the church of Christ in this dispensation. Even if the church has once been planted, it is not at once perfect; on the contrary it has struggle from within and without, is prey to all kinds of attacks of sin and falsehood, and runs every moment danger, to

stray to the right or to the left. The church is a field, which must continually be weeded, a tree, which in its time must be pruned, a flock, which must always be led and fed, a house, at which one must always build, a bride, who must be prepared in order to be presented as a pure virgin to her husband. There are sick, dying, tried, [171] sorrowful, assailed, tempted, doubting, fallen, imprisoned etc., who have need of teaching and instruction, admonition and comfort. And even apart from this, the church ought to grow up in the knowledge and grace of the Lord Jesus Christ; the children must become youths, the youths men, the men fathers in Christ, and for that have need of guidance and care. The teachers too are weak and sinful men and ought to stand under oversight; if the council of elders and the assembly of neighbouring churches does not do this, the church becomes a plaything of the pastor or else a superintendency or episcopate becomes necessary. In one word, the teachers sow the word, the elders seek the fruit. Cf. further on the presbyterate: Calvin, Inst. IV 1, 22. 12, 2. Martyr, Loci p. 392b. Zanchius, Op. IV 730. Bullinger, Huysboeck, Dec. 5 serm. 3. Junius, Op. I 1563. Bucanus, Inst. theol. 493. Mastricht, Theol. VII 2, 22. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. III 436-479. VI 92-109. M. Vitringa IX 229. Renesse, Van het regeerouderlingschap 1659. Koelman, Ambt en pligt der ouderlingen 1765. Nieuwe werken van Th. Harnack, Prakt. Theol. II 291-350. Id. in Zöcklers Handb. der theol. Wiss. III 503-537. Achelis, Prakt. Theol. II 177-323. H. A. Koestlin, Die Lehre von der Seelsorge, Berlin 1895. Kuyper, Enc. III 524. Biesterveld, Het huisbezoek, Kampen 1900 enz.

9. To the activity of the overseers belongs in particular also ecclesiastical discipline, potestas disciplinae. Hebrew has for discipline the word מוּסָר, which properly means adstrictio, constrictio and in Greek is translated by

νουθετημα, διδασκαλια, νομος, σοφια and in the N. T. is rendered especially by the word παιδεια. Both words, like the Dutch word tucht, from tien, trekken, in general indicate that something that is young, tender, small, weak is reared with care. But since in general and especially among human beings this rearing must always at the same time counteract abnormal development, the word tucht acquires the secondary meaning of reproof, chastisement, correction. Almost never do the words denote instruction, teaching alone, cf. however Hd. 7:22, 22:3, but always such an upbringing and instruction as proceed by way of reproof and chastisement. Thus God brings up his children, Hebr. 12:5-11, [172] and Christ his church, Op. 3:19, by means of Scripture, which is useful προς διδασκαλιαν, προς ἐλεγμον, προς ἐπανορθωσιν, προς παιδειαν την ἐν δικαιοσυνῃ, 2 Tim. 3:16. And such a discipline Christ has also instituted in his church. In the O. T. there did not yet exist an ecclesiastical discipline properly so called, although Adam too was banished from paradise and although in Israel the uncircumcised, lepers, and the unclean were kept away from the sanctuary, Lev. 5v., Ezech. 44:9, for for unintentional sins there was always atonement, for sins with a high hand there stood extermination, and the cherem was at the same time a civil punishment. Only when Israel became a church did the exclusively ecclesiastical punishment arise, the separation from the congregation of believers, Ezr. 10:8, and this ban is still applied by the Jews in some cases, Gunning, De Chasidim bl. 55. Perhaps in connection with this synagogal discipline, Christ ordained discipline in his church. In Mt. 16:19 He gives the keys of the kingdom of heaven to Peter, in Mt. 18:18 to the church, in Joh. 20:23 to the apostles, so that they have the power, on the basis of the confession of Christ and under the guidance of the Spirit, to bind and to loose, to retain someone’s sins or to forgive.

Only because Christ gives this power to his church is it authorized to exercise discipline. In Mt. 18:15-17 He then indicates how this discipline must be exercised. God does not will that one of the little ones who believe in Jesus should be lost. Mt. 18:1-14. If therefore someone has been offended or unjustly treated by his brother, then he must first by personal rebuke, then by rebuke in the presence of two or three witnesses, and thereafter by rebuke on the part of the whole church, attempt to win him; and only if all that is of no avail, then he, the offended one (σοι, vs. 17, in sing.) may regard him as a heathen and tax collector, then he has tried everything with him, and he is free from his blood. Such a judgment then has force in heaven. This is the ordinary way along which discipline in the church, according to Jesus' command, must proceed. But from that is to be distinguished the discipline which God himself, which Christ, and which also the apostles sometimes exercise in his name and power. God can visit sins in the church, e.g. the unworthy use of the Lord's Supper, with sickness and death, 1 Cor. 11:30. Ananias and Sapphira, because of their lying against [173] the Spirit of God, fell down dead at Peter's feet, Hd. 5. Paul punished Elymas, Hd. 13:11, with blindness. In 1 Cor. 5 Paul commands the church, while it, together with his spirit, which has already pronounced judgment over the incestuous man in its midst, vs. 3, assembled and thus bound with the power of the Lord Jesus Christ, in Christ's name to deliver such a one to Satan, so that he, struck by this one in his body, might thus nevertheless be saved again in spirit in the day of Christ. Paul at the same time reproaches the Corinthians vs. 2 that they had not already earlier removed him from their midst and thus presupposes that they had the right and the obligation to do so. And precisely because they had not done that, but had borne with the sinner and thus had shared in his sin, therefore he

now deems a radical measure necessary. He himself as apostle has already passed judgment for himself, and now demands that the church, in full assembly, immediately, without further admonition, according to the authority now granted to it by the apostle, indeed according to the power of Christ himself, in his name judge the evil one; and not merely simply place him outside the church, as in vs. 2 was demanded of it, but specifically deliver him to Satan for bodily affliction. Here therefore there is mention, not of ordinary excommunication, as e.g. in Mt. 18:17, but of a special, apostolic act of power. This is also evident from 1 Tim. 1:20, 2 Tim. 2:17, where Paul as apostle, entirely alone, without the church, in the same way delivers Hymenaeus and Alexander to Satan, so that they would be disciplined not to blaspheme any more. There is therefore a great difference between these extraordinary punishments and the ordinary exercise of discipline, which is entrusted to the church. Of this latter Paul spoke in 1 Cor. 5:2 and more closely still in vs. 9-13. There he says namely that in an earlier letter, which thus preceded this "first" letter, he admonished them not to associate, i.e. to have no intercourse, with fornicators. But the Corinthians had misunderstood that and from it inferred that they were not at all to have any dealings, not even in civil life, with fornicators, the covetous, robbers, idolaters outside the church. But that was not the apostle's intention; that would have been an impossible demand, tantamount to this, that they had to go out of the world [174]. Only had he desired that they should have no intercourse with a fornicator etc., if such a one was called a brother and was a member of the church. Yes, in that case he wishes that they will also hold no meal with such a fallen brother, neither go to eat with him nor invite him to eat, not associate with him in a friendly and brotherly way, but that they, while they leave those who are outside to

God's judgment, will remove such an evil one, who associates in their circle, from their midst, cf. 2 Cor. 2:5-10. Likewise Paul elsewhere speaks of the right and the duty of the church, to take heed of and to avoid, ἐκκλινειν, those who cause dissension and offense, Rom. 16:17; in Jesus' name to withdraw, to separate, στελλεσθαι ἀπο, from every brother who walks disorderly, 2 Thess. 3:6, 14; after a first and second, i.e. after repeated admonition, to withdraw from, not to have to do with (παραιτεισθαι, to have oneself excused from something or someone by entreaties, to let go, to dismiss) a heretical man, who (as a member of the church, or perhaps also from outside) breaks the unity of the faith in the church, Tit. 3:10. John says the same; if someone comes to you and does not bring this doctrine, then you may not receive him into your house as a brother, not associate with him in a friendly and brotherly way, and not greet and welcome him as a brother. 2 Joh. 10. And finally in Op. 2:2 the church of Ephesus is praised because it does not tolerate the evil; in Op. 2:14, 20, 24 those of Pergamum and Thyatira are rebuked because they tolerate heretical teachings and heathen abominations. Cf. Meyer, Die Lehre des N. T. von der Kirchenzucht, Zeits. f. kirchl. Wiss. u. kirchl. Leben 1881.

This doctrine of Holy Scripture has been applied most purely in the exercise of discipline of the Reformed churches. According to it, indeed, 1º not impersonal things, writings, buildings, countries, but always persons are the object; and not men in general, for those who are outside, God judges, 1 Cor. 5:10, no dead persons, no class or group of men, but always definite, individual persons, who are members of the congregation either only by baptism, or also by confession. 2º The cause of discipline is not all kinds of weaknesses into which believers fall, nor also such dreadful sins which the Christian government punishes, [175] although the church then follows and

its discipline is not superfluous, Calv. Inst. IV 11, 3. Bucanus 539, but such sins as arouse offence in the midst of the congregation and are not or are very mildly punished by the government, Mastricht, Theol. VII 6, 8. 3º With these sins, to which ecclesiastical discipline is applicable, a distinction must be made between hidden and public sins. The former are dealt with according to the rule of Mt. 18, and first acquire the character of public sins when private admonitions do not avail and thus the whole congregation, or its representation in the consistory, becomes involved in it. 4º With these sins that have become public through obstinacy and with those that are public from the outset by their character (e.g. murder, adultery) the procedure is as follows: as soon as the transgressor shows sincere repentance, all ecclesiastical discipline in the narrower sense ceases. The Lord's Supper may then still be withheld, in order that the offence may be removed from the congregation and the sincerity of the confession of guilt may come to light; but there is no longer any question of discipline. He who confesses his sin finds with God and thus also with his congregation mercy. The discipline that leads to cutting off always begins only after unrepentance and obstinacy have been shown. In order that the congregation may be fully convinced of this and not lightly proceed to the removal of the evil one from its midst, the consistory begins with admonitions. If the transgressor hardens himself against these, there follows first, with withholding of the Lord's Supper, the making known of the sin without the name of the sinner in the midst of the congregation; thereafter the making known of the sin with the name of the sinner, yet not except after a well-grounded advice of the classis; subsequently the making known that he, if he remains persistent, will be cut off; and finally the cutting off itself with the form for the ban. The time that must elapse between all these

admonitions and disciplinary measures is not to be determined, since it is connected with the nature of the sin, the conduct of the transgressor, the offence within and outside the congregation. 5º The punishments that the church applies in this are purely spiritual. They do not consist and may not consist in a monetary fine, bodily chastisement, branding, torture, imprisonment, dishonour, banishment, death penalty, etc., as Rome asserts, nor also in dissolution of family, civil, political relations, as the Anabaptists taught; likewise [176] not in exclusion from the public religious services, as the Christian church in the first period applied this. For the weapons of the congregation are not fleshly but spiritual and therefore powerful before God, 2 Cor. 10:4. But the discipline of the congregation is a serious test whether someone who has misbehaved and hardens himself against all admonition can and may still be regarded as a brother. Excommunication is therefore in the end nothing else but also nothing less than a renunciation of brotherly intercourse and brotherly communion; a withdrawing of the congregation; a finally, with sorrow, letting go of him who presented himself as a brother but proved not to be a brother. It is no handing over to Satan, which in the N. T. occurs only as an apostolic act, no condemnation or cursing, no ἀναθεμα, which in the N. Test. is never, not even in Rom. 9:3, used of ecclesiastical discipline, cf. Cremer s. v., but only and yet also nothing less than a solemn declaration of the congregation in Jesus' name, that the sinner has become public as not being a sincere brother in Christ, and thus a placing of him outside the congregation and its communion, so that God alone may judge him. 6o Excommunication is an ultimate remedy, in order that the one removed from brotherly intercourse may come to repentance. Even the apostolic handing over to Satan still had this meaning, 1 Cor. 5:5, 1 Tim. 1:20. Even if the congregation may regard the expelled

one also as a heathen and tax collector, because it has expended all effort on him, without fruit; even if it had to cast him out, in order itself to have no fellowship in his sins, 1 Cor. 5:6, 7, 11:30; yet the hope remains that he may still be a brother, who by admonition will be set right from his error, 2 Thess. 3:14. 7o Therefore readmission into the congregation always remains possible, Mt. 16:18, 18:18, Joh. 20:23, 2 Cor. 2:5-10; but in that case prior public confession is necessary, which in all other cases may be required only with all caution and according to the judgment of the whole consistory. Cf. Calvin, Inst. IV 12. Ursinus, Explic. Cat. qu. 83-85. Zanchius, Op. IV 736. Polanus, Syst. Theol. p. 544. Martyr, Loci 411. Junius, Theses Theol. 47. Bucanus, Instit. theol. 531. Heidegger II p. 600. Synopsis pur. theol. disp. 48. Voetius, Pol. IV 770-982. Mastricht, Theol. [177] VII c. 6. Moor VI 400-422. M. Vitringa IX 1 p. 498-573 etc. From more recent times: Scheele, Die Kirchenzucht 1852. Fabri, Kirchenzucht im Sinne und Geiste des Evang. 1854. Art. Bann, Kirchenzucht, Schlüsselgewalt, Gerichtsbarkeit in Herzog. Müller, Dogm. Abh. 496 f. Vilmar, Von der christl. Kirchenzucht 1872. Id. Kirchenzucht u. Lehrzucht 1877.

10. In the third place Christ is also priest and still exercises this office from heaven in his church by intercession and blessing. Just as as prophet he teaches his own and as king he governs them, so as priest he shows them the riches of his mercy. When he was on earth, he went about the cities and villages, not only teaching in the synagogues and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, but also healing every disease and every infirmity among the people, Mt. 9:35. And this was no incidental and accidental activity but a principal component of the work which the Father had commissioned him to do, Mt. 8:17, Joh. 5:36, 9:3, 4 etc. The fullness of his power and the

riches of his mercy were made manifest in it; the works of sin and Satan were broken by it; the consequences of sin in the physical world were thereby initially removed; they issued forth and received their seal and consummation in the resurrection, which was the victory over death and the principle of the renewal of all things. When, then, he sends out his disciples, he gives them not only the charge to preach the gospel, but just as certainly and emphatically, to cast out the unclean spirits and to heal every disease and every infirmity, Mt. 10:1, 8, Mk. 3:15, Luk. 9:1, 2, 10:9, 17. The disciples fulfilled that charge, not only during Jesus' stay on earth but also after his ascension, Hd. 5:16, 8:7 etc. Indeed, according to Jesus' own promise, Mk. 16:17, 18, in the first period many extraordinary gifts of healings and workings of powers were bestowed upon the believers, Hd. 2:44, 45, 4:35, Rom. 12:7, 8, 1 Cor. 12:28. Yet just as it went with the gifts of teaching and the gifts of governing, so it also went with those of mercy. The extraordinary condition of the church gradually became normal. And although the gifts were not suppressed or destroyed, they nevertheless were gradually more and more connected [178] with the office. Teaching was entrusted to the didaskalos, governing to the presbyter, and likewise the service of mercy to the deacon, Hand. 6. And the gifts themselves, though remaining gifts of the H. Spirit, acquired a more simple and ordinary character. Rome does indeed claim that the miraculous power continues with her, part I 270, but more beautiful than those miracles on which she prides herself are the works of mercy, which bear powerful witness to her faith and love. For when the diaconate in the Christian church gradually changed entirely in character, the treasure of love and mercy which Christ pours out in his church has revealed itself richly in private charity. Although the regulation of the service of mercy in Rome leaves far too much to be

desired, nevertheless she takes first place among the Christian churches in works of love. For the Reformed church has indeed restored the office of deacon, but she has not properly regulated its place and service and has not brought its activity to development. This development, to which the need of the times at present presses, can in the main not take place otherwise than in this direction: 1o that the office of deacon be honored more than hitherto as an independent organ of the priestly mercy of Christ, 2o that love and mercy as the Christian virtues par excellence be recognized and practiced, 3o that deacons be charged to move all members of the congregation, especially the well-to-do, in the name of Christ to mercy, and to warn and to guard against the sin of greed, which is a root of all evil, 4o that the diaconate not kill private charity, but awaken, regulate, and lead it, 5o that the bearers of this office, if necessary, in large congregations make use of the help of deaconesses, in the same way as the other two offices make use of catechism teachers and comforters of the sick, 6o that they distribute their gifts, in Christ's name, as taken from the tables of the Lord, upon which they have been laid down by the congregation and bestowed upon Christ himself, Mt. 25:40, 7o that they extend their help to all poor, sick, strangers, prisoners, idiots, insane persons, widows, orphans, in a word to all miserable and needy persons who are in the midst of the congregation, and meet them in their suffering with word and [179] with deed, 8o that the service of mercy obtain a much broader place on the agenda of all ecclesiastical assemblies than has hitherto been the case, 9o that the deacons together with ministers and elders be delegated to the broader assemblies of the churches and in all matters concerning the service of mercy obtain a decisive vote, 10o that in these assemblies the service of mercy be regulated according to general principles, with due regard to the

difference of congregational circumstances; that for general needs it be undertaken in common, and from the local congregation be extended to the support of other churches, and furthermore also to the rendering of help to poor, oppressed fellow believers abroad, and 11o that this diaconal labor in its independence remain maintained and not be absorbed into or mixed with the work of the inner Mission, or also with state poor relief, which bears an entirely different character. Cf. Calvin, Inst. IV 3, 9. Musculus, Loci Comm. 425. Bullinger, Huysboeck V 3. Zanchius, Op. IV 765. Junius, Op. I 1566. Bucanus, Inst. 494. Voetius, III 496-513. M. Vitringa IX 272-296. G. Uhlhorn, Die christl. Liebesthätigkeit, Stuttgart 1882-'90. Bonwetsch, das Amt der Diakonie in der alten Kirche, 1890. Seesemann, Das Amt der Diakonissen in der alten Kirche, 1891. Schäfer, Diakonik in Zöcklers Handb. der theol. Wiss. III 538-572. Achelis, Prakt. Theol. II 324-451. Wurster, Die Lehre v. d. inneren Mission, Berlin 1895. Kuyper, Enc. III 535-545.

11. This authority, bestowed by Christ upon his church, comes together in the local church in the consistory. Every local church is, according to the N. Test., independent, an ecclesia completa, and therefore bears, just as much as the church as a whole, the name of temple of God, 1 Cor. 3:16, 17, 2 Cor. 6:16, bride, 2 Cor. 11:2, or body of Christ, 1 Cor. 12:27. The believers do not stand by themselves but form a unity, and thus also the office-bearers in a local church do not remain standing separately alongside one another but unite into a council of the church. Traces of that are already present in the N. Test. In Jerusalem the believers, after they had been incorporated into the church by baptism, came together from time to time, continuing steadfastly in the teaching of the apostles, in the fellowship, in the breaking of bread, in the prayers, Hd. 1:14, 2:41v., 5:12 etc.; and they stood under [180] the

leadership of the college of the apostles, who were soon assisted therein by the presbyters, Hd. 6:2, 15:2, 6, 22. All kinds of circumstances, the gifts of the H. Spirit, in particular those of didaskalie, prophecy and glossolalie, the gatherings of the believers, the administration of word and sacrament, the collection of the offerings, the care of the poor etc., made leadership and regulation and thereby also counsel and deliberation of themselves necessary. At first the apostles provided as much as possible for all those needs, took measures and made determinations, Hd. 15:28v., 1 Cor. 11:4-6, 34, 14:27v., 16:1, 1 Tim. 3 etc. For everything had to take place in the church of Christ decently and with order, in peace and unto edification, 1 Cor. 14:26, 33, 40. But when the office of elders had been instituted, these were charged with the leadership and government of the church; and these soon formed among themselves a college, πρεσβυτηριον, 1 Tim. 4:14. Under the leadership of such a college the church, however, in the first times enjoyed a great measure of independence; in weighty matters it was regularly consulted. In Hd. 1 the disciples come together for the choosing of an apostle; in Hd. 6 the church chooses the deacons; in Hd. 15 it attends the meeting of apostles and elders; in 1 Cor. 5 it exercises discipline. The first synods were gatherings of the local church. But also the local churches all together form a unity. They also all together bear the singular name of ἐκκλησια; they all stand under the apostles, to whom the leadership and government of the whole church has been entrusted; they are with one another one in Christ, thus one in doctrine, in faith, in baptism, in love; they greet one another, Rom. 16:16, 1 Cor. 16:20, 2 Cor. 13:12, serve one another with gifts of love, Rom. 15:26, 1 Cor. 16:1, 2 Cor. 8:1, 4, 9:1, Gal. 2:10, and have one another read the letters which they receive from the apostles, Col. 4:16. It therefore lay in the nature of the case that these

congregations, which were spiritually one, would, as the case might be, deliberate with one another about matters of general importance. The first example of that occurs in Hd. 15, on the occasion of the question whether the Gentiles could be saved without circumcision. The church of Antioch sent Paul and Barnabas and some others to Jerusalem, in order to exchange thoughts about this important question with the apostles and elders there and to come to unanimity. [181] The apostles and elders therefore held with these delegates from Antioch a meeting, 15:6, which perhaps was also attended by the church, 15:12, 22 (in verse 25, however, και οἱ before ἀδελφοι must probably be omitted). After much ζητησις, investigation, disputation, not merely an advice was given, but in the H. Spirit a decision was taken, which bound the brethren in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia, was communicated to them by letter and by Judas and Silas also orally, in a meeting of the church, was explained, Hd. 15:22-31. All these meetings, of which the N. T. reports, were meetings of the local church, only in Hd. 15 attended by delegates from elsewhere. This custom was later, already in the second century as well, imitated. In weighty matters, such as appointment and deposition of a bishop, excommunication, absolution of mortal sins etc., not only did the presbyterium give its leadership but also the church its consent. Cyprian still says that from the beginning of his episcopate he did nothing without the counsel of his presbyterium and the consent of the church, Ep. 14, 4. At the synods of the second and third century therefore not only bishops but also presbyters, deacons and ordinary members of the church are present. Even the council of Nicaea was, besides by bishops, also attended by presbyters, deacons and members, who took part in the debates. And the delegates who at church meetings were invited from neighboring churches were in the first time absolutely not only bishops but

also sometimes presbyters, deacons or other members of the church. But the development of the hierarchical idea brought with it that the consent of the church was asked ever less, that presbyters and deacons were detached from the church and changed into advisers and helpers of the bishop, and that the synods were gradually held only by bishops. Further, in the second and third century all church meetings, attended by delegates from neighboring churches, were equal in rank; there was as yet no hierarchy of ecclesiastical assemblies; there were as yet no provincial, metropolitan, ecumenical councils; all assemblies of the churches took place in the name of Christ, made decisions in the H. Spirit, and were valid for the whole of Christendom (concilium universale, catholicum). But in that too [182] there came change. Already in the third century there are here and there definite provincial synods, i.e. meetings of bishops held in a particular province. In the fourth century there came, as a consequence of the great disputes that divided the church, synods of bishops from different provinces in addition. And the council of Nicaea, although absolutely no representation of the whole of Christendom, because it was attended only by a few bishops from the West, was nevertheless convened by the emperor from all sides. Thus there gradually came an ordering of rank of provincial, national, patriarchal, ecumenical councils, Sohm, Kirchenrecht 247-344. But the characteristic mark of an ecumenical council is difficult to indicate. It cannot lie in the fact that it was convened by the pope, for from the fourth to the tenth century it was convoked by the emperor; nor also in the general validity and the great significance of its decisions, for often the canons of ecumenical councils have been rejected and those of provincial synods accepted; nor also in the fact that an ecumenical council represents the whole of Christendom, for this has by no means always been the case with the so-

called councils. Toward the end of the Middle Ages the theory did indeed arise that a council was ecumenical and infallible only when it consisted of delegates of all churches. But this theory was of revolutionary origin, led in practice to all kinds of difficulties, and was also never accepted by Rome. For Rome a council is ecumenical only when its decisions have been approved by the pope and thereby obtain an infallible character binding the whole of Christendom, Bellarminus, de conciliis et ecclesia lib. I II. Heinrich, Dogm. II 476 f. Scheeben, Dogm. I 230 f. Vering, Kirchenrecht 613 f. etc.

In the Protestant churches the synodal church government first came to development on French soil. In the Lutheran church synods did indeed arise, but these consisted only in assemblies of pastores. Zwingli in 1528 at Zurich instituted synods, which were convened by the council, consisted of the preachers of city and country and a few members of the council, and especially had to consider complaints against the doctrine and life of the preachers, Mörikofer, Ulr. Zwingli, Leipzig 1869 [183] II 118 f. Calvin likewise determined in the Ordonnances ecclesiastiques, that the preachers had to come together every three months, in order to watch over one another's doctrine and life, and moreover in 1546 introduced an annual visitation, Kampschulte, Joh. Calvin I 408. Franz Lambert in 1526 designed for Hesse a church order, in which both congregational meetings and synods, consisting of the preachers and delegates appointed by the congregations, were included, but this church order did not come into effect, Lechler, Gesch. d. Presb. n. Syn. Verf. 14 f. A synodal church government came only in France, where the churches expanded strongly and, from need of unity, on the 26th of May 1559 for the first time came together in synod at Paris and united themselves in a common confession

and church order, Lechler ib. 69. Remarkable in this connection is, that the general synod first arose, that this introduced the provincial synods, and that later, in 1572, between these and the church councils the classis was still inserted, ib. 81, cf. likewise in Scotland 97. Such a synodal church government was then later also introduced in other Reformed churches, in Poland, Bohemia, Hungary, Germany, the Netherlands, Scotland, England, America etc. But there soon came opposition against it from two sides. The Remonstrants, aligning themselves with Zwingli and Erastus, assigned ecclesiastical power to the civil government and inferred from that, that synods were indeed permitted but not commanded and were not necessary for the being or well-being of the church, and that, when they were held, the right to convoke, to delegate, to establish the agenda, to preside belonged to the civil government, Uitenbogaert, Tractaat van ’t ampt ende auctoriteit enz. 1610 bl. 107v. cf. Limborch, Theol. Chr. VII 19. And the Independents, under the influence of the Anabaptist error, went still further, held every group of believers to be independent, and rejected every binding classical or synodal connection, Robinson bij Kist en Roijaards, Ned. Arch. voor Kerk. Gesch. VIII 1848 bl. 371v. Neal, Historie der rechtz. Puriteinen II 1 bl. 96. The grounds that can be brought against the synodal church government are indeed not devoid of weight. For the local churches in the N. T. are all completely independent with respect to one another; of a lawful, binding classical or synodal connection there is not a word. Such a connection seems [184] also to be wholly in conflict with the independence of the local churches, because it introduces assemblies that stand above the local churches and act with authority over against these, and thus in the church of Christ again introduces an unlawful hierarchy and tyranny. And in addition there then comes still, that the history of the synods does not always bear

favorable witness to their usefulness, and often makes them appear as the cause of all kinds of strife and division, so that Gregorius Naz. could already say, μηδεμιας συνοδου τελος είδον χρηστον; and the proverb not without reason runs: omne concilium parit bellum. But over against that, other considerations nevertheless place the necessity and usefulness of the synods clearly in the light. 1o In the N. T. there is as yet no classical or synodal connection of the churches, but there was then also no need for it, because the apostles themselves lived, assisted the congregations with counsel, and also cared for them through evangelists as their substitutes. 2º The congregations were also then already in all kinds of ways connected to one another by spiritual bonds, and obtained the right, not only to assemble themselves, but also to send delegates to other congregations and there to ask for a decision in certain disputes; Hd. 1, 6, 15, 21 show, that synods in a wholly general sense are juris divini permissivi. 3º Synods are not decidedly necessary ad esse ecclesiae and are also not expressly commanded by God's Word, but they are permitted and necessary ad bene esse ecclesiae. 4º The necessity lies in this, that the unity of doctrine, discipline, and cultus, to which the congregation is called; the order, peace, and love, which it has to preserve; and the common interests that are entrusted to it (such as training, calling, sending of ministers; mission among the heathen; support of needy churches etc.) cannot otherwise than by means of synods come into their right. 5º Synods are not a pedestal for but an undermining of all hierarchy; they maintain the independence of the local churches and preserve it from confusion, division, hierarchy of the pastor, domination of a few members; they confirm the freedom of the individual members, by giving them a support in the connection with other churches and allowing appeal to broader assemblies. 6º Nor are they a cause of division and strife, but a

means, to bring disputes, which there [185] in the church here on earth always again arise over doctrine, discipline, service, to decision in a peaceful way, through careful investigation and ample discussion. 7o In order that they answer to their purpose, synods ought always to be assemblies of churches, whose members (pastores, presbyters, deacons or ordinary members) are delegates of churches and bound to credentials of churches, which are convened by the churches themselves and not by civil government, pope etc. and are led by ecclesiastical persons chosen thereto, and which freely and independently, without interference of the civil government, judge and decide on ecclesiastical matters. 8o The ecclesiastical assemblies (local, classical, provincial, general, oecum.) are not essentially different from one another. The one assembly is not per se higher, weightier, less exposed to error, or more assured of the guidance of the H. Spirit than the other. For each church and each group of churches is independent over against the other; and all of them are in the same measure bound to the Word and partakers of the promise of the Spirit. In the ecclesiastical assemblies no representatives of the people but ecclesiastical office-bearers come together, who on Christ's behalf are called to the government of his church. They are therefore distinguished, not by a different kind or higher but only by greater power, which is brought together there and extends over a wider area. 9o The authority of all ecclesiastical assemblies is no other than that of the churches themselves; it is subject to the Word of Christ. Christ is the only one who in the churches and in their various assemblies has authority; his Word alone decides; what seems good to the H. Spirit in and through the members, that alone is binding in the church of Christ. But also these its decisions taken according to God's Word and in the H. Spirit the church cannot maintain otherwise

than by moral means. It has no ruling, coercive but only a serving power. Cf. Calvijn, Inst. IV c. 9. Polanus, Synt. 541. Bullinger, Van de Conciliën, Dordr. 1611. Martyr, Loci Comm. 407. Junius, Op. II 1029. Theses Salmur. III 505. Amyraut, Du gouvernement de l'Eglise contre ceux qui veulent abolir l'usage et l'autorité des synodes, Saumur 1653. Heidegger, Corp. Theol. II 613. Turretinus, Theol. El. XVIII qu. 33. Synopsis pur. theol. disp. 49. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. IV 114-272. Oration of C. Vitringa on the Synods etc., [186] translated from the Latin by S. H. van Idsinga, Harl. 1741. Moor VI 439-461. M. Vitringa IX 1 p. 574-653. Ch. Hodge, Discussions on Church polity, New-York 1878 p. 364-456. Karl Lechler, Die neut. Lehre v. h. Amte 1857 S. 254-275. Stahl, Die Kirchenverfassung u. s. w. 332 f.

12. Thus the church stands in the midst of the world with an origin, essence, activity, and goal of its own. It is in every respect distinct from that world, but yet never stands alongside it separated. To be sure, various tendencies in Christendom have placed church and world over against each other in an absolute, ethical antithesis, and have identified creation and re-creation with sin and grace. But these tendencies, however powerful they may at times have been, have nevertheless never governed the history of Christianity, and could always only lead a sectarian life alongside the churches. Apart from these tendencies, there are only two ways in which in principle the relation of church and world can be determined, the Roman and the Protestant, the supranatural and the ethical. Rome does not regard the natural as sinful like Anabaptism and does not arrive at avoidance and separation, but it does teach that the natural is of a lower order, easily becomes a cause of sin, and therefore needs the rein of the supernatural. Just as the image of God as a donum supernaturale was added to natural man, so from above grace comes mechanically to nature, the church to the

world, the higher to the lower morality; whoever wishes to live according to Rome's ideal must become an ascetic, suppress the natural and devote himself entirely to religion; whoever cannot do that, is granted the necessary latitude for the natural, and finds in the supernatural the boundary that determines it. Quite different was the relation which Protestantism adopted between church and world. It replaced the quantitative, supranaturalistic antithesis with the ethical. The natural was not of a lower order but was in its kind just as good and pure as the supernatural, for it was created by that same God who in re-creation revealed himself as Father of the Lord Jesus Christ. Only it had been corrupted by sin and therefore had to be reconciled and renewed by the grace of Christ. Grace therefore here does not serve to avoid, to suppress, to kill the natural, but precisely to free it from its sinful corruption, and to make it truly natural again. It is true that Luther in the application of these principles stopped halfway, left the natural untouched and limited Christianity all too much to the ethical-religious domain. But Calvin, the man of action, who came after Luther and therefore could mirror himself in Luther, continued the work of the Reformation and sought to reform the whole of life by Christianity. Avoidance is the word of the Anabaptists; asceticism that of the Romans; renewal and sanctification that of the Protestant, specifically of the Reformed Christian. This latter view is without doubt the richest and most beautiful. For there is but one God in both creation and re-creation. The God of creation, of the Old Testament, is no lower God than that of re-creation, than the Father of Christ, than the God of the N. Covenant. Christ, the mediator of the N. Covenant, is also the one through whom God created all things. And the H. Spirit, who is author of regeneration and sanctification, is the same who in the beginning hovered over the waters

and adorned the heavens. Creation and re-creation therefore cannot stand over against each other as lower and higher. They are both good and pure, both glorious works of the one and triune God. Further, sin, which has entered into the world, has indeed corrupted everything, not only the spiritual, the ethical-religious life but also all the natural, the body, the family, society, the whole world. But it is nevertheless no substance, no materia, but forma, and thus not identical with the created, but dwelling in and on the created and always to be loosened from it and removed by the grace of God. Substantially and materially creation after the fall is the same as before that time; it remains a work of God, and as such to be honoured and praised. For the recovery of that fallen world God now indeed brings the powers of grace into that creation. But that grace too is no substance or materia, enclosed in word or sacrament and distributed by the priest, but it is a renewing, re-creating power. It is not per se supernatural, but it bears that character only because of sin, and thus bears it in a certain sense accidentally and temporarily, in order to restore creation. This grace is distributed in a twofold form, as common grace for restraint, as special grace for renewal. Both have their unity in Christ, who is king in the regnum potentiae and gratiae; both are directed against sin; both bring and keep creation and re-creation in connection with each other. The world too after the fall is not left to itself, and not stripped of all grace, but it is borne and spared by common grace, guided and preserved for special grace in Christ. Separation and suppression are therefore unlawful and impossible. Human being and Christian are not two beings. Creation is taken up and restored in re-creation. The man who is born again is substantially no other than he was before regeneration. Incorporated into the church, he nevertheless remains in the world, and has only to keep himself from the

evil one. Just as Christ, the Son of God, from Mary assumed full human nature and thereby regarded nothing human and nothing natural as foreign to himself, so the Christian is nothing other than the reborn, renewed and therefore the true man. The same people who are Christians are and remain in the same calling with which they are called; they remain members of the family, citizens of society, subjects of the government, practitioners of science and art, men or women, parents or children, masters or servants etc. The relation that must exist between church and world is therefore in the first place of an organic, moral, spiritual nature. Christ is prophet, priest, king even now, and he works through his Word and Spirit upon the whole world. Through him there proceeds from everyone who believes in him a renewing, sanctifying influence in family, society, state, vocation, business, art, science etc. The spiritual life is destined to make the natural and moral life again correspond to the law of God in full depth and extent. Along this organic way Christian truth and Christian life are carried into all circles of natural life, so that family and family life are restored in honour, the woman is again regarded as the equal of the man, science and art are Christianized, the level of moral life is raised, society and state are reformed, laws and institutions, morals and customs are stamped Christian. But there is [189] yet another regulation of the relation of church and world, which is much more difficult and about which the greatest difference of opinion exists. Christ rules his church namely also through offices and institutions; and the question is whether the relation of the church to the various domains of natural life is also to be regulated officially and institutionally. Papalism and Caesareopapism stand here over against each other. Caesareopapism regulates the relation in such a way that the church is subjected to the Christian state and has to conduct itself according to its laws. There is some

truth in this; the relation of the church to the state is a wholly different one since this has become Christian. Before the government was Christian, for example, many more sins fell under Christian discipline than after that time. Attendance at pagan feasts, idolatry, worship of the emperor, Sabbath profanation, perjury, blasphemy, marriages in a forbidden degree, abominable sins of fornication, adultery etc., were indeed recognized and punished as sins by the church but not by the state. Since the government has been Christianized, there has come much greater agreement in moral conception and assessment. In many a case the church can therefore wait for the handling of scandalous transgressions by the judiciary and has no need of its own court. But nevertheless too much is inferred from that when all power is taken from the church and assigned to the Christian government. For essentially the power of the church has remained the same, even though its exercise has also been importantly altered. For the administration of word and sacrament is the inalienable right of the church; further, there always remain many sins, such as Sabbath profanation, fornication, drunkenness, swearing etc., which are not punished at all by the government or only, when they are very public and scandalous, are punished moderately; and finally the church also has, with those sinners whom the government punishes, a task of its own, for the government is satisfied with the punishment, but the church seeks to convince, to bring to repentance and to save, Calvin, Inst. IV 11, 4. On the other side stands the papal system, which indeed deserves praise insofar as it maintains the independence and freedom of the church, but otherwise, if not the whole world, then at least the whole baptized Christendom in all its circles of life and relations, wishes to subject judicially and legally to the pope; family, society, state, art, science etc. must [190] be ecclesiastical, for ecclesiastical

is identical with Christian, Roman, papal. This claim of Rome is not meant morally and spiritually, so that everyone who does not submit to the pope stands guilty before God; but it bears precisely this character, that everyone who refuses obedience to the pope also stands guilty before this vicarius Christi in law and legally, can be punished by him, if he judges it useful and has the power to do so, and can be compelled to obedience not only with spiritual and moral means but also with bodily and civil punishments. From this papal tyranny the courage of faith and the strength of spirit of Luther and Calvin have freed us. Their mighty act of reformation consisted in this, that they restored Christianity in its religious-ethical significance, as religion of grace, and freed the natural, not from this Christianity, but from the jurisdiction of the Roman church. From that it followed of itself that the connection between church and world, apart from the above-mentioned organic way, could only be established contractually. It is true that Calvin held with tooth and nail that the government was subjected to God's word, to maintain the two tables of the law, and to listen to the church as interpreter of God's word and had also to punish civilly various sins over which the church exercised discipline. He did draw the boundary line between church and state clearly and sharply but he drew it differently than we; the domain on which both had something to say was much greater than is now determined by us; the government as Christian also had on its terrain and in its measure to watch for the honour of God, for the flourishing of his church, for the expansion of his kingdom. But nevertheless, the relation between church and state was contractual and free. The church could do nothing other than preach the word of God, testify in his name of his commandments; but if the government or whoever then also refused to listen, then the church, then Calvin himself, then every Christian had no

power and also no right any more to coercion. Then nothing remained but resistentia negativa, passive resistance, Calvin, Inst. IV 20, 29, cf. for others Moor VI 513. Such a resistance too was an act, for as Doumergue, Calvin le fondateur des libertés modernes, Montauban 1898 p. 14 so beautifully says, c'est la soumission, mais du corps et non de l'âme. Humilié devant le Dieu, qui le [191] châtie, le calviniste reste le juge inexorable du despote qui l'oppresse. Il y a des soumissions plus mortelles à la tyrannie que des révoltes! But all right to coercion and punishment was nevertheless taken from the church over against the government and over against every human being and Christianity in its purely spiritual power restored and honoured. The government remained, like every human being, for its unbelief, for its rejection of God's word, for its transgression of his commandments, for the persecution and suppression of his church, accountable only to God. If, however, the government freely and independently made profession of the Christian, of the Reformed religion —as indeed as its duty and calling was always preached— then it followed from that that it in its quality and in its domain had to promote this religion and had to ward off and root out heresy and idolatry. The error lay there not in this, that to the Christian government the promotion of God's honour and service was assigned, but that the boundaries of state and church were wrongly drawn and unbelief, heresy etc. were regarded as a state crime. In the century of the Reformation this could indeed not be otherwise. But since the task of the government has been limited, the peoples have become free and mature, the churches split and divide more and more, and all kinds of tendencies in thought and life have appeared, the distinction between crime and sin is more clearly seen and all coercion as precisely in conflict with the Christian confession is recognized by ever more people. In the regulation of the relation between

church and state the following is therefore to be maintained: 1º that the church, even though by its pluriformity its testimony is weakened, cannot desist from the demand that all creatures, art, science, family, society, state etc. submit to the Lord's word; 2º that this demand is only a preaching, a moral testimony and may never be urged directly or indirectly by coercion or punishment; 3º that a Christian, Reformed government has the calling to promote God's honour, to protect his church and to cast down the kingdom of the antichrist; 4º that it however never can or may do this except with means that are in accordance with the nature of the gospel of Christ, and only on that terrain that is entrusted to it for safeguarding; 5º that it, itself owing account to him for its attitude with respect to God's word, may not intervene in the rights of the individual human being nor also in those of family, society, art, science and thus is not responsible for what within these domains happens against God's word and law; 6º that it has to draw the boundaries between sin and crime according to the demand of the gospel and in accordance with the guidance of God's providence in the history of the peoples; which boundaries however do not coincide with those between the first and the second table of the law, for many sins against the second table fall outside the supervision and punishment of the government, and many others against the first table (perjury, Sabbath profanation) are also punishable for the Christian government; 7º that fixed boundaries cannot be indicated by anyone in the abstract, because they vary with people and with century and can only be determined to some extent in their direction by the testimony of the national conscience.

CHAPTER X. ON THE MEANS OF GRACE.

Monergism Books

§ 50. THE WORD.

1. All salvation and blessedness flow to fallen man from grace as a virtue of God. Objectively that grace, with all its benefits, has appeared in Christ, who acquired and dispenses it in the way of the covenant. The communion of those who partake of Christ with all his benefits bears the name of church or congregation. Now the question arises whether Christ, in the communication of these his benefits, makes use of means or not. The mystics are all inclined to answer this question in the negative sense. Entirely in accordance with their dualistic starting-point, they cannot conceive grace as dependent on or bound to external signs and actions; God himself alone, or the Christ in us, the Spirit or the inward word or light works grace in man, and word and sacrament can do nothing other than indicate and depict that inward grace; the written word expresses what is written in the heart of every believer, and the sacraments set before the eyes outwardly what Christ has bestowed inwardly by his Spirit, cf. Moor I 359 sq. Mysticism in the end came to the same thing as rationalism, which, as expressed by Socinianism, Fock II 559 f. and Remonstrantism, Conf. en

Apol. Conf. c. 23. Limborch, Theol. V c. 66, saw in the sacraments only praecepta ceremonialia, signs of remembrance and acts of confession. Directly opposite to that stands Romanism, which thinks grace absolutely bound to means. For according to Rome the [194] church, the visible church borne by the invisible Spirit, is the proper, true, perfect means of grace, the sacrament par excellence. For in it Christ continues his divine-human life on earth, fulfils his prophetic, kingly and especially his priestly office, communicates the fullness of his grace and truth; the church is Christ on earth, Christ, as he, after his completed work of redemption, has entered into the development of the human race bound to space and time, Oswald, Die dogm. Lehre v. d. h. Sakr. der Kath. Kirche I2 8. And that grace, which Christ has merited and communicated to his church, serves above all to raise man from the natural to the supernatural order; it is a gratia elevans, a supernatural, physical power, which is poured into natural man by the priest in the sacrament ex opere operato, part III 444. As in Christ the divine and the human nature, in the church the invisible Spirit and the visible institute, so in the sacrament the spiritual grace and the visible sign are inseparably connected with one another; outside Christ, outside the church, outside the priest, outside the sacrament there is therefore no salvation. It is so, Christ continues in the church not only his priestly, but also his prophetic and kingly office. But the doctrine of Christ proclaimed in the church serves only to awaken faith, i.e. assent, and the discipline maintained in the church serves only to cultivate obedience to the moral law; faith and obedience, however, are neither of them grace itself, but its preparation and its fruit, Oswald t. a. p. 10. The word of God, which moreover with Rome is contained in Scripture and tradition and is conceived as a law, therefore has only a praeparatory, paedagogical significance, and faith is only one of the

seven praeparationes ad gratiam, part III 442. The sacrament handed out by the priest is the proper means of grace, through which vera justitia vel incipit, vel coepta augetur, vel amissa reparatur, Trid. sess. 7 prooem. Between this mystical disparagement and magical overestimation of the means of grace the Reformation took its position and brought about a great change in place and character of church, office and means of grace. For according to the Reformation Christ is the perfect Saviour, the only Mediator of God and of men, and the church [195] is in the first place communio sanctorum, not mediatrix of salvation, but assembly of believers, who live in communion with Christ. Indeed Christ has instituted offices in that congregation, but all those offices are no sacerdotium but a ministerium, absolutely bound to Christ's word and having no other power than the power of that word. The relation of Scripture and church is thus in Protestantism a wholly different one than in Romanism, part I 367. With Rome the church precedes Scripture, the church is not built on Scripture but Scripture has proceeded from the church, Scripture indeed needs the church but the church does not need Scripture. But the Reformation placed the church again on the ground of Scripture, and Scripture again high above the church. Not the church, but Scripture, the word of God became the means of grace par excellence; even the sacrament was subordinated to the word and without the word had absolutely no significance and power. And now that word was indeed, according to the institution of Christ, administered in the midst of the congregation by the teacher; but that nevertheless did not take away that that word was given into everyone's hand, that it was clear for each and every one who investigated it desiring salvation, that it did its work, not only when it was proclaimed publicly, but also when it was examined and read at home. Thus the Christian man, who accepted that

word not merely with a historical faith but with trust of the heart, was freed from priestly domination; there stood between him and Christ no one or nothing; through faith he had the whole salvation; and in the sacrament he received the sign and seal thereof. Thus the Reformation modified the Roman doctrine of the means of grace. But on the other hand there threatened the danger of mysticism, which rejected the means of grace entirely and could adduce all kinds of grounds for that. For God's omnipotence might not be bound by such external means; he was sovereign and free and could, but yet did not need to make use of such means for the distribution of the treasures of grace. That grace was also no materielles Etwas, no physical power, no donum superadditum, no elevatio naturae humanae, but it consisted chiefly in restoration into the favour of God, in the forgiveness of sins, in renewal after his image. Therefore [196] it also could not be enclosed in a sensible sign as in a vessel nor also be dispensed by the minister. Christ was and remained the only one who, after he had acquired it, could also dispense it. He appointed no substitute on earth and instituted no priest, but he himself remained exercising from heaven his prophetic, priestly and kingly office; the sign he might entrust to his servant, but he himself nevertheless remained the only dispenser of the thing signified. And did that not also appear in reality? Thousands received every day the sign of word and sacrament, without becoming partakers of grace; and conversely there died daily thousands of little children of the covenant, who never received a means of grace and concerning whose salvation nevertheless believers, on the ground of God's word, were not permitted to doubt. Frightened by these objections, the Lutherans have in part returned upon their steps, and have again bound grace absolutely to the means, introduced emergency baptism, regarded baptism as the washing

away of sins itself, denied faith to the little children. And also in the Reformed churches, particularly in the Anglican, this same Romanizing tendency has repeatedly risen above and come to dominion. But originally the Reformation took another standpoint. One could not limit the omnipotence and the freedom of God; he could also without external means glorify his grace in the heart of sinners; if he made use therein of men and signs, that was to be ascribed only to his good pleasure, to his great love and grace. Therefore Zwingli taught that God had even elected heathens, who had never heard of the gospel, regenerated them and led them to heavenly salvation. And even if the other Reformers did not go so far, they nevertheless had to concede, especially in the case of children of the covenant dying early, that God also without word or sacrament could regenerate and save by the H. Spirit alone, Calvin, Inst. IV 16, 17. 18. Yet they presented these cases as exceptions and held fast as a rule that word and sacrament for those who grew up were the ordinary means by which God gave his Spirit and communicated his grace. The working of regeneration and faith through the preaching of the Word is the ordinaria Domini oeconomia et dispensatio, quam tenere in vocandis suis solet, Calvin, IV 1, 5. [197] 16, 19, cf. Conf. Belg. 24. Cat. Heid. 64. Conf. Helv. II 18. Conf. Westm. c. 10. 14. Form. Conc. Sol. Decl. 11, 27: Dominus non solet homines immediate vocare, Gerhard, Loc. XX 121, cf. above p. 17. This answer does not satisfy, because the number of children who are saved without means of grace is much greater than is generally supposed, and cannot be booked as an exception to the rule; and also because in those who grow up, regeneration by the H. Spirit, if it does not always precede baptism, the hearing of the word of God and faith, can nevertheless certainly precede them. Hence, among the Lutherans, more and more grace

was bound to the means, and specifically regeneration to baptism, and among the Reformed, who conceived the sacraments as signs and seals of bestowed grace, regeneration was thought of as preceding baptism, so that the means of grace did not serve to regenerate, but to bring the regenerated to faith and conversion. Yet this later development also was not free from one-sidedness. That among the Lutherans led back to Rome, and that among the Reformed ran the danger of considering word, sacrament, church and office, yes even the person and the work of Christ for the acquisition and application of salvation, superfluous and necessary only for the manifestation of life and truth outwardly in the world. But thus the significance of the means of grace is weakened and their concept all too much delimited. For the means of grace of word and sacrament do not stand by themselves but are closely connected with church and office, with Christ's person and work. One can indeed ask whether God could not regenerate and save without Christ and forgive sins without satisfaction. But such questions lead to nothing; we have to rest in the good pleasure of God, that he dispenses salvation in no other way than in and through Christ. He is the Mediator of God and of men, the only name, under heaven given to men for salvation. But further it has likewise been God's good pleasure to dispense salvation in no other way than through and in the congregation of Christ. Whether God, as Zwingli taught, also caused his electing grace to work among the heathens, can here, since this in any case, according to the confession of all Christian churches, counts as an exception, remain undiscussed. [198] Rule is, that God voluntarily binds the distribution of his grace to the congregation of Christ. The church is the communion and thereby also the mother of believers. God establishes his covenant with the parents and in them with their children. He dispenses his benefits in the way

of the covenant. In that sense it is correct that the church as communion of saints is the great means of grace, of which Christ, according to his good pleasure, makes use to gather his elect from the beginning to the end of the world. The church in this sense indeed very definitely intends the salus electorum; that is not its only reason for existence; it also serves for the perfecting of the saints, for the building up of the body of Christ, for the preaching of the gospel to all creatures, for the glorification of God. But it is then nevertheless also there, in order here on earth to form that holy circle, within which Christ communicates all his benefits, also those of regeneration. In order that it might be able to do that, he communicated his Spirit to it, poured out all kinds of gifts into it, instituted the offices in it, entrusted to it the administration of word and sacrament. And these too are all means which Christ employs to bring those given to him by the Father and to lead them to heavenly salvation. Yes, the whole guidance of life with its alternations of prosperity and adversity is in the hand of the H. Spirit many times a means to bring the elect to Christ or into closer communion with him. Indeed the concept of means of grace can be taken still more broadly, so that it also includes what on our side is necessary in order to enjoy the benefits of the covenant for the first time and continually, such as faith, conversion, struggle against sin, prayer, cf. Calvin, Inst. IV. Helv. II art. 16. Westm. 14, 1. Schleiermacher, Chr. Gl. § 127. Now it does not deserve recommendation to include all this under the media gratiae. For Christ is not a means but mediator, acquirer and applier of salvation. The church is no means of grace alongside word and sacrament, for all the power entrusted to it consists in nothing other than in the administration of both; church and office give no grace in themselves but only through word and sacrament. And faith, conversion, prayer are rather fruits than means of

grace; they are no objective institutions but subjective conditions to possess and enjoy the other benefits of the covenant. [199] In the strict sense only word and sacrament are to be regarded as means of grace, i.e. as external, sensible actions and signs, which Christ has bestowed on his church and to which he has bound the communication of his grace. But nevertheless these may not for a moment be detached from the person and the work of Christ, nor also from the church as organism and as institute. Christ brings his own in many ways, and he can do this, because he alone, as the acquirer, so also is and remains the dispenser of grace. He therefore does it without or through the word and sacrament; but he nevertheless always does it through the inward calling of that Spirit, whom he bestowed on the congregation; in the communion of that church, which he charged to preach the gospel to all creatures; in the way of that covenant, which received the gospel as content and the sacrament as sign and seal. Cf. art. Gnadenmittel in Herzog1. Lange, Dogm. § 109. Philippi, Kirchl. Gl. V 2 S. 1 f. Nitzsch, Ev. Dogm. 548. Harless und Harnack, Die kirchl.-relig. Bedeutung der reinen Lehre v. d. Gnadenmitteln 1869. Rohnert, Die Lehre v. d. Gnadenmitteln, Leipzig 1886. Lipsius, Dogm. § 783 f. Frank, Chr. Wahrheit II 298 f. Oosterzee, Chr. Dogm. § 135.

2. The first and principal means of grace is the word of God. Lutherans and the Reformed agree with one another in this. Yet the latter do not discuss the word of God under the media gratiae, because they have usually already treated of it earlier in dogmatics in a separate chapter, Calvin, Inst. II 7-9. Musculus, Loci Comm. § 11. 20. Junius, Theses Theol. § 23. 24. Synopsis pur. theol. disp. 18. 22, or also concerning the law with the covenant of works, and concerning the gospel with the covenant of grace, Marck, Med. Theol. c. 11. 17. This peculiar method of treatment gives no

right to the assertion that the Reformed have not acknowledged the word of God as a means of grace, for time and again they express the contrary, cf. e.g. Conf. Belg. 24. Cat. Heid. qu. 65. But it may indeed be inferred from it, that the word of God for the Reformed had a much richer significance than that it served only, in the narrower sense of the word, as a means of grace. The word of God is also distinguished from the sacrament in this, that the latter serves only for the strengthening of faith [200] and thus has a place only in the midst of the congregation. But the word of God, both as law and as gospel, is revelation of the will of God, is the promulgation of the covenant of works and of grace, concerns all men and creatures, and has a universal significance. The sacrament can be administered only by the lawfully called minister in the assembly of believers, but the word of God also has an existence and place outside it and then too exercises its manifold operation. As a means of grace in the proper sense alongside the sacrament, the word of God comes into consideration only insofar as it is publicly preached by the teacher; upon the word preached in God's name and by virtue of his mission all the emphasis then falls. But as a rule men have already long come into contact with that word in the family, at school, through address or reading, before they heard it publicly proclaimed in the congregation. The public ministry of the word therefore by no means comprises all the power that proceeds from the word; it does indeed also serve to work faith in those who still lack it, but yet much more to strengthen it among believers in their assembly. In a Christian society the word of God comes to man in all sorts of ways, in all sorts of forms, from all sorts of sides, and it comes to him from his earliest youth onward. Yes, God in the inward calling often brings that word, already before consciousness has awakened, to the hearts of the children, in order to

regenerate and sanctify them, just as he in every man from his first existence onward writes the work of the law in his heart and implants the semen religionis in him. Therefore here a distinction is indeed to be made between word of God and Scripture. Not in the sense as if the word of God were to be found only in Scripture and Scripture itself were not; but in this other sense, that the word of God by no means always and even not in most cases comes to us as Scripture, in the form of Scripture, but that it, taken up from Scripture into the consciousness of the congregation, from there again goes out in the form of admonition and address, upbringing and instruction, book and writing, tract and discourse to the most diverse people and does its work. And always God stands behind that word; he is the one who causes it to go out to men in those different forms and thus calls them to conversion and life. In Scripture, accordingly, the expression [201] word of God is never identical with Scripture, although Scripture may without doubt be called by us God's word. A single passage may be pointed out where the expression word of God is applied to a portion of Holy Scripture, e.g. to the written law. But otherwise word of God in Scripture is never the same as Scripture, which is already impossible for this reason as well, that Scripture was then not yet complete. The expression word of God has manifold meanings in Scripture and can denote the power of God, by which he creates and sustains the world, or his revelation to the prophets, or the content of the revelation or the gospel that was proclaimed by the apostles, cf. part I 338. But always it is a word of God, i.e. never a sound only but a power, no mere communication but at the same time an accomplishment of his will, Jes. 55:11. By the word God creates and sustains the world, Gen. 1:3, Ps. 33:6, 148:5, Jes. 48:13, Rom. 4:17, 2 Cor. 4:6, Hebr. 1:3, 11:3, Jesus stills the sea, Mk. 4:39, heals the sick, Mt. 8:16, casts out the devils,

9:6, raises the dead, Luk. 7:14, 8:54, Joh. 5:25, 28, 11:43 etc. By the word he also works in the moral and spiritual domain.

3. The word which God employs to make known and to accomplish his will in the moral and spiritual sphere is to be distinguished into law and gospel. When Jesus appears on earth, to announce the coming of the kingdom promised in the O. T., Mk. 1:15, to bring to publicans and sinners, to the poor and prisoners, the gospel of forgiveness and of salvation, Mt. 5:1v, 11:5, 28-30, Luk. 4:18, 19, 19:10 etc., He naturally comes into conflict with the Pharisaic, nomistic conception of religion which prevailed in his time. Yet although He rejects the human ordinances of the ancients, Mt. 5:21v., 15:9, and although He has another conception of murder, Mt. 5:16, adultery, 5:27, oath, 5:33, fasting, 6:16, divorce, Mt. 19:9, sabbath, Mk. 2:27; He maintains the whole law, also in its ceremonial constituent parts, Mt. 5:23, 24, 17:24-27, 23:2, 3, 23, Mk. 1:44, 11:16; He explains it in its spiritual sense, Mt. 5-7, lays the emphasis on its ethical content, regards love to God and the neighbour as its sum, Mt. 7:12, 9:13, 12:7, Mk. 7:15, 12:28-34 and requires [202] another, more abundant righteousness than that of the Pharisees, Mt. 5:20. He himself, although more than the temple, Mt. 12:6, has therefore also placed himself under the law, Mt. 3:15, and has come to fulfil the law and the prophets, 5:17. And therefore He knows that, although He never urges the abolition of the law, his disciples are inwardly free from the law, Mt. 17:26, that his church is founded not on the law but on the confession of his Messiahship, Mt. 16:18, that in his blood a new covenant is established, Mt. 26:28, that in one word the new wine also demands new wineskins, Mt. 9:17, and the days of temple and people and law are numbered, Mk. 13:2. Jesus does not want a revolutionary overthrow of the legal dispensation of the O. Covenant, but a reformation and renewal,

which is of itself born out of its complete fulfilment, cf. deel III 217. And thus it has also in fact proceeded. The church at Jerusalem still held, in the first period, to temple and law, Hd. 2:46, 3:1, 10:14, 21:20, 22:12. But a new conception was preparing itself. With the conversion of the Gentiles the question came to the fore concerning the significance of the Mosaic law. And Paul was the first who fully understood that in the death of Christ the handwriting of the law had been wiped out, Col. 2:14. By νομος Paul understands, unless a further determination indicates otherwise, e.g. Rom. 3:27, Gal. 6:2, always the Mosaic law, the whole thora, including also the ceremonial commandments, Rom. 9:4, Gal. 2:12, 4:10, 5:3, Phil. 3:5, 6. And he regards that law not, like the epistle to the Hebrews, as an imperfect, preparatory, Old-Testament dispensation of the covenant of grace, which disappears when the high priest and surety of the better covenant has come, but as revelation of God's will, as religious-ethical demand and requirement, as regulation willed by God of the relation between Him and man. And of this law, thus conceived, Paul now teaches that it is indeed holy and good, and bestowed by God, Rom. 2:18, 7:22, 25, 9:4, 2 Cor. 3:3, 7, but instead of, as the Pharisees asserted, being able to bestow righteousness, it is powerless through the flesh, Rom. 8:3, incites desire, 7:7, 8, increases the transgression, 5:20, Gal. 3:19, works wrath, curse and death, Rom. 4:15, 2 Cor. 3:6, Gal. 3:10 and has only for a time, for pedagogical reasons, come in between, Rom. 5:20, [203] Gal. 3:19, 24, 4:2, 3. Therefore that law has now also in Christ, the seed of the promise, reached its end, Rom. 10:4; the believer is free from the law, Gal. 4:26v., 5:1, because he has been redeemed by Christ from the curse of the law, Gal. 3:13, 4:5, and has become partaker of the Spirit of adoption, the Spirit of freedom, Rom. 8:15, 2 Cor. 3:16, 17, Gal. 5:18. This freedom of faith,

however, does not abolish the law but confirms it, Rom. 3:31, because its requirement is precisely fulfilled in those who walk according to the Spirit, 8:4. For that Spirit renews the believers, so that they have a delight in God's law according to the inward man and examine what God's holy will is, Rom. 7:22, 12:2, Ef. 5:10, Phil. 1:10, while they are urged to do God's will by all manner of motives, the great mercy of God, the example of Christ, the dear price for which they have been bought, the communion of the H. Spirit etc. Cf. on the law in the N. T. Weiss, Bibl. Theol. Holtzmann Neut. Theol. I 130 f. II 22 f. L. Jacob, Jesu Stellung zum mos. Gesetz, Gött. 1893. Grafe, Die Paulin. Lehre v. Gesetz2, Leipzig Mohr 1893. Zehnpfund, Das Gesetz in den paulin. Briefen, Neue Kirchl. Zeits. 1897 S. 384-419. Art. νομος bij Cremer enz.

4. This antithesis between law and gospel was, in the Christian church, on the one side, by antinomianism in its various forms of Gnosticism, Manichaeism, Paulicianism, Anabaptism, Hattemism etc., further sharpened and made into an irreconcilable conflict. The whole O. T. was derived from a lower God, from an angry, jealous, vengeful God, and was now replaced by the wholly different revelation of the God of love, of the Father of Christ. On the other side the antithesis between law and gospel was, by nomism in its various forms of Pelagianism, Semi-pelagianism, Romanism, Socinianism, Rationalism etc., weakened and erased. Law and gospel were already by the church fathers and later by scholastic and Roman theologians identified with Old and New Testament and then not set antithetically over against each other but regarded as a lower and higher revelation of God's will. Law and gospel do not differ in this, that the former only demands and the latter only [204] promises, for both contain commandments, threats and promises; mysteria, promissiones, praecepta; res credendae, sperandae en

faciendae; not only Moses, also Christ was legislator. But in all this the gospel of the N. T., the lex nova, far surpasses the law of the O. T., the lex vetus; the mysteries (trinity, incarnation, satisfaction etc.) are in the N. T. revealed much more clearly, the promises are much richer in content and comprise especially spiritual and eternal goods, the laws are much more glorious and lighter, since ceremonial and civil laws have been abolished and replaced by a few ceremonies. Further, the law was given through Moses, grace and truth came through Jesus Christ. The law was temporary and intended for one people; the gospel is eternal and must be brought to all peoples. The law was imperfect, a shadow and example, the gospel is perfect and the body of the goods themselves. The law fostered fear and servitude, the gospel awakens love and freedom. The law could not justify in the full sense, it gave no wealth of grace, it granted no eternal salvation, but the gospel grants in the sacrament the power of grace, which enables one to fulfill God's commandments and to acquire eternal life. In one word, the law is the imperfect gospel, the gospel the perfect law; the gospel lay enclosed in the law as arbor in semine, as granum in spica, cf. deel III 197 and further Suicerus s. v. νομος en εὐαγγελιον. Augustinus, de civ. VIII 11. In ev. Joh. tract. 30. de spir. et litt. 19. 20. Lombardus, Sent. III dist. 25. 40. Thomas, S. Theol. III qu. 106-108. Conc. Trid. VI can. 19-21. Bellarminus, de Justif. IV c. 2 sq. etc. Insofar now as the Old- and the New-testamentary dispensation of the covenant of grace, according to its striking form, can on the precedent of Holy Scripture be designated with the name of law and gospel, the distinction made by Rome between the two is, though not in all parts yet in the main, to be approved. But Rome identified Old and New Covenant with law and gospel entirely, failed to recognize the gospel in the Old and the law in the N. Test., conceived the whole doctrine proclaimed by

Christ and the apostles as gospel, included therein not only promises, but also laws and threats, and thus made the gospel into a second law. The Pauline antithesis of law and [205] gospel was erased. For although it is the case that Paul under the law understands the whole dispensation of the O. T., he then considers it precisely in its legal form and sets it thus directly over against the gospel. And also when he does that, he acknowledges that the legal dispensation has in no way nullified the promise that had already been made to Abraham, Gal. 3:17, 21, that also in the days of the O. V. the gospel was proclaimed, Gal. 3:8, that also then righteousness was obtained from and through faith, Rom. 4:11, 12, 11:32, Gal. 3:6, 7. Of the law as law, abstracted from the promise, to which it in the O. T. had been made subservient, Paul asserts that it cannot justify, that it increases sin, that it is a ministry of condemnation and precisely thereby prepares the fulfillment of the promise and makes another righteousness, namely the righteousness of God in Christ through faith, necessary. And this antithesis of law and gospel was again perceived by the Reformation. Indeed there occur statements among the church fathers which also testify to a better insight, cf. citations in Suicerus, t. a. p., in Bibliotheca studii theol. ex plerisque Doctorum prisci seculi monumentis collecta, apud Is. Crispinum 1565 p. 195-216. Gerhard, Loc. XIV 16. But it does not come to clarity, because they always again confuse the distinction between law and gospel with that between Old and New Covenant. But the Reformers, on the one hand holding fast the unity of the covenant of grace in its two dispensations against the Anabaptists, have on the other hand taken into view the sharp contrast of law and gospel and thereby restored the peculiar character of the Christian religion as religion of grace. For although it is the case that law and gospel in a broader sense can be used for the old and new dispensation of the covenant of grace,

in their proper meaning they nevertheless denote two revelations of God's will, which essentially differ from each other. The law too is God's will, Rom. 2:18, 20, holy and wise and good, spiritual, Rom. 7:12, 14, 12:10, giving life to whoever keeps it, Rom. 2:13, 3:12; but it has become powerless through sin, does not justify but incites desire, increases sin, works wrath, kills and curses and condemns, Rom. 3:20, 4:15, 5:20, 7:5, 8, 9, 13, 2 Cor. 3:6v., Gal. 3:10, 13, 19. And over against that stands the gospel of Christ, the εὐαγγελιον, [206] which contains nothing less than the fulfillment of the Old-test. ἐπαγγελια, Mk. 1:15, Hd. 13:32, Ef. 3:6, which comes to us from God's side, Rom. 1:1, 2, 2 Cor. 11: 7, has Christ as its content, Rom. 1:3, Ef. 3:6 and brings nothing other than grace, Hd. 20:24, reconciliation, 2 Cor. 5:18, forgiveness, Rom. 4:3-8, righteousness, Rom. 3:21, 22, peace, Ef. 6:15, freedom, Gal. 5:13, life, Rom. 1:17, Phil. 2:16 etc. As demand and gift, as command and promise, as sin and grace, as sickness and healing, as death and life, law and gospel stand here over against each other. Although they agree in that they both have God as author, both speak of one and the same perfect righteousness, both are directed to man in order to bring him to eternal life, they nevertheless differ in that the law proceeds from God's holiness, the gospel from God's grace; that the law is known by nature, the gospel only by special revelation; that the law demands perfect righteousness and the gospel grants it; that the law leads through works to eternal life and the gospel causes works to proceed from the eternal life granted in faith; that the law now condemns man and the gospel acquits him; that the law is directed to all men and the gospel only to those who live under it etc. On the occasion of this distinction, there even arose difference over whether the preaching of faith and repentance, which nevertheless seemed a condition and demand, did belong to the gospel and

not rather, with Flacius, Gerhard, Quenstedt, Voetius, Witsius, Coccejus, Moor and others, had to be reckoned to the law. And indeed in the strictest sense there are in the gospel no demands and conditions, but only promises and gifts; faith and repentance are just as much as justification etc. benefits of the covenant of grace. But thus the gospel, concretely, never occurs; it is in practice always connected with the law and is therefore through the whole of Scripture always interwoven with the law. The gospel always presupposes the law, and also needs it in the administration. For it is brought to rational and moral men, who are for themselves responsible to God and therefore must be called to faith and repentance. The demanding, calling form in which the gospel appears is borrowed from the law; every man is not first by the gospel but is by nature [207] obligated by the law to believe God on his word and thus also to accept the gospel, in which He speaks to man. Therefore the gospel from the outset lays claim to all men, binds it in their conscience, for that God who speaks in the gospel is no other than he who has made himself known to them in his law. Faith and repentance are therefore demanded of man in the name of God's law, by virtue of the relation in which man as a rational creature stands to God; and that demand is directed not only to elect and regenerate persons, but to all men without distinction. But they themselves are nevertheless content of the gospel, not operations or fruits of the law. For the law indeed demands faith in God in general, but not that special faith which is directed to Christ, and the law can indeed work μεταμελεια, poenitentia but no μετανοια, resipiscentia, which rather is fruit of faith. And precisely because faith and repentance, although man is by nature obligated to them by the law, are content of the gospel, there can be talk of a law, of a command, of an obedience of faith, Rom. 1:5, 3:27, 1 Joh. 3:23. of being disobedient to and

being judged according to the gospel, Rom. 2:16, 10:16 etc. Law and gospel, considered in concreto, do not differ so much in that the law always appears in commanding and the gospel in promising form, for the law also has promises, and the gospel admonitions and obligations. But they differ especially in content: the law demands that man work out his own righteousness and the gospel invites him to renounce all self-righteousness and to accept that of Christ and to that end even grants the gift of faith. And in that relation law and gospel stand not only before and at the beginning of conversion; but in that relation they remain standing through the whole Christian life, until death. The Lutherans have almost only an eye for the accusing, condemning working of the law and therefore know no higher blessedness than deliverance from the law. The law is only necessary because of sin. In the perfect state there is no law. God is free from the law; Christ was absolutely not for himself subject to the law; the believer is no longer under the law. The Lutherans do indeed speak of a threefold usus of the law, not only of a usus politicus (civilis), to curb sin, [208] and a usus paedagogicus, to awaken knowledge of sin, but also of a usus didacticus, to be for the believer a rule of life. But this last usus is nevertheless solely and only therefore necessary, because and insofar as believers still remain sinners and must be held in check by the law and led to continual knowledge of sin. In itself, with faith and grace the law ceases and loses all its significance. But the Reformed thought quite differently about it. The usus politicus and the usus paedagogicus of the law have only accidentally become necessary through sin; even if these fall away, the principal usus, the usus didacticus, normativus remains. The law is after all expression of God's being; Christ as man was of himself for himself subject to the law; Adam before the fall had the law written in his heart; in the believer it is

again engraved on the tables of his heart by the H. Spirit; and in heaven all will walk according to the Lord's law. The gospel is temporary but the law is eternal and is precisely restored by the gospel. The freedom from the law therefore does not consist in this, that the Christian no longer has anything to do with that law, but it is located herein, that the law can no longer demand anything of the Christian as condition of salvation, can no longer condemn and damn him. But otherwise he has a delight in the law of God according to the inner man and meditates on it day and night. And therefore that law must always in the midst of the congregation, in connection with the gospel, be proclaimed. Law and gospel, the whole word, the full counsel of God is content of preaching. A much broader place than in the doctrine of misery does the law occupy among the Reformed in the doctrine of gratitude. Cf. Luther bij Köstlin I 157 f. II 237 f. 496 f. Melanchton, Loci Comm. de evangelio. Symb. Bücher, ed. Müller S. 87. 181. 533. 633. Gerhard, Loc. XII-XIV. Quenstedt, Theol. IV 1-72. Hollaz, Ex. 996-1043. Schmid, Dogm. d. ev. luth. K. § 52. Heppe, Dogm. d. d. Prot. II 225-262. Schneckenburger, Vergl. Darst. I 127 f. Frank, Dogm. Studien 1892 S. 104-135. Zwingli, in mijne Ethiek van Zwingli 47v. 76v. Calvijn, Inst. II 7-9. Zanchius, Op. VIII 509. Junius, Theses Theol. 23. 24. Ursinus, Explic. Cat. qu. 19. 92. Synopsis pur. theol. disp. 18 en 22. Voetius, Disp. IV 17. V 283. Witsius, Oec. foed. III 1. Misc. Sacr. II 840-848. [209] Coccejus, de foedere IV 72. VI 179. Moor III 377 sq. Vitringa VI 252-292 etc.

5. Apart from the relation of law and gospel, there is in Christian theology also an important difference concerning the power, the efficacia, of the word of God and thus concerning the relation of word and Spirit. Here too, as extremes on the left and on the right stand nomism and antinomism. Nomism, which runs on from Judaism through Pelagianism into more

recent rationalism, is satisfied with an external calling, with an intellectual, moral, or aesthetic working of the word, and deems a special, supernatural power of the H. Spirit superfluous in addition, cf. deel III 434v. 451v. Rome too clearly shows itself to be related to this direction, insofar as it weakens the gratia praeveniens, ascribes to faith only the preparatory meaning of a historical assent, more and more takes the side of Molinism and Congruism, and has the proper, supernatural grace and the indwelling of the H. Spirit first communicated through the sacrament, cf. deel III 439-444. The opposite extreme is taken by antinomism, which first sets itself against the law and the Old Testament but then soon against all external word and against all objective, historical mediation of salvation, and expects everything from the working of the H. Spirit, from the Christ in us, from the internal word and the internal light. In the Anabaptism of Schwencfeld, Franck, Denck e. a. this direction expressed itself most clearly on this point. External and internal word stand to each other as body and soul, death and life, earth and heaven, flesh and spirit, shell and kernel, foam and silver, image and truth, sheath and sword, lantern and light, manger and Christ, nature and God, creature and Creator. Knowledge of the word therefore in itself gives nothing and leaves us cold and dead. In order to understand it, the internal word is already needed beforehand. Just as words alone can teach us only when we know the things, so Scripture then teaches us something only if Christ already dwells inwardly in our heart. The word is but a sign, a shadow, image, symbol and only expresses, only points out, only recalls what is written inwardly in our heart. The internal word thus [210] precedes, stands higher than Scripture, which is but a paper word and moreover also obscure and full of contradictions. And that internal word is nothing other than God or Christ or the H. Spirit himself, who is one in all

men, and is the whole full truth. In order to find God and to know the truth, we therefore do not have to go outside ourselves, to Scripture or the historical Christ; but descending into ourselves, withdrawing ourselves from the world, killing understanding and will and passively waiting for the internal, immediate revelation, we find God, we live in his fellowship and are blessed in his contemplation. Cf. above bl. 193 and further also Cloppenburg, Op. II 200. Hoornbeek, Summa Controv. lib. V. Episcopius, Op. I 527. Quenstedt, Theol. I 169. Maronier, The internal word, Amst. 1890. A. Hegler, Geist und Wort bei Seb. Franck, Freiburg 1892. In fact this Anabaptism was a revival of the pantheistic mysticism, which in the finite sees an eternally changing form of appearance of the infinite and therefore seeks fellowship with God in the depth of feeling, where God and man are one. Over against these two directions of nomism and antinomism the Reformers maintained in common that the word alone is insufficient to bring to faith and conversion, that the H. Spirit can indeed work but ordinarily nevertheless does not work without the word, and that therefore word and Spirit in the application of the salvation of Christ to man go together with each other. Between Lutherans and Reformed there was at first no difference about this. The former too taught that the H. Spirit, although working through word and sacraments as his instruments, nevertheless only by a special power works and can work faith, and that He does that ubi et quando visum est, Symb. B. ed. Müller S. 39. 455. 456. 471. 524. 601. 712. 720. cf. Luther bij Köstlin II 494. Otto, Geist u. Wort nach Luther, Gött. 1898. Melanchton, Ex. ordin. C. R. 23, 15, 18, 37. Loci, ib. 21, 761, 765, and others, Flacius, Chemniz, Hunnius, Hutter, Gerhard bij J, Müller, Das Verhältniss zw. der Wirksamkeit des H. Geistes u. d. Gnadenmittel des göttl. Wortes, Dogm. Abh. 1870 S. 155 f. But yet there

was from the outset already some difference. While the Reformed usually present it thus, that the H. Spirit joins himself with the word, cum verbo, the Lutherans [211] prefer to express themselves thus and lay ever more strongly the emphasis on it, that the H. Spirit works through the word as his instrument, per verbum. And while the Reformed always made a distinction between the ordinary and extraordinary manner in which God worked grace in the heart, the Lutherans, out of fear of the Anabaptists, omitted the extraordinary manner more and more and said, Deum nemini spiritum vel gratiam suam largiri nisi per verbum et cum verbo externo et praecedente, Smalc. III 8, or as Luther repeatedly said: Deus interna non dat nisi per externa. And when now in 1621 the Danzig preacher Hermann Rathmann † 1628 published a writing in which he taught that the word alone had no power to convert man, unless the H. Spirit with his grace came with it, Herzog2 12, 506, then almost all Lutheran theologians rose up against him and developed as the genuine Lutheran doctrine that the word of God possesses in itself the power of the H. Spirit unto conversion, that that power has been placed in it by divine ordinance and is so inseparably connected with it, that it is in the word even still ante et extra omnem usum legitimum, just as the hand of man, even if it does not work, nevertheless always retains the vis operandi, Quenstedt, Theol. I 169. Hollaz, Ex. 992. Buddeus, Inst. theol. 110. Schmid, Dogm. d. ev. luth. K. § 51. Philippi, Kirchl. Gl. V 2 S. 29 f.

Now the word, indeed, which goes forth from God's mouth, is always a power that accomplishes that for which God sends it. That is the case in the natural realm in creation and preservation; that is also the case on moral and spiritual ground in the work of re-creation. And this applies not only to the gospel but also to the law. Paul does indeed say of the Old Test. legal

dispensation that το γραμμα ἀποκτεννει, 2 Cor. 3:6, but by that he expresses as strongly as possible precisely that it is no dead letter; rather, it is so powerful that it works sin, wrath, curse, and death; ὁ νομος ὀργην κατεργαζεται, Rom. 4:15, is δυναμις της ἁμαρτιας, 1 Cor. 15:56, διακονια της κατακρισεως, του θανατου, 2 Cor. 3:7, 9. And over against that now stands the gospel as a δυναμις θεο εἰς σωτηριαν, Rom. 1:16, 1 Cor. 1:18, 2:4, 5, 15:2, Ef. 1:13; it is, because it is not a human but God's word, Hd. 4:29, 1 Thess. 2:13, living and abiding, 1 Petr. 1:25, living and powerful, Hebr. 4:12, spirit and life, Joh. 6:63, a light that shines in a dark [212] place, 2 Petr. 1:19, a seed that is sown in the hearts, Mt. 13:3, grows up and is multiplied, Hd. 12:24, is of great value, even though those who plant and water it are nothing, 1 Cor. 3:7, a sharp two-edged sword that penetrates into the innermost being of man and judges all his thoughts and deliberations, Hebr. 4:12. And therefore it is not empty and vain, but it works, ἐνεργειται, in those who believe, 1 Thess. 2:13; and the works that it brings about are regeneration, 1 Cor. 4:15, Joh. 1:18, 1 Petr. 1:23, faith, Rom. 10:17, illumination, 2 Cor. 4:4-6, Ef. 3:9, 5:14, 1 Tim. 1:20, instruction, correction, consolation, etc., 1 Cor. 14:3, 2 Tim. 3:15. Even in those who perish, the gospel exercises its operation; it is to them for a fall, for an offense and folly, for a stone at which they stumble, for an odor of death unto death, Luk. 2:34, Rom. 9:32, 1 Cor. 2:23, 2 Cor. 2:16, 1 Petr. 2:8. Over against spiritualism, this power of the word of God, and specifically of the gospel, must be maintained with the Lutherans in its full, rich significance. The antithesis of the inward and outward, of the spiritual and the material, of eternity and time, of essence and form, etc., originates from a false philosophy and is in conflict with Scripture. God is the Creator of heaven but also of earth, of both soul and body, of spirit and matter

together. And therefore the word too is no empty sound, no void sign, no cold symbol; but every word, even of man, is a power, greater and more enduring than the power of the sword; there is thought, spirit, soul, life in it. If this holds for the word in general, how much more for the word that goes forth from God's mouth and is spoken by Him? That is a word that creates and preserves, judges and kills, re-creates and renews, always exerts its operation and never returns empty. With a human word it makes a great difference whether it is written or printed, is read or is heard; and with the spoken word, again, the form and delivery are of the greatest significance. The power of the human word also depends on the degree to which someone has laid his heart, his soul into it, on the distance that exists between the person and his word. But with God it is different. It is always His word; He is always present with it; [213] He continually bears it by His almighty and omnipresent power; it is always He Himself who, in whatever form and by whatever means, brings it to men and calls them by it. Therefore, although the word of God, which is freely proclaimed by the ministers or is also brought to men in admonition, address, book, or writing, is indeed taken from Holy Scripture but is not identical with that Scripture, nevertheless it is a word of God that comes to man from God's side, is spoken by the Holy Spirit, and therefore also always exerts its operation. The word of God is never detached from God, from Christ, from the Holy Spirit; it has no subsistence in itself; it is not deistically to be separated from its creator and author. Just as Scripture was not once inspired by the Holy Spirit but is continually borne, preserved, made powerful by that Spirit, so it is also with the word of God that, taken from Scripture, is preached to men in one way or another. Jesus spoke by the Spirit, Joh. 6:63; the apostles, who received that Spirit, Mt. 10:20, Luk. 12:12, 21:15, Joh.

14:26, 15:26, proclaimed the gospel not only in words but also in power and in the Holy Spirit, 1 Thess. 1:5, 6, in demonstration of Spirit and power, 1 Cor. 2:4, and handled it as the sword of the Spirit, Ef. 6:17. Insofar the Lutherans are also entirely right; the word of God is always and everywhere a power of God, a sword of the Spirit; semper huic verbo adest praesens Spiritus Sanctus. But nevertheless Scripture and experience teach that that word of God does not always exert the same operation; efficax it is in a certain sense always, it is never powerless; if it does not raise up, it casts down; if it is not unto a resurrection, then unto a fall; if not unto an odor of life, then unto an odor of death. The question therefore arises, when the word of God is efficax in that sense that it leads to faith and conversion. The Lutherans now, in order to render man inexcusable, enclose this divine, supernatural efficacia in the word, but thereby accomplish nothing and must, in order to explain the different outcome of the word in man, take refuge in free will. But the Reformed reckoned with the fact of that double outcome, did not regard the efficacia as an impersonal, magical power that had been laid in the word, but thought of that word always in connection with its [214] author, with the Christ, who administers it through the Holy Spirit. And that Holy Spirit is not an unconscious power but a person, who is always with the word, always bears it and causes it to be active, but does not always cause it to be active in the same way. He employs, according to the unsearchable good pleasure of God, that word unto conversion but also unto hardening, unto a resurrection but also unto a fall. He always works through the word, but not always in the same way. And if He wills to work through it in such a way that it leads to faith and conversion, then He has no need to add anything objectively to the word. That word is good and wise and holy, a word of God, a word of Christ, and the Holy Spirit takes

everything from Christ. But in order that the seed of the word may bear good fruits, it must fall into well-prepared soil. The field too must be made ready for the reception of the seed. This subjective operation of the Holy Spirit must therefore be added to the objective word. By the nature of the case it cannot be enclosed and shut up in the word; it is another, an additional, a subjective operation, not an operation per verbum but cum verbo, an opening of the heart, Hd. 16:14, an inward revelation, Mt. 11:25, 16:17, Gal. 1:16, a drawing to Christ, Joh. 6:44, an illumination of the understanding, Ef. 1:18, Col. 1:9-11, a working of the willing and the working, Phil. 2:13 etc., cf. deel III 498. Thereby the Spirit is not detached from the word or separated, not even then, when He, as with little children, works regeneration without any means of grace. For the Spirit who regenerates is not the Spirit of God in general, but the Spirit of Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Spirit whom Christ has acquired, by whom Christ reigns, who takes everything only from Christ and who has been poured out by Christ in the church and thus is the Spirit of the church. Leaving aside whether the Holy Spirit sometimes also works and can work in heathens, which in any case is exceptional, as a rule He works regeneration only in such as live under the administration of the covenant. Also little children, who are regenerated by Him, are children of the covenant, of that covenant which has the word of God as its content and received the sacrament as sign and seal. The Holy Spirit thus follows Christ in His course through history; He binds Himself to the word of Christ and works only in the name [215] and according to the command of Christ. Individually and subjectively, when, e.g., a child is conceived apart from his whole environment, from the church in which it is born, it may have the appearance as if the Spirit worked without the word; objectively and materially the Holy Spirit works

only there where the covenant of grace has extended itself with the administration of word and sacrament. And therefore regeneration in little children, when they grow up, is always recognized by and its genuineness proved in that it passes over into the acts of faith and conversion and then attaches itself to the word of God, which objectively lies before us in Holy Scripture. The Holy Spirit, who in regeneration applies nothing other than the word, the power, the merit of Christ, of Himself also leads the conscious life toward that word, which He took from Christ and caused to be written down by prophets and apostles, cf. deel III 484. 504. 525 and further Conf. Belg. 24. Heid. Cat. qu. 65. 67. Helv. II 18. Can. Dordr. III 6. V 7. 14. Calvijn, passim, bv. Inst. III 2, 33. IV 14, 11. adv. Libert. c. 9. Turretinus, Theol. El. XV, 4, 23 sq. Hodge, Syst. Theol. III 466-485. Bartlett, The letter and the spirit, Bampton Lectures 1888. Müller, Dogm. Abhandl. 127-277. Dorner, Chr. Gl. II 799. Frank, Chr. Wahrheit II 243.

§ 51. THE SACRAMENTS.

1. Alongside the word, the sacrament comes as the second means of grace. Holy Scripture does not know this name and also has no doctrine of the sacraments in general. It does indeed speak of circumcision and passover, of baptism and the Lord's Supper, but does not combine these institutions under one concept. Thus it also did not yet happen in the first Christian congregations. Although we read in Hd. 2:42 that the congregation at Jerusalem persevered in the doctrine of the apostles, in the fellowship, in the breaking of bread and in the prayers, and from Hd. 6:4 can infer that there was a ministry of the word, we nevertheless know little about the arrangement of the congregational assembly at Jerusalem. Something more is known to us from 1 Cor. 11:1-14:40 about the religious exercises of the believers from among the Gentiles. After the believers, on the basis [216] of personal confession, had been received by baptism into the name of Christ into the congregation, εἰς ἐν σωμα, Rom. 6:3-5, 1 Cor. 12:13, Gal. 3:27, they came together regularly on the day of the Lord, Hd. 20:7, 1 Cor. 16:2, Op. 1:10. Probably on that day they held two assemblies,

one for the service of the word, to which access also stood open for non-members, 1 Cor. 14:23, in which a portion from the Scripture of the O. T. and later also from the apostolic writings was read aloud, each member of the congregation could freely take the floor, 1 Cor. 14:26, and prayers were offered and songs were sung, Hd. 2:42, Rom. 12:12, 1 Cor. 14:14, 15, 26; and another for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, εἰς το φαγειν, 1 Cor. 11:33, in which only the believers were allowed to participate, 10:16v., 11:20v., in which first prayer and thanksgiving were offered, then a common meal (ἀγαπη) Jud. 12, 2 Petr. 2:13 was held from the gifts brought together by the believers, thereafter again prayer and thanksgiving (εὐχαριστια) and the Lord's Supper was celebrated. Jülicher, Spitta, Haupt, Hoffmann, Drews et al. do indeed think that in the apostolic time the Lord's Supper was not distinguished from the ordinary meal, but that the whole ἀγαπη was a εὐχαριστια, a δειπνον κυριακον, but this opinion is rightly rejected by Harnack, Zahn, Grafe et al.; Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper after the ordinary meal, Mt. 26:26, 1 Cor. 11:25, and Paul distinguishes both in 1 Cor. 11:20, 21 and proposes to separate them entirely, in that the ordinary meal should beforehand be held at home, 1 Cor. 11:22, Weiszäcker, Das apost. Zeitalter2 S. 566 f. Moeller-von Schubert, Kirchengesch. I 96 f. 130 f. Zahn art. Agapen and Drews art. Eucharistie in Herzog3. W. Schmidt, Dogm. II 466. But in the second century a great change gradually came about here. The celebration of the Lord's Supper was, for whatever reasons, cf. Drews in Herzog3 5, 562, detached from the agapae, and the two assemblies, that for the service of the word and that for the Lord's Supper, were united. Henceforth the celebration of the Lord's Supper took place in the ordinary religious service after the ministry of the word; the religious service was distinguished into two parts, at the first, the

ministry of the word, Gentiles or at least catechumens and penitents might also be present, but the second, the celebration of the Lord's Supper, was open only to the baptized, and received [217] through the addition of baptismal confession, administration of baptism, oratio dominica and all kinds of ritual and symbolic acts more and more a mysterious character. The widely disseminated Greek mystery-cult exerted influence on the Christian religion. In the N. T. μυστηριον is the name for words and deeds of God that were formerly hidden but that have now become manifest, part I § 30. But this word soon received in the Christian church a wholly different meaning and became the designation of everything in the Christian religion that was mysterious and incomprehensible. In Latin this word was rendered by sacramenten, which had the meaning of an oath, especially to be taken by the soldier to the standard, or of a sum of money that in a lawsuit had to be deposited in a locus sacer and, upon loss of the suit, fell to the gods, but which now took up into itself the thought of a mysterious, holy act or thing. In this sense everything that stood in any connection with God and his revelation could be called a sacrament, the revelation itself and its content, the doctrine, the trinity, the incarnation, etc., further all kinds of signs, such as the sign of the cross, the salt that was given to the catechumens, finally all holy acts, priestly ordination, marriage, exorcism, sabbath celebration, circumcision and all ceremonies; cf. besides the works named in part I 530v., Moeller-v. Schubert I 332 f. and the literature cited there. Herzog2 art. Sakrament. Ziegert, Ueber die Ansätze zu einer Mysterienlehre, Stud. u. Kr. 1894. Although now among these holy acts designated by the name sacrament baptism and the Lord's Supper still clearly come to the foreground, nevertheless the vagueness of the name was the cause that the number of the sacraments remained for a long time

undetermined. Augustine too still uses the concept in a broader sense and proceeds in his definition from that meaning. Only Pseudodionysius in the 6th century counted in his eccl. hier. IV 2 sq. six sacraments: baptism, confirmation, eucharist, priestly ordination, monastic ordination and usages at the burial. But scholasticism, in the determination of the concept sacrament, attached itself to Augustine and reckoned various holy things and acts under it. Hugo of St. Victor, de Sacr. I 9, 7 names no fewer than 30 sacraments and divides them into three classes: those that are necessary for salvation (baptism, confirmation, eucharist etc.), those that communicate a higher grace (use of holy water etc.) and those that serve as preparation for the other sacraments (consecration of holy implements etc.). Abaelard counts five: baptism, confirmation, eucharist, extreme unction and marriage, while Robert Pullus also names five, but replaces the last two with confession and priestly ordination. Bernard gives no number but in various places names baptism, footwashing, confirmation, eucharist, confession, extreme unction, priestly ordination, investiture, marriage with the name of sacraments. Only Lombardus, Sent. IV dist. 2 has the well-known seven, but even after him theologians and synods (e.g. the lateran council of 1179) still speak of sacraments in a broad sense. And this continues until the sententiae of Lombardus became the general handbook for the study of theology and the council at Florence 1439 established the seven, cf. Schwane, D. G. III 584 f. Harnack, D. G. III 463. With this restriction of the number, the determination of the concept went hand in hand. Among the church fathers many holy acts, especially baptism and the Lord’s Supper, were indeed highly exalted, and were thought to be endowed with a supernatural power and grace. But a doctrine of the sacraments is lacking; the relation of the sensible and spiritual element is not clearly

determined, and the manner of operation is not clearly defined. Augustine distinguishes in the sacraments two constituent parts: dicuntur sacramenta, quia in eis aliud videtur, aliud intellegitur. Quod videtur, speciem habet spiritalem, Serm. 272. detrahe verbum et quid est aqua nisi aqua? accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum, in Ev. Joh. 80, 3. Sometimes he lays so much emphasis on the word and, for the operation of the sacrament, on the faith of the recipient, that the sign becomes only an image of the thing signified. But on the other hand he gave such a broad definition of the concept sacrament that all kinds of ecclesiastical acts could fall under it, and he bound the sacraments, against the Donatists, so to the church that they could indeed be taken along by the heretics but nevertheless could communicate grace only within the church, Hahn, Die Lehre v. d. Sakr. Breslau 1864 S. 11 f. Harnack, D. G. III 141.

The proper doctrine of the sacraments is a product of medieval scholasticism; it was the first to institute a precise and often hair-splitting investigation concerning the concept, the institution, the [219] minister, the necessity, the efficacy, the number, the constituent parts, the relation of the sacramentum and the res sacramenti, the distinction between the sacraments in paradise, the Old and the New Testament, the mutual difference of the seven sacraments, the physical or moral operation, the distinct grace which they communicate, the requirements for the administration and the reception of the sacraments, Hugo Vict., de sacramentis. Lombardus, Sent. IV 1. 2. and comm. of Thomas, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus. Thomas, S. Theol. III qu. 60-65. Bonaventura, Brevil. VI 1-5. Schwane, D. G. III 579-605. Harnack, D. G. III 466 f. The result of this scholastic development was that, partly already at earlier councils but especially at Trent, the following was established concerning the doctrine of the sacraments in general: 1o all

sacraments of the N. Covenant are instituted by Christ and are seven in number: baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, priestly ordination, and marriage. 2o These are all true and proper sacraments, essentially distinct from those of the O. Covenant, but nevertheless mutually different in value. 3o They are, although not all for every human being, necessary unto salvation, so that without them, or at least without desire for them, by faith alone, the grace of justification is not to be obtained. 4o They not only signify grace, but also contain it and communicate it ex opere operato. 5o On the side of the minister, for the truth of the sacrament it is at least required that he have the intention to do what the church does, but otherwise it is indifferent whether he is in mortal sin. 6o Lawful dispensers of the sacraments are only the ordained priests, but confirmation and priestly ordination take place only by the bishop, and baptism may in case of necessity also be administered by laymen. 7o On the side of the recipient it is only necessary that he have the intention to receive what the church gives and place no hindrance in the way of grace. 8o Each sacrament confers a particular grace, and baptism, confirmation, and ordination confer a character indelebilis. Cf. Conc. Trid. VII de sacr. Cat. Rom. II cap. 1. Bellarminus, Controv. III de sacramentis in genere in 2 books. Theol. Wirceb. ed. 3 IX 1-151. Perrone, Prael. theol. ed. Lov. V 301-391. Simar, Dogm.3 659-693. Oswald, Die dogm. Lehre v. d. h. Sakr. der Kath. Kirche2 I 20-132. [220] Möhler, Symbolik § 28. Jansen, Prael. III 281-367 etc. On the doctrine of the sacraments in the Greek church compare Kattenbusch, Vergl. Confessionskunde I 393 f.

2. The development of this doctrine of the sacraments shows that it had removed itself farther and farther from Scripture. This is especially the case in a threefold respect. In the first place, the grace which the sacrament

communicates is conceived by Rome only as a gratia sanctificans, i.e. as a power which is poured into man, elevates him to the supernatural order, and makes him a partaker of the Divine nature. Grace has been almost entirely detached from guilt and forgiveness of sins and transformed into a supernatural gift accruing to man from without. In the second place, the bond of the sacrament to the word has been as good as entirely severed by Rome; the word does indeed have some significance, but only a preliminary and praeparatory one; the faith which is worked by the word is nothing but a historical faith, which is insufficient unto salvation and must be supplemented by love, i.e. by the gratia infusa. And this gratia is communicated only by the sacrament, which therefore occupies its own, independent place alongside the word and far surpasses it in value. In the third place, faith is absolutely no longer a requirement in the recipient of the sacrament; grace, as gratia sanctificans, as something material, lies enclosed in the sacrament, is communicated by it ex opere operato, and thus presupposes at most that the recipient places no insurmountable hindrance in the way. The sacrament therefore works physically and magically, by virtue of a power bestowed by God upon the priest, as an instrument in his hand. On all three points the Reformation reviewed and altered the Roman doctrine of the sacraments according to Scripture; Zwingli, Luther, Calvin were herein in agreement with one another and expressed in common that the grace which was communicated in the sacrament was in the first place forgiving grace and did not relate to the lower nature, deprived of the donum superadditum, but to sin; that the sacrament was a sign and seal, attached to the word, communicated no grace that was not bestowed by the word and thus without the word had absolutely no value; and that not the sacrament itself but nevertheless [221] its operation and fruit depended on

faith and thus in the recipient always presupposed saving faith. But otherwise, in the doctrine of the sacraments, important difference soon manifested itself among the Reformers. The sacraments became, among Romanists, Lutherans, Zwinglians, Reformed, Anabaptists, etc., the center of the struggle. They became the shibboleth of every dogmatic system; therein the principles were embodied practically and concretely from which one proceeded in church and theology, in doctrine and life; the relation of God and world, creation and re-creation, Divine and human nature of Christ, sin and grace, spirit and matter came in the sacrament to their practical application; all struggle moved around the unio sacramentalis, the union of sign and thing signified, the connection of sacramentum and res sacramenti. Luther first, in 1518 and 1519, laid all the emphasis on faith, which alone makes the sacrament work and thus makes communion with Christ and his benefits our portion; then, from 1520 to 1524, he brings the sacrament especially into connection with the word, of which it is a sign and seal; and finally, after 1524, out of fear of the Anabaptists, he came more and more to deem the sacraments indispensable, to maintain their objective character on the ground of the institution of Christ, and to conceive the connection between sign and thing signified temporally, corporeally, and locally, so that according to the later Lutheran conception the res coelestis is hidden in, with, and under the element, just as the power of the H. Spirit has entered into the word, and grace works through the sacraments as through its instrumenta, media, adminicula, vehicula, organa, Luther bij Köstlin II 503 f. Heppe, Dogm. d. d. Prot. III 39 f. Symb. Bücher ed. Müller S. 39. 41. 202. 264. 321 enz. Gerhard, Loc. XVIII. Quenstedt, IV 73-88. Schmid, Dogm. d. ev. luth. K. § 53. Over against this Zwingli taught that the sacraments, because they are administered only to such as have

faith and through that faith are partakers of Christ and all his benefits, are in the first place signs and proofs of faith, acts of confession, and then in the second place also means for the strengthening of faith, because they remind us of the benefits to which our faith relates, continually direct our faith more away from ourselves to God's grace in Christ and thereby exercise and strengthen that faith, [222] Zwingli, Fidei ratio bij Niemeyer, Conf. Ref. 24-26. Expos. chr. fidei, ib. 50-53, en voorts Zeller, Das theol. System Zw. 111 f. Now Calvin too does indeed conceive the sacraments as acts of confession, as mutua nostra erga Deum pietatis testificatio. But with him they are nevertheless only in the second place; first of all the sacraments are divinae in nos gratiae testimonia externo signo confirmata, signs and seals of the promises of God in his word, mirrors in which we behold the riches of his grace. The invisible element, the materia and substantia of the sacrament, is thus the word, the promise, the covenant of grace, the person of Christ with all his benefits. But the visible element does not contain these spiritual goods enclosed within itself, it does not bestow them upon us propria, intrinseca virtute, God does not hand over his work to the signs in the sacrament, He and He alone is the possessor and also remains the only dispenser of grace. The signs render only instrumental, ministerial service; God makes use of them in order to communicate his grace. But He communicates this grace only to those who believe and then strengthens and nourishes their faith; unbelievers receive only the sign without the thing signified. How now God makes use of the sacraments for the distribution of his grace is not made clear in Calvin and also in the later Reformed. Therefore room remains for all kinds of questions; is grace always connected with the sign, so that the sacrament objectively always remains the same? or does God connect grace with the sign only when the sacrament

is received by believers? or does God also offer grace with the sign to the unbelieving users, so that it is their guilt if they accept and receive only the sign? wherein is sacramental grace distinguished from that which believers already received earlier, and wherein does it differ from the subjective working of the H. Spirit, which opens the eye of believers for the sacrament and unlocks their heart for it? does the distribution of grace accompany the administration or the reception of the sign? does it take place simultaneously with it or can it also occur earlier or later and thus can the fruit of the sacrament be enjoyed before and during and after the reception? cf. Calvijn, Inst. IV 14. Catech. Genev. 5. Cons. Tigur. Usteri, Stud. u. Krit. 1884 S. 417-455. Conf. Gall. 34. 37. Belg. 33. Cat. Heid. qu. 66. 67 enz. a Lasco, [223] Op. ed. Kuyper I 115-232. 511-514. Bullinger, Huysboek V 6. Sohnius, Op. I 55. Beza, Tract. Theol. I 206. Junius, Theses Theol. 49. 50. Zanchius, Op. VIII 511. Polanus, Synt. Theol. VI 49-51. Synopsis pur. theol. 43. Turretinus, Theol. El. XIX qu. 1-10. Moor V 218-267. Vitringa VI 308 enz.

Outside the Lutheran and the Reformed churches, which in the wake of Luther and Calvin maintained the objective character of the sacraments, the doctrine of Zwingli found more and more acceptance. The Anabaptists did indeed still accept foot-washing, baptism, and the Lord's Supper as sacraments, but nevertheless saw in them only signs and symbols, no seals; the sacraments do indeed visibly set before the eyes the benefits which believers have received from God, but they do so as confessions of our faith and communicate no grace, Cloppenburg, Op. II 238. The Socinians, like Zwingli, disapproved the name sacrament, regarded the Lord's Supper as a memorial meal and a declaration of what we have in Christ, and denied that baptism rested on a command of Christ and was a permanent institution,

Fock, Der Socin. 559 f. The Remonstrants in their confession c. 23 did indeed still confess that God in the sacraments displays his benefits and certo modo exhibet atque obsignat, but their Apology showed that by this they understood no sealing of God's promise and no communication of his grace; the sacraments are signs of the covenant between God and human beings, whereby these obligate themselves to a holy life and God visibly sets his grace before their eyes, cf. Limborch, Theol. Christ. V 66. Among the Rationalists the sacraments became signs of remembrance and confession, whose purpose was the promotion of virtue, and which therefore could easily be increased with other solemn ceremonies, Wegscheider § 165. The Quakers rejected the sacraments as Jewish ceremonial, understood baptism as baptism of the Spirit, which cleanses us from our sins, and the Lord's Supper as an image of the nourishment of our soul by Christ, Barclay, Verantwoording 1757 bl. 325. This dissolving process was checked by Schleiermacher insofar as he ventured an attempt to maintain the objective character of the sacraments and to unite all the different conceptions in a higher unity. To that end he defined them as fortgesetzte Wirkungen Christi, in Handlungen der Kirche eingehüllt und mit ihnen auf [224] das Innigste verbunden, durch welche er seine hohepriesterliche Tätigkeit auf die Einzelnen ausübt und die Lebensgemeinschaft zwischen ihm und uns, um derentwillen Gott allein die Einzelnen in Christo sieht, erhält und fortpflanzt, Chr. Gl. § 143. But this attempt at reconciliation did not succeed. The Wirkungen Christi, in Handlungen der Kirche eingehüllt, left undecided what in the sacraments was the first and principal thing. Thus theology soon again diverged in different directions. Some continued to adopt the mediating standpoint, Nitzsch, Chr. Lehre § 191. Kaftan, Dogm. 595. Oosterzee, Dogm. II 815;

others reproduced the view of Zwingli, Lipsius, Dogm. § 807 f. 840 f. Schweizer, Chr. Gl. II 400 f. Biedermann, Chr. Dogm. II 632. Ritschl, Unterricht in der christl. Rel. § 83. Scholten, L. H. K. II 310, or returned to the confessional standpoint of the Luth. or Geref. churches, Philippi, Kirchl. Gl. V 2. Hodge, Syst. Theol. III 485. And finally, by the Neolutherans in Germany and by the Zwinglians and the Puseyites in England, a doctrine of the sacraments was advanced which in many respects recalled Rome, let grace work through the sacrament not only upon the soul, but also upon the geistleibliche nature and upon the body of the human being, and often expanded the number of the sacraments, Höfling, Das Sakr. der Taufe, Erl. 1859 I 18-20. Hofmann, Schriftbeweis II 2 S. 167 f. Thomasius, Christi Person u. Werk II3 355 f. Delitzsch, Bibl. Psych.2 340. 350. 354. Martensen, Dogm. § 247-258. Vilmar, Dogm. II 226 f. Paget, Sacraments in Gore's Lux mundi 1892 p. 296-317.

3. Scripture does not know the word sacrament and also contains, in the abstract, no doctrine of the sacraments. It does indeed speak of various ecclesiastical acts in O. and N. Test. but it does not comprehend them under a common concept. And also in the Christian church it is not the concept but the thing that is first; various doctrines and usages of the church were gradually designated with the name of sacrament. Therefore it is understandable that very many had objections to this name and preferred to replace it with that of signs, seals, secret-signs, mysteries, Geheimnisse. Not only Carlstadt, Zwingli, Socinus, Schleiermacher, Doedes etc. disapproved [225] the word; but Luther also said in his praeludium de captivitate Babylonica, that Scripture did not know the word in that meaning which it had in theology; Calvin, Inst. IV 14, 13 observed that the church fathers had put a new sense into the Latin word; Melanchthon replaced in the first

edition of his Loci the word sacramenta with signa, and Musculus, Hottinger, Burman, Coccejus and others also gave preference to the Scriptural names of signs and seals. This objection to the name is further strengthened by the fact that the Greek meaning of the word μυστηριον, translated in Latin by sacramentum, has exercised influence on the conception of the ecclesiastical ceremony designated by that name. Yet for all this the word is not to be rejected. For theology makes use of many words which do not occur in Scripture and which within its circle have acquired a technical meaning. If it had to refrain from these, it would have to cease all scholarly labor and all preaching and exposition of God's word, indeed even all translation of Holy Scripture would be unlawful. For that reason it is also not to be disapproved to let the treatment of the doctrine of the sacraments precede that of baptism and the Lord's Supper. For although in Scripture no separate doctrine about the sacraments is to be found and this must rather be built up from what Scripture teaches about the particular institutions of circumcision, passover, baptism and the Lord's Supper; yet a preceding chapter about the sacraments in general puts us precisely in a position to summarize what those particular institutions have in common in Scripture and to set this correct, Scriptural conception over against the impure doctrine which has gradually penetrated into the Christian church concerning the sacraments. In the definition of the sacraments the Reformed therefore adhered as closely as possible to Scripture. Scholasticism disputed about whether a definition of the sacraments could be given, because they, as composed of res and verba, were no ens reale, no unum per se, cf. Bellarminus, de sacr. in genere I 10. Yet from Augustine, who more than once distinguished in the sacraments a visible and an invisible component, one derived the definition that they were sacrum signum or signum rei

sacrae, Thomas, S. Theol. III qu. 60 art. 1. 2. Hugo Vict. de sacr. I 9, or also [226] invisibilis gratiae visibilis forma, Lombardus, Sent. IV 1. Although not incorrect, this determination is nevertheless too broad. Later Roman theologians therefore usually adopted the determination of the Catech. Rom. II 1, 6, 2, and described the sacraments as signa quaedam sensibus subjecta, quae ex Dei institutione sanctitatis et justitiae tum significandae tum efficiendae vim habent. Although this definition can be understood well, it nevertheless has acquired in Roman theology a sense that is in conflict with Holy Scripture and therefore makes it unusable for the Reformation. For Roman theology conceives the sacrament as a res sacra, abdita atque occulta and places in it the sense, not of the Biblical, but of the Greek μυστηριον. And further it places all the emphasis on the fact that the sacraments contain grace in themselves, that they communicate it ex opere operato, and that this grace consists especially in the gratia sanctificans. Scripture, however, speaks of the rainbow and circumcision as אוֹת הַבְּרִית, Gen. 9:12, 13, 17, 17:11, cf. Ex. 12:13, Hd. 7:8 and calls the latter a σημειον περιτομης, a σφραγις της δικαιοσυνης της πιστεως, Rom. 4:11; and it likewise connects baptism and the Lord's Supper most closely with the covenant of grace, with the mediator and the benefits of that covenant and specifically with the forgiveness of sins, Mk. 1:4, 14:22-24 etc. Accordingly Reformed theology described the sacraments as holy visible signs and seals, instituted by God, by which He gives the believers to understand and assures the promises and benefits of the covenant of grace all the better, and by which these on their part confess and confirm their faith and love before God, angels and men. Here it deserves attention, in the first place, that God is named as the institutor of the sacraments. In general there is no difference about this in the Christian churches. All confess that God alone can be the

author, the institutor, the causa efficiens of the sacraments. For He alone is the possessor and dispenser of all grace; He alone can determine to which means He wishes to bind Himself in the distribution of His grace. Further, Christ also as mediator has the right to institute sacraments, for He as mediator is the acquirer of all the grace of God. Hominum non est instituere et formare Dei cultum, sed traditum a Deo recipere et custodire, Helv. II 19. But Rome here falls into a peculiar [227] difficulty. Because no other sacraments had been instituted by Christ than those of baptism and the Lord's Supper, it had to be asserted of the other sacraments that they either were not sacraments or that the apostles also had the right to the institution of sacraments. Before the council of Trent many asserted, Lombardus, Sent. IV dist. 3, Hugo Vict., de sacr. II 15, 2, Halesius, Bonaventura and others, that the sacraments, e.g. confirmation, confession, had been instituted not immediately by Christ but by the apostles, Schwane, D. G. III 597. But the council at Trent sess. 7 can. 1 expressly determined that all seven sacraments had been instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord Himself, (not mediately for that all acknowledged; then no conciliar decision would have been necessary, but immediately, Bellarm. de sacr. I c. 23) and thereby imposed on theology an unfulfillable obligation. Yet the council was right insofar as it recognizes that the right to institute sacraments cannot even by God be transferred to creatures. Men can make known the institution of a sacrament, Ex. 12:1, Mk. 1:4, 11:30, 1 Cor. 11:23, can hand out its sign, can announce the grace of God, but they cannot by the nature of the case bestow this grace realiter. For grace is not a material good, but it is the favor, the communion of God, inseparable from Him and therefore not to be communicated by any creature, by any man or angel. Therefore God in Christ through the Holy Spirit is the only institutor but also the only

dispenser of the sacrament. Only that sacrament is the true one that is administered by God Himself. It is Christ Himself who in His church baptizes and holds the Lord's Supper. He has not transferred His office and has appointed no substitute on earth, He Himself rules and just as He alone as prophet administers the word, so He is also the only minister of the sacrament, although it is the case that He also there uses men as His instruments, Helv. II 19. Synopsis pur. theol. 43, 8. Turretinus, Th. El. XIX 1, 14. Amyraldus, Theses Salm. III 10. Vitringa VI 338. In the second place, in the Reformed definition of the sacraments it is also noteworthy that they are described as signs. Although some Reformed also, whether generally, or alternately, reckoned them among the ceremoniae, ritus or actiones, Bullinger, Huisboek, V 6. Trelcatius Jr. Loci [228] Comm. p. 141, Junius, Theses Theol. 50, 6 etc., yet by far the most reduced them to the generic concept of signa, sigilla, imagines, symbola, typi, antitypi, cf. Moor V 231. Vitringa VI 341. They deviated in this, partly also from the Romanists but especially from the Lutherans, who were particularly set on the description by actiones and saw in it an important point of dispute with the Reformed, Gerhard, Loc. XVIII 22 sq. This is on the Lutheran side therefore surprising, because they, with the word, teach that the power of the Holy Spirit is enclosed in it, also before and outside the use. The analogy would require that the emphasis fell not on the action but on the sign in the sacrament. Yet this is not the case. The Lutherans see in the sacrament first of all an action, consisting in communication of grace in, with and under the sign. The Reformed now by no means denied that there was in the sacrament an action. But this was a hidden, invisible action of Christ, who inwardly in the hearts through the Holy Spirit bestows grace. By contrast, in the sacrament the main matter does not lie in the action of the minister, as if

that were of so much weight and even brought about a con- or transubstantiation, but in the sign-being of the sacrament; it depicts and assures the action of Christ, indeed the action of the minister of the sacrament, although an actio, is itself an actio significativa. And Scripture therefore calls the sacraments by the name of signs and seals and also obliges Romanists and Lutherans to approve this designation, Bucanus, Instit. theol. 559. Maresius, Syst. Theol. XVIII 8. Mastricht, Theol. VII 3, 14. Turretinus, Theol. El. XIX 3, 9. Vitringa VI 341. In the third place the Reformed definition of the sacraments is still peculiar in that it unites the act of God and the confession of the believers, which is to be observed in it, with one another. Calvin, Inst. IV 14, 1 in that way reconciled Luther and Zwingli with one another. With Luther he was in agreement that the act of God in the sacrament took the first and principal place; but with Zwingli he judged that the believers in the sacrament also made confession of their faith and their love before God, angels and men. In the sacrament God first comes to the believers, to signify and seal to them His benefits; He assures them with visible pledges that He is their God [229] and the God of their seed; He affixes seals to His word, in order to strengthen their faith in that word, Gen. 9:11-15. 17:11, Ex. 12:13, Mk. 1:4, 16:16, Luk. 22:19, Rom. 4:11 etc. But on the other hand the sacraments are also acts of confession; the believers confess in them their conversion, their faith, their obedience, their communion with Christ and with one another; while God assures them that He is their God, they solemnly testify that they are His children; every sacramental use is a renewal of the covenant, a vow of fidelity, an oath, which obliges to the service of Christ, Mk. 1:5, 16:16, Hd. 2:41, 8:37, Rom. 6:3v., 1 Cor. 10:16v., cf. Ned. Gel. 36. Form. v. doop en avondmaal. Vitringa VI 423 sq. Heppe, Dogm. d. ref. K. 441.

4. In the name of sign and seal it is implied that the sacrament consists of two parts, which are distinguished as verbum and elementum, res sacramenti and sacramentum (in the narrower sense), signatum and signum, res coelestis and res terrestris, internal and external matter. For sign and seal both point to something else, of which they are sign and seal. There are many and various signs; there are, as Augustine, de doctr. christ. II 1 already observed, natural and positive, adopted, instituted signs. To the former belong, e.g., the smoke, which calls to mind the fire, the dawn, which calls to mind the sun, the footprint, which calls to mind the walker, the fragrance, which calls to mind the flower, the laugh, which calls to mind joy, the tear, which calls to mind sorrow. Positive signs are such as are established by agreement, convention, custom, or usage and are accepted and recognized in a narrower or wider circle; to this kind belong all letter-signs, passwords, banners, insignia, etc. All these signs are distinguished as ordinary from extraordinary, among which the miracles occupy the foremost place; in Scripture these are often designated by the name σημεια, because they are a proof and sign of God's presence, of his grace or power, of his truth or righteousness. Signs are also still brought into different groups, according as they, like the memorial signs, call to mind something past, Jos. 4:6, or, like the predictive signs, something future, Gen. 4:15, or also, like many other signs, something present and abiding, Deut. 6:8, [230] call to mind. Sacraments now belong to the instituted, extraordinary signs, which are taken by God, not at random, but according to an analogy preformed by Him, from visible things and are employed for the indication and clarification of invisible and eternal goods. Besides signs, the sacraments are also seals, serving for confirmation and strengthening. Seals are distinguished from signs in that they do not merely recall the invisible

thing in our thought, but also authenticate and confirm it for our consciousness. Because there is so much deceit and falsity in the world, all kinds of means are employed to distinguish the true from the false, the genuine from the spurious. Thus a trademark serves to authenticate the genuineness of the product, a stamp, to authenticate the purity of measures and weights, a coin, to authenticate the correct value of the money, and a seal, to authenticate and guarantee the unadulteratedness of writings. Of seal there is also many a time mention in Scripture, when something must be authenticated as genuine and preserved against falsification. Letters of princes, 1 Kon. 21:8, Neh. 9:38, Esth. 3:12, or of other persons, Jer. 32:10, and further laws, Jes. 8:16, books, Dan. 12:4, Op. 22:10. Daniel's lions' den, Dan. 6:18, the grave of Jesus, Mt. 27:66 etc. are sealed and thus protected against violation. God also has a seal, Op. 7:2; He seals the stars, when He hides them and covers them with clouds, Job 9:7; He seals the book of judgment, so that no one, except the Lamb alone, can open and read it, Op. 5:1; He seals the abyss, in which Satan is shut up, so that he may no longer deceive, Op. 20:3; He seals his servants in the last tribulation, so that they are not harmed, Op. 7:3, 9:4; He seals all believers with the H. Spirit, so that they, as heirs, are preserved for the future salvation, 2 Cor. 1:22, Ef. 1:13, 4:30; He seals the Christ by all kinds of signs as the giver of the food that remains unto eternal life, Joh. 6:27; He gives Paul in the blessing upon his labor a seal, a confirmation of his apostleship, 1 Cor. 9:2; He impresses his seal upon the building of the congregation as a pledge that it is his property, 2 Tim. 2:19. Seals therefore are always means to guarantee the genuineness of persons and things or also to preserve them against violation. Thus now [231] Abraham also received in the sign of circumcision a seal, that is, a confirmation, ratification, pledge of the

righteousness which he had by faith, Rom. 4:11. Sacraments are therefore, besides signs, also seals, attached by God to his word, in order to make it, of course not in itself for then it is firm enough as the word of God, but for our consciousness, gain in credibility, in reliability. Sign and seal in the sacraments, however, are not only the visible elements of water, bread, and wine, but the various ceremonial actions that accompany them also have signifying and sealing power. The sprinkling or immersion in baptism, the blessing, breaking, distribution, and receiving of the bread in the Lord's Supper are not arbitrary and indifferent customs, but they also constitute component parts of the sacraments, enable us the better to understand the promises and benefits of the covenant, and together with the elements form the sacraments into signs and seals of the invisible goods of salvation, Vitringa VI 352.

The materia interna in the sacrament, the invisible thing, which is represented and sealed in it, is the covenant of grace, Gen. 9:12, 13, 17:11, the righteousness of faith, Rom. 4:11, forgiveness of sins, Mk. 1:4, Mt. 26:28, faith and repentance, Mk. 1:4, 16:16, communion with Christ, with his death and resurrection, Rom. 6:3v., with his flesh and blood, 1 Cor. 10:16 etc. In summary one can therefore say, that Christ, the whole, rich, full Christ, according to his divine and human nature, with his person and work, in the state of his humiliation and in that of his exaltation, is the materia interna, the res coelestis, the thing signified in the sacrament. For this Christ is, with all his benefits and blessings, the mediator of the covenant of grace, the head of the church, the yea and amen of all the promises of God, the content of his word and testimony, the wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption of believers, the prophet, priest and king, in whom God alone communicates all his grace and who is

yesterday and today and eternally the same. Jesus Christ is the truth of the sacraments, without whom they would not be with all his would-be, Ned. Gel. 33, cf. conf. Belg. 34. 35. Cat. Heid. 67. Conf. Helv. II 19. Scot. 21. Westm. 27, 1. Calvin, Inst. IV 14, 16. 17. Synopsis pur. theol. 43, [232] 20. 21. Mastricht, Theol. VII 3, 7 etc. The Roman Catholics understand by the materia interna of the sacraments the sanctifying, i.e. the created grace added to nature, enabling it to do good works and once to be capable of the vision of God, which does not differ essentially from uncreated grace, that is from God himself, for properly God in every created grace gives himself, Heinrich-Gutberlet, Dogm. VIII 550 f., and they teach that that grace, as something thing-like, has entered into and is contained in the sign, is thus communicated with it ex opere operato, and is not to be obtained in any other way, namely by faith alone in God's word. Conc. Trid. VII can. 4 sq. The Lutheran dogmaticians in the first period called the two constituent parts of the sacrament verbum and elementum, and thus had the sacrament communicate the same grace as the word. But as a consequence of their doctrine of consubstantiation they gradually came, especially since Gerhard, to assume in the sacrament, alongside the word, still a materia coelestis. Through the word of consecration the element not only ceases, as the older dogmaticians said, to be an ordinary, external element, but it also takes up into itself a special, divine power, which is distinct from the word, is designated as materia coelestis, and works through the element as its medium and vehiculum. Therefore there arose a difference between the benefits of grace that were communicated through the word, and those which were communicated through the sacrament; in the Lord's Supper, after all, the very flesh and blood of Christ were enjoyed. Because, however, such a materia coelestis distinct from the benefits of salvation

could be indicated only in the Lord's Supper and not in baptism, Baier and others objected to speaking, with respect to the sacraments in genere, of a materia coelestis, Schmid, Dogm. d. ev. luth. K. 391 f. Yet more recent theology has repeatedly advanced such a conception of the sacrament and has so distinguished word and sacrament, that the first exercises a Person-, and the second a Naturwirkung; that the one is a means of the metanoetical and the other a means of the anagennetical working of the H. Spirit; that the word transforms the consciousness, but the sacrament changes the spirit, the I, yes the geistleibliche nature of man. All this, however, is in conflict with Scripture and an introduction of Roman error. The [233] sacrament bestows not a single benefit that is not also received from the word of God by faith alone. For, whoever believes, is born again, Joh. 1:12, 13, has eternal life, Joh. 3:36, is justified, Rom. 3:28, 5:1, sanctified, Joh. 15:3, Hd. 15:9, glorified, Rom. 8:30, has communion with Christ, Ef. 3:17, with his flesh and blood, Joh. 6:47v., with his Father, 1 Joh. 1:3, with the H. Spirit, Joh. 7:39, Gal. 3:2, 5 etc. The word contains all the promises of God, and faith accepts them all. The content of the word is Christ, the whole Christ, and this is also the content of the sacrament. There is not a single benefit of grace that is held back in the word and is now communicated to believers by a special way, through the sacrament. There is neither a separate baptismal, nor a separate supper grace. The content of word and sacrament is completely the same; both contain the same mediator, the same covenant, the same benefits, the same salvation, the same communion with God; they are even one in modus and instrumentum perceptionis, for also in the sacrament Christ is enjoyed not bodily but spiritually, not by the mouth but by faith. They differ only in forma externa, in the manner in which they offer us the same Christ. In a certain sense the word too is a sign and seal; a

sign that makes us think of the thing which it indicates; a seal, which confirms that which exists in reality. That holds in general for all word, but it holds in a special measure for the word of God; whoever denies that makes God a liar, 1 Joh. 5:10. But the word signifies and seals Christ to us through the sense of hearing; the sacrament signifies and seals Christ to us through the sense of sight. Together they offer Christ with all his benefits to us by way of the two higher senses which God has bestowed on man, without therefore the other senses, smell, taste and touch, being entirely excluded. From this difference in the manner in which they offer us Christ with his benefits there further follows that the sacrament is subordinate to the word; it is a sign of the content of the word; a seal, which God has attached to his testimony; a pillar, as Calvin says, which has been erected on the foundation of the word; an appendix, which is added to the gospel and appended to it. The word is thus something and much without the sacrament, but the sacrament without the word is nothing and then has no value or power of any kind; it is nothing less but also nothing more than a verbum visibile. All goods of salvation are to be obtained from the word and by faith alone, but there is not a single benefit that could be received from the sacrament alone without the word and apart from faith. The word therefore works and strengthens faith, it addresses both unbelievers and believers; but the sacrament says nothing and contains nothing for unbelievers, it is intended exclusively for believers, it can only strengthen the faith that is present; for it is nothing but a sign and seal of the word. Therein consists its only, but nevertheless also according to God's intention its sufficient value and power, to clarify and confirm the word and thereby to strengthen faith. In the struggle against Rome, maintenance of this agreement and of this difference between word and sacrament is of the

highest importance. Whoever determines both otherwise and ascribes to the sacrament another working of grace than to the word, divides Christ and his benefits, breaks the unity of the covenant of grace, materializes grace, makes the sacrament independent over against and above the word, reverses the relation of Scripture and church, makes the sacrament necessary for salvation and makes man dependent on the priest. Therefore the Reformed, just as also the Lutherans in the first period, did not tire of repeatedly bringing this correct, scriptural relation of word and sacrament to light and always anew arguing that the sacrament is subordinate to the word and that both serve to point our faith to the offering of Jesus Christ on the cross, as the only ground of our salvation. Cf. Luther bij Köstlin II 503. Symb. B. ed. Müller 202. 320. 487. 500. Heppe, Dogm. d. d. Prot. II 36. Calvin. Inst. IV 14, 3. 5. 6. 14. Cons. Tigur. bij Niemeyer 204. 206. Conf. Gall. 34. Belg. 33. Cat. Heid. 66. Helv. II 19. Polanus, Synt. VI 51. Mastricht, Theol. VIII 3, 11. Turretinus, Theol. El. XIX 3, 6.

5. The connection that exists between sign and thing signified was sometimes called forma sacramenti, sometimes also unio sacramentalis [235]. Against the latter designation Gomarus, Theses theol. disp. 31 § 36 not without reason raised objection; the relation, he says, that exists between sign and thing signified and in a certain sense unites both, nova et obscura phrasi, unio sacramentalis, Ubiquitariorum imitatione, non satis recta, vulgo nominatur. Quia res significata nobis verius unitur quam signis idque signis denotatur ac confirmatur, cf. also Heidegger, Corp. Theol. XI 58. Roman Catholics and Lutherans can to a certain extent at the Lord's Supper speak of a unio between the materia externa and interna in the sacrament, for they teach that the thing signified enters into the sign and is contained in it; they assume a physical, bodily, local union. But even on

their standpoint there is an objection; for among the Roman Catholics the sign changes into the thing signified, and thus no proper union is possible; and among the Lutherans the thing signified is indeed in, with, and under the sign and thus brought together with the sign in one and the same place and in one and the same space, but such a juxtaposition is nevertheless something quite different from a union. Furthermore, the unio sacramentalis in word and baptism and also in the other sacraments accepted by Rome bears a character so different from that in the Lord's Supper, that it will not do simply to speak in general of a unio sacramentalis. Much more objection, however, exists from the Reformed standpoint. Scripture calls the sacraments signs and seals and thereby indicates the connection that exists between materia interna and externa. No one will call the connection between a word and the thing that it indicates, between an image and the person whom it represents, between a pledge and that of which the pledge is, a union. And yet of that same kind is the relation which exists between sign and thing signified in the sacrament. It is no physical, local, bodily, substantial connection; the signs of water, bread, and wine are no miracula, medicamenta, ὀχηματα, vehicula, canales, causae physicae of the thing signified. But it is an ethical connection, a relation, completely like that between Christ and the gospel, between the benefits of the covenant of grace and the word of God that makes them known to us. Mastricht, Theol. VII 3, 8. Turretinus, Theol. El. XIX 4, 3. With the word that connection with the things that it describes is [236] given of itself. But with the signs in the sacrament this is not the case. Water, bread, wine are not by nature signs and seals of Christ and his benefits. No one could or might see that in them, if God had not expressly declared it. That does not mean that these signs have been chosen by God wholly arbitrarily from the visible things. On the

contrary, now that God has told us it in his word, we discover between sign and thing signified the most striking correspondence. Besides, it is the same God and Father who rules in the realm of nature and in the realm of grace; He created the visible so that we can understand the invisible from it; the natural is an image of the spiritual. But nevertheless a special word of God was necessary, in order to see in the signs of baptism and the Lord's Supper a representation of the spiritual goods of salvation. And this was all the more necessary, because water, bread, and wine not only represent grace but also seal it and thus in God's hand serve to strengthen our faith. In these two things, then, consists the forma sacramenti: in the above-mentioned relation between sign and thing signified (forma interna) and in the divine institution, which by the word lays such a connection between both. Bucanus, Instit. theol. 561. Junius, Theses theol. 49, 8. Maresius, Syst. Theol. XVIII 19. M. Vitringa VI 400.

In accordance with their doctrine of the unio sacramentalis, Roman Catholics and Lutherans ascribe to the word of institution a different power than the Reformed do. With them it must namely serve to change the sign into the thing signified or to carry the thing signified into the sign. It therefore has a consecratory and operative power, is directed more to the element than to the hearers, and for that reason in the Roman church is spoken by the priest in a mysterious, whispering manner and in the Latin language, Bellarminus, de sacr. I 19. But among the Reformed the word of institution, which is spoken by the minister, possesses no hidden, mysterious, magical power; it does not serve and need not serve to incorporate the thing signified into the sign; it is rather a verbum concionale seu praedicatum, which is spoken aloud to the congregation, which brings about absolutely no change in the sign, but only sets it apart from common

use for the consciousness [237] of the hearers and gives it hic et nunc a special destination, Calvijn, Inst. IV 14, 4. Turretinus, Th. El. XIX qu. 6. Without that word and outside the use, water, bread and wine are nothing but ordinary, daily food. Detrahe verbum et quid est aqua nisi aqua; accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum. Therefore the minister, even after he has spoken the word of institution, holds nothing but the sign in his hand, and nothing but the sign does he distribute to the believers. Only God has bound himself, in order, where the sacrament is administered according to his command, himself through his Spirit to grant the invisible grace. God and He alone remains the dispenser of grace, and the Christian, also with the sacrament, does not depend on the minister but on God alone and has everything to expect from Him. This dependence on God alone is by Roman Catholics and Lutherans changed into a dependence on the minister, and this latter is moreover at Rome still strengthened by the fact that in the ministers, when they hand out the sacrament, at least the intention is required to do, quod facit ecclesia, Trid. VII can. 11. In dogmatics this intention is extremely weakened; an intentio generalis, not to hand out this, but a sacrament, is sufficient, and also that intention need not be actualis but is already as virtualis sufficient. It is even not necessary to have the intention to do what the Roman church does; if a minister in the church at Geneva only has the intention to do what the church does which he holds for the true one, then he meets the requirement, and Rome recognizes the sacrament administered by him, Schwane, D. G. III 600. Bellarminus, de sacr. in genere I 27. Nevertheless the requirement of the intention, without further explanation, remains standing as an infallible pronouncement in the Tridentine canons and keeps the earnest Roman Christian in continual uncertainty. And when Calvijn in his Antidotum calls attention to this,

Bellarminus gives only in reply that people in this life do not need such an infallible certainty of their salvation, that a human, moral certainty is sufficient, and that this can be obtained sufficiently, even if one depends on the intention of the minister, cum habere intentionem sit facillimum, ib. 28. Cf. M. Vitringa VI 458 sq. [238]

Although the connection between sign and signified thing does not consist in a corporeal and local union of the two, it is nevertheless objective, real, essential. Roman Catholics and Lutherans, however, have a different concept of reality than the Reformed. If the signified thing is not physically united with the sign, they think that the connection of the two is not essential and that Christ with his benefits is not truly communicated and enjoyed in the sacrament. Yet the difference in the doctrine of the sacraments does not concern whether God truly communicates his grace, but the manner in which He does so. And the Reformed said: in a spiritual manner, because only thus is grace truly communicated and can be communicated. Physical communication of Christ and his benefits is in conflict with the nature of the Christian religion, with the essence of grace, with the nature of re-creation, and would, even if it were possible, nevertheless be of no avail, Joh. 6:63. But the spiritual manner in which, in the sacrament, Christ with his benefits is communicated, forms so little an antithesis with true reality, that it rather brings this about and guarantees it in the full sense. It is no different with the sacrament than with the word. In the word Christ is truly and essentially offered and bestowed upon everyone who believes. And just as really He is communicated to believers in the sacrament. The sacrament gives the same full Christ as the word and in the same, that is, in a spiritual manner through faith, even though the means is also different, audible the one time, and visible the other time. Therefore, in

Reformed theology the so-called phraseologia sacramentalis comes into its own just as well as in Lutheran and Roman Catholic theology. Scripture, namely, in order to indicate the relation which God has established between signum and signatum, sometimes designates the signified thing by the name of the sign, Rom. 2:29, or the sign by the name of the signified thing, Mt. 26:26, or also ascribes the property and operation of the signified thing to the sign, Hd. 22:16, 1 Cor. 11:24. For this manner of speaking detracts nothing from the fact that, also according to Lutherans and Roman Catholics, God is the proper dispenser and worker of grace in the hearts of men. And with this the Reformed agree wholeheartedly. Whether God communicates that grace in, with, under the sign, through the sign as a channel, or whether He [239] does it in connection with the sign, does not affect the reality of that communication itself. Also in Scholastic and Roman Catholic theology there was at all times difference over the manner in which the sacraments work grace. The Thomistic school ascribed to the sacrament a physical, the Scotistic a moral operation. According to Thomas and his followers God works through the sacrament in such a way that it itself in a physical manner causes grace in the recipient. According to Scotus, however, God had bound himself, upon completion of the sacramental act, to let grace follow, without therefore leading it through the sign as through a channel; he represented the sacrament as a confession of guilt, upon which the user receives grace from God. Rome thus does indeed teach that the sacrament works ex opere operato, but leaves open in what manner God, the causa principaliter efficiens, communicates grace through the sacrament as the causa instrumentalis, cf. Schwane, D. G. III 595. IV 363. Jansen, Prael. III 317. Even though the Reformed therefore reject the doctrine that grace is conveyed to us through the sign as a channel, they

have thereby in no respect done injustice to the truthfulness of the sacrament. Indeed, by that means they have maintained the spiritual nature of grace much better than Rome and Luther. For the rest, the manner in which God, in dispensing his grace, makes use of word and sacrament, remains a mystery. Scripture also says of the word of God that it creates and re-creates, regenerates and renews, justifies and sanctifies. But who describes in what manner God thereby makes use of the word and likewise of the sacrament?

6. In proportion as the relation of sign and signified thing is conceived differently, the power and the operation which are ascribed to the sacrament also differ. Since at Rome the visible sign has taken the invisible grace into itself, the sacrament works ex opere operato, without anything else or anything more being required in the recipient than the purely negative non obicem ponere, Trid. VII can. 6-8. Already Augustine had sought the difference between the sacraments of the O. and of the N. Covenant in this, that sacramenta novi testamenti dant salutem, sacramenta veteris testamenti promiserunt salvatorem, [240] Enarr. in Ps. 73, 2. Scholasticism developed this in such a way that the sacraments of the O. T., because they praefigureered the future Christ, had no power in themselves to communicate grace, but worked only out of and through faith. Under the O. Test. everything thus depended on the opus operans, i.e. on the believing subject that looked toward the future Christ. But with the sacraments of the N. T. it is otherwise; the sacrifice of Christ has been offered, and therefore the sacraments now work per se, propria virtute, ex opere operato. This latter expression, which was introduced into theology by William of Auxerre and Alexander of Hales, at first still formed no antithesis with the fact that in the recipient of the sacrament a certain dispositio was required,

—Thomas, e.g., still says that virtus sacramentorum praecipue est ex fide passionis Christi, S. Theol. III qu. 62 art. 5 ad 2—but indicated only that the N. T. sacraments had received their power from the accomplished suffering of Christ ad conferendum gratiam justificantem, Thomas, ib. art. 6. But the maintenance of this objective, causative character of the sacraments then naturally led to weakening the required dispositio in the recipient more and more and finally reducing it to the negative non obicem opponere. Formerly, with this expression, which already occurs in Augustine, Ep. 98, 9, one thought of a positive disposition, of a bonus motus inferior. But the N. T. sacraments worked ex opere operato and excluded, on the side of the recipient, all power and merit; a bonus motus, however, is according to Rome meritorious and therefore unnecessary for the sacrament; indeed even the seven praeparationes, which in adults precede baptism, still have a meritum de congruo and are therefore superfluous for the sacrament; the sacrament works grace in everyone who does not intentionally harden himself, who does not place a positive hindrance in the way, who relates himself to it negatively and passively, Schwane, D. G. III 581. Harnack, D. G. III 479 f. Bellarminus, de sacr. in genere II 1 sq. Simar, Dogm. 686. The grace that is communicated through the sacraments is the gratia habitualis, infusa, sanctificans, whether this, as in baptism, is bestowed for the first time, or, as in penance, renewed after loss, or also, as in the other sacraments, increased. From that is still distinguished the gratia sacramentalis, which [241] adds to the gratia sanctificans yet a divinum auxilium ad consequendum finem sacramenti, is different in the different sacraments, and enables one to attain that special end which is proper to each sacrament in particular, Thomas, S. Theol. III qu. 62 art. 2. And finally there are still three sacraments, baptism, confirmation, and ordination,

which, besides this grace, imprint yet a character indelebilis, Trid. VII c. 9. The church fathers already said that baptism was a spiritual sign and seal that was impressed upon the baptized person; just like a mark that is burned into a soldier's hand, which always makes him known and remains binding. Thus baptism also impresses a πνευματικη σφραγις, nota, character, which is never lost, Schwane, D. G. II 734. Scholasticism also brought this doctrine to further development. It defined the character as a habitus or virtus, which was impressed upon the soul and gave the human being right and power ad cultum divinum. For there were three sacraments which incorporated the human being into a different hierarchical status and made him irrevocably known as a member thereof before God, angels, and human beings. Baptism incorporates into the status fidei genitae, separates believers from unbelievers, and makes us conformed to Christ as our spiritual head; confirmation incorporates into the status fidei roboratae, separates the strong from the weak, and makes us into fighters under Christ as king; ordination incorporates into the status fidei multiplicatae, separates the priests from the laity and elevates them to conformity to Christ as high priest. It is a signum dispositivum, distinguitivum, configurativum, obligativum, which consecrates the human being to God, obliges him to his service, and is never, even in the lost, erased, Schwane, D. G. III 592. Thomas, S. Th. III qu. 63. Bonaventura, Brevil. VI 6. Bellarminus, de sacr. II 18-22.

This doctrine was unanimously rejected by the Reformation. For Scripture clearly taught that the sacraments are signs and seals of the covenant of grace, that they are intended only for believers and therefore always presuppose faith, Mk. 16:16, Hd. 8:37, 38, 9:11, 17, 18, 10:34, Rom. 4:11 etc. Only when faith is present are they means in God's hand to signify and

seal the invisible goods of grace, Hd. 2:38, 22:16, Ef. 5:26. Further, the [242] Scripture makes absolutely no distinction between the gratia sanctificans, which is bestowed in the sacrament, and a special gratia sacramentalis different from it; for the grace that is sealed in the sacrament is neither lesser nor also other than that which is bestowed through the word in faith and which consists first of all in forgiving grace, and thereafter also in sanctifying grace. And finally, there is not a word in Scripture about a character indelebilis, which is impressed by baptism, confirmation, and ordination; the texts, 2 Cor. 1:22, Ef. 1:13, 4:30, to which Bellarminus, t. a. p. c. 22 appeals, do indeed deal with a sealing of believers by the H. Spirit unto future salvation, but make mention of no sacrament to which that sealing is bound, nor of a separate habitus or virtus in which that sealing would consist. Even if it is therefore also true that God holds each one to and judges according to the measure of grace that has been bestowed upon him, yet thereby no juridical affiliation to the church of Rome or any other church has been impressed, Calvijn, Antid. 7, 9. The Lutherans later departed from their original standpoint indeed insofar as they had regeneration in children be effected by baptism and had unbelievers in the Lord's Supper partake corporeally of the flesh and blood. But yet they maintained thereby at all times that in adults faith was decidedly necessary for a salutary reception of the sacrament. Therewith the Protestants were confronted with the task of maintaining their objective, real character, in spite of the fact that the working of the sacraments depended on faith. Among the Roman Catholics and also among the Lutherans this character seems better preserved, because the working of grace is incorporated in word and sacrament. By contrast, the Reformed are apparently in a double difficulty. In the first place, they teach that grace is distributed by God not

per verbum et sacramentum but only cum verbo et sacramento. And in the second place they maintain that a vocatio externa unto salvation is insufficient, that with the calling by the word a calling by the H. Spirit must be added, and that thus per consequentiam the sacrament without more, without special working of the H. Spirit in the heart of believers, does not answer to its purpose. Yet thereby the reality and objectivity of the sacrament is not in the least annulled. [243] For 1o the bond between sign and thing signified in the sacrament is no other but also no lesser than that which exists between the word of the gospel and the person of Christ. Whoever receives the word in faith truly receives, according to God's promise, Christ as his portion; and likewise, whoever receives the sacrament in faith receives in that same way and according to that same promise of God the whole Christ with all his benefits and goods. Whoever, on the other hand, rejects the word through unbelief, thereby rejects Christ himself, even if he has heard the word and even accepted it historically; and in the same way, whoever despises the sacrament, thereby despises Christ himself; even if he receives the sign, he does not become partaker of the thing signified. One rule applies to both; objectively the bond for word and sacrament with Christ remains in existence; for that bond has been laid by God himself. He has said: if anyone receives my word and my sacrament in faith, he shall not perish unto eternity. 2o Roman Catholics and Lutherans assure to the sacrament no other, better reality than that which also belongs to it according to Reformed confession. For unto salvation nothing else but also nothing less and more is needed than the whole Christ, who is offered in word and sacrament and accepted by faith; and one can do nothing more dreadful than to reject that same Christ in and with the word and sacrament. Whether unbelievers then corporeally and locally in the signs of bread and

wine eat the very flesh and blood of Christ, does nothing to the objectivity of the sacrament, is wholly useless, and also does not serve to aggravate the judgment, for the moral rejection, i.e. unbelief, is the great sin. The grace of God in Christ is of a spiritual nature and can therefore be accepted only spiritually. 3o The Lutherans too do not dare, in adults, to abandon the requirement of faith for the reception of the sacrament. In children they, like the Roman Catholics, bring regeneration about through baptism, but children form a category of their own, which according to Reformed confession is in no respect in a less favorable condition than according to Lutheran and Roman confession. In adults, however, faith is required. And even the Roman Catholics require in that case that the recipient of the sacrament shall not place an obstacle in the way. According to both, therefore, the [244] sacrament does not work absolutely ex opere operato. There are cases in which the sacrament does not work, i.e. bestows no grace, and yet retains its objective character. Scholasticism still taught unanimously that qui sine fide vel ficte accedunt, sacramentum, non rem, suscipiunt, Lombardus, Sent. IV dist. 4. And Roman Catholic theology still always deals with the question whether the sacrament, which was first rejected by an obex, can also later still exercise its working, Schwane D. G. IV 371. Jansen, Prael. Theol. III 330. The working of grace does not, according to any confession, always accompany the sacrament simultaneously. And yet nevertheless the objectivity, and the bond of sign and thing signified, is maintained. 4o Roman Catholics and Lutherans finally stand before the same difficulty as the Reformed, that is, before the question when and in which case the sacraments provide salvation to the recipients and communicate grace to them. The question is the same as that which formerly presented itself with the calling through the gospel. There it

was answered in this sense, that with the vocatio externa a vocatio interna had to be added. And it is no different with the sacrament. The unio sacramentalis taught by Roman Catholics and Lutherans, however intimate it may be, is nevertheless not, without more, able to communicate grace, for then it would have to communicate it always and everywhere and in all cases. In adults something must be added on the side of the subject; the obex must be removed and faith must be put in its place. Objectively the sacrament is indeed sufficient; in the sacrament, just as really as in the word, the whole Christ is bestowed. But in the subject it is necessary that his understanding be enlightened, his will be bent, in order truly to understand and accept the sacrament. If one says that unbelief is the fault of the subject, then one speaks the truth, but one does not name the last and deepest cause of the distinction which is to be observed in the use of the sacrament, just as in the hearing of the word. And therefore the Reformed said that although Christ is indeed objectively, truly, and seriously offered to all users of the sacrament just as in the word to all who hear it, yet subjectively a working of the H. Spirit was necessary in order to enjoy the true power of the sacrament. Non omnibus promiscue, sed electis Dei tantum, ad quos interior et [245] efficax Spiritus operatio pervenit, prosunt signa, Cons. Tigur. bij Niemeyer 209. 5o For believers, for those who receive and enjoy the sacraments in faith, they are signs and seals of the covenant of grace. With a view to the many who receive the sacrament and yet do not believe, a distinction was already made by Gomarus, disp. de sacr. § 31. Essenius, Comp. Theol. dogm. XI 6. Kantt. op 1 Cor. 7:14, between an internal and an external covenant. And when the state of the church indicated more and more a separation and opposition between the two, this distinction gave rise to repeatedly renewed dispute. On the one

side it was asserted that in the O. T. an external covenant had existed but that now there was only an internal covenant (C. Vitringa, Labadie etc.); on the other side many said that even now an external covenant still existed, in which all who made confession were participants and had right and claim to the sacraments (Swarte, van Eerde, Janssonius). And between the two stood those who tried to unite external and internal covenant in a more or less successful way (Koelman, Appelius, Bachiene, Kessler), cf. Vitringa VI 361-398. In fact the older theologians and confessional writings know nothing of such a separation. Internal and external covenant are no more two covenants than invisible and visible church are two churches. And the sacraments therefore cannot be only signs and seals of an external covenant, to which also "unoffending ungraced persons" would have a right. They are not a confirmation only of the sententia of the gospel, that whoever believes will be saved, but they are for believers seals of the whole covenant of grace, of all its promises, of the whole Christ and all his benefits. They therefore assure not merely a general truth, but they are seals to the promise: I am your God and the God of your seed; they set before us, both that which God gives us to understand through his word and that which He does inwardly in our hearts, making salvation concise and firm, which He communicates to us, Ned. Gel. 33; they give us to understand them better and seal to us that God, on account of the only sacrifice of Christ, accomplished on the cross, grants us forgiveness of sins and eternal life by grace, Cat. Heid. 66v. Thereby it is not denied that those who receive the sacrament without faith would not enjoy some temporal fruit [246] thereof, for God is rich in mercy and bestows even many benefits upon those who reject his word and sacrament in unbelief, cf. part III 491v. But the full, true

fruit of the sacraments is, just like that of the word, only for believers. They are thereby assured of their salvation.

From all this follows the value of the sacraments. Necessary they are not in themselves, for God did not need to institute them; and his covenant and grace, his word and promise are, as those of a true God, firm enough, that they would have need of the confirmation of the sacraments, Calvin, Inst. IV 14, 3. 6. Necessary they are also not in an absolute sense unto salvation, for Scripture binds salvation only to faith, Joh. 3:16, Mk 16:16, and Roman Catholics and Lutherans, although apparently teaching the absolute necessity and therefore defending emergency baptism, do not maintain this in practice and say e.g. with Augustine, that in the case of the murderer on the cross the baptism of blood replaces the baptism of water. Not privatio but contemptus sacramenti makes guilty before God. But nevertheless the sacraments have great value. Because we are not spirits but sensible, earthly creatures, who cannot understand the spiritual otherwise than under sensible forms, God has instituted the sacraments, in order that we, by the seeing of those signs, would obtain a better insight into his benefits, would receive a more powerful confirmation of his promises, and thus would be supported and strengthened in our faith. The sacraments do not work faith, but they strengthen it, as the wedding ring love. They pour in no physical grace, but they bestow the whole Christ, whom believers already possess through the word, yet they bestow upon them that same Christ in another manner and along another way and strengthen faith. And furthermore they renew the believers' covenant with God, strengthen them in the communion of Christ, bind them together among themselves the more closely, separate them from the world, and testify to angels and men, that they are the people of God, the church of Christ, the communio sanctorum, M. Vitringa VI 422. 437.

7. The number of the sacraments is determined very differently, [247] according as the concept sacrament is taken in a narrower or broader sense. If, with Augustine, it is said: omne signum sacrum est sacramentum, the number is very greatly extended. And also if, with Calvin, under sacraments all those signs are understood which God ever gave to men, in order to assure them of the truth of his promises, Holy Scripture gives us a whole series of sacraments, Inst. IV 14, 18. The Reformed then also enumerated many, especially when later the doctrine of the covenants was worked out and every covenant and each covenant administration had to have the requisite number of sacraments. Thus one sometimes counted, in the covenant of works before the fall, although then properly speaking there could really be no question of means of grace, the sabbath and paradise, the tree of knowledge and the tree of life as sacraments. And in the Old Testament administration of the covenant of grace not only circumcision and passover, but frequently also the expulsion from paradise, the making of coats, the offering of Abel, the bow of Noah, the passage through the Red Sea, the manna, the water from the rock, the bronze serpent, Aaron's staff, Gideon's fleece, Hezekiah's sundial etc. were regarded as sacraments, Polanus, Synt. Theol. VI 50-54. Witsius. Oec. foed. I 6. IV 7. 10. Moor V 258-267. But when one had arrived at the N. Test. sacraments, one at once conceived the concept in a narrower sense and limited their number to two, although it is the case that Calvin still called the laying on of hands, Inst. IV 14, 20 and Luther and Melanchthon the absolution, Symb. B. ed. Müller 173. 202 sometimes still a sacrament. Rome, however, expanded the number of sacraments to seven and introduced alongside them still a great number of so-called sacramentalia. The distinction between the two consists in this, that the sacraments have been instituted by God, the sacramentals by

the church; the former work through the power granted to them by God, the latter through the intercession and blessing of the church; the first effect immediately man's inner sanctification, the latter contribute thereto only by the granting of subordinate graces and the preserving from temporal misfortunes; the sacraments are necessary by virtue of God's command, the sacramentals are recommended by the church as useful and salutary. To the sacramentals belong objects such as churches, altars, priestly garments, chalices, bells, water, oil, salt, bread, wine, palms etc., which are consecrated by the church and set apart for [248] religious use, and further the actions of exorcising and blessing, which the church employs, in order to withdraw things and persons from the evil influence of the devil and to transfer them onto the holy domain of the church. For Rome, indeed, creation is of a much lower order than re-creation; creation is nature, re-creation is grace, i.e. elevatio naturae; the world bears a profane character and moreover stands under the influence of Satan; all that therefore passes from the world into the service of the church must be withdrawn from the power of the devil and consecrated and blessed to the service of God. While thus the sacramentals form the great enclosure that separates the church from the world, the sacraments are the means by which God inwardly sanctifies the members of the church, imparts supernatural grace and makes them partakers of his nature. They are the means to redemption and elevation of the whole visible creation, which is represented in the four elements that they use, namely water, oil, bread and wine, and they are seven in number, because they, uniting the number of the Godhead with the number of the world, by supernatural grace sanctify the whole creation and consecrate it to the service of God. Baptism, instituted by Christ, Mt. 28:19, not only takes away all guilt and punishment of sin, but also delivers from

the stain of sin, implants the principle of grace and holiness, the germ of the new life through regeneration in the soul, and thus makes man a living member of Christ's mystical body and receives him into communion with the triune God. Just as Adam by the donum superadditum entered into a higher world, into the kingdom of grace, so the baptized person is raised into the state of supernatural holiness. But just as Adam had to preserve the bestowed grace by his free will, so also the Christian must by his free will appropriate to himself the grace of baptism. To grant him strength thereto, the second sacrament serves, confirmation or the rite of confirmation. The Roman Catholics cannot prove that Christ instituted this sacrament and commanded it to the apostles, but they must nevertheless believe this because the church says it, and therefore appeal to Hd. 8:15, 19:6, Hebr. 6:2, where there is only mention of extraordinary gifts of the H. Spirit, which were imparted by the apostles with laying on of hands, as is clearly evident from Hd. 8:18, 10:44, [249] 45 cf. 1 Cor. 14:1, 15, 37. Besides laying on of hands, the rite of confirmation further consists in anointing and in the pronouncing of a formula by the bishop, which is wholly unknown to Holy Scripture and was only gradually introduced into the church. According to Rome, this sacrament now grants to the baptized children, when they have come to the use of their reason, the power of the H. Spirit, in order to preserve the life of grace received in baptism and steadfastly to confess the faith with word and deed. This power of the new life is nourished and strengthened by the third sacrament, which is called that of the altar or of the eucharist, in which Christ himself with his divine and human nature is present, offers himself in an unbloody manner for sins and gives his true body and blood to the communicants to partake as nourishment of their soul. Because, however, the life of grace, given man's

weakness, can suffer damage and be lost through all manner of sin, Christ instituted a fourth sacrament, that of penance, in order to restore or renew his sanctifying grace. For the institution by Christ Rome appeals to the power which Christ granted to his apostles to forgive sins, Mt. 16:19, 18:18, Joh. 20:22, 23. Now this commission of Christ is indeed certain, but not a word is said that it bears the character of a sacrament; a sign is lacking in it and Rome knows nothing else to say than that contrition, confession and the disposition to make satisfaction are the sign in this sacrament of penance. The sacrament of penance has therefore with Rome become a tribunal, in which the priest judges the sins confessed in confession, according to the standard of the libri poenitentiales and, although absolving from guilt and eternal punishment, nevertheless makes one atone with all manner of temporal punishments on earth or in purgatory, which, however, can then again be remitted by indulgences. The sacrament of extreme unction does not serve for the healing of the sick, as the adduced proof-text Jak. 4:14 would lead one to expect, but for preparation of the dying person for death; the anointing with holy olive oil signifies the anointing of the H. Spirit, the communication of grace, which delivers the soul from its defects and grants the necessary strength for the last struggle. To these five sacraments there are then added still the sacrament of ordination, which distinguishes the priest [250] from the layman by an official gift of the H. Spirit and grants him the power to change in the mass bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ and to forgive the penitent sinner sins in Christ's name; and the sacrament of marriage, which, according to the word of Ef. 5:25, makes the married state into an image of the union between Christ and his church, to that end binds the married not only to one another by natural bonds but by supernatural grace and grants them the power to persevere in mutual

love unto death and to bring up their children in the fear of God. Cf. Lombardus, Sent. IV Thomas, S. Theol. III qu. 65 sq. Trid. Sess. 7. 13. 14. 21-24. Catech. Rom. pars II. Bellarminus, Controv. Tom. III etc.

From the Protestant side this set of seven sacraments has sometimes been excessively glorified, e.g. by Leibniz, Syst. der Theol. Mainz 1825 S. 195 f. Goethe, Aus meinem Leben II 179. Vilmar, Dogm. II 227. Bilderdijk, Opstellen I 61. Brieven IV 68. 174 V 42 etc. There even arose repeatedly here and there an endeavor to expand the number of sacraments and ceremonies and to enrich the Protestant churches with the symbolic rite of Rome. Yet there is no reason to be jealous of Rome's concept and number of sacraments. With all appreciation of the beauty that is expressed in it, for the Protestant Christian this is nevertheless already decisive beforehand, that for the five sacraments added by Rome to baptism and the Lord's Supper the scriptural proof is lacking. Sometimes this is candidly acknowledged from the Roman side. Thus, for example, Deharbe, Verklaring der Kath. Geloofs- en Zedeleer IV 174 says of confirmation, that we nowhere read that Christ instituted this sacrament or commanded his disciples to administer it. And this applies in the same measure to confession and extreme unction, to marriage and priestly ordination. But apart from this, what does Rome achieve with all these sacraments? It seems that the treasure and the distribution of grace in Rome is extraordinarily rich, but in fact it is so poor, that each time only a small part of sins and punishments is forgiven and can be forgiven and that each time a new sacrament is needed, to impart grace and to release from punishments. Yes, even if one has enjoyed baptism and the Lord's Supper, penance and extreme unction, [251] then after this life an expiation in purgatory still remains necessary. Sins and punishments are by Rome

divided and split so endlessly, that all the sacraments together with the indulgences added to them still cannot completely free from them. Over against this it indeed stands that the saints can bring it so far, that they even over-earn and increase the thesaurus meritorum. But that is exception; it is only possible for saints who, besides the praecepta, fulfill the consilia and lead an exclusively religious life, and provides for themselves no certainty or comfort. The ordinary Roman Christian, who lives in the midst of the world, is to an even greater degree in uncertainty; he remains, even after his death, standing over against God as over against a Judge, whom he must satisfy and whom he still has to reconcile by all kinds of acts of penance. His state of grace is never certain and fixed; always he is in fear whether he is indeed in it and will not fall out of it the next moment. And this uncertainty is not removed in the least by the fact that the sacraments work ex opere operato. For although baptism, confirmation, and ordination bestow a character indelebilis, the sanctifying grace which the sacraments communicate is nevertheless always again losable; its reception in penance, communion, extreme unction, marriage is dependent on a repentant disposition; and also, where it is bestowed, it does not free from all punishment; satisfactio operis always still remains necessary, even after this life in purgatory. And what sort of grace is it, which the Roman Christian receives in the sacrament? No grace of forgiveness and of adoption as children, but a grace which as a donum superadditum is added to nature, which never becomes one with the human being, and therefore either drives him into the monastery or in the world makes him lead a dualistic life. Over against that the Protestant Christian has enough in the word and in the two sacraments instituted by Christ. In them, if he accepts them in faith, he has the whole Christ, the full treasure of his merits, the perfect righteousness

and holiness, the unbreakable communion with God. From all guilt he is freed, from all punishment released. In baptism he is assured of that and in the Lord's Supper he is continually strengthened and confirmed in that faith. Thus he has no separate grace in confirmation, penance, and extreme unction any longer of [252] need, for through word, baptism, and the Lord's Supper he receives all grace which he needs in life and death, for time and eternity. His only comfort is that he is the property of Christ; in that comfort he lives, in that comfort he dies. Christ has accomplished everything for him; from him no penance or punishment is demanded, neither in this nor in the coming life. And all this grace which the Christian receives stands so little above nature or over against it, that it rather renews and sanctifies all that is natural. When he marries, he therefore has no new, sacramental grace of need, for marriage is holy by virtue of its origin, and thus does not need to be elevated above its institution but must only be restored and renewed in its natural ordering. Or if he desires an office of overseer, he is not incorporated by a sacramental grace into a special estate but is called from God's side to a service in his church and for that made fit by the same grace of Christ. In baptism and the Lord's Supper the Protestant Christian possesses infinitely more than the Roman in his seven sacraments; for it is not the number of sacraments that decides but the institution of Christ and the fullness of grace which he communicates in them. Cf. on the Roman sacraments: Calvin, Inst. IV 19. Chamier, Panstr. cath. Loc. IV lib. 4. Synopsis pur. theol. disp. 47. Turretinus, Theol. El. XIX qu. 31. Moor V 330 sq. Gerhard, Loc. XIX 60 sq. Hase, Prot. Polemik5 414 f. Tschackert, Evang. Polemik 67 f. etc.

§ 52. BAPTISM.

1. Baptism in the N. Test. was prepared in the days of the O. Covenant by circumcision, which was expressly prescribed by God to Abraham, Gen. 17:10v. According to Herodotus II 36. 104 circumcision also occurred among the Egyptians, Phoenicians and Syrians. The Reformed, e.g. Witsius, Aegypt. III 6, 11. 12, Marck, Med. Theol. 29, 8, did indeed attempt to refute this testimony or also to show that these peoples had adopted it from Israel. But this opinion is untenable. Among the Egyptians it was already in use in very ancient times, at least for [253] the priests. And more recent ethnological investigations have placed beyond all doubt in the light, that circumcision is a ceremony which occurs among numerous peoples in Asia, America, Africa and even Australia, Delitzsch on Gen. 17. Art. Beschneidung in Herzog3. Glassberg, Die Beschneidung in ihrer geschichtl. ethnogr. relig. u. medic. Bedeutung, Berlin Boas 1896. Just as God, in the institution of temple and priesthood, of sacrifice and altar, of laws and ordinances among Israel, attaches himself to existing usages among other peoples, so He also does with circumcision. He, as it were, takes it over, but

gives it another, a sacramental meaning. For among the peoples bodily circumcision did indeed occur, but there it by no means bore the character of a sacrament. It was also there often, as among the Egyptians, performed only on certain persons, and usually not in the first days of life but at a later age. But when God institutes circumcision with Abraham, then He commands that all that is male shall be circumcised, both the servant and the son of the house; that that circumcision must take place on the eighth day; and that it serves as a sign of the covenant, so that whoever does not receive it is a covenant-breaker and must be cut off from the midst of his people. Although circumcision may thus also be a sanitary measure, it nevertheless does not find its goal therein under Israel; here it extends to a sign and confirmation of the covenant of grace, whose one, great, all-embracing promise is: I will be your God and the God of your seed, Gen. 17:7. Specifically it is a seal of two benefits of that covenant, of the righteousness of faith, Rom. 4:11, and of the circumcision of the heart, Deut. 10:16, 30:6, Jer. 4:4, Rom. 2:28, 29, Col. 2:11, that is, of justification or forgiveness of sins and of regeneration or sanctification. Not that it bestows these benefits instrumentally, for outward circumcision without that of the heart is without value, Hd. 7:51, Rom. 2:28, 29; 3:21, 30, 1 Cor. 7:19, it is a seal of the righteousness of faith and thus presupposes faith. When the Jews more and more sought to set up their own righteousness from the law, they became, just as much as the Gentiles and in spite of their outward circumcision, condemnable before God, Rom. 3:21. Therefore God already before the public appearance of Jesus instituted through [254] John water baptism. This baptism too was not something new, any more than circumcision was in ancient times. All antiquity ascribed to water in religion a symbolic meaning. The water of Euphrates, Indus, Ganges had an

atoning, sanctifying power. Among Greeks and Romans, on all kinds of occasions, e.g. at initiation into the mysteries, washings were prescribed, Pfanner, Syst. Theol. gent. 346. Also among Israel, long before the divine institution of baptism, all kinds of washings were in use, Schürer, Gesch. des jüd. Volkes3 II 481, and for the proselytes, besides circumcision and sacrifice, a baptism was also necessary, in order to be received into the congregation, ib. III 129. But this baptism nevertheless becomes sacrament, sign and seal of grace only through the institution of God. The N. Test. accordingly also teaches expressly, that there went out a ρημα θεου to John to baptize, Luk. 3:2, 3, that God sent him thereto, Joh. 1:33, that his baptism was not ἐξ ἀνθρωπων but ἐς οὐρανου, Mt. 21:25, and that the publicans, who had themselves baptized, justified God, while the Pharisees and lawyers, refusing the baptism of John, rejected the counsel of God, Luk. 7:29, 30. With that baptism John preached to the Jews of his time, that they, though circumcised and baptizing the proselytes, themselves were guilty and unclean and had need of baptism, in order to enter into the kingdom of heaven. The baptism of John was thus an accusation against, a condemnation of the Jews, a preaching of their condemnableness, but —let it not be forgotten— it was also still something more. It was the incontrovertible proof that God had remembered his covenant and fulfilled his promise. Notwithstanding the Jews were guilty and unclean, there was nevertheless forgiveness with God; and this would now begin to reveal itself still more richly than in the days of the O. T. John the Baptist is therefore also not to be regarded as the last of the O. T. prophets, for all the prophets and the law have prophesied up to John, ἐως Ιωαννου, Mt. 11:13, but as the announcer of the coming kingdom of God, Mt. 3:2, as the preacher of the approaching gospel, Luk. 3:18, as the forerunner of Christ,

Mk. 1:2, as the witness of the rising light, Joh. 1:7, 29, 34, 36 cf. Mt. 3:11, Mk. 1:7, Luk. 3:16, Hd. 19:4, who presently makes room for the greater one and leads his disciples to him, Joh. 1:35v., 3:27v. With this [255] content of his preaching his baptism corresponds. It was a βαπτισμα μετανοιας εἰς ἀφεοιν ἀμαρτιων, Mk. 1:4, which does not mean that John's baptism only prepared for the forgiveness later to be received through Christ (Meyer), but very definitely, that he bestowed forgiveness in the way of conversion. For it is said in the same way in Hd. 2:38 of Christian baptism, that it took place εἰς ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτιων, because through baptism as sign and seal one obtains forgiveness. Further, Jesus himself was baptized with the baptism of John, makes absolutely no distinction between the baptism administered by his disciples and that of John, Joh. 3:22, 23, 4:1, simply takes over the disciples baptized by John, without rebaptizing them, Joh. 1:37, Hd. 18:25, and in Mt. 28:19 institutes no other or new baptism, but only extends it to all peoples. On these grounds, by Reformed, Calvin, Inst. IV 15, 7. 8. Mastricht, Theol. VII 4, 17. Turretinus, Theol. El. XIX 16, M. Vitringa VII 52 and Lutherans, Gerhard, Loc. XX 15 sq. 43 sq. in spite of a gradual difference, the essential identity of the Johannine and the Christian baptism was maintained. But this was contested by the Roman Catholics, Thomas, S. Theol. III qu. 66 art. 4. Trid. sess. VII can. 1. Bellarminus, de bapt. I 5, by the Anabaptists, Socinians, Arminians and by many more recent theologians, Schleiermacher, Chr. Gl. § 136, 1. Steitz in Herzog1 15, 468. Höfling, Das Sakr. der Taufe I 26 f. van Oosterzee, Dogm. § 87, 2 etc. There are also indeed weighty objections to be raised against the identity. In the first place, from Mt. 3:11, Mk. 1:8, Luk. 3:16 the objection is derived, that the baptism of John and Christian baptism stand over against each other as water-baptism and as Spirit- and fire-baptism. But Hd. 1:5 clearly

teaches, that John here sets his baptism not over against Christian baptism, but over against the figuratively so called baptism of the H. Spirit on the day of Pentecost. The proper Christian baptism is, after all, also a baptism with water, signifying the washing away of sins, and the baptism of John was likewise a baptism with water, but which at the same time sealed conversion and forgiveness. Both baptisms thus correspond entirely in sign and thing signified. Otherwise there would also follow from it the absurdity, that not only the baptism of John, but also the baptism which Jesus himself before Pentecost had [256] his disciples administer, would have been nothing but a baptism with water. And even the opponents of the identity of the baptism of John and of Christ do not dare to assert that. They usually say, that Christian baptism was instituted either already at Jesus' baptism by John or at the baptizing by Jesus himself through his disciples. But both baptisms, both that of Jesus and that of John, were distinct from that Spirit-baptism which would take place on the day of Pentecost, although they both also signified and sealed the same benefits of conversion and forgiveness of sins. But now again —and that is the second objection against the above-mentioned identity— the Spirit-baptism of the day of Pentecost is brought into connection with Christian water-baptism. According to Hd. 19:1-7, Paul at Ephesus encountered some disciples, who had been baptized εἰς το Ιωαννου βαπτισμα, who were called μαθηται and πιστευσαντες and yet had not received the H. Spirit and did not even know, εἰ πνευμα ἁγιον ἐστιν. Better instructed by Paul concerning the preaching of John, they had themselves baptized εἰς το ὀνομα του κυριου Ιησον, and had hands laid on them and thus received the H. Spirit and began to speak in tongues and to prophesy. From this latter it appears, that with πνευμα ἁγιον here, as likewise 8:15, 10:44, 11:15, 15:8, one must think of the gift of the Spirit of

glossolalia and prophecy; these the disciples in Ephesus had not received and they had not even heard of it. Baptism did not always give that gift, not only that of John did not but also not that of Jesus. For in Hd. 8:15 we read, that the believers in Samaria had indeed been baptized εἰς το ὀυομα του κυριου Ιησου, but had not yet received the H. Spirit, not one of them, and obtained him only through the laying on of hands of the apostles. And likewise Hd. 19:6 does not let this gift be a consequence of baptism but of the laying on of hands. But the strange thing in Hd. 19 is, that the disciples in Ephesus before this laying on of hands were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Paul therefore must not have recognized the baptism which they had received as a true, genuine baptism. They had been baptized εἰς το Ιωαννου βαπτισμα. The baptism of John was indeed good, for he baptized the baptism of conversion to faith in Christ. But among the disciples of John, who had remained with him and had not passed over to Jesus, all kinds of error had crept in, also concerning [257] baptism; and so the disciples in Ephesus had to be baptized not anew but for the first time in Jesus' name, for their baptism to the name of John was no true baptism, not the genuine Christian and also not the genuine, original Johannine baptism. Cf. Baldensperger, Der Prolog des vierten Evang. Freiburg Mohr 1898, who thinks that the whole prologue of Joh. 1 was written against these Baptists or followers of John the Baptist.

2. The divine institution of baptism thus already occurs with John, but Jesus, after having undergone it Himself, adopted it, had it administered by His disciples, Joh. 3:22, 4:1, and in Mt. 28:19 made it binding for all believers from all nations. The last passage is regarded by many as spurious, because in the apostolic time baptism still took place in the name of Jesus and the Trinitarian formula is of later date; and there are even those

who assert that Jesus did not at all institute baptism for His church. Against that, however, there are all kinds of objections. It is indeed not open to denial that Jesus Himself had the baptism of John administered to Him and thereby acknowledged it; He derives it, where He speaks expressly about it, from a command of God, Mt. 21:25. Nor is there any ground to deny that Jesus adopted baptism and administered it, if not Himself, then at least through His disciples, Joh. 3:22, 26, 4:1, 2, for Jesus appeared with the same preaching as John, namely of the nearness of the kingdom of heaven and set for entrance into it the same requirements, namely faith and repentance, Mk. 1:15; it therefore lay at hand that He, like John, had the baptism of repentance administered to everyone who wished to belong to the narrower circle of His disciples. In Joh. 3:5 there is indeed no mention of baptism, part III 501, but the passage nevertheless proves that the communication of the Spirit in the church was regarded as having its symbol in the water. In proportion as the opposition of the Jewish people to Him and His disciples became greater, an act of separation on the one hand and of reception into the church of Jesus on the other hand became all the more necessary. Baptism as incorporation into the Christian church must also have been willed and intended by Jesus Himself, because otherwise it would not be explicable [258] that it was introduced and applied at once, without any struggle, in all Christian churches, both in those from the Jews and from the Gentiles, Hd. 2:38, 41, 8:12, 13, 16, 38, 9:18 etc. Rom. 6:3-5, 1 Cor. 1:13-17, Gal. 3:27, Ef. 5:26 etc. In 1 Cor. 1:17 Paul does indeed say that Christ did not send him to baptize, but to proclaim the gospel. But this by no means proves that Paul esteems baptism lightly or considers it unnecessary; Rom. 6 and other passages teach quite otherwise. Jesus Himself, however, also did not administer baptism but had it administered.

And thus Paul also occupied himself chiefly with the preaching of the gospel and left the baptizing and other labors in the founding and the building up of the churches to his fellow workers.

Now baptism is indeed called in the earliest period a baptism ἐν τῳ ὀνοματι or εἰς το ὀνομα Ιησου, Rom. 6:3, 1 Cor. 1:13, Gal. 3:27, Hd. 2:38, 8:16, 10:48, 19:5, but by that it is absolutely not said that baptism was administered with that particular formula. For Paul says in 1 Cor. 10:2, that the Israelites were baptized εἰς τον Μωυσην, in 1 Cor. 1:13, that the believers at Corinth were not baptized εἰς το ὀνομα Παυλου, in 1 Cor. 12:13, that they were baptized εἰς ἐν σωμα, and in Hd. 19:3 the disciples at Ephesus said that they had been baptized εἰς το Ιωαννου βαπτισμα; in all which cases no one thinks of a formula that was pronounced at baptism. The expression: in the name of Jesus, is not intended as a formula, but is a description of the character of Christian baptism, Zahn, Einl. in das N. T. II 309. The Israelites, departing from Egypt, had themselves baptized in the cloud and in the sea εἰς τον Μωυσην, in relation to Moses, so that they acknowledged him as their savior and deliverer, placed their trust in him and allowed themselves to be led by him. The disciples at Ephesus had been baptized εἰς το Ιωαννου βαπτισμα and had thereby joined themselves to John. And so also Christian baptism is and is called a baptism in or into the name of Jesus, because it places the believers into his fellowship and directs all their trust to Him alone. This same thing is now also meant when Jesus says in Mt. 28:19 that his disciples must be baptized εἰς το ὀνομα του πατρος και του υἱου και του ἁγιου πνευματος. He does not here prescribe to the apostles what they must say in the administration of baptism, but what they must do; the [259] Christian baptism is and must be an incorporation into the fellowship with that God who has revealed himself as Father, Son,

and Spirit. The name designates God in his revelation, and the highest revelation of God consists in this, that He makes himself known and allows himself to be named as Father, Son, and Spirit, deel II 63v. Being baptized in that name therefore does not merely indicate that one is baptized by commission or command of God or as confession of his name; for the expression: in the name, can be interchanged with the person himself, as Paul also speaks of being baptized εἰς Χριστον, Rom. 6:3, Gal. 3:27. But it indicates that the person being baptized is placed in relation to and in fellowship with that God who has revealed himself as Father, Son, and Spirit, and is now on that ground also obligated to confess and glorify that name. Cf. Julius Böhmer, Das biblische „im Namen". Eine sprachwiss. Untersuchung über das hebr. בְּשֵׁם and seine griech. Aequivalente, Giessen Ricker 1898. Although Jesus, however, after his resurrection had described baptism as an incorporation into the fellowship with Father, Son, and Spirit, it lay at hand that in the earliest period it was mostly brought into connection with the person of Christ. In entering the church it depended first of all on conversion and on faith in Christ, in order in that way to obtain forgiveness of sins, and of that baptism was the sign and proof. Therefore baptism in the Acts is still, just as with John, called a βαπτισμα μετανοιας εἰς ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτιων, Hd. 2:38, 22:16. But in the earliest period there was still something else added. John and also Jesus himself had set this baptism of conversion over against the baptism of the Spirit, which would take place on the day of Pentecost. This baptism of the Spirit was absolutely not bound to water baptism, the baptism of conversion unto forgiveness of sins, for in Hd. 2:33 all the disciples receive that Spirit without baptism; in Hd. 9:17, 10:44 the gifts of the Spirit are already bestowed upon Paul, Cornelius and others before baptism, cf. 11:15-17; in

Hd. 8:1, 9:17, 19:6 glossolalia and prophecy are granted not by baptism but by the laying on of hands. But yet for those who stood outside, the baptism of conversion was the ordinary way by which they also could receive the gifts of the Spirit, Hd. 2:38, 19:5, 6. This connection, however, was temporary; glossolalia and prophecy were not the proper benefits [260] of baptism; Christian baptism remained essentially a baptism of conversion and of faith in Christ unto forgiveness of sins. Thus it is also everywhere understood and described in the N. T. Peter says in 1 Petr. 3:21, that, just as Noah and his were saved from death through the water that bore the ark, so believers are rescued from destruction through baptism; but that baptism must then be understood, not as σαρκος ἀποθεσις ρυπου, not as it outwardly causes us to put off the uncleanness of the flesh, but as συνειδησεως ἀγαθης ἐπερωτημα εἰς θεον, δι' ἀναστασεως Ιησου Χριστου, i.e. probably, the petition to God for a good conscience, freed from guilt, which baptism only is and can be through the resurrection of Jesus Christ as proof of our justification, Rom. 4:25. The same conception returns in the epistle to the Hebr.; this indeed counts the διδαχη βαπτισμων, i.e. not the doctrine of Christian baptism but of washings in general, of which a right view was urgently necessary for Jewish Christians, cf. 9:10, among the first principles of Christianity, but distinguishes in Christian baptism two elements: the washing of the body with clean water and the cleansing of the heart from an evil, accusing, conscience, 10:22, 23. From another side baptism is considered by Paul; he connects it not so much with justification as with sanctification. As descending into and coming up out of the water, baptism is an image and pledge of entering into fellowship with Christ, with his death and with his resurrection, Rom. 6:3-6, Col. 2:12. As many then as have been baptized into Christ, into his fellowship, have put on Christ,

appropriated Christ to themselves, so that they are now in Christ, belong to Him, Gal. 3:27-29, walk in newness of life, Rom. 6:4, 6v., Ef. 5:26, live to God, Rom. 6:11, 13, indeed carry the life of Christ himself within them, Gal. 2:20. And just as through baptism they have entered into fellowship with Christ, so also with his church, which is his body; they have all been baptized by one Spirit into one body, 1 Cor. 12:13, Rom. 12:5. Water baptism is with Paul at the same time Spirit baptism, but not a baptism with the spiritual gifts of glossolalia and prophecy, but with the Spirit as principle of the new life. Baptized people are new, spiritual people, πνευματικοι. But this renewal [261] of the human being by the H. Spirit in baptism does not stand apart alongside and does not come accidentally in addition to justification out of faith. They coincide; the Corinthians are at the same moment washed, sanctified, and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God, 1 Cor. 6:11, cf. deel III 531. In baptism all these benefits are joined together and bestowed upon the believers, which however does not take away that the Corinthians, in spite of their baptism, are still called by Paul σαρκικοι, νηπιοι ἐν Χριστῳ and are seriously warned against possible falling away, 1 Cor. 3:1, 3, 10:1-12. Cf. Bossert, Die Bedeutung der Taufe im N. T., Zeits. f. k. Wiss. u. k. Leben 1888 S. 339 f. Ehlers, Das N. T. und die Taufe 1890. Holtzmann, Neut. Theol. I 378 II 178.

3. A fixed doctrine about and a generally valid rite in baptism is not yet found in the ancient Christian church. But nevertheless Didache 7, 1 already knows the Trinitarian formula, while Hermas, Vis. III 7 still speaks of a baptism in the name of the Lord, or, Sim. IX 16, calls it a seal of the Son of God, which gives life. The effects of baptism are especially forgiveness of past sins and a new, supernatural, eternal life through the H. Spirit, Justinus,

Apol. I 61. Tertullianus, de baptismo 4. 5. Cypr. de grat. 3. 4. Greg. Naz. Or. 40, 3 sq. Although it is clearly said that the water in baptism retains its nature, the connection of sign and thing signified is conceived mystically; εἴ τις ἐστιν ἐν τῳ ὑδατι χαρις, οὐκ ἐκ της φυσεως ἐστι του ἰδατος, ἀλλ' ἐκ της του πνευματος παρουσιας, Basil. de spir. sancto c. 15. Λι' ἐκεινου του ἰδατος ἡ θεια χαρις την αἰωνιον δωρειται ζωην, Theodoretus, qu. 26 in Gen., in Suicerus s. v. βαπτισμα, cf. Tert. de bapt. 4. Baptism is therefore also designated with all kinds of names borrowed from the mysteries, φωτισμος, μυστηριον τελετη, τελειωσις, μυησις, μυσταγωγια, and is regarded as ὀχημα προς οὐρανον, ὀχημα προς θεον, κλεις οὐρανων βασιλειας, Schwane, D. G. II 735. Hatch, Griech. u. Christ. 219. Suicerus s. v. And when since the second century the religious service split into a public and a private part, the administration of baptism and the Lord's Supper assumed more and more a mysterious character intelligible only to the initiated. Preceded by the catechumenate, the [262] baptism itself was surrounded with all kinds of symbolic actions, such as the presentation of the person to be baptized by sponsors, the laying down of confession, the blowing on the face and the marking with the cross, the placing of consecrated salt in the mouth of the person to be baptized, the exorcism, the three-times repeated immersion or sprinkling, the anointing with the chrism, the giving of a new name, the hanging on with a white garment, the handing over of a burning candle, the reception into the congregation, the brotherly kiss, and sometimes immediately thereafter the celebration of the Lord's Supper, Suicerus s. v. Moeller-von Schubert, Kirchengesch. I2 339, cf. Catech. Rom. II 2 qu. 45 sq. Bellarminus, de bapt. c. 24-27. While thus in the apostolic time baptism followed immediately upon conversion and was administered in the simplest manner, Hd. 2:38, 41, 8:12, 36, 10:47 etc.,

from the second century onward it was enveloped in an always more expanding ritual and transformed into a magical and mystical means of grace. Even Augustinus promoted the development of the doctrine of baptism in this spirit, even if it is also the case that with adults he required preceding faith and conversion for a salutary working of baptism. For in the first place he says that baptism gives the forgiveness of sins and regeneration only within the church; the sacrament is a sacrament of Christus and given by Him to His church; heretics and schismatics can indeed take it along outside the church, but then it is a stolen and unlawfully possessed good and therefore exercises no salutary effect, but tends ad perniciem, de unit. eccl. 68 de bapt. 3, 13. 5, 7 sq. In the second place he seems with children to teach a salutary working of baptism ex opere operato; children dying unbaptized are lost, de anima I 9. III 12. de pecc. mer. I 20. de nat. et gr. 8., but with those who are baptized, baptism itself or the intercession of the church or the faith of the parents replaces the faith that they themselves cannot yet exercise, de pecc. mer. I 19. 34 sq. And in the third place Augustinus ascribes to baptism in any case the working of a character indelebilis, by which the baptized belong by right to Christus and His church and, if need be, may be brought back under her care with coercion, de bapt. V 21 VI 1. c. epist. Parmen. II 16, cf. Dorner, Augustinus 248 f. Schwane, D. G. II 744 f. Harnack, D. G. III 143 f. Scholasticism at first indeed still remained with Augustinus and acknowledged that [263] baptism with adults presupposed faith and also was not absolutely necessary for salvation. But it nevertheless moved more and more in this direction, that it let the sacrament work ex opere operato, and caused the subjective requirements to lose significance more and more, Lombardus, Sent. IV dist. 3-6, Thomas, S. Theol. III qu. 66-71. Bonaventura, Brevil. VI

7. Schwane, D. G. III 605-622. Harnack, D. G. III 478 f. Thus the doctrine of baptism at Rome was prepared, which in brief comes down to this: baptism is the first sacrament, the door to spiritual life, the entrance into the church; it gives the first supernatural grace, which is presupposed and increased by the other sacraments and is therefore absolutely necessary for salvation, except in a few cases in which it can be replaced by a baptismus sanguinis or flaminis (voti). It must therefore also be administered as soon as possible and in case of necessity by laymen or non-Christians. Through that baptism, namely, are communicated: 1o the character indelebilis, which brings someone under the jurisdiction of the church, 2o the forgiveness of all sins, both original and actual sins, which have been committed before baptism, and remission of all eternal and also of all temporal punishments, insofar as they are opera satisfactionis, but not insofar as they are natural punishments of sins, 3o the spiritual renewal and sanctification of the human being, through the infusion of sanctifying grace and the supernatural virtues of faith, hope, and love, so that the stain of original sin is entirely done away with and only the concupiscentia, by nature proper to the human being as a physical being, remains, which however in itself is no sin but can indeed become an occasion for sinning. 4o The incorporation into the communion of saints and into the visible church of believers. These effects baptism exercises by the fact that, under the pronouncing of the well-known formula, the word of God or the power of the H. Spirit in a mysterious manner connects itself with the water and makes this into an aqua viva et efficax, into a uterus maternus of the new human being. In fact, then, by the sacrament of baptism are regenerated not only all children, but also all adults who have satisfied the seven praeparationes and do not place an obex in the way. Cf. Conc. Flor. in Denzinger n. 591. Trid. VI 4. VII de bapt. XIV

de poenit. 2, Cat. Rom. II 2. Bellarminus, de sacr. bapt. c. 1-27. Oswald, [264] Die dogm. Lehre v. d. h. Sakr. I2 141 f. etc., and for the doctrine of the Greek church, Damasc., de fide orthod. IV 14. Conf. orth. qu. 102. 103. Conf. Dosith. decr. 16. Kattenbusch, Vergl. Conf. I 400 f.

4. The struggle which the Reformation began against Rome's doctrine of the sacraments did not concentrate on baptism but on the Lord's Supper. The German Reformers were even of the opinion that baptism in the papacy had been preserved fairly well unscathed and therefore adopted it with slight modification. Many ceremonies which had gradually been added to baptism also remained in use among the Lutherans, such as naming, the sign of the cross, exorcism, sponsorship, laying on of hands, white clothing, blessing, etc. Furthermore, Luther taught in his two Catechisms and in the Smalc. articles that the word of institution made the water of baptism into a divina, coelestis, sancta et salutifera aqua; indeed he rejected the opinion of Thomas and the Dominicans, who failed to acknowledge the word of institution and had God communicate a virtus spiritualis to the water; but he nevertheless assumed an objective, real union of the word and the water; baptism is verbum Dei cum mersione in aquam, aqua divino mandato comprehensa et verbo Dei obsignata; the water in baptism is, as Luther expressed it elsewhere in his Sermon von der Taufe, durch die göttliche Majestät ganz durchgöttet, as iron is heated by fire. Later dogmaticians elaborated this and taught that through the word of institution the materia coelestis, i.e. tota trinitas or sanguis Christi or Spiritus sanctus, so united itself with the materia terrestris, i.e. the water, that God in, cum and per aquam baptismi, non seorsim et actione peculiari sed conjunctim cum aqua baptismi et per eam, una atque indivisa actione worked regeneration. And finally, Luther in the first period did indeed always let the salutary working

of baptism depend on the faith with which the benefits of baptism were accepted, but later he placed more and more emphasis on the objective character of baptism, and no longer said that children are believers or can be believers, but let infant baptism rest solely on God's command. The Lutherans therefore later taught that the salutary working of baptism in adults does indeed depend on faith, at least [265] on a passiva capacitas, and thus, if faith is present, consists in obsignatio and confirmatio; but in children baptism works regeneration, it is medium ordinarium regenerationis et mundationis a peccatis, yet always in such a way that indeed the guilt and power but not the entire stain of sin is removed; the radix aut fomes peccati remains. Cf. Symb. B. ed. Müller 30. 40. 163. 320. 361. 384. 485. 768. 780. Luther in Köstlin, Luthers Theol. II 507 f., and Harnack, D. G. III 748. Melanchton, Loc. de baptismo. Gerhard, Loc. XX. Quenstedt, Theol. IV 106-176. Hollaz, Ex. theol. 1077-1103. Schmid, Dogm. d. ev. luth. K. § 54. The Reformed, however, rejected not only most of the ceremonies which had gradually become connected with baptism and returned to the simplicity of Holy Scripture. But they also proceeded from the thought and tried to hold fast to it, that baptism was instituted for believers and thus did not work faith but strengthened it. Thereby, with infant baptism they came to face a double difficulty. First, especially over against the Anabaptists but then further also over against Roman Catholics and Lutherans, they had to show that the children of believers were already to be regarded as believers even before baptism and as such ought to be baptized. And second, they were obliged to give an answer to the question in what the gracious working of baptism in children consisted, since they, not yet having come to their understanding and thus not yet possessing the fides actualis, could also with difficulty be strengthened and confirmed in

this faith. To the latter question, however, usually little attention was devoted; one generally confined oneself to saying that baptism was for the parents a proof that their seed had been taken up into God's covenant, for the children later, as they grew up, a rich comfort and blessing, and also already in their unconscious state gave them a right to the goods of the covenant of grace, Witsius, Misc. Sacra II 648-667. The first question, however, was from the beginning answered very differently. For the right of infant baptism one appealed unanimously to Holy Scripture, specifically to its doctrine concerning the covenant of grace. According to the rule of that covenant the children and also the adults had to be judged; faith and conversion give no right to baptism, but only the covenant. The [266] children, born of believing parents, were not heathen children, did not lie under the wrath of God, did not live under the power of Satan, so that an exorcism first had to take place with them. But they were already before baptism children of the covenant; baptism was therefore also not absolutely necessary to salvation, and there was no need for emergency baptism. As soon, however, as one reflected on what this inclusion of the children in the covenant of grace implied, one diverged. There were those who wished to hold fast to the unity of election and covenant as long and as closely as possible; they therefore asserted that all children, born of believing parents, according to the judgment of love had to be held to be regenerated, until they clearly manifested the contrary in doctrine or life, or that at least the elect little children as a rule had already been regenerated by God's Spirit before baptism or even before birth, a Lasco, Ursinus, Acronius, Voetius, Witsius e. a. But others, paying attention to the objections of practice, which so often teaches that baptized children grow up without showing any sign of spiritual life, did not dare to make this regeneration before baptism a

rule. They all without exception did indeed acknowledge that God's grace is not bound to the means and can also work regeneration in the heart of young children, but they left it undecided whether that regeneration in the elect little children takes place before or under or also, sometimes even many years, after baptism, Calvijn, Beza, Zanchius, Bucanus, Walaeus, Amesius, Heidegger, Turretinus e. a. This conception gained the upper hand when the church, through neglect of discipline, came to decline. Election and church, the inner and outer side of the covenant, formerly connected as much as possible but since Gomarus more and more distinguished, fell ever further apart; in the ecclesia an ecclesiola formed itself. Baptism was therefore gradually entirely detached from regeneration, and, because one nevertheless wished to maintain it for the children, conceived and justified as a sacrament of the church and pledge of the seed of believers in general, or as a confirmation of the objective, conditional promise of the gospel, or as proof of communion with the external covenant of grace, or as a guarantee of a losable regeneration, not indissolubly connected with salvation, and later to be confirmed by personal faith, [267] or as a means of education that urges the baptized at a later age to sincere conversion. Cf. Voetius, Disp. II 408 sq. Witsius, Misc. Sacra II 611-618. G. Kramer, The connection of baptism and regeneration, Breukelen 1897. The struggle thereby flared up again and again on the point of the baptismal form. Some understood the expression: to be sanctified in Christ, of the inner renewal by the Holy Spirit and therefore had an objection to putting this question of the baptismal form to parents who did indeed still present their child for baptism but otherwise cared neither for God nor for his command; under pietistic influence they attached less and less value to the external baptismal act, pressed for personal conversion, and withdrew into the narrow circle of

the conventicles, Lodenstein, Gentman, Koelman, Brakonier, van de Putt, Kelderman, Vos e. a. in Proost, Jod. van Lodenstein 1880 p. 160. 229. Ypey and Dermout, Hist. of the N. H. Church III 261-263. Ypey, Hist. of the Chr. Church in the eighteenth century VI 164. M. Vitringa VII 108. 115 sq. Moor V 489. Others understood the expression in an objective, covenantal sense, saw in baptism nothing more than a sign of the external covenant, to which a historical faith and an unoffending life gave sufficient right, Ostervald, Comp. Theol. II 6, 4, 4. Vernet, Christ. Instruction 300. and especially Janssonius and van Eerde against Appelius, cf. M. Vitringa VI 426 sq. 498 sq. VII 125 sq.

Thus in the Reformed churches themselves baptism was almost wholly deprived of its value and in fact that doctrine of baptism was introduced which in the century of the Reformation had already been professed by Socinians and Anabaptists and later by Remonstrants and Rationalists. For these, in spite of all mutual difference, agree in this, that baptism has value not as a seal of grace on God's side but in the first place as an act of confession on man's side. Baptism effects nothing and gives nothing, but is only a symbol of the transition from Judaism and Heathendom to Christianity, a sign of faith and conversion, a promise of obedience and therefore either not at all instituted by Christ as a permanent sacrament or in any case for children at most permitted and useful, but not necessary and commanded; the Quakers even went so far that they wholly rejected water-baptism and [268] acknowledged only the baptism of the Spirit, and the Rationalists disputed about whether baptism, which after all was no more than a solemn symbol, could not better be abolished, cf. M. Vitringa VII 297-415. Strauss, Dogm. II 549-558. Wegscheider, Instit § 171. 172. Kant, Religion ed. Rosenkranz 233. Modern Protestantism still stands on this

standpoint and makes baptism optional, Scholten, Initia 247, Ehlers, Das N. T. und die Taufe, Giessen 1890; and with many others the disparagement of the sacrament continues to have its effect in this, that the centre of gravity is shifted from baptism to the later following, ever more solemnly arranged acceptance and confirmation of members. But over against that, in this century from various sides an attempt was again made to maintain the objective character of baptism. Schleiermacher did indeed see in baptism first of all an act of the church, by which it receives the believer into its fellowship, but then subsequently at the same time therein an admission into the communion of life with Christ, Chr. Gl. § 136-138, cf. Schweizer, Chr. Gl. § 171. Lipsius, Dogm. § 846. Others again placed the act of grace of God in the sacrament in the foreground and taught that baptism does not presuppose regeneration but nevertheless bestows the power of regeneration or this itself, is a point of attachment of the bond of love on Christ's side and lays the foundation for all later benefits, however then to be obtained only in the way of faith, Philippi, Kirchl. Gl. V 2, 83 f. Kahnis, Luth. Dogm. II 333. Dorner, Chr. Gl. II 832. Frank, Chr. Wahrheit II 266 f. Althaus, Die Heilsbedeutung der Taufe im N. T. Gütersloh 1898. H. Cremer, Wesen und Wirkung der Taufgnade, ib. 1899. W. Schmidt, Dogm. II 461. Oosterzee, Dogm. § 138 9v. Many Lutherans even returned to the old doctrine, that the H. Spirit in and through the water of baptism works regeneration and let this consist not only in a spiritual renewal but also in the implantation of a heavenly corporeality, Vilmar, Dogm. II 233. Martensen, Dogm. 398 f. Höfling, Das Sakrament der Taufe I 17 f. Thomasius, Christi Person u. Werk II 297 f. In England Tractarianism appeared with the doctrine of a baptismal regeneration, consisting therein that the children through baptism were so renewed that they later could

independently accept grace through faith, Newman, Lectures on Justification 1838, Waterland, Works, Oxford 1843 [269] IV 425-458 cf. Hodge, Syst. Theol. III 591-604 and Cunningham, Historical Theol. II 133-142. Ryle, Knots untied, 11th ed. London Hunt 1886 p. 105-196. In this country Dr. Kuyper attempted to maintain the objective character of baptism, by ascribing to it a special grace. This does not consist in regeneration, which is presupposed at baptism and thus no longer needs to be bestowed, but in a special benefit otherwise not to be obtained, viz. in incorporation into the body of Christ, or rather in the implantation in our faith of the habitus or the impulse, not to stand on ourselves, but to feel ourselves one with the whole body of Christ, Heraut 646v.

5. Most churches nowadays know baptism almost in no other form than as infant baptism. Except in the field of missions and in the Baptist associations, the baptism of adults occurs only as an exception. Yet in Scripture the reverse is the case; of infant baptism it nowhere speaks in so many words, it always proceeds from the baptism of the aged; and the Christian confessions and theologians have also always followed it therein, insofar as they took the baptism of adults as their point of departure and only thereafter proceeded to infant baptism. This baptism was now instituted by God's command by John and thereafter by Jesus, because the whole world was condemnable before God. That applied not only to the Gentiles, but also to the Jews, who after all sought to establish their own righteousness out of the works of the law and therefore did not come to the law of righteousness, Rom. 9:31. Already the prophets proclaimed, indeed, that God, who is faithful and remembers his covenant, would in the future give to Israel conversion and life, a new heart and a new spirit, forgive them all sins, pour out his Spirit upon them, sprinkle clean water upon them and

cleanse them from all uncleannesses, Hos. 6:2, Joel 2:28, 29, Mich. 7:18-20, Jes. 1:16, 40v., Jer 31:31-34, 33:8, Ezech. 11:17-20, 36:25-28, 37:1-14, 39:29, Zach. 13:1 etc. Regeneration, conversion, faith was necessary, for Israel as well as the Gentiles, in order to enter into the kingdom of heaven and to obtain a share in its goods. John and Jesus appeared with that preaching, and those who accepted it were baptized. [270] The offering and the acceptance of the word of the gospel thus preceded baptism. Scripture leaves not the slightest doubt about it, that baptism is instituted exclusively for believers. No other persons are baptized than those who make confession of their sins and give proof of conversion and faith, Mt. 3:2, 6, Hd. 2:37, 38, 8:12, 37, 18:8; baptism is therefore called a baptism of conversion, in order that in that way one may obtain the forgiveness of sins, Mk. 1:4, Hd. 13:24; in Mt. 28:19 the two participles βαπτιζοντες and διδασκοντες do indeed indicate the way in which the μαθητευειν παντα τα ἐθνη must be accomplished, but the baptizing in the name of the Father, of the Son and of the H. Spirit precisely presupposes the preceding preaching of and the faith in that name, as this is also clearly expressed in Mk. 16:15, 16 and in Joh. 4:1 the making of disciples precedes the baptizing; they are children of God through faith in Christ Jesus, who through baptism have put on Christ, Gal. 3:26, 27. As long as there is talk of the baptism of adults, there is on this point no difference among the Christian churches; not a single church baptizes an adult without prior instruction in the truth, without a confession of faith previously made. Even Rome acknowledges that in the adult the seven praeparationes must precede baptism, and makes not the objective validity but yet the subjective operation of an intentio virtualis as conditio sine qua non dependent in the recipient, Trid. VI c. 5. 7. Catech. Rom. II 2 qu. 30. 44. But Rome has more and more weakened these

subjective conditions in the recipient, and shifted the center of gravity from the word and faith into the sacrament; this sacrament, indeed, works ex opere operato, without demanding anything else in the recipient than a negative obicem non ponere; just as the sins, the benefits of grace are by Rome endlessly split, distributed in bits and pieces here and hereafter; it is always the same idea of hierarchy, which here in the doctrine of grace, as everywhere else, makes its influence felt. Therefore Rome also teaches that preaching and faith have only praeparatory significance; the proper, sanctifying, supernatural grace is communicated only by the sacrament of baptism, which therefore, except in a few cases in which it is replaced by the baptismus sanguinis or flaminis, [271] is absolutely necessary for salvation for all people, adults and children. The Reformation, over against that, has set this Scriptural principle, that the sacrament does not communicate and cannot communicate any single benefit which the believer does not already possess through his trust in the word of God. Faith alone, abstracted from every sacrament, places one in the possession and enjoyment of all the benefits of salvation. If now baptism presupposes this faith, there remains not a single benefit any longer that could still be communicated to the believer by baptism. Baptism can do no other than signify and seal the benefits that have been received by faith and thereby strengthen faith, Ned. Gel. art. 33. 34. Heid. Cat. qu. 69. The Lutherans also assent to this for the baptism of adults, who are previously regenerated and made confession of their faith; just as faith and the gift of the H. Spirit through the preaching of the word is increased in the regenerated, ita quoqae idem fit per baptismum, quin et baptismus donum regenerationis in illis efficaciter obsignat, Gerhard, Loc. XX 123. Quenstedt IV 145. Schmid, Dogm. d. ev. luth. K. 400. 407. A Protestant principle is also at stake here;

whoever ascribes to baptism a communication of grace which cannot be obtained through the word and faith, opens the door for the Roman doctrine of the sacraments.

The form of baptism consists in a connection, established by God, between a visible sign and an invisible spiritual good. As sign, water serves, Mt. 3:6, Hd. 8:36, which has been chosen not accidentally or arbitrarily but on account of its striking correspondence with the thing signified. What the unclean, polluting, and suffocating substance is for the body, that sin is for the soul; and just as water washes away the uncleanness of the body, so the blood of Christ cleanses from all sins. Therefore, among almost all peoples and in all religions, water has a rich, symbolic significance; serving in all kinds of washings, it foreshadowed the spiritual cleansing which every human being needs, in order to live in communion with God; in the Old Test. worship water occupied a broad place, Ex. 30:18-20, 40:30, Lev. 6:28, 8:6, 11:32, 15:12, Num. 8:7, 19:7v. etc., and the prophets represented the spiritual cleansing of the people as a sprinkling with water, Ezech. 36:25, [272] 37:23, Zach. 13:1. Of itself and by nature, i.e. by virtue of the nature which God gave it at creation, water is thus eminently suited, in baptism, to depict and to assure the washing away of sins and spiritual renewal. Therefore it is also not necessary, as Rome asserts, that the baptismal water be previously consecrated on Easter or Pentecost Saturday and mixed with oil, Catech. Rom. II 2 qu. 47. Much less may, with the Paulicians, the use of water be omitted, because Christ is the living water, or, with other sects, baptism be replaced by branding a mark or by scourging unto blood, Moor V 409-411. It is even superfluous, with Beza and others, to concede that, if water is lacking, another liquid may be used, for such a case is as good as impossible, M. Vitringa VII 14. In the earliest period the act of baptizing

consisted in this, that the person to be baptized was immersed in the water and after a moment was drawn up out of it again. The Greek word βαπτιζω already points to that, for it literally means to dip, to dip into, Joh. 13:26, and also, when it is used in a broader sense for washing, Mt. 15:2, Mk. 7:4, Luk. 11:38, Hebr. 9:10 or figuratively, Mt. 3:11, 20:22, Hd. 1:5 etc., it indicates such an act, in which the person or thing that is baptized is wholly immersed and cleansed. Further, the cases which Scripture relates clearly show that baptism in the apostolic time took place by way of immersion, Mt. 3:6, Joh. 3:23, Hd. 8:38. And finally the phraseologia sacramentalis is wholly built upon this manner of administering baptism, Rom. 6:3, 4, Gal. 3:27, Col. 2:12. For centuries, therefore, the immersio also remained in use in the Christian church; the Greek church still adheres to it, sprinkling (adspersio) or rather pouring (infusio) occurred in ancient times only when there was not enough water, Didache c. 7, or when the sick had to be baptized on their bed (baptismus clinicorum); Cyprianus, Ep. 69, 12, defended in this latter case the adspersio or perfusio with appeal to Ezech. 36:25, but otherwise the church fathers always speak of baptism as of an immersion in the water, Suicerus, s. v. ἀναδυω. Pope Stephanus II in 754 permitted baptism per infusionem in case of necessity for children and the sick, but [273] a council of the year 816 still prescribed to the priests, ut non effundant aquam super capita infantium sed semper mergantur in lavacro. Thomas said, tutius est baptizare per immersionem, quia hoc habet usus communis, S. Theol. III qu. 66 art. 7. The Council of Ravenna 1311 left the choice between immersio and superfusio free. Up to the 13th century, therefore, in the West immersion still occurs alongside sprinkling; then, however, the latter becomes more and more general. When in Christianized Europe adult baptism became the exception and infant baptism the rule,

there came, not from dogmatic but from hygienic considerations, also a change in the manner of administering baptism; children were in a certain sense all in infirmitate positi. The Reformers joined this usage; Luther gave preference to immersion, Calvin held the question to be an adiaphoron, but the Anabaptists made a principle of it and therefore returned to the immersio. And this is what alone ought to be opposed. There is no doubt that immersion was formerly generally in use, is still permissible, and also brings out the rich significance of baptism better than sprinkling. But no principle is to be made of it here. For 1o the water is not the blood of Christ itself and does not itself effect the washing away of sins, but is a sign and seal thereof; thus in baptism it cannot depend on the quantity of water that is poured out upon the baptized person or in which he is immersed. 2o The spiritual benefit which is depicted by baptism is called not only a washing away of sins but also a sprinkling with clean water and with the blood of Christ, Ezech. 36:25, Hebr. 12:24, 1 Petr. 1:2, cf. Ex. 24:6, 29:16, 20. 3o Although immersion remained in use for centuries, yet from the earliest times sprinkling was regarded as permissible in cases of necessity; the Christian church never thought of considering baptism invalid solely because it had been administered by way of sprinkling; and the advocates of immersion usually recoil in practice itself from this consequence. 4o Although, in spite of the immersio triplex customary from ancient times, Did. c. 7, it is, with Gregorius M., to be maintained: utrum unica an trina ablutio fiat, nihil referre existimandum est, Catech. Rom. II 2 qu. 14, nevertheless [274] sprinkling must not take place in so slight a degree that every notion of washing away is lost. Just as the Lord's Supper, however curtailed, must remain a meal, so also in the sprinkling with the baptismal water the symbolism of washing away ought to be preserved. Cf. Calvijn,

Inst. IV 15, 19. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. I 683-694. Moor V 413-421. M. Vitringa VII 16-30. Höfling, Das Sakr. der Taufe I 46-60. De Hoop Scheffer, Overzicht der gesch. van den doop bij onderdompeling, Amst. 1882.

6. This water becomes a sacrament through the word of institution. In Scripture baptism is now described as a baptism in the name of Christ, Hd. 2:38, 8:16, 10:48, 19:5 cf. Rom. 6:3, 1 Cor. 1:13-15, 6:11, Gal. 3:27 and then again as a baptism in the name of the Father, of the Son and of the H. Spirit, Mt. 28:19. These expressions do not intend to provide a formula which must be pronounced at baptism, but they describe the essence of Christian baptism; this must be a baptism in the name of Christ and thus in the name of God Triune. That they are not intended as a formula appears from the fact that with circumcision and passover, with the baptism of John and with the Lord's Supper there is no mention of such a formula. But certainly, in administering and receiving baptism, from the beginning onward something or other was already spoken; confession of sins, Mt. 3:6, and of faith in Christ, Hd. 8:37, was made, cf. 1 Tim. 6:12. For that, soon by the nature of the case, a fixed formula came into use, which was derived from the words of institution in Mt. 28:19. The Didache speaks of the Christians as βαπτισθεντες εἰς ὀνομα κυριου, 9:5 but nevertheless already knows the trinitarian formula, 7, 1. 3, cf. Justinus, Apol. I 61. Although now a baptism in the name of Christ or with the confession that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, Hd. 8:37 in the first time was completely sufficient, yet later, when all kinds of heresies arose, precisely for the maintenance of the Christian character of baptism the trinitarian formula had to be regarded more and more as necessary, cf. Cypr. Ep. 73, 16-18 and other church fathers in Suicerus s. v. βαπτισμος. But this trinitarian formula too does not sound the same in the different churches. The Greek church makes use of

the words: [275] βαπτιζεται ὁ δουλος του θεου ὁ δεινα εἰς το ὁνομα του πατρος—ἀμην, και του υἱου—ἀμην, και του ἁγιου πνευματος—ἀμην, νυν και εἰς τους αἰωνας των αἰωνων. Although the Latin church recognizes the baptism administered in this way, it itself nevertheless uses the formula: ego te baptizo in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, Catech. Rom. II 2 qu. 10. 11, and the Protestant churches usually adopted this. The Syrian and Armenian churches again have a formula which differs both from the Greek and from the Latin, Höfling, Das Sakr. der Taufe I 44. Everything proves that the validity of baptism in itself does not depend on the literal words which are spoken there by the administrator. The trinitarian formula has only become necessary in order to ward off heresy, to give a guarantee that the baptism which was administered is the true, Christian baptism, and to bring desired firmness into liturgical usage. In addition, it is still important to note that the trinitarian baptismal formula possesses no magical power to change the water into the blood of Christ. The Reformed not only deny this, but the Greek, Roman and Lutheran church also speak differently at baptism than at the Lord's Supper. In the latter sacrament the emphasis falls on the recitatio of the words of institution, on their consecratory power, and on the trans- or consubstantiation brought about thereby. But even if one also speaks at baptism of a divina virtus which has been communicated to the water, of aqua vivida, sancta, divina, of a regeneratio per aquam in verbo, yet even the Catech. Rom. says that the words of institution must be pronounced clearly and distinctly, for instruction for the people, II 2, 10, and denies that at baptism a transubstantiation, a change of the water into the blood of Christ takes place, II 4, 9. The unio sacramentalis is therefore here different than at the Lord's Supper. Certainly there still remains difference even then. Romanists and Lutherans conceive the working of the

H. Spirit at baptism as proceeding per aquam. The Reformed reject this local, physical union and assume in its place a connection, like that with the word. Just as the H. Spirit indeed works cum verbo but does not confine His power and working within the word, so it is also with the water of baptism. In Ef. 5:26 the words ἐν ρηματι are not, as the Lutherans want, a further [276] determination of λοντρῳ or ἰδατος, for then they would have required the article before them: τῳ or του ἐν ρηματι. But they belong with ἁγιαση: Christ sanctified His church through the word of the gospel, while He cleansed it through the bath of the water. Paul here precisely distinguishes the working of Christ through the word from that through the water, just as that also happens in Hebr. 10:22 and 1 Petr. 3:21. Not the minister and not the water, but Christ sanctifies and gives the thing signified, Mt. 3:11, 1 Cor. 6:11, Hebr. 9:14, 1 Joh. 1:7. If the water of baptism effected regeneration, Paul in 1 Cor. 1:14 could not have said that Christ did not send him to baptize, but to proclaim the gospel. But however much there is difference about the manner in which sign and thing signified are connected in baptism, there is agreement with respect to the reality of that connection. The Reformed church also confesses that Christ in baptism promises and assures to each and every one who receives it in faith, that he is as certainly washed with His blood and Spirit from the uncleanness of the soul, as he is outwardly washed with the water, which is accustomed to remove the impurity of the body, Heid. Catech. 69.

Also concerning the benefits which are bestowed in baptism upon adult believers, there is in the main agreement. They are all comprised in communion with the triune God, into which the believer is incorporated by baptism, Mt. 28:19. The Father testifies to us in baptism that He establishes with us an eternal covenant of grace, and adopts us as His children and

heirs, Gen. 17:7, 10, Hd. 2:39. The Son seals to us that He washes us in His blood and incorporates us into the communion of His death and of His resurrection, Rom. 6:3, Gal. 3:27. The H. Spirit seals to us that He dwells in us and sanctifies us as members of Christ, 1 Cor. 6:11, 12:13, Tit. 3:5. More closely worked out, these benefits are: 1o justification or the forgiveness of sins, Mk. 1:4, Hd. 2:38, 22:16, 1 Petr. 3:21, Hebr. 10:22. Doedes thinks that this benefit is not considered at baptism but only first at the Lord's Supper, because baptism is called a baptism of repentance unto forgiveness of sins, Leer der Zaligheid 326. But this view is clearly contradicted by Hd. 22:16, 1 Petr. 3:21, Hebr. 10:22; repentance is indeed the way through which [277] the forgiveness acquired by Christ comes into our possession and enjoyment, but baptism is precisely proof and pledge of that forgiveness obtained in the way of repentance; for the confession of sins and justifying faith precede baptism. In baptism, therefore, all sins also, with all their guilt and punishment, are forgiven, not only the past but also the present and future, for justification is a juridical act, a change of state and therefore brought about at once, completely and once for all, cf. III 548. 2o regeneration, conversion, mortification of the old and resurrection of the new man through communion in the death and the resurrection of Christ, Mk. 1:4, Rom. 6:2-10, 1 Cor. 6:11, Ef. 5:26, Col. 2:12. According to Rome, in baptism that same grace is bestowed back which Adam received as donum superadditum but lost through sin. Just as now in Adam as homo naturalis even before the fall the concupiscentia also dwelt, which was restrained by the donum superadditum, so this is the case with the baptized person. The concupiscentia remains in him, but this is in itself no sin and is natural to man as consisting of flesh and spirit. Only it can easily give occasion to sin, if man, instead of allowing himself to be guided by

supernatural grace, listens to it and yields to it. But apart from this danger, which always continues to threaten the baptized person, he is by the grace which he receives in baptism freed not only from all guilt but also from all stain of sin. Over against that, the Ned. Geloofsbel. art. 15 declared: original sin is not even by baptism wholly done away nor entirely eradicated (orig. in the Walloon text of 1561: et n'est pas aboli mesme par le baptesme, augmented by the synod of 1566 with the words: ou desraciné du tout). Although many with Doedes, Ned. Gel. 173 disapprove these words, they are nevertheless completely correct and in agreement with Holy Scripture. For this teaches in the places cited above very clearly that baptism, namely as sign and seal, regenerates and renews man, breaks the power of original sin in him, makes him walk in newness of life, yet in such a way that sin still always remains dwelling in his flesh and against his will takes him captive under its law. The inherited stain is thus indeed in part and in principle but [278] not wholly done away by baptism as sacrament; although it no longer condemns the believer, it nevertheless still remains in him until death as an unhappy fountain of all kinds of sin. 3o communion, not only with Christ Himself, but also with the church, which is His body. The baptized person is preserved from the perverse generation, separated from the world, Hd. 2:40, 41, made a disciple of Jesus, Mt. 28:19, Joh. 4:1, incorporated into His church, 1 Cor. 12:13, and thus also obligated to a walk in uprightness, Gen. 17:1, and in newness of life, Rom. 6, to confession of God's name and to the keeping of Jesus' commandments, Mt. 28:19. All these benefits have already been bestowed upon the baptized person before baptism in the word of the gospel; they have on his part been accepted by faith; but now they are to him in baptism also signified and sealed. It must therefore not be presented as though in faith before baptism

only some, or in any case not all, benefits were bestowed, and that the missing ones are then still granted in baptism. For the word contains all promises and faith accepts them all. There is not a single grace which is not distributed by the word and only by the sacrament. Incorporation into the body of Christ also takes place through faith and receives in baptism its sign and seal. Baptismal grace, according to Scripture and Reformed confession, can consist nowhere else than in declaratio and confirmatio, Heid, Catech. 66. 69. Cf. further Calvin, Inst. IV 15. Martyr, Loci Comm. p. 435. Polanus, Synt. p. 495. Bullinger, Huysboek 1612 fol. 254. Ursinus, Explic. Cat. qu. 69 sq. etc.

7. Up to this point there is, between the Christian churches, agreement in the main in the doctrine of baptism. But all manner of difference manifests itself as soon as infant baptism comes under discussion. From the beginning of its introduction down to the present day, this has been rejected by a considerable part of Christendom, especially on these two grounds, that it does not occur in Scripture and, according to its original institution, always presupposes faith and conversion, which do not occur in children or in any case cannot be manifested and recognized, cf. William Wall, The history of Infant Baptism., 4 vol. new ed. Oxford 1836. A. H. Newman, A history of Antipaedobaptism from the rise of [279] Paedobaptism. to A. D. 1609. Philad. American Baptist Publication Society 1897. Strong, Syst. Theol. 534-538. Indeed, up to the time of Tertullian there is also lacking all direct and definite testimony that baptism was administered to children of believers. But too much must nevertheless not be inferred from this silence. It speaks for itself that in the first and second century, when the Christian church rapidly expanded in the world, proselyte baptism attracted far more attention than infant baptism. At first adult baptism was the ordinary,

repeatedly occurring baptism; alongside it infant baptism then gradually arose; and finally, when the church was established and one people after another had been Christianized, infant baptism became the rule and proselyte baptism, except in heathen lands, the exception. When Tertullian, then, for the first time makes mention of infant baptism, de bapt. 18, he does indeed combat it, but not on the ground that it is a novelty and not customary in the apostolic time, but because his conviction in general is this, that cunctatio baptismi utilior est. Si qui pondus intelligant baptismi, magis timebunt consecutionem quam dilationem. In this conviction Tertullian did not stand alone. So long as Christianity could still expand among heathens in the villages, cities, and countries where it was established, and thus transitions still always took place, many were of the opinion that one could do no better than to postpone baptism as long as possible, because otherwise one ran the danger of later falling again into sins and losing the grace received in baptism. But Tertullian was the only one who wished to let this view also apply to the children of believers. The church, however, also in Africa, did not take offense at this combat, and continued with infant baptism; Origen testifies that infant baptism in his days was generally in use and derived from the apostles; and Cyprian defends, in accordance with the council held at Carthage in 256, that infant baptism must be administered not first on the eighth but already on the second or third day after birth. Cf. Höfling, Das Sakr. der Taufe I 104 f. As soon as infant baptism became the rule and adult baptism the exception, its significance naturally had to be set in a clearer light and its legitimacy defended against all manner of opponents. This took place in different ways. 1o When Augustine [280] defended original sin and thus also the necessity of baptism for children over against the Pelagians, he had to give

an account of the right that children had to baptism. Confessing that baptism was instituted only for believers and yet acknowledging that children could not themselves believe, he therefore appealed to the faith of the parents, who presented the child for baptism and answered in its place. Pie recteque creditur, prodesse parvulo eorum fidem, a quibus consecrandus offertur, de lib. arb. III 23. Children of believers must themselves be reckoned among the believers, for they believe fide parentum. Credit in altero, qui peccavit in altero, de verbis apost. sermo de bapt. parv. c. Pelag. c. 14. And not only the faith of the parents but of the whole church accrues to their benefit: offeruntur quippe parvuli ad percipiendum spiritalem gratiam, non tam ab eis quorum gestantur manibus, quamvis et ab ipsis, si et ipsi boni fideles sunt, quam ab universa societate sanctorum atque fidelium, ad Bonif. ep. 25. On this ground the children of believers according to Augustine have a right to baptism, and in that baptism they themselves become partakers of the forgiveness of sins and regeneration, however with this understanding, quod baptizatur parvulus, si ad rationales annos veniens non crediderit, nec se ab illicitis concupiscentiis abstinuerit, nihil ei proderit quod parvus accepit, de pecc. mer. et rem. I 20, cf. Bibl. studii theol. Chrispin 1565 p. 115-128, and furthermore the same representation with theologians of all kinds of direction, Lombardus e. a. on Sent. IV dist. 4. Thomas, S. Theol. III qu. 68 art. 9. Bonav. Brevil. VI 7. Catech. Rom. II 2 qu. 27. 30. Bellarminus, de bapt. I 10. 11. Luther in Köstlin I 236. 352. II 88. Calvin, C. R. VIII 483. 493. Beza, Tract. theol. III 345 and many others, Oecolampadius, Zanchius, Perkins, Bucanus, Marlorat, Rivetus, Venema, Hartmann, cf. M. Vitringa VII 136. Quenstedt, Theol. IV 148. C. Vitringa, Observ. Sacrae II c. 6. Kalchreuter, Der stellvertretende Glaube und die Kindertaufe, Jahrb. f. d. Th. 1866 S. 523-

544. 2o Such a fides aliena, however, cannot compensate for the lack of personal faith in the child and therefore imperceptibly leads to the doctrine of a regeneration through baptism. The faith of the parents or of the church may give the child a right to be baptized, yet in the child itself nothing is required except at most a naturally present capacitas passiva, a negative obicem non ponere. [281] Therefore the child, which, so to speak, is offered up to God by the whole church with prayers, receives in baptism itself the grace that it needs. But that grace which the child receives is then again described very differently. Some scholastics said that no virtues were infused into the children at baptism neither actu nor habitu nor radice, but that these were communicated to them later, when they grew up, or also, when they died, were bestowed at the separation of the soul from the body; others thought that the children at baptism received the virtues, either secundum radicem, or secundum habitum, Comm. on Sent. IV dist. 4, e.g. Bonaventura ib. pars 2 art. 2 qu. 2. Thomas, S. Theol. III qu. 69 art. 6. Trent determined that the sacraments of the N. Test. contain grace in themselves and communicate it to all who place no hindrance in the way, so that also the children in baptism receive grace and the virtues ex opere operato and are not believers beforehand but through baptism become believers, Trid. VII can. 6-8, de bapt. c. 13. 14. cf. Bellarminus, de bapt. I 10. 11. The Lutherans contested that the children had faith before baptism and likewise that they were baptized in aliena fide, but taught that they received faith in baptism, and indeed not merely habitu or potentia, but even actu. Per baptismum et in baptismo Spiritus S. fidem veram, salvificam, vivificam et actualem accendit in infantibus, unde et infantes baptizati vere credunt, Quenstedt IV 147. Also some Reformed theologians Pareus, Baronius, Forbesius à Corse, Davenant, Ward, de Brais in Saumur e. a. taught that to

all children in baptism a certain grace of forgiveness and regeneration was bestowed, which, when they died young, was sufficient unto salvation, but otherwise on their part had to be accepted and confirmed by personal faith, cf. Witsius, de efficacia baptismi in infantibus, Misc. Sacra II 618. Voetius, II Disp. 409. M. Vitringa VII 72. And with this the doctrine of the High Churchmen of a baptismal regeneration agrees. 3o But this doctrine is burdened by many objections. The fides aliena, which at first with Augustine e. a. was still maintained as a remembrance of the faith required according to Scripture for baptism, becomes wholly superfluous if baptism ex opere operato communicates grace and in the child presupposes nothing other than a capacitas passiva. When [282] children then can already receive the grace of baptism if they place no obex in the way, it deserves recommendation to baptize as many children as possible, also heathen ones, for they are all passive and thus all susceptible to the reception of grace; the Scotistic school therefore also defended this over against the Thomistic and determined the practice of the Roman church, Schwane, D. G. III 621. Secondly, baptism is deprived of its Scriptural character, because it is detached from faith and the word, ceases to be sign and seal of God's promises, becomes an independent, self-sufficient, ex opere operato working means of grace and even takes the first and most important place among the means of grace. And finally the benefits which baptism communicates are, on the one hand, exaggerated and, on the other hand, weakened. For with a view to the facts which Scripture and experience provide, no one can maintain that all baptized children later prove to be believers and to be saved. Thus one must then assume that the benefits bestowed in baptism are losable and later must be accepted by personal faith. They are sufficient unto salvation for those dying very young, and

insufficient for children growing up, and place the latter in a doubtful condition between believers and unbelievers, Ex. v. h. Ontw. v. Tol. VI 282-287. VII 493-495. Moor V 489. Witsius t. a. p. The Reformed therefore returned to Scripture and, in the defense of infant baptism, unanimously took their standpoint in the covenant of grace, which according to God's promise included not only the believers but also their seed. Not regeneration, faith, or conversion, and much less our supposition concerning it, but only the covenant of grace gave, both with adults and with children, a right to baptism, Calvin, Inst. IV 16, 23. 24, cf. Kramer. The connection of baptism and regeneration 122. This covenant was the firm, Scriptural, objective ground on which all Reformed in common and without distinction made the right of infant baptism rest; another, deeper, firmer ground they did not have. But the Anabaptists still advanced a second proof against infant baptism; they asserted not only that infant baptism did not occur in Scripture, but also that children could not have or show faith and conversion and therefore also might not be baptized. Over against that the [283] Reformed argued that children indeed could not, like the Lutherans, possess the actus fidei, but yet most certainly could possess the habitus fidei. They expressed themselves very differently; one spoke of fides in semine, in radice, in inclinatione, in potentia, in habitu, in principio, in virtute interna Spiritus, of semen regenerationis etc., cf. M. Vitringa VII 134. But in the matter itself there was complete agreement. All Reformed maintained on the ground of Scripture, Jer. 1:5, Luk. 1:5 and, standing in accordance with the catholicity of the Christian religion over against the Anabaptists, that little children just as well as adults could be accepted by God in grace, regenerated by his Spirit, and endowed with the seed of faith. And with this they had enough over against the Anabaptists. The mutual

differences that presented themselves as soon as they began to work out and apply their principles, above p. 226, receded into the background with this common conviction.

8. The right of infant baptism depends exclusively on how Scripture regards the children of believers and therefore wills that we shall regard them. If Scripture speaks of such children in the same way as of adult believers, then the right and with it also the duty of infant baptism is established; for we may not withhold from children what we bestow on adults. In the baptism of children it is therefore not permitted to demand less, but just as little to demand more, than in the baptism of adults. In the latter case we are and must be satisfied according to Scripture with the fact that someone confesses his faith. We are never completely certain that someone is not a hypocrite and thus receives the sacrament without right; but judgment about that does not belong to us, de intimis non judicat ecclesia. So it is also with infant baptism. Whoever wants absolute certainty can never administer any sacrament. The only question is whether the certainty that we have to do with believers in the children of believers is the same as that which we possess concerning those who confess their faith at adult age. Another, stronger certainty we do not need and may not demand. If the question is posed thus, Scripture gives a clear answer. 1o First of all, the astonishment must be removed that the N. Test. nowhere speaks of [284] infant baptism in so many words. This fact is to be explained from this, that the baptism of adults in the days of the N. T. was the rule and infant baptism, if it occurred at all, was an exception. It was the time in which the Christian church was founded and expanded by transition from Judaism and Heathendom. And it was precisely that transition which was clearly depicted in baptism. Adult baptism is therefore the original baptism;

infant baptism is derived; the former must not be conformed to the latter, but the latter must be conformed to the former. Thereby the right of infant baptism does not lapse, nor does it, for its maintenance, according to Roman assertion, have need of tradition; for also what is derived from Scripture by lawful inference is just as binding as what is expressly mentioned in it. Thus the church acts at every moment in the ministry of the word, in the practice of life, in the development of doctrine; it never remains standing at the letter but derives from the data of Scripture, under the guidance of the H. Spirit, inferences and applications which make and promote its life and development possible. And thus it also acts when it passes from adult baptism to infant baptism. Scripture gives the general rule when baptism may and must be applied, and the church applies this rule concretely in life. It need nowhere say that children may be baptized; it says enough if it regards children in the same way as adults who have come to confession of faith, and never makes mention of a baptismal administration to such adults who had been born of Christian parents. 2o In the O. Test. circumcision was administered to children of the male sex on the eighth day after their birth. According to Col. 2:11, 12 this circumcision has been replaced by baptism. For the Colossians, although Christians from the Heathen, are circumcised just as much as the Jews. But they are circumcised, not with a fleshly circumcision performed by hands, which consists in the stripping off of the σωμα της σαρκος, of the whole fleshly, sinful nature. And it has taken place in Christ, by means of and by virtue of the circumcision which Christ himself, with respect to sin, underwent in his death, at the moment when they in baptism have been buried and raised with Christ. Through the death of Christ, which was a complete putting off and overcoming of sin and thus fully realized [285] the idea of

circumcision, that circumcision has become obsolete and has come in baptism to its antitypical fulfillment. Baptism is therefore more than circumcision, not in essence but in degree; circumcision pointed forward to the death of Christ, baptism points back to it; the former ends, the latter begins with that death. If now, however, that circumcision already might and had to be administered as sign of the covenant to children, then this applies a fortiori to baptism, which is not poorer but much richer in grace. This is also expressed in this, that the sacrament of the O. V. was administered only to male, but that of the N. V. also to female persons; and the opponents of infant baptism also acknowledge in this respect the richer grace of baptism. Sin namely bears in human beings the character of σαρξ; it reveals itself especially in the organs of procreation and shows there its power. Circumcision brings that to light, just as also the uncleanness of the woman after giving birth. But Christ by his death, which is the true circumcision, has taken away all sin, also that which clings to procreation; He has placed the woman in an independent relation to himself; He causes her to share in his grace just as well as the man; in Him there is no man or woman; and therefore both are buried with Christ in baptism and raised to a new life. And finally the richer grace of the sacrament of the N. V. also appears in this, that circumcision might be performed only on the eighth day after birth, for the children shared until then in the uncleanness of the mother; but now, in the days of the N. T. the children from their birth have a right to baptism, because from the first moment of their existence they share in the grace of Christ. 3o Circumcision is by no means the only proof that the O. T. regards the children as partakers of the covenant. The whole covenant-idea brings this view with it. For therein the covenant is distinguished from election, in that it shows how this realizes itself along an

organic and historical way. It is never concluded only with one single person but in that single person at once also with his seed. It never includes the person of the believer alone, in the abstract, but that person concretely, as he historically exists and lives, thus not him alone, but also all that is his; him for his person not alone but him also as father or mother, with his family, with his money and goods, with his influence and power etc., part III 226. Specifically the children are reckoned in him. There is a community of parents and children in sin and misery, ib. 129v. But over against that there is also by God a community of parents and children in grace and blessing set. Children are a blessing and a heritage of the Lord, Ps. 127:3. They are always reckoned with the parents and taken together with them; it goes well with them together, Ex. 20:6, Deut. 1:36, 39, 4:40, 5:29; 12:25, 28. They serve the Lord together, Deut. 6:2, 30:2, 31:12, 13, Jos. 24:15, Jer. 32:39, Ezech. 37:25, Zach. 10:9; the deeds and statutes of God must be handed down by the parents to the children, Ex. 10:2, 12:24, 26, Deut. 4:9, 10, 40, 6:7, 11:19, 29:29, Jos. 4:6, 21, 22:24-27; the covenant of God with its benefits and blessings continues from child to child and from generation to generation, Gen. 9:12, 17:7, 9, Ex. 3:15, 12:17, 16:32, Deut. 7:9, Ps. 105:8 etc. Grace is not an inheritance but it is nevertheless as a rule distributed in the line of the generations. Piorum infantibus primus ad salutem aditus est ipsa ex piis parentibus propagatio, Beza, Resp. ad coll. Mompelg. II 103 bij Gerhard, Loc. XX 211. 4o This view passes over into the N. Testament. Jesus, like John, appears with the preaching: repent and believe the gospel; He takes over the baptism of John and proclaims in it that the Jews in spite of their circumcision have need of repentance and forgiveness; the contrast gradually becomes so strong that Jesus has no expectation at all any more of his people and the people reject Him and

hang Him on the cross. And yet nevertheless He continues to regard the children as children of the covenant, Mt. 18:2v., 19:13v., 21:15v., Mk. 10:13v., Luk. 9:48, 18:15. He calls them to himself, embraces them, lays his hands on them, blesses them, says that of such is the kingdom of heaven, sets them as an example to the adults, warns these not to offend them, says that their angels watch over them, and sees in their Hosanna-cry a fulfillment of the prophecy that God has made the speaking of children into a power by which those who hate Him are brought to silence, and out of their mouth has prepared praise, αἶνον according to the LXX. 5o The apostles proceed from the same thought. The covenant of grace, established with Israel, has indeed been altered as to the dispensation, but in essence has remained the same, part III 216v. The ἐκκλησια has taken the place of the O. Test. Israel, it is the people of God and God is its God and Father, Mt. 1:21, Luk. 1:17, Hd. 3:25, Rom. 9:25, 26, 11:16-21, 2 Cor. 6:16-18, Gal. 3:14-29, Ef. 2:12, 13, Tit. 2:14, Hebr. 8:8-10, 1 Petr. 2:9, Op. 21:3. Just as in the O. Test., under that people of God the children of believers are also included. For the congregation of the N. Test. is not a group of individuals, but an organism, a body, a temple and as such, as a people, has taken the place of Israel. It is as a wild olive tree, while some branches have been cut off, grafted onto the trunk of the tame olive tree and thus have become partakers of its root and fatness, Rom. 11:16, 17. Therefore sometimes whole households pass over to Christianity. The household itself is an institution of God, an organic whole, which shares in a common blessing or curse. Jesus' disciples bring peace to the house which they enter, Luk. 10:5, and He himself says that, if Zacchaeus believes, salvation has come to his house, Luk. 19:9. The apostles teach not only in the temple but also repeatedly proclaim the gospel of Christ in the houses, Hd. 5:42, 20:20.

With the head of the family the whole household is saved, Hd. 11:14, 16:31, and whole households believe and are baptized, Hd. 16:15, 34, 18:8, 1 Cor. 1:16. From this it is indeed not to be proved that infant baptism was already applied by the apostles, but from the silence the opposite is just as little to be inferred; from the early introduction of infant baptism, from the general recognition which it immediately found, and from the testimony of Origen follows the possibility and even the probability that it already was an apostolic usage. Further, Peter says that the promise of the O. V., that God would be the God of believers and of their seed, passes over into the dispensation of the N. T., Hd. 2:39. Indeed this applies first of all to the Jews, and of the Heathen there is first mention in the words: and all who are far off. But this does not take away that the Jews who turn to Christ receive the promise of the covenant not only for themselves but also for their children; and the Heathen who come to faith share in the same privileges and according to the whole N. T. in no respect stand behind the believers from the Jews. [288] According to Paul, 1 Cor. 7:14, even the children from a household of which one of the two parents has become a believer are holy. If such a case occurred, the believing spouse namely must not think that he might not continue married life with the other half. On the contrary, by the faith of the one spouse, the whole marriage is sanctified, also the other spouse is sanctified, ἡγιασται. And Paul proves this by the fact that the children from such a marriage are not ἀκαθαρτα but ἁγια. That therefore stood firm, was generally accepted and could therefore serve as an argument. Children in a household of which father or mother is a believer are reckoned according to the believing spouse, even if this is the woman of the house. The Christian confession sets the tone in such a house; it is the standard by which the whole family must be judged; faith is the higher

which dominates over the lower. The holiness of which Paul here speaks is not to be thought of as a subjective, inward, but as an objective, theocratic one, for otherwise the children and the man would be holy not by the believing mother and wife but by themselves. Nor does Paul here think at all of infant baptism, nor of anything that must serve as a ground for it. But it is only his concern to show that the Christian faith does not break but confirms and sanctifies the natural orders of life, cf. vs. 18-24. For infant baptism this passage is however of importance insofar as it teaches that a whole family is reckoned according to the confession of the believing spouse; the believer has the calling to serve the Lord not only for himself but with all that is his and with his whole family. Therefore the children of believers are also admonished by the apostles as Christian children in the Lord, Hd. 26:22, Ef. 6:1, Col. 3:20, 1 Joh. 2:13, 2 Tim. 3:15; also little ones know the Lord, Hebr. 8:11, Openb. 11:18, 19:5, and are set before the throne, Op. 20:5. Of a neutral upbringing, which wants to let the children at a more advanced age choose completely free and independently, the H. Scripture knows nothing, Trid. de bapt. c. 14. The children of believers are not Heathen, are also not children of the devil, who still, as Romans and Lutherans teach, must be exorcised at baptism; but they are children of the covenant, to whom the promise belongs just as well as to the adults, they are included in the covenant and are holy non natura, Job 14:4, Ps. 51:7, Joh. 3:6, Ef. 2:3, sed foederis privilegio, Heid. Cat. 74. Can. Dordr. I 17. 6o All this presses the more, because grace, especially in the dispensation of the N. T. is much more abundant than sin, Rom. 5:12-21. If the rejection of infant baptism proceeded solely and only from the fact that it is not commanded with literal words in Scripture, it would be to be judged with indulgence. But usually it is connected with wholly other considerations

and flows from a limitation of grace and from a failure to recognize the catholicity of Christianity. For Anabaptism sets to grace, unless it denies original sin and deems regeneration unnecessary for children, a boundary in the childlike age, in the not yet having come to years of discretion, that is thus, in laws and ordinances which by God himself at creation have been established in nature. Such limits grace does not know. Under the O. Test. it may in a certain sense have been enclosed within the people of Israel; in the midst of that people it was as broad as possible. And in the N. T. every boundary of people and land, of sex and age, has been completely erased. In Christ there is no man or woman, no Jew or Greek, no child or gray-haired man, but only a new creature. The Father has loved the world; Christ is a propitiation for the whole world and has also shed his blood for children; and the H. Spirit, who caused Jesus to be conceived in Mary's womb and was already from the first moment of their existence bestowed on a Jeremiah and John, has access to every heart and is hindered therein by no age or youth. Children can therefore, just as they without their knowing are partakers of condemnation in Adam, in the same way again in Christ be accepted to grace. Even if they cannot believe actu, they can nevertheless be regenerated and therein at the same time receive the capacity of faith. 7o By all this the right and thus also the duty of infant baptism is abundantly demonstrated. For if children of believers are to be regarded thus, as Scripture teaches us, then according to the divine institution of baptism they have a claim to this sacrament, in the same and even in a stronger measure than the adults who make confession. Absolute certainty is after all [290] in neither case to be obtained. With the adults we can no more judge about the heart than with the children. For us, who are bound to the outward, only a judgment of love is always possible. According to that judgment we hold

those who make confession for believers and administer the sacraments to them; and according to that same judgment we reckon the children of believers among the believers themselves, because they with their parents are included in the covenant of grace. Indeed the probability that the baptized are true believers is greater with the children than with the adults. For not only does in a baptistic church the weakening of the significance of baptism, the neglect of discipline and the deadening power of habit creep in just as well as in a church which brings infant baptism into practice; but almost half of human beings die away before they have come to years of discretion. For all those there lies in Scripture, insofar as they are included in the covenant of grace, a promise of the Lord, which they cannot reject with consciousness and voluntarily. If they die before the time that they can do that, godly parents may not doubt their election and salvation, Can. Dordr. I 17, cf. Voetius, Disp. II 408. 417. M. Vitringa II 51. And even with those children who grow up, it may and must so long, according to the judgment of love which must prevail in the church of Christ, be believed in their salvation as the contrary does not clearly appear. From the children of believers the congregation, the assembly of true Christian believers, is after all continually built. 8o Yet in addition it may never be forgotten that this is, both with adults and with children, a judgment of love. It is not an infallible pronouncement which establishes the salvation of every baptized person, but only a rule according to which Scripture commands that we shall act in the practice of ecclesiastical life. Ground for baptism is not the supposition that someone is regenerated and even that regeneration itself is not, but only the covenant of God. On the subjective opinion of the minister of the word about the spiritual state of the one being baptized it does not depend at all; whether he is or is not for himself convinced of the sincerity of faith in the

one being baptized, he has not to reckon with that but to act according to the revealed will of God and the rule of his word. But moreover, [291] it helps nothing to close the eyes to the fact that baptism is many times administered to such as later appear not to walk in the way of the covenant. Scripture and experience both teach that not everything is Israel that is called Israel, that there is chaff among the wheat, that in the house of God there are not only golden and silver but also earthen vessels. By no means all were therefore regenerated when they received baptism. Indeed it is not to be proved that the elect are always in their youth, before baptism or even before birth, regenerated by the H. Spirit; God is free in the distribution of his grace and can cause the fruit of baptism to be enjoyed at a much later age. Therefore there also remains in the Christian congregation place for the preaching of the gospel, of regeneration, faith and repentance. The prophets, John the Baptist and Jesus have appeared with that in the midst of their people, which nevertheless was the property of the Lord; and also the apostles have administered the word not only to bring the hidden life to manifestation, but also have preached it as a seed of regeneration and as a means to the working of faith. 9o Yet therefore the essence of baptism may not be made dependent on its effect in life. Just as sincere faith remains what it is according to the description of the Heid. Cat. 21, even if reality shows all kinds of deviations and deformities from it, so also baptism is and may not be other than what Scripture teaches of it. The genuine, essential, Christian baptism is that which is administered to believers. Although baptism, like the outward calling, also for unbelievers still yields many a blessing, part III 492, yet its genuine fruit and full power are enjoyed only by believers. Objectively baptism, like the word, remains the same. Whoever receives the word, and thus also whoever receives baptism in

faith, truly receives a share in the promises which God has connected with it. God remains faithful to himself and grants salvation to everyone who believes. But faith is not of all. In the end the fruit of baptism is enjoyed only by those who are elect and therefore in the Lord's time also come to faith. In that outcome all must acquiesce, whether they are Roman or Protestant, Lutheran or Reformed. Sacramenta in solis electis efficiunt quod figurant, said Augustine and scholasticism repeated it after him, cf. Lombardus, Thomas, [292] Bonaventura on Sent. IV dist. 4, and further also Calvin on Ef. 5:26. Inst. IV 14, 9. 10. C. R. VII 694. Beza, Tract. III 124. Voetius, Disp. II 408. Westm. Conf. 28, 6. M. Vitringa VI 90. VII 378. The elect have grasped it but the others have been hardened. The children of the promise are reckoned for the seed. 10o The benefits of baptism are with children the same as with adults, namely the forgiveness of sin, regeneration and incorporation into the congregation of Christ. And these are not first bestowed in baptism but are already through faith the portion of him who in accordance with the will of God receives baptism. Baptism bestows no single benefit which was not already promised in the word and accepted by faith, but it bestows the same benefits as the word only in another way and in another form, so that faith, according to the measure which God has bestowed on each, is thereby confirmed and strengthened. For children too this rule holds. For just as they can unconsciously be regenerated by the H. Spirit and endowed with the capacity of faith, so they can also by that same H. Spirit outside their knowing be strengthened in that capacity of faith. There is here, as on so many a terrain, a mysterious Wechselwirkung. Just as light and the eye presuppose and support each other, so faith enjoys the sacrament the more in proportion as it is stronger and is at the same time in that same proportion sealed and confirmed by it.

The sacraments therefore for the believer, as he grows up, do not gradually decrease in significance but continually gain in value for him. They display ever more beautifully and gloriously before the eye of faith the riches of God's grace. They are for every believer and for the whole church a proof of received grace, a sign of God's faithfulness, a ground of plea for prayer, a pillar of support for faith, an admonition to new obedience. Cf. on infant baptism: Calvijn, Inst. IV c. 16. Ursinus, Tract. theol. 1584 p. 597-619. Junius, Theses Theol. 52. G. J. Vossius, Disput. XX de baptismo, disp. 13. C. Vitringa, Observ. Sacrae lib. II c. 6. Turretinus, Theol. El. XIX qu. 20. Moor V 476. M. Vitringa VII 99. Martensen, De Kinderdoop 1842. Wormser, De Kinderdoop 1853. Pieters en Kreulen, De Kinderdoop 1861. Van Oosterzee, Dogm. § 138. Thym, The significance of the Christ. [293] baptism and the good right of Infant Baptism 1884. Kuyper, Heraut 652v. Steitz art. Taufe in Herzog2. Bartels, Die bibl. Lehre v. d. Taufe in Gegensatz zur bapt. Entw., Jahrb. f. d. Theol. 1874 S. 69 f. Boy. Die Begründung der Kindertaufe, Neue Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol. 1895 S. 500-511. Lobstein, Zur Rechtf. der Kindertaufe, Zeits. f. Theol. u. Kirche 1896 S. 278-298. Dorner, Chr. Dogm. II 818. 835 f., etc.

9. Of this baptism Christ is the administrator. And only if He baptizes and with the sign also bestows the thing signified, is someone truly baptized. But in the administration of baptism Christ makes use of men, to whom he entrusts the dispensing of the mysteries of God. Under the O. T. circumcision was bound to no office; every Israelite might perform it; usually the father of the household did it, Gen. 17:23, in case of necessity also the mother, Ex. 4:25, 1 Makk. 1:60, later usually the physician and nowadays mostly a mohel specially appointed for that purpose. But in the N. T. baptism is administered only by such as have been appointed to office,

John, Mk. 1:4, Jesus' disciples, Joh. 4:2, the apostles, Hd. 2:38, to whom it had been expressly entrusted by Christ in Mt. 28:19, Philip, who in Jerusalem was a deacon but later acted as evangelist, Hd. 21:8, and as such administered baptism, Hd. 8:38, Ananias, who laid hands on Paul and probably also baptized him, Hd. 9:17, 18, Paul, who sometimes baptized himself but otherwise left the baptizing to his fellow workers, because he as apostle of the Gentiles was in the first place called to the proclamation of the gospel, 1 Cor. 1:14-17, cf. Hd. 10:48. The administration of the sacraments clearly appears from this to be subordinate to the preaching of the word, but nevertheless at all times to have been connected with it. The sacrament follows the word, and therefore the right to administer the sacraments passed of itself from the apostles and evangelists to the teachers, to those presbyters who laboured in the word and the doctrine. When these teachers were later regarded as bishops, who were distinguished in office from the presbyters and elevated above them, the administration of baptism was considered a right of the bishop, Tert. de bapt. c. 17. But the expansion of the congregations and also the view more and more gaining entrance, [294] that baptism was absolutely necessary unto salvation, led to baptism also being allowed to be administered by presbyters, deacons, parochi, and in case of necessity even by every human being who has his reason. The Roman church recognizes the baptism which has been administered by a heretic, yes even that which has been administered by an unbeliever, by a Jew or Heathen, although the required intentio faciendi quod facit ecclesia is difficult to demonstrate here, and in that retains for itself the right to apply the cogite intrare to all the baptized; only the se ipsum baptizare it does not recognize. To be sure, it has even, if there is any doubt whether baptism has been administered or correctly administered, introduced

conditional baptism, in which the minister says: si non baptizatus es, ego te baptizo etc., cf. Suicerus s. v. βαπτισμος. Comm. op Sent. IV dist. 5. Thomas, S. Theol. III qu. 67. Trid. VII de bapt. 4. Cat. Rom. II qu. 18. 23. 42. Bellarminus, de bapt. c. 7. Other churches also, such as the Greek, the Lutheran etc. teach the necessity of baptism and therefore in case of necessity allowed its administration to laymen. But in the end none of them dares to draw the consequence that someone, solely and only because he died unbaptized wholly without his fault, would be lost; all allow exceptions, in which a baptismus sanguinis or flaminis suffices. Conversio cordis potest inesse non percepto baptismo, sed contempto baptismo non potest, Lombardus, Sent. IV 4, 4. The Conf. Aug. art. 9 says in the lat. text indeed of baptism, quod sit necessarius ad salutem but teaches in the German text only, dass sie nöthig sei. The Lutheran theologians do not deny salvation to children who have died unbaptized outside the fault of the parents, Quenstedt, Theol. IV 164. And all who have a special grace communicated through baptism recognize that this can also be bestowed by God in another way, Heraut 651. Therefore the Reformed also judged differently. For baptism was not a cause but sign and seal of regeneration, which God bestows before and without the sacrament; no single benefit was granted by baptism that had not been bestowed by the word and accepted by faith. Thus baptism could not be absolutely necessary unto salvation; not the privatio baptismi in itself, but the contemptus baptismi makes guilty before God. In Mk. 16:16 therefore in the second member baptism is omitted and in Joh. 3:5, which passage on the other side is generally understood of baptism, Trid. VII de bapt. c. 2. Catech. Rom. II 2 qu. 31, according to Calvin etc. there is no mention of baptism, although perhaps baptism is also thought of, for the water occurs here, just as in Mt. 3:11 the

fire, as symbol of the working of the H. Spirit, and is in vs. 6 and 8 not mentioned at all anymore. Therefore there is also no reason to depart from apostolic usage and in cases of necessity to allow the administration of baptism also to persons other than the teachers of the congregation, Calvin, Inst. IV 15, 20. Bucanus, Inst. 613. Perkins, Works I 461. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. I. 631. M. Vitringa VII 75. 163. Moor V 435. Therefore the Reformed were also concerned that baptism should always be administered in the midst of the congregation. Although in the N. T. the administration of baptism took place everywhere where there was water, Mt. 3:6, Joh. 3:23, Hd. 8:36, it nevertheless soon became, when the believers got their own meeting places, the custom to have them take place in these. Yet in cases of necessity, in wintertime, in illnesses, for princes and distinguished persons an exception was made and the administration of baptism in private dwellings was permitted. This is certainly in conflict with the general rule that must apply in the church. Even if cases are conceivable in which the administration of baptism may take place in houses; they can and may be nothing other than a high exception, do not stand for judgment with the minister of the word alone but with the whole consistory, and even then require that the administration not take place except in the presence of the consistory. For in the dispensing of the sacrament it does not depend on the building, but on the assembly of the congregation. The sacrament is a constituent part of public worship, is a good that has been bestowed by Christ upon his church and must therefore with the word be administered publicly in the congregation. For the sacrament is always united with the word; Christ himself has connected the administration of baptism with that of the word, Mt. 28:19. In the planting of the church among a non-Christian population baptism by the nature of the case cannot at once take place in the midst of

the assembly of the believers. But as soon as this exists, administration of word and sacrament must be transferred into it, for they are a constituent part of the [296] public worship and a good of the congregation. Thus in the apostolic time the Lord's Supper was celebrated in the midst of the congregation, 1 Cor. 11:20. And thus no less ought it to happen with baptism, which indeed precisely depicts the incorporation into Christ and his congregation, 1 Cor. 12:13, and therefore is administered most fittingly in the public assembly of the believers, Calvin, Inst. IV 15, 16. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. I 726-730. Moor V 510-512. M. Vitringa VII 171. Syn. Dordr. sess. 163. 175 K. O. art. 56.

On the time at which baptism had to be administered, there prevailed in the church no small difference. Circumcision was performed on the eighth day; baptism in the N. T. was usually administered immediately, when someone believed and made confession, Mt. 3:6, Hd. 2:41, 8:12, 36, 9:18, 10:47, 16:15, 33, 18:8. But when later on all sorts of persons wished to join the church, who were wholly unfamiliar with her doctrine and life, already in the second century the catechumenate arose, which subsequently was regulated more and more and according to the synod of Elvira ± 300, had to last two years. At the end of that, the catechumens were baptized in a solemn manner, preferably on one of the great feast days, and incorporated into the congregation. Led by the thought that baptism forgave only past sins, many even postponed baptism as long as possible and up to the deathbed. But the infant baptism coming more and more into use and the doctrine of the absolute necessity of baptism nevertheless drove the church in another direction. It became customary, not to postpone baptism as long as possible, but to administer it as soon as possible after birth. At first many still pleaded that baptism should be administered in the third or thirtieth

year of life; but others preferred to have it administered on the eighth or on the fortieth day after birth; the synod of Carthage 252 under the chairmanship of Cyprian already determined that the children had to be baptized as soon as possible, on the second or third day after their birth, Cypr. Ep. 59; and this soon became general usage and was regarded as an apostolic custom, cf. Suicerus, s. v. βαπτισμος and κλινικος. Schwane, D. G. I 378. II 755. Moeller-Schubert, Kirchengesch. I 338. The Greek church has no determination about the time, but nevertheless usually postpones baptism [297] no longer than until the eighth day and in case of necessity administers it already earlier, even immediately after birth. The Roman church urges that the child be baptized as soon as possible after birth, Trid. VII de bapt. c. 12. Catech. Rom. II 2 qu. 28. With this general rule the Lutherans, Gerhard, Loc. XX 245 and also the Reformed agree. The prov. synod of Dordrecht 1574 art. 57 even declared that the affection of the parents, who desire to postpone the baptism of their children, until the time when the mothers themselves present their children, or upon the fathers' long waiting, is no lawful cause to postpone baptism. But no other synod adopted this pronouncement. Although all needless postponement is disapproved and there is repeatedly urged a prompt presentation of the child for baptism, it is nevertheless absolutely not the intention of the church orders, when they speak only of the fathers, to exclude the mothers, but to oppose the system of witnesses and not to let these take the place of the fathers, cf. Bucanus, Inst. 634. Bullinger, Huysboek 1612 f. 249 f. Synopsis pur. theol. 44, 52. Voetius, Pol. eccl. I 724. Moor V 512. M. Vitringa VII 176. The system of baptismal witnesses, ἀναδοχοι, sponsores, fidejussores, susceptores, compatres, commatres, patrini, matrinae, patres et matres spirituales, arose when infant baptism became general usage, and is already

mentioned by Tertullian, de bapt. 18. There were now needed persons who in the place of the child made confession and answered the customary questions; who, as it were as sureties, sponsores, acted for the child, and promised to raise it later on the basis of baptism in a Christian manner. They were the representatives of the church, which indeed itself properly as a whole holds the child for baptism and bears it with her prayer. Now it lay at hand to let the parents act as such sponsores at the baptism of the child. And in the first time this also happened thus. But gradually fatherhood and godfatherhood were placed alongside one another, just as birth and rebirth, natural and spiritual kinship. Parents were of themselves already obliged to the Christian upbringing of their child and seemed no longer able to take upon themselves a special vow thereto. They were the natural parents of the child, but the godparenthood was a wholly different spiritual [298] kinship, and therefore gradually became an impedimentum matrimonii between the susceptores on the one hand and the baptized person and his parents on the other and also between them themselves. The council of Mainz 813 therefore already forbade: nullus proprium filium vel filiam de fonte baptismatis suscipiat, cf. Catech. Rom. II 2 qu. 20-24. But this same Catechismus already had to complain that this service in the church was so neglected, ut nudum tantum hujus functionis nomen relictum sit. Lutherans and Reformed did not at all consider this system of baptismal witnesses necessary, because it was not prescribed or mentioned in Scripture, but nevertheless usually held it to be an adiaphoron, which sometimes could be of some use, Gerhard, Loc. XX 267. Buddeus, Inst. p. 1071. Dordsche Kerkenorde 57. Synopsis pur. theol. 44, 54. Bucanus, Inst. theol. 640. Voetius, Pol. eccl. I 704. Moor V 509. M. Vitringa VII 159. But the Reformed nevertheless laid emphasis especially on the fact that in the first

place the parents would answer the questions at baptism and would act as susceptores and sponsores for their child, and required that if witnesses were taken, these would be of pure confession and conduct. Calvin, Op. ed. Amst. IX 142. Hooyer, Oude Kerkenordeningen bl. 7. 11. 17. 46. 69. 105. 153. 205. 265. 314. 344. 456. In addition, in the Roman church the godfathers and godmothers must do service to instruct the child in the doctrine of the faith, because the pastors, as the Catech. Rom. II 2 qu. 20 says, have no time for it. But the Reformed church, following Calvin's lead, introduced the catechesis of the baptized youth and entrusted this to the minister. Thus in a well-ordered Reformed church the system of witnesses, which otherwise soon degenerated into a nudum nomen, has, except in a few special cases, become superfluous and unnecessary and has in practice also all but disappeared. Cf. Suicerus, s. v. ἀναδοχοι. Höfling, Das Sakr. der Taufe II 4-20. Steitz in Herzog2 15, 247.

This entire doctrine of baptism, as it was developed by the Reformed, brings to light how closely they adhered to Holy Scripture. All the more does it deserve attention that they nevertheless, or rather precisely for that reason, in their recognition and administration of baptism knew how to avoid all sectarianism and preserved a truly Christian breadth of heart and breadth of conception. In agreement with the catholic church in its struggle [299] against the African churches, the Reformed also taught unanimously that heretical baptism, provided it was administered in the name of God triune, had to be recognized; but because they did not conceive the baptismal formula magically and did not detach baptism from church and office, they added the further restriction that it had to have been administered by a minister recognized in a Christian congregation. Cf. Dr. G. van Goor, The struggle over heretical baptism. Utr. 1872. Herzog2 art.

Ketzertaufe. Calvin in Herzog, Das Leben Joh. Calvins II 486. Voetius, Pol. eccl. I 631-645. Turretinus, Th. El. XIX qu. 15. Moor V 443-453. Syn. Dordr. 1574 q. 10. Midd. 1578 q. 29. Dordr. 1618 sess. 162. And from baptism they did indeed exclude all things and objects, all dead persons, those who had perished or were still only partly born, all monstra, all children also of heathen parents who had been taken captive, Syn. Dordr. 1618 sess. 18. 19, but they admitted to baptism all children who after the death of their parents or as foundlings had been taken up into Christian families, who had been born from an unlawful marriage or from excommunicati, schismatics, heretics, provided only that there existed some ground for the suspicion that the line of the covenant had not been wholly broken off. Voetius I 645-670. Moor V 500-509. M. Vitringa VII 95. 142-159. The Reformed are rather to be accused of too broad than of too narrow a recognition and administration of baptism. But thereby they have nevertheless in an excellent manner maintained the unity and catholicity of the church of Christ on earth. All Christian churches still recognize one another's baptism and thereby in fact declare that in it there is still so much truth present that the possibility of being saved is not excluded. There is one confession on which they are all built, one faith of which they all partake. In spite of all difference and struggle, all nevertheless acknowledge one Lord, one faith, one baptism.

§ 53. The Lord's Supper.

1. With baptism, the Lord's Supper comes as the second sacrament, which under the O. Test. had its model in the Passover. Just as among the Heathen, Num. 25:2, so also in Israel meals were often connected with the sacrifices [300]. Sometimes the sacrifices on the altar of burnt offering were wholly burned, but with others only a part was burned and the remainder kept for use, either by the priests alone at the altar, Lev. 2:3, 10, 6:16, 25-30, 7:1-10, 10:12, 13, for atonement, Num. 10:17; or by the officiating priest with his family in a clean place for his maintenance, Lev. 7:12-14, 31-34, 10:14; or by the offerer with his family and guests, provided Levitically clean, and outside the sanctuary, Lev. 7:19-21, Deut. 12:7, 12, 1 Sam. 9:13v., 2 Sam. 6:19. The meaning of these meals was that God came together with his people and, on the basis of the sacrifice brought and accepted, in joy united himself with his people. In this sanctuary God comes to the children of Israel and dwells among them, Ex. 20:24, 29:42-46, 33:7, Num. 11:25, 12:5, 17:4, Deut. 31:15; He is the host, who yields up a part of the sacrifice brought to Him and invites his people to the meal;

whoever took part in it entered into covenant with Him. Participation in the Heathen sacrificial meals was therefore forbidden to Israel, Ex. 34:15; it was גצמד, a binding oneself to, an attaching oneself to the false gods, Num. 25:3, 5, Ps. 106:28; the apostles later forbade them to the Christians, Hd. 15:29, 21:25, or warned against them for the sake of the weak in faith, 1 Cor. 8:1v., 10:18v. As such unions of God with his people and also among one another, these meals bore a character of gladness and joy and not infrequently did give occasion to revelries and drunkenness, 1 Sam. 1:13, Jes. 28:8, Spr. 7:14, but on the other hand also served as images and pledges of the highest joy in God, Deut. 27:7, Ps. 22:26v., Jes. 25:6, 62:8, 9, cf. art. Opfermalzeiten in Herzog2. Such a sacrificial meal took place especially at the Passover. Many Protestants maintained over against Rome that the Passover was wholly and entirely absorbed in it, Moor V 322. Witsius, Oec. foed. IV 9, 6. But this is undoubtedly incorrect; the Passover was first of all a sacrificium and thereafter a sacramentum. In Ex. 12:27, 34:25 it is called a זֶבַח for the Lord; the act that accompanied it is called עֲבֹדָה, Ex. 12:26; and the celebration of it is called in Num. 9:7 a bringing of a קָרְבָּן to the Lord. Further, the head of the household, after he had set apart four days before the feast, on the 10th of Abib or Nisan, a one-year-old, male, perfect [301] lamb, had to slaughter it on the 14th of that month between the two evenings and with a bunch of hyssop smear some of the blood on the two posts and the lintel of the house door, Ex. 12:3v. This blood served for atonement. In itself Israel, just as much as the Egyptians, had deserved death; but it is nevertheless not treated as Egypt, but by the Lord graciously saved from death and delivered from the land of bondage. For that, the blood had to be for a sign. When the Lord saw that blood on the house door, He was reconciled, He laid aside his wrath and passed by sparing, (פסח, to

step over something, to pass by, Jes. 31:5, hence פֶּסַח, πασχα), Ex. 12:13, 23, 27. Still more clearly the sacrificial character of the Passover appears from the manner in which it is later celebrated in Canaan. There the lamb is no longer slaughtered by the head of the household but by the Levites, 2 Chr. 30:16, 35:11, Ezr. 6:19; the blood is sprinkled on the altar by the priests, 2 Chron. 30:16, 35:11; the fat portions burned on the altar, 2 Chron. 35:14; and the meal held at the sanctuary, Deut. 16:2. But although the Passover is thus in the first place an offering, it is nevertheless not absorbed in that; it soon becomes a meal. After the lamb had been slaughtered between the two evenings on the 14th of Abib and its blood smeared on the house door or in later time sprinkled on the altar, it had to be roasted whole at the fire, without a bone being broken, with head, legs, and entrails, and then in the same night of the 14th of Abib eaten with unleavened breads and bitter herbs by all who were in the house, thus also by the women, but not by uncircumcised strangers, foreigners, or hired servants, in haste, with loins girded, feet shod, and a staff in the hand, in the house or later at the sanctuary, and what remained had to be burned with fire, Ex. 12:1-28, 43-49, 13:3-9, 23:15, Lev. 23:5-14, Num. 9:10-14, 28:16-25, Deut. 16:1v. The Passover thereby took a wholly special place in the Israelite cultus; it was an offering but thereafter immediately passed over into a meal; it did not belong to the sin offerings, for it was eaten, nor also to the thank offerings, for atonement preceded the meal. Besides, it was instituted by God on a special occasion, before all other sacrifices, and bears a nature of its own; it is an offering for atonement and a [302] meal of fellowship with God and with one another; it is sacrificium and sacramentum at the same time. The N. Test. assigns to this Passover a typical significance, so that it is not only a remembrance of the deliverance from Egypt but also a sign and pledge of

the redemption from the house of bondage of sin and of fellowship with God in the promised Messiah. Jesus himself pointed to this, when he intentionally connected the institution of the Lord's Supper with the celebration of the Passover. But about the manner in which he did that there is no small difference. Some appeal to the Synoptics and say that Jesus on Thursday the 14th Nisan used the actual Passover with his disciples and on that occasion instituted the Lord's Supper. Others side with John, 12:1, 13:1, 2, 29, 18:28, 19:14, 31 and assert that Jesus on Thursday the 13th Nisan held an ordinary meal with his disciples and therewith washed their feet, and then on the 14th Nisan, the actual day of the feast, died as it were as Passover lamb. Whether one now conforms the Synoptics to John or John to the Synoptics; or leaves both unreconciled alongside one another; or also, on the ground of the testimony of the Quartodecimans in the second and third century, who for their practice, to celebrate the Christian Passover feast in the evening of the 14th Nisan, appealed inter alia to the apostle John, denies the genuineness of the fourth gospel, cf. art. Passah, Herzog2 11, 270. Meyer on Joh. 18:28. Schäfer, Das Herrenmahl nach Ursprung und Bedeutung 1897 S. 53-99. Zahn, Einl. in das N. T. II 309 f.; in any case there is agreement to this extent, that Jesus on Thursday evening held a meal with his disciples, died on Friday, and rose on Sunday. Even if now this meal had not been the ordinary Passover of 14 Nisan but held a day earlier, on Thursday 13 Nisan; then there would nevertheless be nothing against assuming that Jesus, who would die the following day and thus could not eat the Passover at the usual time with the Jews, used it a day earlier and in this way connected the Lord's Supper with it. For this latter is beyond all doubt. Both Paul, 1 Cor. 10:16, 11:24, 25 and the Synoptics have Jesus institute the Lord's Supper in the closest connection with the

Passover; from the Passover table he borrows the bread and the wine, which must serve as [303] signs and seals at the Lord's Supper; while he at once takes over baptism from John, he waits with the institution of the Lord's Supper until the last Passover feast and then causes the covenant meal of the O. Covenant to pass over into that of the N. Testaments; and all this finds no contradiction in John, because he is entirely silent about the institution of the Lord's Supper. And further, the date of Jesus' day of death on 14 or on 15 Nisan is completely indifferent for the fact that Jesus died as it were as Passover lamb. For not only does the gospel of John bring this out, 19:33, 36; but Paul also says expressly in 1 Cor. 5:7, that our Passover, namely Christ, has been slaughtered and that therefore the believers must purge out the old leaven of sin, and as ἄζυμοι, as new creatures, unmixed with unrighteousness, ought to walk. And in addition there is still this, that the lamb that is led to slaughter, Jes. 53:7, not improbably contains an allusion to the Passover lamb and thus in the N. Test. is applied to Christ, Joh. 1:29, 36, Hd. 8:32, 1 Petr. 1:19, Op. 5:6 etc. Just as circumcision was a model of baptism and through the death of Christ passed over into that baptism, so the Passover pointed forward to the Lord's Supper and was thereby replaced according to the command of Christ. While, however, the Passover was still in the first place a sacrificium, the Lord's Supper has wholly lost this character. For the offering that was brought in the Passover has obtained its complete fulfillment in the death of Christ. And it is on the ground of that once accomplished and perfect offering that Christ establishes the new dispensation of the covenant of grace and invites and strengthens his disciples at his holy table.

2. After some had taken the lead in earlier times, the institution of the Lord's Supper by Jesus has, however, in recent years been very seriously

contested by Jülicher, Spitta, Mensinga, Brandt, Grafe e. a. As grounds they adduce that the words: do this in remembrance of me, are lacking in Matthew and Mark and occur only as a free addition of Paul in 1 Cor. 11:24, 25 and Luke 22:19; that some manuscripts, especially D, in Luke 22:19, 20 omit the words: το ὑπερ .... ἐκχυννομενον and thus know nothing of a giving of the body of Christ, of a doing in remembrance of him, and of the cup [304] of thanksgiving; that the gospel of John makes no mention of it and the other accounts differ strongly among themselves; and especially, that Jesus could not connect bread and wine with his death, much less could give them to be eaten as signs of his body and blood, but that these representations could first arise when in the congregation a certain view concerning the person and concerning the death of Jesus had been formed. But all these arguments are of little force. For it is a fact that in the time when the gospel of John was written, the Lord's Supper was celebrated generally in the Christian church; the silence concerning the institution therefore can in no case proceed from ignorance. Likewise it is with Luke; the absence of the above-mentioned words in cap. 22:19, 20 cannot suppose that at that time one thought that at the last supper nothing else had happened than what is contained in these words: και λαβων ἀρτον εὐχαριστησας ἐκλασεν και ἐδωκεν αὐτοις λεγων τουτο ἐστιν το σωμα μου. For then the action that then took place would be completely incomprehensible; the text in Codex D presupposes that on that occasion more happened and was spoken and is therefore either corrupt or in the most favorable case an incomplete account of what happened at the last supper. From the time of John and Luke we can ascend to that of Paul; and then it appears that this apostle proceeds from the supposition that the Christian church generally knows and celebrates the Lord's Supper as an

institution of Christ; indeed, he even says that he has received from the Lord and delivered to the Corinthians what relates to the institution of the Lord's Supper, παρελαβον άπο του κυριου, 1 Cor. 11:23. The time in which Paul received this instruction not παρα but άπο του κυριου, from the side of the Lord, undoubtedly coincides with that of his conversion, Hd. 9, and is thus only a few years removed from the last night in which Christ instituted his Lord's Supper. From that it follows that already in the very first years after Jesus' death the Christian congregation unanimously with all the apostles has known the Lord's Supper as an institution of Christ. This is more than sufficient to raise the truth of that institution above all reasonable doubt.

Another question, however, is how Christ instituted this supper and what He meant by it. And then it deserves [305] first of all to be noted that Jesus instituted His supper on the occasion of the Passover meal. The celebration of the Passover in Jesus' time had been expanded with all kinds of ceremonies and took place, in brief, in the following manner. As the feast approached, thousands upon thousands of Israelites went up to Jerusalem, bought a lamb there and had it slaughtered in the afternoon of the 14th Nisan by the Levites in the forecourt; priests stood ready there, to catch the blood in silver and golden bowls, to pass these from one to another, and finally to pour them out all at once over the altar. Meanwhile, under the singing of the hallel by the Levites, the animals were hung up, stripped of the entrails, and the sacrificial pieces were brought by the priest in a vessel to the altar. After that, those who had presented the lamb for slaughter and whose number usually amounted to between ten and twenty men, took the slaughtered animal with them to a private dwelling and roasted it there, without being allowed to break a bone of it. The meal itself began with the

passing around of a cup and with thanksgiving; then bitter herbs and a dish of mash were brought to the table and consumed, and thereafter the lamb was set out with unleavened cakes. Before any of this was eaten, the father of the house, or later a reader, recounted the history of the exodus, the table companions began the first part, Ps. 113-114, of the hallel, Ps. 113-118, and the second cup went around. Only then did the actual meal begin. After its conclusion, the third cup was blessed by the father of the house and drunk out with the table companions. And the whole was then concluded with the pouring of the fourth cup, with the singing of the second part of the hallel, Ps. 115-118, with the blessing of the fourth cup by the father of the house with the words of Ps. 118:26, and with the emptying of it by the guests reclining at table. These four cups were required at the meal, but sometimes a fifth cup still went around under the singing of Ps. 120-137, cf. Keil. Arch. § 81. Herzog2 11, 268-270. Probably Jesus now instituted the supper after the Passover lamb had been eaten, μετα το δειπνησαι, Luk. 22:20, at the third cup, the cup of thanksgiving. In doing so He takes of the ordinary bread and the ordinary wine that had been used at the Passover, and, according to the testimony of all four accounts, Mt. 26:26-29, Mk. 14:22-25, Luk. [306] 22:19, 20, 1 Cor. 11:23-25, directly connects these with His death. There is not a single reason to call this into doubt; Jesus knew and foresaw His death and had already explained its significance more than once to His disciples, part III 354v. Specifically, He here conceives His death as an offering; for only thus are the words and actions to be explained that accompany the institution of the supper. The Passover had just been eaten, and that Passover had been the beginning and foundation of the covenant that God established with Israel in the wilderness; for it first, because the lamb was slaughtered and its blood shed and sprinkled on the

altar, served as an offering of atonement, and was then used for a sacrificial meal to signify the communion of God with His people. All this Christ transfers to Himself; He is the true Passover lamb, which by His death, by the breaking of His body and by the shedding of His blood, accomplishes atonement with God and lays the foundation of a new covenant. Jesus indicates this clearly by instituting the supper on the occasion of the Passover, by for that purpose making use of the bread and the wine of the Passover table, by not only taking and blessing the bread but also, according to all four accounts, cf. Hd. 2:42, breaking it, and especially also by the words that He spoke in doing so. While breaking and distributing the bread He said: τουτο ἐστιν το σωμα μου, Mt. Mr., τουτο ἐστιν το σωμα μου, το ὑπερ ὑμων διδομενον, Luk., or τουτο μου ἐστιν το σωμα το ὑπερ ὑμων, Paul (κλωμενον is lacking in the principal manuscripts and in others alternates with θρυπτομενον and διδομενον). And in giving the cup of drink He said: πιετε ἐξ αὐτου παντες, τουτο γαρ ἐστιν το αἱμα μου της διαθηκης το περι πολλων ἐκχυννομενον εἰς ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιων, Mt., τουτο ἐστιν το αἱμα μου της διαθηκης το ἐκχυννομενον ὑπερ πολλων, Mr., τουτο το ποτηριον ἐν τῳ ἁιματι μου το ὑπερ ὑμων ἐκχυννομενον, Luk., τουτο το ποτηριον ἡ καινη διαθηκη ἐν τῳ ἐμῳ αἱματι, Paul. The divergent readings sufficiently prove that Jesus, at the supper no more than at baptism, prescribed a fixed, unchangeable formula; it is even impossible to determine which words were literally spoken by Jesus Himself on that occasion; He did not determine what had to be said at the supper, [307] but He described what the supper was and had to be. And this is perfectly clear from the four accounts. Jesus has elevated the bread and the wine of the Passover table to signs of His body and blood, and indeed of that body and that blood as it would soon be given up in death as an offering of

atonement. The objection that Jesus' body on the cross was not broken into pieces like the bread, and that His blood there was also not poured out like the wine at the supper, and that therefore these images do not fit, is of little force. For Jesus proceeds from the Passover and from the O. Test. offering, takes over the action and terminology customary there, and applies these to His death. Therefore Luke and Paul add to the words: τουτο ἐστιν το σωμα μου the explanation: το ὑπερ ὑμων διδομενον or only το ὑπερ ὑμων. Whether Jesus literally spoke these words in that way or not; in that sense He nevertheless meant it, when He indicated in the bread a sign of His body. It is a sign of the body of Jesus, as it is offered in death for the atonement of sins. Hence also, the significance of the second sign is described so much more broadly in all four accounts. In the offering, the shedding of blood is the main matter, Hebr. 9:22. The blood of Christ, of which the wine is a sign, is sacrificial blood, blood of atonement, which is shed for many, and thereby the beginning and inauguration of a new covenant. As Passover and old covenant, so supper and new covenant belong together. The cup of drink is therefore το αἱμα μου της διαθηκης or ἡ καινη διαθηκη ἐν τῳ αἱματι μου, i.e. covenant blood, Ex. 24:8, which as sacrificial blood was necessary and serviceable for the ratification of the covenant with God, or the covenant itself, which by that blood, because effecting and bringing about the forgiveness of sins, comes into being and rests therein. The disciples were sorrowful, dreaded the death of Christ and did not understand it; but Jesus here, at the institution of the supper, explains to them that that death is of benefit to them; through it, after all, that forgiveness and that covenant come into being, which in the O. Test. were foreshadowed and foretold; the time of promise is past, that of fulfillment breaks in; the old has passed away, behold, all has become new.

But Jesus does not leave it at that here. In the signs of [308] bread and wine He gives not only an explanation of His death, but He also communicates those signs for use to His disciples. According to Mt. Jesus expressly used the words λαβετε, φαγετε, and πιετε ἐξ αὐτου παντες; and although Mark mentions only the word λαβετε and Luke and Paul make no mention of all these words, yet on the basis of all the reports it is established that Jesus not only elevated the bread and the wine to signs of His body and blood but as such also handed them to His disciples and gave them to partake. After the passover had been used, Jesus instituted a new meal, the components of which were bread and wine, not on and for Himself, but as signs of His broken body and shed blood. Against this Spitta has objected that the eating of the slain body of Jesus and the drinking of His blood are "ebenso schaurige wie für ein israelitisches Bewustsein unverträgliche Gedanken". And therefore it has been thought that, even if Jesus designated bread and wine as signs of His body and blood, He nevertheless did not give them as such to His disciples to partake; that He only declared what would soon happen to Him, but not what His disciples would receive and enjoy; that the eating of Jesus' body and the drinking of His blood at that moment, when Jesus Himself sat at table, was not possible; that, if this partaking was the actual character of the Lord's Supper, then the Lord's Supper later after Jesus' death had a different nature than at the institution; and that it matters so little with respect to the partaking of bread and wine as such signs, that until the middle of the second century, at least in the churches of Rome and Ephesus, the Lord's Supper was celebrated not with wine but with water. There lies in these objections an element of truth. Even if the passover in the O. T. pointed to Christ, the eating of the paschal lamb was nevertheless not an eating of

Christ's broken body, as the partaking of the bread in the Lord's Supper now is. And the blood was indeed shed and sprinkled in the sacrifices of the O. Cov., but it was nevertheless never drunk. The representation that Jesus' flesh had to be eaten and His blood drunk was therefore for the Jews so strange that they took offense at it and left Jesus, Joh. 6:52, 60, 66. The institution of the Lord's Supper does indeed take place in connection with the sacrificial representations of the O. T. but nevertheless again goes beyond them. [309] The Lord's Supper is related to but not identical with the passover. As new to old covenant, as the sacrifice of Christ to that of the O. Test., so stands Lord's Supper to passover. The passover was a sacramentum on the basis of a sacrificium but in both parts a shadow and prophecy of the goods of the N. T. Now, however, by Christ the true and perfect sacrifice has been brought, and therefore on the basis of that sacrifice the communion with God in the Lord's Supper is much richer and fuller than it could be in the days of the O. T. The Lord's Supper is a meal, the essential meal of God and His people; a sacrificial meal, the sacrificial meal par excellence, where the believers partake of Christ Himself, as He has died for them. Jesus expresses that by giving bread and wine as signs of His broken body and shed blood to His disciples to partake. He gives Himself not only for His own; He also gives Himself to His own. Cup and bread in the Lord's Supper are κοινωνια του αἱματος και του σωματος του Χριστου, 1 Cor. 10:16. The above-mentioned objections further have force insofar as they clearly show that a Capernaite eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ is entirely excluded. The Lord's Supper, which Christ Himself, while He sat at table, instituted, is the same as what after His death has been celebrated in the Christian church up to the present day. Bread and wine have no relation to the person of Christ without more, but

specifically to Christ as crucified. In them He sets His sacrifice before our eyes, but also makes us partake of it. And it is indeed precisely on that partaking that the Lord's Supper depends. Jesus gave the signs of bread and wine; He did not hold them in His hand, but He distributed them; He commanded His disciples to take them and to eat; and He added to it according to Luke (only in the distributing of the bread) and Paul (also in the handing over of the cup) the words: τουτο ποιειτε είς την ἐμην ἀναμνησιν. That these words are lacking in Mt. and Mk. proves in the least not that they either were not spoken by Jesus or were added to them by Luke and Paul in conflict with His intention. For in the eating and drinking of the bread and the wine as signs of Jesus' broken body and shed blood the doing in remembrance of Him is of itself included; the former is not possible without the latter. These words further do not imply that the Lord's Supper is only a memorial meal, but they express that the whole Lord's Supper, which in its essence is a sacrificial meal and an exercise of communion with Christ, must take place in remembrance of Him. They do not describe the essence of the Lord's Supper but presuppose that Jesus will soon be absent and prescribe that then nevertheless the Lord's Supper must be celebrated to His remembrance, as a continual proclamation of His death, 1 Cor. 11:26. Therefore with Paul there also stand the words: as often as ye shall eat this bread and drink this cup, 1 Cor. 11:25, 26. The Lord's Supper has been instituted by Christ as an abiding good for His congregation; it is a benefit, added to all other benefits, in order to signify and seal these. And it will remain until the return of Christ. His death must be proclaimed, until He comes. For the cross is and remains in this dispensation the cause of all blessings, the center of the remembrance of the congregation. Jesus Himself said that from now on, from the institution and

the use of the Lord's Supper onward, He would no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until He would drink it new with His disciples in the kingdom of His Father, Mt. 26:29, Mk. 14:25, cf. Luk. 22:16, 18. For He went to heaven, to prepare a place for His disciples. And only when He returns and will have taken His disciples to Himself, will He sit down with them at the wedding table of the Lamb and drink with them of the new wine, which the Kingdom of His Father in the new heaven and the new earth will yield. For that intervening time He instituted the Lord's Supper, as a remembrance of His suffering, as a proclamation of His death, as a means of His rich grace. Cf. Cremer, art. Abendmahl I in Herzog3 1, 32-38 with the literature cited there and further also J. G. Boekenoogen, The origin of the Lord's Supper, Amst. 1883. Rogaar, The Lord's Supper and its original meaning, Gron. 1897. Schultzen, Das Abendmahl im N. T., Göttingen 1895. Josephson, Das H. Ab. und das N. T., Gütersloh 1895. R. A. Hoffmann, Die Abendmahlsgedanken Jesu Christi, Königsberg 1896. Holtzheuer, Das Ab. und die neuere Kritik, Berlin 1896. Schaefer, Das Herrenmahl nach Ursprung und Bedeutung mit Rücksicht auf die neuesten Forschungen, Gütersloh 1897. Eichhorn, Das Ab. im N. T., [311] Leipzig 1898. Clemen, Der Ursprung des h. Ab. Leipzig 1898. W. Schmidt, Chr. Dogm. 1898 II 466. Lichtenstein, Des Ap. Paulus Ueberlieferung von der Einsetzung des h. Ab. Berlin 1899.

3. From the beginning this Lord's Supper occupied a prominent place in Christian worship. It was usually celebrated in a special assembly of the congregation on the Lord's day in the evening and in connection with an ordinary meal, above p. 216. Of the manner of this celebration little is known to us; only we know from Did. 9. 10. 14, that first a confession of sins took place, thereafter over the cup and over the bread separately a

prayer of thanksgiving was pronounced, then the meal was held and the whole was concluded with a thanksgiving. But in the second century there gradually arose throughout the whole church a separation between the ἀγαπαι and the εὐχαριστια. The former went their own way and soon degenerated, Zahn, art. Agapen in Herzog3; and the latter was transferred to the morning worship and brought into connection with the ministry of the word. Various changes accompanied this. The one worship service was soon split into two parts, of which the first, the ministry of the word, was also open to catechumens, penitents and unbelievers, but the second, the celebration of the Lord's Supper, was accessible only to the baptized. This latter acquired more and more a mysterious character, above p. 217; baptism and Lord's Supper became a μυστηριον, a sacramentum, Tert. adv. Marc. 4, 34, and by this name as well as by all kinds of additional ceremonies were shrouded in a mysterious darkness. It is therefore also wholly wrong to interpret the conceptions of those first times according to the opinions which in the West were later, and especially in the 16th century, cherished concerning the unio sacramentalis. Scripture said that the bread is the body and the wine the blood of Christ, and this manner of speaking was adopted and understood and explained by each in his own way. An official interpretation was lacking; no dispute arose about it; and the question concerning the nature of that union of sign and thing signified did not arise; a realistic con- or transubstantiation lay just as far outside the consciousness of that time as an exclusively symbolic or figurative meaning of the Lord's Supper. Symbol and thing were for [312] Eastern thinking much more intimately connected than for Western; we understand, says Harnack, D. 6. I2 397 rightly, by symbol a thing which is not what it signifies, but then one understood much more by symbol a thing which in

one way or another also is what it signifies. It was established from the beginning in the Christian church that bread and wine were the body and blood of Christ; but the manner in which they thought of their mutual union is not clear and therefore susceptible of different interpretation. That holds for Ignatius, Smyrn. 7. Ef. 20. Justinus, Apol. I 66. Iren. adv. haer. IV 18, 5 and for many other writers. But the development of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper was led especially into a wrong track by the application of the idea of sacrifice. In the N. T. indeed the sanctification of the body, Rom. 12:1, prayer, Hebr. 13:15, cf. Op. 5:8, 8:3, beneficence and liberality, Hebr. 13:16, Phil. 4:18, are called a sacrifice, but never the Lord's Supper an offering. Now, however, in the first time the Lord's Supper was connected with an ordinary meal, and for that meal the more well-to-do members of the congregation brought along the necessary ingredients, bread, wine, oil, milk, honey etc., which were probably received by the deacons, placed for the bishop on main and side tables (the later side altars), served at the meal and thereafter destined for the maintenance of the ministers and for the support of the poor. These gifts received the name of προσφοραι, oblationes, θυσιαι, sacrificia, offerings, and were blessed by the bishop with a prayer of thanksgiving, εύχαριστια. This conception was transferred to the whole Lord's Supper. After the prayer of thanksgiving that was spoken over the gifts, soon the Lord's Supper itself and also the two Lord's Supper elements were called εύχαριστια, Did. 9. Ign., Philad. 4. Smyrn. 7. 8. Justinus, Apol. I 66, and it was also soon conceived as an offering that was brought to God by the congregation, Did. θυσια καθαρα, already with appeal to Mal. 1:11. This was still so long fairly harmless, as the Lord's Supper was really regarded as a meal and the thanksgiving was made in the name of the whole congregation; the content of the offering was not the

body and blood of Christ but the gifts brought together by the congregation, so that in the first time one thus thought only of a thank- but by no means of an expiatory sacrifice. But there nevertheless lay in it a dangerous element, which in its time [313] would work wrongly, especially when it was strengthened by the clerical conception of the office. Already Clement compares the episcopi and diaconi with the priests and Levites of the O. T., describes their activity as a προσφερειν τα δωρα της ἐπισκοπης and brings their εὐχαριστια into connection with the O. T. θυσιαι, 1 Cor. 40-44. And when Lord's Supper and agapae, the offering of bread and wine for the Lord's Supper and the contributions for the maintenance of the ministers and the support of the needy, fell apart from one another, the Lord's Supper acquired more and more the character of an offering, which was brought not by the congregation but by the bishop, consisted not in its offering but in his thanksgiving and consecration, and had reference not to the gifts for but to the elements of the Lord's Supper, Justinus, Dial. 41. 70. Iren. adv. haer. IV 18, 5. This conception of the Lord's Supper as an offering now again had influence on the thought which one formed of the unio sacramentalis, just as conversely this on that. In proportion as the bishop was regarded as priest, the thanksgiving as consecration, the Lord's Supper as a sacrifice, the realistic union of bread and wine with the body and blood of Christ also had to recommend itself the more strongly. The symbolic, spiritualistic conception of Origen, which in the essence of the matter is also found with Eusebius Caes., Basilius, Gregorius Naz. e. a., in connection with the Eastern Christology with Cyrillus, Gregorius Nyss., Chrysostomus and Johannes Damascenus makes room for the realistic doctrine of the μεταβολη, μεταποιησις or transformation, which then later still passed over into the doctrine of the μετουσιωσις or transubstantiation, Damascenus, de

fide orthod. IV 14. Conf. orthod. qu. 107. Conf. Dosith. decr. 17, cf. Steitz, Die Abendmahlslehre der gr. K. in ihrer gesch. Entw. Jahrb. f. d. Theol. 1864 S. 409-481. 1865 S. 64-152. 399-463. 1866 S. 193-252. 1867 S. 211-286. 1868 S. 2-67. 649-700. Kattenbusch, Vergl. Konf. I 410 f. Loofs, art. Abendmahl in Herzog3 1, 38-57.

The development proceeded much more slowly in the West, although it later led to the same result. Cyprian indeed strongly brought the sacrificial character of the Lord's Supper to the foreground, but in it nevertheless saw only an imitation of what Christ in truth had done on Golgotha, Ep. 63, 2. 14. And although Augustine repeatedly, in the language of Scripture, calls the bread the body and the wine [314] the blood of Christ, yet in him there is still nothing to be found of the later theory of transubstantiation. On the contrary, Augustine makes as strong as possible a distinction between verbum and elementum, accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum; bread and wine are therefore called sacraments, quia in eis aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur. The sign is indeed often called by the name of the thing signified, but that occurs because it exhibits a likeness of it. Si enim sacramenta quendam similitudinem earum rerum, quarum sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut ergo secundum quendam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum fidei fides est, Ep. 23 ad Bonif. Bread and wine are similitudines, signa, commemorationes of the body and blood of Christ; Dominus non dubitavit dicere: hoc est corpus meum, cum signum daret corporis sui, c. Adam. c. 12. Christ is also no longer bodily with us, but has ascended into heaven; secundum praesentiam majestatis semper habemus Christum, secundum

praesentiam carnis, recte dictum est discipulis: me autem non semper habebitis, tract. 1 in Ev. Joann. If Augustine then also many times calls the Lord's Supper a sacrificium, he does not understand by that that Christ is again in truth, even if in an unbloody manner, offered; but then he calls it so because it is a remembrance of Christ's offering on the cross. Hujus sacrificii caro et sanguis ante adventum Christi per victimarum similitudinem promittebatur; in passione Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebatur; post ascensum Christi per sacramentum memoriae celebratur, c. Faustum 20, 21. Christus se ipsum obtulit holocaustum pro peccatis nostris et ejus sacrificii similitudinem celebrandam in suae passionis memoriam commendavit, 83 qu. qu. 61. de doctr. chr. III 16. Or he also understands by the body of Christ that is offered in the Lord's Supper, the congregation. How is, so he asks, the bread the body of Christ? and he answers: corpus Christi si vis intelligere, apostolum audi dicentem fidelibus: vos estis corpus Christi et membra. Si ergo vos estis corpus Christi et membra, mysterium vestrum in mensa propositum est, mysterium Dei accipitis. And the bread is there the sign of that, [315] quia panis non fit de uno grano sed de multis, Serm. ad infantes, cf. de civ. 10, 6. 22, 10. Therefore Augustine also does not weary of assuring that the use of the Lord's Supper in itself is not sufficient, that it is only for believers unto blessing but for others unto destruction, that the true eating of Christ's body consists in believing: crede et manducasti, Tract. 25 in Joann. and so passim, cf. Bibl. studii theol. apud J. Crispinum 1565 p. 89-100. Dorner, Augustinus 263-276 etc. The doctrine of Augustine, by its powerful influence, for a long time still held back the full development of the realistic theory, and still dominated among the Carolingian theologians, but in the struggle of Ratramnus against Paschasius Radbertus and later in that of Berengarius against Lanfranc was

more and more pushed back and finally entirely replaced by the metabolic theory. The word transsubstantiation we encounter first in Hildebert of Tours † 1134, but he uses it in a sermon, so that it must then already have been fairly generally known, cf. Deutsch in Schürer's Theol. Lit. Z. 1898 col. 442. The matter that was expressed by it had already earlier been established. Berengarius had to sign the formula in 1079, panem et vinum... per mysterium sacrae orationis et verba nostri Redemptoris substantialiter converti in veram et propriam ac vivificatricem carnem et sanguinem Domini nostri J. C. etc. And the Fourth Lateran Council 1215 determined that the body and blood of Christ in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transsubstantiatis pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem potestate divina, Denzinger, Enchir. 298. 357. This dogma presented to the dialectical spirit of scholasticism a series of problems concerning the nature, time, and duration of the change, concerning the relation of substance and accidents, concerning the manner in which Christ was present in both elements and in each part thereof, concerning the preservation and adoration of the host, etc., Lombardus, Thomas, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus on Sent. IV dist. 8-13. Thomas, S. Theol. III qu. 73-83. c. Gent. IV 61-69. Bonaventura, Brevil. VI 9, cf. Schwane, D. G. III 628-661. Harnack, D. G. III 488-498 etc. Concerning the sacrament of the Lord's Supper Rome then teaches thus: the signs in this sacrament are unleavened bread and wine mixed with a little water. These elements are changed by the word of consecration into [316] the proper body and blood of Christ. When the Saviour, namely, at the last meal spoke the words: this is my body, this is my blood; then He not only for this one time caused bread and wine to be changed into His body and blood, but He at the same time therein appointed His disciples as priests and in the words that He

spoke laid a power for changing the substance of bread and wine. The administration of the eucharist is therefore the priestly work par excellence and may never be undertaken by anyone other than an ordained priest. When the priest pronounces the words of consecration, the substance of bread and wine is changed into the substance of the body and blood of Christ. For the bodily presence of Christ in the eucharist cannot be brought about by the fact that Christ leaves heaven and comes to dwell in the sacrament, for Christ is and remains seated at the right hand of the Father; nor can it be effected by creation, for then the bread would not be the proper body of Christ, not the same with which He was born of Mary and died on the cross; it can therefore occur only in such a way that the substance of bread and wine passes over into the substance of Christ's body and blood, approximately as the food that we consume is converted into a constituent of our body. The accidentia of bread and wine, namely the form, taste, smell, color, and even the nourishing power, do indeed remain after the consecration, but they no longer inhere in a subject; the substance of which they were the properties has been removed and replaced by an entirely different one, of which they are no properties, but which they only cover by their appearance for the eye. Since now Christ's body and blood cannot be separated from His human nature and this cannot be separated from His Godhead, the whole Christ is fully present in each element and in each part of both elements. Therefore it is not necessary, although it is also not unlawful and sometimes to be permitted, that the eucharist be received sub utraque specie, for in the smallest piece of bread the whole Christ is nevertheless present. And this Christ is present in the elements from the moment of consecration until the time when they are consumed, thus also ante and extra omnem usum. The eucharist is therefore distinguished from

all other sacraments. For these are all completed by [317] the use; baptism, e.g., is only then a sacrament when the person is actually washed by it. But this is not the case with the eucharist. The formula that is spoken here is not directed to the recipient, but is directed to the element and serves to change this element into the body and blood of Christ. In the eucharist, therefore, the use, the communion, is secondary; it belongs to the perfectio but not to the necessitas of the sacrament. The sacrament of the encharist consists essentially in the consecration itself, in the transubstantiation thereby effected, in the action of the priest, that is, in the offering. The eucharist in Rome is not only a sacramentum, it is in the first place a sacrificium. When Christ spoke the words: this is my body, He at that same moment offered Himself to God; and when He said: do that in remembrance of me, He therein ordained that His priests would repeat this offering from day to day, Mal. 1:11. The offering that takes place by the priest in the mass is the same as that which was accomplished on the cross; it is not a mere image, symbol, remembrance of it, but it is completely identical with it, it is entirely the same offering, only with this difference, that that on the cross is a bloody and this in the mass an unbloody offering. For it is also the same priest who offers himself on the cross and who offers himself here, for Christ himself is he who, by means of the priest, offers himself to God and therefore through his mouth speaks the words: this is my body. Therefore the sacrifice of the mass is not only a praise- and a thanksgiving-, but also a true propitiatory sacrifice, no less rich in efficacy and fruit than the offering on the cross. While the eucharist as sacrament nourishes the spiritual life, preserves from mortal sins, remits temporal punishments, unites the believers and guarantees the future glory, as sacrifice of the mass it effects the remission of temporal punishments and the grace of repentance, not

only for those who attend the mass but also for the absent; not only for the living but also for those doing penance in purgatory. The mass is the center of the Roman cultus, φρικτον μυστηριον, tremendum mysterium. And because the whole Christ is bodily present in the elements of bread and wine, these must be carefully preserved, held forth to the people in a monstrance for adoration, on the [318] festum corporis Christi carried around in solemn procession, and they can also be administered to the sick in their dwelling and given to the dead as a viaticum. Cf. Trident. 13. 21. 22. Catech. Rom. II 2 cap. 4. Bellarminus, de sacr. eucharistiae l. IV and de sacrificio missae, l. II in volume III of his Controversiae p. 150-376. Perrone, Prael. Theol. Lovan. 1841 VI 136-364. Möhler, Symbolik § 34. Jansen, Prael. theol. dogm. III 408-596. Oswald, Die dogm. Lehre v. d. h. Sakr. der Kath. Kirche 2e Aufl. 1864 I 301-584. C. Pesch, Prael. dogm. VI 238-399. Gihr. Das h. Messopfer, 6e Aufl. Freiburg Herder 1897 etc.

4. The Reformation unanimously rejected the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation and sacrifice of the mass, of asservatio, adoratio and circumgestio of the host, of withholding the cup and the use of the Latin language, but it soon diverged in the positive conception of the Lord's Supper. Luther first taught that bread and wine were signs and pledges of the forgiveness of sins, which had been acquired by Christ's death and was received by faith. But he soon went back on this and maintained, especially since 1524 against Carlstadt and Zwingli, on the basis of the synecdochically explained words of institution, that the body of Christ, in accordance with the will and omnipotence of God and his own ubiquity, was really and substantially present in, with and under the Lord's Supper, just as his Divine nature is in the human nature and just as heat is in iron, and therefore was also bodily eaten by the unworthy, even though to their

own destruction, Köstlin, Luthers Theol. I 163 f. 290 f. II 116 f. 511 f. This doctrine passed over into the Lutheran confessional writings, ed. Müller S. 41. 164. 248. 320. 365. 499. 538. 645. 779, and was more broadly elaborated by the dogmaticians, Gerhard, Loc. XXI. Quenstedt, Theol. IV 176-255. Hollaz, Ex. 1103-1141. Schmid, Dogm. d. ev. luth. K. § 55. But many were already in the century of the Reformation of a wholly different opinion. Following the lead of Honius, cf. de Hoop Scheffer, Gesch. d. Kerkherv. I 86v., Zwingli took the words of institution figuratively and explained the little word: is as means, just as everyone does elsewhere time and again, e.g. Gen. 41:26, Joh. 10:9, 15:1. Bread and wine in the Lord's Supper are therefore signs of and [319] remembrances of the death of Christ, and the believers, trusting in this, partake in those signs of the body and blood of Christ. Zwingli decidedly combats the bodily presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, but by that he by no means denies that Christ is present in a spiritual manner for faith. On the contrary, Christ is indeed truly enjoyed in the Lord's Supper, as Joh. 6 clearly teaches, but Christ is present in the Lord's Supper in no other way and is enjoyed therein in no other way than in the word and through faith, that is, in a spiritual manner. This enjoyment of Christ consists in nothing other than trust in his death. Spiritualiter edere corpus Christi nihil est aliud quam spiritu ac mente niti misericordia et bonitate Dei per Christum. And whoever thus enjoys Christ by faith and then comes to the Lord's Supper, he enjoys Him there also sacramentaliter in the signs of bread and wine. In the Lord's Supper we therefore confess our faith, we express what we continually have in Christ through faith and enjoy from Him; and we do that in remembrance of Christ, for the proclamation of and thanksgiving for his benefits, Zwingli, Opera II 1 S. 426. II 2 S. 1 f. III 239. 326. 459. IV 51. 68. Soon there arose

between the German and Swiss Reformation a rupture and dispute, which was not settled by the religious colloquy at Marburg and by the mediating efforts of Bucer on the Reformed and Melanchthon on the Lutheran side. They did not understand one another; on both sides it was acknowledged that Christ truly, with his Divine and human nature, with his own body and blood, was present in the Lord's Supper and was enjoyed, but one attached a different meaning to this "true" presence. When Calvin appeared, there was already no reconciliation to be thought of any more, even though he too, with his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, took a position between and above both parties. For Calvin decidedly stands on Zwingli's side, insofar as he altogether rejects every bodily, local, substantial presence of Christ in the signs of bread and wine; for such a presence is in conflict with the nature of a body, with the true humanity of Christ, with his ascension, with the character of the communion that exists between Christ and his own and differs as far as heaven from an unprofitable oralis manducatio. But further Calvin does not feel satisfied by Zwingli; he has especially two things against his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, 1o that Zwingli lets the gift of God in the Lord's Supper retreat far too much behind what the believers do in it and thus conceives the Lord's Supper one-sidedly as an act of confession, and 2o that in the eating of Christ's body he sees nothing else and nothing higher than believing in his name, trusting in his death. Therefore Calvin further places himself on Luther's side and says that Christ, although not bodily and locally, is nevertheless truly and essentially, with his whole person, also with his body and blood, present in the Lord's Supper and is enjoyed. Not about the fact, only about the manner of that presence does there exist between him and Luther a difference. And the eating of Christ's body in the Lord's Supper does not dissolve into

believing, into trusting in his death. The eating is not one with the believing, even though it always comes about only through believing, but it is rather its fruit, just as in Ef. 3:17 the indwelling of Christ in us indeed takes place through faith but is nevertheless distinct from that faith. Calvin is evidently concerned with the unio mystica, with the communion of the believers with the whole person of Christ. This does not first come about through the Lord's Supper, for Christ is the bread of our soul already in the word, but it is nevertheless bestowed upon us in the Lord's Supper illustrius and in the signs of bread and wine sealed and confirmed. In the Lord's Supper there is a communion not only in the benefits but also in the person of Christ, and again not only in his Divine but also in his human nature, in his own body and blood; and this communion is called an eating. This therefore consists neither in a bodily descent of Christ from heaven nor also in a mixtura vel transfusio carnis Christi cum anima nostra, but in an elevation of our hearts heavenward, in a union with Christ through the H. Spirit, in a communio in his body, as a consequence of which Christ spirat e carnis suae substantia vitam in animas nostras, imo propriam vitam in nos diffundit, Inst. IV c. 17 and further C. R. 37, 461-524. 681-688 etc. cf. my essay on Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper in de Vrije Kerk 1887 bl. 459-487. Calvin's presentation is not in every respect clear, especially not as regards the communion in the very flesh and blood of [321] Christ and the life flowing from it. Utenhove therefore not without reason requested him, when he dealt with the Lord's Supper, to refrain from more or less obscure expressions, Pijper, Jan Utenhove, Leiden 1883 bl. 40. And thus there was also in the confession and doctrine of the Reformed churches and theologians indeed a difference of expression. Some, such as Bucer, sought rapprochement to the Lutheran presentation and said that the body of Christ

substantialiter, quoad substantiam, was present in the Lord's Supper, M. Vitringa VIII 265. 299. But the main thought of Calvin, that in the Lord's Supper through the H. Spirit a spiritual communion is exercised with the person and thus also with the body and blood of Christ and that the believers are thereby nourished and refreshed unto eternal life, has been taken over into various Reformed confessional writings, Tigur. Gall. 36. Belg. 35. Cat. Heid. 75-80. Scot. 21. Helv. II 21. Westmon. 29, and has become common property of Reformed theology, Beza, Tract. Theol. I 30. 206. 211. 259. II 121. III 148. Martyr, Loci Comm. 445. Zanchius, Op. VII 387. VIII 517. Junius, Theses theol. disp. 52. Ursinus, Tract theol. 359. a Lasco, Op. I 190. 549. Polanus, Synt. theol. VI 56. Bucanus, Instit. theol. 649. etc., cf. M. Vitringa VIII 1 p. 266. Heppe, Dogm. 471.

But soon opposition nevertheless arose against this Calvinistic doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The expression in the Conf. Gall. 36, that Christ nourishes us and makes us alive de la substance de son corps et de son sang, aroused in the Swiss churches no slight misgiving. In the year 1572 they addressed the national Synod in France with a request for alteration of these words, but found no hearing. Yet with many the objection continued to exist, and this increased when Bossuet in his Exposition de la doctrine de l'église cath. sur les matières de controverse 1671 sought support in it for the Roman doctrine of the Lord's Supper, M. Vitringa VIII 1 p. 302 sq. Gradually the Zwinglian conception again gained ground, according to which the eating was nothing other than believing and the communion with Christ nothing other than the acceptance of his benefits, Ostervald, Verhandeling v. d. geopenb. godsd. 1742 bl. 385. The relaxation of discipline promoted this externalization of the Lord's Supper and caused one to see in the sacraments only signs of an external covenant, [322] to

which all who lived without giving offence had right and claim, Swarte, van Eerde, Janssonius, cf. Ypey en Dermout, Gesch. v. d. Ned. Herv. Kerk III 612. Thus the way was prepared for rationalism, which repeated the thoughts of Socinians, Remonstrants, Mennonites etc., cf. M. Vitringa VIII 2 p. 1014 sq. and in the Lord's Supper saw nothing higher than a memorial meal, act of confession, and moral educational means, Wegscheider, Instit. § 178. 179. Through Schleiermacher, who rejected not only the doctrine of the Romanists, but also that of the Socinians etc. and recognized those of Luther, Zwingli and Calvin all as orthodox, there nevertheless awoke an endeavor to maintain the Lord's Supper as an objective means of grace and to ascribe to it a strengthening of the communion of life with Christ. This, however, took place in very different ways. Some proceeded from the Lord's Supper as a symbolic act and act of confession but added to it that the believers therein testified that they accepted Christ as having died for them, Doedes, Leer der Zal. § 144v. Ned. Gel. 502. Heid. Catech. 352. Others conceived it as an act of the church, but one which according to God's ordinance serves, by an ethical and psychological way, to strengthen faith in the forgiveness of sins and the communion with God, Lipsius, Dogm. § 853. Biedermann, Chr. Dogm. § 927. Pfleiderer, Grundniss § 156. Many Vermittelung theologians reject the Lutheran consubstantiation and manducatio oralis, and approach the doctrine of Calvin, when they say that Christ is present in the Lord's Supper in a spiritual manner, just as in the word, and communicates himself and his benefits (forgiveness, life, spiritual power, blessedness) to the believer, Kahnis, Luth. Dogm. II 339. Dorner, Chr. Gl. II 848 f. Müller, Dogm. Abhandl. 467. Ebrard, Dogm. § 545. Nitzsch, Ev. Dogm. 567-569. Schmidt, Chr. Dogm. II 471. 478. The old-Lutheran doctrine was again presented by Scheibel, Rudelbach,

Philippi, Kirchl. Gl. V 2 S. 260 f. and by the neo-Lutherans further supplemented with the theosophical conception that Christ through bread and wine nourishes not only the soul but also directly the body, by healing the diseases of the body and strengthening the new man of the resurrection, who in secret has been created through baptism, Martensen, Dogm. § 265. Thomasius, Christi Person u. Werk II3 327. 341, Hofmann, [323] Schriftbeweis II 2 S. 220. Vilmar, Dogm. II 245. Frank, Syst. d. chr. Wahrh. II2 290. Rocholl, Spiritualismus und Realismus, Neue Kirchl. Zeits. 1898, cf. Luther himself in Köstlin II 163. 516. In the English church finally the ritualistic party more and more adopted the doctrine and usages of the Lord's Supper from Rome, Wilberforce, The Doctrine Of The Holy Eucharist 1853. Pusey, The presence of Christ in the holy eucharist 1853 cf. Ryle, Knots untied 1886 p. 205. Williams, The crisis in the Church of England, Presb. and Ref. Rev. July 1899. On the history of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper there further treat the dogma-historical works of Hagenbach, Münscher-v. Coelln, Harnack, Schwane etc., the articles Abendmahl, Transsubstantiation, Messe in Herzog2. Abendmahl, Eucharistie in Herzog3. Rückert, Das h. Ab., sein Wesen u. seine Gesch. in d. alten Kirche 1856. Ebrard, Das Dogma v. h. Ab. u. seine Gesch. 2 Bde 1845/6. Stahl, Die luth. Kirche u. die Union, Berlin 1859. Kahnis, Dogm. II 360-438, and further literature in Dorner, Chr. Gl. II 848. Luthardt, Komp. d. Dogm. § 72.

5. In Scripture the Lord's Supper is designated by the names δειπνον κυριακον, 1 Cor. 11:20, τραπεζα κυριου, 1 Cor. 10:21, κλασις ἁρτου, Hd. 2:42, 20:7, ποτηριον τον κυριου, 1 Cor. 11:27, ποτηριον της εὐλογιας, 1 Cor. 10:16. And the church later added to these many others, such as ἁγαπη, because in the earliest period the Lord's Supper was connected with a love-

feast; εὐχαριστια, already in Did. 9. Ign. Smyrn. 7. 8. Just. M. Apol. I 66, because the believers at the Lord's Supper gave thanks to God for the gifts of his grace; εὐλογια, because over bread and wine, by thanksgiving and praise of God, the blessing was pronounced; συναξις, κοινωνια, because the believers, coming together at the Lord's Supper, exercised fellowship with one another; προσφορα, θυσια (ἁγια, πνευματικη, μυστικη, ἀναιμακτος etc.), because the believers brought along the ingredients for the meal and offered them to God, or because the Lord's Supper was an image and remembrance of the offering of Christ on the cross; and furthermore still δειπνον μυστικον, εἰωχια, ἐφοδιον, viaticum, λατρεια, λειτουργια, φρικτον μυστηριον, tremendum mysterium, sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Domini, sacramentum altaris, missa, derived from the missio catechumenorum after the conclusion of the didactic part [324] of the religious service etc. Although Luther still continued to speak of sacramentum altaris, Art. Smalc. III 6. Cat. maj. 5, the Protestants in general gave preference to the name sacra coena or coena Domini and also held fast in this, that the Lord's Supper was an essential meal. Some Roman theologians, such as Maldonatus on Mt. 26:25, did indeed remark against this, that the expression δειπνον κυριακον in 1 Cor. 11:20 did not refer to the Lord's Supper but to the meal which was held after the Lord's Supper and was offered by the richer members of the congregation to the poorer, M. Vitringa VIII 10; yet the Lord's Supper was held not before but after the ordinary meal, v. 21 and is included under the expression, if not exclusively then at least also. But even if this were not the case, the incorrectness of the designation would by no means thereby be proved. For the Lord's Supper is, according to the tenor of Scripture, an essential meal. The connection with the agapae, the institution on the occasion of the Passover meal, the

components of bread and wine, the eating and drinking thereof—everything points to it, that in the Lord's Supper we have to do with an essential meal, and that we may never remove this character from it. But it is a δειπνον κυριακον, a meal of the Lord. Jesus is its institutor and in this too fulfilled the will of the Father, to do which was his food. The Lord's Supper, like baptism, is of divine origin and must be so, in order to be able to be a sacrament; for God alone is dispenser of grace and he alone can bind its dispensation to means ordained by him. And Jesus institutes this Lord's Supper specifically as mediator; in it he appears as prophet, who proclaims and explains his death; in it he acts as priest, who has given himself up for his own on the cross; in it he comes forward as king, who freely disposes over the grace acquired and gives it to his disciples to enjoy under the signs of bread and wine. And like the institutor, so he is also the host and the minister of the Lord's Supper; he himself takes the bread and the wine, blesses them and distributes them to his disciples. And host and minister he was not only when he bodily sat at table with his disciples; but he is and remains everywhere and always, where his meal is celebrated. Every Lord's Supper, administered in accordance with his institution, is a δειπνον κυριακον. For Christ is institutor not [325] only by example but also by precept. It is a meal in remembrance of him, 1 Cor. 11:24, for proclamation of his death, v. 26, for communion in the body and blood of Christ, 1 Cor. 10:16, 21, 11:27. In the Lord's Supper Christ comes together with the congregation and the congregation with Christ, bearing witness to their spiritual communion, cf. Op. 3:20. The minister, who blesses and distributes bread and wine, therefore does this in the name of Christ and is only an instrument in his hand. Because Paul in 1 Cor. 10:16 speaks in the plural of those who bless the cup, and Tertullianus, Exhort. ad cast. 7 says, ubi

ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus, et offert et tingit sacerdos, qui est ibi solus; sed et ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici, some, such as Grotius, Salmasius, Episcopius e. a., asserted that, if a priest or teacher was lacking, the Lord's Supper might also be administered by an ordinary member of the congregation. But this opinion lacks sufficient ground. In Mt. 28:19 the administration of baptism is at the same time entrusted with that of the word to the apostles; they with the teachers are dispensers of the mysteries of God, proclaimers of the mysteries which God has revealed in the gospel of Christ, 1 Cor. 4:1; stewards of God, who have to dispense his grace, 1 Cor. 9:17, Tit. 1:7. Undoubtedly with these mysteries one must think first of all of the word of the gospel. But the sacrament follows the word and is always connected with the word. The apostles in Jerusalem exercised there the ministry of prayers and of the word, Hd. 6:4; at the breaking of bread, Hd. 20:7, 11, Paul conducts the word; the pronouncing of the thanksgiving at the Lord's Supper was a part of the ministry of the word and thus entrusted to the teacher, even though it, like the breaking of the bread, is presented in 1 Cor. 10:16 as an act of the congregation, Sohm, Kirchenrecht 69. According to Did. 10, 7 the εὐχαριστειν accordingly belongs to the prophets, according to Ign. Smyrn. 8 to the bishop, according to Just. Apol. I 65 to the προεστως, while the deacons therein rendered their service and handed bread and wine to the communicants, cf. Suicerus, s. v. διακονος and συναξις, Voetius, Pol. eccl. I 756-751. Moor V 638-641. M. Vitringa VIII 1 p. 327 sq. This close connection of the administration of the Lord's Supper with that of the word proves that the minister acts in the name [326] of Christ and is active as steward and dispenser of his mysteries. The Lord's Supper is a meal, of which Christ is the host.

Furthermore, the idea of meal in the Lord's Supper comes out very strongly in the food and the drink which are distributed and enjoyed in it. Just as the water in baptism, so the signs of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper have not been chosen at will or by chance. In the sacrifices of the O. Test. flesh and blood were the main thing, because they typically pointed forward to the sacrifice of Christ on the cross. But the Lord's Supper itself is no sacrifice but a memorial of the sacrifice on the cross and expresses the communion of the believers with that sacrifice. Therefore Christ chooses no flesh and blood but bread and wine as food and drink in the Lord's Supper, to make known that it is no sacrifice but a meal, a meal on the ground of, in remembrance of, for the exercise of communion with the crucified Christ. And for that purpose the signs of bread and wine are eminently suitable; they were in the East the ordinary constituents of the meal, they are still easily obtainable everywhere and at all times, they are the principal means of strengthening and gladdening the heart of man, Ps. 104:15, and are an eloquent symbol of the communion of the believers with Christ and with one another, M. Vitringa VIII 1 p. 43. In addition, it is indifferent whether the bread consists of wheat, rye, or barley and the wine bears a white or a red color; whether the bread, according to the usage of the Greek church, is leavened or, according to that of the Roman church, is eaten unleavened; and whether the wine, according to the doctrine of the Armenian Christians, is used unmixed or, according to the definite pronouncement of Trente XX c. 7, mixed with water. Christ has determined or prescribed nothing of all this. The Reformed even did not hesitate to say that, in case bread and wine were decidedly lacking, also another food and drink, e.g. rice and bread, might be used as signs in the Lord's Supper, Voetius, Pol. Eccl. I 732. 738. Moor V 575. M. Vitringa VIII 1 p. 46. But thereby arbitrary deviation from

the institution of Christ has not yet been declared permissible. Just as in this time, so also in the first centuries there were some Christians (Tatianen, Severianen, Gnostieken, Manicheën, Aquarii) who, from an ascetic principle, replaced the wine with water at the Lord's Supper. But we must not [327] be wiser than Christ, who has expressly ordained the wine as a sign of his blood, and whose command in this has been followed by the Christian church at all times, M. Vitringa VIII 1 p. 71-78. For the assertion of Harnack, that the custom of using water at the Lord's Supper was fairly general in the first and second century and still had to be combated in the fifth century; and that also Paul himself, speaking of the cup of drink, does not definitely think of a cup with wine, has been sufficiently refuted by Zahn, Brot und Wein im Abendmahl der alten Kirche, Erlangen 1892, cf. also W. Schmidt, Christl. Dogm. II 465. Likewise the practice of the Roman and Lutheran Christians is to be disapproved, to administer the bread in the form of a wafer (oblie, oblata, because the believers formerly themselves offered the necessities for the Lord's Supper; hostie, hostia, because the bread is a sign of the sacrifice of Christ). For although the quantity of the bread, just as little as the quality, is determined, yet the character of a meal must be preserved, and this is almost entirely lost with the use of a small, round wafer, Voetius, Pol. Eccl. I 733. M. Vitringa VIII 1 p. 49. Finally, the place and the time in which the Lord's Supper was instituted and formerly celebrated also clearly bring out that it is an essential meal. For Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper on the occasion that he reclined with his disciples at the Passover table. And in the first time the Lord's Supper, in connection with an ordinary meal, Hd. 20:7, 11, 1 Cor. 11:21, in the public assembly of the congregation, 1 Cor. 10:17, 11:18, 20, 21, 33, and daily or at least every Sabbath, Hd. 2:46, 20:7, was celebrated. Only gradually was

the Lord's Supper detached from the agapae, transferred from the evening to the morning worship service, administered outside the assembly of the congregation also to the sick and dying in their houses, celebrated as mass wholly outside and without an assembly of the congregation, and the use of the Lord's Supper for the believers fixed at three, or at a single time per year as a minimum, Trid. sess. 13 can. 9. Although now some Reformed were of the opinion that the Lord's Supper in very special cases might also be administered to the sick in their dwelling, but then nevertheless in the presence of others, Calvijn bij Henry II 210. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. I 764, they nevertheless generally held fast the thought that it, as a part [328] of the cultus publicus, belonged at home in the assembly of the congregation and might not be celebrated privately. And although practice has proved stronger than doctrine and the celebration of the Lord's Supper is usually limited to six or four times in the year, Dordr. 1578 art. 73. Midd. 1581 art. 45. 's Grav. 1586 art. 56. Dordr. 1618 art. 63, yet it was originally the wish of Calvijn to celebrate it at least once per month, Kampschulte, Joh. Calvin I 460, cf. a Lasco, bij Dalton 383. Voetius, Pol. Eccl. I 758-767. 801. 802. Moor V 660 sq. 671 sq. M. Vitringa VIII 1 p. 406-414. If baptism, as incorporation into the Christian church, already ought to take place in the public assembly of the believers, then this applies still much more to the Lord's Supper, which essentially is a δειπνον, συναξις, convivium and includes not only a communion with Christ but also a communion of the believers. Therefore the determination of the character of the Lord's Supper finally concentrates wholly around the question whether it must be administered on a table or on an altar. Jesus and his disciples were reclining at a table when they used the Lord's Supper, and the first Christians also knew nothing of an altar. But gradually the distinction between the Old- and

the New-Test. dispensation was lost; the meeting place was changed into a temple, the minister into a priest, the Lord's Supper into a sacrifice, and the table into an altar. In the Roman and Greek church the whole cultus is governed by this view; the Anglican church adopted it for the most part and now inclines toward it more and more; the Lutheran church retained the altar and regarded it as an adiaphoron. But the Reformed restored the scriptural idea of the meal of the Lord also in the table of the Lord's Supper. For the difference between the cultus of the O. and of the N. Testaments consists in this, that temple and altar, priest and sacrifice are no longer on earth but in the heavens. The Jerusalem that is above is the mother of us all, Gal. 4:26; there Christ, the eternal High Priest, has entered in for us, Hebr. 6:20, after he by one sacrifice had brought about an eternal redemption, 9:12, to appear before the face of God for us, 9:24; and there the Christians have their sanctuary, into which they enter with boldness in the blood of Jesus, 4:16, 10:19, 12:22. Here on earth we have only [329] a mutual gathering, in which there is no place for any sacrifice, 10:25. The only altar of the Christians is the cross, on which Christ has brought his sacrifice, 13:10, cf. 7:27, 10:10. From that altar, that is, from the sacrifice brought thereon, they eat, when by faith they have communion in Christ and his benefits. The believers have no other sacrifice to bring than sacrifices of praise, that is, fruit of lips that praise his name, 13:15. The Lord's Supper is a sacrificial meal, a meal of the believers with Christ on the ground of his sacrifice and therefore to be administered not on an altar but on a table. Certissimum est, everti Christi crucem, simulac erigitur altare, Calvijn, Inst. IV 18, 3. Voetius, Pol. eccl. I 792. Moor V 659. M. Vitringa VIII 1 p. 414. Herzog3 art. Altar.

6. The Lord's Supper is thus an essential meal, but as such nevertheless has its own, spiritual meaning and destination. Christ has instituted it, not in order that it should feed us bodily but in order that it should feed us spiritually. Before He distributes bread and wine, He blesses both and says that the bread is His body and the wine His blood; as such, as His broken body and shed blood, bread and wine must be taken and enjoyed by His disciples. The materia sacramenti, the thing signified in the Lord's Supper, is thus the body and blood of Christ, as it has been broken and shed in His sacrificial death for His church unto forgiveness of sins, that is, the crucified and dead Christ with all the benefits and blessings acquired by His death, ipse Christus cum omnibus suis beneficiis, Heppe, Dogm. 466. 467. In the moral, rationalistic conception of the Lord's Supper this meaning does not come into its own. For 1o the Lord's Supper is indeed also a memorial meal, but it is this first on the ground of the fact that Christ has instituted bread and wine as signs of His body and blood. In the first place, in the Lord's Supper it is not a matter of what we do, but of what God does. Before all else the Lord's Supper is a gift of God, a benefit of Christ, a means for His grace. If the Lord's Supper were nothing but a memorial meal and an act of confession, it would cease to be a sacrament in the proper sense; only incidentally and indirectly would it then, just as prayer, be called a means of grace. The Lord's Supper [330] however stands on one line with word and baptism and is therefore first of all, like these, to be regarded as a preaching and assurance of God's grace to us. 2o Christ does not elevate bread and wine in general to signs of His body and blood, but He does this specifically with respect to that bread and that wine which He holds in His hand and imparts to His disciples. And He does not say that in that bread and that wine they have merely to see His body and blood, but

He expressly declares that they must take, eat, and drink both as such. He makes it a meal, in which the disciples enjoy His body and blood and thus enter into the most intimate communion with Him. That communion does not consist in this alone, that they sit together at one table, but they eat of one bread and drink of one wine; indeed the host offers under the signs of bread and wine His own body and blood as food and drink for their souls. That is a communion which far surpasses that in a memorial meal and act of confession. It is not merely a remembrance of, not a reflection on Christ's benefits, but it is a most intimate bond with Christ Himself, as food and drink unite with our body. 3o In the Lord's Supper we receive indeed no other and greater, but yet also no lesser benefits than in the word. Now Jesus, Joh. 6:47-58, has expressly said that in the word and through faith we eat His flesh and drink His blood and thus receive eternal life. Even if in Joh. 6 there is not directly mention of the Lord's Supper, yet it may and can serve for the explanation of this second sacrament. Through the word and in faith we obtain such an intimate communion with Christ, with His body and blood, as arises between the food and him who enjoys it. And this is the doctrine not only of Joh. 6, but of the whole of Scripture. The word does not bestow that communion in a literal sense, nor does faith either, but God has bound Himself to impart to him who believes His word His communion in Christ and all the benefits connected therewith. Calvin therefore rightly remarked against Zwingli that the eating of Christ's body and the drinking of His blood does not dissolve into believing. Believing is a means, a means even that is temporal and once passes over into seeing, but the communion with Christ, which thereby arises, goes [331] much deeper and endures into eternity. It is a unio mystica, which can be made only somewhat clear to us under the images of vine and branch, head and body, bridegroom and bride,

cornerstone and building, cf. deel III 556. And it is this unio mystica which is signified and sealed in the Lord's Supper.

The Christian church has maintained this unio mystica in the Lord's Supper almost unanimously; Greek and Roman, Lutheran and Reformed Christians are therein agreed with one another, that in the Lord's Supper an objective and real communication takes place of the person and the benefits of Christ to every one who believes. But among themselves they differ greatly concerning the manner in which that communication occurs. The former are not satisfied, unless the body and blood of Christ are also physically and locally present in the signs and are received and enjoyed by the bodily mouth. The Reformed, however, teach that Christ in the Lord's Supper is indeed truly and essentially communicated to the believers, but in a spiritual manner and in such a way that He could be received and enjoyed only by the mouth of faith. And for that Scripture supplies abundant proofs. 1o In the words τουτο ἐστι το σωμα μου the subject τουτο can refer to nothing else than to the bread, which Jesus holds in His hand. The predicate is το σωμα μου, and thereby denotes the very body of Christ, which He assumed from Mary and surrendered in death for His own. The copula is ἐστι, which Jesus in the Aramaic did not utter at all but in any case connects two disparate concepts, bread and body, and thus cannot be a copula of actual being. Thus ἐστι here must have significative, figurative meaning, for disparatum de disparate non potest praedicari nisi figurate. The sentence contains a tropus, and this lies not in the subject or in the predicate, but, as Zwingli rightly perceived, in the copula ἐστι, just as is so often the case in Scripture, e.g. Gen. 17:13, 41:26, 27, Ex. 12:11, Ezech. 5:5, Luk. 12:1, Joh. 10:9, 15:1, etc. Gal. 4:24, 1 Cor. 10:4, Hebr. 10:20, Op. 1:20 etc. And that in the words of institution such a tropus must be assumed, is proved still

further, in addition, from the fact that Jesus according to Luke and Paul with the second sign does not say: this wine, but: this cup is the new testament [332] in my blood. Even the Romanists and Lutherans are compelled to assume a tropus here. 2o When the subject τουτο does not refer to the natural bread and to the natural wine, but already to the substance of Jesus' body and blood, which are hidden under the form or within the signs of bread and wine, then bread and wine have already been changed into Jesus' body and blood or have already taken these into themselves, before the words: this is my body, this is my blood, have been spoken, and they lose all the force and value which Romanists and Lutherans ascribe to them. For the trans- or consubstantiation has then not been brought about by those words but has already preceded them; and the words, on which so much emphasis is laid, contain nothing but a declaration of what already exists and came about earlier. Difficult, indeed impossible, is it then to say when and how the trans- or consubstantiation came about; for indeed there is mention of preceding blessing and thanksgiving, but the content thereof is not stated with a single word; we do not know at all what Jesus said in it and thus also not what we must say, in order to bring the trans- and consubstantiation about. And moreover, if Paul in 1 Cor. 10:16 says: the cup of blessing which we bless is communion of the blood of Christ, then he proceeds from the presupposition that the cup contains wine and not blood, for otherwise we could not bless it, and that it as such, as containing wine, by the blessing is communion of Christ's blood. 3o The words which Jesus spoke at the institution of the Lord's Supper are not intended as any fixed formula. That appears from the fact that Matthew, Mark, Luke and Paul reproduce them in different reading and that the liturgical usage of the Christian churches exhibits all manner of divergence among themselves.

According to the Greek church the so-called epiklese, the invocation of the H. Spirit, belongs essentially to the words of consecration, Schwane, D. G. II 810. Kattenbusch, Vergl. Conf. I 413, whereas according to Rome the transubstantiation comes about by the uttering of the words: hoc enim est corpus meum, where the little word enim has been arbitrarily inserted and the words: which is broken for you, have been arbitrarily omitted. Much less is it still to be proved that the words —suppose that it were fixed which were to be used— possess a [333] consecratory, operative, conversive power. For Jesus does not say: this becomes, but: this is my body and thus has already beforehand set the bread apart from common use and by blessing and thanksgiving destined it for a higher purpose. 4o When Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper, He sat bodily with His disciples at table. These therefore could not come to the thought that they enjoyed with the bodily mouth Jesus' own body and blood and could still much less eat that body itself and drink that blood. It avails nothing, to say with Philippi, that they über das Mass ihres gewöhnlichen Verständnisses durch den erleuchtenden Geist emporgehohen wurden, K. Gl. V 2 S. 451, or with Hollaz, Ex. theol. 1119, that Jesus naturali modo sat at table but sacramentaliter gave Himself to be eaten. For not only is there nothing of this in Scripture, but the question runs precisely about the manner in which Jesus at the first Lord's Supper gave His body and blood to be enjoyed and may not be answered with a petitio principii. If the manner in which Romanists and Lutherans with their trans- and consubstantiation imagine this enjoyment of Jesus' body and blood, is excluded by the first Lord's Supper or can be maintained therewith only by an appeal to a miracle or by all manner of evasions for which Scripture offers no ground, then it ought to be abandoned by the Christian who submits to God's word. And if at the first Lord's Supper no

trans- or consubstantiation and no manducatio oralis took place, then it may also not be assumed at the Lord's Supper which the Christian church after Jesus' death celebrates at His command and according to His institution. 5o Just as much as with His bodily sitting at table, the trans- and consubstantiation is now in conflict with His bodily ascension and with His local abode in heaven. If indeed bread and wine at the Lord's Supper are changed into Jesus' body and blood or take these into themselves, that body must descend from heaven or already, according to the Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity, cf. Kübel, art. Ubiquität in Herzog2, be present everywhere beforehand. In the latter case there is nevertheless again an act needed, by which the presence of Christ's body in the Lord's Supper is brought about in a special manner, for ubiquity is of course not sufficient for that; and therefore Luther, Brenz e. a., said that it is [334] still something else, wenn Gott da ist und wenn er dir da ist. Dann aber ist er dir da, wenn er sein Wort dazu tut und bindet sich damit an und spricht: hie sollst du mich finden, bij Kübel, art. Ubiquität in Herzog2 16, 123. 128. The word thus effects in Rome and in Luther such a presence of Christ's body and blood in the Lord's Supper, that He is not only bodily in heaven but also on earth, present in the signs of bread and wine. And this presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper is moreover then still conceived in such a way, that Christ wholly, not only according to His divine but also according to His human nature, is present in every Lord's Supper, where and when it is celebrated; that He with His entire divine and human nature is present in each sign of the Lord's Supper, indeed in each particle of the bread and in each drop of the wine, totus in tota hostia et in qualibet parte. This now is an endless multiplication of Christ, which is in direct conflict with the doctrine of Scripture concerning His human nature, concerning His ascension and

concerning His abode in heaven. For certainly that human nature at the resurrection and the ascension is glorified but therefore not deprived of its essential properties of finitude and limitation, part III 414v. Jesus institutes the Lord's Supper precisely for His remembrance, because He goes away and soon will no longer be bodily with His disciples, as He elsewhere also expressly declares, Mt. 26:11. And at the ascension He went away and was taken up, Hd. 1:9-11, into heaven, which is a place, Joh. 14:2, 4, 17:24, Hd. 7:56, Col. 3:1, Ef. 4:10, Hebr. 7:26, to remain there until His parousie, Hd. 1:11, Phil. 3:20, 1 Thess. 1:10, 4:16. 6o But even if Christ were bodily and locally present in the Lord's Supper, one does not see to what this is necessary and serviceable. The benefit of the manducatio oralis is in no way to be demonstrated, cf. Köstlin, Luthers' Theol. II 516. Suppose even that we with the bodily mouth eat Jesus' own body, what benefit do we have from that? It is after all in the Lord's Supper a matter of this, that our soul, that our spiritual life, is nourished and strengthened. And this cannot by the nature of the case occur through the eating of Christ's body with the bodily mouth; for what we thereby eat passes partly into constituents of our body and is partly cast out. Newer theologians [335] have therefore come upon the thought that the manducatio oralis of Christ's body planted in us the germ of a new, of a resurrection body. But this conception runs wholly against Scripture and is the fruit of a false theosophy. Yet, if this fruit is not connected with the eating of Christ's body, there is no other to be indicated. The manducatio oralis is useless and vain and in the ground, however much one combats it, Capernaite. The Capernaïtes could imagine no other eating of Jesus' flesh than with the bodily mouth, Joh. 6:41, 52. And even though Romanists and Lutherans do indeed assume a spiritual eating of Jesus' body, they nevertheless connect this with, they nevertheless make it

dependent on, the bodily eating, without making the manner of that connection or the nature of that dependence in the least clear. Jesus, however, in the whole discourse which He holds against the Capernaïtes, intended nothing other than a spiritual eating, an eating by faith, and makes no mention for a moment of a bodily eating.

All the objections mentioned here apply to both Roman and Lutheran doctrine; against the former, moreover, the following are added. 7o Transubstantiation is decisively contradicted by the testimony of our senses, by sight and touch, by smell and taste. And our senses have the right to have a say here, because bread and wine fall within their range and can and may be judged by them. They are also, if they observe accurately, just as trustworthy here as elsewhere, because otherwise sceptical nominalism stands at the door and all certainty of faith and of science disappears. Rome, too, must therefore yield to their testimony, but has devised the notion that the substantia changes and the accidentia remain the same. How this is to be conceived remains unanswered. At Cana the water became wine, but in such a way that substance and accidents changed. Accidents also cannot be thought of as separated from the substance and as resting in themselves, for then they cease to be accidents and themselves become substances. Moreover, in the bread and the wine of the Lord's Supper all accidents remain unchanged, both those perceived by smell and taste and those perceived by sight and touch; weight, solidity, colour, perishability, nutritive power, etc., everything remains; what then remains for the substance that can change and has changed? 8o Transubstantiation conflicts with the pair of signs that Jesus ordained at the Lord's Supper. Although even earlier, sometimes in the administration of the Lord's Supper in private homes, to the sick, to prisoners, to anachoretes, to virgines abstemiae, and in missis

praesanctificatorum only the sign of the bread was distributed, and conversely to minors, as still now in the Greek church, only the wine was administered; yet only since the twelfth century did the custom come into vogue of withholding the cup from the laity, and only the council at Constance in 1415 elevated this custom to ecclesiastical law. In spite of the opposition that was waged against it by the Hussites and the Reform-minded, the council of Trent also attached its approval to the withholding of the cup and was led thereto gravibus et justis causis, Sess. 21. The synod does not enumerate these reasons, but they are nevertheless easy to surmise. Apart from the reluctance of some to drink with others from one cup, the aversion to wine, the danger of spilling and thus dishonouring the sacrament, etc., the Roman church was moved to this withholding of the cup especially by the desire to elevate the priestly estate above the laity, and by the conviction that each sign and each part of it had been changed into the whole Christ, Oswald, Die dogm. Lehre v. d. h. Sakr. I 501. Transubstantiation makes a second sign in the Lord's Supper entirely superfluous; in the bread alone and even in the smallest piece of it the whole substance of grace is already contained. Thereby the Roman church comes into conflict with a direct command of Christ, Mt. 26:27, against which its appeal to the conjunction ἤ in 1 Cor. 11:27 avails nothing, and at the same time, according to its own confession, with the custom of the Christian church in the first centuries. It knows how to defend itself only with the assertion that it possesses power to proceed in the distribution of the sacraments as it sees fit, Trid. sess. 21 c. 2. Conversely, the institution of the Lord's Supper under two signs is a strong proof that transubstantiation is not the doctrine of Scripture. Together, after all, they set before our eyes the crucified Christ and communicate Him to believers, not in a bodily but

in a spiritual manner, not in and under but at the same time with the signs; together they form one sacrament, as images and pledges of the one spiritual good, communion with Christ and his benefits. 9o Transubstantiation is finally also refuted by the idolatrous practices that have followed it. Even if the mass is prepared by the idea of sacrifice and priesthood, which was already early brought into connection with the Lord's Supper, it is nevertheless essentially built on the doctrine of transubstantiation first worked out in the Middle Ages. And this is equally presupposed by the asservatio, adoratio and circumgestio. Through the doctrine of the change of essence the Lord's Supper has passed over into the mass, and thereby has been wholly and entirely deprived of its original character. Although the communio, despite all kinds of restriction, has continued to exist, the mass has nevertheless become the centre of Roman worship. It is therefore nothing less than the most complete elaboration of the Roman thought that the church with its priesthood is the mediatrix of salvation, the God-man continually realising himself on earth. In the mass Christ always and again and again repeats his offering on the cross; He offers himself therein essentially and truly, even if in an unbloody manner, and thereby effects with God that the fruits of his offering on the cross, which were acquired there only wholly in general and in the abstract, are now applied, cf. Trid. 22 c. 1, to all who live in the communion of the church, whether on earth or in purgatory, whether they are present at the mass or absent, whether they desire it for themselves or for others, for spiritual or bodily need, for forgiveness of sins and for the prevention or averting of sickness and accident, drought and flooding, war and cattle plague, etc. That is what Rome has made of the Lord's Supper of our Lord Jesus Christ! Of grounds, which with such an important doctrine as the

mass ought to be present in abundance and unshakably firm, there is a complete and total lack. In Gen. 14:18, where Melchizedek offers Abraham bread and wine for refreshment, there is not a word about an offering, even though there follows immediately, not: for, but: and he (Melchizedek) was a priest of the most high God. Mal. 1:11 perhaps does not even deal with the future; but even if this is the case, this passage only describes in Old Test. forms that the Lord's name will be great among the Gentiles and that incense and a pure offering (מִנְחָה, offering-gift in general) will be brought to him; and these forms are in the N. T. precisely replaced by prayer and by the spiritual offering of believers, Rom. 12:1. At the institution of the Lord's Supper Jesus did indeed say: τουτο ποιειτε εἰς την ἐμην ἀναμνησιν, Luk. 22:19, but that Jesus thereby instituted the Lord's Supper as a sacrifice and elevated the disciples to priests is not in the least included in these words and is certainly not proved thereby, that the Hebr. עשׂה and the Lat. facere are sometimes used in the sense of offering. In 1 Cor. 10:21 Paul sets the table of the Lord over against the table of demons; but because the table of demons was an altar, it by no means follows from this that the table of the Lord is also an altar on which sacrifice must be offered. These are the principal and strongest proofs which the Romanists can adduce from Scripture for their doctrine of the mass. And scarcely stronger is their appeal to the church fathers, for they forget in doing so that these, applying the idea of sacrifice to the Lord's Supper, attached to it a wholly different sense than Rome later connected with it. And over against all these apparent arguments stands a series of proofs that place the unscriptural character of the mass in the clearest light. To the institution and the celebration of the Lord's Supper customary in the apostolic church everything that resembles the mass is utterly foreign. The eternity of Christ's priesthood, Hebr. 5:6,

7:17, 21-25, and the perfection of his sacrifice on the cross, Hebr. 7:27, 9:12, 28, 10:10, 12, 14 make a, even if unbloody, repetition of his self-offering superfluous and unlawful; all benefits of grace, forgiveness, sanctification, redemption, the whole salvation, have been acquired by the offering on the cross and can neither need nor be supplemented. Indeed, because Christ once offered himself on the cross and surrendered himself in death, He cannot even do this a second time; his offering in death is not susceptible of repetition, Hebr. 9:26-28. His priestly activity does indeed continue in heaven, but nevertheless does not consist in any propitiatory offering but in his intercession and appearance before God's face on behalf of his people, Hebr. 7:25, 9:24; and in that intercession and appearance before God's face the offering accomplished on the cross always continues to work for the benefit of his own. Because Christ himself lives in heaven to pray for believers and in that intercession lets his offering continue to work, therefore there is no place for the repetition of his offering on earth, deel III 419v. His state of exaltation, his elevation above all suffering, pain and death, his royal dominion as head of the congregation are in direct conflict with a sacrificium propitiatorium and impetratorium, which He would still have to offer on earth every day and in thousands of places. However much Rome may assert that the unbloody offering does not weaken the bloody one on the cross but makes it effective, in fact it is nevertheless a denial of the only offering on the cross; for a sacrifice that does nothing other than let one enjoy the fruits of another sacrifice is a palpable absurdity. If the offering on the cross is sufficient, others are superfluous; if these are necessary, the first is imperfect. And this is confirmed by Roman practice; the attention of the believer is diverted from Christ and his cross and directed toward the priest and his mass. For the least grace the Roman

Christian is dependent on the priest and on the church. He cannot do without them for a moment. In theory it is maintained that Christ has acquired all grace; but in practice grace is allotted successively, in bits and pieces, by the priest. The Lord's Supper has in the hands of Rome become a tremendum mysterium, which keeps believers in the state of minority, binds them for their whole life and well-being to the hierarchical priesthood and makes them kneel down in idolatrous adoration before a God of their own making. Cf. against the doctrine of trans- and consubstantiation: Calvijn, Inst. IV 18. Beza, Tract. theol. I 211 sq. 507 sq. III 148 sq. Martyr, Loci Comm. IV c. 12. Ursinus op Heid. Cat. 78-80 en Tract. theol. 359-596. Chamier, Panstr. Cath. IV l. 6. Amesius, Bellarminus enervatus l. IV. Rivetus, Op. III 339-376. Turretinus, Theol. El. XIX qu. 21. M. Vitringa VIII 769. Art. Messe e. a. in Herzog2. Hase, Prot. Polemik5 488-535 enz.

7. Even better than the Lutherans, the Reformed have purified the Lord's Supper from the Roman admixtures and restored it to its original meaning. The Lord's Supper was, according to the institution of Christ, a meal, an essential meal, in which bread and wine were used as food and drink for the strengthening of the body, and above all served as signs and seals for the exercise of communion with the crucified Christ. [340] It is an ordinary, natural but at the same time an extraordinary, spiritual meal, in which Christ, the host, offers his own crucified body and shed blood as nourishment for our souls. Therefore, in that meal, which Christ has instituted, everything is important; nothing in it is without meaning; everything has a deep sense. In the first place, the signs of bread and wine are not chosen arbitrarily but are pre-eminently suitable to give us an idea of the spiritual food and drink which Christ in his death has prepared for our souls. In the second place, all the actions are significant which Jesus

performs at the institution of the Lord's Supper. He does not take the bread and the wine, as earlier at the Passover, from the hand of others, δεξαμενος, Luk. 22:17, but He takes them himself from the table, λαβων, vs. 19, as proof that He is the host and disposes the food and the drink. He blesses (εὐλογησας, Mt. 26:26, Mk. 14:22, alternating with respect to the cup with εὐχαριστησας, Mt. 26:27, Mk. 14:23, while Luk. 22:19, 20 and Paul, 1 Cor. 11:24, 25 have only εὐχαριστησας) the bread and later likewise the cup; under that blessing it is not to be understood that Christ asks from God a blessing over bread and wine, but the interchange with εὐχαριστησας proves that Jesus blesses God, i.e. praises and thanks for the gifts that have been bestowed by Him. The content of that praise and thanksgiving is not mentioned, but certainly did have reference to the gifts of creation, represented in bread and wine, and further especially to the gifts of grace, which would be acquired by the death of Christ and were offered to the disciples in his body and blood. By that thanksgiving already, bread and wine were set apart from common use and destined for a higher purpose, and at the same time the disciples were prepared for a right understanding of the significant words, this is my body etc., which Jesus would presently utter by way of explanation. Further, Jesus broke the bread, in which the Reformed rightly saw an action which, though not belonging to the essentia yet did belong to the integritas sacramenti; for not only is this breaking mentioned in all four accounts, but the whole Lord's Supper is named from it, Hd. 2:42; just as the breaking of the bread is necessary in order to make it enjoyable for the guests, so Christ must give his body in death, in order that it may be food for our souls, Joh. 6:51, 12:24. Finally, Jesus himself distributes the bread and the wine to his disciples, so that they would eat and drink thereof; He does it with the explicit words: λαβετε, φαγετε, πιετε

ἐξ αὐτου παντες, which most strongly condemn the Roman mass without communicants; the communio belongs to the essence of the Lord's Supper. In the third place, the words are important which Jesus speaks at the distribution of bread and wine; when He gave the bread to his disciples, He said: this is my body, which is given for you, Luk. 22:19; and in handing the cup He said: this cup is my covenant blood, or the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you or for many for the forgiveness of sins. That these words possess a consecratory, operative power finds absolutely no support in the text of the accounts. But after Jesus, by the thanksgiving, has set apart bread and wine from common use, destined them for a higher purpose, and prepared his disciples, He now speaks the words: this is my body and blood. He does not say: let this bread become my body; He does not command and order, but He declares and explains. For it is a symbolic action that He performs; a spiritual meal that He institutes. And of that meal his body and blood, as it is given over in death, is the food and the drink. All the signs, actions, and words in the Lord's Supper are directed thereto, that they point our faith to the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the cross, as to the only ground of our salvation. Yet for that reason the Lord's Supper does not dissolve into a meal in remembrance of Christ and his benefits. Under the signs of bread and wine Jesus in fact gives his own body and blood to be enjoyed; the Lord's Supper table brings about a true communion between Christ and the believers, a communion not only in the benefits but also and before all in the person of Christ, both according to his human and according to his divine nature.

On the reality of that communion there is, between Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed Christians, no difference; in this respect they stand together arrayed against Zwingli. But they do differ among themselves

concerning the nature of that communion and concerning the manner in which it is enjoyed in the Lord's Supper. [342] Roman Catholics and Lutherans think that it cannot truly and fully come into being otherwise, unless they cause Christ to descend bodily from heaven to earth and eat and drink his body and blood, not only spiritually, but also with the bodily mouth. Over against this Calvin from the beginning onward and always again anew has laid the emphasis on the fact that the communion of believers with Christ, also according to his human nature, is spiritual in character, and that it comes into being, not because Christ descends bodily downward, but because we spiritually lift up our hearts upward to heaven, where Jesus Christ is, our advocate, at the right hand of his heavenly Father. And this doctrine rests on Scripture and accords with the character of the N. T. dispensation. For 1o the communion of Christ and believers is indeed so intimate and indissoluble that it is almost not to be expressed in any words and can be clarified only under images, such as of head and body, vine and branch, bridegroom and bride, to some extent. But it is nevertheless no pantheistic mixing or identification, no overflowing of substance, no unity of essence as of the three persons in the Trinity, no personal union as of the two natures in Christ. Christ and believers remain distinct; their personality is maintained; the unio mystica is a union of persons, be it then also not only according to their will and disposition, but also according to their being and nature. 2o This communion is effected by the H. Spirit, who dwells in Christ as the head and in believers as his members. There is no other way to become partaker of that communion. A physical union, such as trans- and consubstantiation with the manducatio oralis connected therewith wishes to bring about, is wholly vain and useless. Only the H. Spirit, who is the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ, can so unite human beings with

Christ that they have part in his person and benefits and are not to be separated from Him by any death or grave, by any world or satan. And therefore that communion is also always spiritual in character. It does indeed also include the human nature of Christ and believers according to their bodies. For Christ as mediator is not to be conceived without his human nature and He purchased believers not only according to their soul but also according to their body. Yet the union remains spiritual [343] in character, because it comes into being only through the H. Spirit. 3o The communion with Christ, which is strengthened in the Lord's Supper, is no other than that which also comes into being through the means of grace of the word. The sacrament adds no grace at all to that which is offered in the word; it only strengthens and confirms what has been accepted from the word by faith. When Roman Catholics and Lutherans therefore object that the communion with Christ in the Lord's Supper according to the Reformed conception is no true communion with the very body and blood of Christ, then against this it need only be remarked that the communion, assured in the Lord's Supper, is no other and cannot be other than that through the word. In exactly the same way as the human being is incorporated into Christ by faith, he is also strengthened and confirmed in that communion by the Lord's Supper. There is no other, higher communion. Whoever believes the word becomes Christ's property according to body and soul; and whoever receives the Lord's Supper in faith is assured and certified thereof. The sacrament bestows no other grace but bestows the same grace, for the strengthening of faith, only in another manner. 4o Also among the Reformed, therefore, Christ is indeed truly and essentially, with his divine and human nature, present in the Lord's Supper, yet in no other manner than He is present in the gospel. He is not bodily enclosed in bread and wine any

more than in the proclaimed word, but whoever accepts the sign in faith receives according to the ordinance of God true communion with the whole Christ. Not in and under, but with the sign Christ bestows the thing signified, that is, himself with all his benefits. For while among Roman Catholics and Lutherans grace is something thing-like and passive, which is even received bodily by the unbeliever, among the Reformed it is the personal, living Christ himself, who in the Lord's Supper communicates himself as spiritual food to believers, Müller, Dogm. Abh. 458. Present, therefore, according to the Reformed in the Lord's Supper He is not less, but much more strongly and truly than according to Rome and Luther, for He is present, not physically, locally within the signs but spiritually, as the acting Christ himself, in the hearts of believers, Aliud est praesentem Christi substantiam, ut nos vivificet, in pane sistere; [344] aliud vivificam esse Christi carnem, quia ex ejus substantia vita in animas nostras profluit, Calvijn, adv. Westph. bij Müller 443 cf. Conf. Angl. 28 en Ryle, Knots untied 235-254. 5o Therefore faith is an indispensable requirement for the reception of the sacrament. The truth of the sacrament does indeed not depend on that faith. For just as with the word, God has bound himself with the Lord's Supper to truly bestow Christ and his benefits upon everyone who believes. But the unbeliever naturally receives only the sign, just as with the word he hears only the sounds and does not become partaker of the thing itself that is indicated thereby. In order to obtain part in the promises and benefits of word and sacrament, therefore, an operation of the H. Spirit in the heart of the human being is necessary; and it is precisely this operation of the Spirit that outside of and in the Lord's Supper brings about and maintains the communion with Christ. 6o The benefits that are enjoyed in the Lord's Supper are easily to be derived from this. In the foreground

stands the strengthening of the communion with Christ. The believer is already partaker of that communion through faith and receives in the Lord's Supper no other than that which he already enjoys through faith. But when Christ himself through the hand of the minister gives him under the signs of bread and wine his body to eat and his blood to drink, then by the H. Spirit he is strengthened and confirmed in that communion, and always more intimately united according to body and soul with the whole Christ both according to his divine and according to his human nature. For manducatio corporis Christi nihil aliud est, quam arctissima cum Christo conjunctio, Junius, Theses theol. 52, 7. From baptism the Lord's Supper is in this respect distinguished, that baptism is the sacrament of incorporation, the Lord's Supper the sacrament of growth in the communion with Christ. Through baptism we are buried with Christ in his death and raised up in his resurrection, and are thus passive; but in the Lord's Supper we ourselves appear acting, eat the body and drink the blood of Christ and thus are fed by his communion unto eternal life. But if we have part in the person of Christ, then we naturally also have it in all his benefits. Among these the forgiveness of sins is named in Scripture in the first place and with the greatest emphasis. [345] In the Lord's Supper Christ gives his body and blood as food for our souls, but that body and blood is such a food not, quia est corporea substantia, quo modo esset cibus corporalis sed quatenus corpus Christi est datum pro mundi vita, Junius t. a. p. Therefore body and blood are set before the eyes separately, each under its own sign, in the Lord's Supper. Therefore Christ says expressly that his body is given and his blood is shed for the forgiveness of sins. Therefore the meaning of the blood in the words of institution is elucidated and explained still more broadly than that of the body, for it is the blood that on the altar makes

atonement for sins. Even if Christ is now glorified, the communion that comes into being through faith and is strengthened in the Lord's Supper is and remains a communion with his crucified body and with his shed blood. On the standpoint of trans- and consubstantiation this is impossible; there the dead Christ recedes behind the glorified one. But if the eating of Christ's body and the drinking of his blood is equal to intima nostri cum Christo conjunctio, Bucanus, Inst. theol. 677, then this and every other benefit is exclusively a fruit of the death of Christ and therefore we are nourished only out of Christ because He was crucified for us. And among the benefits that Christ acquired by his death, then, the forgiveness of sins stands at the top. This benefit too is not bestowed for the first time in the Lord's Supper; for the Christian already possesses it through faith and has received thereof in baptism the sign and seal. It is therefore incorrect to distribute the different graces with Rome over the sacraments in such a way that each time in each sacrament a particular group of sins is forgiven and a particular grace is bestowed, for the forgiveness which the word, baptism, and the Lord's Supper offers us is always the same. The forgiveness which is communicated in the Lord's Supper therefore has absolutely not only reference to culpae quotidianae, to peccata venialia, Trid. sess. 13 c. 2. 22 c. 1. But it is the same full, rich benefit of forgiveness which is offered in the word, is accepted by faith, and is signified and sealed by the sacrament of baptism and the Lord's Supper. With this benefit it clearly comes out that the sacrament adds no new grace at all to the word; it gives the same grace only, for the sake of our weakness, in another manner, so that we might firmly believe and be healed of all doubt. With this benefit of forgiveness comes that of eternal life. The Lord's Supper is a spiritual meal, where Christ feeds our souls with his crucified body and shed blood. The eating

and drinking thereof serves for the strengthening of the spiritual, eternal life, for whoever eats the flesh of the Son of man and drinks his blood has eternal life and is raised up at the last day, Joh. 6:54. It clearly appears from this that eternal life is a benefit that is bestowed upon the whole human being, not only according to his soul but also according to his body. Wrongly some have derived from this that from Christ's body, which is enjoyed in the Lord's Supper, a direct operation proceeds upon our body, so that this is healed of all manner of sickness and weakness and in principle is re-created into a new resurrection body. It is understandable that especially on the Lutheran standpoint one came to this opinion; for if the manducatis oralis does not have this usefulness, it has no value at all. Yet the H. Scripture teaches nothing concerning this. In 1 Cor. 11:30 Paul does indeed say that as a consequence of the dreadful misuse of the Lord's Supper in Corinth many sicknesses and deaths occurred; but this is clearly a κριμα, vs. 29, a punishment, which God caused to occur upon this misuse of the Lord's Supper, and proves not at all that use or a believing use of the Lord's Supper also serves for the healing of the sicknesses of the body. Moreover, Joh. 6 may indeed be used for illustration of the Lord's Supper, but does not deal with it directly; and this chapter too teaches only that whoever by faith, even without the Lord's Supper, eats Christ's flesh and drinks his blood, has eternal life and will be raised up at the last day, cf. 6:40. Absolutely therefore not only through the manducatio oralis, but in general through faith the human being becomes partaker of eternal life and the hope of the resurrection. The H. Spirit, who dwells in believers, is the surest pledge for the resurrection of the body and the day of redemption, Rom. 8:11, Ef. 1:14, 4:30. But this Spirit of Christ does then indeed make use of the Lord's Supper, in order to strengthen the believer in the hope of eternal life and of

[347] blessed resurrection at the end of days. For where the soul has been healed, there the body also has been helped, Luther bij Müller, Dogm. Abh. 419. Praesentia corporis affert non modo indubitatam vitae aeternae fiduciam animis nostris, sed de carnis etiam nostrae immortalitate securos nos reddit, siquidem ab immortali ejus carne jam vivificatur et quodammodo ejus immortalitati communicat, Calvijn, Inst. IV 17, 32, cf. also bij Ebrard, Dogm. v. h. Ab. II 460, and further Philippi, K. Gl. V 2 S. 282 f. Müller, Dogm. Abh. 417. In this sense the Lord's Supper may be called φαρμακον ἀθανασιας, Ign. Ef. 20. Finally, the Lord's Supper also serves, as a memorial celebration and proclamation of Christ's death, for confession of our faith over against the world and for strengthening the communion of believers among themselves. In 1 Cor. 10:17 the apostle argues that the bread must indeed be communion with the body of Christ, for how could otherwise believers, who considered in themselves are many, be one? That unity comes into being only because they in the one bread have communion with the one body of Christ. Believers are one in Christ and therefore also among themselves. Just as from many grains of wheat one bread is baked and from many berries, being pressed together, one wine and drink flows, so all who by true faith have been incorporated into Christ are together one body; and that they confess at the Lord's Supper over against the world, which does not know their unity.

8. Just like baptism, the Lord's Supper has been instituted only for believers. Jesus used it only with his disciples. Whether Judas was still present at it or had left the room before the institution of the Lord's Supper cannot be said with certainty. Mt. 26:21-25, Mk. 14:18-21, Joh. 13:21-35 give the impression that Judas had gone away before that time, but Luk. 22:21-23 relates the discovery of Judas as betrayer after the institution of

the Lord's Supper in vs. 19. 20. It is, however, possible that Luke does not here adhere to the chronological order. But be that as it may, the question has no dogmatic importance. If Judas partook of the Lord's Supper, then he sat down as a disciple of Jesus; that is what he was, that is how he presented himself; what he inwardly deliberated in his heart against Jesus remained for his own account. M. Vitringa VIII 347. Likewise, later the Lord's Supper [348] was celebrated exclusively within the circle of the congregation by the believers, Hd. 2:42, 20:7. Unbelievers did indeed have access to the assembly of the congregation in which the word was administered, 1 Cor. 14:22-24, but were excluded from that in which the agapae were held and the Lord's Supper was celebrated, 1 Cor. 11:18, 20, 33. Thus it remained also when gradually in the second century the Lord's Supper was detached from the agapae and took place in the same assembly as the administration of the word in the morning. The first part was accessible to all, but the second part began only when unbelievers, catechumens, the excommunicated, etc. had been removed. In this second part of the religious service the sacraments were administered; and it was an old and widely spread custom that those who, after completion of the catechumenate, were baptized, immediately thereafter received the Lord's Supper. When infant baptism came into use, this custom was also followed with the children and moreover urged on by the prevailing exegesis of Joh. 6:53, according to which this verse applied to the Lord's Supper and this sacrament was therefore just as necessary to salvation as baptism. In the West, however, this custom, especially since the twelfth century, again fell into disuse and was gradually declared unnecessary by various synods, cf. Trid. 21 c. 4. But in the Greek and other Eastern churches it remained in existence and even today the Lord's Supper is administered to newly

baptized children in the form of a little piece of bread dipped in wine, Art. Kinderkommunion in Herzog2 7, 671. M. Vitringa VIII 368. 612. But the magical conception of the Lord's Supper had still worse abuses as a consequence. The original simplicity was lost amid all kinds of solemn ceremonies. Not only by self-examination, but also by fasting, washing of the hands, clothing, etc., the communicants had to prepare themselves for the Lord's Supper. The bread was first received with the bare hand, later in a linen cloth or a golden little dish, and later still, since the eleventh century, with the mouth and in a kneeling posture at the altar of the priest. The consecrated bread was not only consumed by the communicants in the church, but was also administered to the sick in their dwelling, given along to the dying as a viaticum, and considered useful for warding off all kinds of disasters and obtaining all kinds of blessings and benefits. Not only to the living but also [349] to the dead did the working of the sacrament extend. Already from of old there existed the custom to bring, not only for oneself but also for deceased relatives on their day of death, offerings and to pray for their soul. And when now the doctrine of purgatory had been established by Gregory M., the Lord's Supper was conceived as an offering of the very body and blood of Christ, and the participation of the congregation became less and less, then it soon stood fixed that the mass could effect, not only for present or absent living persons but also for the deceased in purgatory, a reduction of penances and temporal punishments, M. Vitringa VIII 733. Herzog2 9, 623 f. All these corruptions made a return to Holy Scripture necessary, according to which the Lord's Supper is a meal, not capable of existing without guests reclining at table, and intended exclusively for believers. In order to proceed purely and to let Scripture in this respect fully come into its own, the Reformed usually posed two

questions: 1o who have a right to the Lord's Supper and must approach it, and 2o who must be admitted to the Lord's Supper by the church or must be kept away from it, Heid. Cat. 81. 82. The first question deals with the duty of the communicants, the second with the duty of the church and of its ministers. To the last question the answer was given, and according to Holy Scripture the answer could not be otherwise than that the church had to keep away from the Lord's Supper all who, by their confession and their life, present themselves as unbelieving and ungodly people. The Lord's Supper is a good of the church, given by Christ to his congregation and therefore to be enjoyed only by household members of the faith. The unbaptized, unbelievers, heretics, schismatics, public sinners, the excommunicated were thereby excluded of themselves. But the number of those who had a right to the Lord's Supper was restricted much more. In the first place, by the rejection of mass and purgatory, the administration of the Lord's Supper for the deceased was also abolished. In Scripture something of that sort is in fact not found with a single word. Paul does indeed speak in 1 Cor. 15:29 of such as had themselves baptized ὑπερ των νεκρων. But even if (which, however, is absolutely not proven, cf. Cremer3, 156) this passage had to be understood in such a way that at that time there were Christians who had themselves baptized for the benefit of unbaptized deceased friends, even then the apostle makes use of this practice in no other way than [350] as a proof for the resurrection and leaves it standing without approval or disapproval. The church, at the council at Carthage 397, decisively condemned baptism for the dead, which was in use among some sects, and therefore can derive from it no argument for the administration of the Lord's Supper for the benefit of the deceased. In the second place, many Reformed had an objection to the Lord's Supper being administered outside

the public assembly of the believers in a private dwelling to the sick and the dying, Musculus, Bullinger, Beza, Danaeus, Aretius etc., the Reformed churches of France, Scotland, the Netherlands etc. And indeed others, such as Calvin, Oecolampadius, Martyr, Zanchius, the churches of England, Poland, Hungary etc., sometimes allowed this. But even then they nevertheless usually restricted it in such a way that a small assembly of believers had to be present and thereby every occasion for superstition was prevented or avoided, Voetius, Pol. Eccl. I 758. M. Vitringa VIII 356. Moor V 660. In the third place, the children too are excluded from the Lord's Supper. Trent condemned only the necessity, but not the permissibility of the Lord's Supper for children. And on that standpoint, among the Reformed, Musculus also placed himself in his Loci Communes p. 471-473. He adduced for that these grounds: that whoever possesses the thing signified also has a right to the sign; that children, who according to baptism can receive the grace of regeneration, can also without consciousness be nourished in that spiritual life; that Christ is the savior of his whole congregation, also of the children, and feeds and gives drink to them all with his body and blood; that the admonition to self-examination 1 Cor. 11:26-29 is not intended by the apostle as a general requirement. But all these grounds lose their weight over against these considerations: 1o in the O. T. there was a great difference between circumcision and passover. Circumcision was prescribed for all children of the male sex, but the passover was celebrated, not immediately at the institution, but later in Palestine at the temple at Jerusalem; very young children were therefore of themselves excluded from it. 2o Likewise there is a great distinction between baptism and the Lord's Supper. Baptism is the sacrament of regeneration, in which the human being is passive; the Lord's Supper is the

sacrament of the growing up in the communion of Christ, of the nourishment of the [351] spiritual life, and presupposes conscious, acting participation on the part of the one who receives it. 3o Christ instituted the Lord's Supper in the midst of his disciples, said to them all: take, eat, drink, and presupposes that they accept the bread and the wine from his hand. And Paul says that the congregation at Corinth came together in order to eat and gives no other impression than that only conscious, adult persons participate in the Lord's Supper. 4o In 1 Cor. 11:26-29 the apostle expressly sets the requirement that one examine oneself before the Lord's Supper, so that one may discern the body of the Lord and not eat and drink unworthily. This requirement is set quite generally, directed to all participants in the Lord's Supper, and therefore of itself excludes the children. 5o Withholding the Lord's Supper from the children causes them to lack no single benefit of the covenant of grace. This would indeed be the case if baptism were withheld from them. For that can be done only by one who thinks that the children stand outside the covenant of grace. But with the Lord's Supper it is otherwise. Whoever administers baptism to children but not the Lord's Supper acknowledges that they are in the covenant and partake of all its benefits. He withholds from them only a particular manner in which the same benefits are signified and sealed, because this does not suit their age. For the Lord's Supper gives no single benefit which was not previously already bestowed in the word and baptism through faith.

This distinction between baptism and the Lord's Supper soon made a preparation for the worthy reception of the second sacrament necessary. In the apostolic time, when as a rule only adults were baptized, there was as yet no such preparation. Whoever heard and accepted the word of the gospel was immediately baptized and admitted to the Lord's Supper. But

when in the following century the transitions to Christianity became more numerous but also less reliable, the catechumenate gradually arose, which at first had to prepare for baptism and later, after infant baptism became general, for the Lord's Supper. In the Roman church this preparation gradually passed entirely into the sacrament of confirmation, which developed out of the laying on of hands originally connected with baptism and associated itself with an anointing. The Reformation rejected this sacrament, because it had no ground in Scripture, and put in its place [352] catechesis and the public confession, cf. Höfling, Das Sakr. der Taufe II 347 f. Bachmann, Die Gesch. der Einführung der Confirmation, Berlin 1852. Caspari, Die evang. Confirmation vornehmlich in der luth. K. Erl. 1890. Art. in Herzog2 8, 143. Thereby the transition was made from baptism to the Lord's Supper and the church at the same time preserved from degeneration. Calvin wished that, when a child had been sufficiently instructed in the catechism, it should publicly in the congregation make confession of its faith, in Bachmann t. a. p. 70. à Lasco desired that children who had become fourteen years old should make confession before the congregation and on the following Sunday go to the Lord's Supper; but those who lived badly were admonished and finally, in the case of continued obstinacy, at eighteen or twenty years of age cut off from the congregation, ib. 115. The Dutch Church Orders likewise prescribe a confession before the consistory or in the midst of the congregation, and sometimes still speak of a preceding examination before the consistory. This theory ran pure: the children of believers are baptized as believers, then instructed in the truth, upon sufficient examination and after public confession admitted to the Lord's Supper or, in the case of unchristian doctrine or disorderly walk, after repeated admonition removed from the

congregation. According to this doctrine our ecclesiastical life is still to be arranged, even though it at every moment runs up against objections of practice. For pietism and rationalism are always inclined to separate what God has joined together and, with contempt for the sacrament, to lay the emphasis on personal conversion or on ecclesiastical acceptance or confirmation. But the rule of the covenant is this, that the church raise up her youthful members, who are born as children of the covenant and by baptism are incorporated into her, to independent, personal confession and on that ground admit them to the Lord's Supper. Concerning the heart she does not judge and cannot judge. While she thus on the one hand keeps away from the Lord's Supper all who by confession or life present themselves as unbelieving and godless people, on the other hand she never desists from the earnest preaching that the Lord's Supper is instituted only for those who, because of their sins, are displeased with themselves, nevertheless trust that these are forgiven them for Christ's sake, and also desire more and more to strengthen their faith and to amend their life.

CHAPTER XI. ON THE LAST THINGS.

Monergism Books

§ 54. The Intermediate State.

1. Just as origin and essence, so also the end of things is unknown to us. To the question: whither, science gives an answer no more satisfying than to that, whence all things are. And yet religion has an urgent need to know something of the destiny of the individual human being, of humanity and world. All peoples have therefore some thought or other about it and all religions contain a kind of eschatology. There are indeed still those who assert that belief in the immortality of the soul originally is absolutely not proper to all men and even today, e.g. among the Weddas in Ceylon, among the Indian Seelongs and others, is lacking, Büchner, Kraft und Stoff16 423. Häckel, Die Welträthsel, Bonn 1899 S. 223. From the standpoint of evolution, belief in God, in the independent existence of the soul and in its immortality also cannot have constituted an original component of human nature, but must have arisen and developed gradually and accidentally through all kinds of circumstances. Ancestor-veneration, love for deceased blood-relatives, zest for life and the wish for prolongation of life, hope for better conditions of life on the other side of the grave, fear of punishment

and hope of reward etc. have then been the causes which have gradually caused the belief in immortality to arise. But over against that, most and the best practitioners of the history of religions testify that belief in immortality occurs among all peoples and is a [354] component also of the lowest and roughest religions. We encounter it everywhere and at every stage of development, where no philosophical doubts have undermined it or other causes have pushed it into the background, and everywhere it is also connected with religion, Tiele, Inl. tot de godsdienstwetenschap, tweede reeks Amst. 1899 bl. 97. Peschel, Volkerkunde5 257. One can even say that this belief originally was something very natural. Just like the author of the paradise narrative in Genesis, says Tiele, t. a. p. bl. 197, the peoples all proceed from the conviction that man by nature is immortal and that not immortality must be proved, but death must be explained. Death seems something unnatural. Something must have happened, by which something so illogical came into the world. The legends of all kinds of peoples, different in origin and development, express that idea. There was a time when there was neither sickness nor death on earth. The “simple man of nature” cannot even yet believe in death, when he sees it before his eyes. It is a sleep, he says, a state of unconsciousness; the spirit has left the body but can still return. Therefore he waits still a few days, to see whether this will not happen. And if the spirit of the dead does not return, one holds it for certain that he has only disappeared, to enter somewhere, wherever it may be, into another body or to associate with the supernatural spirits. The forms in which this life of the soul after death was represented were very different and were often also connected and mixed with one another. Now one thought that the souls after death continued to live in the vicinity of the grave and for their existence needed the continual care of blood-relatives, or

also in the underworld, in the hades, far removed from gods and men, led a sad, shadowy life. Then again one believed that the souls of the deceased, just as they sometimes already before their dwelling in the human body had undergone all kinds of transformations, so also after leaving it still for a time had to sojourn in other bodies of animals and men, in order to purify themselves, to attain perfection and to be absorbed into the Godhead or into an unconscious Nirvana. Or also it was taught that the souls immediately after death came into the Divine judgment, and if they had done the good, crossed over the dangerous [355] bridge of the dead into the land of the blessed, where they lived in communion of the gods, or also, if they had done the evil, plunged down into a place of eternal darkness and torment. Cf. the second part of C. W. Flügge, Gesch. des Glaubens an Unsterblichkeit, Auferstehung, Gericht und Vergeltung, Leipzig 1795. Spiess, Entwicklungsgesch. der Vorstellungen vom Zustande nach dem Tode auf Grund vergl. Religionsforschung 1877. Knabenhauer, Das Zeugniss des Menschengeschlechts über die Unsterblichkeit der Seele, Freib. 1878. Merschmann, Die Idee der Unsterblichkeit in ihrer gesch. Entw., Berlin 1870. Pfleiderer, Religionsphilos. 1896 S. 625 f. Runze, art. Unsterblichkeit in Herzog2 16, 189 vooral 198 f. Id. Die Psychologie des Unsterblichkeitsglaubens und der Unsterblichkeitsleugnung, Berlin 1894.

The doctrine of personal immortality passed over from religion into philosophy. After Pythagoras, Heraclitus, and Empedocles had already preceded, Plato in particular attempted in the Phaedo to support his religious belief in immortality with philosophical reasonings. His proofs amount to this, that the soul, which draws the knowledge of the ideas from remembrance, already existed before its dwelling in the body and thus will also continue to exist after leaving that body; that by its thinking

contemplation of the eternal ideas it is akin to the divine being and by its mastery of the body and its desires, as something independent and simple, is exalted far above the body; and especially, that as principle of life and identical with life, it cannot be conceived as non-living and perishable. With this doctrine concerning the immortality of the soul he then connects all manner of representations concerning pre-existence, fall, union with the body, judgment, transmigration of souls, which for a principal part bear a mythical character and also by Plato himself certainly are not all intended in a scientific sense. Although other philosophers, such as Democritus, Epicurus, Lucretius, contested the immortality of the soul or, like Aristotle, did not pronounce themselves decisively about it, the doctrine of Plato had an astonishingly great influence on theology and philosophy. The mythical components of praeëxistentie, metempsychose etc. often found entrance with sectarian directions. And theology, under Plato's influence, devoted to the immortality of the soul much greater [356] attention than Holy Scripture. The doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul became an articulus mixtus, whose truth was demonstrated still more from reason than from revelation, Tert., de an. 22. Orig., de princ. VI 36. Iren., adv. haer. II 34 etc., among the Reformed, Heppe, Dogm. 166. Yet there always remained some difference. The awareness never died out wholly and entirely, that Holy Scripture attaches to life and death, besides a physical, also always a religious-ethical significance. Life with it is never only continued existence and death is never equal to annihilation, but life includes communion with God and death is lack of his grace and favor. Hence the church fathers repeatedly say that Christ has come to bestow upon us the ἀθανασια and it can sometimes have the appearance as if they denied the natural immortality of the soul. And there was added to that still,

that one had to combat Plato's doctrine of the praeëxistentie, that is, of the uncreatedness of the soul, and for that reason sometimes made objection to calling the soul immortal by nature, since God alone was immortal of himself and the soul could only be immortal by his will, Just. Dial. 5. Theophylus, ad Autol. II 27. This one must keep in view in the investigation whether among the church fathers there were also proponents of conditional immortality. For even if a single one, such as Arnobius, taught an annihilation of the evil souls and even if Tatian assumed that the soul at death died with the body, in order at the end of days to rise again, the belief was nevertheless general that the soul by virtue of the nature bestowed upon it by God was immortal, Münscher- v. Coelln, D. G. I 333 f. Harnack, D. G. I 449. Dr. Jonker, Theol. Studiën I 167v. Atzberger, Gesch. d. christl. Eschat. 118 f. 187 f. 222 f. 338 f. 577 f. Also in philosophy Plato's doctrine of immortality retained an important place. Descartes conceived spirit and matter, soul and body, as two separated substances, which each had its own attribute, viz. thinking and extension, could each exist for itself and therefore could not be united otherwise than mechanically. Spinoza assumed these same two attributes but regarded them as forms of appearance of the one, eternal, infinite substance, as two sides of the same thing, which cannot fall apart from one another but are always with each other as subject and object, as image and counter-image, as idea and res. For immortality there was in [357] his system no place, and he also had no need of it, for quamvis nesciremus, mentem nostram aeternam esse, pietatem et religionem et absolute omnia, quae ad animositatem et generositatem referri ostendimus in quarta parte, prima haberemus, Eth. V 41. The philosophy of the eighteenth century, however, was not inclined toward Spinoza; it bore a deistic character, contented itself with the trilogy

of God, virtue, and immortality and esteemed of these three the last still the most. Following the lead of Leibniz, Wolf, Mendelssohn and others, its truth was demonstrated with all manner of metaphysical, theological, cosmic, moral, and historical proofs and was urged with sentimental reflections on a blessed recognition and reunion on the other side of the grave, litt. with Bretschneider, Syst. Entw. 824. The utterance of the poet in Ps. 73:25 was, according to the word of Strauss, transformed into this other: wenn ich nur mein Ich in Sicherkeit habe, so frage ich nichts nach Gott und Welt. To that certainty, however, Kant put an end, in that he showed the insufficiency of all proofs adduced for the immortality of the soul, and deemed this only probable as postulate of practical reason. Schleiermacher set over against the egoistic wishes of rationalism his word: wer nicht gelernt hat, mehr zu sein als er selbst, der verliert wenig, wenn er sich selbst verliert, and acknowledged no other and higher immortality than to be om mitten in der Endlichkeit eins zu werden mit dem Unendlichen und ewig zu sein in jedem Augenblick, Reden über die Religion II, cf. Chr. Gl. § 158, 1. And the idealistic philosophy of Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, left for the immortality of the soul no place at all, even though it hesitated to express openly its intimate thought on this point. The book of Fr. Richter, Die Lehre Von Den Letzten Dingen 1833, however, brought to light the consequence of Hegel's system and, in spite of many people's contradiction, paved the way to materialism, which was already loudly preached by Feuerbach and later supported by Vogt, Moleschott, Büchner, Häckel and others with so-called natural-scientific arguments. Upon philosophy these reasonings have made so much impression that it gives up the immortality of the soul entirely, Strauss, Chr. Gl. II 738. Id. Der alte und der neue Glaube2 123 f. Schopenhauer, Die Welt u. s. w. I 330. Hartmann, Religionsphilos. II 232,

or [358] at most argues its possibility and speaks only of a hope of immortality, Hoekstra, De hoop der onsterfelijkheid 1867. Rauwenhoff, Wijsbeg. v. d. godsd. 811. Also theologians often attach to the proofs for the immortality of the soul only slight or no value at all, Vilmar, Dogm. II 295. Runze in Herzog2 16, 211 f. Frank, Chr. Wahrheit II 437 f. But over against them there still stand many men of name, who deem all or some or at least a single one of the proofs strong enough to build upon it a firm faith in the immortality of the soul, Weisse, Philos. Dogm. § 952-972. Fichte, Die Idee der Persönl. u. d. indiv. Fortdauer 1834. Id. Die Seelenfortdauer u. die Weltstellung des Menschen 1867. Göschel, Von den Beweisen für die Unsterbl. der menschl. Seele 1835. Art. Unsterblichkeit in Herzog1 and 2. Kahnis, Dogm. II 485 f. Dorner, Gl. II 916 f. Luthardt, Komp. d. Dogm. § 75. W. Schmidt, Christl. Dogm. 492 f. Doedes, Leer v. God 248. Oosterzee, Dogm. § 68 etc.

2. The proofs for the immortality of the soul, derived from history and reason, give no conclusive certainty, but they are nevertheless not devoid of importance. In the first place it is already of significance that belief in immortality occurs among all peoples, at every stage of development. The consensus gentium is here as strong as in the belief in God, Cic. Tusc. I 3. The various considerations from which one has derived belief in immortality, such as e.g. from fear of death and thirst for life, the experiences of dream and ecstasy, the riddle of death and the impossibility of imagining an absolute annihilation of the thinking being of man, fear of punishment and hope of reward, cf. Herzog2 16, 206-211, can indeed support and confirm belief in immortality a posteriori, but they give no satisfactory explanation of its origin. Even where such considerations are lacking or are regarded as worthless, belief in immortality nevertheless

occurs. The wish to continue to exist is often in many people weaker than that that with death existence might come to an end. The hope of reward does not explain the belief in those who have died to all selfishness and in communion with God have found the highest blessedness [359]. The thought of retribution is foreign to the representations of continued existence as a shadowy life of shades. The riddle of death leads only, in very high exception, to the immortality of animals and plants. And the experiences of dream and ecstasy do not extinguish the awareness of the essential distinction that exists between these phenomena and dying. Rather, with this belief in the immortality of the soul, just as with that in the existence of God, we have to do with a conviction that has not been obtained from reflection and reasoning but precedes all reflection and arises spontaneously from human nature. It is self-evident and natural and is found everywhere where no philosophical doubts have undermined it. With the consciousness of one's own, independent, individual existence there also awakens that of personal continuance. Self-consciousness, not the abstract self-consciousness of which psychology treats, but the self-consciousness of man as a personal, independent, rational, moral, religious being, everywhere and always includes belief in immortality, which therefore is also no mere wish or desire, no conclusion from praemisses, but a powerful, ineradicable testimony of human nature itself, maintaining itself against all reasoning and opposition. And the so-called proofs for immortality are nothing other than various attempts which this belief employs in the way of reasoning, in order, thinking, to give itself to some extent an account of itself, without ever in reality depending on that or making itself dependent on it. Therein lies their strength and at the same

time their weakness; they are testimonies of, not grounds for, the faith; knowing remains far behind believing.

The ontological proof, which concludes from the idea of immortality to its truth, no more bridges, than the ontological proof for the existence of God, part II 53, the gulf which separates thinking from being. It only formulates the consciousness that belief in immortality in man is no arbitrariness or chance, but is given with his nature and is for him necessary in a moral sense. Man does not derive the idea of immortality from the world around him, for this preaches to him nothing but perishableness and death; but it is imposed upon him by his own nature. Just as God does not leave himself without witness [360] but speaks to us out of all the works of his hands, so there presses itself upon man out of his own being the conviction that he does not perish like the beasts of the field. And that is what the ontological proof aims to show; it does not overstep the boundary from thinking to being, but it gives expression to the universality, the necessity, and the apriority of the belief in immortality. One step further goes the metaphysical proof, which concludes from the nature of the soul to its immortality. It can do this, however, and does it in different ways. One can point out that the soul, as principle of life and identical with life, is invulnerable to death; or that it, as appears from the unity of self-consciousness, forms an indivisible, simple unity, lacks all composition and therefore is susceptible to no dissolution; or that it, under all changes of matter and all changes of the body, again as appears from self-consciousness, always remains identical with itself and thus enjoys an existence and life independent of the body, self-subsistent; and along these different paths one can then try to arrive at the conclusion that the soul is immortal. But very serious objections have been raised against this

argument. Even if the soul is an active, living principle, it is nevertheless never identical with life itself. God alone is life itself; He alone is immortal, 1 Tim. 6:16. If the soul continues to exist, that can happen only through God's omnipresent and almighty power. The soul is a creature, and thus limited, finite, relative, never completely free from all passivity and composition, from all change and variation. Besides, we see it before our eyes, that it changes, increases or decreases in knowledge and power, is dependent on the body and undergoes all kinds of influences. And the subjective unity and identity of the I proves absolutely nothing of the objective unity and simplicity of the soul, or would, if it proved these, also prove the immortality of plants or at least of animals, as this then also was consistently assumed by Leibniz, Bonnet, Bilderdijk e. a. But over against these objections stands the incontrovertible fact, that life is not to be explained from mechanical metabolism and points back to a principle of its own. Omne vivum ex vivo is still today the last word of science. And what holds for life in general, holds in an even stronger measure [361] for conscious life; the most primitive sensation is already separated by an unbridgeable gulf from every nerve vibration. With that we enter an entirely new, higher world, which essentially differs from that of sensible, tangible, weighable and measurable things. That life and thus also conscious life is bound to the sensible world and most closely united with it, was already long known and truly is not to be called a discovery of more recent science. But that it has its cause in the sensible world, has indeed often been asserted but thus far by no one proven. The metaphysical proof retains its value, insofar as it concludes from the peculiar psychic phenomena to a self-subsistent, spiritual principle distinct from matter. Yet then the objection still always remains, that in the same way one can reason and conclude in

the case of plants or at least in the case of animals, and that their immortality nevertheless is not plausible. Therefore to the metaphysical there must subsequently be added the anthropological proof, which concludes from the peculiar character of the psychic life of man to a spiritual existence distinct from that of animals and plants. The soul of the animal, although also simple and self-subsistent over against the change of matter, is directed to the sensible; it is limited within the finite; it lives in the present; it is so bound to the body, that it cannot exist outside it. But man has not only sensation and perception, but also understanding and reason; through thinking he goes beyond the sensible, material, finite world; he raises himself to the ideal, the logical, to the true, good and beautiful, which cannot be seen with the eyes and cannot be touched with the hands; he seeks a lasting, eternal happiness, a highest good, which this world cannot bestow on him, and by all this is citizen and inhabitant of another, higher realm than that of nature. The rational, moral, religious consciousness of man points to a psychic existence that goes beyond the visible world; what by virtue of its nature seeks the eternal, must be destined for eternity. To that there is added still the moral and the retributive proof, which shows the disharmony that in this life exists between ethos and physis, and from that concludes to another life, in which both are reconciled. Let one not object against this, that this proof rests on egoism and that virtue bears its reward and sin its [362] punishment in itself, Spinoza, Eth. V 41. 42. Strauss, Gl. II 706 f. For this the pious of all ages well knew, that God had to be served for his own sake and not for any reward, cf. also Calvin, Inst. III 2, 26. 16, 2. But nevertheless they maintained that they, if they were hoping in Christ only in this life, would be the most miserable of all men, 1 Cor. 15:17, 19, 30, 32. For here

absolutely not the satisfaction of a selfish desire is at play, but there is hereby involved nothing less than the dominion and the triumph of justice. The question which lies at the foundation of the moral proof is this: will at the end the good or the evil, God or Satan, Christ or Antichrist win? History gives no conclusive answer to that. From the standpoint of the Diesseits there is no satisfactory explanation of the world possible; then there is only all too much ground for pessimistic despair. And therefore the sense of justice, which the righteous God himself has planted deep in man's heart, demands that there come restoration of justice at the end of days, that there be harmony between virtue and happiness, between sin and punishment, that truth win eternally over the lie and light over darkness. Even if it is rightly said, that le néant fut toujours l'horizon des mauvaises consciences, even they who have nothing good to hope for from a life after this life, are convinced by their sense of justice of the necessity of this restoration of justice. If justice does not prevail at the end, then there is no justice. And if God in the end does not appear to be the conqueror of Satan, life is not worth the trouble of living. Not an egoistic wish, but a deep sense of justice, the thirst for harmony, desire for the complete glorification of God, in whom holiness and blessedness are one, comes to expression in the moral proof. Even art prophesies of such a future, when it presents the ideal to us in visible form. All these proofs, and still more those which are derived from man's capacity for perfection, from his moral personality, from the many uninhabited stars, from the spiritistic appearances etc., are not proofs in that sense that they silence all contradiction, but they are nevertheless testimonies and indications, that belief in immortality arises wholly naturally and spontaneously out of human nature itself. Whoever denies and combats it, does violence to his own nature [363] . Der Gedanke an die

Unsterblichkeit ist schon der erste Akt der Unsterblichkeit, Von Baer bij Splittgerber, Tod, Fortleben und Auferstehung3 1879 S. 93.

3. However much value these indications may have, which nature and history offer us for faith in the immortality of the soul, Scripture, with respect to this doctrine, adopts a standpoint which at first acquaintance cannot but astonish. The immortality of the soul seems to be of the greatest significance for religion and life; and Scripture never mentions it in so many words; it never proclaims it as a Divine revelation and nowhere places it in the foreground; and still less does it ever set to work any attempt to demonstrate its truth or to maintain it over against its opponents. It is therefore explicable that earlier and later many have asserted that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul did not occur at all in the Old Testament, or at least in its oldest books, and was only introduced into Israel from outside, cf. Oehler, Unsterblichkeit in Herzog1 21, 409 f. Himpel, Die Unsterblichkeitslehre der A. T. 1857. Atzberger, Die christl. Eschatologie, Freib. 1890 S. 17. But gradually one has nevertheless returned from this, and nowadays one generally acknowledges that Israel, like all peoples, did indeed believe in a continued existence after death. Indeed, Stade, Gesch. des Volkes Israel I 387-427 and Ueber die altt. Vorstellungen vom Zustande nach dem Tode 1877, further Oort, De doodenvereering bij de Israelieten, Theol. Tijdschr. 1881 bl. 358-363 and especially Fr. Schwally, Das Leben nach dem Tode nach den Vorstellungen des alten Israel u. s. w. Giessen 1892 have tried to demonstrate that in ancient times among Israel, as among the other peoples, the dead were venerated, and thus were undoubtedly thought to exist. The proofs for that they derived from the ritual customary in the case of a death, such as the tearing of garments and wearing of mourning dress, the covering of face

and head, the laying aside of ornaments, special hair arrangement and self-mutilation, the throwing with dust and ash, the not washing and anointing, the fasting and holding of a meal, the raising of lamentations and the bringing of sacrifices, all of which usages would be explicable only from earlier veneration of the dead [364]. But Schwally t. a. p. 75 must himself acknowledge, dass in der Zeit, als Israel in die Geschichte eintritt, die animistische Naturreligion im Princip bereits überwunden ist. And against his derivation of the mourning usages from an original animism, Joh. Frey, Tod, Seelenglaube und Seelenkult im alten Israel, Leipzig 1898, has raised such serious objections that the hypothesis of an original cult of the dead in Israel can first be made plausible by other and new proofs. Yet it is clear that in Israel there was a great difference between the popular religion, which contained all kinds of superstitious and idolatrous components, and the service of Ihvh, which was advocated by Moses and his followers. Jahvism has on the one hand opposed, forbidden, and eradicated that popular religion, but on the other hand has also quietly allowed to continue, or taken over and sanctioned, various religious conceptions and usages which in themselves were not wrong, cf. Wildeboer, Jahvedienst en volksreligie in Israel 1898. In his revelation to Israel God attached himself to the historical circumstances under which it lived; grace did not abolish nature but has renewed and sanctified it. Thus it also went with the popular belief in continued existence after death. Already the custom of burying and the great significance that was attached to it is a proof of that belief. Burning of the corpses was not indigenous in Israel; it took place only after an executed death penalty, Gen. 38:24, Lev. 20:14, 21:9, Jos. 7:15, 25; from 1 Sam. 31:12 and Am. 6:10 nothing can be inferred, because the text is perhaps corrupted or otherwise reports only of cases standing by

themselves; and 2 Chr. 16:14, 21:19, Jer. 34:5 deal only with the burning of fragrant spices at the burial. Burial, however, was held in high esteem and is therefore repeatedly mentioned separately in the O. Test.; to remain unburied was a great disgrace, 1 Sam. 17:44, 46, 1 Kon. 14:11, 13, 16:4, 2 Kon. 9:10, Ps. 79:3, Pred. 6:3, Jes. 14:19, 20, Jer. 7:33, 8:1, 9:22, 16:6, 25:33, Ezech. 29:5. A deceased person no longer belongs in the land of the living; his unburied corpse arouses abhorrence; the shed blood cries out for vengeance, Gen. 4:10, 37:26, Job 16:18, Jes. 26:21, Ezech. 24:7, because the blood is the seat of the soul, Lev. 17:11; and therefore the deceased must be covered, hidden, withdrawn from sight. Through death all souls come into the realm of the dead, into the Sheol, שְׁאוֹל, a word that is of uncertain derivation and according to some comes from שָׁאַל, to ask, to demand, or also to claim, to bring to decision, according to others from שָׁעַל, שׁוּל, to be slack, to hang down, to sink, Delitzsch, Neuer Comm. über die Genesis 444. Atzberger, Christl. Eschat. 24. This Sheol is located in the depth of the earth, so that one descends into it, Num. 16:30, Ps. 30:4, 10, 55:16, Jes. 38:18, belongs to the lowest places of the earth, Ps. 63:10, Ezech. 26:20, 31:14, 32:18, lies still below the waters and the foundations of the mountains, Deut. 32:22, Job 26:5, Jes. 14:15, and is therefore more than once strengthened by the attribute תַּחְתִּית, lowest, Deut. 32:22, Ps. 86:13, 88:7. Therefore Sheol also stands in close connection with the grave or the pit, קֶבֶר or בּוֹר; the two are not identical, for deceased persons who are not buried are nevertheless in Sheol, Gen. 37:33, 35, Num. 16:32; but just as body and soul form the one human being and even after death are still thought in some mutual relation, so grave and Sheol are not to be thought apart from one another. Both belong to the lowest places of the earth, are represented as the dwelling of the dead, and alternate with one another

repeatedly; Sheol is the one great grave that comprises all the graves of the deceased; the realm of the dead, the underworld, and therefore wrongly often rendered in our Statenvertaling by hell. Sheol, for its part, is the place where all deceased persons without exception come together, 1 Kon. 2:2, Job 3:13v., 30:23, Ps. 89:49, Jes. 14:9v., Ezech. 32:18, Hab. 2:5, and from which return is possible only by a miracle, 1 Kon. 17:22, 2 Kon. 4:34, 13:21; the realm of the dead is as it were a city that is provided with barred gates, Ps. 9:14, 107:18, Job 17:16 (to the bars of the underworld my hope descends), 38:17, Jes. 38:10, Mt. 16:18, and by its power, Ps. 49:16, 89:49, Hos. 13:14, holds all human beings captive as in a prison, Jes. 24:22. Sheol is an eternal house, Pred. 12:5; the enemies of Israel, who have been hurled down into it, cannot rise again, Jes. 26:14; he who descends into the grave does not come up again, Job 7:9, 10, 14:7-12, 16:22. In a straight line this realm of the dead therefore stands over against the land of the living, Job 28:13, Spr. 15:24, Ezech. 26:20, 32:23v. [366] To be sure, the deceased are thought of as existing and living; they are often so represented and described as they appeared here on earth, and are therefore also recognized by one another, and moved at the meeting, 1 Sam. 18:14, Jes. 14:9v., Ezech. 32:18v. Also there is mention of innermost, deep inward-lying chambers in Sheol, Spr. 7:27, Ezech. 32:23, and there exists in so far among the deceased a distinction, in that each is gathered to his fathers, Gen. 15:15, Richt. 2:10, or to his people, Gen. 25:8, 17, 35:29, 49:29, and the uncircumcised are laid together, Ezech. 32:19. But otherwise Sheol is always described from its negative side, in contrast with the earth as the land of the living. It is the domain of darkness and of the shadow of death, Job 10:21, 22, Ps. 88:13, 143:3, the place of destruction, indeed destruction itself, אֲבַדּוֹן, Job 26:6, 28:22, 31:12, Ps. 88:12, Spr. 27:20, without

ordinances, i.e. without fixed contours and clear distinctions, Job 10:22, a land of rest, of silence, of forgetfulness, Job 3:13, 17, 18, Ps. 115:17, where God and human beings are no longer to be seen, Jes. 38:11, God no longer praised and thanked, Ps. 6:6, 115:17, his virtues no longer proclaimed, Ps. 88:6, 12, 13, Jes. 38:18, 19, and his wonders no longer beheld, Ps. 88:11, 13, where the dead no longer know anything at all, do no more work, make no more calculation, possess no more wisdom and knowledge and have absolutely no share any more in all that happens under the sun, Pred. 9:5, 6, 10. They are רְפָאִים, from the adjective רָפֶה, slack, Job 26:5, Spr. 2:18, 9:18, 21:6, Ps. 88:11, Jes. 14:9, weakened, Jes. 14:10, without strength, Ps. 88:5.

This entire representation of Sheol is formed from the standpoint of this earthly existence, and is valid only in contrast with the richness of life which man enjoys here on earth. Then dying is indeed a breaking of all earthly bonds, a being-dead for the rich life on earth, a resting, a sleeping, a being-silent, a not-being in relation to the things on this side of the grave. The condition in Sheol is not a destruction of existence, but yet a dreadful diminution of life, a deprivation of all that in this life constitutes the joy of life. For a view which lets only the body die and consoles itself with the immortality of the [367] soul, there is no place in the O. Test. The whole man dies, when at death the spirit, Ps. 146:4, Pred. 12:7, or the soul, Gen. 35:18, 2 Sam. 1:9, 1 Kon. 17:21, Jon. 4:3, goes out from the man. Not only his body but also his soul is in the state of death and belongs to the underworld; therefore one can also speak of a dying of the soul, Gen. 37:21, Num. 23:10, Deut. 22:20, Richt. 16:30, Job 36:14, Ps. 78:50, and of defilement by touching the soul of a dead person, i.e. of a corpse, Lev. 19:28, 21:11, 22:4, Num. 5:2, 6:6, 9:6, 7, 10, Deut. 14:1, Hagg. 2:13. Just as the whole man was destined for life in the way of obedience, so through his

transgression he also wholly, according to soul and body both, falls to death, Gen. 2:17. This thought had to be deeply impressed in the consciousness of humanity; and it was also in antiquity perceived by all peoples, that death is a punishment, that it is something unnatural, in conflict with the being and the destination of man. The revelation which God gave to Israel also connects with this; it lets it exist and takes it over, just as it takes over so many customs and ceremonies (offering, priesthood, circumcision etc.); only it purifies it of the unclean elements which among the peoples had gradually become connected with it, such as self-mutilation, Lev. 19:28, 21:5, Deut. 14:1 and consulting the dead, Lev. 19:31, 20:6, 27, Deut. 18:10, 11. But the revelation does still something else and more. It not only maintains and strengthens the contrast which exists between life and death, but it introduces in this life itself an even sharper contrast. This life, indeed, is not the true life, because it is a sinful, unclean life tormented by suffering and destined for death. It first becomes life in the true sense and first receives an essential content of life through the service of Ihvh and in communion with God. Entirely in accordance with the then dispensation of the covenant of grace and with the election of Israel as people of God, the O. T. thinks the connection between piety and life thus, that the former receives its fruit and its reward in a long life on earth, Ex. 20:12, Deut. 5:16, 29, 6:2, 11:9, 22:7, 30:16, 32:47 etc. Into the generally known, natural contrast of life and death there is woven another, moral, spiritual contrast, namely that between a life [368] in the service of sin and a life in the fear of the Lord. To evil death is bound, to good life is bound. Deut. 30:15. Those who with force have wanted to find the philosophical doctrine of the immortality of the soul in the Old Testament have not understood the revelation of God to Israel and have inserted

Western, rationalistic ideas into the religion of the Eastern people. Much more truly Pfleiderer says, Religionsphilos. 626: was man oft für eine Schwäche der prophetischen Jahvereligion Israels gehalten hat (n.l. dat het Jenseits er zoo geringe plaats in bekleedt), ist in Wahrheit ihre auszeichnende Stärke gewesen; der lebendige Gott, der in geschichtlichen Thaten sich offenbart, hat nichts gemein mit den Schatten des Scheol. The God of Israel is not a God of the dead but of the living. Therefore the expectation of pious Israel was directed almost exclusively to the earthly future of the people, to the realization of the kingdom of God. The question concerning the future of the individual persons in Sheol thereby receded entirely into the background. God, people, and land were inseparably bound together, and the individuals were included in that covenant and were reckoned accordingly. Only when Israel after the exile becomes a religious community and religion becomes individualized, then the question concerning each one's future lot presses itself into the foreground; the spiritual contrast which the revelation had woven into the natural one worked through; the distinction of righteous and ungodly replaced more and more that of Israel and the peoples, and continued also on the other side of the grave. The data for that were, moreover, already present in the revelation of earlier time. The man who serves God remains alive, Gen. 2:17; to the keeping of his commandments life is bound, Lev. 18:5, Deut. 30:20; his word is life, Deut. 8:3, 32:47. In Proverbs, by life there is indeed often understood length of days, 2:18, 3:16, 10:30; but noteworthy is nevertheless that it usually brings death and Sheol into connection only with the ungodly, 2:18, 5:5, 7:27, 9:18, and over against that assigns life almost exclusively to the righteous. Wisdom, righteousness, the fear of the Lord is the way to life, 8:35, 36, 11:19, 12:28, 13:14, 14:27, 19:23; the ungodly is

overthrown when misfortune strikes him, but the righteous preserves even in [369] his death still confidence and comfort, 14:32. Blessed is he who has Ihvh as his God, Deut. 33:29, Ps. 1:1, 2:12, 32:1, 2, 33:12, 34:9 etc., also in the heaviest adversities, Ps. 73:25-28, Hab. 3:17-19; on the other hand the ungodly perish and come to an end, even though they temporarily still enjoy so much prosperity, Ps. 73:18-20. From this standpoint the pious not only expect deliverance from oppression and adversity in time, but with the eye of faith they also many times press through to the other side of the grave and expect a blessed life in communion with God. The passages which are usually adduced for this, Gen. 49:18, Job 14:13-15, 16:16-21, 19:25-27, Ps. 16:9-11, 17:15, 49:16, 73:23-26, 139:18 are of uncertain interpretation, and according to many refer only to temporal rescue from death. But even if this should also be the case, the whole Old Testament teaches that God is Creator of heaven and earth, that his power knows no limits and that He also possesses absolute dominion over life and death. It is God the Lord who has bestowed life on man, Gen. 1:26, 2:7, and still creates and sustains every man, just as all that exists, Job 32:8, 33:4, 34:14, Ps. 104:29, Pred. 12:7. He sovereignly binds life to his law and determines death upon its transgression, Gen. 2:17, Lev. 18:5, Deut. 30:20, 32:47. He dwells in heaven but is also present with his Spirit in Sheol, Ps. 139:7, 8. Sheol and abaddon lie naked and open spread out before the Lord, just as the hearts of the children of men, Job 26:6, 38:17, Spr. 15:11. The Lord kills, preserves in life and makes alive, causes to descend into Sheol and from it to come up again, Deut. 32:39, 1 Sam. 2:6, 2 Kon. 5:7. He has ways out for death, can deliver when death already threatens, Ps. 68:21, Jes. 38:5, Jer. 15:20, Dan. 3:26, etc., can take Enoch and Elijah to himself without death, Gen. 5:24, 2 Kon. 2:11, and can cause the dead to return to life, 1

Kon. 17:22, 2 Kon. 4:34, 13:21. He can abolish death and by raising of the dead triumph completely over its power, Job 14:13-15, 19:25-27, Hos. 6:2, 13:14, Jes. 25:8, 26:19, Ezech. 37:11, 12, Dan. 12:2. Cf. concerning immortality in the Old Test., besides Oort, Schwally, Frey, Stade also Oehler, Theol. des A. T. § 78. 245 f. and art. Unsterbl. in Herzog1. Schultz, Alttest. [370] Theol.4 697 f. Schmend, Altt. Rel. 112 f. 497 f. 504 f. Atzberger, Die christl. Eschat. 1890 S. 15 f. Bertholet, Die israel. Vorstellungen vom Zustande nach dem Tode, Freiburg 1899. Matthes, Mourning and veneration of the dead among the Israel. Theol. Tijdschrift 1900.

4. This doctrine of the Old Testament did not indeed wholly disappear in the later Jewish literature, but it was nevertheless modified and expanded by all kinds of foreign elements. In general the writings of this category agree in this, that they conceive religion more individualistically, under the influence of the idea of retribution allow already immediately at death a provisional separation to take place between righteous and godless, and give a more elaborated description of the different places where these abide. Yet they are clearly to be divided into two groups, a Palestinian and an Alexandrian. The former, to which especially the apocryphal writings of the Maccabees, Baruch, 4 Ezra, Enoch, the Testament of the twelve patriarchs etc. belong, ascribe to the intermediate state only a provisional character. To be sure, they too already take up foreign constituent elements and teach a certain separation between righteous and godless immediately at death. The Apocalypse of Enoch places Sheol in the West, describes it as intersected and surrounded by streams, and distinguishes in it four divisions, two for the good and two for the evil, 17:5, 6, 22:2v.; moreover it also assumes a paradise, which is situated high above and at the ends of the earth and

immediately at their dying became the dwelling-place of Enoch and Elijah, 12:1, 87:3, 89:52 and it also will become for all who walk in their ways, 71:16, 17. But the centre of gravity nevertheless lies with all the writers of this group in the universal eschatology, in the coming of the Messiah and the establishment of the Kingdom of God at the end of the days. Until then the souls of the deceased are preserved in the hades, be it also in different divisions and in provisionally distinct lot, as in ταμιεια, promptuaria animarum, Apoc. Baruch 21:23, 4 Ezr. 4:35, 5:37; resting and sleeping they await the last judgment, 4 Ezr. 7:32-35. Apoc. Baruch 21:24, 23:4, 30:2. But the writings of the second [371] group, such as the Proverbs of Jesus Sirach, the book of Wisdom, Philo, Flavius Josephus etc., lay precisely emphasis on the individual eschatology and thereby allow the coming of the Messiah, the resurrection, the final judgment and the Kingdom of God on earth to recede wholly into the shadow or even do not speak of them with a single word. The chief dogma is the immortality of the soul, which according to Philo was praeëxistent, on account of its fall was temporarily shut up in the prison of the body and according to its conduct after death migrates into other bodies, or in any case immediately after dying receives the definitive decision of its lot, Sir. 1:12, 7:17, 18:24, 41:12, Wijsh. 1:8, 9, 3:1-10, and goes to the holy heaven or to the dark hades, Josephus, Bell. Jud. III 8, 5. At the time of Christ, therefore, all kinds of eschatological ideas crossed one another among the people of Israel. The Pharisees believed in a continued existence and a provisional retribution after death, but in doing so held fast the expectation of the Messiah, of the resurrection of the dead, if not of all men then at least of the righteous, and the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. The Sadducees denied the resurrection, Mt. 22:23, Mk. 12:18, Luk. 20:27, Hd. 23:8, and according to Josephus, Bell. Jud. II 8, 14. Ant.

XVIII 1, 4 also retribution after death and immortality. The Essenes assumed, according to Josephus, Bell. Jud. II 8, 11, that the body was mortal but the soul immortal. The souls originally dwelt in the finest ether, but were seized by sensual lust and placed in bodies, from which they are then again freed by death. The good souls receive a blessed life on the other side of the ocean in a place that is plagued by no rain, snow, or heat, but the bad must suffer everlasting pains in a dark, cold place. Cf. Gröbler, Die Ansichten über Unsterbl. u. Auferst. in der jüd. Lit. der beiden letzten Jahrh. v. Chr., Stud. u. Krit. 1879 S. 651-700. Wünsche, Die Vorst. v. Zustande nach dem Tode nach Apokr., Talmud u. Kirchenvätern, Jahrb. f. prot. Theol. 1880 S. 355-383. 435-523. Weber, Syst. der altsyn. pal. Theol. 322 f. Oehler in Herzog1 21, 424 f. Runze in Herzog2 16, 193. Atzberger, Christl. Eschatol. 96-156. Schwally, Das Leben nach d. Tode 131-192.

In the footsteps of law and prophets, the N. Test. devotes much [372] more attention to general than to special eschatology. Yet it is incorrect, both to assert with Episcopius, Op. II 2 p. 455, Limborch, Theol. Christ. VI 10, 4, Oertel, Hades S. 4-6, Schleiermacher, Chr. Gl. § 159, 2, Hofmann, Schriftbeweis III 462, that Scripture says virtually nothing about the intermediate state or at least contains no doctrine valid for us, and to maintain with Kliefoth, Eschatologie 37, that the N. T. probably says everything about it that can be said. For there is no lack of statements which shed as much light on the intermediate state as we need in and for this life. Even more strongly than the Old, the N. T. brings out that death is a consequence and punishment of sin, Rom. 5:12, 6:23, 8:10, 1 Cor. 15:21; and that death extends to all human beings, 1 Cor. 15:22, Heb. 9:27; only a single one, such as Enoch, has been taken away, so that he should not see death, Heb. 11:5; and also those who experience the parousia of Christ are

changed at once without the intervention of death, 1 Cor. 15:51, 1 Thess. 4:14-17, cf. John 21:22, 23, so that Christ will judge not only the dead but also the living, Acts 10:42, 2 Tim. 4:1, 1 Pet. 4:5. But that death is not the end of the human being; the soul cannot be killed, Mt. 10:28, the body is once raised again, John 5:28, 29, Acts 23:6, Rev. 20:12, 13 and believers even partake of an eternal life that cannot die, John 3:36, 11:25. All the dead, up to the resurrection, are also according to the N. T. in Hades, which is the realm of the dead. In Mt. 11:23 the καταβασις ἐως ᾅδου indicates that proud Capernaum will be humbled to the deepest point. In Mt. 16:18 Jesus promises his church that the πυλαι ᾅδου will have no power over it, that death will not triumph over it. According to Luke 16:23 the poor Lazarus is carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom and the rich man comes immediately through death and burial into Hades; in which case it cannot be proved that Hades is already the same as a place of torment, since this is first indicated by the further addition: ὑπαρχων ἑν βασανοις. Jesus too, as long as he was in the state of death, was in Hades, even though he was not held by it, Acts 2:27, 31; for he descended εἰς τα κατωτερα της γης, Eph. 4:9. And thus all [373] the dead are καταχθονιοι, Phil. 2:10; not only the ungodly but also believers are after death in Hades, they are νεκροι ἑν Χριστῳ, 1 Thess. 4:16, cf. 1 Cor. 15:18, 23; at the resurrection the sea, death, and Hades give back all the dead who were in them, so that they are judged according to their works, Rev. 20:13; Hades follows with and after death, so that death always brings about a transposition into Hades, Rev. 6:8. This conception, that believers too according to Scripture are from death until the resurrection in Hades, is strengthened by the expression ἀναστασις ἑκ νεκρων, Mt. 17:9, Mk. 6:14, Luke 16:30, John 20:9 etc., ἑκ των νεκρων, Eph. 5:14, that is, not out of death, but out of the dead, out of

the realm of the departed. This common being in the state of death, however, does not exclude that the lot of believers and unbelievers there is already very different. The O. T. already expressed this thought, but much more clearly it confronts us in the N. T. According to the parable in Luke 16 the poor Lazarus is carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom, by which it is indicated that Lazarus in heaven, where indeed the angels dwell, enjoys salvation in the proximity of and in fellowship with Abraham, cf. Mt. 8:11. To one of his fellow-crucified Jesus promises that he will be with him today in paradise, Luke 23:43. The word paradise is of Persian origin and in general denotes a garden, a pleasure-garden, Neh. 2:8, Eccl. 2:5, Song 4:13; the LXX used it as a translation of the garden in Gen. 2:8-15; the Jews used it to indicate the place where God grants his fellowship to the righteous after their death, Weber, Syst. der alts. pal. Theol. 330. Undoubtedly also according to the N. T. paradise, like Abraham's bosom, is to be thought of in heaven; shortly after Jesus had promised the murderer that he would be with him today in paradise, he commended his spirit into the hands of his Father, Luke 23:46; in 2 Cor. 12:2, 4 paradise alternates with the third heaven; in Rev. 2:7, 12:2 it denotes the place where in the future God will dwell among his people. In agreement with that, the Gospel of John teaches that believers, who here on earth already have the principle of eternal life and have escaped the judgment of God, 3:15-21, 5:24, partake of a fellowship with [374] Christ that is broken neither by his departure, 12:32, 14:23, nor by death, 11:25, 26, and is once completed in an eternal being-together, 6:39, 14:3, 19, 16:16, 17:24. Dying, Stephen prays that the Lord Jesus may receive his spirit to himself in heaven, Acts 7:59. Paul knows that the believer partakes of a life which is exalted above death, Rom. 8:10, and that nothing, not even death, can separate him from the love of God in

Christ, 8:38, 14:8, 1 Thess. 5:10; although he must remain in the flesh for some time for the sake of the churches, he nevertheless desires to depart and to be with Christ, Phil. 1:23, 2 Cor. 5:8. According to Rev. 6:8, 7:9, the souls of the martyrs are with Christ under the burnt-offering altar standing before the throne of God in the temple of heaven, cf. 2:7, 10, 17, 26, 3:4, 5, 12, 31, 8:3, 9:13, 14:13, 15:2, 16:17, and also Heb. 11:10, 16, 12:23. And just as believers already immediately after death enjoy a provisional blessedness with Christ in heaven, so unbelievers, as soon as they have died, come into a place of torment. The rich man was in torment when he lifted up his eyes in Hades, Luke 16:23. The unbelievers who reject Christ remain under the wrath of God and are already judged on earth, John 3:18, 36, and immediately after death, with all human beings, have a judgment to await, Heb. 9:27. But yet this place of torment is not identical with the γεεννα or the λιμνη του πυρος, for Gehenna is the place of the unquenchable and eternal fire, which is prepared for the devils, Mk. 9:43, 47, 48, Mt. 18:8, 25:4, 46, and the lake of fire is not the present but indeed the future place of punishment of the world-kingdom and the false prophet, Rev. 19:20, of Satan, Rev. 20:10 and of all the ungodly, Rev. 21:8, cf. 2 Pet. 2:17, Jude 13. Rather, they are all now kept in a φυλακη, 1 Pet. 3:19, or in the ἄβυσσος, Luke 8:31, cf. Mt. 8:29, Rom. 10:7, Rev. 9:1, 2, 11, 11:7, 17:8, 20:1, 3 for the final judgment and the lake of fire, 2 Pet. 2:17, Jude 6. 13. This distinction in the intermediate state of the good and the evil does not conflict with the fact that they all together are in Hades, for all the dead as such are καταχθονιοι, belong before the resurrection still to the realm of the dead, and are only by that resurrection completely, [375] as to soul and body both, delivered from the dominion of death, 1 Cor. 15:52-55, Rev. 20:14. Cf. Cremer s. v. ἀδης, ἄβυσσος, γεεννα etc. and further on New-Test.

eschatology in general, besides the well-known works of Weiss, Holtzmann et al. on N. T. theology, Briet, De Eschatologie of leer der toek. dingen volgens de Schriften des N. V. 2 deelen, Tiel 1857/58. Haupt, Die eschatol. Aussagen Jesu in den synopt. Evang., Berlin 1895. Schwartzkopff, Die Weissagungen Jesu Christi von seinem Tode, seiner Auferstehung und Widerkunft und ihrer Erfüllung, Gött. 1895. Kabisch, Die Eschatologie des Paulus in ihrem Zusammenhange mit dem Gesammtbegriff des Paulinismus, Gött. 1893. Teichmann, Die paulin. Voraussetzungen von Auferstehung und Gericht und ihre Beziehung zur jüd. Apokalyptik, Freiburg 1896. Atzberger, Die christl. Eschatologie in den Stadien ihrer Offenbarung im A. u. N. T., Freiburg 1890 S. 190 f.

5. In the earliest period Christian theology confined itself to these simple data of Holy Scripture. The apostolic fathers still have no doctrine concerning the intermediate state and are generally of the opinion that, at death, the pious immediately become partakers of heavenly blessedness and the godless of hellish punishment. Burnet in his tractatus de statu mortuorum et resurgentium 1727 and others after him, such as Blondel, Ernesti, Baumgarten-Crusius etc., did indeed attempt to show that the oldest Christian writers let the proper blessedness of believers begin only after the world-judgment, but they were unable to adduce any conclusive proofs for that, Atzberger, Gesch. der christl. Eschatologie innerhalb der vornicän. Zeit, Freiburg Herder 1896 S. 75-99. Only when the parousia of Christ did not come as soon as was at first generally expected, and various heretics distorted or contested the doctrine of the last things, did one begin to reflect more deliberately on the intermediate state. Ebionitism tried to hold fast the national privileges of Israel to the detriment of Christian universalism and was therefore generally chiliastically disposed; Gnosticism, by virtue of its

dualistic principle, rejected the whole of Christian eschatology and had no other expectation than the liberation of the spirit from matter, and its reception, taking place immediately at death, into the [376] divine pleroma, Atzberger, ib. 172-218. Christian theology was thereby compelled to give itself a clearer account of the character of the intermediate state and of its connection, both with this life and with the final state after the last judgment. Justin already said that the souls of the pious after death sojourned in a better place and those of the unrighteous in a worse, in order to await the time of judgment, dial. c. Tryph. 5, and condemned it as an unchristian doctrine that there is no resurrection of the dead and that souls are taken up into heaven immediately at death, ib. 80. According to Irenaeus the souls of the pious at death do not come immediately into heaven, paradise, or the city of God, which after the last judgment will be three distinct dwelling-places of the righteous, adv. haer. V 36, but into an invisible place determined by God, where they await the resurrection and the vision of God that follows thereafter, for Christ too first sojourned three days there where the dead were, in inferioribus terrae, in order to deliver his holy dead from it, and was, after thus having fulfilled the lex mortuorum, raised and taken up into heaven, V 31. There, in the shadow of death, in Hades, every human being receives dignam habitationem, etiam ante judicium, the pious probably in the bosom of Abraham, which is thus a division of Hades, II 34. The same conception of different receptacula in Hades, where the deceased await the final decision on the last day, we also encounter in Hippolytus, Tertullian, Novatian, Commodian, Victorinus, Lactantius, Hilary, Ambrose, Cyril, and also still in Augustine, Enchir. 109. 110, cf. Atzberger t. a. p. 275 f. 301 f. Schwane, D. G. II 585. But in proportion as the parousia of Christ receded into a far distance, it became

all the more difficult to maintain the old conception of Hades and to regard the sojourn there as a short, preliminary, more or less neutral state. For the martyrs one already made an exception early on; these, according to Irenaeus, Tertullian e. a., had entered heaven immediately after their death and been admitted to the vision of God. The descent of Christ into Hades was in connection therewith interpreted in such a way that he had delivered the believers who had died before Christ's offering from the limbus patrum and had transferred them to heaven. And the doctrine of the [377] necessity and the meritoriousness of good works, which penetrated more and more into the church, naturally led to the thought that those who had devoted their whole life in a special sense to God were now also, at their death, immediately worthy of heavenly blessedness. Thus Hades was gradually deprived of its inhabitants. To be sure, the unbelievers still remained, but this had precisely as a consequence that Hades was regarded more and more as a place of punishment and was identified with Tartarus or Gehenna. Of Christians only those could still sojourn for a time in Hades who had not, here on earth, advanced so far in sanctification that at their death they could enter heavenly glory without delay. With that the thought of a purifying fire was gradually brought into connection, which was first expressed by Origen. According to him all punishments were remedies, φαρμακα, and the whole of Hades, Gehenna included, a place of purification, c. Cels. III 75. VI 25. 26; and specifically sins were consumed and human beings purified by the πυρ καθαρσιον, which at the end of this dispensation would set the world aflame, ib. VI 12. 13. 21. 64. V 15. 16. In the footsteps of Origen the Greek theologians later therefore assumed that the souls of many deceased persons still had to suffer pains and could be delivered from them only by the intercessions and offerings of the living, Conf. orth. qu. 64-68, but they

nevertheless had objections to a particular purifying fire, such as the Western church taught; only at the council of Florence did one make some concessions on this point, Münscher-v. Coelln, D. G. II 313. Schwane, D. G. II 587 III 486. Kattenbusch, Vergl. Conf. I 327. In the West, on the other hand, the purifying fire of which Origen had spoken was transferred from the final judgment to the intermediate state. Augustine sometimes said that after the general resurrection or at the last judgment still some poenae purgatoriae were imposed, de civ. XX 25. XXI 24. But yet he usually lets the development of the kingdom of God close with the last judgment, and therefore deems it not impossible, nonnullos fideles per ignem quendam purgatorium, quanto magis minusve bona pereuntia dilexerunt, tanto tardius citiusve salvari, Enchir. 69. Caesarius of Arles and Gregory the Great worked this out in such a way that specifically the peccata venialia could be expiated here or hereafter. [378] And when with this doctrine the ecclesiastical practice already mentioned by Tertullian, de monog. 10. 11, de exhort. cast. 11, of making intercessions and offerings for the deceased, was brought into connection, the dogma of purgatory was completed. Scholasticism gave it broader development, Lombardus e. a. on Sent. IV 21. Thomas, S. Theol. appendix qu. 2. Bonaventura, Brevil. VII 2. 3; the council of Florence 1439 and of Trent, sess. 6 can. 30. sess. 22 c. 2 can. 3. sess. 25 established it, and later theology gave it an ever greater significance for religious and ecclesiastical life. According to the Roman doctrine the souls of the damned come immediately into hell (gehenna, abyssus, infernus), where they are tormented with the unclean spirits in an eternal and inextinguishable fire. The souls of those who after receiving baptism are no longer defiled by sin or have been cleansed of that defilement here or hereafter are taken up without delay into heaven and

there behold the face of God, albeit according to their merits in differing degree of perfection, in Denzinger n. 870. 875. By the descent of Christ into hell the souls of the saints who had died before that time have also been transferred from the limbus patrum (bosom of Abraham) to heaven. Children dying unbaptized, concerning whose lot the church fathers sometimes judged more gently than more harshly, are referred to the infernus, where, however, the punishments are very unequal, in Denzinger ib., and according to the most common conception come into a special division (limbus infantum), where they suffer only an aeterna poena damni, but not a poena sensus, Lombardus, Thomas, Bonaventura on Sent. II dist. 33. Thomas, S. Theol. suppl. qu. 69 art. 4. But those who, after having received sanctifying grace in baptism or also again in penance, make themselves guilty of peccata venialia and have not been able to satisfy in this life the temporal punishments appointed for them, are not pure enough to be admitted immediately to the blessed vision of God in heaven; they enter a place between heaven and hell, not to acquire new virtues and merits, but to remove the hindrances which stand in the way of their entrance into heaven. To that end, in the first moment after dying, by an act of contrition, per actum peccato veniali contrariae [379] dispositionis, they are freed from the guilt of venial sins and then subsequently still have to bear the temporal punishments which, even after forgiveness, remain imposed on those sins. The purgatorium (purgatory from vagen, vegen, i.e. to cleanse, to purify) is therefore not a place of conversion, of testing, of sanctification, but a place of punishment, in which the fire, mostly conceived as material, serves, idealiter, through the representation of pain, to work purifyingly upon the “poor souls”. Moreover, the church by virtue of the communion of saints can come to the aid of these suffering souls and

mitigate and shorten their punishment by intercessions, Mass-offerings, good works, and indulgences. To be sure, no one knows which souls specifically come into purgatory, how long they must remain there, and under what conditions on their part the prayers and offerings of the living benefit them; but this uncertainty does no harm to the cult of the dead. For more and more it holds as a rule that, with a few exceptions, such as martyrs and special saints, the great mass of believers first comes into purgatory. In any case they are far ahead of the living, who must also go through that purgatorium to heaven; poor souls on the one hand, they are nevertheless, considered from another side, blessed souls, who together with the angels and the blessed are invoked by the living in need for help. Cf. Catech. Rom. I c. 6 qu. 3. Bellarminus, de purgatorio, Controv. II 228-269. Perrone, Prael. III 309. Möhler, Symbolik § 23. Oswald, Eschatologie2 1869 S. 81. Simar, Dogm. § 164. Atzberger, Chr. Eschatologie 269. Deharbe, Kath. geloofs- en zedeleer II 328. Jansen, Prael. III 975.

6. The Reformation saw in this purgatory a limitation of the merits of Christ and taught, by virtue of its principle of justification by faith alone, that the human being immediately after a judicium particulare in agone mortis entered into the blessedness of heaven or into the perdition of hell. Luther himself still often represented the intermediate state of the pious as a sleep, in which they calmly and quietly awaited the future of the Lord, Köstlin, Luthers Theol. II 568; but later Lutheran theologians almost entirely erased the distinction between intermediate state and final state and said that the souls of the pious immediately after death enjoyed a plena et essentialis beatitudo and those [380] of the ungodly immediately received a perfecta ac consummata damnatio, Quenstedt, Theol. IV 540. 567. Gerhard, Loc. XXVI § 160. 191. Schmid, Dogm. der ev. luth. K. § 63. In the main

that was now also indeed the opinion of the Reformed, Catech. Heid. 57. 58. Ned. Gel. 37. Helv. II 26. Westm. c. 32. Junius, Theses theol. 55. 56. Voetius, Disp. V 533-539. But usually they nevertheless brought out better than the Lutherans the difference that existed in the state of the deceased before and after the last day. Calvin said in his writing on the psychopannychia, that Abraham's bosom meant nothing else than that the souls of the pious after death will enjoy full peace, but that then, however, until the day of resurrection something still remains lacking to them, namely summa et perfecta Dei gloria, ad quam semper aspirant, and that our salvation thus always remained in cursu usque ad diem illum, qui omnem cursum claudit et terminabit, C. R. 33, 177-232, cf. Inst. III 25, 6, and further, although mostly expressing themselves somewhat more weakly, Ned. Gel. 37. Synops. pur. theol. 40. 17. Witsius, Oec. foed. III 14, 33, Heidegger, Corpus Theol. 28, 38. Others went still further and assumed a definite intermediate state. Lud. Cappellus said that the souls of the pious after death came into a state that could indeed be called blessed in comparison with that here on earth, but that was longe diversus from that blessedness which after the resurrection took a beginning; for the intermediate state consisted almost entirely in spe atque exspectatione futurae gloriae, non vero in ipsa gloriae fruitione. And likewise the souls of the ungodly after death came into a state in which they awaited the firmly determined future punishment in anxiety and fear, but yet did not suffer that punishment itself, for exspectatio supplicii non est ipsum supplicium. And thus in the main also thought William Sherlock, Thomas Burnet and many other English theologians, and among the Lutherans Calixtus, Hornejus, Zeltner, Tresenreuter, J. H. Ursinus and others, cf. M. Vitringa IV 63-69. Even since the previous century in Protestant theology all the thoughts

returned that earlier had been expressed by pagans and Christians, by philosophers and theologians about the intermediate state. The doctrine of the Roman purgatorium was taken up again by many mystics and pietists, such as Böhme, Antoinette Bourignon, Poiret, Dippel, Petersen, Arnold, Schermer etc., cf. M. Vitringa IV 81. 82, and further by [381] Leibniz, Syst. der Theol. 1825 S. 340, Lessing, Erziehung des Menschengeschl., J. F. v. Meyer, Blätter f. höhere Wahrheit VI 233. Jung-Stilling, Theorie der Geisterkunde § 211. Lange, Dogm. II 1250 f. Rothe, Ethik § 793-795. Martensen, Dogm. § 276. 277. Dorner, Gl. II 952 f. Oosterzee, Dogm. § 142 etc. In imitation of some early-Christian writers, the Socinians taught that, just as the bodies to the earth, so the souls returned to God and with Him until the resurrection led an existence without perception or thought, without pleasure or displeasure, Fock, Der Socin. 714 f. Closely related to that was the doctrine of a soul-sleep, which earlier already was advocated by some heretics, later by the Anabaptists and since the previous century again with Artobe, Heyn, Sulzer, cf. Bretschneider, Dogm. II 395, with Fries, Jahrb. f. d. Theol. 1856. Ulrici, Gott und die Natur2 332 f. and with the Irvingians found acceptance. By others this doctrine of the psychopannychia was so modified that the souls indeed retained an inward consciousness but were cut off from intercourse with the outside world, Episcopius, Op. II 2, 455. Limborch, Theol. Christ. VI 10, 8. J. Müller, Lehre v. d. Sünde II 402-408. Martensen, Dogm. § 276. Ebrard, Dogm. § 570. Dorner, Gl. II 952 f. Frank, Chr. Wahrh. II 460. Others avoided this doctrine of the soul-sleep by assuming that the souls at the laying aside of the material envelope retained the organic and basic form of the body, or also, that after death they received a new body composed of the finest matter, through which they could remain in communion with the outside

world, Paracelsus, Helmont, Böhme, Oetinger, Ph. M. Hahn, Swedenborg, Priestley, Schott, Jean Paul, cf. Bretschneider, Dogm. II 396, and further Rothe, Ethik § 111 f. 793 f. Hamberger, Die Rationalität der himml. Leiblichkeit, Jahrb. f. d. Th. 1863. Delitzsch, Bibl. Psych. 426 f. Martensen, Dogm. § 276. Ulrici, Gott u. die Natur2 333. Güder, Lehre v. d. Erscheinung Christi unter den Todten 321 f. Splittgerber, Tod, Fortleben u. Auferst.3 45 f. Rinck, Vom Zustande nach dem Tode 1885 S. 114 f. Mühe, Das enthüllte Geheimniss der Zukunft3 14 f. Nitzsch, Ev. Dogm. 619. Grétillat, Théol. syst. IV 548 etc. There are even those who have returned to the old doctrine of transmigration of souls and have recommended it in this form, that the souls through continued transitions from the one into the [382] other human body gradually become partakers of perfection, Lessing, Erz. d. Mensch., Schlosser, Ungern-Sternberg, Dr. D. Burger, De Plat. leer der zielsverhuizing, Amersf. 1877, Carl Andresen, Die Lehre v. d. Wiedergeburt auf theist. Grundlage, 2e Aufl. Hamburg 1899, who finds the reincarnation taught in Joh. 3:3-17, and others with M. Vitringa IV 95-97. Bretschneider, Dogm. II 388. Spiess, Entw. Gesch. der Vorstellungen vom Zustande nach d. Tode 1877 S. 31. Falke, Die Lehre v. d. ewigen Verdammnis, 1892 S. 59 f. The idea of development is nowadays so all-dominating that it is also applied to the state on the other side of the grave. The doctrine of the limbus patrum was again taken over by Martensen, Dogm. § 277. Delitzsch, Bibl. Psych. 407 f. Vilmar, Dogm. II 290. Splittgerber t. a. p. 110 f. Cremer, Ueber den Zustand nach dem Tode 1883 S. 9 f. The opinion that in the intermediate state there is still preaching of the gospel and possibility of conversion is a favorite notion of the new theology, Lange II 1250 f. Rothe § 796. 797. Delitzsch 413. Martensen § 277. Dorner II 952 f. Ebrard § 576. Cremer t. a. p. 48. 62 f. Kliefoth,

Eschatologie 97-113. Falke t. a. p. 152 f. Krauss, Lehre v. d. Offenbarung 112. Rinck t. a. p. 79-88. Mühe t. a. p. 30 f. Grétillat IV 540. 549. Oosterzee § 142. Doedes, Ned. Gel. 521 etc. Many even conceive the whole Jenseits as a continuing purification, the result of which is that some possibly are lost eternally (hypothetical universalism), or that those who persist in evil are finally annihilated (conditional immortality) or that at the end all are saved (apocatastasis), cf. § 56.

7. The history of the intermediate state proves that it costs the theologian and man in general effort to keep within the bounds of Holy Scripture and not to be wise above what one ought to be wise. The data which Holy Scripture contains concerning the intermediate state are sufficient for life, but leave many questions, which can arise in the curious mind, unanswered. If one nevertheless wishes to solve these, one cannot do otherwise than enter upon the path of conjectures, and one runs the danger of nullifying the Divine testimony by inventions of human wisdom. Immediately at once [383] this becomes apparent in speaking about death and immortality. Philosophy deals with this in a wholly different manner than Holy Scripture. The former regards death as something natural and thinks it sufficient to have immortality, that is, the continued existence of the soul. But Scripture judges wholly otherwise. Death is not natural, but has its cause in the transgression of God's command, Gen. 2:17, in the devil, insofar as he by his temptation caused man to fall and to die, Joh. 8:44, in sin itself, because it works dissolvingly upon the whole human life and, as it were, brings forth death out of itself, Jak. 1:15, in the judgment of God, because He rewards sin with death, Rom. 6:23. And that death is in Scripture never identical with annihilation, with non-being, but always consists in the breaking of harmony, in the cutting off of the different

relations of life in which a creature is placed according to its nature, in return to the elementary, chaotic being that underlies the whole cosmos, at least logically. According to Herbert Spencer, life consists in continual adaptation of internal to external relations, part I 416. Even if with this definition the essence of life is by no means explained, yet it is true that life is the richer, the more numerous and the healthier by nature are the relations in which it stands to its environment. The highest creature is therefore man; by virtue of his creation he stands in connection with nature and the world of men, visible and invisible things, heaven and earth, God and angels. And he lives, if he and insofar as he stands in the right relation, willed by God, to this whole environment, cf. Drummond, Das Naturgesetz in der Geisteswelt S. 121 f. Death is therefore in its essence and in its whole extent disturbance, breaking of all these relations in which man originally stood and still ought to stand. Its cause is therefore no other and can be no other than sin, that is, disturbance of the right relation to and breaking of the communion of life with God. Sin has death in this sense not merely as a consequence but coincides with it; sin is death, death in the spiritual sense; whoever does sin stands thereby in the same moment over against God, is dead for God and Divine things, has no desire for the knowledge of His ways, turns away from Him in enmity and hatred. And because this [384] relation to God, this created being according to His image and likeness, is no donum superadditum but belongs to man's essence and bears a central character, the disturbance of this relation must work destructively upon all other relations in which man stood to himself, to his fellow men, to nature, to the angels, to the whole creation. Sin, according to its nature, ought actually, at the same moment that it was committed, to have had as its

consequence the full, entire death, Gen. 2:17, return of the whole cosmos to its chaotic existence.

But God has intervened between the two and has broken the power of sin and of death. Indeed, as Schelling said, at the basis of all that exists there lies an irrational remainder. Everything that is left to itself passes over into dissolution. Nature, which is not cultivated, runs wild; the human being, who is not educated, degenerates; the people, that comes to stand outside civilization, becomes bastardized. By nature everything in and outside the human being stands in enmity over against one another. Understanding and will, conscience and inclination, duty and desire, soul and body, the human being and his neighbor, the world of human beings and of animals and of angels, all find themselves on a footing of war against each other and are in a state of dissolution and ruin. But yet God with his grace has intervened between the two, first with his general grace, to restrain the power of sin and death, then with his special grace, to break and to overcome them. Bodily death is not only postponed and by all kinds of measures a human existence and development made possible; but Christ by his cross in principle achieves the victory over sin and death and brings life and immortality to light, Rom. 5:12v., 1 Cor. 15:45, Hebr. 2:14, 2 Tim. 1:10, Op. 1:18, 20:14, so that whoever believes in Him has eternal life and shall not die unto eternity, Joh. 3:36, 5:24, 8:51, 52, 11:25. This life now is it and this immortality, which in Holy Scripture comes to the foreground. Immortality in the philosophical sense, the continued existence of the soul after death, has with it a subordinate value; it does not deny it but it also does not teach it intentionally and is least of all, as deism supposed, given for that purpose, that it would make this immortality known to us as one of the most weighty religious [385] truths. For this truth is sufficiently known

to the human being by nature. What Scripture had to teach us, was this, that naked existence, mere being without more, is not yet life, as befits human beings and is fitting for human beings. That is not so on this side, and that is still much less so on the other side of the grave. Here on earth the life of the human being, also of him who lacks the communion of God, still stands in many relations and thereby receives some content and value. But when all this falls away and all these bonds are broken, then life sinks back to a poor, empty, contentless, shadowy existence. From this side the Old Testament usually views the Jenseits. Dying is a stepping out of this life, a breaking of all bonds with this world; death is, in relation to the life on this side, a non-being, a resting, a sleeping, in one word a complete being-dead for the whole rich, joyful life on earth. The dead have no part any more forever in all that happens under the sun, Pred. 9:5, 6. In the concept of Sheol the negation of this earthly life and work stands in the foreground and thus forms, if not the only, then yet the principal constituent of it. Whether now in Sheol for this completely severed earthly life another comes in its place and the deceased there enter, on another side, into new relations, is expressed in the O. T. only a few times, when the eye of faith of the pious penetrates through the shadows of death to eternal life in communion with God. It was enough at the standpoint of the O. T. revelation, that the great thought was carried into human consciousness, that true life is found only in communion with God. The fear of hell remained just as much as the joy of heaven for the believer of the old day shrouded in mists. Only when Christ had died and risen again, was life in incorruptibility brought to light. Christ has not acquired or revealed immortality in the philosophical sense, the continued existence of souls after death. But He has again filled the life of the human being here and hereafter, emaciated and emptied by sin, with the

positive content of the communion of God, with peace and joy and blessedness. Death is no longer death for him who is in Christ Jesus, but a passage to eternal life, and [386] the grave a sanctified resting-place until the morning of the resurrection.

8. Whoever loses sight of this doctrine of Scripture concerning immortality falls into all manner of errors. For we are unable to form any conception of a pure spirit, of its existence and life and activity. Of God, who is pure spirit, we are not able to speak otherwise than in an anthropomorphistic manner, in which, moreover, Scripture itself goes before us, part II 65v. The angels are spiritual beings, but are represented in human fashion and, upon appearing, often assume human bodies, ib. 435v. And human beings are not only bodily beings, but all their activities are bound to the body and dependent on the body; not only the vegetative and animal but also the intellectual activities of thinking and willing. Although the brain is not the cause of the higher faculty of knowing and desiring, it is nevertheless its bearer and its organ; every disturbance in the brain has an abnormal operation of the anima rationalis as a consequence. Because the body is not a prison of the soul but belongs to the essence of the human being, we are unable to form any conception of the life and work of a soul separated from the body and are therefore readily inclined to suppositions and conjectures. Three hypotheses have therefore, in the main, been devised, in order to make the existence of souls after death somewhat intelligible.

First, many among the Heathen and also among the Christians have thought that the souls, after having been separated from the body, could lead nothing other than a sleeping life. Indeed, the change which occurs at death is of extraordinary significance. For the whole content of our life of

soul is derived from the external world, all knowledge begins with sensible perception, our whole form of thought is material; even of spiritual things we speak in words which originally had a sensible meaning. If death now, as Scripture teaches, is a sudden, violent, complete and absolute breach with the diesseitige world, then there really seems to be no other possibility than that the soul is completely closed to the external world, loses all its content, and as it were sinks back into itself. In sleep the soul also withdraws from the external world and breaks off intercourse with it; but [387] in sleep it does this only in a relative sense, since it remains connected with the body and retains the rich life which it has acquired for itself from the world; indeed it even remains there, though in a confused way, co-active in the dream. And nevertheless, what a change sleep already brings about in human life; the faculties of knowing and desiring cease their activity; consciousness stands still; all sensation and perception ceases; only the vegetative life continues its regulated labor. How much more, then, will all activity of the soul cease when death occurs and breaks all bonds with this world altogether! Everything thus seems to plead for the view that the souls after death are in a sleeping, unconscious state. And Holy Scripture is, to superficial appearance, so far from condemning this doctrine of the sleep of the soul, that it rather commends and favors it. For does it not call dying, not only in the Old but also in the New Test., repeatedly a sleeping, Deut. 31:16, Jer. 51:39, 57, Dan. 12:2, Mt. 9:24, Joh. 11:11, 1 Cor. 7:39, 11:30, 15:6, 18, 20, 51, 1 Thess. 4:13-15, 2 Petr. 3:4 etc.; Sheol is a land of silence, of rest, of forgetfulness, where there is no portion any more for ever in all that is done under the sun, above p. 366; Jesus speaks of the night of death, in which no one can work, Joh. 9:4; and nowhere does Scripture make any mention that those who returned from death to life, such as Lazarus and

others, have related anything of what they saw or heard in the intermediate state. Yet all these reasonings are not able to prove the doctrine of psychopannychia. For 1o it is clear that the dependence of the soul on the body nevertheless does not exclude its independence. The external world may be the occasion for the awakening of our self-consciousness and the first source of our knowledge; thinking may be bound to the brains and have in them its seat and organ; it is unproven and unprovable that the psychic life of man finds its source and origin in the physical phenomena. Thinking and knowing are activities of the soul; it is not the ear that hears and the eye that sees, but it is the psychic I of man that hears through the ear and sees through the eye; the body is an instrument of the spirit. Therefore there is also nothing absurd in [388] thinking that the soul, if need be, can continue its activities without the body. Besides, whoever would wish to deny to spirit as such conscious life, would have to come to consider consciousness and will impossible also in God and the angels. For even if we speak of God in a human way and even if we often imagine the angels bodily, they are nevertheless in themselves spirit and yet partake of consciousness and will. 2o Scripture teaches as clearly as possible that death is a total breach with this whole earthly life and in so far a sleeping, a resting, a being silent. The state of death is a sleep, the deceased sleeps, because intercourse with the diesseitige world has ceased; but nowhere does Scripture say that the soul of the deceased sleeps; on the contrary it always represents it after death as more or less conscious; and as revelation proceeds, it comes ever more clearly to light that, while in death all relations to this world are cut off, other relations to another world immediately take their place. The great thought of Scripture, that to the service of the Lord life is bound and to its rejection death, casts its light also

over the other side of the grave. While the rich man is immediately after his death in torment, the poor Lazarus is carried into Abraham's bosom, Luk. 16:23. And all believers, who indeed already here on earth partake of an eternal life, do not lose this by death, Joh. 11:25, 26, but enjoy it after death much more richly and blessedly in communion with Christ, Luk. 23:43, Hd. 7:59, 2 Cor. 5:8, Phil. 1:23, Op. 6:8, 7:9. Dwelling in the body is precisely a being away from the Lord, and dying thus the way to a nearer and closer communion with Christ. 3o Besides, it need not surprise that those who returned to life by resurrection mention nothing of what they have seen and heard on that side of the grave. For apart from the possibility that they did communicate one thing and another, which has not been recorded in Scripture, it is most probable that they were not permitted and were not able to report to us anything of their experiences on the far side of the grave. We have enough in Moses and the prophets, Luk. 16:29; and Paul, after he had been caught up into the third heaven, could say nothing else, [389] than that he had heard unutterable words, which it is not permitted for a man to speak. Cf. against the doctrine of the sleep of the soul: Tertullianus, de an. 58. Calvin, Psychopannychia, C. R. 33, 177-232. Bullinger, Housebook Dec. 4 serm. 10. Cloppenburg, Op. II 413-417. Voetius, Disp. I 832-835. Witsius, Oec. foed. III 14, 18-22. Gerdesius, Exerc. Acad. 592 sq. Moor VI 594-602. M. Vitringa IV 82-86. Gerhard, Loc. XXVI 293. Delitzsch, Bibl. Psych. 419. Splittgerber, Tod, Fortleben und Auferstehung3 102. Rinck, Vom Zustande nach dem Tode 1885 S. 19. Kliefoth, Christl. Eschatologie 1886 S. 66. Atzberger, Die christl. Eschatol. 212.

9. Others are of the opinion that the souls after death receive a new corporeality and thereby can again enter into communion with the external world, above p. 381. For this view one appeals to the fact that of the life and

activity of the soul without a body no conception can be formed, and further to those passages of Scripture which seem to ascribe to the souls of the deceased a certain corporeality. The inhabitants of the realm of the dead are described exactly as they looked on earth. Samuel is represented as an old man and clothed with a mantle, 1 Sam. 28:14; the kings of the Gentiles sit on thrones and go to meet the king of Babylon, Jes. 14:9; the Gentiles lie there as uncircumcised, Ezech. 31:18, 32:19v. Jesus speaks, even with the deceased, still of eyes and fingers and tongue, Luk. 16:23, 24. Paul expects that, if the earthly house of the tabernacle is broken down, he will have a building from God and will not be unclothed but clothed over, 2 Cor. 5:1-4. And John saw a great multitude, standing before the throne and the Lamb, clothed with long, white garments and with palm branches in their hands, Openb. 6:11, 7:9. But 1o from this manner of speaking of Holy Scripture nothing can be inferred for the corporeality of the souls after death. For it cannot speak of God and the angels, of the souls in the realm of the dead, of the joy in heaven and the pain in hell otherwise than in human language, under images that are borrowed from earthly conditions and relations. But alongside that it nevertheless declares clearly and decisively that God is spirit and that the angels are spirits, and thereby gives the rule [390] into the hand according to which all these anthropomorphic manners of speaking must be understood. And thus it also does in relation to the deceased. It cannot speak of them otherwise than as of men of flesh and blood, but says alongside that they, while their body rests in the grave, are souls, spirits, Pred. 12:7, Ezech. 37:5, Luk. 23:46, Hd. 7:59, Hebr. 12:23, 1 Petr. 3:19, Op. 6:9, 20:4. To these clear statements we must hold. Whoever nevertheless ascribes to the souls a kind of body must also come to represent to himself, with the theosophists, God and the angels in a certain sense as corporeal. 2o

The strongest passage that speaks for a Zwischenleiblichkeit of the souls is 2 Cor. 5:1-4. But this text too, with sound interpretation, loses all its probative force. For about the main thought which Paul here expresses there is no difference; the apostle knows that he, when his earthly body is dissolved, has a building from God; but he nevertheless sighs and is burdened in this body, because he looks up against death, and would therefore rather wish, not to be unclothed of this body, but at once, as to soul and body together, to be clothed over by the heavenly dwelling-place, in order that the mortal might be swallowed up by life. Even if this is also his dearest wish, he knows that he, after the breaking up of this earthly body, even if it is that he is unclothed of the body (the reading in v. 3 εἴ γε και ἐκδυσαμενοι deserves m. i. above εἴπερ or εἰ γε και ἐνδυσαμενοι the preference), nevertheless will therefore not be found naked but will dwell with the Lord, vv. 1. 3. 8. If, however, this is the main thought, then by the dwelling-place from God one cannot think of the resurrection body and still much less of an intermediate body. For Paul desires precisely, without dying, while he retains the earthly body, to be clothed over with that dwelling-place from God; the resurrection body now does not stand alongside the earthly body and is not drawn on over it, but comes forth from it by God's word of power or passes over into it in the case of those who remain alive by transformation, 1 Cor. 45:42, 51; and of an intermediate body there is still much less mention, since Paul would then know no fewer than three bodies, which would be drawn on one over the other successively. Holtzmann, Neut. Theol. II 199 therefore rightly says: von einem Zwischenleib redet man [391] am besten gar nicht mehr, Paulus kennt zwei, nicht drei σωματα die echter dan ook niet dualistisch na en naast elkander te stellen zijn. For this reason the οἰκοδομη ἐκ Θεον can be

nothing other than the heavenly glory conceived as a place and at the same time as a garment, the eternal light, in which God himself dwells, 1 Tim. 6:16, which is from God, not made with hands, out of and in heaven, and into which the believers at death or at the resurrection are transferred, cf. Col. 1:12, Joh. 14:2, 17:24. Finally 3o the corporeality which one ascribes to the souls after death is a concept with which nothing determinate can be thought, and about which the opinions also diverge very far. Delitzsch, on his trichotomistic standpoint, assumes that the soul fulfills this service of the intermediate body for the spirit. With him the soul stands between spirit and matter; it is the life-principle of the body derived from the spirit, the bodily, outward clothing of the spirit and yet again also the immaterial, inward side of the body. Güder teaches that the power which organized our earthly body remains preserved and on the far side of the grave forms a new body out of the elements present there. Splittgeber says that the organic basic form of the body goes along with the soul and gives it in the intermediate state an imperfect, provisional corporeality. Binck is of the opinion that the Nervenleib, a fine, inward body, which is the bearer of the soul-life, accompanies the soul after death and in the case of the regenerate is clothed over by the Spirit of God and by the irradiation of the glorified body of Christ is formed into a Zwischenleib, while in the case of the ungodly it is more and more permeated with sin and darkness, etc. But whatever one may say about it, it remains just as unclear. We know nothing other than spirit and matter; an immaterial Leiblichkeit is a contradiction, which at an ill hour has been transferred from theosophy into Christian theology and in vain attempts to reconcile the false dualism of spirit and matter, of thesis and antithesis, by an unthinkable synthesis, cf. part II 193. 537.

10. In the third place there are many who think that the souls after death still remain in some connection with earthly life. Among many peoples the thought prevailed that the souls [392] after death remained in the vicinity of the grave, and the Jews also thought that they still for some time after dying continued to hover around the corpse and explained from that that the sorceress at Endor could still summon up the spirit of Samuel, Weber, Syst. der altsyn. pal. Theol. 324. Widely spread was the custom to give the deceased food, weapons, possessions, sometimes even also his wives and slaves along into the grave; and usually this veneration of the deceased was not limited to the day of the burial or the time of mourning, but was also continued thereafter and incorporated into the ordinary, private or public, cult. Venerated were not only the dead in general, but also the deceased blood relatives, the parents and ancestors; the fathers and heads of the tribe; the heroes of the people; the princes and kings of the land, sometimes already in their lifetime; and in Buddhism and Islam also the saints. The cult consisted in this, that one maintained their graves, cared for their bodies (e.g. by embalming), from time to time laid flowers and foods down upon their grave, paid homage to their images and relics, arranged meals and games in their honor, sent up prayers to them and brought them offerings. Between the veneration of these deceased human beings and of the gods one thereby often, as in Persia, India, Greece, did make a distinction, but nevertheless the cult of the dead was a principal constituent of religion. With their veneration one intended in part to come to their aid themselves, but especially also to ward off the misfortune that they could cause and to assure oneself of their blessing and assistance, whether in ordinary, whether in extraordinary manner, through oracles and miracles, cf. Ch. de la Saussaye, Lehrb. der Religionsgesch. I 79-87. All these elements

from the second century on also penetrated into the Christian cult. Just as in Buddhism the monks and in Islam the mystics, so in the Christian church the martyrs soon became an object of religious veneration; on the place where they had died or their relics had been interred, altars, chapels, churches were built; there especially on the death-days (dies natales) of the martyrs, the believers came together, to celebrate their memory by vigils and psalm-singing, by the reading of the acta martyrum and the hearing of a sermon in their honor and especially also by the celebrating of the holy eucharist. And after the fourth century this cult [393] of Mary, the angels, the patriarchs, the prophets and the martyrs also extended to bishops, monks, hermits, confessores, virgines and to all kinds of saints and to their relics and images, Schwane D. G. I 389 f. II 620 f.; and in spite of all resistance both in and outside the Roman church, it has not only maintained itself up to this day but it still always increases in a terrifying manner and pushes the worship of the one true God and of Jesus Christ, whom He has sent, more and more into the background. Rome celebrates in this cult in a practical manner the communion of saints. The one Christian church has three divisions, the ecclesia triumphans in heaven, the ecclesia patiens in purgatory, and the ecclesia militans on earth. The share that the ecclesia patiens takes in this communion consists in this, that the blessed in heaven with their intercessions come to the aid of the poor souls in purgatory; that the church on earth softens and shortens the punishments of those souls by prayers, alms, good works, indulgences and especially by the sacrifice of the mass; and finally also still in this, that the souls in purgatory, who in any case are far ahead of most members of the militant church, and therefore may be invoked, help and strengthen the believers on earth by their intercessions. This last element, although also already in the communion

with the ecclesia patiens taking an ever broader place, nevertheless forms the principal constituent of the communion of the militant with the triumphant church. The blessed in heaven are, like the angels, partakers of perfect, supernatural holiness; and therefore they are objects of worship and veneration. In that holiness they do not all share in the same measure; like the angels, they form a spiritual hierarchy; at the top stands Mary and after her follow the patriarchs, the prophets, the apostles, the martyrs, the confessores etc. It is a descending series, but in all something of the Divine virtues shines forth. And in that then also all that has stood or still stands in any connection with the saints shares, their body, limbs, clothes, dwelling, image etc. And in the same measure as something stands nearer to God and partakes more of his holiness, it is the object of religious veneration. Also in this there is thus all manner of difference. There is latria, which belongs to God alone; the human nature of Christ and all its members, e.g. the sacred [394] heart, is indeed not per se and propter se but yet in se an object of latria; Mary has claim to hyperdulia; the saints to dulia; their relics to cultus religiosus relativus etc.; tot sunt species adorationis, quot sunt species excellentiae, adoratio est diversa pro diversitate excellentiae, part II 451v. III 262. 300. The veneration of the saints consists in general in prayers, fasting, watching, feast-days, gifts, pilgrimages, processions etc., and has as its aim, through their intercessions to obtain the favor of God and to receive some benefit from Him. But this veneration and intercession is not only general, but also particular; there are definite saints for definite peoples, families, persons, and there are special saints for the various needs and necessities. Saint George is the patron saint of England, James of Spain, Stephen of Hungary; the painters venerate Saint Luke, the carpenters Joseph, the shoemakers Crispinus; Saint Sebastian helps especially in

plague, Ottilia in eye-disease, Anthony, in case one has lost something; even animals have their protecting saint, the geese are specially guarded by Saint Gallus and the sheep by Saint Wendelinus etc. Cf. Trid. sess. 25 and other ecclesiastical determinations in Denzinger 243. 273. 866 etc. Catech. Rom. III 2 qu. 4-14. Hieronymus, Contra Vigilantium in Migne XXXIII 339-452. Damascenus, de imaginibus, Id. de fide orthod. IV 15. 16. Lombardus e. a. on Sent. IV dist. 45. Thomas, S. Theol. II 2 qu. 83 art. 11. Suppl. qu. 71. 72. Bellarminus, de ecclesia triumphante sive de gloria et cultu sanctorum, Controv. II 269-368. Oswald, Eschatologie2 121-233. Atzberger, Die christl. Eschatol. 263-269 etc. Many of these conceptions have repeatedly also returned in Protestant theology. The Lutherans conceded that the angels and also the saints pray pro ecclesia universa in genere, Apol. conf. 21. Art. Smalc. II 2. Just as Hugo Grotius already earlier in his Votum pro pace had defended the invocation of the saints, so Leibniz later took this and even the veneration of images and relics under protection, Syst. der Theol. 1825 S. 116-195. Ritualism in England goes in the same direction, Ryle, Knots united p. 491 etc. Many theologians assume that after death a certain connection between the soul and the body continues to exist, Beck, Seelenlehre 40 f. Delitzsch, Bibl. Psych. 444 f., [395] that the souls still maintain some intercourse with the earth, take knowledge of the most important events, pray for us and look down upon us blessing, Splittgerber, Tod, Fortleben und Auferstehung 157 f. In the previous century many thought, such as Swedenborg, Jung-Stilling, Oberlin, to stand in direct intercourse with the departed spirits, cf. especially J. C. Wötzel, Meiner Gattin wirkliche Erscheinung nach ihrem Tode, Chemnitz 1804. The possibility of their apparitions was and is still acknowledged by many, such as by Kant, Träume eines Geistersehers,

Lessing, Dramaturgie, J. H. Fichte, Anthropologie, Jung-Stilling, Theorie der Geisterkunde 1808. Kerner, Die Seherin von Prevorst 1829. Eschenmayer, Das Mysterium des inneren Lebens, erläutert aus der Gesch. der Seherin van Prevorst 1830. To that since 1848 spiritism has been added, which deliberately tries to place itself in rapport with the spirit-world and thinks to have received actual revelations (through signs, knocks, writing, psychography), workings (lifting and moving of furniture, untying of knots, playing of musical instruments) and apparitions (materializations) of spirits. Of the rich literature of spiritism let only be mentioned the work of the Russian state councillor Alexander Atsakow, which contains all the material and is entitled: Animismus und Spiritismus 2 Bde, Leipzig Mutze 1894.

In order now to begin with the last, it deserves, 1o, attention that superstitious practices occur among all peoples, also among those with whom Israel came into contact, such as the Egyptians, Gen. 41:8, Ex. 7:11, the Canaanites, Deut. 18:9, 14, the Babylonians, Dan. 1:20, 2:2 etc. Also among Israel they penetrated and were many times zealously practiced, 1 Sam. 28:9, 2 Kings 21:6, Isa. 2:6. To these practices also belonged the consulting of the dead, and those who occupied themselves with that were called אֹבוֹת or יִדְּעֹנִים. The word אוב first indicates the divining spirit that dwells in someone, Lev. 20:27, whom someone possesses, 1 Sam. 28:7, 8, who is consulted by someone, 1 Sam. 28:8, by whom someone causes a dead person to come up, 1 Sam. 28:9, and who, as one imagined of the dead, proclaims oracles in a whispering, mysterious manner, Isa. 8:19, 19:3, 29:4; and then subsequently denotes the diviner himself, 1 Sam. 28:3, 9, 2 Kings 21:6, 2 Chron. 33:6, LXX [396] ἐγγαστρομυθος, ventriloquist. The other word, ידענים, knowing ones, wise ones, is only a further specification of אבות and at first indicated the divining persons and thereafter the divining

spirit that was in them, Lev. 19:31, 20:6, 27, Isa. 19:3. This divining could take place in many ways, but e.g. also by consulting the dead, Deut. 18:11, cf. Stade, Gesch. des Volkes Israel I 443 f. 505. Schwally, Das Leben nach dem Tode 69 f. But law and prophecy declared themselves decisively against that, and called the people back to the Lord, to his revelation and testimony, Ex. 22:18, Lev. 19:26, 31, 20:6, 27, Deut. 18:11, 1 Sam. 28:19, Isa. 8:19, 47:9-15, Jer. 27:9, 29:8, Micah 3:7, 5:11, Neh. 3:4, Mal. 3:5; and the New Testament sets its seal upon that, Luke 16:29, Acts 8:9v., 13:6v., 19:13v., Gal. 5:20, Eph. 5:11, Rev. 9:21, 21:8, 22:15. Indeed it is, 2o, unprovable that Holy Scripture accepts the possibility of the summoning and appearing of the deceased. To be sure, there sometimes take place resuscitations of the dead by God's wondrous power, and Scripture acknowledges demonic powers and workings that go beyond human ability, Deut. 13:1, 2, Mt. 24:24, 2 Thess. 2:9, Rev. 13:13-15. But nowhere does it teach the possibility or the reality of an apparition of the dead. The only passage that can be adduced against this is 1 Sam. 28, where Saul takes refuge with the sorceress at Endor; for the appearance of Moses and Elijah with Christ on the mount of transfiguration Mt. 17, Luke 9, is effected without human mediation by God alone. But even if the rationalistic explanation is to be rejected, which in this history sees nothing other than a deliberate deception by the woman; an objective, real appearance of Samuel is just as little to be accepted. For Saul does not see Samuel, v. 14; the woman does see him but is in a hypnotic condition, v. 12, and she sees him as he looked in his life, as an old man and clothed in a prophet's mantle, v. 14. The fright of the woman, v. 12, therefore also had its cause not in this, that contrary to her expectation she really saw Samuel, but in this, that she, seeing Samuel, in her hypnotic condition also immediately recognized Saul

the king and feared him. After Saul has been brought under the impression that an underground, spiritual being, אלהים, had come up out of the earth and that Samuel himself had appeared, this one speaks out and [397] through the woman to Saul and announces to him the judgment. There is nothing in 1 Sam. 28 that goes beyond the known phenomena of hypnotism and somnambulism and cannot be explained in the same way. 3o There are, however, many who precisely from the phenomena of hypnotism, somnambulism, spiritism etc. think they must conclude to the working of spirits. But this hypothesis seems for the time being absolutely not justified. Apart from the many deceptions that have taken place in this field, what is related of appearance and working of the spirits is so childish and insignificant that the involvement of the spirit world need absolutely not be assumed for it. Thereby it is not denied that all kinds of phenomena occur that have not yet been explained; but these are all of such a nature (such as e.g. the sudden knowing and speaking of foreign languages, clairvoyance, hypnosis, suggestion, secondsight, presentiment, knowledge of what at the same moment happens elsewhere, telepathy etc.), that they do not at all become clearer by the hypothesis of spirit-apparition. When we moreover consider that man in his perceptions is bound to and limited within a certain number of ether vibrations, so that some alteration therein would present to him a wholly different image of the world and he himself possesses a deep and rich soul-life, which in self-consciousness comes to appearance only very partially, cf. my Beginselen der Psychologie 70v. 78v.; then there lies within the bounds of the Diesseits for occultism still such an extensive terrain open, that for the present we need not yet take refuge in the influence of the spirit world. Cf. Kirchner, Der Spiritismus, die Narrheit unseres Zeitalters, Berlin Habel 1883. Ed. v. Hartmann, Der Spiritismus,

Leipzig Friedrich 1885. Id. Die Geisterhypothese des Spiritismus und seine Phantome, ib. 1891. Furthermore, 4o, the whole of Scripture proceeds from the thought that death is a total breach with life on this side of the grave. To be sure, the deceased retain memory of what happened here on earth with them. The rich man and the poor Lazarus know who and what they have been here and in what surroundings they have lived, Luke 16. In the last judgment men are conscious of what they have done on earth, Mt. 7:22. The works follow after those who have died in the Lord, Rev. 14:13. What we have done here on earth becomes our moral property and goes with us into death. Nor is there any doubt that the deceased recognize those whom they have known on earth; the subterranean inhabitants greet mockingly the king of Babylon, Isa. 14; the mighty heroes speak from the midst of Sheol to Egypt's prince and people, Ezek. 32; the rich man knows Lazarus, Luke 16. The friends whom we acquire here by beneficence receive us once with joy in the eternal tabernacles, Luke 16:9. But otherwise Scripture always represents it thus, that communion with this earth is totally broken at death. The deceased have no more share in everything that happens under the sun, Eccl. 9:5, 6, 10. Whether their children come to honor or fall into poverty, they do not know it, Job 14:21. Abraham does not know of the children of Israel and Jacob does not know them, and therefore they call to the Lord, who after all is their Father, Isa. 63:16. Of an intercourse of the deceased with the living there is nowhere any mention; they belong to another realm, which is totally separated from the earth. Also Heb. 11:1 does not teach that the cloud of witnesses sees and watches us in our struggle. For the μαρτυρες there are not eyewitnesses of our struggle but witnesses of faith, who serve for our encouragement. 5o Therefore there is also no place for invocation and veneration of the saints. In itself there is nothing strange or

improper in the thought that angels and blessed ones make intercession for the people on earth; an interest in the history of the militant church, a general intercession was also many times accepted by Protestants. But all the more remarkable is it that Scripture, which so often makes mention of the intercession of people on earth and definitely recommends and prescribes it, Mt. 6:9v., Rom. 15:30, Eph. 6:18, 19, Col. 1:2, 3, 1 Tim. 2:2, and moreover teaches that God often spares others for the sake of the elect and upon their intercession, Gen. 18:23v., Ex. 32:11v., Num. 14:13v., Ezek. 14:14, 20, Mt. 24:22 etc., never speaks with a single word of an intercession of the angels and of the blessed for those living on earth. With respect to the intercession of the angels this has already been proven earlier, part II 449v., and of the intercession of the blessed the Roman Catholics themselves admit that it does not occur in Scripture, cf. e.g. Oswald, Eschatologie2 132; only 2 Macc. 15:12-14 makes mention of [399] an intercession of Onias and Jeremiah for their people in a dream-vision to Judas and proves only that the Jews in that time were convinced of the intercession of the blessed departed. 6o Still less ground is there for the invocation and veneration of the saints. Holy Scripture does say that believers on earth may invoke one another's intercession, Num. 21:7, Jer. 42:2, 1 Thess. 5:25, but nowhere mentions a request to the departed for their intercession; and angels and men expressly ward off all religious veneration from themselves, which belongs to God alone, Deut. 6:13, 10:20, Mt. 4:10, Acts 14:10, Col. 2:18, 19, Rev. 19:10, 22:9, cf. part II 451v. Also of the veneration of relics there is no mention; even if God sometimes works miracles through them, 2 Kings 13:21, Mt. 9:21, Luke 6:19, Acts 5:15, 19:12, they may not be an object of veneration, Deut. 34:6, 2 Kings 18:4, 2 Cor. 5:16. Oswald t. a. p. 143 therefore also counts the invocation and veneration of the saints among

the Traditionsdogmen. Even if a general intercession of the saints for the believers on earth is conceded, it still by no means follows from that that they may be invoked and venerated for that. For indeed a request for someone's intercession is in itself absolutely not unlawful, and therefore also repeatedly takes place among believers. But such a request always presupposes some means of communication, and must be able to be conveyed orally or in writing. And precisely that is lacking here and is also in direct conflict with the teaching of Scripture about the condition of the departed. Rome therefore also does not dare to say that the invocation and veneration of the saints is commanded and necessary, but only pronounces, bonum atque utile esse, suppliciter eos invocare, Trid. sess. 25. Theology is in no way able to make clear how the saints obtain knowledge of our prayers, and puts forward all kinds of conjectures. Some think that they are communicated to them by the angels, who here repeatedly come to earth, or that the saints, like the angels, can move wondrously quickly and quodam modo ubique are; others are of the opinion that the saints are informed by God himself of the content of our prayers, or behold all things that they need to know in the divine consciousness; and there are also those who say that it is not necessary that they know everything, provided only that they bear knowledge quite in general of our needs, or also that we need not concern ourselves about the manner in which they obtain knowledge of our prayers, Thomas S. Theol. II 2 qu. 83 art. 4. Suppl. qu. 72 art. 1. Oswald, Eschatologie2 139. In addition there comes still that the Roman Catholics absolutely do not know with certainty who of the departed are in heaven and belong to the perfect saints. The pious of the O. T. first sojourned in the limbus patrum and were indeed transferred by Christ into heaven, but nevertheless stand too far from us, to be much invoked by us, Oswald t. a.

p. 132. 167. Of some pious in the N. T., such as Mary, the apostles, and also of the later martyrs, Rome does assume that they have been received into heaven. But those are a few, and error is not excluded here. In earlier times it was the voice of the people that ascribed to a deceased person the predicate of holiness; and in that connection it occurred that men who possessed this predicate lost it again, as e.g. Clement of Alexandria by Benedict XIV. In order to prevent these errors, therefore since Alexander III and Innocent III the ecclesiastical declaration of someone's holiness, that is the canonization, has become a right of the apostolic see. However, it is here again a question whether the pope in this canonization is infallible or not. And even if this may also be the case, by the nature of the matter the pope makes sparing use of it. By far the most saints are invoked and venerated without one knowing precisely whether they sojourn in heaven or in purgatory. One must therefore be satisfied with a moral conviction, further consider that a possible error brings no harmful consequences, and for safety's sake also extend the invocation to the "poor souls" in purgatory, as in practice happens more and more, Oswald t. a. p. 148. 164. The invocation of the saints is, 7o, with Rome absolutely no longer only a request for their intercession (ora pro nobis), but has gradually passed over into an adoration and veneration; the saints are object of a cultus religiosus, be it also that this is not called latria but dulia. Now there is no doubt that we would have to show respectful homage to the angels and blessed ones, if we met them and had any intercourse with them, part II 455. But precisely this latter does not occur. And [401] therefore all invocation of the angels and of the blessed ones results in a religious veneration, which is not made good by the name of dulia, ib. 451v. On the path that Rome treads with this veneration of the creature, there is no standstill. Holiness is conceived by

Rome as a donum superadditum, as something substantial, that can be communicated to all creatures in different measure, and in that same measure may then be religiously venerated. Insofar as a person or thing has a share in the divine holiness, they have a claim to a cultus religiosus. First of all, therefore, Mary, the apostles, the martyrs, the saints share in it, but further all and everything that has been in contact with these or still stands in relation to them, thus also relics, images, dwelling places etc. According to this principle every creature can be religiously venerated, quod et quatenus respectum habeat ad Deum, even to the hands of the soldiers who seized Jesus, and the lips of Judas who kissed him, included, Voetius, Disp. III 880. 896. In any case it is not to be seen why the saints who are on earth are not already invoked and venerated by Roman Christians, and among them then especially the pope, who is the saint par excellence. Es spricht an sich nichts dagegen, dass auch die Heiligkeit auf Erden religiös veneriert werde. Wäre man also von der Gottseligkeit einer Person vollkommen überzeugt, so durfte sie an sich wohl eine Verehrung geniessen, wie sie den Heiligen im Himmel zukommt. In einzelnen Fällen mag es privatim geschehen sein und geschieht vielleicht noch, Oswald t. a. p. 157. What is still adduced against this by Oswald is borrowed from utility and shows that the veneration of the living saints, specifically of the pope, with Rome is only a question of time. The communion of saints degenerates into a mutual veneration, which pushes the mediator of God and of men into the background.

11. Up to this point there has only been question of whether the deceased still stand in any direct intercourse with the earth; now the question comes up, whether Holy Scripture teaches us anything about the new relations and conditions in which the dead find themselves on the other side of the grave.

It is not much that Scripture reports to us about that. Yet already in the Old [402] Test. the lines are present which, drawn through, lead to a distinction in the condition of righteous and godless after death. The fear of the Lord is the way to life, but the godless perish and come to an end, above p. 369. And according to the New Test. the rich man comes immediately into a place of torment, which, however, is not yet identical with the gehenna or the abyssus. Where this place is to be sought is not mentioned in Scripture. Indeed the scheol, the hades, the gehenna, the abyssus are always represented as being beneath us. But this cannot and may not be understood in a topographical sense. For the concepts above and below are, taken locally, very relative and in this connection have only an ethical significance; we place the realm of darkness of itself directly opposite that of light and, according to a natural symbolism, seek the first beneath and the second above us. Every determination of the place of punishment of the dead, in the earth, under the earth, in the sea, in the sun, in the air, or on one of the planets is nothing more than a conjecture. Only it can be said that the Jenseits is not only a condition but also a place, for souls may not be circumscriptive in time and space, they are yet much less eternal and omnipresent and must be somewhere and also have a succession of moments of time. For the rest, it is more in accordance with the few data which Scripture offers us, to refrain from every determination of the place of punishment of the dead; μη ζητωμεν που ἐστι, ἀλλα πως αὐτην φυγοιμεν (Chrysostomus). Just as little do we know of the condition in which the unbelievers and godless find themselves after death up to the last judgment. Only we can say with certainty that, when the wrath of God already here remains upon the unbelievers, this after death must at once be felt much more heavily, because all diversion of earthly life is lacking and naked

existence is filled with nothing but the consciousness and the feeling of that wrath. The question has, however, been raised whether for such as these, who here on earth have not heard the gospel or have heard it only very imperfectly, on the other side of the grave there will not yet exist an opportunity to repent and to believe in Christ. The first who in the Christian church gave an affirmative answer to that were Clemens, Strom. VI 6 and Origenes, c. Cels. II 44. They [403] inferred from 1 Petr. 3:18, 19 that Christ and also the apostles had proclaimed the gospel to the dead in the hades who were receptive to it. Although this opinion was now refuted by Augustine, de haeresi c. 79 and others and the descent of Christ into hell was usually understood otherwise, part III 378v., it nevertheless returned time and again and found acceptance especially in this century, in which one obtained a clear awareness of the great multitude and the rapid expansion of the non-Christians, with very many, above p. 382. Indeed it is a fact of the greatest significance that there have been and still are millions of people who have never borne any knowledge of the way of salvation in Christ and thus have also never been placed in the opportunity to accept Him with a believing heart or to reject Him with decisiveness of will. These are not to be reckoned among the unbelievers in the narrower sense, and Scripture itself says that they are judged by another standard than Jews and Christians, Mt. 10:15, 11:20-24, Luk. 10:12-25, 12:47, 48, Joh. 15:22, 24, Rom. 2:12, 2 Petr. 2:20-22.

Yet it follows from that in the least not, that there is or must be also a preaching of the gospel on the other side of the grave. For 1o Scripture speaks of that with not a single word. Many passages, which have indeed sometimes been adduced for it, such as Mt. 12:40, Joh. 20:17, Hd. 2:24, 27, 31, 13:29, 30, 34-37, 1 Tim. 3:16, have not the least force of proof and deal

absolutely not with a preaching of Christ in hell. Ezech. 16:53-63 also opens no prospect upon this; there it is promised by the Lord, that He, in spite of the abominations which Jerusalem has committed and which are worse than those of her sisters, Sodom and Samaria, will nevertheless in the end restore her again and accept her in grace. But in order, however, to remove all false confidence in God's promise and all self-exaltation with Israel, it is added that the Lord will turn not only the captivity of Jerusalem but also that of Sodom and Samaria, vs. 53, so that these also will return to their former state. From this some have concluded to a possibility of conversion in the intermediate state; for Sodom and her sisters, i.e. the other cities in the valley of Siddim, were in Ezekiel's days all already long destroyed and thus could not be restored to their former state and accepted by God in grace, if their former [404] inhabitants did not in the sheol come to conversion through the preaching of the word of God. But this thought lies far outside the text. The Lord promises here only, that He, in spite of her whoredom, will nevertheless again accept Jerusalem in grace; and that not only, but also Sodom and Samaria, which definitely, as appears from vs. 61, are types of all the heathen peoples, will be restored in their former state, i. w. z. the future will be this, that Jerusalem will be restored and the heathen cities will be subjected to her. Of a preaching and conversion in the Sheol and of a resurrection and return of the former inhabitants there is no mention. 2o The only passages, to which one can appeal with semblance of right for a preaching of the gospel in the hades, are 1 Petr. 3:19-21 and 4:6. But these texts also do not contain what one wants to read into them. Even if there should be mention there of a preaching which Christ after his resurrection held to the contemporaries of Noah in the hades, then only this fact would thereby be established but by no means give a right to the

doctrine that in the hades a continuing proclamation of the gospel took place to all who have not heard it on earth. For indeed the contemporaries of Noah were precisely not such people who had never heard the word of God during their life on earth; they had despised the word of Noah, the preacher of righteousness, in wilful wickedness and had been disobedient to the voice of the Lord in full consciousness. With them it was thus a wholly special case, which gives no right to further conclusions; the aorist ἐκηρυξεν also indicates that this preaching by Christ has happened only once. Further, this preaching cannot have been a proclamation of the gospel unto salvation, for if one considers how strictly Scripture always judges concerning all ungodly persons and how it always describes the race of men during Noah as given over to all wickedness and unrighteousness, then the thought becomes absurd that Christ precisely to them in distinction from so many others would have proclaimed the gospel of salvation. At most there can then be mention of a solemn announcement of his triumph to the inhabitants of the underworld, as the old Lutherans explained the text. Moreover, to such a continuing preaching of the gospel in the hades all manner of difficulty is connected. [405] According to 1 Petr. 3:18, 19 Christ, specifically after He had been made alive and had risen, held that preaching. Did He then with his body go locally to the hades? When did He do that? How long did He sojourn there? And let all this now be possible, however improbable it already is in itself, who then brings that preaching in the hades after that time and now always on? Is there then also a church in the underworld? Is there a mission, a calling, an ordering? Are they men or angels, are they the apostles or other ministers of the word, who after their death there proclaim the gospel? The doctrine of a Missionsanstalt in the hades comes in all manner of ways into conflict with Scripture. But it also

finds, as was already shown earlier, part III 422 cf. 379, in 1 Petr. 3:18-22 absolutely no support. There it is only said that Christ, after his resurrection, being made alive as Spirit, has gone to heaven and through this his ascension into heaven has preached to the spirits in prison and has made the angels, powers and forces subject to himself. Neither is there in 1 Petr. 4:6 mention of such a preaching of the gospel in the hades. Already the aorist εὐηγγελισθη calls to mind, not a continuing preaching but a definite fact. That proclamation of the gospel took place once, and indeed with the purpose that they who heard it would be judged in the flesh according to the manner of men, i.e. would die, but would live in the spirit according to the manner of God. The preaching of the gospel thus preceded the dying; the νεκροι are those who are now dead, but who in their life heard the gospel. The reason why Peter calls these people νεκροι lies in the preceding verse. There it was said that Christ stands ready to judge the living and the dead. Well then, just as to the living now, so formerly to those who are now dead the gospel was proclaimed, in order that they, yes, would still indeed die in the flesh, but would nevertheless now already live in the spirit with God. 3o With these objections, derived from Scripture, the whole doctrine of the preaching of the gospel in the intermediate state already falls away. For if Scripture does not contain it, it is not permitted to Christian theology, nevertheless, to propound it. But there are yet also many other objections. Granted that the gospel in the hades is still preached, does that preaching go out to all without distinction? Usually one says no and lets it be brought only to those who did not come to know it here on earth. This now is not only in conflict with their exegesis of 1 Petr. 3:18-22, for if there is mention there of an evangeliepreaching of Christ in the hades, then this takes place there precisely to such as had indeed heard the gospel through Noah, but it

then also of itself raises the question whether life here on earth is for that preaching of the gospel in the hades totally indifferent. Also to this one dares, understandably, as a rule to give no negative answer, for then this life would be wholly without value or significance. Therefore one usually says with Clement and Origen that the gospel in the intermediate state is brought only to such as are susceptible to conversion, who here on earth through their attitude toward the vocatio realis have prepared themselves for the believing acceptance of the gospel, cf. e.g. also Ebrard, Dogm. § 576. In fact thereby the centre of gravity is nevertheless again shifted into this life and the gospel proclamation in the hades only brings to light what here on earth was already hidden in the hearts. That is, the decision about salvation and perdition does not lie with the gospel but with the vocatio realis, with the law. And this is in the essence of the matter the same opinion that was also embraced by the Pelagians, the Socinians, the Deists etc., namely that there are three ways to salvation, the lex naturae, the lex Mosaica and the lex Christi. 4o To that there comes yet, that the doctrine of an evangeliepreaching in the hades proceeds from all manner of incorrect presuppositions. There lies namely at its foundation, that it is God's intention to save all men; that the preaching of the gospel must be absolutely universal; that all men personally and individually must be placed before the choice for or against the gospel; that the decision in that choice stands in the power of man; that original and actual sins are not sufficient to condemn but that only the decided unbelief with respect to the gospel makes one worthy of eternal perdition etc. All these presuppositions are in conflict with decided utterances of Scripture and make the doctrine of the evangeliepreaching in the intermediate state unacceptable. And if then finally it is asked whether it is not hard to believe that all who [407] here on

earth wholly without their fault did not hear the gospel, are lost, then there serves for answer to that: a. that in this most serious matter not our feeling but God's word decides; b. that the doctrine of an evangeliepreaching to the dead in the least does not soften this hardness, since it comes only to the benefit of those who here on earth had already sufficiently prepared themselves for faith; c. that it makes the hardness still increase, since it does not think of the interest of the millions of little children who die young and in fact places them outside the possibility of being saved; and d. that it does not reckon with the sovereignty and the omnipotence of God, which can also save without the outward preaching of the word, only through the inward calling and the regeneration of the H. Spirit.

12. The condition of the deceased believers, who here on earth have not yet attained perfect holiness, is conceived by Rome as a purification of the souls by the punishment of fire. The notion of such a state of purgation is of pagan origin and occurred especially in two forms. The doctrine of the transmigration of souls, which is found among the Indians, the Egyptians, the Greeks, the Jews, etc., implies that the soul, before it came into the human body, has already dwelt in other bodies and also, after it has left the human body, enters into new organisms, in order to purify itself and finally to attain perfection. This doctrine, however, is too much in conflict with Scripture for it ever to be able to gain assent within the bounds of Christianity otherwise than among a few sects and individual persons. For it proceeds from the thought that the souls are praeëxistent, originally possessed no body, and are indifferent toward all bodies. Further, it conflicts with the doctrine of redemption, which has been accomplished by Christ, and regards purification and perfection as man's own work. And finally, it does not at all make clear how the souls, by passing each time into

other bodies, could be freed from sins and trained up to holiness, cf. M. Vitringa IV 87-97. Moor II 1081. Bretschneider, Syst. Entw. 846. Spiess, Entwicklungsgesch. der Vorst. v. Zustande nach dem Tode 31. 558. J. F. von Meyer, Blätter für höhere Wahrheit 1830 I 244-299 etc. More influence on Christian [408] theology had the other representation, that the souls after death must still for a time be purified by all manner of punishments, in order only thereafter to obtain a share in the highest blessedness. In Parseeism we find the belief that after the general resurrection there follows a three-day purgation in flowing metal, which for the good is gentle but for the wicked very painful, Saussaye, Rel. Gesch. II 51. The Jews taught that only the perfectly righteous went immediately to heaven; the others were referred to Gehinnom, which according to some was for all men but in any case for the Jews a purgatory, Weber, Syst. 327. Since Origen this representation also penetrated among the Christians and there led to the doctrine of the Roman purgatory or of a purgation-period accepted by many Protestants, above p. 381. At the first hearing this thought has much that is attractive. For the believers at the moment of their dying are all still burdened with sin; even the most holy possess as yet only a small beginning of perfect obedience. This sin, which clings to the believers, furthermore has its seat not in the body but in the soul, which therefore cannot enter into heaven unless it is beforehand not only freed from the guilt of sin but also completely cleansed from its stain. It is difficult to conceive how this cleansing could suddenly come about through or at death. For not only does sanctification in this life proceed slowly, but in every sphere we see no sudden transitions, but gradual growth and development. Everything therefore pleads for the fact that the souls of the believers after death must

undergo a purgation, in order thereafter first to be received into heaven and to be admitted to the vision of God.

But whatever human reasoning may recommend such a purgatory, the first and in itself already sufficient objection is, that Scripture nowhere speaks of it. To be sure, the Romanists cite some texts, but not one of them proves the service that is demanded of it. Mt. 5:22 does not speak a word of a purgatorium but indeed of the gehenna, cf. deel III 99. To think of purgatory in connection with the φυλακη in Mt. 5:25 is arbitrary; rather it is an image of the gehenna, for whoever enters it has beforehand been condemned by the judge and never again has opportunity to pay off the debt and to leave the prison; [409] the ἐως in vs. 26 indicates an unattainable term, cf. 18:30, 34. In Mt. 12:32 Jesus says that the blasphemy against the H. Spirit will be forgiven neither in this nor in the coming age. The words: nor in the coming age, serve only to strengthen the unforgivableness of the blasphemy against the H. Spirit and therefore by no means need to presuppose that some sins can also still be forgiven after this life. But even if this were so, then this text would still prove nothing for the doctrine of purgatory, for here there is mention of forgiveness of sin, while purgatory is precisely not a place for forgiveness but only a region for payment of temporal punishments; and the text speaks of forgiveness in the coming age, that is the time after the parousie, while purgatory falls before that parousie and ceases to exist with the last judgment. According to 1 Cor. 3:12-15 the work of the ministers of the congregation will have to stand the test on the day of Christ's parousie; whoever will have built on the foundation Christ gold, silver, precious stones, i.e. whoever in his office and service has performed good, sound work, he will indeed be tested in his work, but because that work proves resistant to the fire of judgment, he will receive

reward; whoever, on the other hand, has built on the foundation wood, straw, stubble, which are not resistant to the fire, he will be punished, lose his reward, even though he himself is saved through the fire of judgment. Indeed, therefore, there is spoken here of an ignis revelatorius, vs. 13, an ignis probatorius, vs. 13 and an ignis exarsorius, vs. 15; but Paul thus represents the fire of judgment in the future of Christ and therefore has precisely no place for a purgatory that would now cleanse believers and would end before the last judgment. There are no other texts on which Rome can appeal for the doctrine of purgatory, even if only with some appearance of right. Only one passage in the apocryphal books of the O. Test., namely 2 Makk. 12:42-46 teaches that the Jews of that time considered offerings and prayers for those who had died in sins necessary and good, which in fact is also known from elsewhere. But all the more it deserves attention that this popular belief existing among the Jews is mentioned neither in the Old nor in the New Testament and much less approved. 2o The doctrine of purgatory is most closely connected with [410] that concerning justification. Rome understands by it the infusion of supernatural, sanctifying grace, which then places the human being in a position to do good works and thereby to merit eternal life. This grace, however, is susceptible of increase and decrease; whoever loses it through mortal sin and then dies is lost; whoever by keeping praecepta and consilia brought it to perfection in the hour of death enters heaven immediately; but whoever still has to satisfy the guilt and the temporal punishment for a venial sin or whoever, after having received back in penance the gratia infusa lost through a mortal sin, nevertheless at his death was still in arrears in paying off the temporal punishments, is referred to purgatory and remains there until he has paid the last penny. Justification, sanctification,

glorification is with Rome the work of the human being himself, be it also on the basis of the supernatural grace infused into him; once he has received this, he must make himself worthy of eternal life and the blessed vision of God in heaven according to a meritum ex condigno; and if he thus does not get so far here on earth, he must, just as the Heathens imagined this, continue the begun work in the hereafter as long as, until he has reached perfection. But the Reformation again learned from Scripture the justification of the sinner by faith and therefore had to come to the rejection of the purifying fire. Christ has accomplished everything, not only borne the punishment but also by his keeping of the law acquired eternal life for us. And all those benefits which Christ has acquired by his suffering and dying and which lie wholly perfect and ready in him, become at once the portion of someone, if he truly believes. Whoever believes has eternal life. In justification there is imputed to the human being not only the merit of Christ's passive but also of his active obedience. In that benefit he receives not only forgiveness, immunity from punishment, and does not thereby come into the state of Adam before the fall, who with the strength granted to him had to keep the law and merit eternal life. But he also on the basis of Christ's perfect obedience at once has a right to eternal life; the holy works which Christ has accomplished are ascribed to him; he does not have to merit eternal life by fulfillment of the law but does good works from the principle of eternal life, which has already been granted to him in faith. Sanctification here is therefore no self-preparation for heaven, no self-perfection, but nothing other than the unfolding in the believer of what he already has in Christ, a walking in the good works which God has prepared in Christ, Ef. 2:10. God therefore does not need to wait for any further good works before he can receive the believer into heaven, for in Christ that

heaven is at once opened for everyone who believes. Whoever believes, has forgiveness and eternal life, is "ripe" for heaven, and needs neither here nor hereafter to pass through a purgatorium. Even the suffering that he here on earth often still has to bear and even as a consequence of sin is no punishment, no penance, no payment of a demand of the law, but a fatherly chastisement, which serves for his upbringing. 3o The only question on a Reformation standpoint is therefore this: when does the believer come into the full possession of the benefits of Christ granted to him. Whoever believes receives these at once in a juridical sense; he has in Christ a right to all goods of the covenant, to the whole salvation. But this is nevertheless not yet set in his full possession on earth; when then does this take place, when does the believer cease to be a pilgrim and arrive in the fatherland? To that Scripture has only one answer: at death. Nowhere does it present the pious to us as still after death tormented by punishment or suffering of sin. Always the pious express their certain expectation that with death the end of their pilgrim course and the entrance into the eternal, blessed life of heaven has been reached, Ps. 73:23, 24, Luk. 23:43, Hd. 7:59, 2 Cor. 5:1, Phil. 1:23, 2 Tim. 4:7. After death there is no sanctification any more, but there enters a state of holiness, in which the spirits of the perfected righteous, Hebr. 12:23, are clothed with long, white garments and stand before the throne and before the Lamb, Op. 7:9, 14. Of the modest de Saci of Port-Royal it is related that he always stood in the fear of God and therefore did not dare to hope for an immediate blessedness after death but dying cried out: o bienheureux purgatoire! But such a state of mind is wholly foreign to the pious of the O. and N. Covenant and is only to be explained from this, [412] that someone, looking at himself, has no eye for the accomplished work of Christ. 4o In what way the state of holiness

enters immediately at the death of the believer is of course not to be understood nor clearly to be described. Regeneration and sanctification, which here on earth is worked by the H. Spirit, is also a mystery. But without doubt death thereby serves as a means. Not in the sense of Platonic dualism, as if the liberation from the body without more were already the sanctification of the soul, for sin has its seat precisely in the soul. Nor also in the sense of sentimental rationalism, which by death, as a messenger of peace, lets the human being become an angel, for death is in itself a revelation of God's wrath and a wage of sin. But indeed according to the opinion of Holy Scripture, which in death for the believer sees a dying off of sin. For all chastisement serves believers for their benefit, in order that they may become partakers of the divine holiness, Hebr. 12:10. Whoever, like Christ, suffers in the flesh on account of sin, ceases from sin, 1 Petr. 4:1. But this applies especially to death. The ethical death, i.e. the dying in communion with Christ to sin, has as a consequence that someone is justified from sin and is dead to sin and henceforth lives to God in Christ, Rom. 6:6-11, 8:10, 1 Petr. 2:24. And this ethical death is completed in the physical death, Rom. 7:24, 2 Cor. 5:1, Phil. 1:21, 23. Death is a mighty change, a breaking of all bonds with this earthly life, and an entering into a new world with wholly different relations and conditions. There is nothing strange in it that God, as of all suffering, so of death makes use, in order to sanctify the soul of the believer and to cleanse it from every stain of sin. Against this it does not count as an objection that such a sanctification is mechanical and happens with a leap, for death is the greatest leap that someone can make, a sudden transposition of the believer into the presence of Christ, and thereby a complete destruction of the outward and a total renewal of the inward human being. 5o To this is added that the doctrine of

purgatory does not in the least make this sanctification of the believer more intelligible. For first of all Roman theology too must ascribe to death still a kindred critical [413] significance as the Protestant. Purgatory, after all, is not a place where sins are still forgiven, but only a region where remaining temporal punishments can be paid off. Whoever therefore has committed peccata venialia and for them in this life received no forgiveness, must become partaker of this in death; and thus the Roman theologians also teach that the soul dying in venial sins at once in death receives forgiveness of the guilt, in order then in purgatory to satisfy the temporal punishments determined for it, Oswald, Eschat.2 87. Next, it is not to be seen in what way the purgatorium effects the sanctification of souls. Apart from the fact that purgatory is by the Romanists mostly described as a material fire, which therefore can work upon the soul only idealiter, the question naturally arises how pain without more can sanctify. That would indeed be possible if by means of that torment contrition, humiliation, conversion, faith, love etc. might be worked in the soul. But that may not be assumed on a Roman standpoint. For the purgatorium is no Missionsanstalt, no conversion institute, no school for sanctification, but a place of punishment, where only temporal punishments are paid off. The poor souls therefore on the one hand can no longer sin and load new guilt upon themselves, and on the other hand they also cannot improve themselves, for all improvement with Rome includes merit and in purgatory no more can be merited. Of the condition of the poor souls in purgatory therefore no good conception can be made. If they are still to be thought of as more or less contaminated by sin, then on a Roman standpoint it is not to be understood that they cannot still sin and even wholly lose again the grace received. If this is excluded, then the souls are in themselves pure and holy and have only still to bear

some temporal punishments, which they could not satisfy on earth, in which case it again is incomprehensible that perfect righteous persons can still be temporarily shut out of heaven and be handed over to the torment of purgatory. And in both cases it remains a riddle how purgatory can be an ignis purgatorius; it is nothing other than an ignis vindicativus. Oswald t. a. p. 116 rightly says that this purifying character of purgatory belongs to the quaestiones difficiliores! Finally there are still various questions, [414] to which the doctrine of purgatory remains owing the answer. The pious of the O. T. went according to Roman belief to the limbus patrum; is this limbus to be thought of as a purgatorium, or was for them no purgatory necessary? And how are they purified who die a short time before the parousie and therefore can no longer come into purgatory, because this ceases to exist with the end of this world? The souls of those who died in earlier centuries have much more heavily to answer for than those who later come into purgatory, for the possible duration of the torment in the purgatorium becomes ever shorter. How is this on a Roman standpoint to be reconciled with the justice of God and with the need of purification of souls? If one says that as the end of the world approaches, sanctification is the more transferred into the suffering of the present time and into death, then one undermines the doctrine of purgatory in a questionable way and approaches the standpoint that the Reformation took over against this Roman dogma. 6o If the doctrine of purgatory is untenable, then thereby also all offering and prayer for the deceased falls away of itself. Veneration of the dead by offerings and prayers was customary among the Heathens. Intercession for the deceased later came into use among the Jews, 2 Makk. 12:40-45 and remained so to the present day, Schwally, Das Leben nach dem Tode 188-190. In the Christian church the custom soon arose to wish the deceased

pax, lux, refrigerium and to remember them in the prayers and at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. In the first time this took place with respect to all who had died in the Lord without distinction and these oblationes and sacrificia were celebrated only ob commemorationes eorum, Cypr. Ep. 12, 2. 39, 3. Const. Ap. VI 30. VIII 13. 41-44. But gradually a distinction was made between those souls which were received into heaven immediately and others, who still had to remain for a time in the purgatorium. Communion with the first was then gradually exercised by invocation and veneration, that with the second by intercessions, good works, indulgences and masses for souls, cf. Trid. sess. 22 c. 2. 3. and sess. 25. Bellarminus, de purg. II 15-18. Perrone, Prael. VI 289. VIII 29. Simar, Dogm. 900. Jansen, Prael. III 1 030 etc. In the Old Catholic sense, as a prayer to God that He might increase the salvation of those fallen asleep in [415] Christ and might accept their prayers for the living, and at the same time as a commemoration and an exercise of communion with the deceased, intercession for the dead was also approved by the Greeks, M. Vitringa VIII 509, many Anglicans, ib. 515, the Lutherans, ib. IV 79, Grotius, ib. 80 and by many more recent theologians, Franz, das Gebet für die Todten in seinem Zusammenhang mit Kultus und Lehre nach dem Schriften des h. Augustinus, Nordhausen Büchting 1857. K. M. Leibbrand, Das Gebet für die Todten in der evang. Kirche zulässig und recht, Stuttgart 1864. But the Reformed rejected intercession for the deceased, because their lot at death was unchangeably decided, Suicerus s. v. ταφη. Vossius, Disp. de orationibus et oblationibus pro defunctis, Op. VI 458 sq. Rivetus in his polemic against Grotius, Op. III 962. 1026. Moor V 30-32. In Old or New Testament there is then also not a word of such an intercession. The only place on which one can appeal is 1 Cor. 15:29, where Paul makes mention

of such as had themselves baptized ὑπερ νεκρων. From this, however, it is not to be inferred that such a baptism was undergone by the living, in order that it would benefit the deceased. For there is not a single proof that such a practice occurred in the time of Paul or later. Tertullianus and others do indeed report that this custom was found among the followers of Cerinthus and Marcion, but in the first place the correctness of this report is by no means raised above all doubt, and in the second place it would follow from it that it was a heretical practice, which has never existed in the Christian church or found entrance. Whoever wanted to let this text count as proof for the right to pray for the dead would first of all have to begin to baptize living persons for the benefit of the deceased. Paul, however, also does not say that the living had themselves baptized for the dead, in order that that baptism would benefit the deceased. The dead are presented by Paul as the motive why the living had themselves baptized. Because those who had fallen asleep in Christ would rise, therefore the living believers had themselves baptized on their account, for their sake. The apostle expresses no other thought than this, that baptism presupposes faith in the resurrection of Christ and of believers; take away the resurrection and baptism becomes an empty ceremony. The [416] intercession for the deceased therefore finds not the least ground in Scripture, as indeed Tertullianus already acknowledged. For after he had in the cor. mil. c. 3 spoken of various ecclesiastical usages and in that connection also of the offerings for the deceased, he added in c. 4: harum et aliarum ejusmodi disciplinarum, si legem expostules scripturarum, nullam invenies; traditio tibi praetenditur auctrix, consuetudo confirmatrix, et fides observatrix, cf. also Bellarminus, de missa II c. 7. Oswald, Eschat. 95. Because there is no praeceptum Patris, one must content oneself with the institutio matris, i.e. of the church, which

thus again comes to stand beside and above God's Word. Since thus the intercession for the deceased cannot stand before Scripture, the question of its usefulness and comfort no longer comes into play. Yet these too are difficult to indicate. For although it seems beautiful that the living by their intercessions can help the deceased and can make good what they perhaps have done wrong toward them during their life; in fact this ecclesiastical practice leads Christian piety into a wholly wrong track. It makes it appear as if in conflict with Mt. 8:22 care for the dead is of higher value than love for the living; it ascribes to one's own works and prayers a meritorious, satisfactorische power, which exercises its effect even on the other side of the grave and there can benefit the deceased; it is built on and conducive to the doctrine of purgatory, which on the one hand, especially among the rich, feeds carelessness and on the other side maintains the uncertainty of believers; it weakens in Christian consciousness faith in the sufficiency of the offering and intercession of Christ. Cf. against purgatory: Calvijn, Inst. III 5. Polanus, Synt. Theol. VII 25. Chamier, Panstr. Cath. T. III lib. 26. Amesius, Bellarminus enervatus, T. II lib. 5. Voetius, Disp. II 1240. Forbesius a Corse, Instruct. hist. theol. lib. XIII. Gerhard, Loc. XXVI 181 sq. Quenstedt, Theol. IV 555. Kliefoth, Eschatologie, 82 f. Charles H. H. Wright, The intermediate state and prayers for the dead, examined in the light of Scripture and of ancient Jewish and Christian literature, London Nisbet 1900.

13. Even if there is no place for a veneration of the saints and an intercession for the deceased, there nevertheless is and remains an [417] indissoluble communion between the church militant on earth and the triumphant in heaven. The believers on earth, when they became Christians, have joined the heavenly Jerusalem, which is above and is the mother of all;

to the many thousands of angels, who there serve and praise God; to the assembly of the firstborn, i.e. of the pious of the O. Covenant, who are enrolled in the heavens and have received citizenship there; to the spirits of the righteous, i.e. of the Christians, who have already fallen asleep and have reached perfection, the consummation; to Christ, the mediator of the New Testament, and to God, the judge of all creatures, Hebr. 12:22-24. This communion does not include that there must exist a direct intercourse between the members of the church militant and of the church triumphant; for although this is also lacking between the different men and peoples in the distinct times and places, humanity is nevertheless an organism, sprung from one blood. The personal intercourse which each believer has here on earth is limited to few persons, but nonetheless he is a member of the one, holy, catholic, Christian church. The unity which binds together all believers, both the deceased and the living, lies in Christ, and through Him in the communion with the same Father, in the possession of the same Spirit, in participation in the same goods of the covenant. The love which remains, even when faith and hope disappear, keeps all believers bound to Christ and to one another. And that love expresses itself on our part in this, that we remember with reverence the saints who have gone before us, that we speak worthily of them, that we imitate them in faith and good works, and, encouraged by their example, run with patience the race that is set before us, that we, one with them, feel and live in the expectation of going to them, that we with them and all creatures magnify the name of the Lord. Among the forms in which the communion of the militant with the triumphant church manifests itself, the hope of seeing one another again occupies a broad place. Rationalism has made dreadful misuse of it; it seemed as if the blessedness of heaven lay not in communion with Christ

but in the sentimental enjoyment of one another's presence. But nevertheless there lies in it a good, true thought. The hope of seeing one another again on [418] the other side of the grave is entirely natural, genuinely human, and also in accordance with Holy Scripture. For this teaches no naked immortality of shadowy souls, but eternal life of individual human beings. Regeneration does not erase individuality, personality, character, but sanctifies them and places them in the service of God's name. The congregation is the new humanity, which bears within itself all manner of shading and distinction and in the unity reveals the richest diversity. The joy of heaven therefore lies indeed first of all in communion with Christ, but subsequently nevertheless also in the communion of the blessed among themselves. And just as this on earth, although it is here always defective, does not infringe upon the communion of the believers with Christ, but rather confirms and enriches it, so it is also in heaven. The highest thing Paul desired was to be dissolved and to be with Christ, Phil. 1:23, 1 Thess. 4:17. But Jesus himself represents the joy of heaven under the image of a meal, where all sit at table with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Mt. 8:11, cf. Luk. 13:28. The hope of seeing one another again is therefore in itself not wrong, if only it remains subordinate to the desire for the communion of Christ. And on the other hand it is also not an absurd thought that the blessed in heaven long for the believers who are on earth. For they retain the memory of the persons and conditions which they have known on earth, Luk. 16:27-31. The souls under the altar cry for vengeance over the shed blood, Op. 6:10. The bride, i.e. the whole congregation both in heaven and on earth, prays for the coming of the Lord Jesus, Op. 22:17. Even if Scripture gives us no right to believe that the blessed in heaven know everything that happens here on earth, it is

nevertheless probable that they know of the church militant on earth at least as much as this knows of them. And that little, added to the knowledge which they possess from memory and which perhaps is continually expanded by communications from angels and the newly fallen asleep, is sufficient to make them always think with interest of this earth and of the mighty struggle that is fought here. To this there is added still that the condition of the blessed in heaven, however glorious, nevertheless for various reasons still bears a provisional character. For they are now only in heaven and limited to that [419] heaven, and not yet in possession of the earth, whose inheritance is promised to them together with that of heaven. Further, they are deprived of the body, and this bodiless existence is not, as dualism must suppose, a gain but a loss, no increase but a diminution of being, since the body belongs to the essence of man. And finally the part cannot be perfect without the whole; only in the communion of all the saints is the fullness of Christ's love known, Ef. 3:18; the one group of believers cannot without the other reach the consummation, Hebr. 11:40. Therefore there is with the blessed in heaven also still place for faith and hope, for longing and prayer, Op. 6:10, 22:17. Just like the believers on earth they stretch themselves out toward the return of Christ, the resurrection of the dead and the restoration of all things. Only then is the end reached, 1 Cor. 15:24. This thought stands in Scripture so much in the foreground that the intermediate state shrinks to a short span of time, which at the final judgment is not taken into account at all. Nowhere is it said that also what is performed by the deceased in that intermediate state will be judged on the last day before the judgment seat of Christ. The judgment concerns exclusively what has happened in the body, whether good or evil, 2 Cor. 5:10; the judicium universale is in so far identical with the judicium

particulare. From this, however, it is still not to be inferred with Kliefoth, Eschatologie 61-66, that the souls after death live outside time and space and are deprived of all development or progress. For even if there is certainly no development such as that on earth, and even if there is still much less to be thought of a possible change for the better or for the worse, nevertheless a true existence and life of the souls without activity is not possible, unless one deems them sunk in unconscious sleep. For the deceased remain finite and limited beings and cannot exist otherwise than in space and time. The dimensions of space and the calculations of time are without doubt wholly different on that side of the grave than here on earth, where miles and hours are our standard. But also the souls who dwell there do not become eternal and omnipresent like God; they must, like the angels, part II 438, have an ubi definitivum, cannot be in two places at the same time and are always somewhere [420] in a definite place, in paradise, in heaven, etc. And likewise they are not elevated above every form of time, that is, above all succession of moments, for they have a past, which they remember, a present in which they live, and a future, which they go to meet. The rich man knows that his brothers are still living, Luk. 16:28; the souls under the altar look out toward the day of vengeance, Op. 6:10; the bride longs for the coming of Christ, Op. 22:17; they who have come out of the tribulation serve God day and night, Op. 7:15; and they who have worshiped the beast have no rest day and night, Op. 14:11.

If now the souls exist in some form of space and time, they also cannot be conceived without all activity. True, Jesus says that in the night of death no one can work, Joh. 9:4, and the heavenly blessedness is often represented in Scripture as a resting, Hebr. 4:9, Op. 14:13. But just as it does not conflict with one another that God rests from his work of creation, Gen. 2:2 and yet

always works, Joh. 5:17, or that Christ had finished his work on earth, Joh. 17:4 and yet in heaven prepares a place for his own, Joh. 14:3; so neither does the one exclude the other, that the believers rest from their works and yet serve God in his temple. Their work on earth is finished, but for that reason they still have other works to do in heaven. Scripture teaches this clearly. Those who have fallen asleep in the Lord are with Jesus, Phil. 1:23, stand before the throne of God and of the Lamb, Op. 7:9, 15, cry and pray, praise and serve, Op. 6:10, 7:10, 15, 22:17. Besides, if they have consciousness and know God, Christ, the angels, one another, then by that very fact they of themselves exercise activities of understanding and of will, increase in knowledge and are confirmed in love. If Paul can say that the believers on earth, by beholding the glory of the Lord in the mirror of his word, are changed into his image in form from glory to glory, 2 Cor. 3:18; how much more will that then be the case when they are admitted to his immediate presence and see him face to face? There is no change of state; there is also no development in an earthly sense; not even sanctification, as in the church militant, for holiness itself is the portion of all. [421] But just as Adam before the fall and Christ as man, though perfectly holy, nevertheless could increase in grace and wisdom, so in heaven there is a continuing confirmation of state, an ever more being conformed to the image of the Son, a never-ending growing up in the knowledge and love of God. And with that each has his own task and place. The Roman Catholics assume that the pious of the O. T. after their death sojourned in the limbus patrum and were freed from it only by Christ at his descent into hell; and at the same time they think that children who die unbaptized are received neither into hell nor into heaven but into a separate receptaculum, the limbus infantum. But for neither of both receptacula is there ground in

Scripture. It is indeed self-evident that whoever loses sight of the unity of the covenant of grace and conceives the benefits, acquired by Christ, as a new substance that did not exist earlier, must let the pious of the O. T. wait in the limbus patrum for this acquisition and communication of Christ's benefits. But whoever acknowledges the unity of the covenant, and conceives the benefits of Christ as the good favor of God, which with a view to Christ could already before his suffering and death be distributed, has no need of a limbus patrum. The way to heavenly blessedness was under the O. the same as under the N. Test., even though there is also difference in the light in which the believers then and now walk, cf. deel III 196v. 211v. And likewise on the other side of the grave there is no place for a limbus infantum; for the children of the covenant, baptized or unbaptized, in dying enter into heaven; and about the lot of the others so little has been revealed to us that we do best to refrain from a definite judgment, cf. B. B. Warfield, The development of the doctrine of infant salvation, in zijn Two Studies in the history of doctrine, New-York 1897. But nevertheless there lies in the limbus patrum and infantum this true thought, that there are different degrees both in the punishment of the ungodly and in the blessedness of the pious. There is distinction of rank and activity in the world of the angels. There is diversity among all creatures and the richest among men. There is difference of place and task in the congregation of Christ; to each believer here on earth a particular gift is bestowed and a particular task assigned. And at death each one's works follow after the one who has fallen asleep in the Lord. [422] Without doubt this diversity in heaven is not erased but on the contrary cleansed of all that is sinful and multiplied in the richest manner, Luk. 19:17-19. Yet this difference in degree takes nothing away from the blessedness which each enjoys

according to his measure. For all dwell with the same Lord, 2 Cor. 5:8, are received into the same heaven, Op. 7:9, enjoy the same rest, Hebr. 4:9 and find their joy in the same service of God, Op. 7:15.

§ 55. The Second Coming of Christ.

1. Just as it is appointed for man to die once, so there must also once come an end to the history of the world. Not only religion, but also science was at all times convinced of that. Some, such as Aristotle in antiquity and Czolbe, Friedrich Mohr et al. in more recent times, have indeed thought that this world was eternal and had neither beginning nor end. But the untenability of this opinion is now generally conceded; there are many considerations which raise the finite duration of the world above all doubt. The rotational speed of the earth decreases according to calculation by at least one second in 600,000 years; however little this may be, after billions of years it nevertheless brings about on earth a reversal in the relation of day and night, which puts an end to all life. Furthermore, the rotation of the earth is continually slowed by the influence of ebb and flood, because these displace the parts of the earth and diminish the supply of kinetic energy; the earth therefore constantly approaches the sun and must finally disappear into it. Next, the space in which the planets move is not absolutely empty, but filled with ether or rarefied air, which, however weak,

impedes the motion, diminishes the rotational speed, causes the orbit of the planets to contract and thus brings them ever more into the vicinity of the sun. Further, the sun too cannot last forever; whether it produces its heat by falling meteorites or by continual contraction or by chemical workings, it gradually consumes that heat, diminishes its size, contracts, and goes toward its [423] end; according to Thompson the diameter of the sun would decrease annually by 35 meters and, since it had already shone for 20 million years, it could exist for only another 10 million years. Kinetic energy, to be sure, can be converted into heat, but heat no longer into kinetic energy, unless it flows out upon a colder body. If the temperature therefore will once be equal everywhere, the conversion of heat ceases and the end of things is reached. The question therefore is only, which of the two, the sun or the earth, will hold out the longest; if the sun, then the earth is finally devoured by it and everything ends with burning; if the earth, then once all heat ceases and life perishes in the death of rigidity. In addition there are still all kinds of other grounds for the finitude of the world; the water of the earth must, because of its chemical affinity with the minerals, continually decrease; water and oxygen are increasingly bound to solid substances; the products of the earth, coal, wood, peat, foodstuffs, diminish; the earth, however rich, is once exhausted, and this the more quickly, the more the human race increases and the danger of overpopulation threatens. For an optimistic expectation concerning the future there is therefore, from the standpoint of science, absolutely no place. Yet many have surrendered to that and dreamed of a steady progress and a future paradise of humanity in the Diesseits. Humanists and materialists vie with one another in cherishing such illusions, consider their bread-prophecies guaranteed by the principle of cosmic evolution, and judge that through the increase of ideal

goods, such as science, art, morality, or through progress in material prosperity, through abundance of food and shelter and clothing, the happiness of humanity will once be fully attained. Kant, Lessing, Herder, Fichte, Schelling etc., considered a future impending, in which the ethical Kingdom of God would include all, the Aufklärung would be the share of all and humanity would be the principle of all life. Even Darwin at the close of his book on the Origin of Species and in the last chapter of his Descent of Man expresses the hope that man, who from his animal origin has already climbed so high, is going toward an even higher destiny in a distant future. In that future, according to [424] Pierson, Eene Levensbeschouwing 269, marriage will no longer be desired by the noblest, but the man will associate with the woman as with his sister and lust will no longer be the death of the zest for life, or according to others marriage among a highly civilized people will in time assume the form of a double marriage and two friends jointly marry two women. Still more extravagant are the expectations of the socialists, these chiliasts of unbelief, who think that in the future state according to their model all sin and struggle will have disappeared and a carefree, contented life will be everyone's privilege. But, as has been said, there is not much ground for such expectations. And even if a time of greater prosperity and greater happiness for humanity were to dawn, what would be the advantage of that, if nevertheless all development, as science teaches, must finally perish in death? Fr. van Hellwald at the close of his Kulturgeschichte knows, to the question what everything has been for, what also man with his struggling and striving, his civilization and development has existed for, not to give the least answer. And Otto Henne-Am Rhyn ends his Kulturgeschichte with the prediction that all humanity with its culture will once disappear without a trace; einst wird Alles, was

wir gethan, nirgends mehr aufzufinden sein; and over against that he can comfort himself only with the thought that it will still take a long time before it comes to that. He who lives without God and without Christ, and must expect everything from the Diesseits, from immanent, cosmic forces, is also without hope in the world. Even culture is not to be thought endless. Billions of years can in the past or in the future of the world indeed be arbitrarily assumed but not concretely, filled with history, thought. If, e.g., humanity once became a thousand million years old, a textbook on world history, which treated a century in ten pages, would form no fewer than two hundred thousand volumes, each volume reckoned at five hundred pages, or still twenty thousand volumes, if to each century only one page, or still five hundred volumes, if to each century no more than one line were devoted. And so it would be with all that forms the content of our culture. Man and humanity are finite, and therefore their civilization too is not to be thought endless. An infinite [425] time is for the earth as well as for our race an absurdity, which is still more tangible than the folly of the millions of years, known to us from pagan mythologies. From the standpoint of science there is much more ground to accept the pessimism of Schopenhauer and Ed. von Hartmann, that the redemption of the world consists in the combating of the alogical will by the logical representation, in the absolute Willensverneinung, that is, in the destruction of the world itself. But even then there is not the least guarantee that the absolute will does not pass over to another world-process and, into the infinite, always begins again from the beginning. Many Greek philosophers held it for certain that many other worlds had preceded this one and that many others would follow it; indeed the Pythagoreans and the Stoics were of the opinion that everything would return exactly as it existed in this world and had existed earlier; and also

now many, e.g. Haeckel, Die Welträthsel 430, have returned to such feelings, although Windelband, Geschichte und Naturwissenschaft, Strassburg 1900 S. 22 rightly calls it a painful thought, that in der periodischen Wiederkehr aller Dingen auch die Persönlichkeit mit allem ihrem Thun und Leiden wiederkehren soll. Cf. Lange, Gesch. des Materialismus4 552 f. Pesch, Die grossen Welträthsel2 II 352 f. Mühlhäusser, Die Zukunft der Menschheit Heilbron 1881. Reiff, Die Zukunft der Welt2 Basel 1875. Fürer, Weltende und Endgericht, Gütersloh 1896. Siebeck, Religionsphilos. 1893 S. 399-427. Caro, La question du progrès, in zijne Problèmes de morale sociale, Paris 1887 p. 251. Orr, Christian View 369.

2. Religion has never reconciled itself with this idea of an endless development or of a total downfall of the world. Various reasons held it back from adopting these philosophical theories. For it is beyond all contradiction, that all such representations fall short of the value of personality and sacrifice it to the whole. Further, they fail to recognize the significance of the religious-moral life and place this far below culture. And finally, for the present and for the future they build only on the forces that are immanent in the cosmos and take absolutely no account of a Divine power that governs the world and at [426] last, by direct intervention, causes it to correspond to the goal set by it. All religions therefore have a different expectation for the future. They all know, in a more or less clear degree, a struggle of good and evil; all cherish the hope of the victory of the good, whereby the virtuous are rewarded and the godless are punished; and mostly they also consider that future not otherwise attainable than through a revelation of supernatural powers, cf. deel III 229. In the Persian religion, indeed, at the end of the third world-period the appearance of the third son

of Zarathustra, Sosiosh, was expected, who would introduce a thousand-year kingdom of peace and would complete the work of redemption of his father, Saussaye, Religionsgesch. II 51. Hartmann, Rel. I 239. Herzog2 11, 239. And among the Mohammedans, alongside the belief in the return of Jesus, there gradually also arose the expectation of a Mahdi, who would lead the believers back again into the golden age of the "four righteous Khalifs", Dr. C. Snouck Hurgronje, Der Mahdi, Separatabdruck von der „Revue Coloniale Internationale" 1885. With Israel the expectation concerning the future was built on the foundation of the covenant that God had established with Abraham and his seed. This covenant, after all, bears an eternal character and is not nullified by man's unfaithfulness, deel III 195. Already in the law God repeatedly testifies to the people of Israel, that He, when it transgresses His covenant, will visit it with the heaviest punishments but afterwards will nevertheless again have mercy upon it. When Israel, on account of its sins, shall be scattered among the nations and its land shall be laid waste, then the Lord in that time, by the adoption of other nations, will provoke Israel to jealousy and thereafter convert it and bring it back into its land, bless it with all kinds of spiritual and material blessings and execute vengeance upon all its enemies, Lev. 26, Deut. 4:23-31, 30:1-10, 32:15-43. After the promise to David's house, that it would be enduring and his throne would be firm unto eternity, 2 Sam. 7:16, 23:5, 1 Chr. 17:14, in the expectation concerning Israel's future this element receives more and more significance, that the conversion and the restoration of Israel will not come to pass otherwise than through the anointed king from David's lineage. In prophecy these thoughts are developed more broadly and, notwithstanding the peculiarity [427] that they bear with each of the prophets, they assume ever firmer forms.

In the expectation which the Old Test. cherishes concerning the future of the people of God, the following moments are clearly to be distinguished. All prophets proclaim 1o to Israel and Judah a day of judgment and of punishment. The יום יהוה, that is, the time in which the Lord will have compassion on his people and will avenge himself on his enemies, was conceived by the prophets wholly otherwise than by the people. The people abused this expectation and thought that Ihvh, irrespective of its spiritual condition, would protect it against every danger, Am. 5:18, 6:13, Jer. 29, Ezech. 33:23v. But the prophets said that the day of the Lord would also for Israel be a day of judgment; the people would go into exile and its land would be given over to devastation, Am. 2:4v., 5:16, 18, 27, 6:14 etc., Hos. 1:6, 2:11, 3:4, 8:13, 9:3, 6, 10:6, 11:5, 13:12, 14:1, Joël 2:1v., Mich. 3:12, 4:10, 7:13, Zef. 1:1-18, Hab. 1:5-11, Jes. 2:11v., 5:5v., 7:18v., Jer. 1:11-16 etc. But yet, that punishment is 2o temporary. There comes an end to it after many days, Hos. 3:3, after a few days, that is after a short time, 6:2, after seventy years, Jer. 25:12, 29:10, after three hundred and ninety years for Israel and forty years for Judah, Ezech. 4:4v. God chastises his people with measure, Jes. 27:7v., Jer. 30:11, He forsakes it only for a little time; his wrath is small, but his lovingkindness is eternal, Jes. 54:7, 8. He loves his people with an eternal love, and will therefore have compassion again, Mich. 7:19, Jer. 31:3, 20. He cannot destroy his people, even though He also shakes it as in a sieve, Am. 9:8, 9. His repentance is kindled within Him, Hos. 11:8. He remembers his covenant, Ezech. 16:60. He will redeem his people, not for Israel's sake, but for his name's sake, for his renown among the Heathen, Deut. 32:27, Jes. 43:25, 48:9, Ezech. 36:22. At the end of the time of punishment God sends 3o the Messiah from David's house. Obadiah still speaks in general of saviors, who protect the escaped

congregation on Zion, vs. 17, 21, cf. Jer. 23:4, 33:17, 20, 21, 22, 26. Amos says that God after the judgment over Israel will raise up again the fallen hut of David, 9:11. Hosea expects that the children of Israel will repent and seek the Lord and also David their king, 1:11, 3:5, cf. Jer. 30:9, Ezech. 34:23, 24, 37:22-24. Micah prophesies that Israel will not [428] be delivered from the power of the enemies earlier than until from the Davidic royal house at Bethlehem the Ruler will be born, 5:1, 2. That He will not come forth from Jerusalem but, like David himself, from Bethlehem, proves that the Davidic royal house has lost the throne and has fallen into a state of lowliness. Isaiah therefore also says that a shoot will come forth from the hewn-down trunk of Jesse, 11:1, 2, and Ezekiel expresses the same thought thus, that the Lord will take from the topmost branch of the high cedar a small, tender twig, 17:22. God will cause him to spring forth as a sprout to David's house, Jes. 4:2, Jer. 23:5, 6, 33:14-17, so that accordingly he also bears the name of Sprout, Zach. 3:8, 6:12. Born in Israel's time of suffering, this Davidide will grow up in poor circumstances, Jes. 7:14-17; He is a king, but righteous, gentle, humble and therefore riding on the foal of a she-ass, Zach. 9:9; with the royal he unites the prophetic, Deut. 18:15, Jes. 11:2, 40-66, Mal. 4:5 and the priestly dignity, Jes. 53, Jer. 30:21, Zach. 3, 6:13, Ps. 110; the kingdom which He comes to found is a kingdom of righteousness and peace, Jes. 11, 40-66, Mich. 5:9, Ps. 72, 110; He is and himself acquires the righteousness and the salvation for his people, Jes. 11, 42, 53, Jer. 23:5, 6, Ps. 72 etc. His appearance therefore does not first take place after the day of judgment, but precedes it; Judah is first delivered when God will grant to David a sprout, Jes. 9:1-16, 11:1v., Jer. 23:5, 6, 33:14-17. Among the benefits 4o which by this Anointed One will be bestowed on his people, belongs first of all the return from the land of exile.

Land, people, king and God belong together; the restoration of Israel therefore begins with return from the exile, Am. 9:14, Hos. 11:11, Mich. 4:6, Joel 3:1, Jes. 11:11, Jer. 3:18, Ezech. 11:17 etc. That return will according to the depiction of Isaiah be extraordinarily glorious; the wilderness will bloom like a rose, mountains will be leveled and valleys filled; there will be a highway, on which even the blind cannot go astray, 35:1-9, 41:17-20, 42:15, 16, 43:19, 20 etc. In that return both Israel and Judah will share, Am. 9:9-15, Hos. 1:11, 14:2-9, Jes. 11:13, Jer. 3:6, 18, 31:27, 32:37-40, Ezech. 37:17, 47:13, 21, 48:1-7, 23-29. But to this [429] expectation the return from the Babylonian captivity corresponded only very partially. The post-exilic prophets therefore see in that return only a beginning of the fulfillment of the promises, detach their expectation from a return from the exile, and speak, except Zach. 8:13, no more of the ten tribes; the returnees regarded themselves as the representation of the whole Israel, Ezr. 6:17. Moreover, all the prophets 5o also apprehend the return from the exile at the same time in an ethical sense, as a conversion of Israel. Gathering from the peoples and circumcision of the heart go together, Deut. 30:3-6. By no means all will return and convert to the Lord; many, the most, will perish in the judgment which the day of Ihvh will also bring over Israel. The Lord will indeed not utterly destroy the house of Jacob, but He will nevertheless shake it as in a sieve and cause the sinners to die by the sword, Am. 9:8-10. When the Lord brings back Israel and Judah, He will first lead them into the wilderness and there judge with them and purge out the godless, Hos. 2:13, Ezech. 20:34v. Many men will then fall, so that seven women will seize one man, Jes. 3:25-4:1. The destruction is firmly decided, only a remnant will return, Jes. 4:13, 6:13, 7:3, 10:21, 11:11. The Lord will thresh the children of Israel and then gather them up one by one,

Jes. 27:12. He will destroy the proud, but cause a poor and needy people to remain, Zeph. 3: 21, and preserve his work in life, Hab. 3:2. One from a city and two from a clan will be brought back, Jer. 3:14, two parts will be cut off but the third part will be refined, Zach. 13:8, 9. But these remaining ones will then be to the Lord a holy people, which He betroths to himself for eternity, Hos. 1:10, 12, 2:15, 18, 22, Jes. 4:3, 4, 11:9. The Lord forgives them all iniquity, washes them from all their uncleanness, gives them a new heart, pours out his Spirit upon all, causes all idolatry and sorcery to disappear from her midst, and establishes a new covenant with them, Mich. 5:11-14, Joel 2:28, Jes. 44:21-23, 43:25, Jer. 31:31, Ezech. 11:19, 36:25-28, 37:14, Zach. 13:2 etc. An unclean person will no longer be among them, Jes. 52:1, 11, 12; all of them are his righteous ones, Jes. 60:21, who, taught by God, know Him, trust in his name [430] and do no injustice or speak lies, Jes. 54:13, Jer. 31:31, Zeph. 3:12, 13. Everything will be holy there, even to the bells of the horses, Zach. 14:20, 21. For the glory of the Lord has risen over them, Zach. 2:5, Jes. 60:1, and God himself dwells among them, Ob. 21, Joel 3:17, Hos. 2:22, Zach. 2:10, 8:8 etc. These spiritual benefits 6o for Oldtest. prophecy include the expectation of the restoration of temple and worship. According to Obadiah there will be deliverance on Zion; there dwell the saviors, who will protect Israel and judge its enemies, vs. 17, 21. Joel prophesies that the Lord will dwell on Zion, his holy mountain and that Jerusalem will be a holiness, which will no longer be accessible to strangers and will be of eternal duration, 3:17, 20. Amos expects that the cities of Palestine will be rebuilt and inhabited and that Israel will nevermore be driven out of it, 9:14, 15. Micah proclaims that, although Zion will also be plowed like a field and Jerusalem will become a heap of stones, 3:12, yet the mountain of the house of the Lord will be

established on the top of the mountains, that from Zion the law will go forth and the Lord's word from Jerusalem, and that the Lord will dwell on Zion, 4:1, 2, 7, 7:11. The same thought is expressed by Isaiah, 2:2, who moreover adds to it that Zion and Jerusalem, kingship and priesthood, temple and altar, sacrifices and feast days will be restored, 28:16, 30:19, 33:5, 35:10, 52:1, 56:6, 7, 60:7, 61:6, 66:20-23. Likewise Jeremiah expects that Jerusalem will be rebuilt, the Lord's throne established there, and the worship in the temple renewed, 3:16, 17, 30:18, 31:38, 33:18,21. Haggai predicts that the glory of the second temple will be greater than that of the first, 2:6-10, and Zechariah proclaims that Jerusalem will be rebuilt and expanded, that priesthood and temple will be renewed and that God will dwell in Jerusalem in the midst of his people, 1:17, 2:1-5, 3:1-8, 6:9-15, 8:3v. But by none of the prophets is this image of the future worked out so minutely as by Ezekiel. After he in chap. 34-37 has said that Israel and Judah will again be gathered by the Lord, accepted as his possession as one people under the one shepherd from David's house and endowed with a new heart and a new spirit, and then in chap. 38 and 39 has predicted that Israel, returned to its land, has yet to endure one last attack of Gog from Magog, he gives in chap. 40-48 a developed delineation of the Palestine of the future. The land on the west side of the Jordan will be divided by parallel lines into almost equal strips. The upper seven are inhabited by the tribes Dan, Asher, Naphtali, Manasseh, Ephraim, Reuben, Judah, and the lower five by Benjamin, Simeon, Issachar, Zebulun and Gad. Between these upper and lower parts of the land a strip of land is set apart for the Lord. In the middle of this strip 25000 cubits wide and long lies a high mountain; and upon it is built the temple filled with the glory of the Lord, which amounts to 500 cubits square and is surrounded by a space of 500 cubits on

each side. Around it the priests, who all must be sons of Zadok, receive in the south and the Levites in the north their dwelling-place of 25000 cubits length and 10000 cubits breadth, while in the east and west a portion of the holy strip is assigned to the prince. The city Jerusalem is separated from the temple and lies to the south of the land that is assigned to the priests, in a plain of 25000 cubits length and 5000 cubits breadth. On each side of the city there are in the wall three gates, according to the number of the tribes of Israel. At the great feasts all Israel comes to the temple to sacrifice, but to the Heathen access to the temple is forbidden. If Israel thus lives according to God's ordinances, it will enjoy rich blessing; from under the threshold of the temple door flows a brook, which continually deepens itself, makes the land fruitful and even makes the water of the dead sea wholesome; and on its banks stands tree-growth, whose fruits serve for food and whose leaves serve for healing.

With these spiritual benefits there come 7o all kinds of material blessings. Israel will dwell in safety under the prince of peace from David's house. There will be war no more; bow and sword are broken, Hos. 2:17, horses and chariots destroyed, fortresses demolished, Mich. 5:9, 19, swords beaten into spades and spears into sickles, and all will sit down under their vine and fig tree, Jes. 2:4, Mich. 4:3, 4, for the kingdom is the Lord's and He is their strength, Ob. 21, Joel 3:16, 17. The land will receive an extraordinary fertility, so that the mountains drip with sweet wine and the hills [432] flow with milk; a fountain, going forth from the house of the Lord, will moisten the dry land and recreate the wilderness into an Eden; the evil beast will have been driven away, enemies will no longer rob the harvest, and all the trees, refreshed at the right time by gentle rain, will bear fruit abundantly, Am. 9:13, 14, Hos. 2:17, 20, 21, 14:6, Joel 3:18, Jes. 32:15-20, 51:3, 60:17,

18, 62:8, 9, 65:9, 22, Jer. 31:6, 12-14, Ezech. 34:14, 25, 26, 29, 36:29, 47:1-12, Zach. 8:12, 14:8, 10. There will even take place a great reversal in the whole of nature; the animals receive another nature, Jes. 11:6-8, 65:25, heaven and earth are renewed and the former things are no more remembered, Jes. 34:4, 51:6, 65:17, 66:22; sun and moon are changed, the light of the moon becomes like the sun and the light of the sun is strengthened sevenfold, Jes. 30:26; indeed sun and moon cease, it becomes one single day, for the Lord will be for an everlasting light, Jes. 60:19, 20, Zach. 14:6, 7. And also in the world of men the change will be great. When Israel shall have been gathered, Palestine will resound with people, Mich. 2:12, 13; the seed of the children of Israel will be as the sand of the sea, and especially that of David's house and of the Levites will be multiplied, Hos. 1:10, Jes. 9:2, Jer. 3:16, 33:22. Because of the multitude of men and of beasts Jerusalem will not be measurable and will have to be inhabited village-wise, Zach. 2:1-4. This wondrous increase has various causes. Many Israelites will, when a portion has already been brought back, come to Jerusalem and wish to share in the blessing of Israel, Zach. 2:4-9, 8:7, 8, Jer. 3:14, 16, 18; indeed, when the messengers of the Lord make that blessing known among the Gentiles, these will bring the Israelites still dwelling among them in wagons and sedan-chairs, with horses, mules, and swift runners to Jerusalem, Jes. 66:19, 20. Further, the deceased Israelites also will share in those blessings. All Israel can be said to have been brought back from death into life, Hos. 6:2, 13:14, Jes. 25:8, Ezech. 37:1-14, but specifically Isaiah, 26:19 and Daniel, 12:2, proclaim that also the slain Israelites will rise and at least in part will awake to eternal life. And finally, all citizens of the kingdom of God will reach a great age. There will no longer be there an infant of [433] only a few days, nor an old man who

does not fill up his days, for he who dies as a lad will be a hundred years old, and the sinner who dies a hundred years old will be regarded as having been struck by a curse on account of his sin and therefore as having died so early, Jes. 65:20, cf. Zach. 8:4, 5. Also there will be no more sickness and no mourning and crying, 25:8, 30:19, 65:19, indeed the Lord will destroy death and swallow it up unto victory, 25:8. Finally 8o the Gentiles also will share in that blessing of the kingdom of God. Through the whole Old Test. prophecy runs the thought that God will avenge the blood of His servants upon His enemies. Therefore the prophets announce God's judgments upon various peoples, Philistia, Tyre, Moab, Ammon, Edom, Asshur, Babylon. But those judgments nevertheless do not tend to destruction but to the salvation of the Gentiles; in Abraham's seed all the peoples of the earth are blessed. To be sure, with one prophet more the political side of this subjection of the Gentiles under Israel comes to the foreground, and with another the religious, spiritual side. But all nevertheless expect that the dominion of the Messiah will extend to all peoples, cf. Ps. 2, 21, 24, 45, 46, 47, 48, 68, 72, 86, 89, 96, 98 etc. Israel will possess the Gentiles as an inheritance, Am. 9:12, Ob. 17-21; they will indeed be judged, Joel 3:2-15, but whoever will call upon the name of the Lord will be saved, for on Zion there is deliverance, 2:32. The Ruler from Bethlehem will be great unto the ends of the earth and will protect Israel against his enemies, Mich. 5:3v., but the Gentiles will nevertheless go to Zion, in order to learn the ways of the Lord, 4:1, 2. After the Lord has destroyed all the gods of the peoples, Zef. 2:4-11, 3:8, the islands of the Gentiles will bow before Him, and He will give all peoples pure lips, to call upon His name, 2:11, 3:9. Ethiopia will bring the Lord gifts in Zion, Jes. 18:7, Egyptians and Assyrians will serve Him, 19:18-25, Tyre will hand over her wages to the Lord, 23:15-18, and

for all peoples He will prepare on Zion a fat meal, 25:6-10; indeed the servant of the Lord will also be a light of the Gentiles, make the glory of the Lord known through his messengers also among the peoples of the earth, and also be served by these; the house of the Lord will be a house of prayer for all peoples; all will bring sacrifices there, worship the Lord and call themselves by [434] His name, and pasture Israel's flock and build his fields, while the Israelites can devote themselves as priests wholly to the service of Ihvh, 40-66 passim. When Israel is restored and Jerusalem will be the Lord's throne, all the Gentiles will there be gathered for the name of the Lord, bless themselves in the Lord and glory in Him, Jer. 3:17, 4:2, 16:19-21, 33:9. All peoples will at the end acknowledge that the Lord is God, Ezech. 16:61, 17:24, 25:5v., 26:6, 28:22, 29:6, 30:8v. All the Gentiles will bring their precious things to Jerusalem and fill the house of the Lord with glory, Hagg. 2:7-10. They will come and say: let us go, to entreat the face of the Lord; and ten men will grasp the skirt of a Jewish man and wish to go with him, because God is with him, Zach. 2:11, 8:20-23, 14:16-19. The people of the saints receives the dominion over all nations of the earth, Dan. 7:14, 27. Cf. the literature, listed part III 232 and for the Messianic expectations among the Jews in Jesus' time: Schürer, Gesch. des jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter J. Chr. 3te Aufl. II 496-556.

3. These Messianic expectations of the Old Testament bear, as everyone immediately sees, a very peculiar character; they confine themselves to a future blessedness on earth. In the O. T. the believer may on a single occasion express his hope that after his death he will be received into eternal glory, this expectation is individual and stands by itself; generally the eye of prophecy is directed toward that future in which the people of Israel under the king from David's house will dwell safely in Palestine and

will rule over all the nations of the earth. Of a taking up of the believers at the end of the times into the heaven of glory there is no mention, blessedness is expected not in heaven but on earth. In connection with that, Old-Test. prophecy knows only one coming of the Messiah. Indeed it knows that the Anointed One will be born from David's house, when this house has fallen into decay, and that He will have a share in the suffering of his people, yes that He as servant of the Lord will suffer for his people and bear their iniquities; He will be a wholly different king than the princes of the earth, humble, meek, doing justice, protecting his people; He [435] will be not only king but at the same time prophet and priest. But Old-Test. prophecy never separates in the life of the Messiah the state of humiliation and the state of exaltation from one another; it comprehends both in one image; it distinguishes no first and second coming and does not place the latter, which is for judgment, a long time after the first, which serves for salvation. It is one coming, in which the Messiah bestows righteousness and blessedness upon his people and brings it to dominion over all the peoples of the earth. The kingdom, which He comes to found, is therefore also the completed Kingdom of God. He Himself will indeed reign as king over his people but He is then nevertheless nothing more than a theocratic king, who does not rule arbitrarily but in the absolute sense realizes God's government. Old-Test. prophecy makes no distinction between a Christ-government and a God-government; it does not expect that the Messiah from David's house, after having ruled temporarily, hands over his kingdom to God; it does not regard the future, which it depicts in the Messianic kingdom, as an intermediate condition, which at the end must give way to a God-government in heaven; it considers the Messianic kingdom as the final state and clearly lets the judgment over the enemies, the repelling of the last

attack, the transformation of nature, the resurrection from the dead precede the founding and confirmation of this kingdom. And this kingdom is sketched by all the prophets in paints and colors, under forms and images, which are all borrowed from the historical circumstances under which they lived. Palestine will be retaken, Jerusalem rebuilt, the temple with its sacrificial service restored, Edom and Moab and Ammon, Assur and Babel subdued, to all citizens a long life, a quiet sitting under vine and fig tree will be granted; the image of the future is through and through Old-Testamentary, it is wholly and entirely historically and nationally determined. But into those earthly, sensuous forms prophecy lays an eternal content; the shell becomes bearer of an imperishable kernel, which also in the O. Test. sometimes breaks through it. Return from the exile and true conversion coincide; the religious and the political side of Israel's victory over the enemies are most closely connected; the Messiah is an earthly prince but also an eternal king, a king of righteousness, an eternal father for his people, a prince of peace, a priest-king; [436] the enemies are subjected to Israel but recognize therein that the Lord is God and serve Him in his temple; this temple with its priesthood and sacrificial service are the visible proof that all citizens of the kingdom with a new heart and a new spirit serve the Lord and walk in his ways; and the extraordinary fertility of the land presupposes an entire transformation of nature, the creation of a new heaven and a new earth, in which righteousness dwells.

Later Judaism introduced all kinds of modifications into these Old Test. expectations. Deprived of its political dominion and scattered among the peoples, it began more and more to take account of the future lot of individuals and extended its horizon to humanity and to the whole world. Israel would indeed one day, on the ground of its own legalistic

righteousness, be brought by the Messiah to a political dominion over all peoples; but this Messianic kingdom bore a provisional, temporary character and at the end would make way for a kingdom of God, for a blessedness of the righteous in heaven, which was introduced by the resurrection of all men and by the general judgment of the world. The political and the religious side, which in the prophetic image of the future were most closely united, were in that way torn apart. Israel in Jesus' days expected a sensuous, earthly Messianic kingdom, the condition of which was described in the forms and images of Old Test. prophecy. But these images and forms were now taken in a literal sense; the shell was exchanged with the kernel, the thing with the image, the essence with the form; the Messianic kingdom became a political dominion of Israel over the peoples, a period of outward prosperity and flourishing. And at the end of that, only after the general resurrection, the world-judgment took place, in which each one was judged according to his works and either received the blessedness in heaven as reward or the torment in the gehenna as punishment for his deeds. In that way the doctrine of Chiliasm arose. To be sure, a great portion of the Jewish apocryphal literature still remains with the Old Test. expectations. But often, especially in the Apoc. of Baruch and in the fourth book of Ezra, the representation nevertheless occurs, that the glory of the Messianic kingdom is not the last and the highest, but after a definite time, which is many times [437] calculated and in the Talmud e.g. set at 400 or at 1000 years, will make way for the heavenly blessedness of the kingdom of God. Chiliasm is therefore not of Christian but of Jewish and furthermore also of Persian origin, above p. 426. It always rests on a compromise between the expectations of an earthly and of a heavenly blessedness and attempts to let Old Test. prophecy come into its own in that

sense, that it deems an earthly Messianic kingdom to be predicted by it, which after a determined time will be replaced by the kingdom of God. The strength of Chiliasm now seems indeed to be the Old Testament, but in fact this is not so; the Old Testament is decidedly not chiliastic, it depicts in the Messianic kingdom the completed kingdom of God, which is without end and endures eternally, Dan. 2:44, and which is preceded by judgment, resurrection, and renewal of the world. Nevertheless it found belief among the Jews and also among many Christians and repeatedly came up again, when the world developed its God-hostile power and caused the church to suffer under persecution and oppression. In the oldest time we encounter it with Cerinthus, in the testament of the XII patriarchs, with the Ebionites, with Barnabas, Papias, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Apollinaris, Commodianus, Lactantius, Victorinus. But Montanism admonished to caution; Gnostics, Alexandrian theologians and especially also Augustine opposed it most strongly, and the changed condition of the church, which had overcome the world-power and held itself more and more for the kingdom of God on earth, caused it gradually to die out entirely. Anew it came up before and during the Reformation, when many began to regard Rome as the false whore and the pope as the antichrist; it revived with the Anabaptists, the Davidjorists, the Socinians, and since then has no longer died out, although the official churches rejected it. The political commotions, the religious wars, the persecutions, the sectarian movements repeatedly granted it new life. In Bohemia it was preached by Paul Felgenhauer and Comenius; in Germany by Jakob Böhme, Ezechiel Meth, Gichtel, Petersen, Horche, Spener, J. Lange, S. König; in England by Joh. Archer, Newton, Joseph Mede, Jane Leade and many Independents; in the Netherlands by Labadie, Ant. Bourignon, Poiret etc. Even Reformed theologians inclined to a

moderate Chiliasm, such as Piscator, Alsted, Jurieu, Burnet, Whiston, Serarius, [438] Coccejus, Groenewegen, Jac. Alting, d'Outrein, Vitringa, Brakel, Jungius, Mommers e. a., cf. H. Brinck, Touchstone of truth and opinions 1691 p. 656v. Voetius, Disp. II 1266-1272. Maresius, Syst. Theol. VIII 38. Moor VI 155. M. Vitringa IX. Marck, Exspectatio gloriae futurae Jesu Christi, 2 tomi, L. B. 1730. In the 18th and 19th century, under the pressure of the social and political revolutions, it found acceptance not only with the Swedenborgians, the Darbyists, the Irvingians, the Mormons, the Adventists etc., but after the realistic direction, taken up by Bengel, Oetinger, Ph. M. Hahn, J. M. Hahn, Hasenkamp, Menken, Jung-Stilling, J. F. von Meyer etc., it was also embraced by many theologians in the churches of the Reformation, such as Rothe, Theol. Ethik § 586 f. Hofmann, Weiss. u. Erf. II 372 f. Delitzsch, Die bibl. proph. Theol. 6 f. Beck, Christl. Gl. II. Auberlen, Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenb. Joh. 2e Aufl. 1857 S. 372 f. Martensen, Dogm. § 280. Lange, Dogm. II 1271 f. Luthardt, Die Lehre v. d. letzten Dingen3 1885. Komp. d. Dogm. § 76. Frank, Chr. Wahrh. II 463 f. Vilmar, Dogm. II 307. Ebrard, Dogm. § 572 f. Oosterzee, Dogm. § 146. Saussaye, cf. my Theol. v. Ch. d. l. S. 71. Bogue, Speeches on the thousand-year kingdom, Gron. 1825. Guers, Israel's future and restoration together with a sketch of the thousand-year kingdom Amst. 1863. John Cumming, The great tribulation Amst. 1861. Id. Deliverance near 1862. Id. The thousand-year rest 1863. Id. Considerations on the thousand-year kingdom 1866 etc. Seiss, The coming Christ, Brussels 1892. Art. Chiliasmus in Herzog3 3, 805-817 and the literature cited there.

4. The fundamental ideas of Chiliasm are virtually the same in almost all; they come down to this, that a twofold return of Christ and a double resurrection are to be distinguished; that Christ at his first return will

overcome the antichristian power, bind Satan, raise the deceased believers, gather the church, in particular the church of the converted Israel brought back to Palestine, around himself, rule over the world from out of that church, and will cause for his people a period of spiritual flourishing and material prosperity to dawn; and that He at the end of that time will return once more, in order to raise all men from the dead, [439] to judge them before his judgment-seat and to determine their eternal lot. But these fundamental ideas nevertheless allow all kinds of modifications. The beginning of the thousand-year kingdom was determined differently; following the Epistle of Barnabas many church fathers and later also the Cocceians taught that it would begin with the seventh millennium of the world; the Fifth-monarchmen had it begin after the fall of the fourth world-kingdom; Hippolytus set its beginning in the year 500, Groenewegen in 1700, Whiston in 1715 and later in 1766, Jurieu in 1785, Bengel in 1836, Stilling in 1816 etc. The duration was fixed at 400 (4 Ezra) or 500 (Evang. van Nicodemus) or a thousand (Talmud etc.) or twice a thousand (Bengel) or only 7 (Darby) or also an indeterminate number of years, so that the number in Op. 20:2, 3 is taken symbolically (Rothe, Martensen, Lange etc.). Some think that for the establishment of the thousand-year kingdom there will be no return of Christ (Kurtz); or at least no visible return (Darby), or a return visible only to the believers (Irving) will take place, and that no resurrection of the believers before the millennium ought to be assumed (Bengel). Many do assume that Christ after his first return remains on earth, but others are of the opinion that He only appears for a moment, in order to establish his kingdom and thereafter withdraws again into heaven. The government of Christ in the millennium takes place according to Piscator, Alsted etc. from out of heaven. In that dominion then share the risen

martyrs, who either were taken up into heaven (Piscator) or remained behind on earth (Alsted), or all the risen believers, who remain here on earth (Justinus, Irenaeus etc.) or who at his appearing in the clouds are led to meet Christ in the air (Irving), or especially the people Israel. For generally the chiliasts expect a national conversion of Israel, and most imagine that the converted Israel will be brought back to Palestine and there will be the principal citizens of the thousand-year kingdom (Jurieu, Oetinger, Hofmann, Auberlen etc.). If one assumes a remaining of Christ on earth after his first return, one usually designates the rebuilt Jerusalem as his dwelling-place, although the Montanists formerly thought of Pepuza and the Mormons now think of their Salt Lake Valley. Restoration of temple and altar, of priesthood and sacrifice was as a rule, as all [440] too clearly in conflict with the New Testament, rejected, but nevertheless still found defense among the Ebionites and in more recent times with Serarius, Oetinger, Hess and others. Of the character and condition of the thousand-year kingdom one forms very different conceptions. Sometimes it is described as a kingdom of sensual enjoyments (Cerinthus, Ebionites etc.); then again it is conceived more spiritually, and all enjoyment of food and drink, all marriage and procreation removed from it (Burnet, Lavater, Rothe, Ebrard). Most often the millennium is regarded as a transitional state between the Diesseits and the Jenseits; it is a kingdom in which the believers are prepared for the vision of God (Irenaeus); in which they enjoy rest and peace, without yet being wholly delivered from sin and raised above death; in which nature (Irenaeus) and also men (Lactantius) will be extraordinarily fruitful; and in which, according to a later favorite thought, the church will especially accomplish her missionary work to humanity (Lavater, Ebrard, Auberlen etc.). All these modifications formulate just as

many objections against Chiliasm; already before the prophecy of the Old Testament, to which it preferably appeals, it cannot stand. For, apart from the fact that, as has already been said above, the Old Testament in the Messianic kingdom sees not a preliminary, temporal condition but the final result of world history, Chiliasm in the explanation of prophecy makes itself guilty of the greatest arbitrariness. It doubles the return of Christ and the resurrection of the dead, without the Old Testament knowing anything of it. It lacks every rule and method in interpretation and arbitrarily comes to a halt, according to the subjective opinion of the interpreter. The prophets all proclaim just as loudly and just as powerfully, not only the conversion of Israel and of the nations, but also the return to Palestine, the rebuilding of Jerusalem, the restoration of temple, priesthood and sacrificial service etc. And it is nothing but arbitrariness to take one feature of this picture literally and the other spiritually. It is one picture of the future that prophecy draws for us. And this picture is either to be taken literally, as it presents itself, but then one breaks with Christianity and falls back into Judaism; or there is to be given of this picture a wholly different explanation than Chiliasm attempts. Such an explanation is [441] given to us by Scripture itself and must by us be derived from it.

5. Already in the Old Test. there are many indications of another and better explanation than Chiliasm offers of the prophetic expectations. Even the modern historical view of Israel acknowledges that the Jahvism of the prophets, by its moral character, distinguishes itself from the nature-religions and gradually has bestowed upon the religious laws and usages in Israel a spiritual significance. The true circumcision is that of the heart, Deut. 10:16, 30:6, Jer. 4:4; the sacrifices that are pleasing to God are a broken heart and a contrite spirit, 1 Sam. 15:22, Ps. 40:7, 50:8v., 51:19,

Hos. 6:6, Am. 5:21v., Mich. 6:6v., Jes. 1:11v., Jer. 6:20, 7:21v. etc.; the true fasting is the loosening of the bonds of ungodliness, Jes. 58:3v., Jer. 14:12; for a great part the struggle of the prophets is directed against the external, self-righteous cultus of the people. The essence of the dispensation of the future therefore consists in this, that the Lord will establish a new covenant with his people, that He will grant them a new heart and will write his law therein, and that He will pour out his Spirit upon all, so that they love Him with their whole heart and walk in his ways, Deut. 30:6, Jer. 31:32, 32:38v., Ezech. 11:19, 36:26, Joel 2:28, Zach. 12:10. And indeed that future is now depicted in images borrowed from the historical circumstances, so that Zion and Jerusalem, temple and altar, sacrifice and priesthood continue to occupy a great place therein. But 1o let one consider that we too do the same and cannot speak of God and divine matters, of spiritual and heavenly things, otherwise than in earthly, sensible forms. The Oldtest. worship-service has also been instituted by God for this purpose, that we might be able to speak truly of the heavenly things not in self-made but in correct images given to us by Him himself. The New Test. therefore also adopts this manner of speaking and speaks in the future Kingdom of God of Zion and Jerusalem, of temple and altar, of prophets and priests; the earthly is an image of the heavenly, Alles Vergängliche ist nur ein Gleichniss. Let one 2o not forget that all prophecy is poetry, which must be explained according to its own nature. The error [442] of the exegesis formerly prevailing consisted not in its spiritualizing as such, but rather in this, that it wished to convert all details serving for illustration into a spiritual sense and thereby, as also with the parables of Jesus, often lost sight of the main thought. If, e.g., it is said that the Lord will raise up a twig from the hewn-down trunk of Isaiah, that He will exalt the mountain of Zion upon the top of the mountains, that He

will bring back of the banished one out of a city and two out of a family, that He will sprinkle clean water upon all and cleanse them from their sins, that He will cause the mountains to drip with sweet wine and the hills to flow with milk etc., then everyone feels that he has here to do with a poetic description, which cannot or may not be taken literally. The realistic explanation here comes into conflict with itself and fails to recognize the character of prophecy. Nor is it 3o correct that the prophets themselves would have been absolutely not conscious of the distinction between thing and image. Not only are the above-mentioned poetic circumlocutions without doubt understood by the prophets as image, but with the names of Sodom, Gomorrah, Edom, Moab, Philistea, Egypt, Assur, Babel they more than once designate the power of the heathen world, which will once be subjected to Israel and will share in its blessings, Ob. 16, 17, Jes. 34:5, Ezech. 16:46v., Dan. 2, 7v., Zach. 14:21. Zion is often the name for the people, for the congregation of God, Jes. 49:14, 50:1, 51:3, 52:1, 54:1. And although Oldtest. prophecy cannot imagine the future Kingdom of God without temple and sacrifice, yet it repeatedly goes beyond all national and earthly relations and proclaims that there will no longer be an ark of the covenant, because all Jerusalem is God's throne, Jer. 3:16, 17, that the kingdom of the Messiah will be eternal and will encompass the whole world, Ps. 2:8, 72:8, 17, Dan. 2:44, that all inhabitants will be prophets and priests, Jes. 54:13, 61:6, Jer. 31:31, that all uncleanness and sin, all sickness and death will be banished from it, 25:8, 33:24, 52:1, 11, Zach. 14:20, 21, Ps. 104:35, that it will be established in a new heaven and on a new earth, and will no longer have need of sun or moon, Jes. 60:19, 20, 65:17, 66:22. Even the realistic picture of the future of Ezekiel contains elements that make a symbolic explanation necessary; the equal portions that are assigned

to all [443] tribes, although very different in numerical strength; the measured strips that are destined for priests, Levites, and prince; the separation of temple and city, the high situation of the temple on a mountain and the brook that flows from under the threshold of the eastern temple door to the Dead Sea; and finally the artificial composition and the practical unfeasibility, they oppose a so-called realistic interpretation. Finally 4o in the exegesis of the Old Testament the question is not whether the prophets were wholly or in part conscious of the symbolic character of their predictions, for even in the word of classical writers there lies more than they themselves have thought of it or have meant by it. But rather the question is what the Spirit of Christ, who was in them, wished thereby to testify and to reveal. That is now decided by the New Testament, which is the completion, the fulfillment and therefore the explanation of the Old, for in the fruit the nature of the tree becomes manifest. Even modern criticism acknowledges that not Judaism but that Christianity is the full realization of the religion of the prophets.

On this there can surely be no doubt, that the N. Testament regards itself as the spiritual and thus as the perfect and true fulfilment of the Old Testament. The spiritualizing of the O. T., provided it is understood in a good sense, is not an invention of Christian theology, but has taken its beginning in the N. T. itself. The spiritualized Old Testament, that is, the Old Testament stripped of its temporal, sensuous form, is the New Testament. The peculiarity of the old dispensation was precisely that the covenant of grace was presented under perceptible images and clothed in national, sensuous forms. Sin was symbolized in Levitical uncleanness. Atonement was effected by the offering of a slaughtered animal. Cleansing was foreshadowed in bodily washings. Communion with God was bound to

going up to Jerusalem. Need of God's favour and nearness expressed itself in a longing for his courts. Eternal life was conceived as a long life on earth etc. All that was spiritual, heavenly, and eternal was, in accordance with the capacity of Israel, which as a child was placed under the discipline of the law, veiled in earthly shadows. Although the great mass of the people [444] often remained with those outward forms, just as many Christians in the sacrament remain stuck to the sign, the pious Israelites did indeed penetrate with their hearts to the spiritual kernel that was hidden in the shell, but yet they too saw that spiritual only in shadow and image. Therefore the New Testament says that the Old was σκια των μελλοντων, το δε σωμα Χριστου, Col. 2:17, ὑποδειγμα και σκια των ἐπουρανιων, Hebr. 8:5. The shadow is not the body, but nevertheless points to the body, and falls away when this itself has come. The New Testament is the truth, the essence, the kernel, the actual content of the Old Testament; Vetus Test. in Novo patet, Novum Test. in Vetere latet. Therefore in the N. Test. there is so often mention of the truth. Over against the law, which was given through Moses, stands the truth, which has come in Jesus Christ, Joh. 1:14, 17. He is the truth, Joh. 14:6; the Spirit, whom he sent out, is the Spirit of truth, Joh. 16:13, 1 Joh. 5:6; the word of God, which he preached, is the word of truth, Joh. 17:17; the saving good promised and foreshadowed under the O. Test. has in Christ become manifest for all as eternal, true reality; all the promises of God are in him yea and amen, 2 Cor. 1:20; the Old Testament has not been abolished but has in the new dispensation come to its fulfilment and in it still always continues to come to fulfilment up to the parousia of Christ. Christ is therefore the true prophet, priest, and king; the genuine servant of the Lord, the true propitiatory sacrifice, Rom. 3:25, the true circumcision, Col. 2:11, the true pascha, 1 Cor. 5:7, the true offering, Ef. 5:2, and his church is the

true seed of Abraham, the true Israel, the true people of God, Mt. 1:21, Luk. 1:17, Rom. 9:25, 26, 2 Cor. 6:16-18, Gal. 3:29, Tit. 2:14, Hebr. 8:8-10, Jak. 1:1, 18, 1 Petr. 2:9, Op. 21:3, 12, the true temple of God, 1 Cor. 3:16, 2 Cor. 6:16, Ef. 2:22, 2 Thess. 2:4, Hebr. 8:2, the true Zion and Jerusalem, Gal. 4:26, Hebr. 12:22, Op. 3:12, 21:2, 10; her spiritual offering is the true religion, Joh. 4:24, Rom. 12:1, Phil. 3:3, 4:18, cf. deel III 217. All concepts of the Old Testament lay aside their outward, national-Israelite meaning and become manifest in their spiritual, eternal sense; the Semitic no longer needs, as Bunsen wished, to be [445] translated by us into the Japhetic; the N. Test. itself has given to the particularistic ideas of the O. Test. a universalistic, cosmic meaning. Completely wrong, therefore, is the view of Chiliasm, according to which the N. Test. with the church from the Gentiles is an intermezzo, a side-path, which God has taken because Israel rejected its Messiah, so that the actual continuation and fulfilment of the Old Testament would only begin at the second coming of Christ. Rather, the reverse is true. Not the New, but the Old Testament is an interlude. The covenant with Israel is temporal, the law has been inserted between the promise to Abraham and its fulfilment in Christ, in order that it might increase the transgression and as a tutor might lead to Christ, Rom. 5:20, Gal. 3:19. Therefore Paul always goes back to Abraham, Rom. 4:11v., Gal. 3:6v., and attaches his gospel to the promise that was made to him. Abraham is the father of the believers, of all believers, not only from the Jews but also from the Gentiles, Rom. 4:11; the children of the promise are his seed; Rom. 9:6-8; the blessing of Abraham comes in Christ to the Gentiles, Gal. 3:14; those who are of Christ are Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise, Gal. 3:29. The people of Israel are in the days of the O. Test. chosen temporarily, in order that salvation would presently, in

the fullness of time, come to the benefit of the whole world. Israel is not chosen to the detriment but to the benefit of the nations. The promise to Adam and Noah had from its first beginning a universalistic tendency and has this, after laying aside its temporal, legal form under Israel, in Christ fully revealed for all nations. The veil has been torn, the dividing wall has fallen, the handwriting of the law has been nailed to the cross; and now the believers from the Gentiles are with those from the Jews co-heirs, fellow-citizens of the saints, members of God's household, brought near in Christ, and built upon the same foundation of apostles and prophets, Ef. 1:9-11, 2:11-22. The New Testament is therefore no intermezzo, no interlude, no side-path, no deviation from the line of the O. Covenant, but the long-foreseen goal, the direct continuation, the true fulfilment of the Old Testament. Chiliasm, judging otherwise, comes into conflict with Christianity itself. In principle considered, [446] it is one with Judaism and must come to ascribe to Christianity, to the historical person of Christ, to his suffering and death, a temporal, passing value and to expect the actual salvation only from Christ's second coming, from his appearing in glory. Just like Judaism, it subordinates the spiritual to the material, the ethical to the physical, stiffens the Jews in their fleshly disposition, excuses their rejection of the Messiah, makes heavier the veil that lies upon their face in the reading of the Old Testament, and promotes the imagination that the fleshly descendant of Abraham will still as such have a prerogative in the kingdom of heaven. Scripture, however, says that the true reading and explanation of the O. Test. is to be found with him who has been converted to the Lord Christ, 2 Cor. 3:14-16, that he is a Jew who is one inwardly and partakes of the circumcision of the heart, Rom. 2:29, that in Christ there is no male or female, no Jew or Greek, but that they all are one in Christ

Jesus, 1 Cor. 12:13, Gal. 3:28, Col. 3:11. The Jew who becomes a Christian, was not but became through his faith a child of Abraham, Gal. 3:29. Cf. against Chiliasm: Augustine, de civ. XX c. 6-9. Luther in Köstlin II 564 f. Gerhard, Loc. XXIX c. 7. Quenstedt, Theol. IV 649. Calvin, Inst. III 25, 5. Walaeus, Op. I 537-554. Voetius, Disp. II 1248-1272. Turretinus, Theol. El. XX qu 3. Moor VI 149-162. Hengstenberg in his comm. on the Revelation of John. Keil on Ezekiel 1868 S. 495 f. Kliefoth, Eschatologie 1886 S. 147 f. Philippi, Kirchl. Gl. VI 214 f. Hodge, Syst. Theol. III 805-812. 861-866. Kuyper, Heraut 981-1003 etc.

6. Although with this, in general, the result already stands completely established, that the New Testament is antichiliastic, Kuenen, Prof. II 271, this must nevertheless still be demonstrated more closely in particulars. Chiliasm includes the expectation that, toward the return of Christ, a national conversion of Israel will take place, that the Jews will then return to Palestine, and from there will rule over the nations under Christ. In this there is among the chiliasts a difference as to whether the conversion will precede the return or this will precede that, [447] cf. e.g. Guers, Israels toekomst en herstel 171. Because it is difficult to think that the scattered Jews would first be converted successively and then together conceive the plan to go to Palestine, some think that the Jews will first gradually return to Canaan and then later be converted to Christ there jointly, or others try to unite both views in such a way that first a great part of the Jews move to Palestine, and that these, after first restoring city and temple and worship and thereafter being converted to Christ, are gradually followed by their other fellow-nationals. And they point out that this expectation is already being fulfilled initially. There are already thousands of Jews in Palestine; the Eastern question is approaching its solution, for Turkey owes its

existence only to the mutual jealousy of the great powers; and if Turkey is once destroyed, then there is every chance that Palestine will be assigned to the Jews, to whom it rightfully belongs; furthermore, in many Jews, as appears from the Zionism that has arisen in recent times, there works a desire to return to Palestine and to form an independent kingdom there; and finally the great improvement of the means of transport, which one already considers predicted in Nah. 2:3, 4, Jes. 11:16, 66:20, also makes such a return simple and easy. However one may now judge about these political combinations, the New Testament offers not the least support for such an expectation. When the fullness of time had come, the Jews, considered as a people, stood on one line with the Gentiles; they were together condemnable before God, because they sought to establish a righteousness of their own from the law and rejected the righteousness that is from faith, Rom. 3:21. Therefore God sent John to them with the baptism of repentance and had it announced to them in it that they, although being circumcised and baptizing proselytes, themselves stood guilty and unclean before his face and, just as much as the Gentiles, had need of regeneration and conversion in order to enter into the kingdom of heaven. By baptism John already separated the true Israelites from the mass of the people. And Jesus continued on this track; He took over the baptism of John and had it administered by his disciples. Indeed, like John, He at first came forward with the preaching that the kingdom [448] of God had come near. But He conceived that kingdom quite differently from his contemporaries; He understood by it not a political but a religious-ethical dominion and taught that no fleshly descent from Abraham but only regeneration from water and spirit opened access to that kingdom of heaven, part III 232v. Thereby He gradually gathered around himself a crowd of disciples, which

distinguished itself and separated itself from the people of the Jews. And these were the true ἐκκλησια, the genuine people of God, as Israel ought to have been but now in its rejection of the Messiah showed not to be. This separation between the people of the Jews and the Newtest. ἐκκλησια became sharper and sharper. Indeed there were many who believed in Christ, but the people, led by the Pharisees and scribes, rejected Him. Although for some unto a resurrection, He was for many unto a fall and unto a sign that was spoken against, Luk. 2:34. He came to his own, but his own have not received Him, Joh. 1:11. Jesus himself says that a prophet is not honored in his fatherland, Mt. 13:17. Time and again He experiences that the Jews do not want to come to Him, Joh. 5:37-47, 6:64; He testifies that they will die in their sins, 8:21, that they are children of the devil, 8:44, plants not planted by the Father, Mt. 15:13, 14, and sees in their unbelief no accidental, unforeseen circumstance but fulfillment of prophecy, Mt. 13:13v., Joh. 12:37v. But not only has Jesus nothing to hope from the Jews in the present, also in the future He expects nothing for them. On the contrary He announces the complete destruction of city and temple, so that no stone will be left upon another, Joh. 2:18-21, Mt. 22:7, 23:37-39, 24:1v., Mk. 13, Luk. 21:6v. At his entry into Jerusalem He weeps over the city, Luk. 19:41-44. On the Monday before his death he curses on the way to Bethany the fig tree, which in that it had not yet fruits but indeed already leaves, was an image of the hypocritically pious, self-righteous Israel, and said that no one would eat any fruit from it any more unto eternity, Mk. 11:12-14. On his way to the cross He commands the women not to weep over Him but over Jerusalem, Luk. 23:28. He even preaches that salvation, rejected by Israel, will become the portion of the Gentiles. The kingdom of God will be taken from Israel [449] and given to another people that brings

forth its fruits, Mt. 21:43; the vineyard is rented out to other husbandmen, Mt. 21:41; to the wedding are called those who are at the exits of the roads, Mt. 22:9; the lost son goes before the eldest son, Luk. 15. And thus He says that many will come from East and West and will sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, Mt. 8:10-12; that He has yet other sheep that are not of this fold, Joh. 10:16; and rejoices in it that, when some Greeks desire to see Him, He must now fall as a grain of wheat into the earth and die and thus bear much fruit, Joh. 12:24. After his resurrection He therefore also commands his disciples to preach the gospel to all nations, Mt. 28:18. And we encounter the same judgment about Israel with all apostles. Indeed, as Jesus' witnesses they must begin their labor from Jerusalem, but then continue it to the uttermost part of the earth, Hd. 1:8. Peter therefore brings the gospel immediately to the Jews, Hd. 2:14, 3:19, 5:31, but sees in a vision that henceforth no one is unclean, but that acceptable to God is everyone who fears Him, from whatever people he may come, Hd. 10:35, 43. Paul always begins his preaching first with the Jews, but turns, when these reject it, to the Gentiles, Hd. 13:46, 18:6, 28:25-28. First the Jew, but also the Greek, is the rule that he observes on his missionary journeys, Rom. 1:16, 1 Cor. 1:21-24. For Jews and Gentiles are both condemnable before God and have need of the same gospel, Rom. 3:19v. There is for all only one way to salvation, namely faith, as that was already practiced by Abraham before the law and reckoned to him for righteousness, Rom. 4, Gal. 3. Those of the Jews who reject Christ are no true, genuine Jews, Rom. 2:28, 29; they are not the circumcision but the concision, Phil. 3:2, they are disorderly ones, speakers of vanity, deceivers of minds, whose mouth one must stop, Tit. 1:10, 11; they have killed the Lord Jesus and their own prophets, they persecute the believers, they do not

please God and are against all men, they hinder the apostles from speaking to the Gentiles, and fill up the measure of their sins, so that wrath has come upon them to its utmost limit and now discharges itself over them, [450] 1 Thess. 2:14-16. The Jews who slander the church of Smyrna indeed say that they are Jews, but they are not, they are much rather a synagogue of Satan, Op. 2:9, 3:9. Genuine Jews, true children of Abraham are those who believe in Christ, Rom. 9:8, Gal. 3:29 etc. Thus the N. Test. judges about the Jews; the church of believers has in all respects replaced the national, fleshly Israel; the Old Testament is fulfilled in the New.

7. Only a few passages seem to be in conflict with this continuous doctrine of Scripture and to contain something else. The first passage is Mt. 23:37-39, Luk. 13:33-35, where Jesus says to the inhabitants of Jerusalem that their house will be left desolate, and that they will not see Him until they will say: blessed is He who comes in the name of the Lord. Here Jesus indeed expresses the expectation that the Jews will once, namely at His return, acknowledge Him as Messiah. If now from elsewhere a thousand-year kingdom and a conversion of Israel coinciding with it were established, this passage could be explained accordingly. But since this is not the case, not even in Op. 20, as will appear later, one can here think only of the Messiah-acknowledgment of the Jews at Christ's return for judgment. And until then, Jesus says expressly, Jerusalem will be left desolate; a rebuilding of city and temple is therefore in any case not expected by Jesus before His return. Secondly, Luk. 21:24 comes into consideration, where Jesus says that Jerusalem will be trampled by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled. The conjunction ἄχρι οὐ does not yet include that, at the dawning of the term thereby indicated, the opposite, namely the being rebuilt and inhabited of Jerusalem

by the Jews, will take place. But even if this were so, then Jesus still does not thereby say that an end will come to the trampling of Jerusalem before His parousie, for He immediately, after having pronounced the judgment over Jerusalem, passes over to the discussion of the signs before and at His return, Luk. 21:25v.; the times of the Gentiles continue until His return. Again, if the N. T. taught a twofold return of Christ, this passage could be interpreted in accordance [451] with it, but it will soon become clear that no ground for that is present in the N. T. The third text that comes into consideration here is Hd. 3:19-21. There Peter exhorts the Jews to conversion, in order that their sins may be blotted out and in order that καιροι ἀναψυξεως, moments of refreshment, may come from the side of the face of the Lord and He, namely God, may send the Christ Jesus destined for you (the Jews), whom heaven must receive until the times of the restoration of all things. Some think that the times of refreshment of which mention is made here will then dawn when the Jewish people are converted and all things are restored again to their original destination in the thousand-year kingdom, and that they will then last until the second return of Jesus. But against this interpretation there is great objection. The χρονοι ἀποκαταστασεως παντων are difficult to understand as the restoration of the natural and moral relations that is expected by the Chiliasts in the millennium, for it is stated clearly that these times are the end point of the sojourn of Jesus in heaven; until then Jesus therefore remains at the Father's right hand, and since Scripture knows only one return of Christ, the times of the restoration of all things coincide with the consummation of the world; moreover, ἀποκαταστασις παντων is far too strong an expression for that restoration of the Jewish kingdom which Chiliasm expects. The times of refreshment are therefore not identical with but precede the times of the

restoration of all things. For Peter indicates a twofold purpose of the conversion of the Jews, in order that times of refreshment may dawn for them and in order that God may send them the Christ destined for them. The times of refreshment fall before the return of Christ and then refer either to the spiritual peace that is the consequence of conversion and forgiveness of sins, or to certain future times of divine blessing and favor. The latter is the most probable, because the times of refreshment are connected not immediately with the blotting out of sins but with the sending of Christ. And the thought which Peter here expresses is then this: be converted, O Jews, to the blotting out of your sins, in order that there may also for you as a people, who have delivered up, denied, and killed Christ, vs. [452] 13-15, times of refreshment from God's face dawn and God thereafter may send from heaven that Christ, who in the first place is destined for you and therefore also came first to you, vs. 26, in order also for your salvation to restore all things again. Whether such times will ever dawn for the Jews, Peter does not say; that depends on their conversion, and whether this is to be expected is not mentioned here with a single word.

The last passage is Rom. 11:11-32. In Rom. 9-11 Paul deals with the tremendous problem of how God's promise to Israel is to be reconciled with the rejection of the gospel by the vast majority of Israel. The apostle gives, in the first place, the answer that the promise of God applies not to the fleshly but to the spiritual seed of Abraham, and he works this out at length, Rom. 9 and 10. And secondly he observes that God also within Israel still always has his elect, and thus has not rejected that people; he himself is proof of this, and many with him; however many may be hardened and blinded, the elect have nevertheless obtained salvation; there is always a remnant according to the election of grace, Rom. 11:1-10. But this

hardening, which has come upon the greater part of Israel, is nevertheless not God's final goal; rather, it is in his hand a means to bring salvation to the Gentiles, in order that these, accepting that salvation in faith, may in their turn provoke Israel again to jealousy, 11:11-15. After having admonished the believers from the Gentiles not to exalt themselves on this account, vv. 16-24, Paul develops this thought still further and says that hardening has come upon a part of Israel, until the pleroma of the Gentiles, the full number of those destined for salvation from among them, shall have been fulfilled. And in that way all Israel shall be saved according to God's promise. The unbelieving Jews are therefore now indeed hated by God in relation to the gospel, so that the salvation rejected by them might come to the Gentiles; but according to the election they are beloved for the fathers' sake, for God's promises are irrevocable. As it has thus gone with the Gentiles, so it will also go with the hardened Jews; the Gentiles were first disobedient and have now become objects of mercy, and so also the Jews are now disobedient, in order that they too, through the mercy shown to the Gentiles, may receive mercy [453]. For God has shut up all, Gentiles and Jews, under sin, in order that He might have mercy on them all, vv. 25-32. Most interpreters think that the question whether God has rejected his people, 11:1, is not fully answered by the fact that God always preserves his elect within Israel, who are successively brought in in the course of the centuries, 11:1-10, and they therefore judge that everything that follows in chap. 11 is not merely a further explication, but a supplement to the answer given in vv. 1-10, a new answer, which only then fully removes the objection as though God would reject his people. Under πας Ισραηλ in v. 26 they therefore understand the national whole of Israel, which will be converted in the last days. But however general this explanation may be,

there exist weighty objections against it. a. If it were the apostle's intention to give in 11:25-32 a new, supplementary answer, he would bring his reasoning at the end into conflict with its beginning and point of departure. For he has said in 9:6v. that the promises of God have not failed, because they apply to the spiritual seed of Abraham, and in this spiritual seed still always attain their fulfillment, 11:1-10. A priori it is very improbable that Paul would later have returned to this reasoning and would have supplemented and improved it in this sense, that the promises of God do not come fully to their fulfillment in this salvation of the spiritual Israel, but are then only completely realized when in the last time a national conversion of Israel takes place. b. In any case, in chap. 9:1-10:11 there is not a single word about such an expectation for the people of Israel, and there is not a single expression that suggests it and prepares for it. And chap. 11:11-24 also still contains nothing that points to such an expectation. Indeed 11:11-15 is understood in that sense by many. But even if these words are not hypothetical, as an element in the reasoning, but are to be understood as a description of a fact, then they nevertheless contain only this thought: the rejection of Christ by Israel has been a great gain for the Gentiles, for thereby the reconciliation brought about by Christ's death has become the portion of the Gentiles; a much greater gain than that will the acceptance of Israel by God be for the Gentiles, for when Israel has reached its pleroma, its [454] full number of elect, and the pleroma of the Gentiles has also entered in, then that will have as its consequence the life from the dead, the resurrection from the dead of the new humanity. To Israel's ἥττωμα the Gentile world owes, mediately, its reconciliation; to Israel's πληρωμα it will one day owe its life from the dead. c. If Paul in 11:25 wanted to communicate a new fact, the manner in which he does this is most

surprising. For he does not say: and then, thereafter, namely after the fullness of the Gentiles has entered in, shall all Israel, but: και οὐτως πας Ισραὴλ σωθησεται, and in that way all Israel shall be saved. That cannot mean anything other than: in that way, as described in the preceding verses. Immediately before, in v. 24, Paul has said that the hardening has always come upon Israel only in part, ἀπο μερους. The believers from the Gentiles could indeed begin to think, as Israel formerly did, that they alone were the elect people of God, and that Israel was wholly rejected. But Paul says that this is not so. No, Israel is not as such rejected; there is always among them a remnant according to the election of grace; there are indeed some branches broken off, for which the wild olive tree of the Gentile world has come in their place, but the trunk of the cultivated olive tree has remained; the hardening has come upon Israel only in part; while the pleroma from the Gentiles enters in, the pleroma from Israel is also being brought in; and in that way all Israel is saved. d. This fact, namely that the hardening has come upon Israel only in part, Paul calls a μυστηριον, 11:25. Elsewhere he so often calls the fact that the Gentiles are now co-heirs and fellow-citizens of the saints and members of God's household, and here he designates with the same word the fact that the Jews are hardened only in part and that God continually brings many elect from among them into his church. For that partial hardening will last until the pleroma of the Gentiles shall have entered in. Never, until the end of the ages, will God wholly reject his ancient people; always, alongside a part from the Gentile world, a part from Israel will also be brought to faith in Christ. The Gentiles, but also the Jews, had deserved something wholly different. But this is the great mysterium, that God is rich in mercy, that He gathers his elect from every people, also from the people of the Jews, who rejected Him [455], that He shut up all

under sin, in order that He might have mercy on all. That mysterium brings the apostle into rapture and causes him, in admiration, to worship the depth of God's wisdom and knowledge, 11:33-36. e. Πας Ισραηλ in 11:25 is therefore not the people of Israel, which at the ends of the days will be converted en masse; it is also not the church from Jews and Gentiles together, but it is the pleroma that in the course of the centuries is brought in from Israel. Israel remains as a people, so Paul predicts, existing alongside the Gentiles; it will not perish nor disappear from the earth; it remains until the end of the ages, supplies its pleroma for the kingdom of God just as well as the Gentiles, and retains for that kingdom of God its special task and place; from all peoples and nations and tongues the church of God is gathered. f. How great that pleroma from Israel will be, Paul does not calculate. It is quite possible that the number of the elect from Israel in the last times will be much greater than it was in Paul's or in later or in our days; there is not a single reason to deny this; rather, the spread of the gospel among all peoples leads one to expect that both from Israel and from the Gentiles an ever greater number will be saved. But that is not what Paul intends to say; he does not count, but he weighs. From the Gentile world the full pleroma will come, and also from Israel, and that pleroma will be πας Ισραηλ. In that pleroma all Israel is preserved, just as in the church in its entirety the whole of humanity is rescued. g. Another conversion of Israel than in the manner indicated by Paul is also difficult to conceive. For what is a national conversion, and how and when will it take place in Israel? There is of course nothing against it; rather, the fact of the continued existence of the people of Israel in connection with the prophecy pleads for it, that also from Israel a very great number will still be brought to faith in Christ; but however great this number may be, it remains a remnant

according to the election of grace. Even the strongest chiliast will surely not think that once at the end all Jews without exception will be converted. And even if he assumed that, thinking that only thus Rom. 11:25 would be fully fulfilled, then such a national conversion at the end would nevertheless not benefit the millions of Jews who through the centuries up to that end-time [456] have died away in unbelief and hardening. If one really thinks that God's promise to Israel is only then truly fulfilled when not an ἐκλογη out of the people, but the people itself is brought in, then one comes into conflict with history. Always, through all centuries, also in the days of the O. T., when the national Israel was God's people, it was only a small part of the people that in truth served and feared God. And so it is not only among the Jews, but so it is also among the Gentiles. Always it is a remnant according to the election of grace that from the Christian peoples becomes partaker of salvation in Christ. Moreover, for such a national conversion of Israel as the Chiliasts expect, no place remains in Paul's sketch of the future. For he says expressly that the hardening has come upon a part of Israel until the pleroma of the Gentiles has entered in, and that not thereafter but that in that way all Israel is saved, Rom. 11:25, 26. The hardening upon a part of Israel thus lasts as long as until the pleroma from the Gentile world has been brought in, and according to the Chiliasts the national conversion of Israel must then fall thereafter. But is there then still a span of time between the entering in of the pleroma of the Gentile world and the end of the ages? If so, are there in that time then also still Gentile peoples, and is not a single one more converted from among them? The entering in of the pleroma of the Gentiles cannot be conceived as temporally preceding the being saved of all Israel. Rom. 11:26 does not name a new fact that takes place after the entering in of the fullness of the

Gentiles. But the entering in of the fullness of the Gentiles and the being saved of all Israel run parallel, because the hardening has come upon Israel only in part. Finally, one should also note that, even if Paul at the end also expected a national conversion of Israel, he nevertheless with not a word makes mention of a return of the Jews to Palestine, of a rebuilding of city and temple, of a visible reign of Christ; in his picture of the future there is no place for all that. Cf. on the conversion of the Jews, besides the commentaries on Rom. 11, Voetius, Disp. II 124 sq. Witsius, Oec. foed. IV 15, 20-32. Moor VI 127-130. Hodge, Syst. Theol. III 805. Kliefoth, Eschatologie 147. [457]

8. In discussing the expectations which the N. Test. cherishes for the future with respect to the people of Israel, it was still left undecided whether the N. Test. perhaps in other places than those there discussed teaches an intermediate state between this dispensation and the consummation of the ages. If this, it was acknowledged, were the case, then Mt. 23:37-39, Luk. 21:24 and Hd. 3:19-21, although in themselves they gave absolutely no occasion for assuming such a transitional period, could nevertheless be interpreted and explained in that sense. Now therefore the question arises whether, according to Jesus and the apostles, a time of power and glory is to be expected for the church, which precedes the general resurrection and the judgment of the world. If this were so, we would expect clear mention of it in the eschatological discourse which Jesus held to his disciples in the last days of his life, Mt. 24, Mk. 13, Luk. 21. But there is not a word in it, not even an allusion to such a kingdom. The Chiliasts attempt to insert their millennium at one place or another in this discourse, and say, e.g., that the first coming of Christ is mentioned in Mt. 24:27 and the second coming in v. 30, but this exegesis nevertheless lacks all foundation. In his

eschatological discourse Jesus gives answer to two questions which his disciples put to him, namely, when the things will happen which he has spoken concerning Jerusalem, namely, that not one stone of the temple will be left upon another, and what the sign will be of his coming and of the consummation of the world. Jesus answers first the first question, and indeed in such a way that he first deals with the portents, Mk. 13:1-8, cf. Mt. 24:1-8, Luk. 21:5-11, then with the lot of the disciples, Mk. 13:9-13, cf. Mt. 24:9-14, Luk. 21:12-18, and finally with the catastrophe in Judea, Mk. 13:14-23, cf. Mt. 24:15-26, Luk. 21:20-24. The second question concerning the parousia of Jesus and the consummation of the world is answered in Mk. 13:24-31, cf. Mt. 24:29-35, Luk. 21:25-33; and in doing so Jesus immediately connects his parousia with the destruction of Jerusalem; in the fall of this city he sees the announcement and the preparation of the consummation of the world; Mt. 24:29 εὐθεως, Mk. 13:24 ἐν ἐκειναις ταις ἡμεραις. He even says that this generation will by no means pass away until all these things shall have happened, [458] Mt. 24:34, Mk. 13:30, Luk. 21:32. However this expectation of his speedy parousia, following immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem, is to be understood in Jesus (about which more later); in any case it is clearly evident that in this discourse there is no place for a thousand-year kingdom. Jesus first enumerates, Mk. 13:1-8, some general portents, by which the disciples can see that everything together, namely, the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world, is approaching; and these signa communia are: the arising of false Christs, wars and rumors of wars, commotion and uprising of the nations with earthquake, famine, etc., further the preaching of the gospel in the whole world for a testimony to all nations, Mk. 13:10, and finally, as prelude to the final drama, what takes place in Judea and Jerusalem, Mk.

13:14-23. Thereafter follow the portents immediately preceding the parousia, the signa propria, namely, darkening of sun and moon, falling down of the stars, movement of the powers in the heavens, Mk. 13:24, 25. With the parousia of Christ the judgment, the separation of good and evil, the consummation of the world, is then immediately connected, Mk. 13:26, 27. This corresponds to what Jesus says in Mt. 13:37-43 and 47-50; the growing up together of tares and wheat, and the bringing together of all kinds of fish, continues until the consummation of the ages, until the time of the harvest and of the judgment of the world. Jesus knows only two aeons, the present and the future. In the present age his disciples have nothing but tribulation and persecution to expect and must leave everything for his sake. Nowhere does Jesus predict to his disciples a glorious future on earth before the consummation of the world; on the contrary, as it went with him, so it will also go with his church; a disciple is not above his master and a servant not above his lord; only in the future age do his disciples receive everything back with eternal life, Mt. 5:3-12, 8:19, 20, 10:16-42, 16:24-27, 19:27-30, Joh. 16:2, 33, 17:14, 15 etc. When, then, the disciples in Hd. 1:6 ask Jesus whether he will at this time restore the kingdom to Israel, he does not deny it but tacitly concedes that this will happen once; yet he says that the Father has set the times or seasons for that in his own power, and that the disciples in this time have the calling, [459] to act as his witnesses from Jerusalem to the uttermost part of the earth. In this same spirit the whole New Testament speaks, which is written from the standpoint of the cross-church. The believers, who are not many wise and powerful and noble, 1 Cor. 1:27, have here on earth nothing but suffering and tribulation to expect, Rom. 8:36, Phil. 1:29, they are guests and strangers, Hebr. 11:13, their citizenship is in the heavens, Phil. 3:20, they do not look at the things which are seen, 2 Cor.

4:18, but set their mind on the things which are above, Col. 3:2, they have here no abiding city but seek the coming one, Hebr. 13:14. But they are nevertheless saved in hope, Rom. 8:24, and know that, if they suffer with Christ, they will also be glorified with him, Rom. 6:8, 8:17, Col. 3:4. Therefore with the whole groaning creation they stretch themselves out eagerly toward the future of Christ and toward the revelation of the glory of the children of God, Rom. 8:19, 1 Cor. 15:48v. etc., against which glory the suffering of the present time does not weigh up, Rom. 8:18, 2 Cor. 4:17. Nowhere in the N. Test. does any hope shine through that the church of Christ will yet once come here on earth to power and dominion. The highest that it imagines is that it may lead a quiet and tranquil life among the kings and all who are in high position in all godliness and propriety, Rom. 13:1v., 1 Tim. 2:2. And therefore the N. Test. does not in the first place commend those virtues which enable one to conquer the world, but, while avoiding all false asceticism, Rom. 14:14, 1 Tim. 4:4, 5, Tit. 1:15, names, as fruits of the Spirit, the virtues of love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, Gal. 5:22, Ef. 4:32, 1 Thess. 5:14v., 1 Petr. 3:8v., 2 Petr. 1:5-7, 1 Joh. 2:15 etc.

Even the continuing expectation of the N. Test. is that, as the gospel of the cross spreads, the enmity of the world also becomes manifest. Christ is destined to be for many unto a resurrection but also for many unto a fall and to bring their hostile deliberations to revelation; He has come into the world unto a crisis, in order that those who do not see may see and those who see may become blind, Mt. 21:44, Luk. 2:34, Joh. 3:19-21, 3:39, Rom. 9:32, 33, 1 Cor. 1:23, [460] 2 Cor. 2:16, Hebr. 4:12, 1 Petr. 2:7, 8. In the last times, in the days that precede the return of Christ, the godlessness of men will rise to a terrifying height; the days of Noah return; lust, love of pleasure,

debauchery, greed, unbelief, pride, mockery, blasphemy will break out in a dreadful manner, Mt. 24:37v., Luk. 17:26v., 2 Tim. 3:1, 2 Petr. 3:3, Jud. 18; also among the confessors the apostasy will be great; the temptation will become so powerful that it, if it were possible, would even bring the elect to a fall; love will grow cold in many and watchfulness will so decrease that the wise fall asleep with the foolish virgins; it will become such a general apostasy that Jesus can ask the question whether the Son of man at his coming will still find faith on earth, Mt. 24:24, 44v., 25:1v., Luk. 18:8, 1 Tim. 4:1. The book of the Revelation of John agrees with that. The letters to the seven churches do indeed treat concrete conditions, as they then existed in those churches, and are indeed addressed first of all to those churches, to exhort them to watchfulness and to prepare them for the impending persecutions and the return of Christ. But they nevertheless clearly have a much further scope. The sevenfold number, which in Revelation always has such great significance, already points to that; it is the number of perfection and makes the seven churches, which have here been selected from the many churches in Asia Minor, appear as types of the whole Christian church. The letters, addressed by John to her, did not first exist separately, and were not each by itself first sent to the respective church, but they belong together, have been composed together and joined to one another, and are addressed to the whole church; whoever has ears, let him hear what the Spirit says to all the churches. But even though the letters thus undoubtedly have a significance that extends much further than to the seven named, then existing in Asia Minor, yet this does not lie in this, that they would describe successive periods in the history of Jesus' church and would be a small compendium of the whole church history. But they depict ecclesiastical conditions that were then present and that are at the same time

typical for the whole church of Christ, which thus can occur repeatedly in the church and which especially [461] will return at the end of the days. For it is clear that they are all written under the impression of the impending persecution and the speedy return of Christ. All of them contain a reference to the parousia, and with a view to that exhort the churches to watchfulness and faithfulness. They serve to call back to the first love the Christianity that was becoming more and more conformed to the world, to awaken it out of indifference, and with a view to the crown that awaits it, to gird it for the struggle and to cause it to persevere with unbroken faithfulness unto death. For the day of the Lord draws near; after John has first described the conditions that in his time, and later, especially toward the end of the world, exist in the church of Christ, he proceeds to mention what will happen after this, 4:1. The book of God's decree of counsel concerning the end of things is opened in heaven by the Lamb, chapters 4 and 5, and in particular that is shown by an angel to John, what has reference to the very last time, chapter 10, and concerns all peoples of the earth, 10:11. Alternately John now transports us on earth and in heaven. In heaven, there everything is already decided and determined, there honor is already brought to God and the Lamb, as if the struggle were already fought and the victory achieved, chapters 4 and 5; there the souls of the martyrs are already clothed in long white garments and wait only for the fulfillment of their number, 6:9-11; there John already sees proleptically the whole multitude of the redeemed standing before the throne, 7:9-19; there the prayers of the saints have already been heard by God, 8:1-4; there have already, also proleptically, been taken up the 144000, who were sealed, 7:1-8, who as firstfruits go before the others, 14:1-5, and have achieved the victory over the beast and his image, 15:1-4; there the whole multitude of the redeemed already brings

glory and honor to God, because the wedding of the Lamb has come, 19:1-8. The church on earth therefore need not be afraid of the judgments with which God visits the world at the end. The 144000 servants of God out of all tribes of the children of Israel are sealed beforehand, 7:1-8; the temple and the altar and those who worship therein are not given over to the Gentiles and the two witnesses, who have prophesied there, are indeed killed but also raised and taken up into heaven [462] , 11:1-12, and the Christian church, though for Christ's sake persecuted by Satan, finds in the wilderness a place of refuge, 12:1-14. In principle the struggle is already decided. For Christ has been taken up into heaven, 12:5; and Satan has been overcome by Michael and his angels and cast out of heaven onto earth, 12:7-11. Now he has on earth only a short time, 12:12. But that time he makes use of. He causes the arising of the beast out of the sea or the abyss, 13:1, 11:7, 17:8, and gives it power and glory. This beast is the Roman empire, 13:1-10, is supported by another beast, the beast of the earth, that is, the false prophet, the false religion, the antichrist, 13:11-18, realizes itself fully in one person, who himself therefore can be called the beast, 13:3, 12, 18, 17:8, 10, 11 and has its center in the city Babylon, that is Rome, the great whore, which rules over all peoples, chapters 17 and 18. But all this development of power is vain. By the opening of the seven seals, by the blowing of the seven trumpets, by the pouring out of the seven bowls God reveals his wrath, visits nature and humanity with his judgments, and prepares the final judgment. First Babel falls, chapter 18. Then Christ appears, 19:11-16, overcomes the beast out of the sea and the beast of the earth, 19-21 and soon also Satan, 20:1-3.

9. Now it is very strange that this final victory over Satan takes place in two tempos. First he is bound for a thousand years and cast into the abyss,

and thereafter he again seduces the peoples, wages war against the congregation, and is then overcome for good and cast into the lake of fire and sulphur, 20:1-10. The advocates of Chiliasm find, apart from in the Old Testament, in this pericope their strongest support, and the opponents are in no small measure embarrassed by it and have tried all their exegetical art upon it. The thought that after the victory over the world-kingdom yet a final attack of the peoples had to be repelled is undoubtedly borrowed by John from Ezekiel. This prophet expects that Israel, after it will have returned into its land and will dwell there securely, will yet once be attacked by Gog from the land Magog, prince of Rosch, Meschech and [463] Tubal, that is, by the people of the Scythians, in connection with all sorts of other peoples from the north, east and south. The attack ends, however, with this, that God himself will destroy these peoples upon the mountains of Israel in his wrath, c. 38 and 39. In hoofdst. 38:17 the Lord says that He has already earlier spoken of those peoples through the service of his prophets. And indeed earlier prophets already proclaimed that not only those historical peoples, in whose midst Israel lived and with whom it came into contact, but also all far-dwelling Heathens would be judged by the Lord in his day, Joel 2:32, 3:2, 11v., Mich. 4:5, 11, 5:6-8, Jes. 25:5-8, 26:21, Jer. 12:14-16, 30:23, 24. Very clearly similar prophecy occurs with Zechariah, who in hoofdst. 12-14 sketches how toward the day of the Lord Jerusalem will be besieged by the peoples, and these will then be judged by the Lord. And Daniel sees not only in Antiochus Epiphanes the embodiment of the God-hostile world-kingdom, but also expects that this God-hostile power will yet once exalt itself and thus become ripe for judgment, 11:40v. Twofold, therefore, was the expectation of prophecy, first of a victory of the people of God over the peoples, in whose midst it dwelt, and thereafter of a triumph

over the peoples, who up to now had not yet appeared upon the stage of world history. This double expectation passed over into the apocryphal literature, Schürer, Gesch. des jüd. Volkes II3 532. 551, but also into the New Testament. Naturally the first expectation stands in the foreground. The appearance of Christ awakens the antichristian principle. Jesus speaks of ψευδοπροφηται and ψευδοχριστοι, who will set themselves over against Him and his kingdom, Mt. 7:15, 24:5, 24, Mk. 13:21, 22, Luk. 17:23. In order to temper the impatience of the Thessalonians in their expectation of Jesus' speedy return, Paul points out in 2 Thess. 2 that that day of Christ does not dawn unless first the apostasy comes and the man of sin is revealed. This one cannot now yet come, because there is something that restrains him. Indeed at present also already active is το μυστηριον της ἀνομιας, but yet the man of sin cannot come before he who restrains him is taken out of the midst. Thereafter only will the ἀνομος be revealed, but also immediately be brought to nothing by Jesus. The Apocalypse sees the antichristian power [464] embodied in the beast from the sea, that is, the Roman empire, which has the city of Rome as centre and a definite emperor as head, and besides that in the beast of the earth, that is, the false prophecy, which seduces to homage of the world-kingdom and its emperor. This opponent of Christ John then in his letters is the first to call with the name of αντιχριστος, in 1 Joh. 2:18 probably even without article; and he sees his essence realized in those who in principle deny the coming of Christ in the flesh, 1 Joh. 2:22. 4:2, 3, 2 Joh. 7. The representations of the antichrist in Scripture are thus different. Daniel sees his type in Antiochus Epiphanes; Jesus loosens the antichristian principle from the Old-Test. opposition of Israel and the peoples and sees it embodied in many false Christs and many false prophets, who will arise after and against Him; Paul lets the man of sin

arise out of a general apostasy and calls him the ἄνομος and the ἀντικειμενος, namely of Christ, but also depicts him, with traits borrowed from Daniel, as the one who exalts himself above everything that is called God and that is venerated by men, so that he in God's temple seats himself as a God and presents himself as a God. John in his letters deems the antichrist to have come in the heretics of his days. And the Apocalypse sees his power develop in the world-kingdom, which is supported by the false prophecy. From that it appears that with the antichrist one must not think exclusively of one person or of a group of persons, e.g. the heretics of the first centuries, the Roman empire, Nero, the Jews, Mohammed, the pope, Napoleon etc. Scripture teaches clearly that the antichristian power has its history, in different times reveals itself in different ways and finally develops itself fully in a general falling-away and breaking of all natural and moral bonds, which now still hold back such an apostasy, and then embodies itself in a world-kingdom, which takes the false church into service and in the deification of the head of that kingdom apotheosizes itself. To this antichristian power in its highest and last development Christ himself then by his appearance makes an end. Cf. the more recent litt. on the antichrist: Lünemann in his comm. on Thess., 3te Aufl. S. 219-225. Rinck, Die Lehre der H. S. von Antichrist. 1867. Boehmer, [465] Zur Lehre vom Antichrist, Jahrb. f. d. Th. 1859 S. 405-467 F. Philippi, Die bibl. kirchl. Lehre v. Antichrist 1877. Kliefoth, Eschatologie 205 f. Renan, L'antéchrist 1877. Bousset, Der Antichrist 1877. Wadstein, Die eschatol. Ideengruppe Antichrist, Weltsabbat, Weltende und Weltgericht, Leipzig 1896. Ebbes, Der Antichrist in den Schriften des N. T. (Theol. Arb. aus d. rhein. westf. Pred. Verein. N. F. Heft 1 S. 1-57). Art. in Herzog3 van Seuffert.

But with that the complete victory has not yet been achieved. The antichristian principle can, of course, appear only among those nations that have known the gospel and in the end have rejected it in conscious and deliberate enmity. But there have always been, there are still, and there will be until the end of days, peoples who, like severed branches, stand outside the history and the culture of humanity. Jesus does indeed say, Mt. 24:14, that the end comes only after the gospel has been preached in the whole inhabited world as a testimony to all nations. But this prophecy nevertheless does not include that Christianity will once be the dominant religion among all peoples, or that it will be known to every human being, head by head; for history teaches that millions of people and many peoples, even in the centuries after Christ's coming to earth, have died out without having had any knowledge of the gospel. But Jesus' word only implies that the preaching of the gospel will penetrate to all peoples and in no way determines precisely the degree in which, nor the boundary up to which, this will take place. The prophecy is also not fulfilled all at once but successively through the course of the centuries, so that many peoples who formerly walked in the light of the gospel have later again been deprived of it. While in this nineteenth century the gospel is spreading among the Heathen, among the Christian peoples apostasy increases by leaps and bounds. And therefore it is more than probable that toward the time of the parousia again many peoples on earth will be deprived of the knowledge of Christ. And with this fact the twentieth chapter of John's Revelation reckons. Because there there is mention of a thousand-year binding of Satan and of a living and reigning during that time of the martyrs with Christ, many have thought that here clearly and incontrovertibly the so-called thousand-year kingdom was [466] taught. But in fact this is an explaining of

Op. 20, not according to the analogy of Scripture, but according to the analogy of apocryphal literature. Op. 20 contains in itself nothing of all that belongs to the essence of the chiliastic faith. For, 1o with not a single word is mention made of a conversion and a return of the Jews, of a rebuilding of the city of Jerusalem, of a restoration of temple and worship, of an initial renewal of the earth. Rather, all this is excluded. For even if the 144000 in chap. 7 were to be understood of the pleroma from Israel and were distinct from those in 14:1, then thereby nothing else and nothing more would be meant than that also many Christians from the Jews will stand firm in the great tribulation and will occupy a place of their own among the multitude before God's throne; but it is absolutely not said that they will rise and dwell in Jerusalem. The Christians are the true Jews, and the Jews who harden themselves in their unbelief are a synagogue of Satan, 2:9. Even if perhaps the earthly Jerusalem is still once or twice called the holy city and the temple there the temple of God, 11:1, 2, yet that Jerusalem is in a spiritual sense called Sodom and Egypt, 11:8; the true Jerusalem is above, 3:12, 21:2, 10, and there also is the temple of God, 3:12, 7:15, 11:19 etc., and the ark, 11:19 and the altar, 6:9, 8:3, 5, 9:13, 14:18, 16:7. And that Jerusalem does not descend to earth already in Op. 20 but only in Op. 21. 2o The living and reigning of the believers who remained faithful in the great tribulation takes place not on earth but in heaven. Of the earth there is not a word. John sees the angel who binds Satan come up out of heaven, 20:1; the thrones which he beholds, 20:4, are located in heaven, 4:4, 11:16; and the souls of the martyrs are seen by John here, 20:4, just as everywhere else in heaven, 6:9, 7:9, 14, 15, 11:12, 14:1-5, 18:20, 19:1-8. The believers have already on earth been made by Christ to God kings and priests, 1:6; they are this in heaven, 5:10, and expect that they will once also be this on

earth, 5:10, but this expectation is fulfilled only in the new Jerusalem, which descends from above; then they will be kings unto eternity, 22:5. Now, however, in heaven, their kingship is temporary; it lasts a thousand years. 3o Nor does John know of a [467] first bodily resurrection, which would precede the thousand-year kingdom, and a second, which would follow it. Nowhere in Scripture is such a first resurrection taught. There is indeed mention of a spiritual resurrection from sin, Joh. 4:25, 26, Rom. 6:4 etc. There is also an ἀναστασις ἐκ νεκρων, which looks to some cases, such as the resurrection of Christ, 1 Petr. 1:3, cf. Hd. 26:23, 1 Cor. 15:23, or has reference only to the believers, Luk. 20:35, 36, Hd. 4:2, but in this case is absolutely not temporally distinguished by a thousand-year kingdom from the general αναστασις νεκρων, Mt. 22:31, Joh. 5:28, 29, Hd. 24:15, 1 Cor. 15:13, 42. To be sure, one has thought to find this in 1 Cor. 15:20-28 and 1 Thess. 4:13-18, but wrongly. In 1 Cor. 15:20-28 Paul very certainly deals only with the resurrection of the believers, while he does not speak at all here of that of the ungodly and does not need to speak of it; but of that resurrection of the believers he says clearly that it will take place at the parousia of Christ and that thereafter the end will be, in which He hands over the kingdom to the Father, vs. 23, 24. One could from this passage by itself indeed infer that there is no resurrection of the ungodly according to Paul, but it is impossible that this is separated by a thousand-year kingdom from that of the believers. For upon the resurrection of the believers the end follows immediately and the handing over of the kingdom, because all enemies have been conquered and the last enemy, that is death, has been done away with. Nor is there anything of such a first, bodily resurrection of the believers in 1 Thess. 4:13-18. In Thessalonica one became uneasy about the lot of those who had died in Christ. Of what nature that uneasiness was,

we do not know. The Chiliasts think that the Thessalonians did not doubt the resurrection and the eternal life of those fallen asleep in Christ, but that they believed in two resurrections, one before and one after the thousand-year kingdom, and were now concerned that the believers already dead would rise only at the second resurrection and thus would have no part in the glory of the thousand-year kingdom. But this opinion is far-fetched and finds absolutely no support in the text; if there were a first resurrection of the believers, one would precisely expect that the congregation in Thessalonica would not make itself anxious about the lot of the dead, [468] for these would then precisely share in the privilege of that first resurrection. And if one answers that precisely in Thessalonica one did not know that there was a first resurrection of the believers, then the apostle could have told them that simply with a few words. But he does not do that at all; he does not speak of a first and a second resurrection; he only argues that the believers who at Jesus' coming have remained alive will have no advantage over those who have already earlier fallen asleep in Christ. In what the Thessalonians thought that the latter would fall behind the former is unknown to us. But this also does not matter; the fact stands firm that one judged so in Thessalonica. And over against that Paul now says that this is not the case, for God will, by means of Jesus, who will raise them, cause the sleeping believers to be at once with Him (with Jesus) in His coming, so that He as it were brings them along, and the believers remaining alive will absolutely not be ahead of them, for the resurrection of the dead precedes, and thereafter all believers, both the risen and the changed believers, together are caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord. The text thus contains nothing of a first and a second resurrection. If now nowhere in Scripture such a twofold resurrection occurs, one will do well not to find it all too

quickly in Op. 20. And in fact it does not occur there either. There in verse 4 and 5 only this is stated, that the souls of the believers who remained faithful in the great tribulation live and reign as kings with Christ a thousand years and that this is the first resurrection. John says clearly that he saw the souls, τας ψυχας, of the martyrs, cf. 6:9, and makes no mention of a resurrection of their bodies. He further says that those souls did not rise or were raised or entered into life, but that they lived and that they at once lived and reigned as kings with Christ a thousand years. He further speaks of the rest of the dead, οἱ λοιποι των νεκρων, and thus presupposes that the believers whose souls he saw in heaven also still in a certain sense belong to the dead, but nevertheless lived and reigned; over against that he says of the rest of the dead, not, as it stands in the Statenvertaling, that they did not become alive again, but that they did not live, οὐκ ἐζησαν. And finally he adds with emphasis that this living and reigning of the [469] souls of the faithful believers in contrast with the not living of the rest of the dead is the first resurrection. One feels as it were the contrast: that is not the first resurrection, which was assumed by some, already also in John's days, as if a bodily resurrection of the believers would precede the thousand-year kingdom; but the first resurrection consists in the living and reigning of the faithful believers in heaven with Christ. The believers to whom John writes and who will soon face the tribulation must not think that they will first be saved at the end of days. No, blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from now on, ἀπαρτι, 14:13; they receive at once rest from their labors; they are immediately crowned at their death; they live and reign with Christ in heaven from the first moment after their death; and therefore they can go encouraged to meet the tribulation, the crown of life lies ready for them, 2:10. John repeats here, 20:4, 5, in brief, what he earlier wrote to the seven

churches. The promises which there were given to the believers, if they persevered to the end, all came down to this, that he who overcomes would be crowned. He who overcomes receives to eat of the tree of life, 2:7, of the hidden manna, 2:17, receives power over the Heathen, 2:26, receives the morning star, 2:28, is clothed with white garments, 3:5, is made into a pillar in God's temple, 3:12, holds supper with Jesus, 3:20. In one word, he who overcomes, I will give him to sit with me in my throne, 2:21. What John first saw in the promise, he now sees in chap. 20 in the fulfillment; they who remain faithful unto death live and reign at once with Christ in His throne in heaven; and that is the first resurrection. But John adds something more to it, and thereby confirms the explanation given above. Namely, he says: blessed and holy is he who has part in the first resurrection; over him the second death has no power, but they will be priests of God and of Christ, and will reign with Him the thousand years. The second death is according to 20:14 nothing else than being cast into the lake of fire. Whatever now the lot of the rest of the dead mentioned in vs. 5 may be, in any case the faithful believers who live and reign with Christ are safeguarded against that second death. They already have the crown of life and already eat of the manna of life, and therefore need not fear the later following judgment; he who overcomes will not be harmed by the second death, which enters in at the final judgment, 2:11. If John understood the first resurrection in a chiliastic sense, as a bodily resurrection of the believers before the thousand-year kingdom, then he would not have needed to give such a consolation to the believers. He could then have contented himself with saying that they would rise even before the thousand-year kingdom. But no, the believers remain in a certain sense belonging to the dead until the final judgment; yet no need, if they persevere to the end, then

they are at once crowned and can, even though the first death still rules over their bodies, not be harmed by the second death.

10. Against this explanation one may, however, object that John nevertheless clearly speaks of a thousand-year dominion of the believers with Christ, be it also in heaven, and that he places this after the return of Christ, 19:11-16, and the fall of the world-kingdom and of the false prophet, 19:20. Yet this objection does not weigh as heavily as it seems. For 1o the placing of the vision in Rev. 20 after that in chap. 19 in itself by no means at all decides the chronological order. In general the art of the word, in distinction e.g. from the art of painting, can relate that which takes place simultaneously only successively, the one after the other. Scripture makes no exception here and often relates one after another what in reality occurs alongside one another. With the prophets it happens many times that they successively see and describe what takes place simultaneously or even in an entirely different order, or will take place. Especially is that, as is more and more recognized, the case in the book of Revelation. The letters to the seven churches are not descriptions of ecclesiastical conditions following one another in that same order. The seven seals, the seven trumpets, and the seven bowls form no chronological series but run parallel and lead us each time to the end, to the last struggle of the antichristian power. And thus there is in itself nothing against assuming that what is related in Rev. 20 runs parallel with the [471] events of the earlier chapters. 2o It must be acknowledged that John, with the world-kingdom that he depicts, thinks of the Roman imperium. Prophecy, in the Old and also in the New Testament, does not move high in the air but stands on historical ground and sees in the concrete powers, in whose midst it lives, the struggle embodied of the world-kingdom against the kingdom of God. The book of Daniel e.g. runs

up to Antiochus Epiphanes and sees in him the personification of the enmity against God and his people. And so also John derives the features for his world-kingdom from the Roman empire of his days. Although all that was written before was also written for our instruction, yet the Revelation of John is in the first place a book of consolation for the church under the cross of his time, to urge her to perseverance in the struggle and to encourage her by the sight of the crown that awaits her. If John for himself thought that in the Roman empire the very last development of the world-kingdom had appeared and that Christ would come within a few years to put an end to it, then there would be nothing unusual to be found in that, nothing that would be in conflict with the spirit of prophecy. We are not bound to John's personal opinion, but to the word of his prophecy; and the prophecy, which casts its light over history, is in its turn also explained and unveiled by history. 3o If John really for himself believed that the Roman empire would be brought to nothing within a few years by the appearance of Christ, then in any case he thought that the history of the world was not thereby finished, for in that case there would be no place for the dominion of the believers with Christ in heaven alongside it and this would have to begin only after that time. But this zeitgeschichtliche conception, however much truth it may contain, does not reproduce the complete thought of John's Revelation. For it clearly appears that in chap. 19 the history of the world has reached its end. Babylon has fallen, chap. 18, God reigns as king, 19:6, the marriage of the Lamb has come, 19:7-9, Christ has appeared, 19:11-16, the last battle of all the kings of the earth and of their armies has been fought, 19:17-19, the world-kingdom and the false prophet have been destroyed and cast into [472] the lake of fire, which as the second death is first opened after the judgment, 19:20, cf. 20:14, and the rest were killed,

19:21. The 19th chapter thus clearly runs through to that same world-end that is depicted in 20:10-15. There is no material left for the continuation of world history. The zeitgeschichtliche exegesis leaves the origin of the peoples, who appear in 20:3, 8, unexplained or otherwise comes into conflict with 19:17-21. But just as the letters to the seven churches and likewise the seven seals, trumpets, and bowls first of all refer to the conditions and events in John's days yet then have a further scope for the church of all ages and for the whole history of the world, so it also holds of the world-kingdom depicted in Revelation that it has its type in the Roman empire of the first centuries but in it nevertheless does not yet receive its full realization. It rises up again and again and must always anew succumb to the appearance of Christ, until it finally exerts its utmost powers, exhausts itself in a last gigantic struggle, and then is destroyed forever by the coming of Christ. 4o If this conception is correct, the vision of John 20 does not intend to relate to us what in chronological order after the events that occurred in Rev. 19 will happen, but it has an independent place and reports to us what runs parallel with the preceding. There are namely two kinds of end of the history of the world to relate, one of the historical peoples, among whom Christianity appears, and another of the wild peoples, who, as Rev. 20:8 so clearly says, dwell in the four corners of the earth, and thus have lived outside the center of the history and the culture of humanity. Among the former only the world-kingdom and the false prophecy could appear, for antichristianity presupposes familiarity with the gospel; these bring it only to a savage attack on the church of Christ. But it is nevertheless the same Satan who works there and here. Each time that he is pushed back and defeated among the culture-bearing peoples, he organizes in the wild peoples a new instrument for the struggle against

Christ. First he is cast out of heaven; thereafter he works on earth and there sets up his world-kingdom against Christ; and finally he causes the wild peoples to appear on the breadth of the earth, to fight the last battle against Christ. But all this not in a time-reckoning but [473] in a logical, spiritual sense. 5o The thousand years are a symbolic number, as is now generally acknowledged; they stand over against the few days during which the faithful believers here on earth have been oppressed and persecuted, 12:14, but also over against the completed glory, which is eternal, 22:5. They are an indication of the holy, blessed rest of the deceased believers in heaven with Christ and at the same time of the longing with which they look out for the day of the avenging of their blood, 6:9, while on earth the struggle of world-kingdom and world of peoples against Christ still continues. And when John then in Rev. 20:1-9 has related the history of the wild peoples up to that end to which also that of the culture-bearing peoples in 19:17-21 has run out, then the thread of both visions is taken up and the very last end of the entire world history is related. There, in 19:21, the people were killed by the sword of Christ; here in 20:9, they are consumed by fire from heaven. But after world-kingdom, false prophet, and Satan have been condemned and cast into the lake, 19:20, 20:10, all the dead rise and are judged according to their works, 20:11-15.

11. The doctrine of Scripture developed thus far clearly brings to light that the course and the outcome of world history are quite different from what people usually imagine. If anywhere, then it applies above all with respect to the end of things, that God's ways are higher than our ways, and his thoughts higher than our thoughts. The kingdom of God, although like a mustard seed and a leaven and a seed that sprouts and grows long without the knowledge and doing of man, Mt. 13:31, 33, Mk. 4:27, nevertheless

does not reach its completion in the way of gradual development or of an ethical process. Rather, the history of humanity, both among the culture-bearing and among the cultureless peoples, according to the incontrovertible testimony of Scripture, runs out into a general apostasy and into a dreadful final struggle of all satanic powers against God and his kingdom. But then the end is also there; the world, in time and with the power granted to it by God, has done nothing other than, as in the days of Noah, make itself ripe for judgment; at the height of its power, [474] it suddenly collapses at the appearance of Christ. A catastrophe, a drastic act of God, finally puts an end to the dominion of Satan here on earth and brings about the completion of the immovable kingdom of the heavens. As with the believer perfection is not the fruit of a slowly progressing sanctification but enters in immediately after death for them, so also the perfecting of humanity and world does not come about gradually but suddenly through the appearance of Christ. Specifically it is Christ, who has been appointed by the Father to bring an end to the history of humanity and world. And he has been appointed to that, because he is the Savior, the perfect Savior. The labor that he accomplished on earth is only a part of the great work of redemption that he has undertaken; and the time that he spent here is only a small portion of the ages over which he has been appointed as Lord and King. Anointed from eternity by the Father, he began at once to exercise his prophetic, priestly, and kingly activity after sin had come into the world; he continued that activity through all the revolving ages; and he will once complete it at the end of the times. What he acquired on earth through his suffering and death, that he applies from heaven through the power of his word and the working of his Spirit; and what he has thus applied, that he maintains and protects against all attacks of Satan, in order

once at the end to present it, wholly perfect, without spot or wrinkle, to his Father, who is in the heavens. The return of Christ for judgment is therefore not an arbitrary addition that can be detached from his preceding work and set by itself; but it forms a necessary, indispensable constituent of that work, it brings that work to its completion and sets the crown upon it; it is the last and highest step in the state of his exaltation. Because Christ is the Savior of the world, he once returns as its Judge; the κρισις, which he brought about by his first coming, he completes at his second coming; the Father gave him power, to κρισιν ποιειν, because he is Son of man, Joh. 5:27. Eschatology therefore is rooted in Christology and is itself Christology, doctrine of the final, perfect triumph of Christ and of his kingdom over all his enemies. Even [475] we can with Scripture go back still further. The Son is not only on account of sin mediator reconciliationis, but also apart from sin mediator unionis between God and his creature. He is not only the causa exemplaris, but also the causa finalis of creation; the world has in the Son its foundation and example and therefore it has in him also its goal; it has been created through him and also unto him, Col. 1:16. Because creation is his work, it cannot and may not remain a prey of Satan; the Son is Head, Lord, and Heir of all things. Summed up in the Son, gathered under him as Head, the creatures return again to the Father, the fountain of all good things, part II 408. The second coming of Christ is thus demanded by his first; it is included in this, flows from it in due time necessarily, brings it to its full effect and completion and was therefore by the Old Test. prophecy comprehended with the first coming in one image. And not only does the second coming hang together with the first ideally and logically, but there also exists between the two a real connection. As the Old Testament was a continual coming of God to his people, until he in

Christ came to dwell bodily among them; so also the dispensation of the New Testament is an always continuing coming of Christ to his inheritance, in order finally to take it into his possession for good. Christ is not only the one who in the days of the Old Test. would come and in the fullness of time has come; but he is also the coming one, ὁ ἐρχομενος, and the one who will come, ὁ ἐρχομενος ἠξει, Hebr. 10:37, cf. Op. 1:4, 8 etc. The second coming of Christ is the complement of the first.

12. This ideal and real connection of Christ's first and second coming also explains the manner in which the N. Test. speaks about the time of his parousia. A whole series of passages places this parousia very near. Jesus immediately links the prophecy of the consummation of the ages to that of the destruction of Jerusalem, Mt. 24:29 c. parall. Paul considers it possible that he and his fellow-believers will still experience the parousia of Christ, 1 Thess. 4:15, 1 Cor. 15:51. And all the apostles say that they are in the last time, that the coming of the Lord is near, and derive from that an urgent exhortation to watchfulness, Rom. 13:11, 1 Cor. 10:11, Hebr. 3:14, [476] 6:11, 10:25, 37, Jak. 5:7-9, 1 Petr. 1:6, 20, 4:17, 5:10, 1 Joh. 2:18, Op. 1:3, 3:11, 20, 22:7, 10, 12, 20. In the interpretation of this Newtest. expectation concerning the speedy return of Christ, error has been made both on the one side and on the other. The N. Testament contains absolutely no doctrine about the time of Christ's return. It in no way establishes that that return will take place still before or immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem. Indeed, this has been derived by many from Mt. 10:23, 16:28, 24:34, 26:64 c. parall., but wrongly. For it is not open to any reasonable doubt that Jesus spoke of his coming in different senses. In Joh. 14:18-24, cf. 16:16-24 he speaks to his disciples of his coming in the Spirit after the day of Pentecost or, according to other interpreters, of his coming after the

resurrection, when he will again appear to his disciples for a short time. In Mt. 26:64 Jesus before the high council not only confirmed his Messiahship with an oath, but he also said that he would convince them of this, in that they would from now on, ἀπαρτι, see him sitting at the right hand of God's power and would see him coming on the clouds of heaven. Such a coming in his glory is also spoken of elsewhere. Mt. 16:28, cf. Mk. 9:1, Luk. 9:27, raises this above all objection. Jesus says there that some of those standing around him will not taste death until they have seen the Son of man coming in his kingdom. Immediately before that he had admonished them to be especially intent on the salvation of the soul; and he pressed this admonition by saying that the Son of man would come, clothed with divine glory, and would then repay each according to his works. But so long, he adds in vs. 28, as it were by way of explanation, this will not even last, for even before all those standing around him have died, the Son of man already comes in his kingdom, ἐν τῃ βασιλειᾳ αὐτου, that is, with the royal power and dignity which the Father will give him. For by his resurrection and ascension Christ is appointed by the Father as Head, King, Lord, Hd. 2:33, 5:31; and from that moment on he continually comes in his royal dignity, in proportion as his kingdom is founded and extended on earth. And therefore in Mk. 9:1 and Luk. 9:27 the expression is thus explained, [477] that many will not taste death until they have seen the kingdom of God or have seen it come in power. In the same way Mt. 10:23 is to be explained: the disciples would not have completed their journey through the cities of Israel until the Son of man should come; although the coming is not further explained here at all, the parousia nevertheless cannot possibly be meant, since Jesus would then come into contradiction with himself; in Mt. 24 he in any case has his parousia follow upon the destruction of Jerusalem. How long after

this dreadful event it would take place is not said by Jesus. Indeed he immediately ties it in his prophecy to the fall of Jerusalem; the translation of εὐθεως in Mt. 24:29 by suddenly instead of by immediately, also advocated by van Leeuwen, De Parousie-verwachting in het N. T. Utrecht 1898 bl. 37, makes no change in that, for it is clearly added that the signs of the parousia will begin εὐθεως after the tribulation of those days, in those days, after that tribulation, Mk. 13:24, cf. Luk. 21:25-27. This is confirmed by Mt. 24:34 cf. Mk. 13:29, Luk. 21:32, where Jesus says that this generation will not pass away until all these things have happened. The words ἡ γενεα αὐτη cannot be understood of the people of the Jews, but undoubtedly refer to the generation then living, cf. Cremer s. v. On the other hand it is clear that the words παντα ταυτα do not include the parousia itself, but only refer to the signs that precede and announce it. For after Jesus has predicted the destruction of Jerusalem and the portents and his return and even the gathering of his elect by the angels, and thus has actually ended his eschatological discourse, he proceeds in verse 32 to apply it practically and says that, just as the sprouting of the leaves on the fig tree announces the summer, so also παντα ταυτα are portents of the fact that the end is near or that the Messiah is near at the door. Here παντα ταυτα without any doubt refers to the portents of the parousia, not to this itself, for otherwise it would be absurd to say that, when παντα ταυτα will happen, the end is only near. In verse 34 the words παντα ταυτα have the same sense; and Jesus therefore does not say that his parousia will still take place within the time of the generation now living, [478] but that its portents and announcements, such as would be seen in the destruction of Jerusalem and the events taking place therewith, would still begin within the time of the generation now living. And of that Jesus is so certain that he says that

heaven and earth will indeed pass away, but that his words will by no means pass away. But otherwise Jesus refrains from all further determination of time. It is not his concern to make his disciples know the exact moment of his parousia, but to urge them to watchfulness. And therefore he does not say when he will come, but what the signs of the times are that announce his coming. Paying attention to the signs of the times is a duty for Jesus' disciples; calculating the exact time of his coming is forbidden to them and also impossible. The first requires that Jesus let his light fall on the events that will take place; and so he does, just as before him all the prophets and after him all his apostles have done. Therefore he also does not say that many centuries would still elapse between the destruction of Jerusalem and his parousia; that would at once have again rendered the admonition to watchfulness powerless. Just as prophecy at all times does, Jesus announces in the events of his time the approach of the end. And the apostles follow his example and depict for us in heresy and lie, in the judgments and judicial acts, in Jerusalem's fall and Rome's imperium the forerunners of Christ's return and the initial fulfillment of his prophecy. For all believers ought at all times to live as if the coming of Christ were imminent. Die Nähe der Parusie ist gewissermaassen nur ein anderer Ausdruck für die absolute Gewissheit derselben, Baldensperger bij Holtzmann, Neut. Theol. I 312. But therefore also the second, that is, the calculating of the exact moment of the parousia, is not becoming to Christians. For Jesus has intentionally left this wholly undecided. His coming will be sudden, unexpected, surprising like that of a thief in the night, Mt. 24:43, Luk. 12:39, cf. like a snare, Luk. 21:35. Many things must happen before the end is there, Mt. 24:6. The gospel must be preached in the whole world, Mt. 24:14. The bridegroom delays and the lord of the servants departed abroad

for a long time, Mt. 25:5, 13, 19. [479] Weeds and wheat must grow up together until the day of harvest, Mt. 13:30. The mustard seed must become a tree, and the leaven must leaven everything, Mt. 13:32, 33. Yes, Jesus expressly says, on the occasion that he deals with his parousia, that the day and the hour of his coming is known to no one, to angels nor men, yes not even to the Son, Mk. 13:32, and testifies even after his resurrection that the Father has set the times and occasions for the establishment of his kingdom in his power, Hd. 1:7. And likewise all the apostles speak; Christ comes as a thief in the night, 1 Thess. 5:1, 2, 2 Petr. 3:10, Op. 3:3, 16:15; he does not appear until after the antichrist has first come, 2 Thess. 2:2v.; the resurrection takes place in a fixed order, first that of Christ, thereafter that of the believers at his coming, 1 Cor. 15:23; and that coming delays, because the Lord has another standard for time than we do and in his longsuffering wills that all come to repentance, 2 Petr. 3:8, 9.

Just as soberly as about the time, Holy Scripture speaks about the manner of Jesus' return. The second coming of Christ is in the N. T. often designated by the name of παρουσια, either absolutely, Mt. 24:3, or more closely defined as παρουσια του υἱου του ἀνθρωπου or παρουσια του κυριου ἡμων Ιησου Χριστου, Mt. 24:27, 37, 39, 1 Thess. 3:13, 4:15, 5:23 etc., or παρουσια της του θεου ἡμερας, 2 Petr. 3:12. The word properly does not include the concept of return, but indicates that Jesus, after having been absent and hidden for a time, Hd. 3:21, Col. 3:3, 4, and thereafter having come anew, Mt. 16:27, 24:30 etc., cf. Luk. 19:12, 15, will again be present and in attendance and will then remain present. Therefore it also alternates with ἐπιφανεια, Mt. 24:30, 1 Tim. 6:14, Tit. 2:13, ἀποκαλυψις, Luk. 17:30, 1 Cor. 1:7, 2 Thess. 1:7, 1 Petr. 1:7, 13, φανερωσις, Col. 3:4, 1 Petr. 5:4, 1 Joh. 2:28; in 2 Thess. 2:8 there is even mention of ἡ ἐπιφανεια

της παρουσιας αὐτου. This parousia is a work of God, insofar as he will send his Christ and for that determines the times and occasions, Hd. 1:7, 3:20, 1 Tim. 6:14-16, but it is also an act of Christ himself, as Son of man, to whom by the Father the judgment has been given and who as king must reign, until all enemies are laid under his feet [480], Joh. 5:27, 1 Cor. 15:25. Because at his departure from the earth he was taken up into heaven, at his parousia he comes again from heaven, Phil. 3:20, 1 Thess. 1:10, 2 Thess. 1:7, Op. 19:11; and just as a cloud at his ascension took him up and hid him from the sight of his disciples, Hd. 1:9, so in Old Testament language he is also described as returning on clouds of heaven, which as a chariot of triumph bear him hither to this earth, Mt. 24:30, 26:64, Mk. 13:26, 14:62, Luk. 21:27, Op. 1:7, 14:14. For he does not return in the form of a servant, but with great power and with his and his Father's glory, Mt. 16:27, 24:30, Mk. 8:38, 13:26, Luk. 22:27, Col. 3:3, 4, 2 Thess. 1:9, 10, Tit. 2:13, as a King of kings and Lord of lords, Op. 17:14, 19:11-16, surrounded by his angels, Mt. 16:27, 25:31, Mk. 8:38, Luk. 9:26, 2 Thess. 1:7, Op. 19:14, by his saints, among whom perhaps also the already blessed are included, 1 Thess. 3:13, 2 Thess. 1:10, Jud. 14. Although his parousia, because of the unexpected, corresponds with the breaking in of a thief in the night, it will nevertheless be visible for all people over the whole earth, will be like a lightning flash that gives light from the one side of heaven to the other, Mt. 24:27, Luk. 17:24, Op. 1:7, and be announced by the voice of an archangel and the trumpet of the angels, Mt. 24:31, 1 Cor. 15:52, 1 Thess. 4:16. In connection with their doctrine of the ascension, part III 414, the Lutherans said that the return of Christ was not subject to any succession of moments but consisted in nothing other than the sudden becoming-visible of the body of Christ, which at the exaltation had once become invisible and

omnipresent. Although one generally acknowledged that the return of Christ was visibilis and localis, one nevertheless understood by that only that the human nature of Christ, by a singularis Dei dispositio, for the special purpose of the judgment, became visible for a time in a certain place, without thereby abandoning its presence in other places, Gerhard, Loc. XXVII de extr. jud. n. 35. Quenstedt, Theol. IV 614. Hollaz, Ex. 1249. But the Reformed ascribed to the return of Christ a bodily, local, temporal character; they even acknowledged that that return, even if it should [481] be very sudden, was nevertheless successiva, subject to a succession of moments; even at the highest stage of his exaltation, at the return for judgment, Christ retained his truly human nature, cf. M. Vitringa IV 160. Cf. on the return of Christ in general, besides the works already cited above, also: Thomas, S. Theol. III qu. 59 art. 2 Suppl. qu. 90 art. 1. 2. Oswald, Eschat. 234 f. Jansen, Prael. III 1038. Atzberger, Die christl. Eschat. 300 f. Simar, Dogm. § 166. Gerhard, Loc. XXVIII de extr. jud. c. 3. Quenstedt, Theol. 649. Hollaz, Ex. 1249. Polanus, Synt. VI c. 65. Voetius, Disp. II 51 sq. Marck, Exspect. Jesu Chr. I c. 1-24. M. Vitringa IV 160. Kliefoth, Eschat. 228 f. Nitzsch, Ev. Dogm. 607 f.

§ 56. The Consummation of the Ages.

1. With the appearance of Christ on the clouds begins the יום יהוה, ἡ ἡμερα του κυριου ἡμων Ιησου Χριστου, Mt. 24:36v., Luk. 17:24v., 21:34, Hd. 17:30, 1 Cor. 1:8, 5:5 etc. Scripture by no means intends thereby to make known that all that belongs to the last things, return, resurrection, judgment etc., runs its course within a space of twelve or twenty-four hours. Under the Old Testament the day of the Lord was that time in which God in wondrously glorious manner as king would come to his people, in order to deliver it from all its enemies and to cause it to dwell with him in Jerusalem in peace and safety. With that coming of God the great turning-point entered, whereby the old time passed over into the new and all conditions and relations in nature and the world of men would change wholly and entirely. Later this was represented by the Jews in such a way that with the day of the Lord the present world-time, עולם הזה, passed over into the future, עולם הבא, which then was often again further distinguished into the three generations or into the days of the Messiah lasting 40 or 100 or 600 or 1000 or 2000 or 7000 years, ימות המשיח, and the eternity entering thereafter, עולם

הבא or עתיד הבא, Weber, System 354. According to the New [482] Testament, with the first coming of Christ the last portion of the αἰων οὐτος has taken a beginning, so that we now live in the last days or in the last hour, 1 Cor. 10:11, Hebr. 1:1, 19:26, Joh. 2:18, and with his second coming the αἰων μελλων enters, Mt. 19:28, Mk. 10:30, Luk. 18:30, 20:35, 1 Cor. 15:23, Hebr. 2:5 etc., cf. Cremer s. v. αἰων. And this αἰων μελλων begins with the ἡμερα του κυριου, that is the time in which Christ appears, raises the dead, pronounces the judgment and renews the world. This time is nowhere in the N. Test. represented as going to last long; Paul says 1 Cor. 15:52, that the transformation of those remaining alive and the resurrection of the deceased believers will take place in a point of time, in an instant, cf. 1 Thess. 4:15-17; resurrection and last judgment are most closely, as into one act, connected, Luk. 14:14, 2 Cor. 4:14, Op. 20:11-13; and the judgment is set on a day, Mt. 10:15, 11:22 etc., yes even on an hour, Op. 14:7. But this last determination proves that Scripture does not think of limiting all the events in the parousia of Christ precisely within a space of twenty-four hours or of sixty minutes; ὠρα, originally season of the year, often denotes a much longer time than an hour of sixty minutes, Mt. 26:45, Joh. 4:21, 5:25, 16:2, 32, Kom. 13:11, 1 Joh. 2:18. The events which must take place in the parousia of Christ are also so extensive that they certainly take up a considerable time. The inventions of this century have, for mutual intercourse, for the exercise of communion, for the hearing and seeing of what happens at great distance, caused the distances to shrink to a minimum; and they are probably still only beginning and prophecy of what will be discovered in following centuries. But however much with all this also in the doctrine of the last things account ought to be taken; yet his appearance of Christ, so that all see him, resurrection of all the dead and

transformation of those remaining alive, pronouncing of judgment over all men according to all their works, burning and renewal of the world are such tremendous events that they cannot take place otherwise than in a certain lapse of time.

The first event which follows upon the appearing of Christ is the resurrection of the dead. This is not the result of a development of the bodies in general, or in particular [483] of the resurrection-body implanted in believers through regeneration and sacrament, cf. Kübel, Herzog2 1, 764, but the effect of an almighty, creative act of God, Mt. 22:29, 1 Cor. 6:14, 15:38, 2 Cor. 1:9. Specifically, the Father carries out this work through the Son, to whom He has given to have life in Himself, Joh. 5:28, 6:29, 40, 44, 1 Cor. 6:14, 2 Cor. 4:14, 1 Thess. 4:14, who is the resurrection and the life, the firstborn from the dead, Joh. 11:25, Hd. 16:23, 1 Cor. 15:20, Col. 1:18, Op. 1:5, and therefore must necessarily bring about the resurrection of His own, Joh. 6:39, 40, 1 Cor. 15:20-23, 47-49. Scripture teaches without doubt a general resurrection, a resurrection not only of believers but also of unbelievers and of all human beings, Dan. 12:2, Mt. 5:29, 30, 10:28, Joh. 5:29, Hd. 24:15, Op. 20:12, 13, and it also ascribes this to Christ, Joh. 5:29. But it speaks of this general resurrection very seldom, because it stands in an entirely different relation to Christ than the resurrection of believers. For the resurrection of the dead in general is only incidentally a fruit of the work of Christ; it has become necessary only because temporal death has entered; and this has become separated from eternal death because God intervened with His grace. The punishment for sin was originally death, death in its full extent and weight. But because God had chosen for Himself from the fallen human race a church unto eternal life, He immediately already postponed temporal death with Adam and Eve, He let them

propagate themselves from generation to generation, and only at the end of the ages does He refer those who are disobedient to His law and gospel to eternal perdition. The general resurrection thus serves only to restore, in all human beings, the temporal breaking of the bond between soul and body, which occurred in between for the sake of grace in Christ, and to place them all as human beings, according to soul and body together, before God's judgment seat and to have them hear the judgment from His mouth. This general resurrection too the Father brings about through Christ, because He has given to the Son not only life but also judgment, and this judgment must strike the whole human being, according to both soul and body, Joh. 5:27-29, cf. M. Vitringa IV 149. The resurrection of the dead in general is thus in the first place a judicial act of God. But this act is for believers full of rich consolation. And therefore in Scripture the resurrection of the congregation stands everywhere in the foreground, so much so even that the resurrection of all human beings is sometimes entirely set aside and passed over in silence, Job 19:25-27, Ps. 73:23-26, Hos. 6:2, 13:14, Jes. 26:19, 20, Ezech. 37, Mk. 12:25, 1 Cor. 15, 1 Thess. 4:16, Phil. 3:11. This resurrection is the proper, true resurrection and has been directly acquired by Christ, for it is not merely a reunion of soul and body, but a making alive, a renewal, an entering at once, according to both soul and body, into communion with Christ, a being re-created after God's image, Rom. 8:11, 29, Phil. 3:21. Therefore Paul lets the resurrection of believers coincide with the change of those who remain alive; the latter have no advantage over the former, for the rising precedes the being changed, and together they are then led to meet the Lord in the air, 1 Cor. 15:51, 52, 2 Cor. 5:2, 4, 1 Thess. 4:15-17.

2. In this resurrection the identity of the resurrection body with the body that died is preserved. In the raisings to life which take place in the Old and

New Test. the dead body is animated with new life. Jesus rises with that same body in which He suffered on the cross and which had been laid in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea. When Jesus died, many bodies of the saints were raised and went out of their graves, Mt. 27:52. In the resurrection on the last day all who are in the graves will hear Jesus' voice and come forth, Joh. 5:28, 29; out of the graves, out of the sea, out of death and Hades the dead return to the earth, Op. 20:13. And Paul teaches that the resurrection body proceeds from the body that has died, just as God brings forth another from the sown grain, 1 Cor. 15:36v. This identity of the resurrection body with the body that was laid aside at death is of great significance in the Christian religion. For in the first place it thereby stands in direct opposition to every dualistic doctrine, according to which the body is only an accidental dwelling-place or even a prison of the soul. The essence of man consists [485] precisely in the closest possible union of soul and body into one personality. The soul belongs by nature with the body and the body with the soul; indeed every soul, although it does not itself create the body, nevertheless has its own body. In the identity of the body, just as much as in that of the soul, the continuity of the individual, human being is maintained. And in the second place redemption through Christ is not a second, new creation but a re-creation. It would have been much simpler if God had destroyed the whole fallen world and replaced it with an entirely new one. But it was His good pleasure to raise up the fallen world again, and to deliver from sin the same humanity that had sinned. This deliverance consists in this, that Christ redeems His church from all sin and from all consequences of sin, and thus also causes it to triumph completely over death. That is the last enemy that must be destroyed. And therein the power of Christ comes to expression, that He not only gives eternal life to His own

but consequently also raises them up on the last day. The rebirth out of water and spirit is completed in the rebirth of all things, Mt. 19:28. The spiritual redemption from sin is first brought to completion in the bodily redemption at the end of days. Christ is a perfect Saviour; just as He first appeared in order to establish the kingdom of heaven in the hearts of believers, so He comes once again, in order to give it a visible form and to bring His absolute power over sin and death, incontrovertibly before the eyes of all creatures, to revelation and recognition. Leiblichkeit ist das Ende der Wege Gottes. The care for the dead stands in direct connection with this. Cremation is not to be rejected because it would set bounds and limits to God's omnipotence and would make the resurrection impossible. But it is nevertheless of pagan origin, was never in use among Israel and among the Christian peoples, and conflicts with Christian custom. By contrast, burial is much more in accordance with Scripture and confession, history and liturgy, with the doctrine of the image of God, which also comes to expression in the body, and of death as a punishment of sin, with the respect owed to the dead and the resurrection on the last day. The Christian does not preserve the corpses artificially, like the Egyptians; he also does not destroy them [486] mechanically, as many now desire, but he entrusts them to the bosom of the earth, and lets them rest until the day of resurrection, Kuyper, Ons Program 802v. Sartorius, Die Leichenverbrennung innerhalb der christl. Kirche, Basel 1886.

The Christian church and theology therefore held most strictly to the identity of the resurrection body with the body that had died. Indeed, it often swung over to another extreme and confessed not only a resurrection of the flesh, but sometimes taught that the totalitas materiae, which had belonged to a body, in the resurrection would be gathered together by God

from all corners of the earth and led back to the different parts of the body in the same manner and measure as formerly, cf. Iren. adv. haer. V 12. 13. Augustine, Enchir. 26. de civ. XX 4. 13 sq. Thomas, S. Theol. III qu. 75-86 etc. But this representation runs up against insurmountable objections. For 1o it leads to all kinds of subtle and curious investigations, which are of no value for the doctrine of the resurrection. The question then becomes whether hair and nails, blood and bile, semen and urina, intestina and genitalia will rise and will be formed from the same atoms, equal in number and kind, as those from which they here consisted in the bodies. With defective people, who lacked one or more limbs, and with children, who died young and sometimes even before birth, one came by this representation into no small embarrassment; one had, whether one wished it or not, in all these and similar cases to take refuge in the supposition that the resurrection bodies were supplemented by constituent parts that did not formerly belong to them. The resurrection cannot consist in return and vivification of the totalitas materiae. 2o Physiology teaches that the human body, like all organisms, is subject to continual metabolism, so that after seven years not a single particle of matter is any longer present of those which before that time formed the substance of the body. The substances of which our bodies consist, such as oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, etc., are the same in kind as those which occur in other creatures around us, but they change unceasingly; and this change proves sufficiently that the identity of the bodies cannot lie in this, that they always consist of the same substances in number. It is enough that they consist of the same substances in kind. 3o This is reinforced by the manifold metamorphoses, [487] which nature offers to view in all her kingdoms. Through the action of air, water, etc., plants pass over into peat and coal, carbon into diamond, clay into brick,

and rock into fertile earth. In the plant and animal kingdom there is within the limits of the species an endless variety. And every organism undergoes in the time of its existence a series of changes; the maggot becomes a fly, every larva passes from the undeveloped state into a more developed one, the embryo runs through different phases and then comes to an extrauterine existence, the caterpillar becomes a pupa and thereafter a butterfly, etc. What remains the same under all these transformations, we do not know. Matter and form change, there seems to be nothing stable in the whole organism; and yet the identity is maintained, which therefore is independent of the coarse mass of matter, of its change and quantity.

3. If we relate these data to what Scripture teaches us about the resurrection, we see the way opened to maintain both the substantial unity and also the qualitative distinction between the present and the future body. For Scripture, in the strict sense, teaches no resurrection of the flesh but of the body. From the raisings, of which it gives us report, and from the resurrection of Christ, it is indeed possible to conclude something as to the essence, but not as to the form and the manner, with respect to the resurrection of the dead in the last of days. For in all those raisings the body still existed in its entirety, and the body of Christ was even not given over to corruption, Hd. 2:31. But the bodies of those who rise in the parousia are dissolved in their constituent parts and scattered in all manner of ways and have passed over into other creatures. Of flesh, in the proper sense, there can then no longer be any question, for flesh is always ensouled; what ceases to be ensouled and living thereby also ceases to be flesh and returns to dust again, Gen. 3:19. Job can indeed, even assuming that this translation is the correct one, say that he will behold God out of his flesh, 19:26, and Jesus after his resurrection can testify that a spirit does not have flesh and

bones, as He had, Luk. 24:39. But this nevertheless yields no conclusive proof for the resurrection of the flesh in the strict sense of this word. For the flesh of which [488] Job's body consisted was indeed the substrate for the body of the resurrection, but for that reason did not yet form its substance. And Jesus rose with that same body in which He had died and which had not even seen corruption, and moreover remained up to his ascension in a transitional state, so that He could also still take food. Very clearly Paul teaches, however, that flesh and blood, since they are subject to perishability, cannot inherit imperishability in the kingdom of heaven. Entirely wrongly Holsten, Holtzmann et al. have inferred from this that according to Paul the dead body does not rise at all and that the actual resurrection already takes place at death. For the apostle expressly confesses his faith in the bodily resurrection and defends it against those who in the church of Corinth denied it both with Jesus and with the believers. And he is also very decidedly of the opinion that the same body that is laid in the grave is raised in the resurrection, cf. Bornhäuser, Das Recht des Bekenntnisses zur Auferstehung des Fleisches, Gütersloh 1899. But at the same time he argues that the resurrection is not a restoration but a reformation. The body rises, but not as flesh and blood, weak, perishable, mortal, but as a body that is clothed with imperishability and glory. The body consisting of flesh and blood is indeed the seed from which the resurrection body comes forth, 1 Cor. 15:35-38. But nevertheless there is between the two a great difference. Already on earth there is much difference in flesh among organic beings, and in body among inorganic creatures, vs. 39-41. And likewise there is an important distinction between the present and the future body, as also the contrast of Adam and Christ proves, vs. 42-49. The first is a σωμα ψυχικον, consisting of flesh and blood

ensouled by ψυχη, subject to change; but the latter is a σωμα πνευματικον, it is indeed a true σωμα but it is no longer governed by the ψυχη but by the πνευμα; it no longer consists of flesh and blood, it is above the life of sex, Mt. 22:30, raised above the need for food and drink, 1 Cor. 6:13, and in that even distinguished from the body that man possessed before the fall; it is immortal, imperishable, spiritualized, glorified, 1 Cor. 15:42v., Phil. 3:21. Also according to Paul [489] the identity of the resurrection body with the body entrusted to the bosom of the earth is therefore independent of the mass of matter and its continual change. All organisms and thus also human bodies indeed always consist of the same substances in kind but not in number. And thus also it is absolutely not necessary for the resurrection body that it should consist precisely of those same atoms in number as those of which it consisted when it was laid in the grave. But for identity it is indeed a requirement that in the resurrection body that same organization and form, that same schema and type, be preserved which here stamped the body as the own body of a particular person. Under the transformations to which all creatures are subject, their identity and continuity are preserved. The body of man may perish after death and, as to its mass of matter, be converted into all manner of other organisms, there remains on earth something of it that constitutes the substrate of the resurrection body. What that is, we do not know and we can never discover. But what is astonishing about it disappears as soon as we consider that the very last constituent parts of things are completely unknown to us. Every smallest atom is again susceptible of analysis; chemical analysis continues endlessly but never reaches the absolutely simple being. And yet in all organisms and thus also in the human body there must be something that in the continually proceeding transformation retains its identity. What absurdity is there, then,

in assuming that such an "organic basic form," such a "schema of individuality," also remains after the death of the human body, to serve as seed for the body of the resurrection? For this is established according to Scripture, that the body of the resurrection is not brought along from heaven by the blessed or formed out of spiritual, heavenly elements. The body of the resurrection does not come from heaven but from the earth; it is not a self-formed product of pneuma or psyche, but rises up out of the body that at death was laid in the grave; and it is therefore not spiritual in the sense that the pneuma would have as its substance, but it is and remains material, even though that matter is no longer organized into perishable flesh and blood but into a glorified body. Cf. Tertullianus, de resurrectione carnis. Augustinus, de civ. XXII c. 12-20. Enchir. 84-93. [490] Lombardus, Sent. IV dist. 43. Thomas, suppl. qu. 82-87. Oswald, Eschat. 262 f. Jansen, Prael. III 1044. Simar, Dogm. § 168. Gerhard, Loc. XXVI tract. 2. Quenstedt, Theol. IV 576-605. Polanus, Synt. VI c. 66. Synopsis pur. theol., disp. 51. Mastricht, Theol. VIII 4, 6. Amyraldus, Theses Salm. III 840. Turretinus, Theol. El. XX qu. 1-3. Marck, Exspect. J. C. II c. 1-18. M. Vitringa IV 109-156. Kliefoth, Eschat. 248 f. Splittgerber, Tod. Fortleben und Auferstehung3 1879. Nitzsch, Ev. Dogm. 614 f. Art. Auferstehung in Herzog3.

4. After the resurrection follows the judgment, which in the Old Testament is represented as a victory by the Messiah over all the enemies of Israel, but in the New Testament is described more spiritually as a judicial work of Christ, whereby He judges and sentences all men in accordance with the law given to them by God. For Jesus came to earth the first time, not to condemn the world but to save it, Joh. 3:17, 12:47; but nevertheless, at once at his appearance He called a κρισις into life, which has as consequence and as purpose that those who do not see may see and those

who see may become blind, 3:19, 20, 9:39. Jesus continually holds judgment as Son of man, when He already here on earth grants eternal life to those who believe and lets the wrath of God rest upon those who do not believe, 3:36, 5:22-27. There is thus undoubtedly an inward, spiritual judgment; a crisis, which is accomplished from generation to generation; an immanent, diesseitig judgment, which is set up in the consciences of men. Faith and unbelief already here on earth bring their fruit and their reward with them; just as faith is followed by justification and peace with God, so unbelief leads to continuing darkening and hardening and to surrender to all kinds of unrighteousness. Yes, even outside the antithesis of faith and unbelief, virtue and vice each bear their own fruits; the good and the evil also in natural life have their own reward, not only in the excusing or accusing of the conscience, but also in the outward prosperity or adversity which are often connected with them. Scripture and history moreover teach it as beyond dispute, that blessing and curse, mercy and wrath, favors and judgments alternate with one another in the life [491] of men and of peoples. There lies a great truth in the word of the poet: die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht. But yet in this saying the truth is mixed with the lie. It is conceived not theistically but pantheistically, and undermines all judgment, instead of confirming it and holding it high. For, if world history is the world judgment, it altogether ceases to be a judgment and becomes a natural process, which does not at all concern itself with the tremendous antithesis of good and evil and drives this back into the hidden corner of the conscience, and even there only for a time. For then indeed there is no longer any God, who can make the order of nature subservient to the moral order, but there is nothing other than a natural power, which rules the whole physical world and presently also contracts and causes to disappear that

limited terrain which at first was still conceded for the moral dominion of the good. For the good is no power that can withstand nature, if it does not have its support in an almighty God, who is Creator of both nature and moral order. To be sure, pantheism always again objects against this, that the good must nevertheless be done for its own sake and not out of hope for reward or out of fear of punishment. But the desire of the soul for the triumph of the good, for the victory of justice, has absolutely nothing in common with the selfish wish for earthly happiness and sensual satisfaction. On the contrary, however much Scripture reckons with the fact that man is a sensual being, and holds before him a reward, great in the heavens; that reward is always subordinate to the honor of God's name and, with the good works in which believers walk, acquired by Christ. It is precisely the pious who look with outstretched neck toward that day, in which God glorifies his name before the eyes of all creatures and in their cause makes his own triumph over all opposition. And this desire becomes the stronger, the more the blood that cries for vengeance flows over the earth in broader and deeper stream, the more injustice triumphs, godlessness increases, the lie triumphs and Satan's kingdom expands and exalts itself against the kingdom of righteousness. The whole of history cries out for a world judgment; the whole creation sighs for it; all peoples testify of it; the martyrs in heaven cry for it with a loud voice; the [492] congregation prays for the coming of Christ; and Christ himself, who is the Alpha and the Omega, says: Behold, I come quickly and my reward is with me, to repay each one according to his work. However much Scripture therefore, especially in the gospel of John, acknowledges a spiritual judgment running through history, it nevertheless everywhere also speaks of a final judgment, which makes the kingdom of Christ triumph over all

unrighteousness. World history may be a world judgment; the world judgment takes place at the end of days, when Christ comes to judge the living and the dead. More than once Holy Scripture in that connection ascribes the judgment to the Father, Mt. 18:35, 2 Thess. 1:5, Hebr. 11:6, Jak. 4:12, 1 Petr. 1:17, 2:23, Op. 20:11, 12; but He nevertheless carries out this work through Christ, to whom He has given all judgment, whom He has appointed as Judge, Joh. 5:22, 27, Hd. 10:42, 17:31, Rom. 14:9, and who therefore will one day summon all men before his judgment seat and will judge them according to their works, Mt. 25:32, Rom. 14:9-13, 2 Cor. 5:10, 2 Tim. 4:1, 8, 1 Petr. 4:5, Op. 19:11-21. For Christ is the Son of man, who by his appearance already brought about a crisis, which continues it in history and completes it at the end of days. The relation to Him determines man's eternal weal or woe; in the judgment over living and dead He celebrates his highest triumph and reaches the consummation of his kingdom and the complete subjection of all his enemies. Therefore the principal question in the last judgment is also that concerning faith or unbelief. Faith in Christ is indeed the work of God par excellence, Joh. 6:29, 1 Joh. 3:23. He who believes does not come into the judgment, Joh. 5:24, and he who does not believe is already judged and remains under God's wrath, Joh. 3:18, 36. The standard in the final judgment is thus in the first place the gospel, Joh. 12:48. But that gospel does not stand over against and is not even to be thought of apart from the law; the demand for faith is after all itself already grounded in the law, and the gospel is the restoration and fulfillment of the law. Therefore in the final judgment all the works also come into consideration, which have been performed by men and are recorded in the books before God's face, Pred. 12:14, 2 Cor. 5:10, Ef. 6:8, 1 Petr. 1:17, Op. 20:12, 22:12. For those works are expressions and

fruits of the principle of life that dwells within in the heart, Mt. 7:17, 12:33, Luk. 6:44, and [493] include everything that has been done by man, not in the intermediate state, but in his body, not only the deeds, Mt. 25:35v., Mk. 9:41, 42, Luk. 6:35, 14:13, 14, 1 Cor. 3:8, 1, Thess. 4:6 etc., but also the words, Mt. 12:36, and the hidden counsels of the heart, Rom. 2:16, 1 Cor. 4:5; for nothing remains hidden and everything becomes manifest, Mt. 6:4, 6, 18, 10:26, Ef. 5:11-14, 1 Tim. 5:24, 25. The norm is thus in the final judgment the whole word of God, according to its two parts: law and gospel. But in addition Scripture nevertheless says clearly, that account will be taken of the measure of revelation which has fallen to someone's share. Those who knew the will of the Lord and did not do it, will be beaten with double stripes, Luk. 12:47. It will be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgment than for Jerusalem and Capernaum, Mt. 10:15, 11:22, 24, Mk. 6:11, Luk. 10:12, 14, Hebr. 2:3. Those who did not hear the gospel are also not judged according to the gospel but according to the law; and the Gentiles, who did not know the Mosaic law but sinned against the law that is known to them by nature, also perish without that Mosaic law, while the Jews are judged precisely by it, Rom. 2:12. Although Scripture lets the judgment go over all men without exception, Mt. 25:32, Hd. 17:31, Rom. 2:6, 14:10, 2 Cor. 5:10, 2 Tim. 4:1, Op. 20:12, it nevertheless in that connection makes a distinction between those nations which have known the gospel and in the end have brought forth antichristendom, and those other peoples which have never heard of Christ and therefore for the first time at his parousie learn of Him, while it further speaks in particular of the judgment over the evil angels, and of the place which the good angels and the believers occupy in the final judgment.

Certainly it takes effort to form a somewhat clear conception of that judgment. Without doubt it does not bear an exclusively inward and spiritual character, so that it would take place only in the conscience of man; but it is definitely a judgment that is also carried out outwardly before the eyes of all creatures. However much image and reality may still flow together, the appearing of Christ, the resurrection, and likewise all that is related of the judgment is drawn too realistically for it to be permissible to spiritualize everything. But then [494] for the holding of this judgment a place and some span of time are also necessary. And Scripture gives us occasion to think that it has a successive course. The angels accompany Christ at his coming on the clouds, in order to assist him in the execution of the sentence; they gather the righteous, separate the wicked from them, and drive them away from before his face, Mt. 13:30, 49, 24:31. Moreover, He is surrounded by the blessed, 1 Thess. 3:13, 4:16, 2 Thess. 1:10, Jud. 14, Op. 17:14, 19:14. After then the resurrection of the dead and the transformation of the believers who remain alive has taken place, these are caught up together in the clouds, to meet the Lord, in the air, 1 Thess. 4:17. It is not impossible that, just as with Christ resurrection and ascension fell apart and were even separated from one another by forty days, so also the resurrection or transformation of the believers at the end of days does not at once add to them that full glory which after the renewal of the world in the new heaven or on the new earth will be their portion, Lampe and Gerdes with M. Vitringa IV 143. But however this may be, the resurrection or transformation includes for the believers, just as for Christ, the justification. It is true that Scripture says that all men without distinction, thus also the believers, must appear before the judgment seat of Christ. But it testifies at the same time that whoever believes is not judged and does not come into

judgment, for he already has eternal life, Joh. 3:18, 5:24; that the deceased believers are already in heaven with Christ and are clothed with long, white garments, 2 Cor. 5:8, Phil. 1:23, Op. 6:11, 7:9, 14; and that Christ comes, to be glorified in his saints and to be admired in all who believe, 2 Thess. 1:10. Before Christ pronounces the sentence over the evil angels, over the antichristian world, and over the cultureless peoples, He has already set the sheep at his right hand and is thronged by his angels and his saints. This is also evident from 1 Cor. 6:2, 4, where Paul expressly says that the saints will judge the world and the angels, M. Vitringa IV 163. For this statement may not be weakened into an approving by the believers of the judgment that Christ passes upon world and angels, but clearly indicates, as the connection shows, that the saints will take part [495] in the judgment over the world and angels. Besides, Jesus already promised to his twelve disciples that they would sit with Him on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel, Mt. 19:28, Luk. 22:30, and John saw around the throne of God thrones in heaven, occupied by the elders of the church, Op. 4:4, 11:16, 20:4, 6. For Christ and his church are one; what world and angels have done wrong against her, that He counts as if it had been done against Him, Mt. 25:40, 45, Mk. 9:41, 42. Even to the good angels this judgment of Christ and his church extends, 1 Cor. 6:4, for the angels are ministering spirits, who are sent out for service for the sake of those who will inherit salvation and therefore in the future kingdom of God obtain a place according to the service which they have performed in relation to Christ and his church. In the vision of John, therefore, Christ, surrounded by his armies, goes to meet the antichristian power, Op. 19:11-21; the triumphant church shares in his royal dominion, Op. 20:4-6 and finally with Christ puts an end to all resistance, when he judges the peoples who dwell in the four corners of the

earth, Op. 20:7-10. Cf. on the last judgment: Lombardus, Sent. IV dist. 43 sq. Thomas, Suppl. qu. 88-90. Oswald, Eschat. 334f. Atzberger, Die christl. Eschat. 356-370. Jansen, Prael. III 1062. Simar, Dogm. § 169. Gerhard, Loc. XXVIII. Quenstedt, Theol. IV 605-634. Polanus, Synt. VI c. 69. Synopsis pur. theol., disp. 51. Mastricht, Theol. VIII 4, 7. Turretinus, Theol. XX qu. 6. Marck, Exspect. J. C. 1. III c. 1-18. Moor VI 706-718. Kliefoth, Eschat 236f. 275f. Nitzsch, Ev. Dogm. 620f. Art. Gericht in Herzog3.

5. The place to which the ungodly are referred after the judgment bears in the N. Test. the name of gehenna. The Hebr. גֵּי הִנֹּום was originally the name of the valley of Hinnom, which lay to the southeast of Jerusalem and according to Jos. 15:8, 18:16 formed the boundary line between two tribes. Under Ahaz and Manasse this valley became a place for the cult of Moloch, in whose honor children were slaughtered and burned, 2 Kon. 16:3, 21:6, 2 Chr. 28:3, 33:6, Jer. 32:34, 35. Therefore this place was destroyed under Josiah and declared unclean by the priests, 2 Kon. 23:10. Jeremiah prophesied, [496] that here a dreadful bloodbath would be wrought for the Israelites and the name of the valley Tofeth would be changed into that of valley of slaughter, Jer. 7:32, 19:6. And the apocryphal book of Enoch expressed the expectation that in this valley the ungodly would be gathered for the judgment. For this reason later the name Gehinnom was transferred to the place of punishment of the ungodly after death. According to others, however, this transfer had another cause. After the valley of Hinnom had been destroyed by Josiah, it was, according to the later Jews, used for the throwing down and burning of all kinds of uncleanness. Just as Gan Eden indicated the place where after death the righteous sojourned, so Gehinnom became the name of the region to which the unclean and ungodly were referred, in order to suffer punishment there in the eternal fire. Fire,

moreover, had from of old been a revelation and symbol of the wrath and the fury of the Lord. Israel's God is a consuming fire, an eternal glow, Deut. 4:24, 9:3, Jes. 33:14; He spoke to the children of Israel out of the midst of the fire, Deut. 4:12, 33, 5:4, 22-26, 9:10, 10:4, cf. Ex. 3:2; his wrath is a burning fire, going forth from his nose, Ps. 18:9, 79:5, 89:47, Jer. 4:4; fire, going forth from the face of the Lord, consumes the offering, Lev. 9:24; by fire He destroys Nadab and Abihu, Lev. 10:2, the murmurers of the people, Num. 11:1, Ps. 106:18, the Korahites, Num. 16:35, the bands that are sent against Elijah, 2 Kon. 1:10v.; and in fire He comes once, to execute justice on earth and to punish the ungodly, Deut. 32:22, Ps. 11:6, 83:15, 97:3, 140:11, Jes. 30:33, 31:9, 66:15, 16, 24, Jer. 4:4, 15:14, 17:4, Am. 1:4v., Joel 2:30; and that fire burns down to the lowest Sheol, Deut. 32:22, it is never quenched, Jes. 66:24, and burns eternally, Jer. 17:4. This representation passed over into the New Testament. Gehenna is the place of punishment of the ungodly after the day of judgment, distinguished from ἀδης, φυλακη, ἀβυσσος, above bl. 374, but identical with the καμινος του πυρος, Mt. 13:42, 50 and the λιμνη του πυρος, Op. 19:20, 20:10, 14, 15, 21:8. It is the place destined for the beast from the abyss and for the false prophet, Op. 19:20, for Satan and his angels, Op. 20:10, for death and hades, Op. 20:14, and for all the ungodly, Op. 20:15, 21:8. And these are all cast into it after the [497] resurrection, Mt. 5:29, 30, 10:28, and after the final judgment, Op. 19:20, 20:10, 14, 15, 21:8, while before that time hades, the prison, φυλακη, 1 Petr. 3:19, Op. 20:7 or the abyssus are their dwelling place, and the punishment of the eternal fire or the darkness of darkness is still kept for them, Mt. 8:29, 25:41, 46, 2 Petr. 2:17, Jud. 13. In that gehenna, indeed, the eternal, unquenchable fire burns, Mt. 18:8, Mk. 9:43, 44, 48, the worm gnaws that does not die, Mk. 9:44, 48, and there is an eternal torment, Mt.

25:46, 2 Thess. 1:9, Op. 14:11; it is a γεεννα or καμινος του πυρος, Mt. 5:22, 13:42, 50, 18:9, and at the same time a place of the utmost and outermost darkness, Mt. 8:12, 22:13, 25:30, 2 Petr. 2:17, Jud. 13, cf. Deut. 5:22, Ps. 97:2, 3, lying outside, Op. 22:15, in the depth, so that one is cast into it, Mt. 5:29, 30, Op. 19:20, 20:10, 14, 15, far from the wedding table of the Lamb, Mt. 8:11, 12, 22:13, far from communion with God and with Christ, Mt. 7:23, 25:41, Luk. 13:27, 28, 2 Thess. 1:9, in the company of Satan and his angels, Mt. 25:41, Op. 20:10, 15. The wrath of God reveals itself there in all its terribleness, Rom. 2:5-8, 9:22, 1 Thess. 1:10, Hebr. 10:31, Op. 6:16, 17, so that the gehenna is not only a region of deprivation, but also of pain and torment, both as to soul and as to body, a place of κολασις, Mt. 25:46, Op. 14:10, 11, of κλαυθμος and βρυγμος των ὁδοντων, Mt. 8:12, 13:42 etc., of θλιψις and στενοχωρια, Rom. 2:9, 2 Thess. 1:6, of ἀπωλεια, Mt. 7:13, Rom. 9:22, Phil. 1:28, 3:19, 2 Petr. 3:7, Op. 17:8, 11, of φθορα, Gal. 6:8, ὀλεθρος, 1 Thess. 5:3, 2 Thess. 1:9, 1 Tim. 6:9; the gehenna is the domain of the second death, Op. 2:11, 20:6, 14, 15, 21:8.

On this firm ground of Scripture the doctrine of the eternity of hellish punishment was built in the Christian church; and theology and preaching, poetry and painting, often vied with one another in plastic description and realistic depiction of the pains which there, in body and soul, were suffered in the eternal fire. But from time to time objections were nevertheless raised against this doctrine. And since the Aufklärung in the previous century caused a milder assessment of sin and crime to arise, abolished the torture-racks, mitigated punishments, and everywhere caused a feeling of humanity to awaken, there also came [498] a wholly different view concerning the punishments of hell, and these were by many either represented in altered form or entirely rejected, Lecky, Gesch. d. Ursprungs und Einflusses der

Aufklärung in Europa, Leipzig 1873 I 259f. The grounds on which the eternity of hellish punishment is contested then always come down to this: a. eternal punishment conflicts with the goodness, the love, the mercy of God and makes Him into a tyrant who takes pleasure in plaguing and tormenting and prepares praise for himself out of the eternal groaning of millions of unhappy creatures. b. Eternal punishment conflicts with the justice of God, because it has no connection with and is not proportionate to the sin, which, however dreadful, nevertheless always bears a limited, finite character. It is not to be conceived that God, who is perfect love and the highest justice, will punish a child of man, even if it had sinned a thousand years, with an everlasting tormenting. c. Such an eternal punishment is also unimaginable and unthinkable. Scripture speaks of fire and worm and darkness, but these are all images; taken literally, they would exclude one another. But apart from that, what is the value of an eternal punishment that has no other purpose than to torment the sinner eternally? What usefulness has it for him who undergoes it, since it by its nature must exclude true repentance and continually causes him to go on sinning? What honor does it bring to God's name, if it does not overcome and destroy sin but perpetuates it and causes it to endure eternally? And how is it possible that the lost under such an eternal punishment continually harden themselves, without ever coming to repentance and humbling themselves before God? d. Scripture, then, also does not teach an eternal, endless punishment in hell. Indeed it speaks of eternal pain etc., but eternal there, as elsewhere, does not have the meaning of endless, but denotes a duration of time whose boundary eludes observation or calculation; αιωνιος is what goes beyond a longer or shorter αἰων. This is further strengthened by the fact that αἰωνιος, in bonam partem of the goods of salvation, e.g. of life, is used especially to

indicate an inner quality, by which all these goods of salvation are presented as elevated above perishability. Over against that, the condition of the lost is designated as ἀπωλεια, φθορα, ὀλεθρος, θανατος, which points to the fact that they thus cannot remain in existence eternally but are either utterly [499] destroyed or once wholly and entirely restored. e. For the latter Scripture offers hope, when it teaches that Christ is a reconciliation for the sins of the whole world, 1 Joh. 2:2, Col. 1:19, 20, and that God in that way wills the salvation of all, 1 Tim. 2:4, 4:10. As all men die in Adam, so are they also all made alive in Christ, 1 Cor. 15:22, Rom. 5:18. Now God gathers all things together under Christ as head, Ef. 1:10, in order that once every knee may bow before Christ, Phil. 2:10, and God may be all in all, 1 Cor. 15:28. God has shut up all under sin, in order that He might be merciful to all, Rom. 11:32.

On these considerations, then, concerning the end of the ungodly, if we disregard pantheism and materialism, which deny all immortality and eternity, the following three hypotheses are built. First, there are those who teach that a possibility of conversion remains open, not only in the intermediate state up to the final judgment, above p. 382, but also thereafter and into all eternity. Whether, therefore, there is a hell and an eternal punishment depends entirely on man and on his free will. If he continually resists the call to conversion, he entangles himself ever more firmly and deeply in sin and prolongs his punishment. But since the preaching of faith and conversion never ceases and the will of man always remains free, the possibility of an eternal punishment in hell becomes very improbable, and one rather flatters oneself with the hope that in the end all will come to conversion and enter into eternal life. Eternal pain in Scripture thus signifies only that those who convert so late always retain the memory of

their stubborn resistance and, compared with those who in this life believed the gospel, will eternally remain behind. This hypothetical universalism thus amounts to a continual purification and is a renewal of the doctrine of transmigration of souls. The difference is only that metempsychosis lets this purification take place in the Diesseits, whereas hypothetical universalism places it in the Jenseits. This doctrine found acceptance especially in the previous century among the Rationalists, but is also at present defended by many theologians, cf. Wegscheider, Instit. § 200. Bretschneider, Dogm. II 468 f. 581 f. Reinhard, Dogm. 706 f. Lange, Posit. Dogm. § 131. Dorner, Gl. II 972. [500] Nitzsch, Ev. Dogm. 624. W. Schmidt, Christl. Dogm. II 517. Saussaye, my Theol. van Ch. d. l. S. 71-75. H. Ernst, Faith and Freedom 1886 pp. 407-444. Furthermore in England the proponents of the so-called future (second) probation or of the wider hope, such as Robertson, Maurice, Theol. Essays 1853 p. 442: the word eternal and the punishment of the wicked. Thomas de Quincey, On the supposed scriptural expression for eternity 1852. Tennyson, In Memoriam. Farrar, Eternal Hope 1878 and Mercy and Judgment 1881 with the literature called forth by these two works, cf. The wider hope, essays and strictures on the doctrine and literature of future punishment by numerous writers, lay and clerical, London Unwin 1890. In America the defenders of the Andover position, adopted by the five professors of Andover College, Churchhill, Harris, Hincks, Tucker and Egb. C. Smith, who deviated from various articles of the confession, also from that concerning eternal punishment, cf. Andover Review April 1890 p. 434 etc. Of itself this opinion of a continuing conversion and purification leads to the doctrine of the so-called universalists, who think that at the end all creatures will become partakers of salvation and glory. What is desired and hoped for there is here certainly

expected and proclaimed as dogma. The doctrine of the return of all things into God already occurs in Indian and Greek philosophy, passed from there over into Gnosticism and Neoplatonism, and was then first advanced in Christian theology by Origen. He does indeed speak repeatedly of an eternal punishment in hell, but nevertheless sees in it only a practical doctrine, which is necessary for the undeveloped, but is understood quite differently by the gnostics. According to Origen, however, all spirits are originally created equal by God, but the acts of the free will bring inequality and cause the souls of men, for purification, to be transferred into a material world and bound to bodies. But this purification also continues after death and after the final judgment, until out of and through the greatest possible diversity the equality again appears, and all spirits return again to God in that same state in which they originally had fellowship with Him. But because the free will always remains the same, it can just as well as return from evil [501] to good, so again return from good to evil, and thus there is a continual alternation of falling away and restoration of all things, an endless creation and destruction of the material world, cf. Atzberger, Gesch. der christl. Eschat. 1896 S. 366-456. This thought of the restoration of all things found an echo in antiquity in Gregory Naz., Gregory Nyss., Didymus, Diodorus of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and others, cf. Petavius, de angelis III 7. 8, in the Middle Ages in Scotus Erigena, Amalric of Bena and the brothers and sisters of the free spirit, after the Reformation in Denck and many Anabaptists, in Jane Leade, J. W. Petersen, Ludwig Gerhard, F. C. Oetinger, Michael Hahn, Jung-Stilling, Swedenborg etc., and in more recent times in Schleiermacher, Chr. Gl. § 117-120 and § 163 Appendix. Schweizer, Gl. II 577 f. 591. 604. Schoeberlein, Prinzip und System der Dogm. 679. Riemann, Die Lehre von der Apokatastasis2

Magdeburg 1897. Scholten, Initia 268 sq. W. Francken, Faith and Freedom 1886. Cf. Köstlin, art. Apokatastasis in Herzog3. Much greater assent, however, was found by a third opinion, which is known under the name of conditional immortality. Although earlier theology very often spoke of immortality in a spiritual sense, as a gift acquired by Christ, yet almost no one therefore thought of denying the natural immortality of the soul. The Socinians were the first, under the influence of their abstract supranaturalism, to teach that souls were not immortal by nature but became so only in the case of obedience through a gift of God. From that it followed that the ungodly and the devils, by virtue of a natural perishability, would once have to cease to exist. Socinus did not yet express this so clearly, but his followers taught without circumlocution that the second death consisted in annihilation; and this then, according to Crell, Schmalz and others, did not take place at or soon after death, but only after the general resurrection and the judgment of the world, Fock, Der Socin. 714 f. From the Socinians this doctrine was taken over by Locke, Warburton, Whiston, Dodwell, Walter and others, and in this century by Rothe, Theol. Ethik § 470-472 and Weisse, Ueber die philos. Bedeutung der christl. Eschat. Stud. u. Krit. 1836. Above all, however, it began to make headway and to find adherents since it was defended in 1885 by [502] Edward White in his Life in Christ, a study of the Scripture doctrine on the nature of man, the object of the divine incarnation and the conditions of human immortality, 3 ed. Stock London 1878. This book set many pens in motion and elicited not only serious opposition but also manifold expressions of assent. Everywhere conditionalism now finds numerous defenders, such as e.g. Schultz, Voraussetzungen der christl. Lehre von der Unsterblichkeit 1861. H. Plitt, Evang. Glaubenslehre 1863. II 413. Weisse, Philos. Dogm. §

970. Lemme, Endlosigkeit der Verdammnis und allgemeine Wiederbringung, Lichterfelde-Berlin, Runge. (lecture, delivered 12 Aug. 1898). Charles Byse, L'immortalité conditionelle ou la vie en Christ, Paris 1880. Petavel-Olliff, Le problème de l'immortalité, Paris 1891. Dr. Jonker, The doctrine of condit. immortality, Theol. Stud. I.

6. If now, in the doctrine of eternal punishment, human feeling had to decide, it would certainly be difficult to maintain and would now also find only few defenders. It ought to be gratefully acknowledged that since the previous century the idea of humanity and the feeling of sympathy have powerfully awakened and have put an end to the cruelty which formerly prevailed, especially also in the sphere of criminal law. But no one can be blind to the fact that this humanitarian view also brings with it its one-sidednesses and dangers. The mighty reversal that has taken place can in this respect be described in this one sentence, that, whereas formerly the insane were even treated as criminals, now the criminals are regarded as insane. Formerly, in every abnormality guilt was seen; now all concepts of guilt, crime, responsibility, imputability, etc. are deprived of their reality, cf. Simons, Nieuwe richtingen in de strafrechtwetenschap, Gids April 1900 bl. 48-84. The consciousness of right and justice, of transgression of the law and guilt is weakened in a questionable way, in proportion as the standard of all these things is shifted not in God but in man and in society. Therewith, gradually all certainty and security are lost. For if the interest of society gives the decisive weight, then not only is every boundary between good and evil erased, but right also runs the danger of being sacrificed to power. It is expedient for you, [503] that one man die for the people and not the whole people perish, Joh. 11:50, then becomes the language of the highest administration of justice. And the same human feeling that first

pleaded for the humanitarian treatment of the criminal does not shrink from soon demanding the death by torture of the innocent; the hosanna makes room for him for the cross; the vox populi, which is often wrongly honored as a vox Dei, recoils from no horrors; and while the righteous still takes account of how his cattle are doing, even the inward parts, the heart, the mind of the godless is still cruel, Spr. 12:10. Therefore little can be built on human feeling; it may and can in the determination of right and law not give the decision; even if the appearance is against it, it is nevertheless infinitely much better to fall into the hand of the Lord than into that of men, 1 Chron. 21:13. And this also holds with the doctrine of the eternal punishments in hell. For 1o it deserves notice that this doctrine, however much it has often been worked out far too realistically in church and theology, is nevertheless grounded in Scripture. And no one speaks of it in Scripture more often and more extensively than our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom no one can deny depth of human feeling and compassion, and who was the meekest and most humble among all the children of men. It is the highest love that threatens with the heaviest punishments. Over against the blessedness of eternal life, which He acquired for His own, stands the misery of eternal perdition, which He announces to the godless. Both were in the Old Test. veiled in shadows and were presented under images. But in the New Test. it is Christ who opens the vista both into the depths of the outer darkness and into the dwellings of the eternal light. 2o That the punishment in this place of the outer darkness is an eternal one cannot be doubted with Scripture in hand. It is true, αἰωνιος (from αἰων, hebr. עולם, i.e. duration of time, duration of life, course of life, human lifetime, indefinitely long time in past or future; the present world-age, αἰων οὐτος; the coming age, αἰων μελλων) very often indicates a duration of time that

indeed surpasses human calculation but is absolutely not endless or eternal. Often it is also still used in the N. T. of the whole world-age that has passed up to the appearing of Christ, in which the counsel of God was proclaimed by the prophets but nevertheless was not fully revealed, Luk. 1:70, Hd. 3:21, Rom. 16:25, Col. 1:26, 2 Tim. 1:9, Tit. 1:2. But the word αἰωνιος serves in the N. T. especially to denote the incorruptible nature of the salvific benefits acquired by Christ, elevated above all corruption and destruction, and is then in particular very often connected with ζωη; the eternal life that Christ gives to everyone who believes has its beginning already here on earth but nevertheless becomes fully manifest only in the future; it belongs essentially to the αἰων μελλων, Luk. 18:30, is incorruptible, Joh. 11:25, 26, and is called eternal, just like the οἰκοδομη ἐκ θεου, 2 Cor. 5:1, the σωτηρια, Hebr. 5:9, the λυτρωσις, 9:12, the κληρονομια, 9:15, the δοξα, 2 Tim. 2:10, the βασιλεια, 2 Petr. 1:11, just as God, Christ, the H. Spirit are also called eternal, Rom. 16:26, Hebr. 9:14, 13:8 etc. Over against that it is said that the punishment of the godless will consist in το πυρ το αἰωνιον; Mt. 18:8, 25:41, Jud. 7, κολασις αἰωνιος, Mt. 25:46, ὀλεθρος αἰωνιος, 2 Thess. 1:9, κρισις αἰωνιος, Mk. 3:29. Just like eternal life, by this description eternal punishment is presented as belonging to the αἰων μελλων, in which no change of state is any longer possible. Nowhere does Scripture indicate with any word or even leave open the possibility that the condition that enters there could still come to an end. And positively it declares that the fire there is unquenchable, Mt. 3:12, that the worm does not die, Mk. 9:44, that the smoke of the torment goes up unto all eternity, Op. 14:11, and continues day and night unto all eternity, 20:10, and that it as eternal torment stands over against the eternal life of the righteous, Mt. 25:46. Unprejudiced exegesis can find here nothing other

than an eternal punishment that never ends. Cf. Cremer s. v. 3o The condition of the lost is described as ἀπωλεια, Mt. 7:13, φθορα. Gal. 6:8, ὀλεθρος, 2 Thess. 1:9, θανατος, Op. 2:11 etc., in accordance with the fact that in O. and N. Test. it is often said that the godless will be destroyed, exterminated, devastated, corrupted, done away with, cast out, cut off, burned like chaff, etc. The advocates of conditional immortality understand all these expressions in the sense of a complete annihilation, cf. White, Life in Christ 358-390. But this view lacks [505] all ground. Life in Scripture never means pure existence, and death is never the same as annihilation. Of the temporal, bodily death the conditionalists also cannot deny this; they mostly assume, like the Socinians, that the godless also after death continue to exist, either in order first after resurrection and final judgment to be annihilated by God, or in order gradually to die away and finally also physically to perish. The latter is both philosophically and Scripturally an impossible thought. Sin, after all, is no substance, no materia but forma, which presupposes a being and does not annihilate that being but directs it in a wrong direction turned away from God, part III 81v. And bodily death is not merely a natural consequence but a positive punishment threatened and executed by God upon sin, ib. 176v. In that death God does not annihilate man, but He separates soul and body temporarily from one another, in order to preserve both and at the resurrection to unite them again. Scripture teaches clearly and incontrovertibly the immortality of man. Conditionalism confuses the ethical with the physical being, when it sees in ἀπωλεια, which is the punishment of sin, an annihilation of the substance of man. And just as God in the first death does not annihilate man, so He also does not do this in the second death. For this is also described in Scripture as torment, Mt. 25:46, weeping and gnashing of

teeth, Mt. 8:12, tribulation and distress, Rom. 2:9, unquenchable fire, Mt. 18:8, worm that never dies, Mk. 9:44 etc., which expressions all presuppose the existence of the lost. But their condition can nevertheless be called ἀπωλεια, φθορα, ὀλεθρος, θανατος, because in moral, spiritual sense they have wholly gone to ruin and in absolute sense lack that fullness of life which is bestowed upon believers by Christ. Thus the prodigal son is called νεκρος and ἀπολωλος, Luk. 15:24, 32, the Ephesians in their former condition νεκροι in their sins and trespasses, Ef. 2:3, alienated from the life of God, Ef. 4:18, those of Sardis νεκροι, Op. 3:1 etc., without anyone here thinking of their non-existence. 4o Of the same misunderstanding of the ethical character of sin the advocates of the apokatastasis are guilty. The word is borrowed from Hd. 3:21 but there, as everyone now acknowledges, it absolutely does not contain what is now meant by it. Scripture nowhere teaches that once all men and even all devils will be saved. It does indeed often speak very universalistically, because the work of Christ is intensively of infinite value and benefits the whole world and humanity in its organic existence, part III 390v. But it decisively excludes that all individuals among men or even the devils would once become citizens in the kingdom of God. At all times the doctrine of the restoration of all things has therefore been taught only by a few isolated persons, and even today among theologians conditionalism rather than apokatastasis finds advocacy. In fact this doctrine is also not of Christian but of pagan origin, and it bears not a Scriptural but a philosophical character. It is pantheism that lies at its foundation and causes all things, just as they proceed from God, so also successively to return to Him. God here is no Lawgiver and Judge, who will once judge the world in righteousness, but an unconscious, immanent force that drives everything forward to the end and once draws everything back

into itself. Sin here is no ἀνομια, but a necessary moment in the development of the world. And redemption in Christ is no juridical restoration and no ethical renewal but a physical process that governs everything. 5o In order therefore to justify eternal punishment it is necessary before all things that one, with Scripture, acknowledge the incorruptible righteousness of God and the deeply sinful character of sin. Sin is no weakness, no defect, no temporary and gradually disappearing imperfection, but according to its origin and essence it is ἀνομια, transgression of the law, rebellion and enmity against God, negation of His right, of His authority, even of His existence. Sin is indeed finite in the sense that it is committed by a finite creature in a finite time, but Augustine already rightly remarked that not the duration of time in which the sin is committed but its inner nature is the standard of its punishment. An hour of thoughtlessness can make one weep for years. Upon sins of a single moment follows a whole life of shame and punishment. Whoever commits a crime is sometimes punished with death and by the earthly authority transferred into an irreparable condition. Thus God also does; for what on earth is the death penalty is the punishment of hell in the [507] final judgment. He judges and punishes sin according to its inner quality. And then sin is infinite in the sense that it is committed against the highest Majesty, who has an absolute right to our love and our veneration. God is worthy of our obedience and devotion in an absolute, infinite way; the law in which He demands these is therefore absolutely binding, its bindingness infinitely great; and the transgression of that law is thus, considered intensively, an absolute, an infinite evil. Moreover, here not so much the diuturnitas peccandi comes into consideration as the voluntas peccantis, quae hujusmodi est ut semper vellet peccare si posset, Aug. de civ. 21, 11.

Whoever does sin is a servant of sin and will and can do nothing other than sin. It truly does not lie with him if he is placed outside the opportunity to continue on the sinful way; according to his inner desire he would want nothing other than to live eternally in order to be able to sin eternally. Who then, attending to this sinful nature of sin, would dare to say that God is unrighteous if He visits it not only with temporal but also with eternal punishments? 6o Commonly this argument, derived from the righteousness of God, is therefore also advanced only timidly and hesitantly. All the more is eternal punishment regarded as in conflict with the goodness and the love of God. If, however, it is not in conflict with the righteousness of God, then it is also not and even cannot be with His goodness. There is here no choice. If eternal punishment is unrighteous, then it is thereby judged and the goodness of God no longer needs to be brought into it. If, however, it corresponds to God's righteousness, then the goodness of God remains thereby unharmed; what is righteous is also good. The argument, derived from God's goodness against eternal punishment, thus in the track of Marcion secretly introduces a conflict between God's righteousness and His goodness and sacrifices the former to the latter. A goodness, however, that nullifies righteousness is no true, essential goodness any more. It is nothing other than human weakness and softness, and, transferred to God, a fabrication of the human brain, in no way corresponding to the living, true God, who has revealed Himself in Scripture and also in nature. For if eternal [508] punishment is incompatible with God's goodness, then so is temporal punishment. But this is a fact that can be denied by no one. Humanity perishes under God's wrath and by His indignation it is terrified. Who can reconcile the suffering of the world with God's goodness and love? Yet it must be able to be brought into agreement with it, for it exists.

If now the existence of the dreadful suffering in this world may not make us doubt God's goodness, then eternal punishment also may not lead us to its denial. If this world is compatible with God's love, as it is and must be, then so is hell. For outside Holy Scripture there is no stronger proof for the existence of hell than the existence of this world, from whose misery the features of the image of hell have been borrowed. 7o Moreover, for the man who combats eternal punishment there exists great danger of playing the hypocrite over against God. He presents himself as the loving one, who in goodness and compassion far surpasses the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. That does not prevent that same man, as soon as his honor is assailed, from flaring up in rage and wishing all evil upon his insulter in this and in the coming life. Envy, hatred, anger, vindictiveness arise in the heart of every man against everyone who stands in his way. We seek our own honor, but for the honor of God we do not care; we stand up for our own right, but the right of God we let be trampled underfoot. That is truly a conclusive proof that man is not the suitable judge of the words and the actions of God. And yet, also in that standing up for one's own right and honor there lies something good. However wrongly man may apply it, there nevertheless lies in it that right and honor go above good and life. There slumbers also in the sinner still a deep sense of right and honor. And when that is assailed, it awakens and suppresses all compassion. When in a struggle between two men or between two peoples it is about right, then each prays with all his heart that God let right triumph and strike the violators of it with His judgment. All men still sense something of the fiat justitia, pereat mundus, and approve it that right triumph at the cost of thousands of human lives. It is also about right in the day of judgment, and not about some private right, but about right par excellence, [509] about right in its whole meaning and in

its full extent, about the righteousness of God, about God Himself to be praised as God unto eternity. 8o There is therefore also no doubt that God will in the day of judgment, even when He pronounces eternal punishment over the sinners, fully justify Himself before the eyes of all creatures. Now we know in part and also know the horribleness of sin only in part. But if we already here, upon hearing of certain atrocities, do not consider the heaviest punishment heavy enough, what will it then be when at the end of days we receive an insight into the depths of unrighteousness? And besides, we are here on earth always one-sided; sense of right and compassion repeatedly come into conflict; we are either too soft or far too strict in our judgment. But thus it is not and cannot be with the Lord our God. In Christ He has revealed His full love, and that love is therefore so great because it has bestowed a redemption from the coming wrath and from eternal perdition. The opponents of eternal punishment not only do injustice to the damnableness of sin, to the strictness of the divine right; they also infringe upon the greatness of God's love and of the redemption that is in Christ. If it had not been about the rescue from an eternal perdition, the price of the blood of God's own Son would have been far too dear. The heaven that He acquired for us by His atoning death presupposes a hell from which He delivered us. The eternal life that He bestowed upon us presupposes an eternal death from which He has redeemed us. The favor and the good pleasure of God, in which He causes us to share eternally, presupposes a wrath under which we otherwise would have had to sink eternally. And therefore this Christ also will once hold judgment and pronounce the sentence. A man, a true, perfect man, who knows what is in man, who is the meekest of all men, will be the judge of men, so righteous that all will acknowledge it and every knee will bow before Him and every tongue will

confess that Christ is the Lord, to the glory of God the Father. God will at the end, if not willingly, then unwillingly, be acknowledged as God by all creatures. 9o This must be enough for us. Investigations about the location and size of hell, about the nature of fire and worm, about the psychic and the physical condition of the lost lead to no result, [510] because Scripture keeps silence about it. Only this we still know, that the punishment of hell first begins after the day of judgment, that it is always threatened to those who stubbornly resist the truth of God, to the fearful and unbelieving and abominable and murderers and fornicators and sorcerers and idolaters and liars, Op. 21:8, and that it even then still differs according to the measure of each one's unrighteousness. Nowhere does Scripture teach that there is then still room for repentance and forgiveness. The addition in Mt. 12:32: neither in this age nor in the coming, does not serve to extend the forgivability of the sin against the Son of man also still in the coming age, but to set in the light the absolute unforgivability of the sin against the H. Spirit. Punishment is in its essence maintenance of righteousness and serves, specifically after the judgment, not to purify but to repay each one according to his work. But nevertheless Scripture teaches very clearly that there are degrees in that punishment; the poena damni is equal, but the poena sensus differs; each one receives according to his works, Mt. 10:15, 11:24, 23:14, 24:51, Luk. 10:12, 14, 12:46, 47, 2 Cor. 5:10 etc. And therein still something of God's mercy is expressed, part II 362. 365. All sin stands absolutely over against righteousness, but nevertheless God in the punishment takes account of the relative difference that exists between the sins. Even if therefore, with Augustine, Enchir. 110, cf. Lombardus, Thomas, Bonaventura on Sent. IV 46, it is not conceded, poenas damnatorum certis temporum intervallis aliquatenus mitigari, nevertheless

His righteousness in eternal punishment shows itself in such a way that His goodness and love remain uninjured and can never lawfully be accused. Also in hell the word holds that He does not afflict men from the heart, Klaagl. 3:33; the pain that He sends is no object of His or of the blessed' delight, but a means to the glorification of His virtues and thus by this final end determined in its heaviness and its measure. Cf. Augustinus, Enchir. 110-113. de civ. XXI. Lombardus e. a. on Sent. IV 46-50. Thomas, S. Theol. suppl. qu. 97-99. Dante, De Hel. Petavius, Theol. dogm. t. IV de angelis III c. 4-8. Simar, Dogm. § 163. Jansen, Prael. III 946-975. Bautz, Die Hölle, Mainz 1882. Sachs, Die ewige Dauer der Höllenstrafen, Paderborn 1900. Gerhard, Loc. IX tract. 5 and [511] Loc. XXX. Quenstedt, Theol. I 560-565. Vilmar, Dogm. II 323. Philippi, Kirchl. Gl. III 389. Kähler, Art. Höllenstrafen in Herzog3. Limborch, Theol. Christ. VI 13. Calvijn, Inst. III 25, 12. Synopsis pur. theol. disp. 52. Turretinus, Theol. El. XX qu. 7. Marck, Exspect. J. Chr. III c. 12. 13. Moor III 354-358. VI 798. M. Vitringa IV 175 II 305. 320. J. A. Turretinus, Op. II 612. Swinden, An inquiry into the nature and place of hell. Lond. 1727. Jon. Edwards, Works, New-York 1881 I 612-642 IV 254-321. Id. Plea for the eternity of punishments in a future life, Utrecht 1792. Hodge, Syst. Theol. III 818. Shedd, Dogm. Theol. II 667. Oosterzee, Dogm. § 149.

7. After the final judgment follows the renewal of the world. Some, with Thomas, S. Theol. suppl. qu. 74 art. 7, have indeed placed this before the last judgment, but the common representation is nevertheless this, that it follows upon it and then first enters, when the godless have already been banished from the earth. Undoubtedly this order also corresponds most with that in Holy Scripture. In the Old Test. the day of the Lord is indeed preceded by all kinds of dreadful signs and the judgment over the nations

takes place amid all kinds of terrible events, but the new earth with its extraordinary fertility then first begins, when the victory over the enemies has been achieved and the people of Israel has returned to its land and has been restored. Likewise, according to the New Test., many signs precede the day of judgment, such as darkening of sun and moon and stars, movement of the powers of heaven, etc., Mt. 24:29, but the burning of the earth nevertheless takes place only on the day of the Lord, 2 Petr. 3:10, and thereafter then comes the new heaven and the new earth, in which righteousness dwells, 2 Petr. 3:13. When the judgment has been carried out, John sees the new Jerusalem descending from God out of heaven, Op. 21:1v. With this expectation of a renewal of the world, Scripture takes a standpoint between two extremes. On the one hand it has been asserted by many, such as Plato, Aristotle, Xenophanes, Philo, Maimonides, Averroes, Nolanus, Peyrère, Edelmann, Czolbe etc., that this world would continue eternally in its present form. And on the other hand Origen, the Lutherans, the Mennonites, the Socinians, Vorstius, the Remonstrants and [512] also some Reformed, such as Beza, Rivetus, Junius, Wollebius, Prideaux, were of the opinion that it would not only be changed in form but destroyed in substance and replaced by an entirely new world, M. Vitringa IV 194-200. But neither of these two opinions finds support in Scripture. Oldtest. prophecy expects an extraordinary change in the whole of nature but nevertheless teaches no destruction of the present world. The passages in which one thinks this latter is taught, Ps. 102:27, Jes. 34:4, 51:6, 16, 65:17, 66:22, do indeed describe the change which will enter after the day of the Lord in very strong terms, but nevertheless do not include a destruction of the world's substance. For in the first place the description which is given there is far too figurative for a literal reductio ad nihilum of the whole

world to be able to be derived from it. Further, the passing away, אבד, of heaven and earth, Ps. 102:27, which in itself already never indicates an absolute destruction of the substance, is explained by this, that they will grow old like a garment, be changed like a robe, fall off like a leaf, vanish like smoke, Ps. 102:27, Jes. 34:4, 51:6. And finally the word create, ברא, which is used of the new heaven and the new earth, Jes. 65:17, by no means always indicates a bringing forth out of nothing, but often denotes such an activity of God by which He causes something new to come forth out of the old, Jes. 41:20, 43:7, 54:16, 57:19; therefore it also alternates with plant, found, make, Jes. 51:16, 66:22, and the Lord can say in Jes. 51:16, that He begins that new creation with this, that He puts his word in Israel's mouth and covers it with the shadow of his hand. The New Test. in the same way proclaims that heaven and earth will pass away, Mt. 5:18, 24:35, 2 Petr. 3:10, 1 Joh. 2:17, Op. 21:1, that they will perish, and grow old like a garment, Hebr. 1:11, be dissolved, 2 Petr. 3:11, be burned, 2 Petr. 3:10, be changed, Hebr. 1:12. But none of these expressions includes a destruction of the substance. For Peter expressly teaches that the old earth, which arose by separation of the waters, perished by the water of the flood, 2 Petr. 3:6, and that the present world likewise, although by virtue of God's promise no longer by water, nevertheless by fire [513] will perish. A destruction of the substance in the perishing of the present world is therefore just as little to be thought of as in the destruction of the former world in the flood; fire burns, cleanses, purifies but does not destroy. The contrast in 1 Joh. 2:17: he who does the will of God remains unto eternity, teaches that with the words: the world passes away with its lust, there is not meant a destruction of the substance of the world, but a disappearance of the world in its form devastated by sin. Paul therefore also says very clearly that the form, το

σχημα, of this world passes away, 1 Cor. 7:31. Moreover, such a renewal of the world alone accords with what Scripture teaches about redemption. This is, after all, never a second, new creation, but a re-creation of what exists. Therein consists precisely God's honor, that He redeems and renews the same humanity, the same world, the same heaven and the same earth, which were corrupted and defiled by sin. As a human being in Christ is a new creature, with whom the old has passed away and all has become new, 2 Cor. 5:17, so also this world in its present form passes away, in order, at the mighty word of God, out of its womb to give to a new world its appearance. As with the individual human being, so at the end of days there also takes place with the world a regeneration, Mt. 19:28, which is no physical creation but a spiritual renewal. Cf. Thomas, S. Theol. Suppl. qu. 74 art. 1 and qu. 91. Atzberger, Die christl. Eschat. 372 f. Gomarus, Op. I 131-133. 416. Spanheim, Dubia Evang. III 670-712. Turretinus, Th. El. XX qu. 5. Moor VI 733-736. M. Vitringa IV 186-215. Kliefoth, Eschat. 297 f.

8. This renewal of the visible world brings to light the one-sidedness of spiritualism, which restricts future blessedness to heaven. In Old Testament prophecy there can be no doubt that it describes blessedness as an earthly one; it expects that the people of God after the great day will dwell in safety and peace under the anointed king from David's house in Palestine and will be surrounded and served by the heathen nations. There is truth in the words of Delitzsch on Isa. 66:24: Das ist ja eben der Unterschied des A. und N. T., dass das [514] A. T. das Jenseits verdiesseitigt, das N. T. das Diesseits verjenseitigt; dass das A. T. das Jenseits in den Gesichtskreis des Diesseits herabzieht, das N. T. das Diesseits in das Jenseits emporhebt. But yet they do not allow the N. T. expectation of future blessedness to come fully into its own. There is in the N. Test. undoubtedly a spiritualization of Old

Testament prophecy; because Jesus' coming falls apart into a first and a second, the kingdom of God is first planted in a spiritual sense in the heart of men; and the goods of that kingdom are all inward and invisible, forgiveness, peace, righteousness, eternal life. Correspondingly, the essence of future blessedness is also conceived more spiritually, especially by Paul and John, as a being always with the Lord, Joh. 12:26, 14:3, 17:24, 2 Cor. 5:8, Phil. 1:23, 1 Thess. 4:17, 5:10, 1 Joh. 3:2. But yet that blessedness is not thereby shut up within heaven. That this cannot be the case is shown in principle already from this, that the N. T. teaches the incarnation of the Word and the bodily resurrection of Christ, expects at the end of days his bodily return, and immediately thereafter has the bodily resurrection of all men, and in particular that of believers, take place. All this overturns the spiritualism which, if it remained faithful to its principle, like Origen after the day of judgment might leave nothing but spirits in an uncreated heaven. Scripture, however, teaches quite otherwise. According to it the world consists of heaven and earth, man of soul and body, and accordingly the kingdom of God also has a spiritual, hidden and an outward, visible side. While Jesus has come the first time in order to found that kingdom in a spiritual sense, he returns at the end of days in order to give it also a visible form. The reformation proceeds from within to without; the rebirth of men is completed in the rebirth of creation; the kingdom of God is then only fully realized when it is also visibly extended over the earth. Thus the disciples also understood it, when after his resurrection they asked Jesus whether he would now restore the kingdom to Israel. And Jesus in his answer to that question does not deny that he will once establish such a kingdom, but only says that the times for that have been fixed by the Father and that his disciples [515] now have the calling to be his witnesses in the

power of the H. Spirit unto the uttermost part of the earth, Hd. 1:6-8. Elsewhere he testifies expressly that the meek shall inherit the earth, Mt. 5:5, and he represents future blessedness as a meal, where one sits at table with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Mt. 8:11, enjoys food and drink, Luk. 22:30, eats of the new, perfect passover, Luk. 22:16, and drinks of the fruit of the new vine, Mt. 26:29. Indeed in this dispensation, up to the parousia, the eye of believers is directed upward, toward heaven. There is their treasure, Mt. 6:20, 19:21; there is Jesus, who is their life, seated at the right hand of God, Joh. 14:3, 17:24, Col. 3:1-3; there is their citizenship, while they are strangers here, Phil. 3:20, Hebr. 11:13-16; there the inheritance is kept for them, Hebr. 10:34, 1 Petr. 1:4. But that inheritance is destined to be revealed. Christ once comes back visibly, and then in his glory causes the whole congregation, indeed the whole world, to share. Believers are not only changed into his image, Joh. 17:24, Rom. 8:17, 18, 28, Phil. 3:21, Col. 3:4, 1 Joh. 3:2, but the whole creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God, Rom. 8:21; earth and heaven are thus renewed, so that righteousness dwells in it, 2 Petr. 3:13, Op. 21:1; the heavenly Jerusalem, which is now above and was the pattern of the earthly Jerusalem, then descends to earth, Gal. 4:26, Hebr. 11:10, 13-16, 12:22, 13:14, Op. 3:12, 21:2v. This new Jerusalem is not identical with the church, although it can also figuratively be called the bride of the Lamb, Op. 21:2, 9, for Hebr. 12:22, 23 makes very clearly a distinction between the heavenly Jerusalem and the church of the firstborn (pious of the O. T.) and of the perfected righteous (departed Christians). The heavenly Jerusalem is a city, built by God himself, Hebr. 11:10; it is the city of the living God, because God is not only its builder but also himself dwells in it, Op. 21:3; the angels are therein the servants and form the court

retinue of the great King, Hebr. 12:22; the blessed are therein the citizens, Op. 21:27, 22:3, 4. The description which John gives of that Jerusalem, Op. 21 and 22, may certainly no more than his preceding visions be taken literally; this is already excluded by the fact that John represents it as a cube, of which length, breadth and height are equal, namely 12000 stadia, i.e. 300 German miles, while the height of the wall is yet only 144 cubits, Op. 21:15-17. John does not mean by his description a drawing of the city, but he gives thoughts and interprets them in images, because the glory of the kingdom of God cannot be brought to our consciousness in any other way. And those images he borrows from paradise, with its river and tree of life, Op. 21:6, 22:1, 2, from the earthly Jerusalem with its gates and streets, Op. 21:12v., from the temple with its holy of holies, in which God himself dwelt, Op. 21:3, 22, from the whole realm of nature with all its treasures of gold and precious stones, Op. 21:11, 18-21. But although they are thoughts which in that way are interpreted by images, those thoughts are nevertheless not imaginations or fictions but this-worldly descriptions of other-worldly realities. All that is true, all that is noble, all that is righteous, all that is pure, all that is lovely, all that is of good report, in the whole creation, in heaven and earth, is brought together in the future city of God, but renewed, re-created, raised to its highest glory. The substance for it is present in this creation. As the caterpillar develops into a butterfly, as carbon is transformed into diamond, as the grain of wheat, dying in the earth, brings forth another, as the whole nature revives in spring and adorns itself in festive attire, as the church is formed out of Adam’s fallen race, as the resurrection body is raised out of the body that has died and been buried in the earth; so also once by the re-creating power of Christ out of the elements of this world purified by fire the new heaven and earth appear,

radiant in imperishable glory and for ever delivered from the δουλεια της φθορας. More glorious than this beautiful earth, more glorious than the earthly Jerusalem, more glorious even than paradise will be the glory of the new Jerusalem, of which God himself is the artist and the builder. The status gloriae will not be a pure restoration of the original status naturae, but a reformation which, thanks to the power of Christ, causes all ὑλη to pass over into εἰδος, all potentia into actus and will set the whole creation before God's face, radiant [517] in unfading splendor and blooming in the spring of an eternal youth. Substantially nothing is lost. Outside indeed are the dogs and the sorcerers and the whoremongers and the murderers and the idolaters and every one that loves or does the lie, Op. 22:15. But in the new heaven and the new earth the world is restored; in the church the human race is preserved; in that church, which out of all nations and languages and tongues has been bought and gathered by Christ, Op. 5:9 etc., all the peoples, also Israel, each retains its distinct place and calling, Mt. 8:11, Rom. 11:25, Op. 21:24, 22:2; and all those peoples bring together into the new Jerusalem all that each according to its distinct nature has received from God in glory and honor, Op. 21:24, 26.

9. The blessings in which the blessed share are therefore not only spiritual but also material or bodily in nature. As wrong as it is, with the heathen peoples and also with some Chiliasts, to make the latter the chief constituent of future blessedness, so one-sided is it also to count them with Stoic indifference or also to exclude them altogether from blessedness. Scripture always keeps the spiritual and the natural in close connection; since the world consists of heaven and earth and man of soul and body, holiness and glory, virtue and happiness, moral and natural world-order ought in the end also to be harmoniously connected. The blessed will

therefore not only be free from all sin, but also from all consequences of sin, from ignorance and error, Joh. 6:45, from death, Luk. 20:36, 1 Cor. 15:26, Op. 2:11, 20:6, 14, from poverty and sickness, pain and fear, hunger and thirst, cold and heat, Mt. 5:4, Luk. 6:21, Op. 7:16, 17, 21:4, from all weakness, dishonour and corruption, 1 Cor. 15:42 etc. But the spiritual blessings are nevertheless the principal ones and are innumerably many: holiness, Op. 3:4, 5, 7:14, 19:8, 21:27, blessedness, Rom. 13:11, 1 Thess. 5:9, Hebr. 1:14, 5:9, glory, Luk. 24:36, Rom. 2:10, 8:18, 21, adoption as children, Rom. 8:23, eternal life, Mt. 19:16, 29 etc., beholding of and conformity to God and Christ, Mt. 5:8, Joh. 17:24, Rom. 8:29, 1 Cor. 13:12, 2 Cor. 3:18, Phil. 3:21, 1 Joh. 3:2, Op. 22:4, [518] communion with and serving and praising of God and Christ, Joh. 17:24, 2 Cor. 5:8, Phil. 1:23, Op. 4:10, 5:9, 13, 7:10, 15, 21:3, 22:3 etc. Because all these benefits are in principle already bestowed on believers on earth, such as e.g. adoption as children, Rom. 9:4, 8:15, Gal. 4:5, Ef. 1:5, and eternal life, Joh. 3:15, 16, 36 etc., many have conceived the blessedness which Christ bestows exclusively as a present one, which only in the way of an ethical process realises itself more and more, Pfleiderer, Grundriss § 177. Biedermann, Dogm. § 974 f. Scholten, Initia c. 7. Ritschl too and many of his adherents lay one-sided emphasis on the diesseitige Weltstellung des Menschen, regard the moral freedom which the Christian receives in faith over against the world as the principal benefit, and speak little or not at all of the eternal blessedness which Christ in the future prepares for his own, Ritschl, Rechtf. u. Vers. III2 459 f. 484 f. 534 f. 600 f. Over against the abstract supranaturalism of the Greek and Roman church, which conceives blessedness exclusively as transcendent and thus here on earth deems the Christian ideal of life embodied in the monk, this view defends an

important truth. The Reformation, returning to Scripture, has in principle overcome this supranaturalistic and ascetic view of life. He who believes has at that same moment forgiveness of sins and eternal life; he is a child of God, who serves the Father, not as a servant out of hope for reward, but as a son, who out of love and gratitude fulfils the will of the Father; and he fulfils that will, not by fleeing away from the world but by being faithful in the calling which is entrusted to him here on earth. Life for heaven therefore forms no antithesis with life in the midst of the world; precisely in that world Christ preserves his disciples from the Evil One. The new heaven and earth is, after all, built up out of the elements of the world that now exists, and the church is the restored humanity under Christ as Head. But however much blessedness in a certain sense is already the portion of believers on earth, it is that only in principle and not in full reality. Believers are saved in hope, Rom. 8:24; Jesus calls the poor in spirit etc. blessed, because theirs is the kingdom of heaven, which in the future will be established on earth, [519] Mt. 5:3-10. Believers are children of God and yet still expect the full realisation of that sonship, Mt. 5:9, Rom. 8:23. They have eternal life, and yet must still receive it at the resurrection, also according to John, 5:20-29, 6:40, 44, 54. Both therefore is true, that the kingdom of heaven is there and that it nevertheless still comes. And this double truth determines the whole character of the state of glory. Just as the new heaven and earth is formed out of the elements of this world and the church is a re-creation of the human race fallen in Adam, so also the life of the blessed hereafter is to be thought of in analogy with the life of believers here on earth. It consists on the one hand not in a visio Dei in the Roman sense, to which human nature can be raised only by a donum superadditum, and on the other hand it is also not a slow and gradual development of the

Christian life that is already led here on earth by believers. It is a truly natural life, but raised by grace to its highest glory, and unfolded in its richest beauty; the materia remains, but the forma differs. Religion, that is, communion with God, therefore takes in it the first, the central place. But that communion will be richer, deeper, more blessed, than it ever was or could be here on earth, for it will be disturbed by no sin, broken by no distance, mediated by no nature or Scripture. Now we see in the mirror of God's revelation only his image; then we see face to face, and know, as we are known. Visio, comprehensio, fruitio Dei constitute the essence of future blessedness. The blessed see God, indeed not with bodily eyes, but yet in a way that far surpasses all revelation in this dispensation by means of nature and of Scripture; and correspondingly they will all know him, though each according to the measure of his capacity, with a knowledge that has in the knowledge of God its image and likeness, direct, immediate, pure and clean, part II 150-155. They then receive and possess everything which here they have expected only in hope. And thus, beholding God and possessing God, they enjoy God and are blessed in his communion; blessed according to soul and according to body, in understanding and in will. In theology there was difference over whether blessedness hereafter formaliter resided in the understanding or in [520] the will, and thus consisted in knowledge or in love. Thomas said the former, S. Theol. I 2 qu. 3 art. 4, and Duns Scotus asserted the latter, Sent. IV dist. 49 qu. 4. But Bonaventura united both and observed that the fruitio Dei was not only a fruit of the cognitio Dei but also of the amor Dei and had its cause in the union and cooperation of both, Sent. IV dist. 49 p. 1 art. unic. qu. 4. 5, cf. Voetius, Disp. II 1217-1239.

10. The blessedness of communion with God is enjoyed in and increased by the communion of saints. Already on earth this communion is a glorious benefit of faith. Those who for Jesus' sake have left house or brothers or sisters or father or mother or wife or children or fields, receive back already in this life, with persecutions, houses and brothers and sisters and mothers and children and fields, Mk. 10:29, 30, for all who do the will of the Father are Jesus' brother and sister and mother, Mt. 12:50. Through the Mediator of the New Testament the believers come into communion, not only with the church militant on earth, but also with the church triumphant in heaven, the assembly of the firstborn, the spirits of the perfected righteous, even with the many thousands of angels, Hebr. 12:22-24. But this communion, although existing already on earth in principle, above p. 28, will nevertheless be incomparably much richer and more glorious, when all dividing walls of descent and language, of time and space, have been demolished, all sin and error banished, and all the elect will have been brought together in the new Jerusalem. Then the prayer of Jesus will be fully answered, that all his sheep form one flock under one Shepherd, Joh. 10:16, 17:21. All the saints will then together fully comprehend what the breadth and length and depth and height are of the love of Christ, Ef. 3:18; they will together be filled unto all the fullness of God, Ef. 3:19, Col. 2:2, 10, for Christ, whom God fills, Col. 1:19, in his turn fills the church with himself and makes it his pleroma, Ef. 1:23, 4:10, cf. part III 417. And sitting down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob at one table, Mt. 8:11, they raise with one mouth the song of praise to the honor of God and of the Lamb, Op. 4:11, 5:12 etc. Of the church on earth Scripture says many times that it forms a little flock, Mt. 7:14, [521] 22:14, Luk. 12:32, 13:23, which is confirmed by history up to the present day. And even toward the end of

days, when the gospel will be preached among all peoples, the apostasy will increase and the number of the faithful will be small; already the prophecy of the O. Test. proclaimed that only a remnant of Israel would turn to the Lord and be saved, above p. 429; and the N. Test. likewise cherishes the expectation that those who persevere to the end will be few, Mt. 24:13, 25:1v., Luk. 18:8. But on the other hand Scripture often nevertheless speaks very universalistically. The covenant of grace is made known in Adam to the whole of humanity, Gen. 3:15. The covenant of nature, which is concluded after the flood, includes all creatures, Gen. 9:9, 10. In Abraham all the families of the earth are blessed, Gen. 12:3. The redemption which will once be bestowed on Israel benefits all Gentiles, above p. 433. Jesus says that he will give his soul as a ransom for many, Mt. 20:28, and that many will come from East and West and will sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, Mt. 8:11. The grace that has appeared in him is much more abundant than Adam's transgression; it comes upon all men unto justification of life, Rom. 5:12-20, 1 Cor. 15:22. Now in this dispensation all things in heaven and on earth are gathered together under Christ into one, Ef. 1:10. And once at the end, every knee will bow before Christ and every tongue confess him as the Lord, Phil. 2:10, 11. Then a great multitude, which no one can count, will stand before the throne and the Lamb, Op. 7:9, 19:1, 6. They are peoples who are saved and walk in the light of the new Jerusalem, Op. 21:24, 26, 22:2. And God will then be all in all, 1 Cor. 15:28. In connection with and with appeal to this latter series of texts many have cherished the hope that in the end, if not all creatures, then at least all men and, if even this should not be the case, then at least by far the most men would be saved; hell would not exist at all or would be only a small corner in the universe. They grounded this expectation of theirs either

on the possibility of also being saved by the works of the law (Pelagians, Socinians, Deists etc.), or on the opportunity to hear the gospel also after death in the intermediate state or [522] even still after the day of judgment and to accept it in faith (Universalists). These opinions have already been discussed earlier and therefore now no longer need to be tested by Scripture, cf. part I 232. II 318 f. 340 f. 350 f. III 390-408 and above p. 499v. But also among those who hold fast the confession that no one comes to the Father except through Christ and that there is only one name under heaven given for salvation, Joh. 14:6, Hd. 4:12, there have always been some who believed in the possibility of salvation in this life outside the preaching of the gospel. Thus they taught with respect to the children of the covenant, to all the children dying young within and outside the boundaries of Christendom, to idiots, insane persons, deaf-mutes, who in fact were deprived of the preaching of the gospel, and also to some or to many Gentiles, who in their clear insight and virtuous life gave proofs of a true piety. Some church fathers assumed an activity of the Logos in the Gentile world, part I 238. Augustine believed that from the beginning there had always been some, not only among Israel but also among other peoples, who believed in the Logos and lived piously and righteously according to his commandments, Ep. 102. de civ. 18, 47 and other places in Reuter, Aug. Studien 1887 S. 90 f. Abaelard asserted that Gentiles too could partake of salvation, in Münscher-v. Coelln, D. G. II 147. According to Strauss, Chr. Gl. I 271, Luther once expressed the wish that God might also be gracious to men such as Cicero and Seneca, and Melanchthon wanted to leave it open whether He perhaps by a special way had communicated to Solon, Themistocles e. a. some knowledge of forgiveness in Christ. Zwingli spoke more decisively and believed that God also had his elect among the

Gentiles, Chr. fidei expos. Op. IV 65. But others left only the possibility open and dared no more than to hope and wish, as e.g. à Lasco, in Kuyper, Heraut 1047. Zanchius, in Shedd, Dogm. Theol. I 436 II 704. Bilderdijk, Letters V 81. Kuyper, Heraut 594 cf. 1047. Ebrard, Das Dogma v. h. Ab. II 77. Shedd, Dogm. Theol. I 436 II 704. This opinion, however, always remained the opinion of a few; the churches did not express themselves about it in their confessions and most theologians opposed it, cf. literature in M. Vitringa I 29. Somewhat more favorably [523] one judged concerning the salvation of children dying young. The Roman Catholics teach that all Christian children who, voto or re baptized, die, are saved, and all other children dying early suffer in the limbus infantum a poena damni, not sensus, Lombardus e. a. on Sent. II dist. 33. The Lutherans judge with respect to Christian children as the Roman Catholics and leave the others to God's judgment, Gerhard, Loc. XVI § 169. Buddeus, Inst. theol. V I, 6. The Reformed inclined to believe that all children born in the covenant of grace and then taken away by death before the years of discernment partake of heavenly salvation, Can. Dordr. I 7. Voetius, Disp. II 417, although many here too made a distinction between elect and reprobate children and did not dare to ascribe salvation with certainty to each of these children individually, Martyr, Loci Comm. p. 76. 436, Beza, Pareus, Zanchius, Perkins e. a. As for the children dying early outside the covenant, some judged rather mildly; Junius preferred to suspect out of love that they were saved rather than that they were lost, Op. II 333, and Voetius said: whether they are lost or whether some among them are elect and are regenerated before their death, nolim negare, affirmare non possum, Disp. II 413, cf. further literature in M. Vitringa II 51. 52, and especially B. Warfield, The development of the doctrine of infant salvation, in: Two studies in the

history of doctrine, New-York, Christ. Lit. Comp. 1897 p. 143-239. With Scripture in hand we can, both with respect to the salvation of the Gentiles and to that of children dying young, not get further than that we refrain from a decided and definite judgment in a positive or negative sense. Only it deserves remark that Reformed theology in these serious questions is in a much more favorable condition than any other. For all other churches can in this matter cherish a milder judgment only if they go back on their doctrine of the absolute necessity of the means of grace or make an inroad on that of the condemnability of sin. But the Reformed, in the first place, did not want to determine the measure of grace with which a man can still be bound to God even under many errors and sins, nor to determine the degree of knowledge that is indispensably necessary for salvation, Voetius, Disp. II 537. 538. 781. Witsius, Apost. Geloof II 2 and 15. Spanheim, Op. III 1291. [524] And in the second place they maintained that the means of grace were not absolutely necessary for salvation and that God could also regenerate unto eternal life outside word and sacraments, Calvin, Inst. IV 16, 19. In the second Helv. Confession, art. 1 it reads: agnoscimus Deum illuminare posse homines, etiam sine externo ministerio, quos et quando velit; id quod ejus potentiae est. And the Westminster Confession states in cap. X § 3 that elect children who die in their infancy are regenerated and saved by the Spirit of Christ, qui quando et ubi et quo sibi placuerit modo operatur, and that this also applies to the other elect, quotquot externae vocationis per ministerium verbi sunt incapaces. Reuter therefore rightly says, when he has set forth Augustine's doctrine on this point: In der That, es lässt sich das Paradoxon rechtfertigen, gerade die partikularistische Prädestinationslehre habe jene universalistisch klingenden Phrasen ermöglicht, Aug. Studien 92. In Reformed theology even the above-cited universalistic texts of Scripture

come best and most beautifully into their own. For universalistic in the sense that all men or even all creatures are saved, those texts are certainly not intended and also not understood by any Christian church. All confess without exception that there is not only a heaven but also a hell. At most there is therefore difference about the number of those who are saved and who are lost. But about that one must not dispute; for that number is known to God alone. To the question: Lord, are there also few who are saved, Jesus gave only the answer: strive to enter through the narrow gate, for many will seek to enter and will not be able, Luk. 13:24. This alone is directly of importance for us; the number of the elect need not be known to us. But in any case this stands firm, that the number of the elect in Reformed theology for no single reason and in no single respect needs to be thought smaller than in any other theology. When it comes to it, the Reformed confession is more generous of heart and broader of view than any other Christian confession. It finds the last, deepest cause of salvation only in God's good pleasure, in his eternal compassion, in his unfathomable mercy, in the unsearchable riches of his almighty and free grace. What firmer, broader [525] foundation could besides that be found for the salvation of a guilty and lost human race? Let many then fall away; however moving this may be, in Christ the church, humanity, the world is nevertheless saved. The organism of creation is restored. The ungodly are destroyed from the earth, Ps. 104:35, they are cast out, Joh. 12:31, 15:6, Op. 22:15. But under Christ all things, in heaven and on earth, are gathered together into one, Ef. 1:10. All things have been created through him and unto him, Col. 1:16.

11. Communion with God, which is enjoyed in the communion of the saints, certainly no more in the coming age than in this dispensation excludes all action and all activity. Christian theology has as a rule devoted

little attention to this and has mostly spoken of heavenly blessedness as a knowing and enjoying of God. And this is without doubt also the core and the center, the source and the power of eternal life. Scripture also offers few data to form for us a clear conception of the activity of the blessed. It describes blessedness more as a resting from earthly labor than as the accomplishing of a new activity, Hebr. 4:9, Op. 14:13. But nevertheless the rest that is enjoyed in the new Jerusalem is, no more with God, Joh. 5:17, than with his children, to be conceived as a blessed doing-nothing. Holy Scripture itself says that eternal life consists in a knowing and serving, in a praising and extolling of God, Joh. 17:3, Op. 4:11, 5:8 etc. His children also remain his servants, who serve Him day and night, Op. 22:3. They are prophets, priests, and kings, who reign on the earth unto all eternity, Op. 1:6, 5:10, 22:5. In proportion as they have been faithful over little on earth, they are set over much in the kingdom of God, Mt. 24:47, 25:21, 23. Each retains his own personality, for of all who enter into the new Jerusalem the names are written in the book of life of the Lamb, Op. 20:15, 27, and each receives a own, new name, Jes. 62:2, 65:15, Op. 2:17, 3:12, cf. 21:12, 14. The dead who die in the Lord rest from their toils, but are each followed by his own works, Op. 14:13. Generations, peoples, nations contribute what is theirs to the enrichment of life in the [526] new Jerusalem, Op. 5:9, 7:9, 21:24, 26. What is sown here is reaped in eternity, Mt. 25:24, 26, 1 Cor. 15:42v., 2 Cor. 9:6, Gal. 6:7, 8. The great diversity that exists among men in every respect is not destroyed in eternity but cleansed of all that is sinful and made serviceable to communion with God and with one another. And just as natural diversity in the church on earth is still increased by spiritual diversity, 1 Cor. 12:7v., so this natural and spiritual difference in heaven increases still further by the fact that there are different degrees of glory. In

opposition to the meritoriousness of good works some Reformed, such as Martyr, Loci C. III 17, 8, Camero, Schoenfeld, Tilenus, Spanheim, just as already in the fourth century Jovinianus and later some Socinians and even now Gerlach, have denied all distinction in glory hereafter. And it is also true that the same benefits in the future of Christ are promised to all believers; they all receive the same eternal life, the same dwelling place in the new Jerusalem, the same communion with God, the same blessedness, etc. But nevertheless Scripture places it beyond all doubt that in that unity and equality there is a very great variation and diversity. Even the parable, Mt. 20:1-16, to which one many times appeals for the contrary, pleads for such a distinction; for Jesus wishes by that parable to teach that many who in their own and others' opinion have labored long and heavily will in the future Messianic kingdom absolutely not lag behind those who have been active in the vineyard for a much shorter time; the last overtake the first, for many are indeed called and labor in the service of the kingdom of God, but few are there who for that enjoy a special distinction hereafter and receive a chosen place. Much more clearly such a gradational difference in glory is taught in other places in Scripture, especially where there is mention of a reward that will be bestowed on each according to his works. That reward is now kept in the heavens, Mt. 5:12, 6:1v., Luk. 6:23, 1 Tim. 6:19, Hebr. 10:34-37, and is only distributed publicly at the parousia, Mt. 6:4, 6, 18, 24:47, 2 Thess. 1:7, 1 Petr. 4:13. It is then bestowed as [527] compensation for what the disciples of Jesus here on earth for his sake have denied and suffered, Mt. 5:10v., 19:29, Luk. 6:21v., Rom. 8:17, 18, 2 Cor. 4:17, 2 Thess. 1:7, Hebr. 10:34, 1 Petr. 4:13, and further also as recompense for the good works that they have performed, such as e.g. for good use of the talents, Mt. 25:15v., Luk. 19:13v., for love of enemies and disinterested

generosity, Luk. 6:35, for care of the poor, Mt. 6:1, for praying and fasting, Mt. 6:6, 18, for serving the brethren, Mt. 10:40-42, for faithful service in the kingdom of God, Mt. 24:44-47, 1 Cor. 3:8 etc. That reward will be connected with and proportionate to the works, Mt. 16:27, 19:29, 25:21, 23, Luk. 6:38, 19:17, 19, Rom. 2:6, 1 Cor. 3:8, 2 Cor. 4:17, 5:10, 9:6, Gal. 6:8, 9, Hebr. 11:26, Op. 2:23, 11:18, 20:12, 22:12. Blessedness is indeed the same for all, but there is difference in luster and glory, Dan. 12:3, 1 Cor. 15:41; there are in the Father's house, which receives all children, many dwellings, Joh. 14:2; and the churches all receive according to the measure of their faithfulness and devotion, from the king of the church an own ornament and crown, Op. 1-3. The Roman Catholics have on these statements of Scripture built the doctrine of the meritoriousness of good works, Trid. VI can. 31. 32, and the right to special rewards in heaven, which according to Ex. 25:25 are called aureolae and are added to the corona aurea that falls to all, especially assigned to the martyrs, the celibates, and the teachers, Thomas, S. Theol. III qu. 96. Bonaventura, Brevil. VII 7. But this misuse does not take away the truth that there is distinction in glory according to the works that have been performed by believers here on earth. There is no reward to which man by nature could lay claim, for the law of God is absolutely binding and does not make the demand for fulfillment depend on the free choice of man. If therefore he has fulfilled the whole law, nothing else befits him to say than that he is an unprofitable servant, who has only done what he was obliged to do, Luk. 17:10. All claim to reward can therefore arise only from a covenant, from a sovereign and gracious disposition of God, and is therefore a given right, part II 553. So it was in the covenant of works and so it is still much more in the covenant of grace, part III 563. For [528] Christ has accomplished

everything, not only suffered the punishment but also by fulfilling the law acquired eternal life. The eternal blessedness and glory which He received was for Him the reward for his perfect obedience. But when He bestows this his righteousness on his own through faith and connects eternal life to it, then both, both that bestowed righteousness and the future blessedness, are gifts of his grace, which altogether excludes all merit on the side of believers. For believers are God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God has prepared, that they should walk in them, Ef. 2:10. It is given to them by grace in the matter of Christ, not only to believe in Him but also to suffer for Him, Phil. 1:29, Hd. 5:41. Not only in the gift of eternal life to each who believes, but also in the distribution of a different measure of glory to those who from that faith have brought forth good works, God crowns his own work. But He does that also, in order that, as here, so hereafter in the church there would be a rich diversity and in that diversity the glory of his virtues would come forth. For by that diversity the life of communion with God, with the angels, and of the blessed among themselves increases in depth and in intimacy. In that communion each has, as in the church here on earth, Rom. 12:4-8, 1 Cor. 12, in connection with his person and character, an own place and task. Of the activity of the blessed we may be unable to form a pure conception, yet Scripture teaches that the prophetic, priestly, and kingly office, which man originally possessed, is in them through Christ fully restored. The service of God, mutual communion, and the inhabiting of the new heaven and the new earth undoubtedly offers for the exercise of these offices abundant opportunity, even if the form and manner of it is unknown to us. But that working is a resting and enjoying at the same time. The distinction of day and night, of sabbath and workdays has ceased; time is permeated with the eternity of

God; space is full of his presence; the eternal becoming is married to the unchangeable being. Even the antithesis of heaven and earth has disappeared. For all that is in heaven and on earth is gathered into one under [529] Christ as Head, Ef. 1:10. All creatures are and live and move in God, who is all in all, who in the mirror of his works reflects all his virtues and therein glorifies himself. Cf. on heavenly blessedness: Augustinus, de civ. XXII c. 29. 30. Lombardus, Sent. IV dist. 49. Thomas, suppl. qu. 92-96. Bonaventura, Brevil. VII c. 7. Oswald, Eschat. 38-57. Atzberger, Die christl. Eschat. 238 f. Simar, Dogm. § 162. Jansen, Prael. III 903-946. O. Ritschl, Luthers Seligkeitsvorstellung in ihrer Entstehung und Bedeutung, Christl. Welt 1889 S. 874-880. Gerhard, Loc. XXXI. Quenstedt, Theol. I 550-560. Hollaz 451 sq. Polanus, Synt. VI c. 72-75. Amyraldus, Theses Salm. III 859. Synopsis pur. theol., disp. 52. Mastricht, Theol. VIII 4, 10. Turretinus, Theol. El. XX qu. 8-13. Marck, Exspect J. C. III c. 8. 10. 11. Moor VI 718-733. M. Vitringa IV 179. Kliefoth, Eschat. 311 f. Titius, Die N. T. Lehre von der Seligkeit im Reiche Gottes und ihre Bedeutung für die Gegenwart 1895-1900. [530]

Broader Table of Contents.

Monergism Books

FIRST PART.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. Name and concept of Dogmatics pp. 1-9. Names of dogmatics n. 1[A]. The word dogma 2. Authority of the dogma 3. Material content of the dogma 4. 5.

[A] These figures indicate the numbers under which the material of the various paragraphs is divided.

§ 2. Encyclopaedic Place of Dogmatics pp. 9-14. In systematic Theology 1. Distinction of Dogmatics from Symbolics, Catechetics 2 and Ethics 3.

§ 3. Method of Dogmatics pp. 14-31. Scripture, church and personal conviction as factors with which Dogmatics has to reckon 1-3. Critical direction, which draws knowledge from the subject 4. Ecclesiastical, which deems tradition infallible 5. Biblical, which consults Scripture apart from history 6. Significance of the church and of its confession for Dogmatics 7.

On Scripture (and the revelation of God in nature, theol. naturalis) 8. On personal conviction 9.

§ 4. Division of Dogmatics pp. 31-51. With Clement, Orig., Theodoretus, Damascenus, Augustine 1, Lombardus, Bonaventura, Thomas 2, later Roman theologians 3. With Melanchthon, Calvin 4, and later Reformed and Lutheran theologians 5. Reaction against the synthetic method with Calixtus, Coccejus 6, and still more strongly with Rationalism 7, and is the new theology 8. Division into a general and a special part, and of this latter according to the synthetic order 9. 10.

§ 5. History and Literature of Dogmatics pp. 51-139. Scientific theology, which does not yet occur among the Apost. fathers 1, becomes necessary after the combating of the faith by Lucian, Celsus, Porphyry, Julian, the Gnostics, for self-defence among the Apologists 2, and then diverges in the direction of the N. Afr., Asia Minor, or Alex. School 3, and in the controversy against monarchianism [531] in the 3rd century obtains a firm foundation 4. Establishment and defence of the trinitarian and christological dogma in the East in the 4th to the 8th century 5. The dogmatic development in the East culminates in Joh. Damascenus 6, and then indeed continues, but is for a great part still unknown 7. Dogmatics in the West bears from the beginning, already in Tert., Cypr., Iren., a character of its own, even though it is also dependent on the East 8, and finds its most excellent interpreter in Augustine 9. Gregory led church and theology over to the new peoples, who at first simply adopted both (Isidore, Alcuin) 10, but then became independent and in scholasticism produced a theology of their own 11. Scholasticism proceeded in three periods 12, and had mysticism alongside it 13. In the last part of the M. E. it fell into decline and was exposed to much criticism, but after the Reformation it recovered

again 14, and especially in Spain came to flourishing 15. In the 18th century Roman theology came under the influence of Rationalism 16, and remained there also still in part in the 19th century (Hermes, Günther); but it nevertheless knew how to free itself again and appeared independently again as traditionalism, romanticism, mediation theology, and especially as Thomism 17. The Lutheran Reformation received its first dogmatician in Melanchthon and its consensus in the Form. Conc. 18, was developed scholastically in the 17th century 19, but in the 18th century weakened by Pietism, Hernhuttism, Rationalism 20, 21, and in this century attached itself especially to the various systems of philosophy, to Kant 22, Jacobi 23, Schleiermacher 24, Hegel 25, Schelling 26, or appeared as confessionalism, Biblical theology 27, or neo-Kantianism 28. The Swiss Reformation, which differs in principle from the German 29, received its dogmatic system from Calvin and found acceptance in France, the Netherlands, England, Scotland, Germany 30. Toward the end of the 16th century the scholastic method arose in Reformed theology, which brought it to great flourishing in various countries 31, but through Anab., Arm., Cartes., Coccejanism 32, Amyraldism, Independentism, Baptism, Quakerism, Deism came to decline 33. Tolerance, neology, supranaturalism, neonomism now came to the fore 34. But over against the negative directions in our fatherland of supranaturalism, Groningen and modern theology there came a revival of positive theology through Secession and Réveil, Utrecht and ethical-iren. direction and through the awakening Calvinism 35, a revival which also occurs elsewhere, but usually bears a less decided Reformed character, Germany 35, Switzerland and France 36. England and Scotland 37, America 38, 39. [532]

CHAPTER I. Principles in general.

§ 6. Meaning of the principia pp. 140-145. The name ἀρχη, principium 1. Principium essendi 2. Principium cognoscendi, externum and internum 3. Unity and distinction of these three principia 4.

§ 7. Principles in science pp. 145-170. Rationalism, which runs through the whole history of philosophy 1, derives all knowledge from the subject 2, but fails to recognize the princ. cogn. externum and lapses into idealism and illusionism 3. Empiricism seeks the source of knowledge in sensible perception 4, but fails to recognize the princ. cogn. internum and leads to materialism 5. In contrast, Realism proceeds from the general, natural certainty concerning the objectivity and truth of knowledge 6, recognizes both the princ. cogn. internum and externum 7, lets all knowledge begin with sensible perception 8, but ascribes to the understanding the capacity to penetrate from the phaenomena to the noumena 9, because reason in us and reason outside us together have their origin in the Logos 10.

§ 8. Principles in Religion pp. 171-214. The essence of religion, whose name is of uncertain derivation 1, is according to Holy Scripture, as religio objectiva identical with God's revelation and as religio subjectiva with the disposition to walk in his ways 2. This distinction is indispensable for determining the essence of religion. As religio objectiva all religions contain the elements of tradition, dogma, ethos, cultus 3. And as religio subjectiva they are pietas, which has cultus as its fruit 4. This religio subjectiva, which is a habitus, was corrupted by sin, is renewed by regeneration, and according to Holy Scripture consists in faith 5, which

manifests itself in a cultus according to God's will 6. The seat of religion has especially been investigated, since the essence of religion, wrongly, was placed only in the religio subjectiva 7, 8, is not exclusively the understanding 9, for religion and science are distinct 10, nor also the will 11, for religion and morality are two 12, nor also feeling 13, for religion is something other than art 14, but the whole human being, who must serve God wholly and always and everywhere 15. The origin of religion is not fear, priestly deceit, ignorance, animism etc., 16, nor also the desire to maintain oneself over against the world 16, 17. Historical and psychological method are insufficient for explaining essence and origin of religion 18. Religion is explicable only when the existence of God and the truthfulness of his revelation are assumed 19. [533]

CHAPTER II. External principle.

§ 9. General Revelation pp. 215-244. Revelation is a religious concept, which can be maintained only in theism 1, and consists in general in an act of God, whereby He places man in a religious relation to Himself 2. The distinction between natural and supernatural revelation already derives from the oldest ecclesiastical writers, but with Rome it became a rational antithesis 3, which was indeed modified by the Reformation, but nevertheless continued to live on in Socinianism etc. and undermined the whole concept of revelation 4. Scripture makes no conceptual distinction between natural and supernatural revelation, since all revelation acknowledges the personal existence of God, exalted above nature, and differs only in the means by which it comes to us 5. Supernatural revelation is not identical with immediate revelation, for all revelation takes place mediately, but differs from the natural in the ways through which it comes to us. Therefore the distinction of general and special revelation deserves preference 6. General revelation is insufficient, since it contains nothing of God's grace in Christ 7, but is nevertheless of great value for the heathen world 8, 9, and also for the church.

§ 10. Special Revelation pp. 224-295. Like all religions, Christianity appeals to a special revelation, φανερωσις, ἀποκαλυψις, which takes place in a threefold way 1, through theophany 2, prophecy (speaking of God, lot, urim, dream, vision, inward illumination) 3, miracles 4. Holy Scripture thereby makes special revelation known to us, not as a mere communication of doctrine or as religious inspiration or as an infusion of new life or as the

becoming-conscious of God in the human spirit 5, but as a system of words and deeds of God, which concentrate in the person of Christ and, after his appearance and after the completion of Scripture, modified, continue and are completed in the dispensation of the Holy Spirit. 6. In this rich sense, however, it is misconceived, both by the abstract supranaturalism of Rome etc., 7, 8, and by rationalistic naturalism 9, which, however, is insufficient for the explanation of the phenomena of revelation 10, and has its ground in a pantheistic or materialistic monism 11. But this monism is contradicted both by a correct view of nature 11, and by Scripture; in its view of the world special revelation takes an appropriate, harmonious place 12.

§ 11. Holy Scripture pp. 295-362. The special revelation, which is history and as such passes by, is extended to humanity and the world, in that it appears in the form of Scripture 1. The [534] Scripture is therefore not all of revelation nor merely a document of revelation, but the final act, the keystone of revelation 2. For revelation as a whole falls apart into two dispensations; the first brings about the incarnation of the Logos and the scripturation of his word, the second applies the treasures of Christ and of his testimony in the church, which therefore always stands in living, organic connection with that Scripture 3. Of that Scripture the divine inspiration has always been confessed by the church, from the oldest times onward 4, by scholasticism 5, by the Roman Catholics 6, the Reformers 7, but also often contested from without and then weakened into a dualistic or dynamic inspiration or also wholly denied 8. Scripture, however, clearly teaches its own inspiration, both in the Old Test. 9, and in the N. T. concerning the O. T. 10, as also in the N. T. concerning itself 11 and therefore presents itself as the Word of God 12. This self-testimony of Scripture is unassailable 13, distinguishes the inspiration by which Scripture came into being from every

other, genial inspiration, from God's immanent activity in the world, from revelation and from regeneration, although it also stands in connection with all these 14. It is a speaking of God by means of prophets and apostles, however not in a mechanical but in an organic sense 15, and not to be limited to the animation of the persons or to the inspiration of main points 16. The objections raised against this inspiration are without doubt for a part connected with the enmity of the human heart 17, and are on the other hand diminished by an organic conception 18, and by a clear definition of the purpose for which Scripture has been given 19.

§ 12. Properties of Scripture pp. 363-415. The doctrine of the properties of Scripture developed in the struggle against Rome, which determines the relation of Scripture and church quite differently than the Reformation does 1, 2. The authority of Scripture in Rome rests on the church 3, and according to the Reformation, without misrecognition of the pedagogical significance of the church, on Scripture itself 4. Although with that authority the auctoritas historiae et normae is to be distinguished 5, its divine character nevertheless is not to be exchanged for a human, historical, moral authority 6. For in religion a divine authority, which however is something quite different than violence, is indispensable 7. The necessity of Scripture is denied by Rome, by many mystical directions 8, and also by Schleiermacher 9, but nevertheless stands firm, because the church always rested on an unwritten or written Word of God 10, without such a word falls into error and falsehood 11, and in this dispensation continues always to have need of it 12. The perspicuity of Scripture is likewise rejected by Rome for the benefit of the church 13, but, rightly understood, is grounded on Scripture itself, generally recognized by the ancient church 14, and for the maintenance of the freedom of the Christian 15, and of the facultas S.

Scr. se ipsam interpretandi [535] of the greatest significance 16. The sufficiency of Scripture finally, contested by Rome in favor of tradition 17, which however in the end retains no other mark for its truth than the papal pronouncement 19, and subjects Scripture to the church, that is, to the pope 19, was by the Reformation again maintained over against tradition 20, because it is taught by Scripture itself and corresponds with the nature of the present dispensation 21, without thereby the relative right of tradition being denied 22.

CHAPTER III. Internal Principle.

§ 13. Meaning of the principium internum pp. 416-421. To the objective principle a subjective one must correspond, which in each person from childhood onward, in accordance with the religion in which he is born, assumes a definite form 1, and in its deepest ground almost withdraws itself from all investigation 2. Therefore, for faith many and different grounds are also named (historical-apologetic, speculative, ethical-practical), which, however, fail to recognize the independence of religion and the work of the Spirit 3.

§ 14. The historico-apologetic method pp. 423-431 was applied especially by Rome 1, and by various supranaturalistic tendencies 2, but is, although a believing apologetics has a right to exist, theoretically and practically untenable 3.

§ 15. The speculative method pp. 431-444, followed by Hegel 1, by the Vermittlungstheologie 2, and in modified form by Hofmann and Frank 3, did indeed offer important advantages over the apologetic, but fell into the error of the old Gnosticism and sacrificed being to thinking, history to the idea 4. The attempt of Frank as well, to derive the objective truth of the dogmas from the subjective certainty of the Christian, has not succeeded 5, and rests on an incorrect Erkenntnistheorie 6.

§ 16. The ethical-psychological method pp. 444-465, though customary from of old, came into honour through Pascal and Vinet 1. It is related to Kant’s moral proof 2, and in this form finds support with many in this country 3, and especially also with Ritschl and Lipsius c. s. 4, 5. But,

although religion cannot lack the element of consolation, experience of the heart can 6, no more than religious valuation, be proof for the truth of religion 7, and moreover leads to an untenable dualism between believing and knowing 8.

§ 17. Faith pp. 465-484. Since the principium internum must correspond to the princ. ext., it cannot lie in the natural, but only in the human being illumined by God's Spirit, so that [536] the dogmatician thereby adopts a subjective standpoint 1. Scripture names as this princ. internum faith, which is an act of consciousness, akin to faith on natural terrain 2, but nevertheless to be distinguished from it 3, and also not to be identified with nudus assensus 4. That faith brings with it a certainty of its own 5, which alongside scientific and moral certainty has a right to exist 6.

§ 18. The ground of faith pp. 484-509. Since this faith can be wrought by no proofs or reasonings, but only by God's grace 1, Rome thereby in principle adopts the same subjective standpoint as the Reformation 2. The testimonium Sp. S. is the final ground of faith, as the Reformation, especially Calvin, acknowledged, but rationalism wrongly opposed 3. For it corresponds to the testimony which our spirit in general gives to the truth 4, answers to the special revelation in Christ and maintains its autopistie 5. It furthermore does not exclude argumentation, is strong as the testimony of the whole of Christendom, presupposes regeneration and proceeds therefrom spontaneously and freely 6. Nor does it have a one-sided relation to the authority of the H. S., but stands in connection with the whole life of faith, assures subjectively of all the truth of God and therein also of the divinitas of the H. S. 7, and is not deprived of its truth by the mutual differences of Christians 8.

§ 19. Faith and Theology pp. 509-532. Although in faith certain of the truth, the Christian church nevertheless always, notwithstanding all opposition, strove after a scientific theology 1, which also, in spite of its many aberrations, has a right to exist and without which revelation, religion, the history of dogma, the church run the risk of being misunderstood 2. This theology is a fruit of the thinking consciousness of the congregation and has need of the help of philosophy 3. Faith is therefore distinct from theology, as also formerly, as appears from the doctrine of the fides implicita 4, the distinction of theologia infusa and acquisita and that between fundamental and non-fundamental articles was accepted 5. But their affinity is as great as their difference 6. And since theology has its origin not in faith as such but in believing thought, for its practice the developed reason and thus philosophy is indispensable 7, even though the knowledge which theology provides never becomes a comprehending and ends in admiration of the mystery 8. [537]

SECOND PART.

CHAPTER IV. On God.

§ 20. The incomprehensibility of God pp. 1-24. Dogmatics lives in the mystery, for it always has to do with God, who according to Holy Scripture is incomprehensible and even cannot be named with any name 1. This incomprehensibility of God has also been acknowledged outside the domain of special revelation 2, in Christian theology of the church fathers 3, 4, taken up by the scholastics 5, adopted by the Reformers 6, and in more recent philosophy replaced by the absolute unknowability of God 7, 8. The grounds which this agnosticism adduces 9 are, although there is very certainly no adequate knowledge of God, not tenable, because agnosticism would make all speaking on our part about God and all revelation on God's side to us impossible 10. The denial of the knowability of God includes that God has not willed and has not been able to reveal himself, and that we even lack the ground to assume his existence 11.

§ 21. The knowability of God (cognitio Dei insita) pp. 24-44. God is knowable, insofar as He reveals Himself. And that He reveals Himself, is certain according to Scripture and nature and is confirmed by all men; atheists there are scarcely any 1. The naturalness, universality, and necessity of the knowledge of God have led many to belief in innate concepts 2, 3. But Christian theology rejected this doctrine, not only the patres and scholastics 4, but also Luth. and Geref. 5, because it led to rationalism or mysticism 6. Yet thereby it was not denied that man brings with him the potentia and inclinatio, in order of himself, without scientific reasoning, to come to some knowledge of God 7.

§ 22. The knowability of God (cognitio Dei acquisita) pp. 44-62. The cognitio Dei insita is increased by the cognitio Dei acquisita obtained by way of reflection and reasoning 1. Both belong to the theologia naturalis, which is not a product of human reason but is included in Scripture and is derived by the believer from nature 2. Holy Scripture does not prove God's existence but testifies to it 3. The so-called proofs for God's existence, partly over-, partly underestimated 4, namely the ontological 5, cosmological 6, teleological 7, and moral proof 8, are wrongly called proofs but are signa and testimonia, that God does not leave himself without witness to man 9.

§ 23. The Names of God pp. 62-78. All that becomes knowable of God through his revelation, Holy Scripture sums up under the names by which God, on the ground of his revelation (nomen editum), is named (nomen inditum) 1. All those names are anthropomorphistic 2, and formed according to the analogy in creatures 3, but this rightly, because God himself reveals himself in and through the creatures and in no other way is nameable 4. They therefore indeed give no adaequate but also no untrue 5, but an ectypal, analogical knowledge of God 6.

§ 24. Classification of the names of God pp. 78-102. Holy Scripture likewise honors all the virtues of God and does not know the distinction between essence and attributes 1, which later arose in theology and caused the essence of God to be defined as the Absolute or as Sovereign or as Father etc., 2-4, and separated the attributes thereof 5. But in God there is no distinction between essence and attributes 6, although the attributes are mutually different ratione ratiocinata 7. The attributes were classified in many ways 8, but all those classifications substantially agree and are

burdened by the same objections, so that a good classification is difficult to find 9.

§ 25. The proper names of God pp. 102-115, taken in a broader sense, are those by which God is named and addressed, such as θεος, deus, God 1, in Holy Scripture, El, Elohim, Eljon, Adonai 2, El Schaddai, Ihvh 3, Ihvh Zebaoth 4, κυριος, πατηρ, Father, Son and Holy Spirit 5.

§ 26. The essential names of God pp. 115-227, which must be treated before the doctrine of the Trinity, contain first those by which God is designated as the Being in the absolute sense, namely, independence 1, immutability 2, infinity, which in turn includes eternity 3, and omnipresence 4. Subsequently there are names which make God known to us as the Living One, as Spirit, namely, simplicity 5, spirituality 6, invisibility 7. Further, there are names which describe the Divine being as perfectly self-conscious, as Light, namely, knowledge of himself and of the world (wherein the praescientia and the scientia media come under discussion) 8, wisdom (ideas in God) 9, truthfulness 10. Furthermore, there are names which point us to the ethical nature of God's being and make Him known as the Holy One, namely, goodness (lovingkindness, mercy, longsuffering, grace, love) 11, holiness 12, glory 13, righteousness 14. And finally there are names in which God meets us as the absolute power, as Sovereign, namely, the will, which is distinguished as propensio Dei in se ipsum (necessaria) and as propensio in creaturas (libera) 15, which in the latter sense is indeed to be conceived as free but not as pure arbitrariness 16, further divides into voluntas beneplaciti and signi 17, and finally is to be honoured as omnipotence 18.

§ 27. The personal names of God pp. 227-312 make known to us, in the one Divine being, the self-distinctions, which already occur in the O. T.

(Elohim or Ihvh brings everything to pass through Word and Spirit) 1, but, especially also in contrast with the false doctrine of intermediate beings in Jewish philosophy 2, 3, are revealed much more clearly in the N. Test. The N. Test. teaches not only, that everything in nature and grace comes to pass through Father, Son and Spirit 4, but [539] also makes known to us something of the relations between these three persons, when it calls the Father, in a metaph. sense, the Father of Christ 5, Christ, in a special sense, the Word, the Son, the Image of God 6, and the Spirit, in a particular sense, Spirit of the Father and of the Son 7. These data of the H. S. led the church to the confession of the Trinity, a dogma, which in the first period was developed by Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen 8, subsequently was especially elaborated and defended by Athanasius 9 and Augustine 10, but was strongly opposed by Arianism and Sabellianism 11, and the directions attaching themselves thereto 12, 13. The terms, which are customary with this dogma, essence, persons, tri-unity etc., are indeed not taken from Scripture but are therefore not unlawful 14. The word essence denotes the Godhead, the Divine nature, as that exists in the persons 15. Persons are called the three independent modi subsistendi in the one Divine being 16, which differ from that being not re but yet realiter and are mutually distinguished in names, personal properties and manner of working 17. The first person has as personal property the paternitas 18. The second person is the Son, who by spiritual, simple, eternal generation has been generated out of the essence of the Father 19. The third person is the Spirit, whose personality and Godhead, although in the church recognized later than that of the Son, is of the highest importance for doctrine and life 20, and whose personal property is the εκπορευσις, not only from the Father 21, but also from the Son, Filioque 22. This ontological Trinity is mirrored in the

economical, which, together with the unity, also brings out the distinction of the three persons in the revelation 23, but it is, although it has been very much attempted, difficult to elucidate by images or to prove by reasonings 24. Yet it is of the greatest significance for the doctrine of God, of creation and re-creation, indeed for the whole Christian religion 25.

§ 28. The Counsel of God pp. 313-385, which, as comprising the opera essentialia ad intra, indicates the connection between God and his works (opera ad extra), occurs in the O. T. especially as a fact in history 1, and appears in the N. T. clearly to be eternal, personal, and relating to the destiny hereafter 2. But in the Christian church the doctrine of predestination was weakened by the Greek church, by Pelagianism, Semipelagianism 3, by the Roman church 4, and even by the Lutherans 5, while the Reformed indeed maintained it, but differed over the method of treatment 6, and over the infral. or supral. order of the decrees 7, and many others, Socin., Remonstr. etc., denied it or converted it into a philosophical determinism or modified it in a pelag. or semipel. sense 8. Now God's counsel is nothing other than his simple and eternal decree concerning all that in time shall be or shall happen 9, first of all comprising the providentia in the sense of ratio ordinis [540] rerum 10, and subsequently the praedestinatio, which by Pelag. was exchanged for the praescientia 11, and is opposed especially on three points 12. Among the Reformed there was difference over its infral. or supral. order 13, both of which have something for and something against them 14 and neither of which offers the true solution 15. The reprobatio, which occurs repeatedly in the H. S., in a certain sense decidedly belongs to the praedestinatio 16, but in another sense nevertheless belongs to it differently than the election 17, in which the praedestinatio reaches its end and comes to its full reality 18, for the

election has Christ and his church as its object and the honour of God in the salvation of the fallen world as its goal 19.

CHAPTER V. On the world in its original state.

§ 29. Creation pp. 386-424 is the beginning of the execution of God's counsel. Its doctrine occupies a broad place in Holy Scripture 1, and is to be understood only by faith, so that the Heathens did not know it and philosophy usually rejected it, in order to explain the world pantheistically or materialistically 2. Pantheism and materialism, however, are both incapable of making known to us the origin of things 3. The Christian church therefore adhered to the doctrine of Holy Scripture 4, and taught a creation out of nothing 5, which had been brought about by God triune, Father, Son, and Spirit 6, and has specifically the Son as Mediator 7. It did not take place in, but coincided with the creation of time 8, and did not have its cause in God's overflowing fullness of being nor in his poverty and need 9, but in God's will, which thereby has in view the glory of his name 10. As product of God's will, the world is one whole, which contains within itself the greatest diversity.

§ 30. The spiritual world pp. 424-456 comprises the beings who usually bear the name of angels. Their existence is assumed in almost all religions, but has nevertheless also many times been rejected 1; philosophically and historically unprovable, it is for religion, although no central dogma, nevertheless of importance 2. Scripture has for them not one common name, but calls different classes 3. Yet they are in this nevertheless one, that they all are created 4, spiritual, incorporeal 5, rational 6, moral beings 7, essentially distinct from man, who is the image of God 8, called to an extraordinary and ordinary service in the kingdom of heaven, which

however includes no personal protection and intercession 9, and lays claim to no religious veneration 10.

§ 31. The material world pp. 456-489 remains in its origin outside the H. S. unexplained 1, but arises according to Gen. 1:1 through [541] creation out of nothing (creatio prima) and is prepared in the six days (creatio secunda) 2, wherein a definite order is to be observed 3. This hexaemeron was in Christian theology often treated at length and without objection modified according to the prevailing world-view (ptolem. copernic.) 4. But the hypothesis of Kant and Laplace 5, as well as that of the developmental periods of the earth built upon the earth-layers, are difficult to reconcile with Scripture 6. The attempts at reconciliation cannot be called successful 7, even though they also contain good elements 8. But a correct conception of the creation narrative 9, and a pure sifting between the certain and the uncertain in geological science nevertheless bring about a provisional agreement 10.

§ 32. The origin of man pp. 490-507 is described differently in the first and second creation narrative, but according to both narratives is to be ascribed to God's creative omnipotence 1. The Christian church maintained this divine origin of man, against every materialistic, evolutionistic explanation, in earlier and later times 2, and in this also found support among many men of science who opposed Darwinism 3. And furthermore, between Holy Scripture and contemporary science not only the origin of man is in dispute, but also the age 4, the unity 5, and the cradle of humanity 6.

§ 33. The essence of man pp. 508-545 lies according to Holy Scripture in this, that he is the image of God 1. The content of this image was variously conceived in the Christian church. In particular, there gradually came to

stand over against one another two conceptions, the naturalistic 2, which is equally contradicted by history, Scripture, and sound reasoning 3, and the supranaturalistic, which came to development in the Roman doctrine of the donum superadditum 4, but rests on a false conception of man and of his destination 5. The Reformation therefore taught that the image of God was essentially proper to man 6, not as a substance, but as a quality belonging to the essence of man 7. The whole man is, after all, the image of God, as the Reformed, with their distinction of the image of God in a broader and a narrower sense, acknowledged over against the Lutherans, according to soul and spirit, which are not two substances, and according to all their faculties 8, according to the virtues of knowledge, righteousness, and holiness (justitia originalis) and even in a certain sense according to the body 9. Human nature is, among the works of creation, the highest revelation of God 10.

§ 34. The destination of man pp. 545-571. Adam, although the image of God, according to Holy Scripture did not yet at once possess the highest, and was therefore placed in the covenant of works 1. Christian theology has not fully acknowledged this truth and has in turn estimated Adam's condition too low or too high. But the Reformed have incorporated it in the doctrine of the foedus operum 2, a doctrine which, although developed all too [542] scholastically, nevertheless contains a profound thought, because it maintains religion as communion with God 3, takes full account of Adam's state before the fall 4, allows the richness of the image of God first to unfold itself in the human race 5, and therefore also explains why Roman Catholics and Reformed, in distinction from the Lutherans, were in general adherents of creationism 6, 7.

THIRD PART.

CHAPTER VI. On the World in its Fallen State.

§ 35. Providence pp. 1-34. The work of creation passes over into the work of providence, which is clearly taught in Holy Scripture but is also in part known from nature 1. Yet the Christian doctrine of providence is different from that of philosophy, even if it also borrowed from it the name not customary in Holy Scripture. For providence, as executio ordinis to be well distinguished from the ratio ordinis belonging to the counsel of God, is no nuda praescientia but an almighty and omnipresent act of God 2, which avoids both fate and chance, pantheism and deism 3, as preservation maintains both the connection with and the distinction from creation 4, as concurrence guarantees the proper nature of the creatures with their causae secundae precisely through their absolute dependence on God 5, and as government leads the whole creation, also through the fall into sin, onward to the end determined by God 6.

§ 36. The origin of sin pp. 34-72, according to Holy Scripture, does not lie in God, even though He also created the possibility of sin, but in voluntary transgression of God's commandment, to which the human being in turn was seduced by the fallen angel 1. Although such a fall is not entirely unknown outside the special revelation, one has nevertheless usually tried to explain sin differently, whether deistically from the will that always remains free and innocent, as Pelagius also did 2, 3, or pantheistically from the nature of things, namely from the sensuousness of the human being, or from the cosmos, or from God 4. All these explanations, however, are unsatisfactory, both those from the will always free and from sensuousness

5, and those from the world and from God 6. To be sure, God's providence also extends over sin, and not with a nuda but with an efficax permissio. But sin, in which the materia and the forma are indeed to be distinguished, nevertheless does not have in God its causa efficiens 7. He willed that it would be, but He did not will it as sin and not in the same way as He wills the good and as human beings will it 8. The origin of sin lies in the will of the creature, which was created mutable [543] good and with the possibility to sin, and which in an incomprehensible way caused that possibility to pass over into actuality 9. This fall was not eternal and also did not take place in the moment of creation but, whether a longer or shorter time after creation, first occurred with the angels and thereafter with human beings 10.

§ 37. The essence of sin pp. 72-104. The first sin already enclosed all others within itself and made its true nature manifest 1, which, according to the names and the description of sin in Holy Scripture, consists in ἀνομια and thus has its standard in God's law 2. Correspondingly the Christian church, against all tendencies which saw in it a substance or a necessary, transitory moment of development, conceived sin as a privatio 3, which therefore can exist only in relation to the good, is to be regarded as a deformitas, and has the will as its proper subject 4. Although one in essence, sins are nevertheless distinguished in degree. There are devilish and human sins 5, and the latter again differ, according as they have been committed with more or less knowledge and intent, against God or man, in aggravating or mitigating circumstances. Therefore they are also to be classified differently, but the Roman distinction into peccata mortalia and venialia is to be rejected 6, and the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit bears a special character 7.

§ 38. The spread of sin pp. 104-154. Scripture and experience both teach that sin is quite universal, and thus extends over all human beings and in the individual human being over his whole being, and that by virtue of their descent from the first human being 1. The Christian church built upon that the doctrine of original sin, which was indeed denied by Pelagianism 2, and weakened by Semipelagianism 3, but was especially developed and defended by Augustine, and, after being unrecognized by Rome 4, was taken up again by the Reformation 5. For correct understanding, original sin is to be distinguished into peccatum originans and peccatum originatum; the first is the imputation of Adam's sin to all his descendants on the ground not only of their physical but also of their federal unity 6. The second is a consequence and in a certain sense a punishment of the first, consisting in total moral corruption 7, which not by imitation but by generation, as also the more recent doctrine of heredity to a certain extent acknowledges, becomes the portion of all human beings 8, also of Mary but not of Christ 9, and in the individual human being has affected soul and spirit and body and all faculties and powers and makes him incapable of all spiritual good 10.

§ 39. The punishment of sin pp. 155-186. The punishment, which was threatened by God upon the first sin, has been postponed and modified by intervening grace. But nevertheless it is, even already on earth, in part carried out, for the restoration and maintenance of the right of God 1, and [544] always consists in a certain suffering, which is added to the transgressor and makes him bow under the right 2. It comprises guilt, i.e. obligation to punishment 3, stain, i.e. moral corruption 4, suffering according to body and soul 5, death, i.e. separation of soul and body 6, and dominion of Satan 7.

CHAPTER VII. On Christ.

§ 40. The covenant of grace pp. 187-228. Grace begins immediately after the fall, even mingles in the punishment for sin, and at once acquires the character of a covenant 1, which is then later established more formally with Noah, Abraham, and Israel at Sinai and gradually comes to light ever more clearly as a divine ordinance, as a διαθηκη, 2. This covenant-idea passed from Scripture into theology and was there, for the maintenance of the unity and the distinction between Old and New Testament, first defended against Gnosticism and Judaism 3, and later, especially by the Reformed, against Anabaptism, and brought to richer development 4. For church and theology this doctrine of the covenant of grace therefore has the greatest significance. It rests on the pactum salutis 5, it stands in connection with the foedus gratiae in a broader sense, which has been established with the whole fallen world 6, it maintains the unity and the distinction in the dispensation of grace under Old and New Test. 7, it is pure grace and is fixed in God alone, so that it, although taking the broken covenant of works into itself, is nevertheless distinguished from it and is also not identical with the pactum salutis 8, it maintains God's sovereignty in the work of redemption and at the same time, although knowing no demands in the proper sense, causes the rational and moral nature of man to come into its right; and finally lets election realize itself through the generations, through the organism of humanity 9.

§ 41. The person of the Mediator pp. 228-302. The covenant of grace has in Christ a mediator of reconciliation, who himself by his Spirit in Israel,

with his institutions and offices, caused testimony to be borne beforehand of his own person and work 1, and then in the fullness of time appeared on earth, founded the kingdom of heaven and, as Son of God and Son of man, both in an altogether unique sense, revealed himself 2. Gathering the data of Scripture and avoiding Ebionitism and Gnosticism at the same time, the christ. church soon came to the confession of the personal unity of the two natures in Christ 3, which, however, was again understood differently in the Greek and Roman, in the Lutheran and Reformed 4, and was contested by all manner of movements on the right and left, especially also in the more recent theology (Kant, Schleiermacher, Ritschl c. s.) 5. [545] This is not surprising, because the person of Christ, though not the point of departure, is nevertheless the center of Scripture, religion and dogmatics. The incarnation, which a priori is unacceptable from a pantheistic and deistic standpoint, presupposes the Trinity and specifically therein the eternal generation, for the person of the Son has become man 6. It further presupposes creation, even though it is not immediately given with this and even though the doctrine of the incarnation apart from sin is objectionable 7. It finally presupposes the revelation among Israel with the election and preparation of Mary as mother of Jesus, even though her immaculate conception is not taught in Scripture 8. Yet, although Christ in his incarnation connects with the preceding revelation, he is no product of the past, but existed personally from eternity and was and remained true God 9, who assumed the human nature through conception by the H. Spirit and through birth from Mary 10, 11, and who therefore, in contrast with Docetism, was true, and, in contrast with Apollinaris, perfect man 12, so that God and man, two distinct natures, undivided and unseparated (against Nestorius), unchanged and unmingled (against Entyches) are united in him

13. This union is therefore not to be conceived otherwise than as a personal one, as union of the person of the Son with an impersonal human nature 14, and necessarily entails the communicatio idiomatum, the communicatio apotelesmatum and the communicatio charismatum, which especially in Reformed theology, for the maintenance of the true human nature of Christ, was developed 15, and finally also the honor adorationis 16.

§ 42. The work of the Mediator pp. 302-424. Among all peoples there occur holy persons, prophets, kings and especially priests, who by sacrifices effect and maintain communion with God 1. Also in Israel a priestly order was chosen and sacrifices were prescribed by God, which clearly had a typical significance and pointed to the true sacrifice of the servant of the Lord, who would be the true priest and at the same time the true prophet and king 2. According to the N. T. Jesus, the son of Mary, is this servant of the Lord, who in his threefold office accomplishes the great work of God, as prophet proclaims the law and the gospel, as priest by his self-surrender, which fulfils all the sacrifices of the O. T., acquires for his own the whole salvation, and as king applies this to them 3. This work of Christ was described in Christian theology in different ways, now once more as illumination or as communication of new life, then again as ransom from the power of Satan or as satisfaction to God's justice. The latter representation gained currency especially through Anselm and, although importantly modified, passed over into Protestant theology 4. But it was opposed not only by all kinds of mystical, but also by many rationalistic [546] directions, and especially by the Socinians, who adduced everything that could be said against the doctrine of satisfaction 5. In the more recent philosophy and theology it was therefore wholly rejected or reconstructed in a mystical or ethical sense 6. But already by his names Jesus is

designated as the mediator of God and of men, who was this according to his two natures, who from eternity had already been anointed by the Father as prophet, priest and king and had already exercised these offices in the days of the O. T. 7, so that the doctrine of the munus triplex is wrongly opposed by Ritschl et al. 8. As such Christ is a revelation of God's love but at the same time of his righteousness, which does not conflict with love 9, and in connection with God's holy nature, with the dreadfulness of sin, with the unbreakable character of the moral law makes satisfaction necessary 10. The Socinians c. s. have indeed contested this necessity, but thereby made a false antithesis between justice and grace 11. The sacrifice of satisfaction, which Christ brought, consisted in his perfect obedience, which is not exclusively, as formerly often, e.g. with Piscator, to be conceived as passive but also includes the active 12, and also not exclusively, as mostly in the more recent theology, may be conceived as active but also contains the passive 13. This whole obedience bears the character of a satisfactio and indeed of a satisfactio vicaria 14, which against all kinds of objections requires further explanation and defence 15, and whose possibility is opened by the way of the covenant 16. Christ accomplished this work in the state of humiliation, from his conception up to the descent into hell 17, thereby acquired the whole salvation with all the benefits included under it of reconciliation (ἱλασμος and καταλλαγη), justification, sanctification, glorification, which therefore cannot be limited to one single concept of satisfactio, meritum, Erlösung or Versöhnung 18, and he acquired these, not for all creatures or men, as the universalists asserted and the Reformed in general opposed 19, but for his church, as Scripture clearly teaches 20, even though it is also the case that the work of Christ has significance for the whole creation 21. This work, accomplished in the state of humiliation,

Christ carries out and applies in the state of exaltation with its various stages, which in the first place for Christ himself was the reward for his labour 22, but further comes to the benefit of his church, for also in heaven he remains her prophet, priest and king, until he has brought the whole re-creation to completion 23. [547]

CHAPTER VIII. On the Benefits of the Covenant.

§ 43. The order of salvation pp. 425-485. While in the heathen religions man must work out his own salvation, in Holy Scripture it is God himself who seeks out man, communicates to him in the way of the covenant out of grace his benefits, and then on that ground obliges him to a new obedience 1. When Jesus appears with the gospel of the kingdom, He sets no other demand than that of faith and repentance, which themselves in turn are gifts of grace from God. For He is himself the one who by his death acquired all the goods of the kingdom for his own, and now communicates them to them from heaven through the Holy Spirit as the master-builder of faith and of a new life 2. This doctrine of grace was in Christian theology already soon, especially by Pelagius, weakened for the benefit of freedom of the will 3, and, notwithstanding the powerful defence of Augustine and in spite of the maintenance of the gratia praeveniens 4, also in Roman theology, because of the semi-Pelagian direction which it more and more took, did not come into its own 5. The Lutheran Reformation rose up in opposition to that, but nevertheless soon again fell back into synergism 6. Much better the doctrine of grace, also in the application of salvation, was maintained by the Reformed 7, but alongside them there nevertheless arose the directions of mysticism and rationalism, of antinomianism and neonomianism, which identified the application of salvation with the acquisition or detached it wholly from it 8, 9, and also in the new philosophy and theology still have effects 10. The order of salvation, however, which points out the way along which the sinner comes into the possession of Christ and his benefits, then

runs purely only when it avoids the two dangerous cliffs of nomism and antinomism 11, and on the foundation of the trinitarian confession in the application of salvation sees a work of the Holy Spirit, which is indeed distinguished from the acquisition by Christ but not separated, since the Holy Spirit takes everything out of Christ 12. The benefits which Christ acquired and applies through the Holy Spirit can all be summed up under the name of grace, but this is conceived by the Reformation wholly differently than by Rome 13, and contains many particular benefits, which gradually were worked out more broadly in dogmatics but are reducible to three groups 14.

§ 44. Calling and regeneration pp. 485-511 form the first group. Just as God brings creation into being through Word and Spirit, so also re-creation. In a certain sense He already calls through nature (vocatio realis), but yet especially through his word (vocatis verbalis) 1, which calling is general, serious, and of great value 2. But the vocatio verbalis as such is not sufficient and must therefore on the basis [548] of Holy Scripture be distinguished into an externa and interna 3, and in the latter sense comes to stand in the closest connection with regeneration, which in a narrower sense is the infusion of the principle of the new life 4, and, without doing the human being any injustice, cuts off Pelagianism at the root and, also in the application of salvation, maintains grace undiminished 5.

§ 45. Faith and justification pp. 511-552. The spiritual man, who is implanted in regeneration, in due time comes through the illumination of the H. Spirit to faith, which, although a gift of God, is no substance foreign to man nor a supernatural addition, but, in accordance with the new life, binds him to the word of Christ 1. For in Scripture it bears a twofold character: it is an accepting as truth of the apostolic testimony concerning

Christ, and it is a personal trust in Christ as mighty to forgive sins and to bestow all benefits of grace; and these two stand with one another in indissoluble connection 2. Although in doctrine and practice they are often separated from one another, they ought always to go together, since on the one hand there is no communion in Christ's benefits except after and through communion in his person, and on the other hand this communion comes about in no other way than by means of the apostolic testimony 3. Of that faith one of the most glorious fruits is justification, which according to Scripture is not an ethical but a juridical act 4, has its ground, not in man's, in an ἰδια δικαιοσυνη, but in a δικαιοσυνη θεου, which has been revealed in Christ and lies ready, is imputed to man by God out of grace and on his part is accepted by faith 5. Indeed this doctrine of the justitia imputata is strongly contested, but this contestation proceeds for the most part from an entirely erroneous conception of the imputation of Christ's righteousness 6. This justification takes place in a certain sense in the decree, in the resurrection of Christ, in the vocatio interna, but nevertheless according to the prevailing representation of the H. S. takes place especially out of and through faith and precisely as such stands over against that out of works 7. It comprises not only the complete forgiveness of all sins, of both guilt and punishment, which, however, does not nullify the daily confession of guilt and prayer for forgiveness, but furthermore the adoption as children and the granting of the right to eternal life 8.

§ 46. Sanctification and perseverance pp. 553-572. Upon justification follows sanctification, which is essentially distinct from it, but may not be separated from it for a single moment, for Christ bestows himself upon his own not only objectively but also subjectively (unio mystica) 1. This sanctification is in the first place a work of God, consisting not only in

outward separation from the world [549] but also in inward renewal by the H. Spirit, without this therefore already reaching its completion in this life either at once or gradually; but further it is also a work of the believers, insofar as these, on the ground of the benefits received, are called to sanctify themselves and to bring forth good works as fruits of their faith 2. Likewise the perseverance of the saints is an act and a gift of God, but one which, through the believers themselves, in the way of the means, realizes itself, and therefore does not exclude their self-activity but does offer them rich comfort and certainty 3.

FOURTH PART.

CHAPTER IX. On the Church.

§ 47. The essence of the church pp. 1-59. The community of those who partake of Christ and his benefits bears the name of the church, which finds its analogies in the pagan religions and was prepared in the O. Test. 1, but in the proper sense was nevertheless founded only in the days of the N. T. 2. After the apostolic time it soon developed into a catholic, visible, infallible, hierarchical institute of salvation 3, so that reformation was urgently necessary. Luther, Zwingli and Calvin brought this about, each in his own way 4, but on the left and right the concept of the church was falsified by rationalism and mysticism, so that even now, in spite of many attempts at restoration, it suffers from great confusion 5. The name which the church bears already indicates it as an assembly of Christian believers, and Scripture sets this, in all manner of ways, under all manner of images, especially also by what it says concerning the communion of saints, in the clearest light 6. As such it can be taken in a broader and narrower sense (ecclesia generalis, triumphans, militans, universalis, nationalis, particularis). But never does it, according to its idea, include the unbelievers, even though these are also on earth always present in the church 7. Nor is it to be defined as an assembly of praedestinati, perfecti, communicantes, vocati, baptizati, but as an assembly of believers, which has both a visible and an invisible side. Visible and invisible church are therefore not two churches, are not equal to the circle of unbelievers and believers in the church, nor to the church as institute and as organism, but are two sides of the same church 8. Marks of the church are not the 15 notae

which Ballarminus gives 9, but the Word of God, which is administered and confessed in preaching, sacrament, confession, life, and is wrongly rejected on the Roman side 10. For even if with this mark the possibility of great schism and division of the churches is given, Rome too cannot [550] prevent this, and the pluriformity of the church, however sinful and painful on the one hand also, nevertheless on the other hand includes a blessing 11. In accordance therewith, the properties of the church, unity, holiness, catholicity, apostolicity, imperishableness and infallibility, have with us a different sense than with Rome 12.

§ 48. The government of the church pp. 59-131. The church is inconceivable without government and has therefore also always had a government. It was always at the same time institute and organism 1, both in the O. and in the N. Test. The apostleship is especially a strong proof for the institutional character of the church; and to this office there was added that of the evangelists and prophets, while Peter among the apostles was primus inter pares 2, and later that of ruling and teaching elders and of deacons 3. This aristocratic-presbyterial church government after the apostolic time soon passed over into a monarchical-episcopal, which still prevails in many churches, and at Rome into a papal church government, which in the declaration of the infallibility of the pope drew its consequence 4. Both these forms of church government, however, are in conflict with the doctrine of the H. S. concerning the relation of clergy and laity, concerning the episcopate, concerning the apostleship, concerning Peter's primacy, and furthermore also with the oldest testimonies of the church 5. The opposition against the Roman hierarchy brought many to rejection of all government of the church, but this too contradicts Scripture, which ascribes to the church a government of its own. Hence the Reformed have maintained this in its

distinctness from the political power 6. For Christ is the only head of the congregation, both of the local and of all churches together. He pours out his gifts into it, anoints all as prophets, priests and kings 7, and furthermore institutes various offices, which are not the organ of the congregation, but derive their authority from Christ, and which are obtained in the way of vocation, examination and ordination 8. These offices have indeed been arbitrarily increased in the church and changed in character, but are two, respectively three in number (teaching and ruling elders and deacons).

§ 49. The power of the church pp. 132-192. The church, like the state, arose only after sin, and was gradually more clearly distinguished from the state. Even in Israel both, though closely united, were not one 1, and in the N. T. Christ gave to his church a power which, by its spiritual character, differs essentially from that of the civil authority 2. This spiritual power of the church, however, degenerated at Rome into a juridical, coercive power, which, in contrast with the Caesareopapism of the Greek church, subjects all spheres of life, including that of the state, to itself and makes them subservient 3, and culminates in the plena et suprema potestas of the pope. This power, specifically the infallibility of the pope, however, not only finds no support in Scripture, but is also in itself indeterminate, unfounded, in conflict with the [551] episcopate and antichristian 4. The Reformation therefore unanimously rejected this power, but again diverged, insofar as Luther and Calvin judged differently concerning confession, concerning presbyterate and discipline, concerning the relation of ecclesiastical and secular power. The distinction of these latter two powers in the centuries after the Reformation passed more and more into a, at least relative, separation 5. Now, however, it is not open to any doubt that Christ has bestowed upon his church a power which has its own origin, organ, nature,

and goal, and is equally misconstrued by Romanism and Anabaptism. This power of the church is threefold 6, namely, in the first place potestas docendi, that is, the power to preach, to explain, to defend, to confess the word of God 7, in the second place potestas gubernationis, that is, the power to govern the congregation 8 and to exercise discipline 9, and in the third place potestas misericordiae, that is, the power to show mercy to the wretched 10. This power comes together in the local church in the consistory and for multiple churches in the broader assemblies, which are already of ancient date and are necessary and good for the welfare of the churches 11. With this power the church stands in the world independent and free, but serving it with the goods which Christ bestows upon her 12.

CHAPTER X. On the Means of Grace.

§ 50. The Word pp. 193-215. In the distribution of his grace Christ makes use of means, which by mysticism and rationalism are wrongly unacknowledged, by Rome are wrongly conceived in an absolute sense, but by the Reformation, specifically by Calvin, were restored to their proper value 1. To these means of grace belongs in the first place the word of God, which also works outside the official ministry 2, and as a means of grace is to be distinguished into law and gospel 3. This distinction, however, is no irreconcilable antithesis, as antinomianism teaches, and likewise no essential identity, as nomism wishes, for both differ in principle but nevertheless in preaching always go together 4. And likewise the word as a means of grace is neither to be separated from the working of the Spirit nor also to be identified with it. The Holy Spirit works not sine verbo nor per verbum but cum verbo 5.

§ 51. The Sacraments pp. 215-252. The second means of grace is the sacrament. The name does not occur in Scripture, was at first customary for all kinds of ecclesiastical acts and ceremonies, and was only in the Middle Ages limited to a set of seven ceremonies. The doctrine of the sacraments, too, was first worked out by scholasticism and exhibited, the longer [552] the greater deviation from Scripture 1. For Rome, indeed, understands by the grace communicated through the sacrament only the gratia sanctificans, and detaches the sacrament from the word and likewise from faith. The Reformation rejected these errors but nevertheless, in the persons of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, advanced a different conception, which divided the

churches and, despite the weakening of the significance of the sacraments by mysticism and rationalism, even today causes church and theology to diverge 2. Although the name of sacrament does not occur in Scripture, it is therefore not yet to be rejected. Nor is the treatment of the general doctrine of the sacraments before that of baptism and the Lord's Supper to be disapproved, because thereby the difference in conception clearly comes to light and the error is easily perceived. According to Scripture the sacraments are signs and seals of God's grace and at the same time acts of confession of faith 3. As visible signs and seals they indicate and confirm the invisible grace, bestowed by God in Christ, that is, the same grace which is also offered in the word, be it also in another manner 4. The connection between sign and thing signified is not physical, corporeal, local, but a connection of relation, which is brought about by the word of institution, and, though of a spiritual nature, is nevertheless objective and real 5. Therefore the sacraments also do not work ex opere operato but presuppose in the recipient faith, which does not detract from their objectivity and leaves their value unimpaired 6. The number of the sacraments amounts not to seven, but only to two, yet these two in value weigh against Rome's set of seven 7.

§ 52. Baptism pp. 252-299. In the O. T. prepared by circumcision, baptism was, by Divine command, first administered by John to the Jews 1. This baptism of John does not differ essentially from Christian baptism, but was taken over by Jesus and, before his ascension, extended to all peoples, as sign and seal of the forgiveness of sins and of incorporation into Christ and his church 2. After the time of the apostles it was already soon administered with the Trinitarian formula, conceived as a mysterium of initiation, surrounded with all kinds of ceremonies and represented more and more as

magical in its operation. According to Rome, by the intimate connection of sign and thing signified ex opere operato, besides a character indelebilis, it bestows sanctifying grace, which delivers from all guilt, punishment, and stain of sin 3. The Lutherans taught a similar close union of the water of baptism with Divine grace, and at least in the case of children let regeneration come about through baptism, but the Reformed maintained that baptism, as a sacrament, also in the case of children presupposed faith and rested on the foundation of the covenant of grace. But this covenant was increasingly externalized; and rationalism and [553] mysticism so greatly failed to recognize the value of baptism that in more recent times various attempts to maintain the objective character of baptism have been tried 4. Scripture speaks only of the baptism of adults, and teaches clearly that it is instituted only for believers and may be administered after confession. The sign in baptism is water, in which the person being baptized is immersed or with which he is sprinkled 5. This water becomes a sacrament through the word of institution, which in Scripture is not intended as a formula but nevertheless was soon applied as such in the church, and brings about between sign and thing signified indeed a real but no physical and local union. The benefits of baptism are in the main forgiveness and regeneration 6. To those who have a right to baptism also belong the children of believers. This right was, over against the opponents of infant baptism, argued in various ways 7, and rests on many scriptural grounds 8. The administrator of baptism is Christ, who in that makes use of men, specifically of the teachers; has it administered in the public assembly of the congregation; at undetermined times; in the case of infant baptism, in the presence of the parents; to all persons who can still be reckoned to belong within the circle of the covenant 9.

§ 53. The Lord's Supper pp. 299-352. The second sacrament is the Lord's Supper, which in the O. T. was prefigured and prepared by the Passover 1, and in the N. T. was instituted by Christ, as a sign and seal of communion in his offering on the cross 2. This Supper soon became the center of Christian worship and was gradually, especially since scholasticism, conceived as an unbloody offering of the body and blood of Christ, to which communion is subordinate 3. The Reformation did indeed unanimously reject this Roman doctrine, but in the positive exposition of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper it diverged very widely. Luther, Zwingli, Calvin each advanced a distinct view, which, after them modified and abandoned, nevertheless continues to the present day 4. The names for the Lord's Supper are very numerous in number, but the best is that of holy supper or meal of the Lord, because it is an essential meal with Christ as host, the ministers as his servants, with bread and wine for food and drink, in the first period connected with an ordinary meal, to be celebrated at a table and not on an altar 5. But this meal has a spiritual significance, is not merely a memorial meal or an act of confession, but an exercise of communion through faith with the crucified Christ. Indeed Christ is not physically and locally present in the signs, for trans- and consubstantiation are both excluded for many scriptural and natural reasons 6. But nevertheless that communion with Christ in the Lord's Supper is objective and real, yet in such a way that it on the side of the recipient presupposes faith and precisely thereby, as communion in [554] the person and in the benefits of Christ, is strengthened 7. Just as baptism, so also this Lord's Supper is instituted only for the congregation, and indeed for baptized and living believers, who have made confession of their faith and are not barred by the church in doctrine and life 8.

CHAPTER XI. On the Last Things.

§ 54. The Intermediate State pp. 353-422. All religions contain a certain eschatology and teach specifically the immortality of the soul; and philosophy has many times adopted this latter doctrine 1. The proofs adduced for the immortality of the soul have, over against unbelief, no compelling force, but are nevertheless important as testimonies and justifications of faith 2. Scripture also indeed already contains in the O. T. the doctrine of the immortality, as its representation of Sheol clearly proves, but it adds thereto the much richer revelation, that true life is obtained and enjoyed only in communion with God, who triumphs over death and grave 3. The later Jewish literature did not do justice to this revelation, but the N. Test. brings out even better than the O. Test. that death is a punishment of sin, that believers through Christ become partakers of a life which is exalted far above death, and that they, although after dying in a certain sense belonging to the realm of the dead, nevertheless immediately enter into another state than the unbelievers 4. The Christian church at first remained with these few data of Scripture concerning the intermediate state, but devoted more attention to it, in proportion as the return of Christ tarried, and gradually came to the acceptance of five receptacula on the other side of the grave, among which especially purgatory is of significance for the intermediate state 5. The Reformation rejected this doctrine, but soon saw all manner of opinions about the intermediate state arise, such as that of a provisional state, of a purgatorium, of a sleep of the soul, of a certain corporeality of the souls, of transmigration of souls and continuing

purification, of limbus patrum, limbus infantum and possible conversion after death 6. Scripture contains little about the intermediate state, because it, while assuming the immortality of the soul, especially wishes to make known the new life which Christ has brought to light and without which human life here already on earth and especially hereafter in Sheol loses its content and value 7. The gaps which Scripture leaves open in our conception of the intermediate state may not be filled in with human conjectures, such as the sleep of the soul 8, the corporeality of the souls after death 9, the continuing intercourse of the dead with the living, which then [555] brings with it mass-offering, intercession, veneration of saints, conjuration of the dead and cult of relics, 10. Of the place of the intermediate state little is to be said, but certain it is that immediately at death a different state enters for believers and unbelievers, in which no change through conversion, as many now think, is any longer possible 11. Nor is the state of the deceased believers to be conceived as a purgatory, for according to the teaching of Scripture they come immediately after death into heaven with Christ. Although therefore there can be no question of a veneration of the saints and of an intercession for the departed 12, there nevertheless remains a communion of the triumphant with the militant church. The blessed in heaven also are not perfect without us; they look out longingly for the parousia of Christ, and are also not exalted above all space, time, and activity 13.

§ 55. The second coming of Christ pp. 422-481. Just as an end comes to the life of the individual human being, so also to that of humanity and world. Science confirms that 1, the religions generally cherish this expectation, and the Old Test. prophecy proclaims at the end of this dispensation the establishment of the Messianic kingdom, which, rich in

spiritual and material blessings, shall extend to the ends of the earth 2. The O. T. describes in this Messianic kingdom no intermediate period but a final state, but the later Jewish literature began to make a distinction between a preceding Messianic kingdom and a subsequently following Kingdom of God and thus caused the doctrine of chiliasm to arise, which was also adopted by many Christians, especially in times of persecution and oppression 3. Although agreeing in some main points, the Chiliasts are nevertheless very much in conflict with one another and all of them make themselves guilty of great arbitrariness in the interpretation of Scripture 4. Already the O. Test. itself provides a better explanation of prophecy than chiliasm offers us, and the N. Test. regards itself as the spiritual and thus true fulfilment of the O. Test. 5. But not only is chiliasm in conflict with this main thought of Scripture, but further, also with many other data, especially with the continuous expectation of the N. T. concerning the Jewish people 6, which is not contradicted by a few passages, especially Rom. 11:11-32, 7. Further, the N. T. nowhere expects a state of glory and honour for the church of Christ in this dispensation, but rather increasing persecution and oppression, to which only the single second coming of Christ puts an end 8. Indeed, in Rev. 20 there is mention of a thousand-year binding of Satan. But this chapter actually contains nothing of all that is essentially proper to chiliasm, any more than other passages of Scripture 9. And the events, related in Rev. 20, do not fall chronologically after those of the previous capita, but run parallel with them. They intend to sketch for us the [556] end of the cultureless peoples, just as the previous chapters did with respect to those nations in whose midst the gospel is preached and thus the anti-Christian power can develop 10. To world history, therefore, Christ, to whom as Son of man the judgment has been given, by his second coming

puts an end 11. The time of that second coming is not determined in the N. T., although its signs already begin with the fall of Jerusalem. And equally sober is Scripture in the description of the manner in which that second coming takes place 12.

§ 56. The Consummation of the ages pp. 481-529. With the return of Christ begins the Day of the Lord, the duration of which cannot be determined. The first event that then takes place is the resurrection of the dead 1, in which the identity of the resurrection body with the body that died is preserved 2, 3. Then follows the judgment, which extends over all human beings and angels and over all their thoughts, words, and deeds 4. The place to which the ungodly are referred and suffer eternal punishments is the gehenna. The eternity of the hellish punishment has indeed many times been contested on all manner of grounds and in turn replaced by the doctrine of hypothetical universalism, of the restoration of all things, or of conditional immortality 5. But it is contained in Scripture, and required by the nature of sin and divine justice, although it does not exclude very different degrees in its application 6. After the final judgment follows the renewal of the world, which consists not in any destruction of its substance but in a re-creation of its forma 7. This renewal of the world proves that salvation is to be conceived not exclusively as a heavenly but also as an earthly one 8, and comprises not only spiritual but also material blessings, both of which indeed begin here but are completed only in eternity. Communion with God, which is the essence of future salvation and is enjoyed with both understanding and will 9, is heightened by the communion of the saints, whose number, even if it does not include all human beings and even if there is little to be said about the salvation of Heathens and children dying young, will nevertheless form a multitude that

no one can count 10, and which itself includes all manner of diversity of personality, gifts, reward, and activity 11.

REGISTER OF MORE OR LESS EXPLAINED SCRIPTURE PASSAGES.

Gen. 1 II, 457v.

Gen. 1:1-3 II, 397, 457v, 460, 469, 478. According to the restitution theory II 473; III, 69.

Gene. 1:26, 27 II, 508, 509, 512.

Gen. 2:4bv. II, 490.

Gen. 2:7 II, 536, 540.

Gene. 2:17 III, 155, 176, 187.

Gen. 3 III, 35v., 108, 191.

Gen. 3:7v. III, 188.

Gen. 3:9-13 III, 188v.

Gen. 3:14, 15 III, 189, 213.

Gen. 3:16 III, 189.

Gen. 3:17-19 III, 190.

Gen. 3:22-24 III, 190.

Gen. 4:26 IV, 3.

Gen. 6:2 II, 436.

Gen. 9:1-7 II, 560.
Gen. 14:18 IV, 337.
Gen. 18 II, 231.
Exod. 6:3 II, 109v.
Deuteron. 32:8 II, 449.
Josh. 10:12, 13 II, 465v.
1 Sam. 28 IV, 396 BC.
2 Kings 20:9 II, 465v.
Job III, 32.
Job 33:23 II, 450.
Job 38:7 II, 434.
Ps. 2:7 II, 243.
Ps. 51:7 III, 105.
Ps. 73 III, 32.
Ps. 104:4 II, 437.
Prov. 8:22v. II, 242.
Isa. 53 III, 363.
Isa. 53:11 III, 531.
Isa. 65:20 IV, 433.
Ezek. 16:53-63 IV, 403 BC.
Ezek. 38 and 39 IV, 462.
Ezek. 40-48 IV, 431, 442 v.
Dan. 10:13, 20 II, 449.
Dan. 12:3 III, 531.
Hos. 6:7 II, 547.
Mic. 5:1 II, 243 III, 231.
Hab. 1:4 III, 17.

Zech. 6:13 III, 203.
Mal. 1:11 IV, 337.
Matt. 5:22 III, 99v. IV, 408.
Matt. 7:12 III, 77.
Matt. 10:23 IV, 477.
Matt. 11:23 IV, 372.
Matt. 12:31 III, 101
Matt. 12:32 IV, 409, 510.
Matt. 16:18 IV, 4 v., 71, 100 v., 372.
Matt. 16:19 IV, 135.
Matt. 16:28 IV, 476.
Matt. 18:10 II, 450.
Matt. 18:15-17 IV, 4v., 172.
Matt. 20:1-16 IV, 526.
Matt. 20:28 III, 363.
Matt. 22:30 II, 437.
Matt. 23:37-39 IV, 450.
Matt. 24 IV, 457, 477.
Matt. 24:14 IV, 465.
Matt. 24:29 IV, 477.
Matt. 24:34 IV, 477.
Matt. 26:39-42 III, 355.
Matt. 26:64 IV, 476.
Matt. 28:19 IV, 257, 258 v., 270, 274.
Mark 10:45 III, 363.
Luke 13:33-35 IV, 450.
Luke 15:7 II, 450.

Luke 16:23 IV, 373.
Luke 21:24 IV, 450.
Luke 22:19 IV, 338.
Luke 22:32 IV, 100, 101 v.
Luke 23:34 III, 400,
Luke 23:43 IV, 373.
Joh. 1:1-18 III, 261.
John 3:5 IV, 295.
John 3:6 III, 105.
Joh. 6 IV, 330, 346.
Joh. 7:39 III, 430.
Joh. 8:44 III, 39.
[558] John 14:18-24 IV, 476.
John 14:28 II, 245.
John 21:15-17 IV, 100, 102.
Handel. 2:39 IV, 287.
Acts 3:19-21 IV, 451.
Trade. 6 IV, 79 v.
Trade. 11:30 IV, 80.
Handel. 13:48 II, 316.
Trade. 14:23 IV, 79.
Trade. 15 IV, 180 BC.
Trade. 19:1-7 IV, 256 v., 258.
Rom. 1:3, 4 III, 415.
Rom. 2:12-16 III, 75.
Rom. 3:25, 26 III, 312, 339, 533.
Rom. 4:17 II, 399.

Rom. 5:12-21 II, 547, III, 75, 109f.
Rom. 7:7-26 III, 106v., 561.
Rom. 8:30 III, 485.
Rom. 9 II, 316v., 318.
Rom. 11:11-32 IV, 452 BC.
1 Cor. 3:12-15 IV, 409.
1 Cor. 5:1v. IV, 173
1 Cor. 6:2, 4 IV, 494.
1 Cor. 6:11 III, 531.
1 Cor. 7:14 IV, 288.
1 Cor. 9:9 III, 18.
1 Cor. 10:2 IV, 258.
1 Cor. 10:15 I, 336.
1 Cor. 10:17 IV, 347.
1 Cor. 10:21 IV, 338.
1 Cor. 11:10 II, 437.
1 Cor. 11:30 IV, 346.
1 Cor. 15:20-28 IV, 467.
1 Cor. 15:21v. III, 109.
1 Cor. 15:29 IV, 349, 415.
1 Cor. 15:35-38 IV, 488.
1 Cor. 15:45-49 II, 545, III, 65f.
2 Cor. 3:17 III, 417.
2 Cor. 5:1-4 IV, 390.
2 Cor. 5:21 III, 366.
Gal. 3:13 III, 366.
Eph. 1:4 II, 380, 382.

Eph. 1:10 II, 444, III, 406.
Eph. 1:23 III, 417v.
Eph. 2:3 III, 105.
Eph. 4:9 III, 377.
Eph. 4:11 IV, 76 v.
Eph. 4:24 II, 509.
Eph. 5:26 IV, 275 v.
Phil. 2:5-11 III, 375, 412.
Phil. 3:9 III, 536.
Col. 1:15 II, 245.
Col. 1:19, 20 II, 444, III, 406.
Col. 2:11, 12 IV, 284.
Col. 3:10 II, 509.
1 Thess. 4:13-18 IV, 467.
2 Thessal. 2 IV, 463.
1 Tim. 2:4, according to Augustine II, 321, III 391; according to the Semipelag. III, 391v. follow. the Schol. II, 323; III, 393, cf. III, 398v.
1 Tim. 3:6 III, 39.
1 Tim. 3:15 IV, 167.
1 Tim. 5:17, 18 IV, 74, 78.
2 Tim. 3:16 I, 329v., 342.
Tit. 3:5 III, 500.
Tit. 3:7 III, 532.
Tit. 3:10 IV, 174.
Heb. 1:3 II, 244.
Heb. 2:10 III, 412.
Heb. 2:17 III, 182.

Heb. 5:7 III, 355.
Heb. 5:9 III, 412.
Heb. 6:4-8 III, 103, 567.
Heb. 7:22 III, 204.
Heb. 10:25-29 III, 103, 567.
Heb. 11:3 II, 399.
Heb. 12:22-24 IV, 417.
1 Pet. 1:23 III, 500v.
1 Peter 3:19-21 III, 377, 380, 422, IV, 404 v.
1 Pet. 3:21 IV, 260.
1 Pet. 4:6 IV, 405.
2 Pet. 1:19-21 I, 345.
2 Pet. 2:18-22 III, 567.
1 John 2:17 IV, 513.
1 John 5:7 II, 239.
1 John 5:16 III, 103.
Jude 6 III, 39.
Rev. John IV, 460 B.C.
Public 1:20v. II, 450, IV, 78, 85, 97.
Rev. 8:3 II, 450.
Rev. 20 IV, 462 BC.
Rev. 21 and 22 IV, 515 BC.
Rev. 22:11 III, 532.

REGISTER OF NAMES.

A.

Abaelard, On Scripture I, 311. On Satisfaction III, 317.

Agobard of Lyon, On Inspiration I, 311.

Alcuinus, I, 79.

Alexandrian Theologians, Their Idiosyncrasy I, 59v.

Alsted, His Theol. naturalis I, 223.

Alting, Jac. On the Passion of Christ III, 350v, 352.

Ambrosius, I, 71; on original sin III, 119.

Amesius, On Theology III, 455.

Amyraldus, I, 122; II, 341; III, 454.

Anselm, His Method in General I, 82; his Theory of Satisfaction III, 317v., 349, 411.

Apollinaris, His Christology I, 63; III, 277.

Apologists, I, 55v., 423v., 445, 484; on the Holy Scripture I, 307; on the Trinity II, 250v., 405v.

Apostolic Fathers, Character of their writings I, 52; on the Holy Scripture I, 307; on the Trinity II, 249; on the intermediate state IV, 375.

Appelius, I, 126.

Aristotle, On the ἀρχαι I, 140; II, 29; on the origin and essence of sin III, 42.

Arius, On the Trinity II, 260v.; on the humanity of Christ III, 277.

Arminius, On Predestination II, 340; on the demand for obedience after the fall III, 220.

Athanasius, Its Significance for Theology I, 62v., II, 256; On the Holy Spirit II, 289v.

Augustine, His Division of Dogmatic Matter I, 32ff.; Significance for Theology I, 72ff., On Human Knowledge I, 165ff., 168; On the Insufficiency of General Revelation I, 231; On the Elements of Truth in Paganism I, 238; On Miracles I, 291ff.; On Church and Scripture I, 367, 368; On the Necessity of Scripture I, 381; On the Meaning of Faith in the General Sense I, 470; On the Incomprehensibility of God II, 6; On Man's Knowledge of General Necessity, Truths II, 33ff.; on the essentia Dei II, 79, 80, 87, 175; on the virtues of God II, 89, 92, 140; on the immutability of God II, 120; on the omnipresence of God II, 136; on the omniscience of God in connection with man's freedom II, 162; on the Ideas in God II, 170, 407; on the beauty of creatures and the beauty of God II, 193v., 421v.; on the omnipotence of God II, 225; on the Trinity II, 258v., 276, 291, 301v., 539; on predestination II, 320v., 334v., 358; on the number of angels II, 433; III, 407; [560] on the knowledge of angels II, 439; on paradise II, 505; on the state of Adam II, 549ff.; on permissio III, 56ff.; on the privative character of sin III, 78ff., 80; on original sin III, 119ff.; on the work of Christ III, 316; on particular satisfaction III, 391; on grace III, 436ff., 443;

on perseverance III, 565, 566; on the Church I, 75; IV, 9ff., 32, 262 ; on the Sacraments IV, 218 ; on Baptism IV, 252 ; on Infant Baptism IV, 262, 279 v.; on the Lord's Supper IV, 313 v.

Augustine Steuchus, On the Omnipresence of God II, 133; On the Location of Paradise II, 505.

Aureolus, His Nominalism I, 84.

B.

Baader, Franz von I, 95.

Bajus, I, 92.

Basilius, On the Relation of the Essence and Attributes of God II, 86; On the Distinction of the Attributes of God II, 92.

Baudissin, On the Holiness of God II, 185.

Baumgarten, SJ I, 101.

Baxter, Richard I, 118; III, 395.

Beck, His Theology I, 15, 108.

Bekker, Balthazar, On the Angels II, 425.

Bellarminus, On the Efficacy of Calling III, 497v., against Justitia Imputata III, 538v.; on the Unbelievers in Bellarmine, the Church IV, 32 v.; on the Signs of the Church IV 39, 40 v., 45 v.

Berti, On de gratia III, 441.

Biedermann, His Dogmatic Standpoint I, 107, 432.

Böhl, On the Image of God II, 510.

Böhme, On the Trinity II, 266; On the Work of Christ III, 321.

Bonaventure, Its Significance for the Classification of Dogmatic Matter I, 34; On Holy Scripture I, 310v.; On the Knowledge of God and of the Prima Principia II, 34v.

Bonfrerius, On Inspiration I, 313.

Bonnet, On the Miracles I, 292.
Boston, Thomas I, 128; III, 395.
Bourignon, Antoinette, On the Work of Christ III, 321.
Bradwardina, I, 87.
Brahé, J. I, 126; III, 453.
Bretschneider, I, 102.
Briggs, Charles I, 139.
Bruining, Dr. A. I, 185.
Bull, George III, 454.
Bullinger, His Difference from Calvin I, 115.
Büsching, AF I, 15.
Bushnell, Horace, On the Work of Christ III, 331.
Byzantine Theologians I, 67v.
C.
Calixtus, His Classification of Dogmatic Matter I, 40v.; His Reaction against the Scholastic Treatment of Dogma and His Syncretism I, 100.
Calovius, On the Object of Theology I, 7.
Calvin, His Institutes I, 38ff.; its significance for Reformed Dogmatics I, 112ff.; on inspiration I, 315ff.; on the testimonium spir. sancti I, 490ff.; [561] on the nat. knowledge of God II, 37; on the potentia absoluta Dei II, 226; on predestination II, 330ff.; in connection with the question of supra- and infralapsarianism II, 336ff.; on the image of God II, 531; on original sin III, 125; on the order of salvation III, 448; on the church IV, 17ff.; as father of presbyterian church government IV, 129ff.; his judgment on separation from the church IV, 48 ; on ecclesiastical discipline IV, 155 ; on Church and State IV, 190 f.; on the Sacraments IV, 222, 228 f.; on the Holy Communion IV, 319 f., 330, 342 f.; on the intermediate state IV, 380.

Camero, I, 122; III, 454.

Campbell, John M. Leod, On the Work of Christ III, 330.

Canus, On the Ultimate Ground of Faith in Revelation I, 487.

Cappellus, I, 122, on the intermediate state IV, 380.

Cartesius, On Innate Concepts II, 30; on the Creatio Secunda II, 474; on the Primacy of the Will in God II, 124; his Dualism IV, 356.

Cassian, See Semipelagianism.

Celsus, As an Opponent of Christianity I, 53, 317v.

Chalcedon, Council of, On the Person of Christ III, 241, 283.

Chemnitz, I, 99.

Chrismann, On Inspiration I, 313.

Cicero, On Innate Concepts II, 30; on God's Omniscience and Man's Freedom II, 161, 352.

Clemens Alexandrinus as dogmatist I, 31, 60.

Cocceius, His Theology I, 41v., 121; III, 200v.; on the omnipresence of God II, 134; on the image of God II, 531.

Comrie, I, 126; on justification and faith III, 453; on the union of Christ and the church II, 339, 362; III, 260.

Crell, On the Omnipresence of God II, 134.

Cremer, BS III, 453.

Cusanus, On the Knowledge of God II, 9.

Cyprian, On the Church of Rome in Relation to the Others IV, 88.

Cyril, On the Natures of Christ III, 241, 283.

D.

Damascene, His Dogmatics I, 32, 66.

Darby, J. On the Church IV, 22.

Darmesteter, J. On the relationship v. Parzism and Judaism II, 425.

Darwin, On the Origin of Religion I, 202; his theory of evolution II, 492v.

Delitzsch, Franz, On the intermediate body after death IV, 391.

Delitzsch, Friedrich, On the Location of Paradise II, 506.

Dionysius, Areopagita (Pseudo), His Writings I, 66; on the incomprehensibility of God II, 7; on the origin of the world II, 389; on the celestial and ecclesiastical hierarchy II, 432v.

Dippel, J.C. On the Work of Christ III, 321.

Doedes, His Threefold Dogmatics I, 11; his separation of belief and knowledge I, 451; his division of the attributes of God II, 89; [562] on Baptism IV, 276.

Dorner, On the Immutability of God II, 122ff.; his Christology III, 252, 282.

Durand de St. Porciano, His Nominalism I, 84.

E.

Ebrard, Character of his Dogmatics I, 434.

Edwards, Jon. Sr. I. 137; on original sin III, 127, 139; on man's powerlessness to do good III, 150.

Edwards, Jon. Jr. I, 137.

Eerde, from On the External Covenant and the Sacraments IV, 322.

Erasmus, On Inspiration I, 313.

Erastus, IV, 155.

Erigena, Joh. Scotus I, 79v.; on the incomprehensibility of God II, 7, 400; on the origin of the world II, 389.

Ernesti, On the Offices of Christ III, 326.

Erskine, Ralph and Ebenezer I, 128f.; III, 395.

Erskine, Thomas, On the Work of Christ III, 330.

Eunomius, On the Essence of God II, 19, 86, 91, 141, 279.

Eutyches, On the Union of the Natures in Christ III, 283.

F.

Farrar, FW I, 134.

Feuerbach, I, 106; on the Idea of God II, 14.

Fichte, J.G. On the Concept of God II, 13, 17, 82; on the Moral World Order II, 17, 59, 82; on religio I, 191; on the Person of Christ III, 248.

Flacius, On Original Sin III, 125.

Frank, His System der christlichen Gewissheit I, 434v., 439v.

Frohschammer, I, 95.

G.

Gomarus, On the expression: unio sacramentalis IV, 235.

Gotti, On the Nature of God II, 81.

Gregorius, Magnus I, 77.

Gregory v. Nyssa, On the Relation of the Essence and Attributes of God II, 86; on the Distinction of the Attributes of God II, 92; his Realism in the Trin. Doctrine II, 271.

Grotius, His Theory of Satisfaction III, 325, 358; On the Election of Church Ministers IV, 122.

Günther, I, 95; on the demonstrability of the Trin. II, 306.

H.

Halesius, Alexander, His Method in Theology I, 82ff.; on the donum superadditum II, 518v.

Hamelius, On Inspiration I, 312.

Hamilton, William On the Knowability of God II, 15.

Harnack, His Struggle with Zahn over the History of the NT Cannon I, 337; over the Theological Dogmata I, 511, 513v.; over the Art. “Reception of the Holy Spirit” III, 268v.

Hartmann, Ed. von, On the Unconscious II, 56v., 148, 156v.; on the Order of Salvation III, 459v.

Hase, I, 104.

Hatch, Edwin, About the Theologian. dogmata I, 135, 511v.

[563] Hegel, His Philosophical System and Influence on Theology I, 106, 432, 436ff.; On Religion I, 187ff.; On Revelation I, 266; His Merits and Faults I, 436ff.; On the Knowability of God II, 14, 19; On the Proofs for God's Existence II, 52; His Concept of God II, 83, 267; On the Spiritual Nature of God II, 148; On the Origin of the World II, 203, 391; III, 47; His Dialectical Method and Its Triplicity II, 300; On Judaism III, 202; On the Person of Christ III, 249; symbolic conception of the work of Christ III, 327; on the order of salvation III, 460, 468; on the Church IV, 20.

Helmholtz, On the Qualitative Properties of Things I, 147v.

Herbert of Cherbury, I, 125.

Hermes, I, 94.

Herrmann, On the Ground of Faith in the Person of Christ I, 453v.

Hieronymus, I, 72; his limitation of God's omniscience. II, 160; III, 11.

Hilarius Pictaviensis I, 71.

Hodge, Ch. I, 138.

Hoekstra, His Connection to Side I, 450.

Hofmann, On Dogmatics I, 434.

Holden, On Inspiration I, 313.

Holtius, I, 126; III, 453.

Honert, J. van den, On Faith and Justification III, 454.

Hopkins, Sam. I, 137.

Huss, Joh. I, 87.

Ignatius, On the Episcopate IV, 84, 85.

Irenaeus, Its Significance for Theology I, 57ff.; on the Trin. II, 253ff.; on the Two Natures in Christ III, 240; on the Work of Christ III, 316; on the Church of Rome in Relation to Others IV, 88 ; on the Intermediate State IV, 376.

Isidore, Hispalensis I, 33, 78.

J.

Jacobi, I, 104, 196; on the proofs for God's existence II, 52, 60.

Jansonius, On the External Covenant and the Sacraments IV, 322.

Joris, David, His Doctrine of the Trinity, II, 265.

Justin, Martyr I, 56; on the Trin. and the Godhead of Christ II, 250v.; on creation out of nothing II, 388; on the work of Christ III, 315; on the intermediate state IV, 376.

K.

Kant, His Philosophical System and Influence on the Theology of the 19th Century I, 103v., 450v., 481; On Religion I, 12, 190v.; His Postulate Theory I, 447v., 480v.; On the Different Kinds of Certainty I, 480v.; On the Knowability of God II, 12, 17; On the Proofs for God's Existence II, 51v.; On the Trinity II, 267; On the Intelligible Act III, 70; On Radical Boss III, 70, 153; on Judaism III, 202; [564] on the person of Christ III, 247v., 327; on the order of salvation III, 459; on the church IV, 20 ; on the immortality of the soul IV, 357.

Karg, (Parsimonius) On the obed. assets III, 322, 350.

Carolingian Theologians I, 79.

Keckermann, I, 41.

Kleman, His Order of Salvation III, 454, 497.

Kleutgen, I, 97.

König, On the Character of Prophetic Visions I, 255; On the Activity of the Spirit in Revelation I, 256.

Kuyper, A. On grace in Baptism IV, 269.

L.

Labadie, J. de, On the Church IV, 21.

Leibniz, On Miracles I, 292; on Innate Conceptions II, 30ff.; on this world as the best II, 213.

Leidenroth, His derivation of the word religion I, 171.

Lessing, On Holy Scripture I, 374, 382.

Lessius, On Inspiration I, 312.

Leydecker, His Classification of Dogma. I, 42.

Liguori, Alphonsus von I, 94.

Lipsius, Compared with Ritschl I, 109; his theological position I, 455ff.; on angels II, 426.

Lombardus, His Sententiae I, 33, 82.

Lugo, On the Grounds of Faith in Revelation I, 488.

Luther, M. Its Significance for Theology I, 98; on Reason in Religious Matters I, 222; on Inspiration I, 315; on Predestination II, 327; on the Relation of the Old and New Testament III, 199; on the Two Natures in Christ III, 244; on Penance and Faith III, 444ff.; on the Church IV, 14ff.; on the Government of the Church IV, 108ff.; on Offices in the Church IV, 119, 128ff.; on the Characteristics of the Church IV, 44 ; on Private Confession IV, 153ff.; on Nature and Grace I, 222ff.; IV, 155ff., 187 ; on the Sacraments IV, 221 ; on Holy Baptism IV, 264 v.; on the Holy Supper IV, 318.

M.

Mansel, Henr. Longueville, On the Knowability of God II, 15v.

Marcion, On the OT I, 317; II, 200; III, 196, 339.

Mariana, On Inspiration I, 313.

Marshall, His Combat with General Satisfaction III, 396.

Maurice, On the Work of Christ III, 331.

Melanchton, His Loci Communes I, 2, 37, 98; his deviation from Luther I, 98; II, 327; III, 446; on the marks of the church IV, 44.

Menken, G. On the Holiness of God II, 185.

Milligan, W. III, 419.

Milton, His Arianism II, 263.

Molina, On Predestination II, 326.

Mosheim, JL von I, 101.

Müller, Max, On the Origin of Religion I, 203.

Musculus, On the Lord's Supper for Children IV, 350. [565]

N.

Nestorius, On the Two Natures of Christ I, 63; III, 281v.; On the Worship of Christ III, 298.

Nicaea, Conc. of II, 256.

O.

Occam, His Nominalism I, 84; II, 212.

Oort, On the veneration of the dead under Israel IV, 363 BC.

Opzoomer, I, 130.

Origen, His division of the matter of dogma I, 32; his theology I, 60ff.; on praescientia and predestination II, 162; on the Trin. II, 255; on creation as an eternal act of God II, 409; on the original equality of all creatures II, 442, 549; III, 70; IV, 500 ; on the guardian angels II, 447; on the restitution of all things III, 390; IV, 500 ; on the fire of purification IV, 377, 500.

Os, van den, On faith III, 454.

Osiander, On the archetype of the image of God in man II, 535, 542; on the work of Christ III, 320, 332.

Osterwald, I, 127.

Owen, I, 123.

P.

Pascal, As Defender of Christianity I, 446.

Payon, Claude I, 123; III, 454, 497.

Pelagius, On Sin and Grace II, 319v., 349; III, 434v.; on the status integritatis and the image of God II, 512; on original sin III, 112.

Perrone, I, 97.

Peyrère, Isaac de la, His Pre-Adamitism II, 501.

Pfleiderer, I, 107,

Philaret, I, 68.

Philippi, I, 108.

Philippists in Germany I, 98.

Philo, On the Name Ihvh in Connection with the Incomprehensibility of God II, 4, 80; his Theology of Logos II, 86, 233v.

Photius, I, 66.

Piscator, About obed. assets III, 322, 350v.

Placaeus, I, 122; III, 127.

Plato, On the Possibility of Learning II, 29; On the Ideas II, 85v., 232; On the Origin and Nature of Sin III, 42, 46, 70, 129; On the Immortality of the Soul IV, 355.

Plotinus, On the Incomprehensibility of God II, 4; On the Becoming of God II, 123, 204.

Pobedonoszew, IV, 22.

Poiret, On the Work of Christ III, 321.

Porphyry, As an Opponent of Christianity I, 54, 318.

Procopowitsch I, 68.

R.

Ramus, Petrus III, 455.

Rathmann, H. On Word and Spirit IV, 211.

Rauwenhoff, I, 186, 198, 461v.

Raymund de Sabunde I, 220.

Reinhard, I, 102.

Reland, On the Situation of Paradise II, 505v.

Richer, On Offices in the Church IV, 119.

Ritschl, Character of his Theology I, 15, 109v., 452v.; [566] compared with Lipsius, I, 109; on revelation I, 267; his concept of God II, 84v., 88; on the person of Christ II, 264; III, 252v., 266; on original sin III, 43, 113, 115; on the worship of Christ III, 299; on the work of Christ and his offices III, 329v., 335, 350v.; on Mark 10:45 III, 363; on the fruit of Christ's work III, 386v., 397, 398; IV, 518 ; compared with Schleiermacher III, 387; on the order of salvation III, 462v.

Rothe, On Dogmatics and Ethics I, 12; on revelation I, 265; on the distinction between Jesus and the Apostle in their relation to the Old Testament Scripture I, 340; his speculative method I, 434; his Christology III, 251ff.

Rufinus, I, 71.

S.

Sabellius, II, 262.

Sanseverino, I, 97.

Schelling, Groundwork of his philosophy from the 2nd period I, 107, 191; II, 203v., 393; in his 1st period on revelation I, 266; his concept of God II,

83, 267; his Trin. doctrine II, 304v.; his explanation of the origin of all things, II, 304v., 390v., III, 47, 169v.; on the good angels II, 426; his polygenism II, 502; on Christ, in his 1st period III, 248; in his 2nd period III, 251; his symbolic conception of the work of Christ III, 327; on the order of salvation III, 459.

Scherer, E. I, 131.

Schleiermacher, On the essence and character of a dogma I, 4; on the place of Dogma in the Encycl. I, 9, 45; on the distinction between Dogma and Ethics I, 12; his Theol. and Influence I, 104ff., 433ff.; III, 249ff.; on religion I, 180, 197; on revelation I, 265; on inspiration I, 319ff.; on Holy Scripture I, 383; his subjective starting-point I, 437ff.; on the knowability of God II, 13; on the symbolic character of the knowledge of God II, 76; on the attributes of God II, 76, 92, 98ff.; on the Trin. II, 267; on predestination II, 342; on angels II, 426, 429; on Judaism III, 202; on Christ III, 249ff., 328ff., 354, 371; on the fruit of Christ's work III, 386ff.; compared with Ritschl III, 387; on the order of salvation III, 461; on the church IV, 24, 38, 61 ; on the distinction between Protestantism and Romanism IV, 61 ; on the Sacram. IV, 223ff., 322 ; on Baptism IV, 268 ; on the immortality of the soul IV, 357.

Scholten, I, 432.

Schopenhauer, On the Egoism of Man. Nature III, 153; On the Order of Salvation III, 459. See also Pessimism.

Schultens, JJ On Justification and Faith III, 454.

Schultz, On the Holiness of God II, 185.

[567] Schwally, On the Veneration of the Dead in Israel IV, 363 BC.

Schweizer, His identification of Theologia natur. and foedus operum I, 47v.

Scotus (Duns, Joh) His refutation of Thomas I, 83; on the knowledge of God II, 9; on the essence of God II, 81, 89; on the will of God II, 210ff.; his refutation of the necessity of satisfaction II, 211; III, 317, 366ff.; on the efficacy of the sacraments IV, 239.

Napkin, On the Trinity II, 266.

Shedd, I, 138; III, 497; his Realism in the doctrine of original sin III, 131 and of Christ III, 371v.

Sherlock, Th. His Tritheism II, 264.

Smith, Henry I, 139.

Socrates, On the Origin and Nature of Sin III, 42.

Sohm, IV, 152 v.

Spencer, Herbert, His Agnosticism II, 15v.

Spener, See Pietism.

Spinoza, His Controversy of Revelation I, 279; on Substance II, 127, 134; on the Attributes of the Substantive II, 91; on the Origin of the World II, 390; on the Immortality of the Soul IV, 356.

Stade, On the concept of חטא in the OT III, 75, 95; on the veneration of the dead in Israel IV, 363 BC.

Stancarus, On the Work of Christ III, 322, 332v.

Stead, WT I, 134.

Stearns, Lewis I, 139.

Stoa, Its Doctrine of Logos II, 232; On the Origin of Sin III, 42.

Strausz, DF I, 106v., III, 249; on the angels II, 426.

Suarez, On the Grounds of Faith in Revelation I, 487v.

Swedenborg, On the Trinity II, 267; on the Angels II, 426; on the work of Christ III, 321v.

T.

Tertullian, Its Significance for Theology I, 57ff.; on the Natural Knowledge of God II, 33; on the Bodily Nature of God II, 146ff.; on the Trinity II, 254ff., 276; on the Two Natures of Christ III, 240ff.; on the Work of Christ III, 316; on the Church of Rome in Relation to Others IV, 88 ; on Infant Baptism IV, 279.

Theodoret, His Classification of Dogmatic Matter I, 32.

Thomas, His Summa I, 34v.; on the Virtues and Religion I, 177v.; on the Faith of the Articuli Mixti I, 220v.; on the Holy Scripture I, 309v.; on the Knowledge of God II, 8v.; on the Providence of God II, 347v.; III, 6; on Satisfaction III, 317v.; on the Superabundance of Satisfaction III, 367; on the Necessity of Internal Grace III, 439.

Thuïnen, van, III, 453.

Til, Sal. from, About the Theol. naturalis I, 43.

V.

Victorinus Rhetor I, 71.

Vincentius Lerinensis, On the Characteristics of Tradition I, 402.

Vinet, Alex. I, 131; as a defender of Christianity. I, 447.

[568] Plane, III, 454.

Voetius, His refutation of Cartesius' doctrine of the ideas of innatae II, 38.

Vorstius, On the Simplicity of God, II, 141; the Unchangeable Nature of God II, 121; on the Human Nature of God II, 147.

Vrolikhert, III, 453.

W.

Wegscheider, I, 102; on the revelation I, 280.

Weismann, On heredity, III, 141.

Wernle, Paul, On Sanctification III, 558.

Law, the, His dogmatic position I, 104.

Whiston, W. His Arianism II, 263.

White, Edward (As an advocate of the Condition of Immortality) IV, 502.

Wiclif, I, 87.

Z.

Zinzendorf, see Herrnhuttism.

Zwingli, Als Geref. dogmatist I, 112; on inspiration I, 315; on the Salvation of Gentiles I, 232; IV, 196, 522 ; on predestination II, 330; about the causae secundae III, 26; on the invisible and visible church IV, 17 ; his Dualism IV, 155 ; on the exercise of ecclesiastical power IV, 155 ; on the Sacraments IV, 221 ff.; on the Holy Communion IV, 318 ff.

REGISTER OF AFFAIRS.

A.

Adoration of Christ, III, 298v.

Offer of Grace, Struggle about it in Scotland III, 395; generality III, 399, 488v.

Innate Concepts, I, 159; II, 29v.

Adoption as children, III, 551v.

Contemplation of God, II, 150v.; IV, 519.

Earth as the Center of Creation, II, 466.

Ἄβυσσος, IV, 374.

Acceptance in the satisfaction of Christ, III, 367v.

Actus purissimus, used of God. II, 123.

Adam and Christ compared according to their nature and person II, 545v.; III, 65v., 258. As covenant heads II, 563v.; III, 134v., 226v., 351, 361, 373, 547.

אֲדֹנָי, II, 105.

Adoptionism, II, 244.

Secession from the church. Judgment of the Reformed Church on this matter. IV, 48, cf. 52.

Ἀγαπαι, in the first Chr. church IV, 216, 311.

Ἀγεννησια, as a person. property of the Father II, 279v.

Agnosticism, II, 15v.

Αιων οὐτος and μέλλων in the NT, IV, 482.

Αἰωνες, as name of the world II, 420v.

Αἰωνιος, in the NT IV, 498, 503 v.

Omnipotence of God II, 222v.

Omnipresence of God II, 132v.

Office of the Faithful IV, 117 v.

Offices of Christ III, 313v., 334v., 353v.

Offices in the Church. Origin IV, 73 ff.; character IV, 119 ff.; number IV, 126 ff.; relation to the gifts IV, 63.

America, History of Dogmatics in I, 135v.

Anabaptism, on nature and grace, I, 222; IV, 20, 162, 186 ; on Holy Scripture, I, 381v.; III, 198; IV, 209 v.; on Trin. II, 265; on the image of God II, 512; on the human nature of Christ III, 275v.; on the church IV, 20 ; on ecclesiastical power and discipline IV, 155, 162 ; on the Sacraments IV, 223 ; on infant baptism IV, 282 v., 289.

Analogia fidei in the interpretation of Holy Scripture I, 398v.

Analytic classification of Dogmatics. See Dogmatics.

Andover position, in America IV, 500.

Anglican Church IV, 87.

Anthropological Proof for the Immortality of the Soul IV, 361 B.C.

Anthropomorphites in the Christian Church, II, 147.

Anthropomorphism in the revelation of God I, 228f., 268f., 358; II, 65v., 536.

Antichrist IV, 464.

Anti-geological theory for the reconciliation of Scripture and natural science, II, 474v.

Antinomianism sur de satisfactio vicaria III, 365; on the order of salvation III, 451f., 467f., 525, 527, 553; IV, 209 ; on the law IV, 203 v.

Antinomianism in England I, 118; III, 453.

Ἀποκαλύπτειν and φανερουν I, 244v.

Apologetics I, 429v.; its value in Rome I, 424v.

Apostolate I, 334f.; IV, 64 v., 69 v., 99 v.; in a broader sense IV, 66 v.

[570] Apostolicity of the Church IV, 57 v.

Ἀρχή, in the Philos. I, 140; in Holy Scripture and Theol. I, 141.

Arianism II, 260v., 262v., 309, 401, 404.

Aristotelian-Ptolemaic Worldview II, 464.

Armenian hypothesis on the location of Paradise II, 505v.

Arminianism in England I, 117f.; in the Netherlands I, 120.

Atheism II, 25v.

Atoms in Materialism II, 394v.

Aufklärung in Germany I, 102.

Augustinians in the Roman Church, I, 93; on predestination II, 326; on grace III, 441, 497.

Autoritas historica et normativa der H. Schrift. See Authority of HS

Avesta, on the fall of man, III, 40.

Communion, IV, 299 v.; celebration in the 1st Christ church IV, 216, 311 ; conception in Rome IV, 249, 315 v.; institution IV, 302 v., 340 v.; regarded as a sacrifice IV, 312 v.; ministers IV, 324 v.; place of administration IV, 327

v., 348 ; manner of administration IV, 328 v., 348 ; in private homes IV, 327, 350 ; for children IV, 348, 350 v.; and Baptism IV, 344, 350 v.

B.

Baptism in England, I, 123v.

ברא I, 396; IV, 512.

Mercy of God II, 180v.; in hell II, 362, 365; IV, 510.

Bath-Kol among the Jews I, 252.

Distribution of the Public Transport, Peculiarity III, 176, 213v., 229; IV, 443 v.

Ministry of the Word, IV, 165 v.; in Rome IV, 138 v., 163.

Image of God as name of the second person II, 244v., 511; not the angels, but man, II, 442v., 542, 568; doctrine vb II, 508v.; III, 82v.; limit of the, II, 557; III, 64v.; to what extent lost through sin III, 82v., 165v.

Iconoclasm in the 8th and 9th centuries I, 66.

Burial of Christ III, 377.

Buried, The, in Israel IV, 364 ; in general, IV, 485.

Concepts, Their Relation to Reality, I, 166v.

Conversion, III, 480v.; claim of IV, 206 v.

Confession, As an incomplete expression of the faith of the church, I, 5v.; relationship to Scripture, I, 25; IV, 168 ; to Dogmatics, I, 27; not a source of knowledge of Dogmatics, I, 26v.

ברית, III, 192v.

Guardian Angels, II, 447v.

Circumcision in the Old Testament, IV, 252 v.; transition in Baptism, IV, 284 v.

Circumcision of Christ, III, 375.

Sprinkling in Baptism, IV, 272 b.c.

God's existence as a presupposition of religion, I, 209v.

Proofs for God's Existence, II, 48v.

Demoniacs in the NT, III, 184v.

Confession, See Penance.

Superstition, I, 247; III, 180v.

Episcopal office, at Rome, etc. IV, 9 f., 96 f., 126 f.; origin, IV, 82 f.; criticism, IV, 96 f.; relation to other offices, IV, 127 f.; to the Pope, IV, 147 f., 150 f.; at some Ref. offices, IV, 99, 130.

Blood of Christ, III, 377.

Book of Life, II, 314v., 318.

Bélé, used of the will of God, II, 315.

Penance in the 1st Chr. church, III, 434; in Luther, III, 444v., 480; in the Reformed, III, 480; as a sacrament in the Roman Church, IV, 139 v., 163 v., 170, 249.

Tree of the knowledge of good and evil, II, 559; III, 35v.

Tree of Life, II, 559.

Surety of Christ, III, 204v.

[571] Supernatural, Conception in Theology, I, 222, 273v.

Broad-church party in England, I, 133v.

Buddhism, III, 41, 426; IV, 2.

C.

Calvinism, II, 371v.

Calvinist Theology in France, I, 113, 122v., 127, 131; in the Netherlands, I, 114, 116, 125v., 129v.; in England and Scotland, I, 114v., 117v., 123v., 128, 132v.; in Germany, I, 115, 130; in America, I, 135v.

Canonization in the Roman Church, IV, 400.

Cartesianism in the Theol. I, 120v.

Catechesis in the Reformation. IV, 352.
Causa sui, applied to God, II, 122, 123, 124.
Causae secundae, III, 22, 25v.
Caesareopapism, IV, 189 ; in the East, IV, 142.
Chaldean Genesis, II, 388.
Character indelebilis at Rome, IV, 241 v.
Charisms in the Church IV, 29, 117 ; relation to the offices, IV, 63.
Cherubim, II, 430v.
Chiliasm, IV, 436 v.
Chochma in Israel, II, 169.
Christianity, in relation to Paganism, I, 240, 247v.; III, 228v.; and natural science, II, 422v., 465; III, 23v.; according to Rome, II, 528v.
Christ, Is he causa electionis? II, 380; III, 356; as object of predestination and election II, 382ff.; in his relation to the angels II, 444ff.; III, 405ff.; his sinlessness, III, 145, 295ff., 366; his person, III, 228ff.; his Godhead, III, 239, 264ff.; his conception of the Holy Spirit, III, 268ff., 272ff.; as Davidide, III, 274; as revelation of God, III, 342; his humanity, III, 275ff., 287ff., 291ff.; his testimony on the OT, I, 333; III, 295; his work, III, 302ff.; his relation to the Law, IV, 201ff.; did He also deserve anything for Himself? III, 312ff., 411ff.; in the more recent Theol. and Philos., III, 247ff., 276, 328.
Chronology of Scripture, II, 470v., 488.
Clergy at Rome, IV, 86, 95 v., 126 v.; division, IV, 127 v.
Coadamitism, II, 501.
Cocceianism, I, 121. See also Cocceius.
Communicatio apotelesmatum, III, 290.
Communicatio charismatum, III, 290.

Communicatio idioimatum, III, 290: with Rome and the Lutherans, III, 243v., 290v.

Communism, II, 561.

Council of Constance, I, 87.

Council of Trent, I, 88; on the relationship between the episcopal and papal office, IV, 147.

Concordist Theory for the Reconciliation of Scripture and Natural Science, II, 473v., 479.

Concupiscentia, III, 86f., 125; in Augustine, III, 86, 120; at Rome, III, 86, 122; IV, 277.

Concursus, III, 8, 16, 20v., 25v.; different view in the Roman Theol., III, 11v.

Confucianism, III, 41.

Congregants in the Roman Church, I, 93; III, 441, 497v.

Constantinople as a rival of Rome, I, 70; IV, 90 BC.

Creatianism, II, 565v.; with a view to the propagation of original sin, II, 567; III, 144.

Creatio prima et secunda, II, 459.

Cultus Dei and religion among the Reformed Churches, I, 179, 182.

Culture and Religion, I, 201.

[572]

D.

Day of the Lord in prophecy, I, 261ff.; IV, 427, 481 ; in Jewish theology and the NT, IV, 481ff.

Δαιμων, as the name of God, II, 103.

Darwinism, II, 492v., 513v.; as polygenism, II, 502, 506v.; significance for the maintenance of the unity of the human race, II, 503.

David as a theocratic king, III, 230.

Decretum horribile, from Calvin, II, 371.

Deism, General character, I, 17; II, 308; III, 13v.; on religion I, 194; about eternity. God, II, 128; about the ubiquity. God, II, 134, 137f.; about providence. God, III, 11f.; on the causae secundae, III, 26; on the origin of sin, III, 43v.

Deism in England, I, 124v.; concerning the historical character of revelation, I, 297; on the sufficiency of general revelation, I, 232.

Determinism, in its distinction from predestination, II, 341v.; III, 9v.

Virtues of God, II, 78v.; conceived as hypostases, II, 85v.; in relation to the essence of God, II, 86v.; subjective conception, II, 91v.; classifications, II, 95v.

Virtues of the Pagans and Unbelievers, I, 238v.; III, 149, 152, 210v.

Διαθηκή in LXX and NT III, 195.

Deaconate, IV, 78 v., 165, 177 v.; at Rome, IV, 128.

Διακονία, in the NT IV, 80.

Dicta duriora in Augustine and de Geref., II, 372v.; III, 57v.

Δικαιοσυνή θεοῦ in Paulus, III, 533v.

Diocese near Rome, IV, 85.

Doctorate, IV, 130.

Dogma, I, 3v.; origin of, I, 514v.; follow. Harnack and Hatch, I, 511v.

Dogmatics, Name I, 1v.; formal concept, I, 6; material concept, I, 6v.; II, 1; place in the Encyclopedia, I, 9v.; method, I, 14v.; classification, I, 31v.; history, I, 51v.; ecclesiastical character, I, 14, 23; personal character, I, 28v.; critical direction in the I, 16v.

Dogmatic Terminology, I, 528; II, 268; IV, 225.

Δόξα, II, 191.

Donatism, on the lapsi IV, 139.

Donum superadditum at Rome; in the angelic world, II, 441; among men, II, 517v., 555.

Death as punishment for sin, III, 176v.; IV, 367, 372, 383, 505 ; for the faithful, IV, 411 v.

Death of Christ. See Cross, work of Christ.

Veneration of the dead in the various religions, IV, 392 ; in Israel, IV, 363 v.

Questions about the dead in the HS, IV, 395 v.

Baptism, IV, 252 f.; in connection with regeneration, IV, 197 f., 266, 290 f.; to the Lord's Supper, IV, 344 f., 350 ; of John the Baptist, IV, 254 f., 447 ; ministers, IV, 293 f.; place of administration, IV, 295 f.; time of administration, IV, 296 f.; legality, IV, 299 ; objects, IV, 299 ; at Rome, III, 442; IV, 248, 262 f., 270, 275, 277.

Baptism of Christ, III, 375.

Baptismal witnesses, IV, 297 v.

Δουλεια and λατρεια, II, 452f.; IV, 393 v., 400 v.

Three. Number in Nature and Scripture, II, 298v., 311.

Trinity, II, 227v.; in connection with the simplicity of God, II, 144v.; with the doctrine of man, II, 539; as the supposition of the incarnation, III, 254v.; importance for the order of salvation, III, 469v.

Dreams as a means of revelation, I, 253v.

Dualism on metaphys. area in question to the person of Christ, III, 278f.; of believing and knowing in the N. Theol., I, 463v., 482, 512; II, 456.

[573] Clarity of Scripture. See Scripture.

Devils, III, 90v.; nature of their sin, III, 92v.; power over the world, III, 199v.

Millennial Kingdom. See Chiliasm.

E.

Ebionitism on Christ, III, 240; on His work, III, 320; on the future, IV, 375.

אֵל , II, 104.

ברית , II, 104, 228.

אֵל שַׁדַּי, II, 106.

Unity of the Church, IV, 7 v., 31, 53 v.

Simplicity of God, II, 88, 94, 140v.

Eternity of God, II, 128v., 412.

Eternity and Time, II, 128v., 410v., 412v.

Proper names of God, II, 102v.

Attributes of God. See Virtues of God.

Properties of Scripture. See Scripture.

Ἐκκλησία. Meaning and use, IV, 4, 6, 25, 448.

Εκλογή, II, 316.

Theory of Emanation, II, 400v., 414.

Empiricism, I, 151v.

Angel of the Lord. See Malak Ihvh.

Angels, II, 425v.; as mediators of revelation, I, 249; II, 428, 445, 454; conceived as inhabitants of the planets, II, 426v.; number, II, 431, 433; existence, II, 425v.; names, II, 429v.; order among the, II, 432v.; their creation, II, 434v.; spiritual nature, II, 435v.; appearances, II, 437; rational nature, II, 438v.; moral nature, II, 440v.; compared with men, II, 442v., 567v.; service and activity, II, 445v.; intercession, II, 448v.; IV, 394, 398 ; veneration, II, 451v.; has Christ merited anything for them? II, 444v.; III,

405v.; are they members of the church, II, 445; IV, 30 v.; significance of faith to the II, 428, 451v.

Episcopate. See Episcopal office.

Episcopal system of church government, IV, 82 v., 96 v.

Επισκοποι and πρεσβυτεροι, IV, 74 v., 97 v.

Heredity according to the modern science, III, 140 BC.

Original Sin, III, 108v.; at Rome, II, 525,; III, 116, 121v.

Experience as Evidence for the Truth of Religion, I, 458v.

Essenes. Their Eschatology, IV, 371.

Essentia, as a designation of the essence of God, II, 270; Dei, in the Church Fathers, II, 79, 87, 117.

Ethicism, I, 191v.

Ethics, Relation to Dogmatics, I, 12v.

Gospel and Law, IV, 201 v.; at the final judgment, IV, 492 v.

Gospel preaching beyond the grave, IV, 382, 402 v., 499.

Evangelists in the NT, IV, 67 v.

Evolution theory, I, 236f., 345; II, 491v., 513v.; on the corruption of man, III, 153v.

Examination, IV, 123 v.

Expromissio en fidejussio, III, 204.

Ecstasy at the Prophetic Vision, I, 255, 256.

F.

Fate. See Doom.

Fidejussio en expromissio, III, 204.

Fides implicita at Rome, I, 518v.

Filioque. Struggle over the, between the East and the West, II, 291v.

Foederalism in the doctrine of original sin, III, 131v.

Formula Concordiae, I, 99; about the preedest. and freedom of the will, II, 328f.; III, 446.

Fundamental Articles of the Prototype I, 520v.

Future probation theory in England, IV, 500. [574]

G.

Gabriel, II, 431.

Gallicanism, I, 403.

חַטָּאת , III, 74v., 95.

Gifts, spiritual. See Charismata.

Spirit, Holy II, 246v., 285v.; as principle of revelation I, 256v.; II, 230v.; as principle of creation, II, 228v., 405; its going forth, II, 246v., 287v.; its person and Godhead, II, 247, 285v.; in man in a state of uprightness, II, 540v.; sin against the, III, 101v.; activity in relation to the human nature of Christ, III, 268v., 272v., 416v., 430, 471v.; in relation to the elect, III, 430v., 469v., 556v.; IV, 342 ; outpouring on the day of Pentecost, III, 217, 430v.; IV, 5 ; his operation with regard to the Word, IV, 209 v.; as dispenser of gifts in the church, IV, 29.

Spirit of Man, II, 537; and soul, II, 537v.

Apparitions of spirits, IV, 395, 396 v.

Spiritual nature of God, II, 145v.

Spiritual world, II, 424v.; significance of belief in it for religion, II, 428, 454v.

Spiritual life in relation to natural and moral life, IV, 188.

Gehenna, IV, 374, 495.

Obedience to Christ. Actual, see active obedience. Passive, see passive obedience.

Faith in the general sense, I, 469ff.; III, 514; in religious sense, I, 174, 181ff., 472ff.; III, 450, 514ff.; as principal internal of the religious Theological Seminary I, 468ff.; view in the first Christian church, I, 475ff.; in Rome, I, 476, 523; III, 442, 521ff.; in the Reformation. I, 477ff., 523; III, 522; and Theology I, 509ff.; in Christ, III, 294ff., 515; requirement of IV, 206ff.; in relation to justice making, III, 452v., 535v.; meaning for the Sacraments IV, 241 v., 344.

Position of faith, indispensable for the dogmatist, I, 467v., 524.

Belief and Knowledge, I, 463v., 483v.

Belief on Authority, I, 374v., 376v.

Communion of saints, IV, 28 v., 520 v.; of the militant and triumphant church, IV, 417 v., 520.

Community and Church, IV, 25 v.; its significance and influence in the government of the Church, IV, 73, 79, 122 v., 180 v.

Congregational religious services in the apostolic period and aftermath IV, 215 v., 311.

God's grace, II, 181; its revelation immediately after the fall, III, 155, 187v., 207v.; no opposition to God's righteousness, II, 200v.; III, 339v., 346v., 381v.

Grace, III, 474v.; character in Rome, II, 524, 528; III, 443v., 475v.; in the Ref. III, 476v., 508v; IV, 187 v.; gen. see gratia communis ; prep., see gratia praeparans.

Generation of the Son, II, 282v.; in connection with the creation, II, 282, 310v., 401; III, 257.

Geology on the development history of the earth, II, 469v., 482v.; III, 208; difference with the public. II, 470v.; value of II, 477.

Geological Periods, Objections thereto, II, 482v.

Justice of God, II, 194v; III, 157, 340, 533. Cf. also grace of God.

Justice among men, II, 197v.; III, 427.

Reformed, difference from the Lutherans, I, 111; II, 328, 418; shades among them, I, 115; II, 331v.; on the heathen religions, I, 239; on inspiration, I, 315v.; on the incomprehensibility of God II, 10v.; on the natural knowledge of God, II, 37v.; their description of God, II, 81v.; on predestination, II, 330v., 358v., 373; [575] on the image of God, II, 531, 535; on the state of righteousness, II, 557v.; on original sin III, 126v.; their covenant doctrine, III, 199v.; their Christology, III, 246, 291v., 294, 300v.; on particular satisfaction, III, 394v.; on the kingship of Christ, III, 424; on the order of salvation, III, 447v., 463v.; differences with regard to the order of salvation, III, 452v.; on the church, IV, 16 v.; on the marks of the church, IV, 44 ; on the various offices in the church, IV, 130 v.; on the power of the church, IV, 153 v., 164 v.; their rejection of confession, IV, 154, 170 ; on the means of grace, IV, 196 v., 199 ; on the law, IV, 208 ; on the relation of Word and Spirit, IV, 210 f.; on the Sacraments, IV, 226 f., 236 f.; on Baptism, IV, 265 f., 275 f.; on infant baptism, IV, 281 f., 297, 298 ; on the Lord's Supper, IV, 321, 331 f., 341 f.; on the intermediate state, IV, 380 ; on children who die early, IV, 523.

Reformed. Dogmatics. History I, 111v, cf. Dogmatics.

Feeling as the source of knowledge of Dogmatics, I, 16v.; as the seat of religion, I, 195v.

Sentiment in Germany in the 18th century, I, 104.

Conscience, III, 164.

Authority in family and society, I, 376; in science and art, I, 377; in religion and theology I, 378v.

Authority of Scripture. See Scripture.

Giesseusche and Tubinger theologians on the exinanitio Christi III, 245.

עֶלְיוֹן , II, 105.

Gnesio Lutherans in the 16th Century, I, 98v.

Gnosimachi, I, 509.

Gnosticism, I, 54v.; on Scripture, I, 380; on the incomprehensibility of God, II, 4; on the Old Testament, III, 196v.; on creation, II, 401; on Christ, III, 240, 275; on the work of Christ, III, 320; on the Church, IV, 9 ; on Eschatology, IV, 375 v.

God, as the Becoming in the panth. philos., II, 122, 124v.; as Being, II, 115v.; as Spirit, II, 140v.; as Light, II, 155v.; as the Holy One, II, 176v.; as Sovereign, II, 202v.; derivation of the name, II, 103; as nomen personale of the first person, II, 240v.; applied to the Son, II, 245v.; III, 239, 264v., 266v.

The Godhead of Christ. See Christ.

Concept of God, History of the Second World War, 78v.

Religious Studies, more recent I, 183v.; method, I, 185v., 208v.; on the origin of religion, I, 204v., 236v.; on the original character of paganism, I, 236v.

Goede, Het II, 177.

Good works, III, 564v., 571v.

God's Goodness, II, 180.

Goodness of God, II, 176; in the absolutist sense as perfection, II, 178; for others, II, 179v.; as motive of world creation, II, 415v.

Goodness of Man, II, 539v.

Gottschalksche strijd, II, 322v.

Degrees of sin, III, 89v.; of hellish punishment, IV, 421 v., 510 ; of future salvation, IV, 421 v., 526 v.

Gratia communis at the Geref. I, 239; III, 2O7v.; IV, 188, 384.

Gratia praeparans, III, 493v.

Gratia praeveniens at Rome, II, 326; III, 439, 440v.

Greek Church. Its Character and Theology I, 68v.; II, 292v., 319, 539; III, 116, 242; on the descent into hell, III, 378; on ecclesiastical power, IV. 153, 164.

Grounds of Faith. Difficulty of Inquiry Into It, I, 418ff.; follow. the historical apology. argumentation, I, 420, 423ff.; [576] follow. the speculative argumentation, I, 420, 431ff.; follow. the ethical psychology. argumentation I, 420, 444ff.; in the Christian Church and Theology I, 484ff.

Groninger Theology, I, 129; her concept of God, II, 84; on Christ's work, III, 330, 354.

Greatness of God, II, 194.

H.

Hatred of God, II, 196.

הָדָר , II, 191.

Hades in the NT, IV, 372 v. Cf. further Scheol.

Heresy. See heresy.

Laying on of hands, III, 306; IV, 124 v.

Heart of Man, II, 538v.

Hattemisten, III, 452.

Hebrews, III, 452.

Glory of God, II, 191v.

Paganism, Orig. and char. according to Scripture, I, 234v.; III, 425; according to modern religious studies, I, 236v.; elements of truth in, I, 238v., 247v., III, 228v.; compared with the relation of Israel, I, 247v., III, 211v.; with Christianity, I, 240, 247v.

Pagans. Possibility of Their Salvation, I, 232; IV, 522 v.

Sacred, as an attribute of persons and things, II, 186; III, 557.
Saints, as an act of God, II, 186v.
Holiness of God, II, 184v.
Holiness of the Church, IV, 54 v.
Sanctification, III, 553v.; IV, 411 ; in relation to justification, III, 431v., 540, 553v.; perfect, at death, IV, 411 v.
Canonization in the Roman Catholic Church. See Canonization.
Order of Salvation, III, 425v.
Hellenistic Greek in the NT, I, 348, II, 236.
Infernal punishments, IV, 496 v. Comp. Gehenna.
Heaven in Sacred Scripture, II, 434v.
Ascension of Christ, III, 410v.
Heredity. See Heredity.
Herrnhutism, I, 101; II, 266f.; III, 300, 321, 457f.; IV, 21.
Hexaemeron. See Creation Days.
Historical books of the Old Testament, I, 327.
Historical-critical investigation of the Holy Scripture in connection with inspiration, I, 318v., 340v., 360.
הוֹד , II, 191.
High Church Party in England, I, 133.
House churches, IV, 6, 73, 116.
Marriage as a Sacred Act at Rome, IV, 250.
I.
Innate ideas. See Innate concepts.
Ideal theory for the reconciliation of Scripture and natural science, II, 471v., 476.
Idealism. See Rationalism.

Ideas in general, II, 171f.; in God, II, 170v.

Zeal of God, II, 197.

Ἱλασμος and καταλλαγη, III, 313, 381f., 524.

Immanence of God. Physical and Ethical, II, 138v.

Independentism, I, 123; IV, 21 v., 115, 116, 183.

Indifferentism, (religious) I, 174, 184v.

Infralapsarianism. See Supra- and Infralapsarianism.

Inspiration, I, 306v.; in a broader sense, I, 251; subsequens, I, 313; as negative assistance of the Holy Spirit, I, 313; only of the religious-ethical in Rome, I, 313; under the Protest, I, 318v., 349, 351v.; realis in Rome, I, 314; dynamic, I, 319v., 351 v.; to be understood organically, I, 346v.; objections to the, I, 353v. [577]

Irvingism, IV, 23.

Islam about preedest. and freedom of the will, II, 318; on redemption, III, 425f.; on the Mahdi, IV, 426.

Israel, divine v. compared with others. I, 247v.; III, 211v.; Church and State in, IV, 3, 132 v.; future v. according to the OT, IV, 426 v.; according to the NT, IV, 446 v.; cf. also Dispensation of the Holy Covenant.

J.

יָהּ , II, 110.

יהוה , II, 107v., 116.

Yahvism and Popular Religion in Israel, IV, 364.

James and Paul on Justification, III, 546v.

Jesuits, Their influence on the plaice. practice of Theol., I, 91, 97; Their doctrine of inspiration, I, 312f.; vd scientia media, II, 162v.

Jesus, Meaning of the Name, III, 332. Cf. further Christ.

John the Baptist, IV, 254 b.c.

Jewish Theology on Inspiration and Tradition, I, 306 v.; on the different hypostases and sephiroth of God, II, 86, 127, 147, 234; on the origin of sin, III, 41, 45, 112; on the intermediate state, IV, 370 v.; on the future of Israel, IV, 436 v.

Judaism, III, 196.

Jude, His Presence at the Supper, IV, 347.

Justitia originalis, II, 526v., 532, 540.

K.

כָּבוֹד יה, II, 191.

Kant, Laplace's Hypothesis, II, 467v.

Καταλλαγή and ἱλασμος, III, 313, 381v., 524v.

Catholicity of the Church, IV, 8 v., 55 v.

Knowledge of God as the content of Dogma. I, 6v.; II, 1v., 77v.; its basis: revelation II, 22v., 24v., 40, 41, 45; inadequate, II, 5, 25, 73, 75v.; not symbolic, II, 76v.; innate, II, 24v.; obtained, II, 44v.

Κενωσις, Doctrine vd, in the newer Theology, II, 122v., III, 252, 283v.

Church, Its essence, I, 422; IV, 1 f.; visible and invisible, IV, 15 f., 33 f., 37 f.; as an institution, IV, 34 f., 60 f., 197 f.; signs, IV, 38 f.; division, IV, 41 f., 49 f.; properties, IV, 53 f.; true and false, IV, 47 f., 52 ; government, IV, 59 f.; power, IV, 132 f.; confessional character, IV, 168 f.; in its relation to Scripture, I, 24, 304, 363f., 366f., 380, 383, 385, 424f.; IV, 39, 43 f., 195 ; as a ground of faith in Scripture, in Rome, I, 424, cf. 431; IV, 39 f.; its calling with regard to the interpretation of Scripture, I, 399, IV, 167 f.; in its relation to Theology, I, 517, 525; to the State, see State ; to the Kingdom of God, IV, 27 ; to the world, IV, 186 f.

Church Order, Significance, IV, 110.

Church Council, IV, 127, 179 v.

Church Fathers, On Sacred Scripture, I, 308v.
Church association, IV, 115.
Parish formation, IV, 116 v.
Heresy, IV, 299.
Heresy, IV, 52.
Infant baptism, IV, 265, 278 v.
Children, the youngest dying. Their future fate. See salvation.
Servant of the Lord in Isaiah, III, 231v., 308v.
קדשׁ , II, 185.
Kingship of God, III, 2v., 28v.
Kingship under Israel, III, 230.
Royal office of Christ, III, 335v., 421v.; IV, 111 v.; [578] as Material principle of the Reformed church government, IV, 113 v.
Kingdom of God in the prophecies, IV, 435 f.; in Jewish theology, IV, 436 f.; in Jesus, III, 233 f., 429; IV, 447 f., 514 ; and church, IV, 27.
Kopernikan worldview, II, 465.
Cosmogonies of the Pagans, II, 387v., 457.
Cosmological proof for the existence of God, II, 54v.
Criticism, newer, On the bond idea, III, 191v.; on the O. Test. in 't alg., III, 202v.
Death of Christ on the Cross, III, 376v.
Art and Religion, I, 199v.
Κυριος, as the name of God, II, 103, 113.
L.
Longsuffering of God, II, 181.
Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, III, 101v.
Λατρεια and δουλεια, II, 452f.; IV, 393 v., 400 v.

Teaching position, IV, 76 v., 166 v.
Salvation Army, IV, 22.
Life in the Holy Scriptures, IV, 356, 367 v., 383, 384 v., 505.
Lives of Jesus. Judgment on the Matter, III, 374v.
Longevity, longer, of men before the flood, III, 208.
Reading the Scriptures by the Laymen at Rome, I, 394, 396.
Libertinism, III, 55.
Body of man, II, 541v.; union with the soul, II, 541v.
Corporeality of the Deceased Souls, IV, 381, 389 v.
Light, used by God, II, 155, 192v.; nature of the II, 460v.
Love of God, II, 183v.; and the satisfaction of Christ, III, 357, 381v.
Love in the Church, IV, 30, 169.
Suffering, in relation to the reign of God, III, 32v., as punishment for sin, III, 159v., 167v.
Cremation of corpses, IV, 485.
Limbus infantum near Rome, IV, 378, 421.
Limbus patrum at Rome, IV, 378, 421 ; at others, IV, 382.
Loci, Meaning of this expression in Roman Theology, I. 2.
Loci Communes, Meaning in Cicero, I, 1; as name d. Dogmatics, I, 2.
Logos, as the name of Christ in Scripture, I, 339; II, 234v., 241v., 283, 407v.; in the Stoa, II, 232; in Philo, II, 233v.; in the Apology, II, 405; conceived as the world-idea, II, 405v.
Wages in Holy Scripture, II, 553v.; III, 563v.; IV, 526 v.
Lot as a form of revelation, I, 252.
Lutheran Dogmatics, History, I, 98v.
Lutheran, Difference from the Ref., I, 110v.; II, 328v., 418, 556v., 567v.; III, 446v.; relationship with the Remonstrants, II, 329v.; on the duo

hemisphaeria, I, 223; II, 35v., 534v.; III, 152; IV, 156, 187 ; on the cognitio Dei insita, II, 36v.; on the virtues of God (classification), II, 98; on predestination, II, 328v.; on the image of God, II, 529v., 530v., 534v., 556v., 565, 567v.; on original sin, II, 567, 569; III, 125v.; on the relation of O. and N. Test., III, 199; on the two natures in Christ, III, 244v., 290, 294, 350, 412v.; on the adoration of Christ, III, 300; on the descent into hell, III, 379; on the exaltation of Christ, III, 412v.; on the order of salvation III, 446v.; on the church, IV, 23 ; on the government of the church, IV, 108 v., 128 v., 156, 164 ; on the episcopate, IV, 99 ; on the means of grace, IV, 196 ; on the law, IV, 207 f., cf. II, 556; III, 350; [579] on Word and Spirit, IV, 210 f.; on the Sacram. IV, 228, 232, 235 f., 242, 243 ; on Baptism, IV, 264 f., 271, 281 ; on the Lord's Supper, IV, 318, 331 f., 341 f.; on the intermediate state, IV, 379 f.; on the second coming of Christ, IV, 480.

Λύτρον, used of Christ, III, 363.

M.

Magic, I, 246.

Mahdi, according to Mohammedanism, IV, 426.

Majesty of God, II, 194.

Mal'ak Ihvh, I, 250; II, 229v.

Manichaeism, II, 388; III, 54.

Mantiek, I, 246.

Maria, III, 261f.; Her Immaculate Conception, follow. Rome III, 145v. 262v.; her continued virginity, III, 271.

Marrow Controversy in Scotland, I, 128; III, 395v.

Materialism, I, 285; II, 391, 392v., 394v., 419v.; on the moral life, II, 59.

Man, Compared with the angels, II, 442v., 567v.; with the animals, II, 490, 557v.; his origin, II, 490v.; age, II, 498v.; unity, physical and ethical, II,

500v., 563v., 568v.; III, 129v.; original place of residence, II, 504v., 543; essence, II, 508v.; dominion over the earth, II, 543v.; his relationship to nature, according to the Christian world-view, II, 422v.; III, 24v.; his destiny, II, 545v.; redemptionability, III, 188.

Incarnation of the Son, III, 253ff.; as center of revelation, I, 268, 269; III, 257f.; outside of sin, II, 406; III, 258v.; preparation therefor, III, 210v., 211v., 256v.; in its relation to religion, III, 285f.; was she a humiliation? III, 291, 375.

Meritum ex congruo at Rome, II, 324, 356; III, 442.

Messianic expectation in the prophecies, III 230v., 308v.; IV, 427 v.; in apocryphal literature, III, 232v.; among the Jews in Jesus' day, III, 232v.

Metaphysical Proof of the Immortality of the Soul, IV, 360 BC.

Methodism, I, 132; III, 458, 466v., 481v., IV, 21 v.

Michael, II, 431.

Mediation of Christ, III, 332v.; of eternity, III, 206, 334. Cf. further covenant of grace, work of Christ.

Means of Grace, IV, 193 v.

Mass in the Roman Church, IV, 249, 317, 337 v.; for the deceased, IV, 317, 349.

Moderns in the Netherlands, I, 129v.; ethical, I, 192, 451; their concept of God, II, 84; III, 13; their position between creation and evolution, II, 514v.; on the work of Christ, III, 328; on the order of salvation, III, 460.

Molinists, I, 93; on predestination, II, 326, 327; on the concursus, III, 11; on grace, III, 441v.

Monarchianism, I, 61.

Monism, I, 285v.

Monophysitism in the East, I, 64, III, 242.

Montanism, I, 381; III, 320; on the Church, IV, 9 ; on the lapsi, IV, 139.

Morale indépendante, I, 192, II, 59.

Moral proof for the existence of God, II, 58v.; for the immortality of the soul, IV, 361 v.

Moral Theory of the Work of Christ, III, 329, 358v., 364.

Motazelites, II, 318.

[580] Motiva credibilitatis in de Romansche Theol. I, 36, 424v., 485v.

Μυστηριον, I, 530f.; IV, 217.

Mysteries follow. Rome, I, 221; IV, 217.

Mysticism, I, 380f.; II, 34, 39, 539; III, 320v., 450v.; IV, 193, 195 v.

Mysticism in the Middle Ages, I, 85v.; cf. Mysticism.

Mystical theory of the work of Christ, III, 320v., 328, 358v., 364.

N.

Name of God in Holy Scripture, II, 62v.

Naturalism, I, 227; on special revelation, I, 279ff.; on the image of God, II, 513ff.

Natures, Two, of Christ, III, 240v., 279v.

Nature, The, and its order according to the theistic worldview, I, 259, 273, 286f., 290f.; II, 420v.; III, 10, 21f.; influence of the fall of man on the, II, 548v., 558, 560v.; III, 173v.; as a source of knowledge for Theology, See Theol. naturalis.

Nature and Grace, I, 240v., 278v.; II, 534v.; III, 471, 476v.; IV, 155 v., 186 v.; in Rome, I, 276v.; II, 524; III, 475v.; IV, 162, 186, 248 ; in Luther, II, 534v.; in Anabaptism, I, 222; IV, 162, 186, 289.

Natural Science and Christianity, I, 289v.; II, 422v., 465; III, 23v.

Laws of Nature, I, 287v.; III, 21v.

Imitation of Christ. Its Conception in the Christian Church, III, 349, 434.

Descent into Hell, III, 377v.; among the Lutherans, III, 379, 413.

Dutch Confession of Faith, Art. 15, IV, 277.

Neo-Kantianism, I, 109; II, 15, 84. Cf. further Ritschl.

Neo-Lutheran conception of the working of the Sacr., IV, 224 ; of Baptism, IV, 268 ; of the Lord's Supper, IV, 322 ff., 334 ff., 346.

Neonomianism in England, I, 118; III, 454, 455; in general. to the order of salvation, III, 454v.

Neo-Scholasticism after Trent, I, 88v.; in the 19th century, I, 97.

Nestorianism, III, 281v.

New-England Theology in America, I, 137, 138; III, 127, 326, 396.

New Jerusalem, IV, 515.

New Testament, Authority, I, 333v.; on the Old Testament, I, 329v. Cf. further Dispensation of the New Testament and Old Testament.

Nominalism in the Middle Ages, I, 83v., 166; on the knowledge of God, II, 9; on God's will and power, II, 210v., 224v.

Nomism, III, 553; IV, 203 v., 209.

Emergency baptism, IV, 294 v.

Fate, III, 9v.

Necessity of Scripture. See Scripture.

Novatianism on the Lapsi, IV, 139.

O.

Obedientia activa of Christ, III, 349v.; compare with the obed. liabilities, III, 361v.

Obedientia passiva of Christ, III, 353v.; compare with the obed. assets, III, 361v.

Ecumenical Councils, IV, 92, 182.

Sacrifice, Origin and essence, III, 303v.; in Israel, III, 305v., 362v.;

of Christ, III, 311v., 364; IV, 338.

Sacrificial meals, IV, 300 BC.

Extreme Unction, sacred, at Rome, IV, 249.

Independence of God, II, 116v.

Incomprehensibility of God, II, 1v.

Immersion. at Baptism, IV, 272 v.

[581] Infinite. Conception in the N. Phil., II, 17, 20, 127, 144.

Infinity of God, II, 126v.

Infallibility of the church and the Pope at Rome, I, 364, 387, 403v. 406; IV, 58 v., 94 v., 144 v.; of the church in a good sense, IV, 59.

Man's inability to do good, III, 147v., 477v.

Innocence of Children, III, 114.

Immortality of the first man, II, 542v.; of the soul, IV, 353 v., 384 ; conditional, among the Church Fathers, IV, 356, 501 ; in modern times, IV, 501 v.

Abstinence from the Chalice in the Lord's Supper at Rome, IV, 336.

Ontological proof for the existence of God, II, 53ff.; for the immortality of the soul, IV, 359ff.

Ontologism, I, 96; II, 31, 35.

Conception of the Holy Spirit. See Christ.

Immutability of God, II, 119v.; III, 382; in connection with creation, II, 409v.

Invisibility of God, II, 150v.

Judgment, Last, IV, 490 v.

Eastern Church and Theology as distinguished from Western, I, 69; II, 289v.; III, 242; IV, 90, 142 ; influence on the West, I, 71v.; III, 242v.

Public Confession, IV, 352.

Revelation. Concept, I, 217ff.; relation to religion, I, 175ff., 210ff., 215ff., 226; II, 428; always supranatural, I, 218, 225; II, 428; in a certain sense also natural, I, 290ff.; distinction in the, I, 219ff.; according to Scripture, I, 224ff.; always mediate, I, 228; General I, 229ff.; Particular I, 244ff.; means, I, 245ff.; concept, I, 263ff.; supernat. char. I, 273ff.; opposition by Naturalism, I, 279v.; historical character, I, 268, 297v., 371v.; human character, I, 228v., 268v., 348v., 358; II, 65v.; relation to Scripture, I, 299v.; to nature, I, 278, 289v.; history, I, 270, 302v., 421.

Training of servants of the Word, IV, 167.

Resurrection of Christ, III, 409v.

Resurrection of the Dead, IV, 482 v.

Overseers. See office of elders.

Ordination to the office, IV, 124 v.; at Rome, IV, 125, 138, 139, 249 v.

Orthodox Theology in Germany in the 19th Century, I, 108.

Old Testament. Authority with Israel, I, 306ff., 328; with Jesus and the Apostles, I, 307, 329ff.; quotations in the New Testament, I, 329, 331ff.; history of the, in the Christian church, in its relation to the NT, III, 196ff.; IV, 203 ; relation to the NT, I, 332; III, 206ff., 216ff.; IV, 202, 443ff., 513ff.

Office of elder. Institution, IV, 74 ff.; task, IV, 75 ff., 169 ff.; election by the congregation, IV, 79 ; in Rome, IV, 127 ff.; in Luth. IV, 129 ; in the Reformed Church, IV, 129 ff.

Ουσία, Use of this word in the Theol., II, 269, 271.

Government as ruler of the church according to the Lutherans etc., IV, 108 v., 111, 160 v., 189.

Oxford movement in England, I, 133.

P.

Pactum salutis, III, 203v., 256; increase to the Covenant of Grace, III, 221f.

Palaeontology, II, 485v.; III, 174.

Pantheism. General character, I, 17, 149, 285; II, 121ff., 227, 308, 392ff.; III, 278ff.; on religion and revelation, I, 194, 216; on the unchangeable nature of God, II, 121ff.; on the eternity of God, II, 129; his concept of God, II, 20ff., 82ff., 91, 127, 144; on consciousness

[582] Gods, II, 156f.; about the spirit. nature of God, II, 146, 148; about the original of things, II, 388f., 392f., 409, 411f., 414f., 419f.; in relation to the Providence faith, III, 9; to the causae secundae, III, 25f.; Dualism in the, III, 278.

Papal system, I, 403v.; IV, 87 v., 144 v., 189 v.

Paradise, II, 504v.; IV, 373.

Parish near Rome, IV, 115.

Parousia. See the return of Christ.

Parzism, Verh. to Judaism, II, 425; on origin of sin, III, 41, 54; on the token., IV, 426.

Passover. IV, 299 BC

Pasi-tigris hypothesis on the situation of Paradise, II, 505.

Paul as Apostle, I, 335v.; IV, 65 v.

Pope. His primacy, I, 403ff.; IV, 87ff.; his power, I, 407; IV, 143ff.; Cf. further infallibility, Papal system.

Pelagianism, II, 319v., 349v., 371, 377v., 512, 513v., 539; III, 43v., 63v., 112, 136, 464v., 496, 505v.; on the sufficiency of general revelation, I, 232; on the will of God, II, 220; on the order of decrees, II, 333v.

Peremtoir exam, IV, 123, 124.

Permissio, II, 334, 336f., 363f.; III, 31, 55v.

Person in the Doctrine of Trinity, II, 273v.

Personal character of Dogmatics. See Dogmatics.

Personal nature of God, II, 17, 21ff.; in connection with the spiritual nature of God, II, 150.

Pessimism, III, 47, 55, 169f.; IV, 425.

Peter as Apostle, IV, 71 v.; his primacy succeed. Rome, IV, 93 v., 100 v.; his stay in Rome; IV, 103.

Pharisees. Their eschatological ideas, IV, 371.

Phraseologia sacramentalis, IV, 238 v.

Pietism in Germany, I, 100v.; III, 456v.; in the Reformed Church, III, 455v.; assessment, III, 466v., 481v.; on the church, IV, 21.

Pilate, Pontius as Judge of Jesus, III, 376.

Local churches in their relation to the universal church, IV, 7, 32, 114 ff.; their equality, IV, 115.

Substitution in moral matters, III, 134v., 369v.

Planets. Are They Inhabited? II, 426v.

Poetic books of the OT, I, 327v.

Polygenism, II, 501, 502.

Potentia absoluta Dei, follow. Nominalism, II, 212, 224; follow. de Geref., II, 226, 373.

Potestas docendi der church, IV, 165 v.; at Rome, IV, 138 v., 163.

Potestas gubernationis, IV, 164 v., 169 v.

Potestas juris-dictionis at Rome, IV, 139 v.

Potestas misericordiae, IV, 165, 177 v.

Potestas ordinis near Rome, IV, 139.

Praeadamitism, II, 501, 502.

Predestination, II, 316v.; place in Dogmatics, II, 332v.; complete and incomplete sumpta at Rome, II, 325.

Praedestinatio gemina, II, 323, 335, 358, 365, 369, 372.

Praedestinatus, The Book, II, 322, 324.

Praeexistentianism, II, 564f.; III, 70f., 129.

Preparatory examination, IV, 124.

Praescientia Dei, II, 161f.; in connection with man's freedom, II, 161v., 351v.

Πρεσβυτεροι and ἐπισκοποι in the NT, IV, 74 v., 97 v.

Presbyteral Church Government, IV, 129 B.C.

Priesthood, III, 302; of Christ, See work of Christ.

Princeton College and Theology in America, I, 138.

Principium. Meaning. of this expression in the Philos., I, 141; in the Theol. I, 141; essendi der Theol., I, 141f.; cognoscendi der Theol., I, 142v.; externum and internum, I, 143f.; in science, I, 145f.; in religion, I, 171f.; [583] externum der Dogm., I, 24v., 215v.; internum, I, 416v.

Προγνῶσις, II, 316, 351.

Trial Commandment in Paradise, II, 555, 558v.

Prophets of the Old Testament, Their self-consciousness, I, 323ff.; their writing, I, 324ff.; their relation to the Torah, I, 325; their historical description, I, 327, cf. Prophecy.

Prophets in the NT, IV, 68.

Prophecy, I, 251v., 323v.

Prophecies of the OT about Israel's future. and recovery, IV, 426 v., 441 v.

Prophetic office of Christ, I, 257v.; III, 310v., 388; in the exaltation, III, 418.

Προορισμος, II, 316.

Προσωπον, indicating the 3 persons, II, 273v.

Προθεσις, II, 316.

Q.

Quakerism, I, 124; III, 321, 401, 403; IV, 21 v.; on the Sacr., IV, 223, 267.

R.

Council of Peace. See Pactum Salutis.

God's Counsel, II, 313v.

Ratio ratiocinans et ratiocinata. Meaning. of this distinction, II, 75, 93.

Rationalism in epistemology, I, 145f.

Rationalism of the 18th century, I, 101, 427v.; III, 451; various forms, I, 279v.; on revelation I, 280v.; on the knowableness of God, II, 11v.; on the order of salvation III, 451; on the church, IV, 20 ; on the Sacram., IV, 223 ; on the Lord's Supper, IV, 322.

Realism in the Theory of Recognition, I, 157f.; in the statement d. original sin, II, 569; III, 129v.; in the consideration of the suffering of Christ, III, 371f.

Reatus culpae et poenae at Rome, III, 162.

Reatus potentialis et actualis at the Geref. III, 162, 549.

Law and Religion, II, 84v.; III, 345v.

Legal Order, II, 201; III, 157v., 346v.

Justification, III, 529v.; IV, 410 ; in its relation to faith, III, 452v., 481v., 522v., 535v., 544v.

Reason, Its Nature, I, 169; Task in Theology, I, 525v.

Reformation, The, on natural and supernatural revelation, I, 221ff.; on faith, I, 477; on the relation between faith and theology, I, 520ff.; on the mysteries of faith, I, 531; on the work of Christ, III, 319ff.; on the church, IV, 14ff., 33ff.; its judgment on the Roman church, IV, 47 ; on the means of

grace, IV, 194ff.; on Law and Gospel, IV, 205ff.; on the Sacrament IV, 220ff., 271 ; on the intermediate state, IV, 379ff.

Reformation of the Church, IV, 118 v.

Reign of God, III, 28v.

Government of the church. See church.

Religion, Principia, I, 171v.; essence, I, 171v.; II, 552v.; objective, I, 172v., 175v.; subjective, I, 172v., 177v.; seat, I, 183v.; IV, 1 ; intellectualist conception, I, 186v.; moralistic conception, I, 190v.; aesthetic conception, I, 195v.; and science, I, 189, 210, 376; and morality, I, 193v., 462; III, 553; and art, I, 199v., 210; origin, I, 202v.; in its relation to revelation, I, 175, 210. cf. revelation; to the covenant, II, 551ff.; to the incarnation, III, 285; to law, II, 84; III, 346ff.; social element in IV, 1 f.

Remonstrantism, on inspiration, I, 318; [584] on the knowability of God, II, 11; on the simplicity of God, II, 142; on predestination, II, 340ff.; on providence, III, 12; on the OV, III, 199; on the worship of Christ, III, 298; on the work of Christ, III, 325, 401; their theory of acceptance, III, 367; on the order of salvation, III, 451; on the church, IV, 20 ; on the power of the church, IV, 155 ; on the synods, IV, 183 ; on the means of grace, IV, 193 ; on the confession, IV, 167ff.; on the sacr., IV, 223, 267.

Restitution Theory for the Reconciliation of Scripture and Natural Science, II, 473, 478.

Revival. Character, I, 131.

Empire of Sin, III, 96, 167, 184.

Ritualism in the English. church, IV, 23.

Calling, III, 485v.; object, III, 399, 488; in connection with rebirth, III, 480, 483v., 500v.; not universal, II, 354; III, 488.

Calling to the Office, IV, 121 v.

Romanticism, I, 196, 431.

Rome. Ground Thought, I, 221, 276, 277, 426v.; II, 517v., 526; III, 243, 443v.; IV, 162, 186, 248 ; on the Principle of Dogma, I, 17v.; on Inspiration, I, 312v.; on the Relation between Scripture and Church, See Church ; on the Necessity of Scripture, I, 380v.; on the Clarity of Scripture, I, 392v.; on the Motivata Credibilitatis, I, 36v., 424v., 485v.; on Faith, I, 476v.; III, 442, 521v.; on the basis of faith, I, 485f.; IV, 40 ; on the fides implicita, I, 518f.; on the relationship of faith and Theol., I, 517f.; on the Mysteries I, 531; on the visio Dei per essentiam, I, 152v., 518; on predestination, sin and grace, II, 323f.; III, 394, 439v., 442v., 475v.; IV, 410 ; on the source of knowledge of the doctrine of creation, II, 387; on λατρεια and δοίλεια, II, 452f.; IV, 393 v., 400 v.; on the image of God and the donum superadditum, II, 518v., 555, 570; on original sin, II, 525; III, 116f.; on the concupiscentia, III, 86, 122; on the distinction of peccata venialia and mortalia, III, 98v.; on the immaculate conception of Mary, III, 145v., 262 v.; on reatus culpae et poenae III, 162; his protection of superstition, III, 181v.; on the distinction between O. and N. Test., III, 198; on the two natures of Christ, III, 243v., 291, 414; on the worship of Christ, III, 243v., 299v.; on the work of Christ, III, 318v., 333v.; on the obed. activa, III, 349; on the descent into hell, III, 378v.; on the order of salvation, see praedest., sin and grace ; on the church, IV, 11v., 32v., 35 ; on the marks of the church, IV, 12v., 38v.; on the properties of the church, IV, 53 f.; on the “ extra ecclesiam nulla salus ”, IV, 42 f.; on the power of the church, IV, 138 f., 162 f.; on the means of grace, IV, 193 f.; on Law and Gospel, IV, 204 f.; on the number of the sacraments, IV, 218 f.; on the sacraments in general, IV, 218 f., 226, 232, 236 f., 239 f., 247 f.; on Baptism, IV, 248, 262 f., 270, 275, 277, 281 ; on the Lord’s Supper, IV, 315 f., 331 f.; on purgatory, IV, 378 v.; on the invocation and

veneration of the saints, IV, 392 v., 398 v.; on the future state of children, IV, 523.

Roman Theology, after Trent. I, 88v.

Space, Concept of the II, 135v.

Russian Church, I, 68v.; IV, 22, 142. See also Greek Church.

God's rest on the 7th day, II, 462; III, 1.

[585] S.

Sabbath Commandment in the State of Righteousness, II, 559.

Sabellianism, II, 262, 264v., 310.

Sacramentals at Rome, IV, 247.

Sacraments, IV, 215 f.; relation to the Word, IV, 166, 199 f., 220, 232 f.; number of, IV, 217 f., 246 f.

Sadducees, IV, 371.

Σαρξ in Paulus, III, 49v., 66v.

Satan, Doctrine of in Scripture, III, 90v.; as deceiver of man, III, 38v.; his power, III, 182v.; Christ and, III, 421v.

Saumursche Theologie, I, 122v.; II, 341; III, 127, 454; in England, III, 395.

Savoy Declaration, I, 123.

Shame, III, 164; lack of, in the first man, II, 515.

Sche'ol in the HS, IV, 365 v., 385 v.

Creation, II, 386v.; as the basis of revelation, I, 225; in connection with the Trinity, II, 228, 282, 310v., 401, 402v.; out of nothing, II, 397v.; in its relation to the Son, II, 405v.; IV, 475 ; to time, II, 408v.; to providence, III, 16v.; final goal, II, 415v.; its infralapsarian character, II, 546; III, 175, 258; as the supposition of the incarnation, III, 256v.

Days of Creation. Sequence, II, 460ff.; according to the ideal theory, II, 464, 471ff.; duration of the, II, 473ff., 478ff.

Creation Story, II, 457, 490.

Schism, IV, 52.

Scholasticism in the general sense, I, 80; in Reformed Theology, I, 115ff.; error of I, 161.

Scholasticism, Middle Ages, I, 80v.; influence on the division of dogmatic material, I, 36; on human knowledge, I, 165v.; on the distinction between Theological nature and supranat., I, 220v.; on the incomprehensibility of God, II, 8; on innate concepts, II, 35; on predestination, II, 323v.; on the extent of the satisfaction of Christ, III, 392v.; on grace, III, 438v.

Scripture The, in general sense, I, 296.

Sacred Scripture, as principium of Theology, I. 25v., 241; meaning of I, 305v.; no code of law, I, 20, 372v., 527; church and, I, 24, 304, 363, 366v., 380, 383, 385, 424; IV, 195 v.; in its relation to revelation, I, 299v., 344; its temporal character, I, 143v., 300, 389v., 422; its significance for the sciences, I, 359v.; II, 465, 476; properties of I, 363v.; authority, I, 366v.; necessity, I, 380ff.; clarity, I, 392ff.; sufficiency I, 400ff.; struggle against the I, 354ff.

Sacred Scriptures in Religions, I, 295.

Guilt of sin, III, 161v.; in connection with stain, III, 137v., 164v.

Consciousness of guilt, no standard of sin, III, 95, 163; in connection with the object, guilt, III, 163v.

Scientia media, II, 162v., 326.

Semipelagianism, II, 320; III, 43v., 115v., 391v., 435v.

Seraphim. II, 431.

Simplicitas Dei. See simple. God's.

Serpent in Paradise, III, 37v.

Key Power, IV, 135 v.c.; in Rome, IV, 138 v.c.; in Lutheran and Reformed Churches IV, 152 v.c.

Stain of sin, III, 164f.; in verb to the debt, III, 137v., 164v.

Socialism, II, 561.

Socinianism, I, 120; on the nat. knowledge of God, I, 222; on inspiration, I, 318; on the knowability of God, II, 11, 82; on the simplicity of God, II, 141, 147; on God's omniscience in connection with man's freedom, II, 161v., 352; on the Trinity, II, 263v.; [586] on predestination, II, 340, 352; on creation, II, 390; on the image of God, II, 512, 543; on providence, III, 11v.; on the Old Testament, III, 198v.; on the Incarnation, III, 254; on the Deity of Christ, III, 266, 412, 414, 424; on the worship of Christ, III, 298; on the satisfactio vicaria, III, 322v., 345v.; on the priestly office of Christ, III, 323, 418v.; on the order of salvation, III, 451; on the Church, IV, 20 ; on the means of grace, IV, 193, 223 ; on Baptism, IV, 267 ; on the intermediate state, IV, 381 ; on the future destruction of the ungodly, IV, 501.

Solidarity among people, III, 132v.

Species, immutability of, in organic beings, II, 495.

Inspiration of the Holy Spirit. See Holy Spirit.

Spiritualism, II, 427; IV, 395 v., 397 v.

Spiritualism, on the future salvation, IV, 513 v.

Confusion of Tongues of Babel. Meaning, I, 235; II, 502v.

State and Church, IV, 111, 161 v., 189 v.; among Israel, IV, 3, 132 v.; in antiquity, IV, 132 ; near Rome, IV, 141 v., 148 v.; in the East, IV, 142 ; in the Ref., IV, 152 v.; among the Ref., IV, 156 v.

States of Christ, III, 374v.; state of humiliation, III, 374v.; of exaltation, III, 408v., 430.

Status integritatis in the Heid., II, 508; follow. Naturalism, II, 512v., 548; follow. the supranatur. ed., II, 517v., 548; correct ed., II, 529v., 546, 556v.; III, 64, 173.

Status gloriae, II, 522v.; IV, 518 v.

Positive punishments for sin, III, 159v.

Day of Death of Jesus, IV, 302, 303.

Material world, II, 456v.

Punishment, essence of, III, 156v.; of sin, III, 155v.

Punishments, hellish. See Hellish punishments.

Punishments, secular, in the Roman Church, IV, 141 v., 164.

Subjective starting point of the Christian. Theol., I, 467, 494.

Subordinatianism in the Trin. doctrine, II, 255, 263.

Sufism, II, 389.

Supra- and Infralapsarianism, II, 333v., 358v.

Supranaturalism of the 18th century in Germany, I, 102, 428; in Netherlands, I, 126, 129, 428.

Supernaturalistic conception of the image of God. See Image of God.

Symbolism, I, 10; relation to Dogma, I, 27.

Symbolic character of Christian theology follows the newer view, II, 77.

Symbolic Acts of the Prophets, I, 261.

Synagogues among Israel, IV, 3 v., 134.

Synod of Dordrecht regarding the question of supra- and infralapsarianism, II, 339.

Synod of Orange, I, 76; II, 322; III, 438.

Synods, IV, 180 v.; in the Roman Church, IV, 92, 181.

Synthetic classification of Dogmatics. See Dogmatics.

T.

Language, Meaning of, I, 296.
Drawing, IV, 229.
Teleological proof for the existence of God. II, 56v., 157v.
Teleological and mechanical worldview, II, 56v.
Testament. Use of this word in the Stat. trans., III, 195.
Testimonium Spiritus Sancti, I, 421v., 490v.
Tetradism, II, 265.
Theism, I, 218, 227, 286f.; III, 16v.
Theistic philosophers. Their concept of God, II, 21, 83.
[587] Theologia archetypa en ectypa, I, 142, 144.
Theologia Biblica, I, 15, 19v., 108.
Theologia naturalis, according to the pure Reformed op., I, 25v., 221v.; II, 46v.; 50v.; in later times, I, 43, 222v., 427v.; II, 46, 51.
Theology, as a science, I, 509v.; its principium cogn. internum, I, 516v.; and church, I, 517, 525; and faith, I, 509v., 517v.; and Philosophy, See Philosophy.
Theophany, I, 248v.
Theopneusty, as an element of revelation, I, 301, 302, 344; as a property of Scripture, I, 302, 305, 354.
Θεός, as name of God, II, 103.
Theosophy. General Character, I, 107; on the Bodily Nature of God, II, 147ff., 192ff.; its speculation on the Trinitarian doctrine, II, 304ff.; III, 47.
Thomists, on the praedest., II, 326; on grace, I, 92; III, 441, 497; on the working of the sacr., IV, 239.
Torah, I, 325v.
Time, Concept of, II, 129v., 411; in connection with creation, II, 408v.

Application of salvation in its relation to acquisition, III, 399v., 430v., 449, 469v.; among the Antinomians, III, 451v., 467v.

Chance, III, 14.

Tolerants in the Netherlands, I, 125.

Wrath of God, II, 196.

Tractarianism in England, IV, 268.

Tradition, adj. Rome, I, 400v.; among the Jews, I, 306v.; adj. the Reformation. I, 413v.

Traditionalism, I, 95f., 296f.

Traducianism, II, 565v.

Transubstantiation, IV, 313, 315 v., 331 v.

Trichotomism, II, 537.

Tridentinum, on the praedest., II, 325.

Trinitarian formula at Baptism, IV, 274 v.

Tritheism in the Chr. church, II, 264v.

Tubinger school, Roomsche on inspiration, I, 313v.

Discipline, Ecclesiastical, IV, 171 BC; in the First Christian church, IV, 139 BC ; in Rome, IV, 140 ; in Luther, IV, 154 BC; in Calvin and the Reformed, IV, 155 BC.

צַדֶּק , II, 194v.

You.

The coming forth of the Holy Spirit. See Holy Spirit.

Unio mystica, III, 448, 555v.; IV, 342.

Unitarianism in England, I, 135.

Universalism, in the doctrine of satisfaction, III, 390v., 489v.; hypothetical, IV, 499, 500 v., 521 v.

Ὑποστασις, Use of this word in the Theol., II, 269, 273.

Urim and Thummim, I, 252.

V.

Father name of God, II, 113v., 239v., 279v.; III, 29.

Purgatory near Rome, IV, 377 BC, 407 BC; outside Rome, IV, 380 BC, 408.

Fall of the angels, III, 39v., 66, 72; time of that, III, 69, 71.

Fall of man, III, 37v., 72v.; time of it, III, 68v., 71; influence on nature, II, 558v.; III, 173, 407. Cf. further sin.

Vatican Council, on the Pope, IV, 94 v.

Imagination. Its Influence on the Origin of Sin, III, 65.

Covenant, in the HS, III, 191v.; as a form of religion, II, 551v.; doctrine of the in the Chr. Theol., II, 549; III, 196v.; in the Geref., II. 550v.; III, 199v., 221v.

Covenant of grace, III, 187ff.; in a wider sense (Noachide), III, 209ff., 218; with Abraham, III, 212; with Israel, III, 212ff., 426; monopleuric character, III, 194, 225; [588] two sides of, III, 227ff.; IV, 245 ; in its relation to election, III, 224ff., 226ff.; IV, 285ff.; to the covenant of works, II, 554, 564, 571; III, 219, 220ff.; to the pactum salutis, III, 221ff., 372ff.; benefits, III, 425ff.; in relation to children, IV, 265 v., 282 v., 286 v.

Covenant of works, I, 226; II, 547v.; III, 131v., 219; to what extent broken by sin, III, 83, 165, 219; in its relation to the covenant of grace, II, 554, 564, 571; III, 219, 220v.

Veneration of martyrs and saints, IV, 392 v., 398 v.

Forgiveness of sins, III, 548v.; in relation to satisfaction, III, 348, at Rome, III, 443.

Hardening of God, II, 369v.

Election, II, 377v.; of Israel, II, 314; in the New Testament, II, 317v.; conversion to the covenant of grace, III, 224v., 226v.; IV, 285 v.; its object, the human race, II, 366, 384.

Election to offices by the municipality, IV, 73, 79, 122 v.

Enlightenment, inh., as a form of revelation, I, 256v.; of the Holy Spirit, III, 513.

Redemption of man, III, 188.

Theology of Remission of Clement and Origen, I, 60, 61; in the Roman Church, I, 96; in the Lutheran Church of the 19th century, I, 105v., 433v., 438v.; on the Holy Scripture, I, 26, 319, 373, 383, 387; on the order of salvation, III, 461.

Renewal of the World, IV, 511 v.

Rejection, II, 369v.; in Augustine, II, 321, 334v., 358; in Rome, II, 326v.; negative and positive, II, 323, 335, 364, 369.

Assurance of faith, III, 526v., 57Ov.

Temptation of Christ, III, 297, 376.

Reconciliation as the fruit of satisfaction, III, 381v.; in Ritschl, III, 329v., 386v.

Viae, the three, in the knowledge of God, II, 96.

Visions, as a means of revelation, I, 254v.

Visio Dei per essentiam, II, 151v., 518, 522; IV, 519.

Meat-eating before the sun, II, 560v.

Curse of God, III, 162v.

Satisfaction. Necessary II, 209, 214; III, 341v.; time of III, 350v.; in connection with God’s love, III, 356v., 381v.; as a substitute, III, 359v.; their equivalence, III, 366v.; fruits, III, 380v.; expanse, III, 390v.; opposition to the doctrine of III, 320v., 365v.

Consummation of the Ages, IV, 481 BC
Perseverance of the Saints, III, 565v.
Fullness of times, III, 210, 215v., 260v.
Peoples. Their Origin, II, 502v.
Popular Religion and Jahvedienst in Israel, IV, 364.
Perfectibility of the faithful, III, 559v.
Perfection of God, II, 128, 178.
Intercession for the Deceased, IV, 414 v.
Preparatory grace. See gratia praeparans.
Intercession of Christ, III, 419v.; IV, 338 ; of the blessed, IV, 398 v. See also angels.
Propagation of the human race, II, 564v.
Providence of God, III, 1v.; taken as a conclusion, II, 347v.; III, 5.
Confirmation in the Roman Church, IV, 248, 351.
Woman, Creation of, II, 563.
W.
Truthfulness of God, II, 173v.
Truth, understanding, in the New Testament, IV, 444.
[589] Perception, sensual, I, 161v.
Divination in the OT, IV, 395 BC.
Anabaptists, I, 120. Cf. further Anabaptism.
Rebirth, III, 479v., 500v.; IV, 214 v.; in Paul and John, III, 500v.; and Baptism, IV, 197, 266, 290 v.
Restoration of all things, IV, 500 BC, 505 BC
Second Coming of Christ, IV, 422 v.; time, IV, 475 v.; manner, IV, 479 v.
Reunion after Death, IV, 417 v.

World, Concept, according to Theism, I, 286, 290v.; II, 419v.; III, 21v.; can it be eternal? II, 410v.; IV, 422 v.; is it the best? II, 213, 423v.; relation to God's essence, II, 159v., 346; as object of election, II, 384; of Christ's work, III, 390, 403v.; its renewal, IV, 511 v.

Covenant of works. See covenant of works.

Werthurtheile, as content and proof of Chr. religion, I, 454, 460f.

Western Church and Theology, as distinguished from the Eastern. See Greek, Eastern Church.

God's Law, its char., II, 209, 214; III, 343v.; in Paradise, II, 558v.; different forms, III, 75; as a standard of moral conduct, III, 75v., 84v., 151; as a source of knowledge of sin, III, 84v.; its unity, III, 94; its meaning in the Old Testament, III, 215; as part of God's word, IV, 201 v.; in Paul, IV, 202 v., 205 ; and Gospel, IV, 201 v.; in the final judgment, IV, 492 v.

Science, Principia in de, I, 145v.; in its relation to religion, I, 189, 210, 376.

Science of God, II, 155v.

The essence of God, in abstracto, II, 78; variously determined in Christian Theol., II, 80ff.; and distinguished from the properties of God, II, 86ff.; with respect to the properties, II, 90, 115; in Trin. doctrine, II, 270ff.

Wider hope theory in England, IV, 500.

Will, character of, II, 205v.; III, 87; as subject of sin, III, 53, 85v.

Will of God, II, 202v.; III, 341v.; in regards to zz, II, 178, 206, 418; to created things, II, 207, 413f., 419; as antecedent and consequent, II, 218f., 325, 354; III, 394; of decree and command, II, 216v.

Freedom of the will in Pelag. sentence, II, 164f.; in Ger. sentence, II, 167; in connection with the praescientia Dei, II, 167v.; with the praedest., II, 318v.

Philosophy. Its relation to Theology, I, 516v.; II, 456; its use in Theology by the Apologetics and Church Fathers, I, 55, 57v., 59v., 511v.; II, 252; the position of the Reformation regarding it, I, 516v.; its influence on Dogmatics in the 18th and 19th centuries, I, 42v.

Wisdom of God, II, 168v.; as hypostasis, II, 228v., 232, 242, 405.

Miracles, I, 258v., 275, 289v.; III, 22; IV, 229 ; interpretation by Ration., I, 281v.; of Christ, III, 311, 376; spiritual, as an element of revelation, I, 274v., 303v.

Word and fact in public. God's, I, 258f., 283f., 304, 352.

Word of God. Meaning in Sacred Scripture, I, 338f., 372, IV, 201 ; and Scripture, IV, 200 f.; as the name of Christ, see Logos ; as the sign of the church, IV, 44 f., 51 ; as the means of grace, IV, 62, 193 f.; and Spirit, IV, 209 f.; and sacraments, IV, 166, 199 f., 220, 232 f., 271 ; its efficacy, IV, 211 f.

God's Vengeance, II, 196. [590]

Z.

Salvation of God, II, 178v., 206.

Salvation, as the fruit of Christ's work, III, 380 v.; future, IV, 517 v.; of the youngest dying children, IV, 522 v.

Anointing, III, 335; of Christ, III, 336.

Zebaoth, as the name of God, II, 111.

Moral world order, II, 59; III, 157v., 344, 347.

Morality and Religion, I, 193v., 462, III, 553.

Seal in Sacred Scripture, IV, 230.

Certainty, Kinds of I, 158, 470v., 478v.; of faith, I, 158, 469v., 478v.; III, 526v., 571v.; of salvation according to Rome, I, 479; III, 570v.; IV, 251 ; moral, in Kant, I, 481v.

God's Self-Consciousness, II, 158v.

Self-consciousness of Jesus as Messiah and Son of God, III, 237v.

Soul of man, II, 536; and spirit, II, 537; powers of, II, 538; union with the body, II, 541v.

Soul sleep, doctrine vd, IV, 381, 386 v.

Transmigration of souls, doctrine of, in antiquity, IV, 407 ; in modern times, IV, 381 BC.

Pastoral care in the Reformed Church, IV, 170 v.

Austerity sacrifice, III, 304v.

Sin, Concerning reprobation, II, 373; to the government of God, II, 369v., 373v.; III, 30v., 34v., 55v., 61v.; origin, III, 34v.; influence on nature, II, 558v.; III, 173, 407; ethical character, II, 53, 80, 81; essence, III, 72v.; IV, 506 v.; in angels and in men, III, 51, 66v., 92, 188; degrees in the, III, 89v.; principle, III, 96v.; distinction between pardonable and depraved, in Rome, III, 98v.; against the Holy Ghost, see blasphemy ; spreading, III, 104v.; punishment, III, 155v.; as punishment for sin, III, 135v.

The Flood. Its Geological Significance, II, 474v., 487v.

Son of God. Use of this name in Holy Scripture, II, 243; as the name of the second person, II, 243ff.; III, 238; in relation to creation, II, 405ff.; IV, 475.

Son of Man. Meaning of this name, III, 235v.

PROJECT GUTENBERG EDITOR'S REMARKS.

Every effort has been made to accurately reproduce the original version in this file. In the original, æ is rendered as ae, œ as oe; this spelling has been retained here.

Here and there, spacing and punctuation have been silently corrected. Also, some compound expressions such as "afaan" and "alwat," etc., have been silently split into "af aan," "al wat," etc.

Some commonly used abbreviations such as LXX, OT and NT have been provided with explanations to improve ease of reading when using a screen reader.

Any typographical errors in Greek have been reproduced unchanged. Obvious typographical errors in Hebrew have been corrected, and diacritical marks have been silently corrected or added where necessary.

Obvious typographical errors and spelling errors in the original have been corrected as follows.

Corrections.

Pag. 5: replace “chose” with “chose” (but He also chose some young people).

Pag. 33: inserted “not” (they do not belong to the kingdom of Christ).

Pag. 36: replace “institutnut” with “institute” (which also means institute and organism of the church).

Pag. 45: replace “pronounce” with “pronounce” (which pronounces this clearly and distinctly).

Pag. 46: 'one' replaced twice by 'ohne' (Gottes Wort kann nicht ohne Gottes Volk sein, wiederum Gottes Volk kann nicht ohne Gottes Wort sein).

Pag. 46: replace “one” with “ohne” (Gottes Volk kann nicht ohne Gottes Wort sein).

Pag. 68: Replace “Huyper” with “Kuyper” (Dr. H.H. Kuyper, The training for the ministry of the Word).

Pag. 86: Replace “toestemmiag” with “toestemming” (those elected with the consent of the municipalities).

Pag. 100: replace “the eleven” with “themselves” (that he had in common with them).

Pag. 143: Replace “Poutif” with “Pontif” (Bellarminus, de Rom. Pontif. V. de membris eccl. III. Hergenröther).

Pag. 145: replace 'snbordinationis' by ' subordinationis ' (officio hierarchicae subordinationis veraeque obedientiae obstringuntu).

Pag. 152: replace “tnsschen” with “tusschen” (Calvin similarly made a distinction between church and state).

Pag. 155: replace “qaalitatieve” with “qualitative” (it exchanged the quantitative opposition... for the qualitative, ethical opposition).

Pag. 157: replace 'pessim' by 'passim' (Voetius, Pol. Eccl. I 124 sq. en passim. Disp. sel. II).

Pag. 185: replace ' venlent ' by ' veulent ' (contre ceux qui veulent abolir l'usage et l'autorité).

Pag. 187: replace “elkandar” with “elkander” (so they cannot be contrasted with “lower” and “higher”).

Pag. 220: Replace “Confessionsknnde” with “Confessionskunde” (Kattenbusch, Vergl. Confessionskunde I).

Pag. 221: Replace “eu” with “en” (focusing on God’s grace in Christ and thereby exercising that faith).

Pag. 244: “Lomhardus” replaced by “Lombardus” (sacramentum, non rem, suscipiunt, Lombardus, Sent. IV).

Pag. 253: ' Bedentung ' replaced by ' Bedeutung ' (Die Beschneidung in ihrer geschichtl. ethnogr. relig. u. medic. Bedeutung).

Pag. 261: 'in' replaced by 'im' (Die Bedeutung der Taufe im NT).

Pag. 294: replace “they” with “his” (that he died unbaptized through no fault of his own).

Pag. 368: ' anszeichnende ' replaced by ' auszeichnende ' (ist in Wahrheit ihre auszeichnende Stärke gewesen).

Pag. 394: “ united ” replaced by “ united ” (Ryle, Knots united p. 491).

Pag. 396: Replace “18” with “28” (the argument that can be raised against this is 1 Sam. 28, where Saul).

Pag. 401: 'venerirt' replaced by 'veneriert' (die Heiligkeit auf Erden religios veneriert werke).

Pag. 414: 'III1' replaced by 'III 1' (Jansen, Prael. III 1 030 etc.).

Pag. 424: Replace “ Deisseits ” with “ Diesseits ” (and everything of the Diesseits, of immanent, cosmic forces).

Pag. 435: replace “never” with “never” (and the state of exaltation never of one).

Pag. 451: Replace “strak” with “straks” (but it will become clear shortly).

Pag. 501: Replace “sisters” with “brothers and sisters of the free spirit.”

Pag. 501: 'van' replaced by 'von' (Die Lehre von der Apokatastasis2 Magdeburg).

Pag. 504: replace “dikwerk” with “dikwerf” (and then it is especially connected very dikwerf with ζωη).

Pag. 532: replace “cogu” with “cogn” (but ignores the princ. cogn. internum).

Pag. 535: Replace “Vermittelungstheologie” with “Vermittlungstheologie” (by Hegel 1, by Vermittlungstheologie 2).

Pag. 545: replace “so that” with “so that” (12, so that God and man, two distinct natures).

Pag. 548: replace “righteousness” with “righteousness” (from the imputation of Christ's righteousness 6).

Pag. 557: Replace “18” with “28” (1 Sam. 28 IV, 396v.)

Pag. 557: Replace “2S” with “28” (Matt. 20:28 III, 363.)

Pag. 560: Replace “79” with “279” (Augustine... on Infant Baptism IV, 262, 279v.)

Pag. 560: replace “omnipresence” with “omnipresence” (Augustine Steuchus, On the Omnipresence of God).

Pag. 561 (Doedes): replace “they” with “his” (Doedes,... his division of the attributes of God).

Pag. 564: Replace “Max Müller” with “Müller, Max” (Müller, Max, On the Origin of Religion).

Pag. 565 (Origen): replace “separate beings” with “creatures” (the original equality of all creatures).

Pag. 569: replace “vau” with “van” (Acceptance in the satisfaction of Christ).

Pag. 576: replace “311v.” with “411v.” (Sanctification... complete, at death, IV, 411v.)

Pag. 588: replace “election” with “deed” (Election,... deed to the covenant of grace).