Editor’s Notes

You have just received the November 2017 issue of the Protestant Reformed Theological Journal. We apologize for its late arrival. We don’t want to make excuses, but we would like our readers to know that there is an explanation for its lateness. Originally, we had planned to publish the six speeches recently given at the seminary’s celebration of the 500th anniversary of the Reformation. Three were planned for this issue, and the remaining three speeches were planned for our April 2018 issue. In the meantime, the Reformed Free Publishing Association approached us with a proposal to publish the speeches in a commemorative book. All the speakers agreed on the value of this. But one of the stipulations was that we were not to publish the speeches in the Journal. That left us scrambling a bit for content for this issue. Thankfully, the Lord provided and we have more than enough material for what we believe is another very worthwhile issue of PRTJ. The bottom line, however, is that our readers should be on the lookout for a new book published by the RFPA celebrating our Reformation heritage. Hopefully the book will be available sometime the first part of 2018. And, hopefully, you will all buy and read the book.

You will find several bibliographies in this issue. Included is another installment of the “John Calvin Research Bibliography.” The newest addition to our faculty, not unknown to the readers of this Journal, Prof. Douglas J. Kuiper, contributes the first installment of his fascinating bibliography of one of the seminary’s first faculty members, the Rev. Prof. George Martin Ophoff. And our librarian, Mr. Charles Terpstra, contributes another “Significant Additions to the Protestant Reformed Theological Seminary Library.”

Two articles of interest also make up this issue of the journal. The first is Prof. Russell J. Dykstra’s third installment of “The Covenant of Grace in the Psalms.” Prof. Dykstra continues to demonstrate that every important aspect of the doctrine of the covenant is set forth in the book of Psalms, and that from a personal and experiential viewpoint. Indeed, the doctrine of the covenant is not a cold, abstract dogma, but
the living and daily experience of the people of God, as anyone who reads the Psalms knows. The Rev. Angus Stewart treats us to an article on “Martin and Katie Luther: A Reformation Marriage.” You will learn a great deal about Luther’s view of marriage, his reforming of marriage, and his own personal marriage. Luther once commented on the fact that Katie was just the wife God knew that he needed. How true! How true! What a support she was to him in all the different aspects of his reformatory work.

And we have some book reviews, which we trust you will enjoy. Our readers often express appreciation for that portion of our Journal. Hopefully, the ten book reviews that are included in this issue will prompt our readers to read for themselves the books that are reviewed. Along the way, we trust that the reviews prove to be doctrinally instructive, properly polemical, and generally edifying.

One of the reviews is of a book lately published by one of our regular readers, Mr. Marco Barone. Prof. David Engelsma gives a very positive review of our brother’s book, Luther’s Augustinian Theology of the Cross: The Augustinianism of Martin Luther’s Heidelberg Disputation and the Origins of Modern Philosophy of Religion. We heartily recommend the book, which has recently been published by Wipf and Stock Publishers and readily available through Amazon.com. Indeed, it can be demonstrated that in so many respects, the Reformation was a return to Augustine. Both Luther and Calvin repeatedly appealed to Augustine.

Read and enjoy!

Soli Deo Gloria!

—RLC
The Covenant of Grace in the Psalms (3):
A Living, Personal Relationship
Russell Dykstra

In times of spiritual strength, God’s people know and appreciate the tremendous value of the Psalms. Martin Luther expressed his appreciation in his preface to the Psalms, writing,

The Psalter ought to be a precious and beloved book, if for no other reason than this: it promises Christ’s death and resurrection so clearly—and pictures his kingdom and the condition and nature of all Christendom—that it might well be called a little Bible. In it is comprehended most beautifully and briefly everything that is in the entire Bible.

He expressed the opinion that the Holy Spirit composed a “short Bible and book of examples...so that anyone who could not read the whole Bible would have here anyway almost the entire summary of it, comprised in one little book.”

John Calvin’s praise for the Psalms was equally effusive in his preface, in which he writes, “The varied and resplendent riches which are contained in this treasury is no easy matter to express in words.” Calvin’s conviction was “that in proportion to the proficiency which a man shall have attained in understanding them, will be his knowledge of the most important part of celestial doctrine.”

These convictions of the great Reformers were in line with the views of the church fathers going back to Athanasius of the fourth century. In a lengthy letter to Marcellinus on the use and interpretation of the Psalms, Athanasius wrote that “all the books of Scripture, both Old

3 Calvin, Psalms, I, xxxvii.
Testament and New, are inspired by God and useful for instruction, as it is written; but to those who really study it the Psalter yields especial treasure. Each book of the Bible has, of course, its own particular message.” After illustrating the various themes of several books of the Bible, Athanasius pointed out that “each of these books, you see, is like a garden which grows one special kind of fruit; by contrast, the Psalter is a garden which, besides its special fruit, grows also some of those of all the rest.”

The additional, and significant, spiritual value of the Psalms for the believer is exactly the personal nature of the Psalms. Luther points out that the Psalms record the speech of believers in a unique way. He writes that the Psalter presents to us not the simple, ordinary speech of the saints, but the best of their language, that which they used when they talked with God himself in great earnestness and on the most important matters. Thus the Psalter lays before us not only their words instead of their deeds, but their very hearts and the inmost treasure of their souls…

The fact that the Psalms are like a “short Bible” in which is found the whole truth of God makes it possible to set forth a complete doctrine of the covenant from the Psalms. Further, the intensely personal and spiritual character of the Psalms means that the doctrine of the covenant flows naturally from the Psalms. For the covenant is a relationship of friendship that God sovereignly establishes with His people in Christ the Mediator. God maintains this covenant with believers and their seed. This covenant is eternal, established from everlasting with Jesus Christ, the elect of God. And because it can never be broken in Jesus, the covenant will abide unto eternity. The goal of these articles is to demonstrate these truths from the Psalms.

But the individual believer must go deeper into this precious covenant truth by applying it to himself and his relationship to God. The covenant must not be merely an interesting doctrine that believers can discuss. It must be experienced as a living, personal relationship with God. The believer must face the question: How shall I live as

4 This letter is available online.
a member of God’s everlasting covenant of grace, and as a friend of God? In answering that question, the Psalms are invaluable. They are the expression not only of believers, but of holy men of old, in their personal lives with Jehovah. The problem in such an article as this is certainly not to find sufficient passages in the Psalms to demonstrate this, but rather how to limit the selection.

In the development of the truth that the covenant is a living, personal relationship, the Psalms will manifest concretely that God and His people know and commune with each other. Second, the Psalms will demonstrate the effect of this relationship on the believer’s life in especially two ways—the holiness unto the Lord, and the antithetical life in this world. Third, the Psalms will reveal that while there are times when the believer is not living in intimate friendship with his God, still the believer seeks to maintain a close relationship to his covenant Friend, for God’s favor is “better than life” to him (Ps. 63:3).

**Living and Personal**

What an astounding realization comes to every covenant member, that is to say, to every believer—God knows you, and God loves you. Few Psalms demonstrate God’s intimate knowledge of His people as powerfully as Psalm 139. The psalmist begins with the acknowledgment, “O L ORD, thou hast searched me, and known me” (1). God knows all his activities—“Thou knowest my downsitting and mine uprising,…thou compassest my path and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways” (2, 3). All the words that he speaks, God knows them—“For there is not a word in my tongue, but, lo, O L ORD, thou knowest it altogether” (4). Even his thoughts are not hidden from God (2). And the psalmist goes on to say that, if he should try, there is no place he could go to be apart from God—neither heaven above nor the grave, neither the farthest regions of the sea nor pitch darkness, can hide him from the all-knowing, all-seeing God (5-12).

In fact, God knows each believer from the inside out, as it were. The psalmist realizes that God has known him from conception, already covering him in his “mother’s womb” (13). His “soul knoweth right well” that God formed him, “fearfully and wonderfully” (14). The bones, heart, muscles, flesh took shape in the darkness of the
womb, as God determined (15). And even before that, God’s eyes saw the substance before they were formed, for each member (part) of the physical body, as well as each individual member of the covenant body, was written in God’s book (16). The believer exclaims, “Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it” (6). God’s perfect knowledge of each believer is his salvation, “For the L ORD knoweth the way of the righteous: but the way of the ungodly shall perish” (Ps. 1:6).

God’s knowledge of His covenant people is the knowledge of love. God knew His people eternally. He chose them in Christ, in love. The believer basks in the experience of Jehovah’s favor. In that love God gives His people complete and perfect protection. The psalmist sings, “For thou, L ORD, wilt bless the righteous; with favour wilt thou compass him as with a shield” (Ps. 5:12). The believer dares to request, “Keep me as the apple of the eye, hide me under the shadow of thy wings” (Ps. 17:8). The care of the perfect shepherd is his (Ps. 23). This care, the psalmist knows, is “because [the L ORD] delighted in” him (Ps. 18:19). In response to that the believer exalts, “Let all those that put their trust in thee rejoice: let them ever shout for joy, because thou defendest them: let them also that love thy name be joyful in thee” (Ps. 5:11).

The covenant believer knows from experience that Jehovah loves him. This is tremendously significant because the love of God is one of His attributes. God’s love is powerful—a drawing, embracing, transforming love that draws His chosen to Himself so that they come willingly—“When thou saidst, Seek ye my face; my heart said unto thee, Thy face, L ORD, will I seek” (Ps. 27:8). God’s love leads His people to trust in him—“How excellent is thy lovingkindness, O God! therefore the children of men put their trust under the shadow of thy wings” (Ps. 36:7). Their experience is that “in his favour is life” (Ps. 30:5). But when God hides His face, believers are “troubled” (7). God’s powerful saving love makes His people to sing of their love for Him—“I will love thee, O L ORD, my strength” (Ps. 18:1). And again, “I love the L ORD, because he hath heard my voice and my supplications” (Ps. 116:1).

That love is an attribute of God also means that that love is changeless, for God is unchanging (“But thou art the same” Ps. 102:27).
Because God’s love never changes, the psalmist confesses, “But the mercy of the LORD is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him” (Ps 103:17), and twenty-six times in Psalm 136 confesses, “for his mercy endureth forever.”

What an impact this has on the believer’s relationship to His God! It is impossible to trust someone who hates you. The believer trusts in God (Ps. 36:7). God’s unchanging love leads the believer to call on Him even when in deepest distress, when “deep calleth unto deep at the noise of thy waterspouts: all thy waves and thy billows are gone over me,” for the believer is confident that “the LORD will command his lovingkindness in the daytime, and in the night his song shall be with me, and my prayer unto the God of my life” (Ps. 42:7, 8). When the believer has grievously sinned against God, yet he dares to ask, “Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy lovingkindness” (Ps. 51:1). And that divine love leads to joyful praises—“Because thy lovingkindness is better than life, my lips shall praise thee” (Ps. 63:3).

God’s everlasting covenant of grace is governed by His eternal knowledge of and unchanging love for His people.

That leads God’s covenant people to speak to God in prayer. All the Psalms are praise and worship that believers bring to Jehovah. Most of the Psalms are prayers directed to God.

Prayer is God’s amazing gift to His covenant people. Consider first, that God gives the creature the right and privilege to speak with Him! Consider the honor that God bestows. How many citizens of a country in this world have had even one appointment with the president or prime minister of his country? A half hour in his office to talk? We all know that important, powerful, earthly rulers are too busy to grant the ordinary citizen a personal audience.

In stark contrast to that, prayer leads one into the presence of almighty God, Ruler of heaven and earth! Prayer gives one access to the One who is not a fellow man, though with an important position. Rather, prayer brings one to the Creator and Sustainer of the entire universe and every creature in it. The believer confesses, “O LORD our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth! who hast set thy glory above the heavens” (Ps. 8:1). One stands before the God Who controls the sun, rain, beasts of the field, and indeed, all of history. This God gives His people—mere creatures formed from the dust of the earth—the right to come and to
speak to Him as long and as often as they will! In astonishment, every believer sings, “When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; What is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him?” (Ps. 8:3-4).

But there is more. For this God is holy and He “is in his holy temple, the Lord’s throne is in heaven: his eyes behold, his eyelids try, the children of men…[and] the wicked and him that loveth violence his soul hateth” (Ps. 11:4, 5). But, concerning himself, the believer is painfully aware—“Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.” Daily he confesses, “I acknowledge my transgressions: and my sin is ever before me” (Ps. 51:3-5). Yet the holy God allows the sinful believer to come and address Him, in and through Christ, the Head and Mediator of the covenant.

God does more than allow prayer, He demands it. “Seek ye my face” (Ps. 27:8). “Call upon me in the day of trouble: I will deliver thee…” (Ps. 50:15). God gives His covenant people that duty.

This free and ready access to God in prayer is amazing. The believer can and may call on God anytime day and night, and God hears him. He might call on God when two million other covenant children are speaking to Him, but he has the confidence that “the Lord will hear when I call unto him” (Ps. 4:3).

Prayer is God’s gift to His covenant people, and to them alone. The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to Him, for, the psalmist confesses, “thou art not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness: neither shall evil dwell with thee. The foolish shall not stand in thy sight: thou hatest all workers of iniquity” (Ps. 5:4, 5).

In His wisdom, God gave prayer to His people because the covenant is a relationship of friendship. Friendship is fellowship; fellowship is communion—it is talking together. (Recall Ps. 25:14, “The secret of the Lord is with them….”) Covenant people, therefore, have opportunity to speak to God. They may pour out their hearts to God, expressing their most private thoughts and desires. They bring their disappointments, sorrows, heartaches, and yes, their horrible sins, all to God. Prayer is the way, from the side of the believer, of communing with God in the covenant. This is not merely formal communication, it is the most intimate communication found in all the earth. There are things that a man will tell his friends that he will not say to just
anyone he happens to meet. There are other secrets he might divulge only to a friend. There are still deeper secrets that he might reveal to his own wife. But there are other matters that a man will not even tell his own wife, but he will confide them in God.

What a blessing is prayer! It is indispensable to the covenant. It should be obvious that if the covenant of God were an agreement or a conditional “arrangement” between God and His people, then prayer would not be essential to the relationship. But because the covenant is a relationship of friendship, prayer is indispensable. A relationship of friendship cannot be sustained without communication.

Further, God delights to hear His children speak to Him. The Psalms indicate that the communion is intimate. Yet, the communication is never between equals. The covenant people address Jehovah, the almighty God and Father in *heaven*. Still, even as in this life a child approaches his earthly father or mother with intimate confidence, so the believer to his God. In his commentary on the Psalms, John Calvin often uses the word “familiarly” to describe the way in which God’s people approach Him. In his comments on Psalm 31:9 Calvin notes that God “allows the faithful to deal familiarly with him, that they may disburden themselves of their cares.”6 On Psalm 10:13, he observes, “but still [God] permits us to make use of them, and to speak to him in prayer, as familiarly as a son speaks to an earthly father”7 [emphasis added]. Calvin beautifully sums it as follows:

Having elsewhere spoken more fully of these forms of expression, it may suffice, at present, briefly to observe, that when God permits us to lay open before him our infirmities without reserve, and patiently bears with our foolishness, he deals in a way of great tenderness towards us. To pour out our complaints before him after the manner of little children would certainly be to treat his Majesty with very little reverence, were it not that he has been pleased to allow us such freedom. I purposely make use of this illustration, that the weak, who are afraid to draw near to God, may understand that they are invited to him with such gentleness as that nothing may hinder them from familiarly and confidently approaching him.8

---

6  Calvin, *Psalms* (at Psalm 31:9), 506.
7  Calvin, *Psalms* (at Psalm 10:13), 150.
8  Calvin, *Psalms* (at Psalm 102:2), 98.
The covenant child can come to his heavenly Father in every circumstance and situation. The covenant child comes to God in trials, also when his afflictions cause bewilderment. Perplexed about life, the psalmist confesses that “his feet were almost gone” (Ps. 73:2). Why? Because the wicked of the earth prosper. Why, he inquires of God, does it seem that God is good to the wicked, while He afflicts his covenant people?

When the covenant believer falls into deep and horrible sins, he has access to his merciful Father, and can confess “Against thee, thee only have I sinned” (Ps. 51:4), and plead, “Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy lovingkindness: according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions” (1). And he beseeches, “Deliver me from blood guiltiness, O God!” (14).

When he is lonely and deserted, and even his earthly father and mother have forsaken him, then the Lord will take him up (Ps. 27:10). He cries out, “My lovers and my friends stand aloof from my sore; and my kinsmen stand afar off” (Ps. 38:11); yet, he confidently affirms, “In thee, O L O R D, do I hope: thou wilt hear, O Lord my God” (15).

Even more dreadful it is when it seems that his heavenly Father has forsaken him, and he calls out, “L O R D, why castest thou off my soul? why hidest thou thy face from me? I am afflicted and ready to die from my youth up: while I suffer thy terrors I am distracted. Thy fierce wrath goeth over me; thy terrors have cut me off” (Ps. 88:14-16). Or when the believer sinks into the dark pit of depression, and God seems so far away, and he mourns, “My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God: when shall I come and appear before God? My tears have been my meat day and night, while they continually say unto me, Where is thy God?” (Ps. 42:2-3). Or again, in overwhelming sorrows, “I am weary with my groaning; all the night make I my bed to swim; I water my couch with my tears” (Ps. 6:6).

God not only grants His covenant people access to Him, He makes them to know that He hears their cries. He responds to their prayers! The psalmist relates his experience when he recounts, “The sorrows of death compassed me, and the floods of ungodly men made me afraid” (Ps. 18:4). Then he adds, “In my distress I called upon the L O R D, and cried unto my God: he heard my voice out of his temple, and my cry came before him, even into his ears” (Ps. 18:6). The evidence that God
heard his prayer was manifest in that God came in fierce judgment on the ungodly who were afflicting him unto death.

Psalm 31 reveals the same confidence that Jehovah hears the cries of His covenant people. The psalmist admits that in a time of trouble he had “said in [his] haste, I am cut off from before thine eyes.” But he was to confess, “Nevertheless thou heardest the voice of my supplications when I cried unto thee” (Ps. 31:22). John Calvin points out that this is very much tied to God’s covenant. He writes, that “we may cherish the hope of being saved by him from the respect he has for the glory of his name, and from his having adopted us on condition of never forsaking us.”

Calvin elaborates on this in his comments on the following verse, pointing out that God is “the author of the covenant,” and that to his people “to whom he was bound by an everlasting covenant” he “had bestowed the privilege of adoption.” Calvin notes that “God in all his promises, is set before us as if he were our willing debtor.”

So certain is it that God will hear and answer the prayers of his children, says Calvin, that when we hope on God, “in a sense, we lay God under obligation to us, for…in promising to sustain the relationship of a father, he gives what men would call a pledge.”

This reality that God hears the cries of His distressed people and saves them is the reason why many Psalms begin as a grievous lament—for sins committed against the psalmist, or for sins committed by the psalmist—and by the end of the Psalm, the lament has changed to praise (see Psalms 22, 31, et al.).

**The Effect of the Covenant on Life**

The covenant life that God establishes with His people set forth in the Psalms is clearly a relationship of friendship, built on the bond of unchanging love that God has for His people. It is an intimate friendship. That kind of relationship affects every area of the covenant member’s life—his thinking, his speech, and his conduct. The Psalms bring that out especially in two ways. First, in that the believer is de-
voted to God, manifested in holy living. And second, his membership in the covenant directly affects the believer’s life with other people.

Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? or who shall stand in his holy place? He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart; who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn deceitfully. He shall receive the blessing from the Lord, and righteousness from the God of his salvation (Ps. 24:3-5).

This is one of many Psalms demanding of God’s covenant people that they be holy. Calvin comments on this Psalm:

He tells them that it was reasonable that those whom God had adopted as his children, should bear certain marks peculiar to themselves, and not be altogether like strangers…. [H]e teaches them, from the end or design of their election, that they shall then have secured to them the firm and peaceful possession of the honor which God had conferred upon them above other nations, when they devote themselves to an upright and holy life.13

Why is this demanded? God is holy (Ps. 22:3, 99:5).14 The Psalms frequently speak of God’s dwelling place as being holy—His holy hill (Ps. 2:6, 3:4), holy temple (Ps. 5:7, 11:4), holy heaven (Ps. 20:6), and holy habitation (Ps. 68:5). Jehovah is called the holy One of Israel (Ps. 71:22, 78:41). He hates sin and all workers of iniquity (Ps. 5:5). Evil shall not dwell with Him (Ps. 5:4). He is righteous, loves righteousness, and judges righteously (Ps. 7:9, 9:8, 33:5).

In light of God’s holiness, the psalmist exhorts the covenant people, “Ye that love the Lord, hate evil” (Ps. 97:10). They must strive to keep His commandments. The whole of Psalm 119 is a song of praise to God’s righteous statutes and judgments, with repeated promises to observe them. The covenant people must know, meditate on, love, and obey His commandments. And they are ready to confess not only that they can only do so by the power of Jehovah, but also that they often fail to obey, exactly as expressed in Psalm 119’s concluding

13 Calvin, Psalms (at Psalm 24:1), 401.
14 The references in this paragraph to God’s holiness are but a small part of the many passages that could be cited.
verse: “I have gone astray like a lost sheep; seek thy servant; for I do not forget thy commandments” (176).

In very practical terms, covenantal devotion means that the believer must serve and worship only Jehovah God. He must keep the Sabbath holy, even if it costs him his current employment. He must honor all in authority—parents, teachers, church elders, policemen, and all rulers. He must love his neighbor and seek his good. No sexual impurity may blemish his life—public or private. And he must speak the truth in love. The Psalms do not explicitly set forth these particular commandments, for that is not the nature of the Psalms. However, the rest of Scripture does, and the psalmist sings, “O how love I thy law” (Ps. 119:97), and, “Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O LORD, my strength, and my redeemer” (Ps. 19:14). The goal of the covenant people is perfect holiness before the Lord.

The Psalms indicate that the covenant people do not merely seek to be obedient. They are devoted to God Himself. The psalmist sings, “Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee. My flesh and my heart faileth: but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion for ever” (Ps. 73:25-26). God is everything for the covenant people, and all they do is for the Lord’s sake. They live as godly husbands or wives for the Lord’s sake. They obey their parents because they love God. They work faithfully in school or their job because they want God to be honored. They live for Him, each one confessing, “The LORD is the portion of mine inheritance and of my cup” (Ps. 16:5).

Consider just a few of the many expressions of devotion to God in the Psalms. “As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God” (42:1). “With my whole heart have I sought thee” (119:10). “I will love thee, O LORD, my strength” (18:1). The psalmist exhorts each of the covenant people, “Delight thyself also in the LORD; and he shall give thee the desires of thine heart” (37:4). He confesses from experience, “I love the LORD, because he hath heard my voice and my supplications” (116:1). And he knows that a far better covenant life with Jehovah is coming—“As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness” (17:15).
These passages express the life and hope of the covenant people. They live for Him and unto Him. He is the reason they get up every morning and face the new day. He is the reason why they eat, read, work, play, and worship. They love God, and are devoted to Him in every area of their lives.

This life with God also determines how the covenant people live with other people. They are called to love the neighbor, and especially their fellow covenant members. This latter calling will be developed in the next article on the covenant community, so no more will be said of that in this article. Rather, we will dwell on the covenant people’s relation to those who manifest by their wickedness and rebellion that they are not God’s covenant people.

The Psalms bring out that the relationship of covenant people to the enemies of God must be antithetical. Psalm 139 brings this out emphatically as the psalmist declares, “Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate thee? and am not I grieved with those that rise up against thee? I hate them with perfect hatred: I count them mine enemies” (21-22). Now, in light of the clear command to love the neighbor, even one’s enemies, and the psalmist’s assertion that he in fact did show love and kindness to those who persecuted him,15 this expression of hatred might seem to create some conflict. But not really so, for the enemy whom the psalmist hates is the enemy of God, that is, the one who manifests his hatred of God and the whole of God’s cause in the world.

Psalm 139 is hardly the only expression of the believer’s righteous abhorrence for the wicked. The psalmist insists that “he that worketh deceit shall not dwell within my house: he that telleth lies shall not tarry in my sight” (Ps. 101:7). Certain that God “wilt slay the wicked,” he declares, “Depart from me therefore, ye bloody men” (Ps. 139:19). He will not be a friend of those who hate and speak against God, for God is his covenant friend.

He also knows that the ungodly companions will cause him to stray from God’s commandments. “Depart from me, ye evildoers: for I will keep the commandments of my God” (Ps. 119:115). Conversely, he

15 For example, “But as for me, when they were sick, my clothing was sackcloth: I humbled my soul with fasting; and my prayer returned into mine own bosom” (Ps. 35:13).
affirms, “I am a companion of all them that fear thee, and of them that keep thy precepts” (Ps. 119:63). Recreation, fellowship, eating—all forms of friendship are not with the ungodly, but with God’s people. Covenant people find their delight in fellow saints “in the earth, and to the excellent” (Ps. 16:3), and their fellowship is with “the faithful of the land” with whom he determines to “dwell” (Ps. 101:6), but not with the ungodly.

Both the love for covenant people and the hatred of the ungodly are rooted in the love that the believer has for God. Those whom he hates are those “that hate thee,” that is, his God. These men clearly manifest in their lives the reality that they hate God: they hate His church; they seek to destroy God’s church in the world. It is concerning these that the inspired psalmist says, “I hate them.” And he does so “with perfect hatred,” which is to say, with a hatred that is complete and proper. Covenant people rightly desire the destruction of those who are God’s enemies. The hatred is not due to the fact that they have hurt the believer, though it may well be that they have injured him, even severely. Rather the hatred is due to the fact that they oppose Jehovah, his covenant God, whom he loves with all his heart.

This is not difficult to illustrate from earthly life. Consider the natural and proper reaction of a man to a threat against his dearly beloved wife. If someone tries to destroy her, that husband will not only seek to protect her, but he will hate the one who seeks to harm her. Everyone who loves God will hate those who hate Him. One can, even must still pray, “Lord, my desire is that this enemy be turned from his evil way; that he repent and confess Thy name, and that he be delivered from destruction.” That is the expression of the proper love for the neighbor. But if it is not God’s will to turn and to save that man who manifests that he is an enemy of God, then the believer’s desire is that God will destroy that ungodly man.

This manifestation of the antithetical relationship rises out of the covenant life with God. The ungodly cannot be the friends of God’s friends. God’s friends, not knowing who are elect or reprobate, love the neighbor and seek his salvation. But they also hate God’s enemies, with a perfect hatred. A living, personal relationship with God will lead to this kind of life.
Maintaining the Intimacy of Covenant Life

How then, is such a relationship with God maintained? The reality is, obviously, that God maintains His covenant—sovereignly, powerfully, and apart from any work of man. It is God’s covenant—planned, realized, and maintained by His sovereign grace.

However, the reality is that the covenant relationship that believers have with God is not always close and intimate, from the point of view of the believer’s experience. Sometimes the relationship is strained, even distant. The reason for this is always the same, the sins of the covenant people. Sins are transgressions of God law, the will of God that governs the life of the covenant. Sins offend God, make His children guilty and ashamed. Sins bring God’s wrath, for God is holy and therefore abhors sin. God is angry when His children walk in sin. This experience is also recorded in the Psalms. “For we are consumed by thine anger, and by thy wrath are we troubled. Thou hast set our iniquities before thee, our secret sins in the light of thy countenance. For all our days are passed away in thy wrath: we spend our years as a tale that is told” (Ps. 90:7-9).

The sins of covenant people are particularly heinous. They are sins against God’s grace. Sin causes a breech in the relationship. It puts a distance between God and His people. If the sin is not removed, two who were friends become estranged.

What then must be done? The only way to remove the offence is to confess the sin. The Psalms demonstrate the importance of this with an abundance of expressions in which the psalmist bemoans his sins, transgressions, and iniquities. The Psalms also show that confession of sin is the way to restored fellowship with God. In Psalm 32, David described what life was like when he refused to confess his sins: “When I kept silence, my bones waxed old through my roaring all the day long. For day and night thy hand was heavy upon me: my moisture is turned into the drought of summer” (3-4). But then he notes the result of heartfelt confession: “I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the L ORD; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin” (5). In the same Psalm he exalts in the “blessedness” of the man who is forgiven, and concludes this prayer with rejoicing: “Be glad
in the Lord, and rejoice, ye righteous: and shout for joy, all ye that are upright in heart” (11).

The inspired psalmist demonstrates the proper confession of sins. His confessions are thorough and genuine. He acknowledges how evil his deeds were. He had not merely hurt other people around him, but confessed David, “Against thee, thee only have I sinned” (Ps. 51:4). He had not merely hurt his wife or his parents; his sin was against his Father in heaven, the one whose love is boundless. He confesses not merely that he broke a commandment, but rather acknowledges that he is a vile sinner (“Behold, I was shapen in iniquity….” Ps. 51:5). He fully realizes that he has nothing to bring to God to earn forgiveness, crying out, “If thou, Lord, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand?” (Ps. 130:3).

This is the pattern set forth in the Psalms for being restored to the joys of the life of friendship and experiencing the favor of God. There is forgiveness, but it is in the blood of the sacrifice foreshadowing the cross of Christ. The psalmist indicates that, praying, “Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean” (51:7), the hyssop being the branch with which the people were cleansed through the sprinkling of the blood on them (see Ex. 12:22; Heb. 9:19). Through that forgiveness, the breach to the friendship is removed, and reconciliation is accomplished!

Other times, friendships are ruined, not by a notable offence, but through neglect. In this earthly life one can often find two close friends, who talked often and enjoyed sweet fellowship, but who drifted apart. Perhaps one or both began to have different interests. Perhaps other friends pulled them apart gradually. Perhaps one moved far away and the opportunity to meet was rare. Whatever the cause, they simply ceased talking regularly, and gradually it became harder to enjoy good conversation, and it became a chore, not a joy for these formerly close friends to talk.

That same thing happens between God and His covenant people. But if there is a drifting apart, who moved? God did not—He is changeless. The problem is the neglect of the covenant people. Perhaps they are not faithful in coming to God’s house, maybe even moving away from a faithful church for the sake of better employment. Perhaps they take on new interests that consume their time—a job, school, hobbies, or recreation. They do not spend time with the
Scriptures, nor in meaningful prayer. Perhaps they strike up new friendships—friends with the world, who draw them away from covenant life with God. Covenant people can drift away from the intimacy of covenant life with God.

Do understand, that the one with whom God establishes His covenant of grace in Jesus Christ cannot be lost. He is chosen in Christ, redeemed in His blood, and has eternal life in Him. God does not break His covenant (Ps. 89:34). He chastises, He sends troubles and sorrows, He draws His people back to Himself with bands of love, for the “Lord preserveth all them that love him” (Ps. 145:20).

This dreadful possibility of drifting away from intimate covenant fellowship emphasizes the importance of reading Scripture, praying, and coming to God’s house to worship. Covenant communication must be maintained! Understanding this, the psalmist cries out, “O God, thou art my God; early will I seek thee: my soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee in a dry and thirsty land, where no water is; To see thy power and thy glory, so as I have seen thee in the sanctuary” (Ps. 63:1-2). And, “O how love I thy law! it is my meditation all the day” (Ps. 119:97). And, “It is good for me to draw near to God” (Ps. 73:28). Even then, the psalmist recognizes that all these good desires are but the fruit of the faithful covenant God in His elect child, as he sings, “Blessed is the man whom thou choosest, and causest to approach unto thee, that he may dwell in thy courts: we shall be satisfied with the goodness of thy house, even of thy holy temple” (Ps. 65:4).

The Psalms set forth beautifully the living, personal life of the covenant. They do so by giving the believer the very words to express his joys, sorrows, disappointments, remorse, love, thankfulness, and praise to the great Jehovah. The life of the covenant, that relationship of love and friendship that God establishes with His people in His Son, Jesus Christ, the Psalms are the Spirit-inspired response of the covenant people to the glorious covenant with God. The believer who knows and loves the Psalms will not only know how important is that life with God, he will have the very words to speak to Jehovah in that personal, intimate covenant life.
Martin and Katie Luther: A Reformation Marriage
Angus Stewart

Martin Luther truly declared, “The life of married people, if they are in the faith, deserves to be rated higher than those who are famous for miracles.”¹ He confessed with gratitude that his heavenly Father gave this wonderful gift to him personally, speaking of “the exceedingly happy marriage that has been bestowed upon me by the grace of God.”²

This article commemorates the 500th anniversary of the beginning of the glorious Protestant Reformation by examining one aspect of it that is both highly significant and deeply touching. It considers the marriage between the greatest German Reformer and the most charismatic figure in the Reformation, the one whom God used to begin this great movement of Christ’s Spirit of truth, and Katherine von Bora, a very capable ex-nun with a formidable work rate and a strong personality, a true “help meet” or helper comparable to him (Gen. 2:20), who would not be cowed by her husband’s larger-than-life persona.

This essay begins by tracing the (separate) lives of Martin and Katherine (or Catherine or Kathie or Katie) before their marriage, including analyzing their disparate origins and backgrounds; explaining how she came to hear about him and how he, by God’s illumination, came to see that the sinful vows of monks and nuns should be broken; following the planning of Katie’s great escape from her convent and its execution; and summarizing her first two years as a free and single lady in Wittenberg. Next, we will turn to the very brief courtship of Martin and Katie, their highly unusual wedding, their blessed married and family life, Martin’s death, and Katie’s penurious widowhood.

¹ Quoted in Eric Metaxas, Martin Luther: The Man Who Rediscovered God and Changed the World (USA: Viking, 2017), 338.
² Quoted in Heinz Stade and Thomas A. Siedel, In the Footsteps of Martin Luther, trans. John Gledhill, ed. Malcolm Walters (Germany: Wartburg Verlag, 2010), 197.
and decease. In conclusion, we shall consider the significance of the union between these two remarkable children of God.

**Martin’s and Katie’s Different Backgrounds**

Martin and Katherine Luther were very happily married for over twenty years in sixteenth-century, eastern Germany, yet they were quite different in their backgrounds. Martin was born in Eisleben on November 10, 1483; Katie was born in Lippendorf on January 29, 1499. Thus there were over fifteen years between them.

Martin’s and Katie’s families were not of the same social status. Martin was of hearty peasant stock but his father, Hans, was a copper smelter master in Mansfeld, so his family, economically and socially, was on its way up. Katie’s family was of the minor landed gentry. Hence, her maiden name was von Bora, with “von” indicating nobility. However, economically and socially, Katie’s family was on the way down.

Their own recent economic developments led both of their fathers to plot their children’s education and future. Hans Luther wanted his eldest son to get on in this world as a lawyer, so Martin was sent to schools in Mansfeld, Magdeburg, and Eisenach. Then he was enrolled at the University of Erfurt. After completing the foundation course, he entered the law faculty. Katie’s father, also called Hans, wanted his daughter to become a nun, in part to save him money, for then he would not have to pay a dowry. When five years old, Katie was sent to the Benedictine cloister in Brehna to be educated. When she was ten, Katie was moved to the Cistercian monastery in Nimbschen.

But one earthly father’s will was soon contradicted. It was not Katie who stepped out of her father’s plan. As an obedient daughter, she took her vows as a nun in 1515. It was Martin. His disobedience to his father’s designs was occasioned by an extraordinary event near Stotterheim. He was almost struck by lightning! In sheer terror, Martin cried out, “Help me, St. Anne! I will become a monk.” Young Luther

---

4 Katie’s mother died when she was a baby and her father remarried after he consigned her to the convent (Roland H. Bainton, *Here I Stand: A Life of Martin Luther* [USA: Mentor, 1956], 227).
5 Martin Luther cried out to St. Anne because she was the patron saint of miners—his father’s profession.
Martin and Katie Luther kept his vow. Fifteen days later, he entered a monastery. Later that year (1505), he made another promissory oath: his monastic vows of poverty, celibacy and obedience. Martin’s father was furious, raging that his son had disobeyed him and wasted all the money that he had lavished upon his education. Hans Luther was also deeply grieved that he was not going to have grandchildren through Martin and that his son was going to be poor!

The different circumstances leading to their monastic vows explain the different monasteries that Martin and Katie joined. Young Luther joined the Augustinian monastery in Erfurt, because it was well-known for both its strictness and its scholarship. Martin was determined that he would become a monk with all his might! Katie joined the Cistercian nunnery in Nimbschen because it was the place for the daughters of noblemen—a posher nunnery, if you will.

In their time at school and in their monasteries, Martin and Katie received a good education and useful training that was to serve them well in their lives apart and in their life together. Martin learned (among other things) Latin, the biblical languages of Hebrew and Greek, philosophy, and theology. He also personally experienced the truth that man cannot earn righteousness before God and peace of heart by his own works or will. Katie learned to read and write, as well as some Latin. She acquired skills in cookery and needlecraft, and with herbs and medicine. All of these things would be very helpful in her future marriage, with her children and in her busy family home.6

In their early years, Martin and Katie never met and had not heard of each other. The towns or cities connected with the young Luther were all in the western part of east Germany: Eisleben (where he was born); Mansfeld, Magdeburg, and Eisenach (where he grew up and received his early education); and Erfurt (where he joined the university and later the Augustinian monastery). The places connected with Katie’s childhood were all to the east: Lippendorf (where she

---

6 In the education, training and experiences of the young Martin Luther and Katie von Bora, we have an excellent illustration of the truth that the Lord prepares a man and a woman, and a minister of the Word and his spouse, for their intimately intertwined married life and work together. This too is included in the truth that God “doth yet as with His hand bring unto every man his wife,” as the Reformed “Form for the Confirmation of Marriage Before the Church” puts it.
was born in 1499), Brehna (where she joined the Benedictine cloister in 1504), and Nimbschen (to which she moved in 1509). It would be in Wittenberg to the northeast, where Martin Luther would move in 1511 to teach theology at its relatively new university, and where the two would meet, marry, and spend two fruitful decades together.

How Katie Came to Hear About Martin

Before Katie actually met Martin, she had heard of him through several factors. First, there was a connection between their friends, the Staupitzes. Johann von Staupitz was Martin Luther’s superior, the vicar-general of his monastery. It was Johann who pointed Luther, when troubled with his sins, to forgiveness in the cross of Christ. Staupitz was the one who encouraged Luther to study and teach Scripture and theology. Johann’s sister, Magdalena von Staupitz, was a nun with Katie in Nimbschen. Magdalena heard of Martin and his views from her brother, Johann, and she disseminated Luther’s doctrines to her fellow nuns.

Second, Martin preached on at least two occasions in Grimma, which was just six miles north of Katie’s Nimbschen convent. In 1516 (when Katie was seventeen) and 1519 (when she was twenty), the Augustinian monk proclaimed God’s Word with authority in German (not Latin!). Surely, news of this would have penetrated the walls of the Katie’s nunnery.

Third, Katherine von Bora, like almost everyone else in Germany, would have heard of Martin Luther in connection with the “big events” of his life. In 1517, Luther nailed his Ninety-Five Theses to the Castle Church door in Wittenberg, challenging the sale of indulgences and thereby attacking the papal pocket. Word of this spread like wildfire, after the Ninety-Five Theses were quickly translated into many

---


8 Alexander, Ladies of the Reformation, 75.

languages and spread throughout Europe. Two years later came the Reformer’s famous debate with John Eck in Leipzig (1519), dealing with papal authority, purgatory and indulgences. Katie had spent all her life so far in the region around Leipzig. She must have heard something of this debate. In 1520, Luther was excommunicated by Pope Leo X as a heretic. The German Reformer publicly burnt the papal bull of excommunication on the night of December 10, outside the Elster gate, on the east of Wittenberg. This surely reached the ears of the nuns of Nimbschen. The next year witnessed the earnest monk’s celebrated confession before the Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V, and a vast company of civil and ecclesiastical dignitaries at the Diet of Worms (1521). Katie would have heard of Luther’s bold stand summarized in those immortal words: “Unless I am convinced by Scripture and plain reason, for my conscience is captive to the Word of God, I cannot and I will not recant for it is neither right nor safe for a Christian to go against his conscience. Here I stand. I cannot do otherwise. God help me. Amen.”

Fourth, Katie would have known of, and probably even read, some of Martin’s many books. After all, Luther was the most prolific and most read author of his day. Three of his greatest works were published in 1520: “Address to the German Nobility” (calling upon the nobles to forward the Reformation and advocating the priesthood of all believers), “The Babylonian Captivity of the Church” (an attack on Rome’s sacramental system) and “The Freedom of a Christian Man” (advocating true biblical liberty). Moreover, Luther’s German New Testament was printed in September of 1522.

So already, before they ever met, Katie was able to form a picture of the man, Martin Luther, through the Staupitz connection, reports of his preaching in the area, news of his courageous acts criticizing key elements of Rome’s doctrine and practice, and his books. He was not a heretic, as some claimed. He was a godly monk, a powerful preacher, a forceful writer and a capable theologian. He was also an heroic man of action: nailing his Ninety-Five Theses to the church door, debating Eck in Leipzig, burning the papal bull, and confessing his faith in Worms.

From Luther and the various forces that he set in motion, Katie learned the biblical and Reformation gospel that we are righteous
before God by Christ alone (not Mary or the saints or the church), through faith alone (not our own works or will), by grace alone (not our merit), according to Scripture alone (not false church tradition or papal doctrine) and all to the glory of God alone (not the sinner or the ecclesiastical hierarchy).

So, what was Katie to do? Should she leave the convent? This presented many practical problems. Her family would not like it and society would be outraged. What if she were caught escaping? Furthermore, this was the only life she could remember. After all, she was sent to the cloister when only five years old! Moreover, she had no money for a new life outside the nunnery.

There were also religious and legal issues. It was against the law for anyone to leave a monastery. Katie, like all nuns, had taken vows of obedience (to her monastic superiors), poverty (she must not possess earthly goods) and chastity (courtship and marriage were forbidden her). Leaving the convent and living in ordinary society would likely mean smashing all three vows. These were massive moral and theological issues for a nun in the sixteenth century. Having believed the gospel of Christ, should she forsake the convent? And if so, how and when?

**Martin in the Wartburg Castle**

Now we need to return to Martin Luther. Especially after the Diet of Worms in 1521, his life was in grave danger. For this reason, he went into hiding for some months in the Wartburg, a castle near Eisenach, the town where he had spent three or four of his teenage years (1497/1498-1501) and where some of his relatives lived.¹⁰ To disguise himself, he grew a beard and went by the name Junker George.

The Wartburg Castle has a significant place in German architecture and history. The totalitarian Adolf Hitler called it “the most German of German castles.” It was in the Wartburg, in 1817, that German students adopted a flag of black, red, and gold (the colors of the current German flag) for the united Germany that they desired.¹¹

---

¹⁰ Brecht, *Luther: His Road to Reformation*, 17.
The Wartburg is significant not only for German architecture, German history, German unification, and the German flag, but especially for Martin Luther and his work in producing a German Bible (and thus developing the German language).

During the ten months in 1521-1522 that he spent in the Wartburg, Luther translated the Greek New Testament into German and wrote fourteen Reformation works. Yet he complained that he was often listless and lazy! One of these treatises, “On Monastic Vows” (1521) is of special significance for our present subject. Luther grounds his teaching upon two great gospel truths: justification by faith alone and the priesthood of all believers. He argued that there are no elite groups of Christians, for monks and nuns do not have a higher standard of holiness, and priests are not special mediators with God. Vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience are not biblical. Instead, they arise out of and strengthen the damnable doctrine that man merits and earns with the Almighty. Believing, baptized Christians have evangelical freedom to serve God according to His Word. Luther points out that very few people have the will power to remain celibate throughout their lives and that “it is better to marry than to burn” in lust (I Cor. 7:9). The first commandment is the most basic: The vow to have God alone as our God, so that we believe and follow Him, supersedes legalistic, monastic vows.  

Katie’s Great Escape

These and like arguments persuaded Katie, Magdalena von Staupitz, and ten other nuns at Nimbschen. These twelve ladies were also emboldened by the fact that some monks had recently left the nearby monastery in Grimma. They decided that each of them would write to her parents or guardians to ask if they could return home. Some responded harshly and some responded kindly, but all said, “No!”

12 Cf. *Westminster Confession* 22:7: “No man may vow to do any thing forbidden in the word of God, or what would hinder any duty therein commanded, or which is not in his own power, and for the performance whereof he hath no promise of ability from God. In which respects, Popish monastical vows of perpetual single life, professed poverty, and regular obedience, are so far from being degrees of higher perfection, that they are superstitious and sinful snares, in which no Christian may entangle himself.”

So, Magdalena von Staupitz wrote to Luther on behalf of the dozen nuns. The Reformer agreed that he would help them to escape. He lined up Leonhard Koppe (or Kopp), a sixty-year-old Torgau merchant, to rescue them. Koppe had made deliveries of supplies to the convent, so he knew the layout of the monastery and the roads. He slipped a secret message to the nuns, explaining his plan.

The great escape from Nimbschen convent took place on April 4, the night before Easter Sunday, 1523. Koppe and two friends drove to the convent in a covered wagon carrying barrels of herring. The twelve nuns clambered out of a window and the three men helped them over the boundary wall. The dozen women climbed into a wagon which lumbered off through the dark countryside.

It was a dangerous undertaking. The penalty for abducting nuns was death and their journey took them through the Roman Catholic territory of hostile Ducal Saxony, belonging to Luther’s inveterate enemy, Duke George. But they were not caught. All twelve nuns escaped, smelly but safe! Eventually, Herr Koppe’s covered wagon, with its precious cargo, rolled up at his house in Torgau.

What happened to the twelve (ex) nuns? Three of them went swiftly back to their families. The remaining nine came trundling into Wittenberg in Koppe’s wagon as a special delivery for Dr. Martin Luther! Soon six of them were married off or settled with homes or in employment, leaving just three. Then two of the remaining three got married, leaving just one. You can guess which one remained: Katherine von Bora!

**Katie’s First Two Years in Wittenberg**

So, what about Katie in Wittenberg? That day on which she arrived (April 7, 1523), when she was twenty-four and he was thirty-nine, was the first time that she and Martin met. There was no love at first sight for either of them.

---

14 Brecht, *Luther: Shaping and Defining the Reformation*, 100. Incidentally, Nimbschen convent is only a few miles from the famous Colditz Castle or Oflag IV-C, a World War II prisoner-of-war camp for Allied officers who had repeatedly escaped from other camps.

15 However, Metaxas declares that the oft-repeated story of the twelve nuns hiding in herring barrels is “apocryphal,” a “colorful fiction” based upon a misunderstanding of a recollection of someone still living around 1600 (*Martin Luther*, 306).
Luther wrote a short, oft-reprinted work about the great escape of the nuns: “Why Nuns May, in All Godliness, Leave the Convents: Ground and Reply” (1523). This was the very first time in Reformation history that we read of a group of runaway nuns and it caused a sensation! Evil reports would doubtless circulate from his Roman Catholic adversaries, especially if the incident were hushed up, so Luther made it of necessity a virtue. He publicized the escape to encourage other nuns to follow their example and break free of their monastic shackles.

The Reformer explained that the natural calling of (most) women is to marry and have children. Since the parents and relatives of these nuns had failed to act, the brave Leonhard Koppe had rescued them. Some may say that Koppe was a robber but, if so, he was a “blessed robber”!16 In this work, Luther even mentioned by name the nine ex-nuns who arrived in Wittenberg. Along with Magdalena von Staupitz and the names of seven others was Katherine von Bora—the German Reformer’s first written reference to her.

For her first two years in Wittenberg, Katie was housed with two families. First, she stayed with Philip Reichenbach, a distinguished lawyer and the Wittenberg town clerk, and his wife, who were childless. Then she lived in the home of the famous painter, Lucas Cranach the Elder, and his wife.

During this time, Katie was not without marriage proposals and had at least two suitors. First, there was a young patrician, Jerome Baumgartner, who was a Wittenberg student. He wanted to marry her and she wanted to marry him, but his wealthy parents put the kibosh on it, deeming the poor girl unsuitable. Next, there was Dr. Kasper Glatz (or Glacius), a pastor. He wanted to marry her but Katie had “neither desire nor love” for him.17 Then Katie told Nicholas von Amsdorf, Luther’s fellow Reformer, that she would be open to a proposal from either him or Martin!

But Martin had no intention of marrying Katie.18 Several difficul-

16 Brecht, *Luther: Shaping and Defining the Reformation*, 100.
18 Around this period, Martin considered marrying two different women, both called Ave (or Eva): Ave Alemann and Ave von Schönfeld (or Schönfeld) (Brecht, *Luther: Shaping and Defining the Reformation*, 197).
ties applied to his marrying any woman. He thought that he was too old at forty-one. And he expected that he would be martyred. This was around the hottest period in the German Peasants’ Revolt (1524-1526) and Luther knew that his enemies would say that he only formed his doctrines and attacked the pope in order to get a wife. Besides, he was not especially attracted to Katie. Some thought—and Luther did too!—that she was haughty and bossy.

However, as the Reformer thought about it, he realized that he needed a wife, that his marrying would be practicing what he had preached to others and that he would be setting a good example to those who had been Roman monks or priests. Philip Schaff summarizes Luther’s thinking: “By taking to himself a wife, he wished to please his father, to tease the Pope, and to vex the Devil.”19 The ex-Augustinian monk reckoned that his marrying would make the angels laugh and the demons weep. Eric Metaxas expresses the revolutionary nature of this action in language akin to that of Luther himself: “To someone for whom spiritual warfare was quite real, the act of marrying a nun was as though he had delivered a whirling roundhouse kick to the devil’s own snout.”20 So he decided to marry Katherine von Bora. “Unanimously [his] friends reacted negatively: ‘not that one, someone else!’”21

The Wedding of Martin and Katie

Both in Luther’s day and ours, there is usually a lengthy gap between the day of one’s engagement, and the wedding day and reception. But there were highly unusual circumstances in the case of the German Reformer, as well as criticisms and rumors that he wanted to forestall.22 “Why is he getting married? Why is he getting married now, in the midst of the Peasants’ Revolt? Why is he getting married to this woman?”

So, Dr. Luther and Katie von Bora became engaged and married

20 Metaxas, Martin Luther, 338.
21 Brecht, Luther: Shaping and Defining the Reformation, 198.
all on one day. The wedding took place in the Augustinian monastery, where Martin lived. Only a small group of five were present with the happy couple, including Pastor Johannes Bugenhagen who officiated. The date was June 13, 1525. It was a Tuesday, the usual day for weddings at that time. Since there was no time between Luther’s engagement and his wedding day, there was no opportunity to discuss the merits or demerits of his approaching marriage with Katie. Luther simply presented the world with a *fait accompli*: “We are married; now deal with it!”

Having united their engagement and wedding on the one day, Martin and Katie Luther separated their wedding from the wedding procession to the church and the reception. On June 27, over two weeks after their wedding, at 10 o’clock in the morning, the couple went in procession to the town church for a blessing. The bells rang out and the crowd rejoiced. Later, there was a banquet at the Augustinian monastery. Amongst many others, Leonhard Koppe, the merchant who had rescued Katie from Nimbschen convent two years before, was invited. Both of Martin Luther’s parents were also there. Martin’s message to them was, in effect: “I was wrong to have become a monk. Now I have married. God willing, we will have children and you will have grandchildren!”

Not everyone was pleased. Philip Melanchthon, Luther’s fellow Reformer in Wittenberg, thought that, with the Peasants’ Revolt going on, the timing was inappropriate. He was annoyed that Luther did not take him into his confidence regarding the wedding and that he was not invited to it. Yet, in time, he got over it.

The papal party, consisting of both Roman apologists and people, discoursed in a hyper-pious manner concerning the sanctity of monastic vows. They claimed that Katherine was a prostitute, and that she and Martin had been fornicating together. The papists recalled

23 Metaxas, *Martin Luther*, 344.
24 Strangely enough, Mary and I were married 475 years later to the very day on June 13, 2000, which also happened to be a Tuesday! We were unaware of this when we picked a date for our wedding some months before.
25 I am not suggesting that others emulate Martin Luther in this regard. He was a great man and was in a practically unique situation.
the old notion that the Antichrist would be the spawn of a monk and a nun. “Perhaps Martin and Katie would beget him?” they mused. 28

King Henry VIII had crossed swords earlier with Luther. The English monarch wrote his “Defence of the Seven Sacraments” (1521) against the German Reformer, for which Pope Leo X declared him *Fidei Defensor* (Defender of the Faith). In Luther’s response, he declared that Henry was king by the “disgrace of God.” So, upon hearing of Martin’s marriage to Katie, Henry wrote a vituperative letter, calling the Reformer a “mangy dog” and a “Hell-wolf.” These were two of Henry’s milder expressions. 29

Erasmus of Rotterdam, the learned humanist, was currently in the midst of a battle with Luther over the will of fallen man. The Dutchman repeated the slanderous charges against Luther and Katie, though he later apologized. In the first few months of their marriage, Luther would write probably his greatest work *The Bondage of the Will* (December 1525), against Erasmus and the heresy of free will. Katie strongly encouraged Martin to defend the truth against the humanist—a blessed ministry of encouragement in a worthy cause that, all by itself, endears every Reformed Christian to Mrs. Luther! 30

**The Married Life of Martin and Katie**

Living with Katie in a renovated part of the Augustinian monastery was a radical change for Dr. Luther. She sorted out his bed, which was stained with mildew and fouled with sweat. He had not made it for a year! 31 Martin refers to their “pillow weeks,” when the two of them slept on one pillow. 32 He states that, after forty-one years of singleness, waking up to see “pigtails” next to him took a bit of getting used to.

God gave to Dr. and Mrs. Luther six children in this order: boy, girl; girl, boy; boy, girl. Five years after the birth of their sixth child, a seventh was on the way but Katie had a miscarriage (1539).

Regarding the three boys, Hans, who was named after both of his
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28 If the Antichrist really is to be the bastard child of a monk and a nun, it is a wonder that he has not come already, given the fornication during many centuries of monasticism!

29 MacCuish, *Luther and His Katie*, 36.


grandfathers, studied law and became a court adviser; Martin, who was named after his father, studied theology but never became a pastor (he died aged only 33); and Paul, who was named after his father’s favorite apostle, studied medicine and became a famous physician.33

Sadly, Elizabeth, the Luthers’ first girl, died after just eight months. Magdalene (or Lena) was born exactly one year after Elizabeth’s death (May 4 or 5) and her parents saw her as a divine replacement.34 By all accounts, Magdalene was a lovely, godly girl, but she died in her father’s arms aged just thirteen. Both her parents were devastated and it took them a long time to recover. Margarete (or Margaretha) was the last child born to Martin and Katie.35

Luther was deeply concerned that believers bring up their children in the fear of the Lord. His commitment to Christian education and Christian day schools is evident even in his early works and this only increased over time. The Reformer declared,

But where the Holy Scripture does not rule I certainly advise no one to send his child. Everyone not unceasingly occupied with the Word of God must become corrupt; therefore we must see what people in the higher schools are and grow up to be…I greatly fear that schools for higher learning are wide gates to hell if they do not diligently teach the Holy Scriptures and impress them on the young folk.36

Katie had a massive portfolio in their life together. She was a real Proverbs 31 woman. She ran, in effect, a boardinghouse. Besides her own six children, she cared for up to six or seven orphans.37 She also

33 Hans was also named after his godfather and Luther’s pastor, Johannes Bugenhagen (Metaxas, Martin Luther, 355).
34 Like Seth in Genesis 4:25.
35 Interestingly, Margarete was an ancestress of Paul von Hindenburg (1847-1934), the German military hero of World War I and the elected President of the Weimar Republic (1925-1934). When he died, Hitler overthrew constitutional government in Germany.
36 Quoted in Ewald M. Plass, What Luther Says (St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1959), 449.
37 Brecht, Luther: Shaping and Defining the Reformation, 204; Martin Brecht, Martin Luther: The Preservation of the Church, 1532-1546, trans. James L. Schaaf (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1999), 238.
took in paying students, to supplement the Luthers’ limited income, as well as other guests. Their home in the Augustinian monastery typically numbered up to thirty or so people.

The vegetables Martin grew in his garden included peas, beans, lettuce, cabbage, radishes, strawberries, cucumbers, and melons. But Mrs. Luther managed the farm: Zulsdorf (or Zöllsdorf). Her fruit trees produced apples, pears, peaches, grapes, nuts, and figs. Trout, carp, pike, and perch were in her fish pond. For livestock, Katie had pigs, ducks, hens, and cows, which she bred, sold, and butchered. All were needed to feed their children, borders and guests.

Katie even ran a brewery. For this, she had a license from the Elector of Saxony. Her beer was of good quality, and was highly praised by her husband and others.

Of course, Katie could not do all of this work directly and personally. The Luthers had menservants (including Wolfgang Sieberger, the gardener and Luther’s personal servant) and maidservants, but they needed instruction and oversight.

Katie was Martin’s treasurer, for he was no good with money and was a soft touch for ne’er-do-wells. She served as a nurse for her husband, who was often sick, especially in 1527, and many others. Katie was also the Reformer’s masseuse.

Martin had many pet names for his wife, including “the morning star of Wittenberg” (she got up at 4 A.M.), “the Lady of Zulsdorf,” “the Lady of the pig market,” “Lady Luther,” “my Lord Katie,” “my Empress” and “my rib.” Martin Luther loved her dearly and praised

38 Bainton, *Here I Stand*, 228; MacCuish, *Luther and His Katie*, 41-42.
39 According to Gertrude Hoeksema, there was something of this in Herman Hoeksema, for he was too easily taken in by unscrupulous salesmen, so his wife would help to keep him straight (*Therefore Have I Spoken* [USA: RFPA, 1969], 215).
40 Bainton mentions Luther’s gout, insomnia, catarrh, haemorrhoids, constipation, kidney stones, dizziness and tinnitus, as well as the cataract in one of his eyes (*Here I Stand*, 228).
41 Bainton, *Here I Stand*, 228.
42 Martin’s reference to Katie as his “rib” is an allusion to Genesis 2:22. This verse also states that God “built” Eve from the rib of Adam to be his wife. Commenting on this, Luther wrote, “There are not only men who think it clever to find fault with the opposite sex and to have nothing to do with
her highly. “My Katie is in all things so obliging and pleasing to me that I would not exchange my poverty for the riches of Croesus,” he wrote in a letter of August 11, 1526. He reckoned her of greater worth than Venice or France. The Reformer referred to Galatians, that great antithetical book on justification by faith alone, as “his Katie,” as a sign of his deep affection for both the epistle and the woman. He also “liked to tease his Katie.”

Katie was even included in Luther’s famous “table talk.” Luther’s friends, theologians, students, and visiting dignitaries would be present to discuss the Scriptures, philosophy, the church, and the big issues of the day. Normally, this was an all-male preserve but an exception was made for Lady Luther.

Their home life together was rich and blessed. Besides their family devotions, in 1535 Martin promised Katie fifty gulden if she would read through the Bible from cover to cover, which she did. No one knows, though, where the money came from! As well as Scripture, prayer, and hard work, the Luther home was filled with singing. The German Reformer reckoned that music was the second greatest gift of God, only behind theology. He loved several-part harmonies.

Dolina MacCuish notes that “Luther had a bowling alley built at the back of the monastery and often led the game himself.” His family also made time for picnics:

Out through the Elster Gate [on the east of Wittenberg] and less than a quarter of a mile from the town was a well which Luther had discovered and renewed in 1520. There in 1526 he built a little summer house and often he and Katie relaxed there with their friends. While the children played together…the grown-ups chatted and laughed,

...marriage but also men who, after they have married, desert their wives and refuse to support their children. Through their baseness and wickedness these people lay waste God's building, and they are really abominable monsters of nature. Let us, therefore, obey the Word of God and recognize our wives as a building of God.”

44 Schaff, The German Reformation, 461.
45 Brecht, Luther: The Preservation of the Church, 246.
46 MacCuish, Luther and His Katie, 61.
the women perhaps sewing or knitting as they joined in the general conversation or exchanged recipes and news.\textsuperscript{47}

**Martin’s Death and Katie’s Widowhood**

Together, Martin and Katie shared their lives and experienced the Reformation struggles for over two decades. When the great man died in Eisleben, which was also the place of his birth, aged sixty-two, on February 18, 1546, Katie was not there. Of his family, only his two youngest sons, Martin and Paul, were present.\textsuperscript{48} Katie knew that her husband was in bad health and had begged him not to go to Eisleben to try to reconcile the counts of Mansfeld. Many letters had passed to and fro between them during this trip but Katie was never to see her Martin alive again. A scrap of paper containing Martin Luther’s last remaining words was found in his pocket on his deathbed. At the very end comes this poignant line: “We are beggars: this is true.”

The Reformer’s coffin was carried in procession from Eisleben, where he was born and died, to Wittenberg, the chief seat of his labors. Masses of people lined the streets as the body of the great theologian, preacher, pastor, author, and controversialist passed by. They came to honor the monk who shook the world! The funeral cortège processed from the Elster gate on the east, near where Luther burned the papal bull a quarter of a century before, to the Castle Church on the west on February 22, 1546. The route took them past the Augustinian monastery, Philip Melanchthon’s house, the university, the town church, the Cranach house, and more. Katie was, of course, the chief mourner. He was buried in the Castle Church, underneath the pulpit. Pastor Bugenhagen preached on I Thessalonians 4:13-14. Melanchthon gave the funeral oration or eulogy.

Understandably, Katie was distraught. In a letter written a few weeks after her husband’s death, she lamented,

For who would not be sad and afflicted at the loss of such a precious man as my dear lord was? He did great things not just for a city or a single land, but for the whole world. Therefore I am truly so deeply grieved that I cannot tell a single person of the great pain that is in my heart. And I do not understand how I can cope with this. I cannot eat

\textsuperscript{47} MacCuish, *Luther and His Katie*, 50.

\textsuperscript{48} MacCuish, *Luther and His Katie*, 72.
or drink, nor can I sleep. And if I had had a principality or an empire and lost it, it would not have been as painful as it is now that the dear Lord God has taken from me this precious and beloved man, and not from me alone, but from the whole world.49

In 1547, one year after the Reformer’s burial, war broke out between the Roman Catholic forces and the Lutheran princes. Wittenberg fell to the emperor’s army but Katie had already fled. Charles V stood in the Castle Church in front of Luther’s grave. He was the very one before whom the Reformer stood at the Diet of Worms over a quarter of a century before. One of the emperor’s men urged him to desecrate Luther’s burial site but Charles firmly refused.

Luther’s last will and testament is significant. According to Sax-on inheritance law, his goods would have gone almost entirely to his remaining children; but the Reformer determined that, apart from the books he owned, all of the little he possessed would go to Katie.50 He gave three reasons for this: first, she had faithfully loved him and their children; second, she would be enabled to pay any remaining debts he had; third, he did not want her to be dependent on their children. Despite Luther’s will, his widow was poor for the rest of her life.

J. H. Alexander gives three reasons that explain how Luther’s widow came to be destitute: “Katherine’s beloved little farm lay directly in the path of the war, heavy war taxes impoverished her and many others, and the whole disastrous upheaval diverted the attention of her benefactors, sincere as their promises had been.”51 The Lutheran King of Denmark was amongst those who later sent Luther’s widow financial support. One of Katie’s friends drew an important lesson regarding the comfort of memorized Scripture, even decades after it was first committed to memory: “I often think of that man of God, Dr. Martin Luther, how he made his wife commit to memory Psalm 31 when she was young, vigorous, and cheerful and could not then know how this psalm would afterwards be so sweet and consolatory to her in her sorrows.”52

Five years after her first flight, widow Luther again had to make

49 Quoted in Metaxas, *Martin Luther*, 432.
50 Brecht, *Luther: The Preservation of the Church*, 244.
a hasty departure from Wittenberg—not this time because of war but due to the black plague in the town. As the wagon jolted, she fell out into an icy ditch. The shock and chill brought on a fever. Katie lodged on the first floor of a house in Torgau, not far from the home of Leonhard Koppe, the merchant who had rescued her from Nimbschen convent.\textsuperscript{53} Katie never regained her strength but grew weaker and weaker. She developed pneumonia and died on December 20, 1552, Luther’s widow of almost seven years. During her three months in Torgau, she spoke often of her beloved husband. On her deathbed, she confessed, “I will cleave to Christ as the burr to the cloth.” Katie was buried in the nearby Torgau church.\textsuperscript{54}

\textbf{The Significance of the Union of Martin and Katie}

Martin Luther had an extremely prominent role in the sixteenth-century recovery of the gospel and thus the Reformation of theology, preaching, the church, ethics, education, and the home. He affected the reformation of marriage more than any other man through his powerful writings and sermons, his larger-than-life personality, and his godly example with Katie and their children.\textsuperscript{55} He exposed and cleared away the false view of marriage as one of Rome’s seven sacraments, though he did not positively develop the doctrine of marriage by, for example, relating it closely to God’s unbreakable covenant of grace, as did Herman Hoeksema and the Protestant Reformed Churches (PRC) over four hundred years later.\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{53} Part of the house in which Mrs. Luther stayed is now a museum. It contains, among other things, Katie's wedding ring.

\textsuperscript{54} On April 25, 1945, two weeks before Germany's unconditional surrender in World War II, the US troops moving east and the Soviet troops moving west met at Torgau. This is commemorated by a monument by the River Elbe, which flows to the east of the town (Stade and Siedel, \textit{In the Footsteps of Martin Luther}, 191).

\textsuperscript{55} Katie has even been called “the mother of the Reformation.”

\textsuperscript{56} However, Luther did, on occasion, speak of marriage as a covenant bond. He called it “a covenant of fidelity. The whole basis and essence of marriage is that each gives himself or herself to the other, and they promise to remain faithful to each other and not give themselves to any other. By binding themselves to each other, and surrendering themselves to each other, the way is barred to the body of anyone else, and they content themselves in the
Luther brought the truth of marriage, as he did with just about everything, into a vital relationship with the gospel of free justification, including the non-imputation of sin (Ps. 32:1-2; Rom. 4:6-8):

God thus deals graciously with marriage. Although marriage is naturally impure [since the Fall], it is in fact not impure for those who are Christians and live in faith. Rather, their marriage bed is now called pure [cf. Heb. 13:4], not because it is inherently pure in and of itself or as a result of our nature, but because God covers its impurity with his grace and does not impute the natural sin and impurity which the devil has planted within us. Go, then, and purify this station in life with God’s work and proclaim that it is now a divine and holy station. God does not do this by removing passion or married love or by forbidding the marital act, even though we cannot do it without sinning…. Rather, it is purified because God in his grace proclaims it to be pure and does not impute the sin that is now part of our nature.57

Luther also changed the ideal. Holy people do not have to be celibate, as nuns or monks or priests. In the Reformation doctrine of sanctification and the Christian life, there are not two tiers of morality, with Christian perfection only possible to the celibate clergy with their supposedly greater “merit.” Monastic world-flight and asceticism were banished. Luther proclaimed by word and life that Christians have a high and glorious calling in marriage and in the home; as husbands and wives; as fathers, mothers, and children, living out of faith in Jesus Christ and in thankful obedience to the Scriptures, and so serving the glory of God.58

Philip Schaff writes of the Reformers and especially Martin Luther that “it was their mission to introduce by example as well as by precept, a new type of Christian morality, to restore and re-create clerical family life, and to secure the purity, peace and happiness of marriage bed with their one companion” (quoted in Paul Althaus, *The Ethics of Martin Luther*, trans. Robert C. Schultz [Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2007], 92). For the PRC doctrine of marriage, see, e.g., David J. Engelsma, *Marriage, the Mystery of Christ and the Church: The Covenant-Bond in Scripture and History* (Grandville, MI: RFPA, rev. 1998).

58 The German Reformer also did justice to the dignity of a godly, single life, as per the apostle in 1 Corinthians 7 (cf. Plass, *What Luther Says*, 886-887; Althaus, *The Ethics of Martin Luther*, 87-88).
innumerable homes.”59 Roland Bainton observes that the former Augustinian monk “did more than any other person to determine the tone of German domestic relations for the next four centuries.”60 Owen Chadwick explains,

The Luther that survived in the memory of Germany was not Luther the friar but Luther the father of a family. During the Peasants’ War he married an ex-nun, Catherine von Bora, and lived with her in the empty house of the Austin Friars.... Catherine, plain in features and unadorned in dress, was an excellent and busy housewife.... The characteristic memory of Luther is of a man presenting at his own table, with his colleagues and friends around, arguing with him, listening to his divinity, his politics, and his humour.61

The great school for godly character, and the place where Christ and His church are especially to be served, is not the monastery but the Christian home, through marriage and with one’s family.62 Christendom would be reformed not through the keeping of monastic vows but through the keeping of wedding vows and baptismal vows.

Just look at the destruction caused by Rome’s doctrine of the “celibacy” of priests and monks. Its “forbidding to marry” is a “doctrine of devils” (I Tim. 4:1-3), as Luther repeatedly pointed out.63 It

59 Schaff, The German Reformation, 476.
60 Bainton, Here I Stand, 233.
62 William G. Naphy provides a fine summary: “Protestants did reject the idea that celibacy was possible for almost anyone through vows and the active aid of the Holy Spirit—the notion underpinning the Catholic approach to monks, nuns and celibate parish priests. Luther and the other reformers held that very few were 'gifted' with celibacy, and that the vast majority of people should marry. This resulted, accidentally, in the family acquiring an enormous elevation in status. In particular, the family of the pastor became the model for the rest of society, rather than, like a priest, being set off as different. For Lutherans, this also meant the reinterpretation of Mary as the dutiful, ideal housewife and mother, rather than as the Virgin Queen of Heaven” (The Protestant Revolution From Martin Luther to Martin Luther King Jr [Great Britain: BBC Books, 2008], 62).
63 Cf. Plass, What Luther Says, 890.
often leads to fornication and even, as we are seeing especially in our day, to paedophilia and sodomy, for the vast majority of paedophile priests molest boys and not girls. These gross sins against the seventh commandment by its clergy have been covered up for decades and centuries by Rome through pressurizing the victims into silence and moving the criminals off to other places. This is a gross perversion of church discipline and another unmistakable manifestation that it is a false church (Belgic Confession, Art. 29).

It has been rightly stated that “Perhaps the clearest, and surely the most momentous, of historic love affairs was that of Friar Martin and Sister Catherine…. The act, symbolizing and crowning the whole revolt from Rome, created an immense sensation throughout Europe.”64 By living and teaching the truth of Scripture, including his influential expositions of Psalms 127 and 128, Luther set forth the glory of the Christian home and the pastor’s home. Thereby, as he put it, he was blessed as no bishop had been for a thousand years because he had the love of a “fruitful vine” of a wife and “children like olive plants about [his] table” (Ps. 128:3).

64 P. Smith and H. Gallinger, quoted in Plass, What Luther Says, 888, n.5.
George Martin Ophoff: A Bibliography (1)
Douglas Kuiper

In the beginning, there were three—three ministers who, with large segments of their consistories, were deposed from the Christian Reformed Church in North America (CRCNA). Three ministers who served the first three congregations of what later became the Protestant Reformed Churches in America (PRCA). Three ministers who trained prospective pastors in a fledgling seminary.

One of them, Herman Hoeksema (1886-1965), is well remembered today. He was the pastor of Eastern Avenue CRC in Grand Rapids, MI until 1924, and then became the pastor of the First PRC of Grand Rapids. Hoeksema was a prolific author, whose writings can be found in the Standard Bearer, in several books published by the RFPA, and in other pamphlets and works published by various bodies. In addition, one can readily find biographies of him.¹

Almost forgotten is Henry Danhof (1879-1952), pastor of First CRC of Kalamazoo, MI until January 1925, and thereafter of the PRC in Kalamazoo. Rev. Andrew Lanning renewed our acquaintance with Rev. Danhof by a series of articles that were published in the Standard Bearer about ten years ago.² These articles covered the

¹ The most familiar biography was written by his daughter-in-law, and published shortly after his death: Gertrude Hoeksema, Therefore Have I Spoken: A Biography of Herman Hoeksema (Jenison, MI: Reformed Free Publishing Association, 1969). A more intimate account of Hoeksema’s life written by his daughter: Lois E. Kregel, Just Dad: Stories of Herman Hoeksema (Jenison, MI: Reformed Free Publishing Association, 2014). The most critical was written by one who never knew Hoeksema personally: Patrick Baskwell, Herman Hoeksema: A Theological Biography. The book was written as a thesis for an advanced degree. It has no publication information, but is available through www.lulu.com.

² Seven articles by Rev. Andrew Lanning appeared in the Standard Bearer volumes 84-86. They include: “Henry Danhof (1) An Introduction,”
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life of Henry Danhof from his birth to his deposition from the CRC in 1925. Danhof’s influence on the PRC in her formative years was significant, but his exit from the PRC in 1927 limited his influence on the denomination.

Most who are acquainted with the history of the formation of the PRC know the name of the third: George Martin Ophoff (1891-1962). From 1922-1924 Ophoff pastored the Hope CRC, and from 1924-1929 the Hope PRC, located in what was then the Township of Walker, MI. He pastored the PRC in Byron Center, MI from 1929-1945. From 1925 to 1945, in addition to his pastoral work, he served as professor in the Protestant Reformed Theological Seminary, and from 1945-1959 he was a full-time professor in the seminary. Both as pastor and professor, he played a significant role in the preservation of the PRC, not only as an institution, but more importantly as a body of churches that were faithful to the doctrines of sovereign grace.

Though not forgotten in name, Ophoff has been overlooked in scholarship. That he wrote prolifically the following bibliography will demonstrate. However, most of his writings have not been published. Those that have been published are not widely distributed. No book-length biography of Ophoff exists. To my knowledge, only one man, Prof. Herman Hanko, has done any biographical work regarding him. Hanko’s contributions are included in the bibliography that follows.

This article begins a bibliography of George M. Ophoff.

Usually, the bibliography of a person begins with primary sources (writings by him), and then moves on to secondary sources (writings about him). I will reverse that order, largely because we can treat the secondary sources quickly, and the primary sources will take longer to organize. In this article, I will first note the secondary sources, then those primary sources that were published outside of the Standard Bearer. That they were “published outside of the Standard Bearer” does not mean that they are not also found in the Standard Bearer; in January 1, 2008 (84:160-2); “Henry Danhof (2) Danhof’s Early Years,” February 1, 2008 (84:208-10); “Henry Danhof (3) The Pastor of Sully CRC,” April 1, 2008 (84:294-7); “Henry Danhof (4) The Pastor of Dennis Avenue CRC,” August 2008 (84:443-5); “Henry Danhof (5) Standing in the Gap in Kalamazoo,” November 15, 2008 (85:92-94); “Henry Danhof (6) Danhof and Common Grace,” September 1, 2009 (85:471-3); and “Henry Danhof (7) Deposed and Cast Out,” November 15, 2009 (86:89-91).
fact, some are. But one can access them today without going to the Standard Bearer. In future articles I will classify and list his writings in the Standard Bearer.

In brackets next to each work, I indicate where the work can be found. The Library of Congress call numbers indicate where a book can be found in the library of the Protestant Reformed Theological Seminary. The term “PRC Archives” refers to the archives of the PRC, which are housed in a special room in the seminary building.

Although this bibliography will be comprehensive, I cannot claim that it will be complete, simply because it is a bibliography only of those works available to me. I welcome any help from our readership in finding additional resources relating to Ophoff.

My desire, subject to God’s will, is that this bibliography will provide a foundation for future scholarship relating to George M. Ophoff.

SECONDARY SOURCES


Hoeksema, Herman. “Entered Into Rest.” Standard Bearer, vol. 38, no. 18 (July 1, 1962), 413. This editorial appeared immediately after Ophoff’s death. [BX 9651.S71 v. 38]


Ophoff, Herman. “A Tribute to My Father.” [PRC Archives].


In addition to the above-mentioned resources, many articles and notices in the Standard Bearer, especially in the first 38 volumes,
contain references to Ophoff. God willing, I will study these in more
detail to glean more information.

PRIMARY SOURCES
NOT PUBLISHED IN THE STANDARD BEARER

Sermons
Reformed Witness Hour Radio Sermons (written). [PRC Archives
and/or BX 9650 S2 R28].
? indicates that the numbering and/or date is out of sequence for
inexplicable reasons.
* indicates that the sermon is also available in audio format.

Exodus 9:16, “The Lord Maketh Pharaoh to Stand” (#242, 8/31/1947)
Exodus 9:13-14, “All God’s Plagues on Pharaoh’s Heart” (#246,
9/28/1947)
Exodus 4:2-4, “The Miracle of the Rod” (#247, 10/05/1947)
Exodus 12:13, “God Seeing the Blood” (#248, 10/12/1947)
Exodus 12:07, “Eating the Lord’s Passover” (#249, 10/19/1947)
Exodus 14:19, “God’s People Live Alone” (#250, 10/26/1947)
Ruth 1:15, 16, “Intreat Me not to Leave Thee” (#196, 10/13/1946) *
reel to reel, archives
1 Samuel 1:11, “Hannah’s Vow” (#133?, 10/20/1946)
1 Samuel 2:01, “The Lord’s Salvation” (10/20/1946?)
Job 42:5,6, “Indestructibility of Faith” (#161, 8/05/1945)
Ecclesiastes 1:1, “Vanity of Vanities” (#162, 8/19/1945)
Isaiah 49:13, “God’s Unfailing Love for Zion,” (10/01/1944) * no
written form of this sermon can be found; it is found in audio form
at www.prica.org/resources/sermons/audio.
Isaiah 49:14-16, “God’s Love for Zion” (#122, 9/17/1944)
Isaiah 53:1, “The Arm of the Lord Revealed” (#265, 2/08/1948)
Isaiah 53:2, “The Glory of Christ Heavenly” (#266, 2/15/1948)
Isaiah 53:3-5, “Jesus, The Man of Sorrows” (#267, 2/22/1948)
Isaiah 53:6-7, “Christ Brought as a Lamb to the Slaughter” (#268,
2/29/1948)
Protestant Reformed Theological Journal

Isaiah 53:8-9, “Christ Alone in His Sufferings” (#269, 3/07/1948)
Isaiah 53:9-10, “Christ Sees His Seed” (#270, 3/14/1948)
Isaiah 53:11-12, “The Risen Christ” (#271, 3/21/1948)
Matthew 6:5-6, “Praying to the Father” (#408, 11/05/1950)
Romans 1:16, “Not Ashamed of the Gospel” (#184, 7/07/1946) * reel to reel, archives
Romans 1:16, 17, “Power of God unto Salvation” (#185, 7/14/1946) * reel to reel, archives
Romans 1:17, “For Therein Is the Righteousness of God Revealed” (#657, 8/14/1955)
Romans 5:1-2, “Rejoicing in Hope” (#658, 8/21/1955)
Romans 5:6-9, “Christ Died for the Ungodly” (#659, 8/28/1955)
Romans 9:20-21, “The Potter and the Clay” (#244, 9/14/1947)
1 Corinthians 13:12 (untitled; #80?, 1945/8/12)
1 John 3:1-3, “Father’s Love” (#181, 6/21/1946)

Other Sermons
Colossians 3:1-4, “Risen with Christ.” Unknown date and location. Archives only.

Pamphlets/booklets
“The Doctrine of Sovereign Elective Grace.” Grand Rapids, MI: Mission Committee of the Protestant Ref. Churches, undated. 24 pages. This pamphlet was reproduced in the May 1, 1932 issue of the Standard Bearer (8:344-349). A more recent version (1997) with brief introduction has been published by the Peace
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Protestant Reformed Church, Lansing, IL. [BT 761 O63; www.prca.org/resources/publications/pamphlets/item/573-gods-sovereign-elective-grace].

“God’s Promise and His Promises: Reply to Rev. A. Petter” and “A False Charge Unmasked: Reply to Rev. A. Cammenga.” Grand Rapids, MI: Consistory of the First Protestant Reformed Church, 1953. 23 pages. These two articles are responses to a letter Rev. Petter wrote to the consistory of the First PRC and published in the *Reformed Guardian* (August 8, 1953), and to an article of Rev. A. Cammenga in the same issue of *Reformed Guardian*. They are, of course, relevant to the 1953 controversy in the PRC. [BX 9654 O63 1953]

Seminary class notes published by the Protestant Reformed Theological Seminary

“Ancient Church History.” 261 pages. This volume covers introductory material and the history of the church until about the year 500. Ophoff also wrote on this time period in a series of articles in the *Standard Bearer*. To be investigated is the question whether the *Standard Bearer* articles or these class notes are older, and whether the newer of them is merely a duplication of the older, or a revision. [BR 165 O63]

“Church Right.” 152 pages. This volume covers introductory notes for church polity, and Ophoff’s exposition of Articles 1-70 of the Church Order. His explanation of Articles 71-86 is found in another volume (see “Poimenics” below). [BV 601 O63]

“Old Testament History.” 826 pages, in 4 volumes. These cover introductory material and the history of the Old Testament from creation through Israel’s wilderness wanderings. At times some of the material is covered twice, and the pagination is not always successive. [BS 1192.5 O63, v. 1-4]

“Poimenics.” 20 pages on poimenics proper, and 31 pages covering the last part of the Church Order (see “Church Right” above). These notes treat the pastor’s authority, his gifts (spiritual, natural, and acquired), and the pastor in his personal, family, social, and official life. Fully a quarter of these 20 pages treat the subject of how the pastor should conduct family visitation. [BV 4010 O63]

“Questions on Old Testament History: Sections I-III.” 54 pages.
Section one covers the ten plagues; section two, the twelve prophets and the later kings of Judah; section three is a longer survey of the history of Israel and Judah after the division during the time of Rehoboam. To a good number of questions, Ophoff’s answer is simply to refer to an article that he wrote in the *Standard Bearer*. Other sections of the booklet were clearly reproduced as *Standard Bearer* articles, or from *Standard Bearer* articles. [BS 1192.5 O63]

**Seminary class notes, unpublished [loose-leaf typewritten or handwritten notes, PRC Archives]**

“Old Testament Exegesis.” This folder contains some exegetical work on Isaiah 1 and on Malachi 1, as well as working principles for the interpretation of the prophets.

“Old Testament Isagogics.” “Isagogics” refers to that discipline that studies introductory matters regarding the books of the Bible: human author, date, occasion, purpose, etc. The archives contain two folders of notes, one covering Genesis to Joshua, and the other covering the Old Testament prophets.

“Questions on Church Polity.” The purpose of these questions is not clear; perhaps they formed the basis of a general introduction to the course, or perhaps he used them when questioning students at their oral synodical exams.

“Typology.” These articles contain a study of the Old Testament tabernacle.

Already it is apparent that Ophoff was a prolific writer. His published class notes numbering 1,344 typewritten pages. In addition, he wrote well over 1,000 articles for the *Standard Bearer*, the average length of each being about five pages of rather small type. ●
#11: Calvin’s Doctrine of Sanctification and the Christian Life

Related Topics:
Calvin’s doctrine of the Holy Spirit
Calvin’s “Golden Book of the True Christian Life”
The relation between sanctification and justification—the double grace
The Christian life as a life of self-denial
The Christian life as cross-bearing
The Christian life as living the antithesis
Christ and the law
The Christian and the law
Calvin’s explanation of the Decalogue
Calvin on Marriage and Family


Calvin, John. A Guide to Christian Living, Being Part of Book 3 of the Institutes of the Christian Religion. (This new rendering of a portion of Book 3 of the Institutes by the Banner of Truth Trust was originally published in English under the title Golden Booklet of the True Christian Life. Translated by Henry J. Van Andel and first published in 1952, it was frequently republished. The original
translation was based on the 1559 Latin and 1560 French editions of the *Institutes.*

______. *Commentary on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans.* Romans 6:1-8:39, 121-89.

______. *Commentary on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans.* Romans 10:4, 221-2.


______. *Commentary on the Gospel according to John.* John 17:1-26, part two, 134-52.


______. *John Calvin’s Sermons on the Ten Commandments.* (Sixteen sermons preached between June 7 and July 19, 1555.)


De Klerk, Peter, ed. *Calvin and Christian Ethics: Papers and Re-
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Protestant Reformed Theological Journal
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_____. “Calvin on the Holy Spirit and the Christian Life.” In History and Theology: Festschrift for Professor Hideo Ohki, ed. Furuya Yasuo et al., 3-25.

_____. Calvin’s Concept of the Law.


Jones, Serene. *Calvin and the Rhetoric of Piety*.


Moon, Byung Ho. *Christ the Mediator of the Law: Calvin’s Christological Understanding of the Law as the Rule of Living and Life-Giving.*


Scheuers, Timothy R. “‘So Many Coaxing Nudges’: Rhetorical Per-
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#12: “The Chief Exercise of Faith:” Calvin’s Teaching Concerning Prayer

Related Topics:

- Faith and prayer
- The necessity of prayer
- Objections against prayer
- “The rules of right prayer”
- The confidence of prayer
- The plea for forgiveness of sins as the most important part of prayer
- Prayer in the name of Jesus
- Rejection of Rome’s perversion(s) of prayer
- Public prayer
- Exposition of the Lord’s Prayer
- Patient perseverance in prayer
- Calvin’s own prayers


_____. “The Twenty-First Sermon, which is the Sixth on the Third Chapter, and the First on the Fourth.” *Sermons on the Epistle to the Ephesians*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1974, 303-16.


Calvin’s *Catechism (1537)*, Article 22, “Prayer,” Article 23, “What


Haight, Roger S. J. “Calvin’s Contribution to a Common Ecclesial Spirituality.” In Restoration through Redemption: John Calvin
______. “Calvin’s Interpretation of ‘Hallowed Be Thy Name.’” Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie 60, no. 2 (2013): 396-403.
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#13: Calvin’s Doctrine of the Church

Related Topics:

The essence of the church
The marks of the true church, “mother of the godly”
The worship of the church, including the primacy of the Word in Worship
The proper government of the church, including the offices of elder and deacon
The discipline of the church
Calvin and the Libertines
Calvin and the Nicodemites
Calvin’s ecumenical endeavors
Calvin’s view of missions and the missionary calling of the church


______. Sermons on the Epistle to the Ephesians. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1974:
   a. 25th sermon, Ephesians 4:11, 12, pp. 361-375.
   b. 26th sermon, Ephesians 4:11-14, pp. 376-389.


______. “The Dedicatory Epistle” to Calvin’s Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John, 1-3.


Calvin’s Catechism (1545), Q/A 92-105. In James T. Dennison Jr. Reformed Confessions of the 16th and 17th Centuries in English
John Calvin Research Bibliography
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Johnson, Stephen M. “‘The Sinews of the Body of Christ’ in Calvin’s
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Kuhr, Olaf. “Calvin and Basel: The Significance of Oecolampadius and the Basel Discipline Ordinance for the Institution of Eccle-
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______. John Calvin on the Diaconate.


______. “Ecclesiastical Discipline and Communal Reorganization
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Note: The information on these books is preserved in the format in which it appears in the library catalog program. Hence, the somewhat unusual style.

Biblical Studies / Commentaries

Series
Encountering Biblical Studies: Romans (D. Moo).
Focus on the Bible Series: 1-3 John (J. Hannah).
New International Greek Testament Commentary (Baker)—Mark, Hebrews, 1 Corinthians.
Teach the Text Commentary Series—Exodus, 1 & 2 Samuel, Romans, Revelation.

Individual Titles
Exposition of the Apocalypse / 4th century. Ticonius; Francis X. Gu-
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Additions to PRC Seminary Library


Church History/Biography


Four Hundred Years: Commemorative Essays on the Reformation of Dr. Martin Luther and Its Blessed Results, in the Year of the Four-Hundredth Anniversary of the Reformation / William H. T. Dau; C. Abbetmeyer; Arthur H. C. Both—reprint-pb.—St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing / Forgotten Books, c1916.


The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse: Religion, War, Famine, and Death in Reformation Europe / Andrew Cunningham; Ole Peter Grell—1st-hc.—Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, c2000.


Additions to PRC Seminary Library

**Creeds/Confessions/History of**


**Dogmatics/Theology/Historical Theology**


Death in Adam, Life in Christ: The Doctrine of Imputation / J. V. Fesko; J. V. Fesko and Matthew Barrett—1st-pb.—Fearn, Ross-shire, Great Britain: Mentor, 2016 (Reformed Exegetical Doctrinal Studies Series (R.E.D.S.)).
Additions to PRC Seminary Library


Philosophy/Logic/Ethics
Logic: A God-Centered Approach to the Foundation of Western Thought / Vern S. Poythress—1st-pb.—Wheaton, IL: Crossway, c2013.

Practical Theology/Missions
Servants of the Kingdom: Professionalization among Ministers of the Nineteenth-Century Netherlands Reformed Church / David. Bos; Wim Janse—1st-hc.—Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010. (Brill’s Series in Church History; Religious History and Culture Series; 43).
Misc. (Science, Family, Education, etc.)
Called to Womanhood: A Biblical View for Today’s World / Beth Impson—1st-pb.—Wheaton, IL: Crossway, c2001 (Focal Point Series).

Periodicals (Old & New)
Canadian Reformed Magazine (predecessor to the Clarion), Vols.1-16 (1952-1967)

Significant Additions to the PRC Seminary Library
3rd quarter 2017: July-September

Biblical studies/ Commentaries
Additions to PRC Seminary Library

Reformation Commentary on Scripture, OT & NT (IVP)—I Corinthians (S. Manetsch.

Individual Titles
Protestant Reformed Theological Journal


Church History/Biography


Maarten Luther: Doctor Der Heilige Schrift, Reformator Der Kerk. / Willem J. Kooiman, 1903-1968—2nd-hc.—Amsterdam: W. ten Have, 1948.


Additions to PRC Seminary Library

The Counter-Reformation, 1500-1600 / B. J. Kidd—1st-hc.—London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1933 [Letis collection].


How the Pope Became Infallible: Pius IX and the Politics of Persuasion / August Hasler; Peter Heinegg, transl.—1st-hc.—Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1981 [Letis collection].

The Decline and Fall of the Roman Church / Malachi Martin—1st-hc.—New York: Putnam, 1981 [Letis collection].


Frisians to America, 1880-1914: With the Baggage of the Fatherland / Annemieke Galema—1st-pb.—Groningen, the Netherlands: REGIO-Project Uitgevers, 1996.


Creeds/Confessions/History of

Dogmatics/Theology/Historical Theology
Jerome Zanchi (1516-90) and the Analysis of Reformed Scholastic Christology / Stefan Lindholm—1st-hc.—Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016 (Reformed Historical Theology), vol. 37.
Additions to PRC Seminary Library

The Anatomy of Arminianisme: or the Opening of the Controversies Lately Handled in the Low-Countries, Concerning the Doctrine of Providence, of Predestination, of the Death of Christ, of Nature and Grace / Peter Moulin, 1568–1658—Bound Photocopy.—London: Nathaniel Newbery, 1620.


Philosophy/Logic/Ethics


Practical Theology/Missions


Messages of the Word: Sermons by Ministers of the Reformed Church in America / James F. Zwemer; John W. Beardslee; Ame Vennema; James F. Zwemer—1st-hc.—Holland, MI: Holland Printing Co., 1912.


How to Preach and Teach the Old Testament for All Its Worth / Christopher J. H. Wright—1st-pb.—Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2016.

Misc. (Science, Family, Education, etc.)

*History of Classical Scholarship: From the Sixth Century B.C. to the End of the Middle Ages* / Sir John E. Sandys—3rd-hc.—Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1921 (3 vols., covering all periods of history) [Letis collection].


*The Bible and Christian Education: Papers Delivered at the Educational Convention of the National Union of Christian Schools, 1925* / J. Althuis; G.W. Hylkema; H. Van Zyl—1st-pb.—National Union of Christian Schools, 1925.


**Periodicals (Old & New)**

*9Marks Journal* (Calvinistic Baptist).
The bulk of this small book is demonstration that the theology of Luther is faithful to, and based upon, the theology of the church father, Augustine. Specifically, this is true of what Luther called “the theology of the cross.” By the theology of the cross, Luther referred to the gospel of salvation by the cross of Jesus Christ, as the basis and source of all of salvation. This theology, Luther contrasted with the “theology of glory” of the church of his day—today’s Roman Catholic Church. This church taught, and teaches, salvation by the will and works of the sinner, thus achieving glory apart from, or obscuring, or minimizing, the shame and scandal of the cross.

Luther says that, in order to know God, intellectual knowledge and ethical acceptance of the cross of Christ are necessary. This is because God wills to reveal himself and to be known firstly in the cross. A person who does this is a theologian of the cross because he bases his theological philosophy on the cross. On the contrary, a theologian of glory bypasses the cross of Christ either by denying it or rejecting the theological doctrines that it includes. Therefore, they want to see God in his glory, without passing through the cross of Christ which is, for Luther and Augustine, a necessary intellectual and personal experience. They are “theologians of glory” because they skip the cross of Christ in order to attain the essential glory of God (80).

Fundamental to the “theology of the cross” are the doctrines of total depravity, the bondage of the will, justification by faith alone, and predestination, as the book shows from Luther’s writings. The theology of the cross, therefore, condemns semi-Pelagianism and Pelagianism as the false gos-
pel of glory. For Luther, as for Augustine, a theology that does not “start from” and “properly consider…Jesus Christ” is Pelagian. And Pelagianism, in every form, including semi-Pelagianism and Arminianism, is the grievous heresy of not starting from and properly considering (thus denying) the cross of Jesus Christ.

For the theology of the cross, the right source of the knowledge of God and His truth is required. For Luther, this was the revelation of Scripture. The theology of glory, in contrast, always takes as its source man’s own unaided reason. Human reason, Luther charged, will always produce a theology of glory, that is, a Pelagian “gospel.”

By no means did Luther’s rejection of reason as the source and standard of the knowledge of God and His ways imply a rejection of the use of reason altogether in theology, as though Luther advocated and practiced an irrational, illogical, and contradictory theology. On the contrary, he insisted on and himself exercised “an honest and convincing logic applied to the interpretation of Scripture” (119). His own paradoxical formulations of the truth of Scripture are not contradictions: “by ‘paradox’ is not intended a truth or an idea that is paradoxical or logically contra-
dictory in itself. A paradox in this context is a concept that appears impossible to natural man apart from God’s enlightenment” (41).

There have always been, are today, and will be to the world’s end two, and only two, theologies, or gospels: the theology of the cross and a theology of glory.

The theology of glory always teaches salvation by the law, rather than salvation by the cross of Christ.

On the basis especially of Paul in Romans and Galatians, in accordance with the thought of Augustine and against the theology of glory, that the sinner must save himself by his own will and works, Luther contended that “in itself it [the law] has no saving power whatsoever” (38). Here too, Luther was one with Augustine: “For Augustine…the law of God, even though it is the only good and holy model of conduct, has no saving efficacy. The purpose of the law is to command, and to display the sinfulness of man, in order to lead man to the true source of grace, that is, the cross” (89). Augustine charged against Pelagianism that “according to it grace is the law, and the law is grace” (89). Pelagians “attribute saving power to the law of God when the law has actually
a deadly power because it accuses man of sinfulness and point[s] to commands that man is not able to fulfill as God requires, i.e., perfectly” (91). Thus, “Pelagians are enemies of the cross” (90).

Barone draws Luther’s Augustinian theology of the cross mainly from Luther’s “Heidelberg Disputation.” This manifesto of grace, often overshadowed by the Ninety-Five Theses, if not overlooked altogether, is a clear, extraordinarily forceful confession of the Reformer’s gospel of the cross. Rightly, Barone speaks of it as “a manifesto of Luther’s theology” (99). The Disputation dates from 1518, a year later than the appearance of the Ninety-Five Theses. It contains “the hallmark of his [Luther’s] entire theology” (2).

The work of Augustine from which Barone largely makes his case, that Luther’s theology derives from Augustine, is the African father’s The Spirit and the Letter, although Barone shows remarkable familiarity with the entire corpus of Augustine’s writings.

No small profit and appeal of the book is the ample quotation of both Luther and Augustine, expressing their understanding of, and commitment to, what we would call the gospel of sovereign grace and what Luther called the theology of the cross.

Although Barone himself does not make the observation, it becomes painfully apparent that the theology, or gospel, of much of Lutheran and Reformed Christianity in our day is a semi-Pelagian theology of glory, rather than Luther’s theology of the cross.

For Augustine, “without the grace of God through Jesus Christ our Lord…[men] do absolutely no good thing, whether in thought, or will and affection, or in action” (59). Luther agreed: “man is by nature unable and unwilling to love God, unless God himself first bestows his regenerative love” (67). And then there is the German Reformer’s Bondage of the Will. Most of Protestantism, including Reformed Protestantism, is as averse to this fundamental aspect of the theology of the cross as were the Pelagians in Augustine’s day and as was the Roman Catholic Church at the time of Luther.

In the last long chapter of the book, Barone takes his readers into the deep, murky waters of philosophy. The Reformed man or woman can swim in these waters, if he or she exerts himself or herself. The benefit is worth the
effort. Barone proves his contention that the great theological issue at the Reformation—theology of the cross/theology of glory—bears on philosophy in the Western world. All thinking that bases itself on man’s reason, rather than on the revelation of Scripture, proclaims the hope of “salvation” as man’s own will and works, rather than the cross of Jesus Christ. It shows itself as philosophical Pelagianism.

Barone argues his case from the philosophies of Kant and Leibniz. They were philosophers who had one foot in the Protestantism of Luther and the other in the modernity that boasted in its liberating itself from the “shackles” of the authority of divine revelation, that is, the Bible; philosophers who still paid lip service to the Christian religion; and philosophers who determined the nature of subsequent philosophy to the present day. Inasmuch as their philosophies exalted man’s reason over divine revelation, their philosophies were Pelagian.

Justification of the inclusion of this philosophical chapter at the conclusion of a book of theology, if one is needed, includes the following. First, the theology of glory against which Luther himself contended, that is, the theology of Aquinas and the Roman Catholic Church, owed much to the philosophy of Aristotle. Therefore, Luther explicitly condemned the philosophy of Aristotle.

Virtually the entire Ethics of Aristotle is the worst enemy of grace. This is in opposition to the scholastics.

It is an error to say that no man can become a theologian without Aristotle. This is in opposition to common opinion.

Indeed, no one can become a theologian unless he becomes one without Aristotle.

Briefly, the whole Aristotle is to theology as darkness is to light. This is in opposition to the scholastics (116; the quotation of Luther).

In Luther’s age, when theology and philosophy were not so sharply distinguished as they are today, Luther would, on occasion, refer to his theology as the genuine “philosophy” and to the theology that diminished the cross in favor of the will and works of the sinner as the “philosophy” of glory.

Second, Barone’s analysis of contemporary philosophy, which extends far beyond the classroom where philosophy, strictly speaking, is taught, to science, to literature, and to the living of
life itself, illumines, not only the thinking of the secular academies of our day, which are training the leaders of our society, but also the thinking of the “man on the street.” His authority is the mind of man. His hope of salvation, if he has one, is his own morality, such as it is. God is not in all his thoughts. The cross of Christ is foolishness to him.

The thinking of the formerly “Christian West” is Christ-less and “cross-less.” It is a thoroughly Pelagian philosophy/theology of glory.

The only alternative, as it is also the sworn enemy, in philosophy strictly so-called, science, literature, and popular thinking is Luther’s and the Reformation’s philosophy/theology of the cross.

Let the churches, covenant homes, and Christian schools take heed!

---


This is the best single volume of Bible study helps, charts, drawings, pictures, and timelines that this writer has seen. The book is packed full of information and is a goldmine for the serious-minded student of the Bible who, like the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 30:8, is concerned to understand that which he reads. Not only is the volume full of helpful material for individual Bible study, but the potential for sharing the information with students makes the volume especially attractive. And what adds to its attractiveness is its very reasonable purchase price—under thirty dollars. If the book is purchased on Amazon, the cost is cheaper still—just over sixteen dollars!

The Baker Book of Bible Charts, Maps, and Time Lines is divided into three main sections: “Part One: General Bible,” “Part Two: Old Testament,” and “Part Three: New Testament.” Each of the three sections begins, in turn, with three sections: a general timeline for that particular section, a collection of maps, and a number of charts that provide overviews and organize information about events, people,
and other items of interest. The sections on the Old and New Testaments include two additional sections. The first of these sections contains archeological information, including reports of archeological finds, as well as pictures of various places and items that have been unearthed. The second additional section includes illustrations of reconstructions of important places and things found in each of the biblical testaments.

Everything in the book is done in color, which definitely adds to its appeal. It is hardcover, but the pages are spiral bound. The fact that they are spiral bound makes possible easy reproduction (photocopying) of select pages by professors and teachers for use in their classrooms. At the bottom of most pages is the notice: “May be reproduced for classroom use only, not for resale.” A limited number of pages contain the notice in bold: “Reproduction of this page is prohibited.” Those who use this book need to be reminded of the importance of observing the existing laws that govern photocopying. But the book is designed in such a way that it is easy to pass throughout a class in order to have students look at a particular page connected with a professor’s instruction, if photocopying is restricted.

It is worth summarizing the individual sections of the book. The first section is entitled “General Bible.” It begins with a two-page timeline that compares people and events in the Bible to peoples and events in the world at that time. This is helpful in order to place biblical events in the context of world history, something that we tend to overlook. This timeline, as the timeline for the Old Testament, begins with Abraham. There is no approximate dating of any events prior to Abraham, such as the flood and Babel. One wonders why this is so. The timeline is followed by maps of “Ancient Near East and Its Road Systems,” “Old and New Testament Cities in the Promised Land,” “Geographical Zones of the Promised Land,” “Rainfall in the Promised Land,” and others.

The lengthiest section is the section of charts. It is introduced by a two-column chart on “The Bible’s Human Side and the Bible’s Divine Side.” In this chart, the author affirms that “The Bible came to be through a supernatural process called divine inspiration.” Further, he affirms that “The Holy Spirit moved the thoughts of God into writing through human hands.
without extinguishing each writer’s unique background, vocabulary, and writing style” and that “The Holy Spirit prevented the writers from introducing errors into what they wrote” (16). This commitment to divine inspiration is a praiseworthy feature of the book that comes out repeatedly. Included in this section is a very well-done “Bible Book Overview” (17-28), as well as charts of “Fifty Key People of the Bible” (34), “Fifty Key Places of the Bible” (35) “Plants and Trees of the Bible” (45), “Wild Animals of the Bible” (47), “Weights and Measures” (54), and “Prophets of the Bible (Nonwriting)” (56).


The section on “Archeology of the Old Testament” is helpful. Archeological discoveries are not presented as of value above the Bible, but as illuminating what is found in the Bible. Included are such things as “Gilgamesh Epic (Tablet 11)” (126), “Four-horned altar” (127), “Ugarit (Ras Shamra) tablets” (128), “Pool at Gibeon” (129), “Black Obelisk” (132), the “Taylor Prism” that speaks of Sennacherib’s attack on Judah (134), the “Cyrus Cylinder” (135), and samples of the “Dead Sea Scrolls” (135).

The last section contains artists’ reconstructions of such things as “Noah’s Ark” (136), the “Tabernacle” (137), the “Dress

The third and last section of the book concerns the New Testament. The maps in this portion are clear and very helpful. They include: “New Testament Israel” (155), “Galilee in the Time of Jesus” (156), “New Testament Jerusalem” (158), each of the apostle Paul’s missionary journeys and his trip to Rome (160-3), the “Seven Churches of Revelation” (164), and “Jewish Population Centers in the Roman World” (165).


Harbor,” and “Temple of Artemis at Ephesus” (220-34).

The Baker Book of Bible Charts, Maps, and Time Lines begins with a detailed table of contents and concludes with a helpful “Index to Maps.”

My criticisms are more in the form of suggestions for future editions. Some of the charts could be improved upon by adding visuals, like the too plain charts of “Bible Translation” and “Holidays and Celebrations.” Pictures would enhance the descriptions of “Plants and Trees of the Bible.” “Weights and Measures” would be more helpful if the specified amounts were depicted with containers filled with different amounts in order that readers could actually imagine what modern-day equivalents would be. In addition, descriptions of the beliefs of Jewish sects in Jesus’ day—the chart “Jewish Sects and Jesus”—could include biblical references demonstrating these beliefs and Jesus’ interaction with them.

But despite these suggestions for improvement, The Baker Book of Bible Charts, Maps, and Time Lines is a resource like no other. The amount of information packed into this book, as well as the impressive way in which it is organized and depicted, make it a most desirable addition to any Christian’s library. It is a valuable resource that I highly recommend.

---


One Holy Catholic Church

When the Apostles’ Creed and the Nicene Creed were written, one organizational church existed. The confession of “one holy catholic church” appeared to be true outwardly and visibly.

When the Belgic Confession (1561) and the Heidelberg Catechism (1563) were written, Christendom had already seen two major church splits—the separation of Eastern Orthodoxy and Rome (1054), and the great Protestant Reformation, beginning in 1517, and resulting in the Lutheran tradition, the Presbyterian/Reformed tradition, and Anabaptist tradition. Yet, in the face of the church’s apparent
outward disunity, the Heidelberg Catechism (Q&A 54) and the Belgic Confession (Art. 27) both insisted that we believe one holy catholic church! And they did so with nary a hint that every church that considers itself to be part of the catholic church is required to seek ecumenical relations with other Christian bodies.

Explaining this approach of our confessions is the Reformed doctrine of the church, which teaches that she is one, holy, catholic, and apostolic, not institutionally, but spiritually. To say that she is this not institutionally is not to minimize the calling of instituted churches to reflect and manifest these attributes. Rather, it is to emphasize that the reason instituted churches must and can do so is because these four attributes characterize Christ’s spiritual body. Beginning with this fundamental premise does not lead one to cry out in dismay at the division of the church on earth into various factions and denominations and condemn such divisions as contrary to the church’s confession, particularly when these divisions were occasioned by doctrinal errors in an existing denomination, so that they are instances of church reformation. Rather, one concludes that not every organization that calls itself church is indeed part of Christ’s church.

As becomes clear already in his first chapter, Bray proceeds from a different starting point regarding the nature of the church. Treating “The Origins of the Church,” Bray posits that Old Testament Israel was not the church (14-24), and that the church began at Pentecost (29). In other words, Christ’s one church did not include Old Testament Israel. Were one to defend him by saying that he is writing of the church in her New Testament form, I would counter that Bray is writing of the church in her visible earthly form. Throughout the book, the church in her visible, earthly form is his concern.

This wrong starting point explains the book’s fundamental weaknesses, which are theological and, more specifically, ecclesiological, in nature.

“A Theological and Historical Account”

Though it has weaknesses, the book has value as a survey of church history. Bray asserts that “[t]his book is not a history of the church” (viii). Granted, the book is not a comprehensive survey of the church’s history. But church
history pervades the book. For one thing, the chapters proceed according to the church’s history. For another, each chapter is filled with historical dates and facts.

Chapter 2 looks at the church’s organization and mission during the apostolic era (up to A.D. 100). Chapter 3 covers the church’s spread and persecution, as well as the rise of the episcopate in the next two centuries (which resulted ultimately in Rome’s hierarchy). Chapter 4 surveys the rest of the first millennium, treating the various heresies (“schisms”) that arose in the early church, the development of the papacy and sacramentalism, and the great schism of A.D. 1054. Chapter 5 treats the apostasy of the Romish church, which gave rise to the pre-reformers and later to the great Protestant Reformation. Chapter 6 covers the time of the Reformation and later centuries.

In these chapters, looking at various historical themes (for instance, the rise of the papacy, 102ff., or the development of Rome’s sacramental system, 119ff.), Bray briefly points the reader to various historical events that relate to that theme. He does not treat every single related event, and he assumes that the reader knows something of the events to which he refers. This underscores the fact that the reader of this book must be somewhat familiar with church history.

Bray’s pace through history is fast. As a result, the reader might suppose that the various historical events relating to a theme happened in quick succession, and that the former caused the latter. The reader must bear in mind that such was not the case.

In his analysis of this history, Bray is not always to the point. I give two examples. Bray writes:

Martin Luther did not invent justification by faith, but when he began to preach it, many of his hearers heard and understood it for the first time, perhaps because it was something that a stained-glass window or a mystery play could not convey to a wider public. (132)

Bray is correct that the doctrine of justification by faith (alone) cannot be portrayed; it must be preached, and Luther preached it. But Bray is not to the point, for two reasons: first, Luther did not preach a generic doctrine of justification by faith; rather, he preached justification by faith alone. And second, Rome
was not proclaiming justification by faith alone at all, but justification by faith and works. Rome’s basic fault was not her method (though we do not defend using stained glass windows or mystery plays to teach), but her theology of justification by faith and works.

Again, speaking of the radical change that the Protestant Reformation worked, Bray writes: “In the course of a single generation, from about 1520 to about 1560, Western Christendom was torn in two and a new kind of Christendom came into being. At the heart of this revolution was the doctrine of the church” (165). True, the doctrine of the church was at stake. True, Rome’s view of the church was and is faulty, and the Reformation was God’s means to restore to the church the right doctrine of the church. But was the doctrine of the church “at the heart of this revolution”? For Bray to say so fits his purpose, but I contend that the doctrine of salvation was at the heart of the Reformation. The doctrine that Luther was attacking when he nailed his ninety-five theses to the church door was that of justification and the place of works in salvation. Rome’s wrong ecclesiology flowed from her wrong soteriology, and when the church was restored to a right understanding of soteriology, she was also able to develop a proper ecclesiology.

But none of this gets at Bray’s real point in treating this history. His real point is to trace the development of the doctrine of the church, and more specifically the church’s understanding of her unity, catholicity, holiness, and apostolicity throughout the centuries. Chapters 2 through 5 each end with a section in which Bray notes this development during the historical period that that chapter covers. Chapter six does not end with such a section; rather, in subsequent sections Bray treats the four attributes of the church as manifest in the post-Reformation era. So doing, Bray is preparing the reader for his real purpose.

**Writing Style**

I consider Bray’s style of writing to be a weakness of the book. Bray’s paragraphs are long; the thematic distinction between one paragraph and another is not always clear; and often, after reading several pages full of interesting tidbits of history, I had to stop and ask myself: “The facts are interesting, but what is his point?” In his opening pages,
Bray clearly states the aim and goal of his book but does not seem to be governed by that aim throughout the book.

I could illustrate my point with references from earlier chapters, but the entire final chapter illustrates it best. The title of chapter 7 is, “What Should the Church Be?” An interesting question it is, and Bray’s answer to it I was eager to learn. But Bray does not give a definitive answer to the question (a characteristic of Bray throughout the book; at times I wish he would give us his opinion). What should the church be? Clearly, “one, holy, catholic, apostolic church”—and Bray uses those attributes as the structure for the chapter.

But how, concretely, should these attributes manifest themselves in the church? Not necessarily the way they did in the New Testament church; after all, “we simply do not have enough information to be able to reconstruct the inner life of any new Testament congregation,” and “the apostles are no longer with us” (222). Bray’s answer does not take the form of an argument or thesis; rather, in the chapter he gives the answer of various groups and denominations to the question of what the church should be. His answer is an observation of how various churches are answering that question rather than his own position, defended with arguments regarding what the church should be.

**Encouraging Ecumenism**

Bray’s stated purpose in the book is to help Christians and Christian churches understand one another” so that “we can at least come to terms with one another’s traditions and perhaps even learn from them. That is the aim of this book” (ix).

Underlying this goal, the reader senses that Bray is encouraging the church to be “one, holy, catholic, and apostolic” in her ecumenical relations. This comes out when Bray says that his book “is an attempt to understand how and why the different Christian bodies that now exist have come to understand the church in the ways that they have and why they persist with their own interpretations of ecclesiology even when they know that by doing so they are perpetuating the disunity of the Christian world” (viii, italics added).

Let us be clear: Bray is not promoting the institutional unity of every Christian denomination today. He recognizes that is not possible, and does not claim that such institutional unity is
the church’s calling. Rather, he is promoting a cooperation and appreciation for each segment of Christianity. And he himself lives by that principle. In a biographical and personal note, he writes that he is an ordained priest of the Church of England and is of the Evangelical persuasion within that church. Over the years he has worked, and at various times has worshiped, with Presbyterians, Baptists, Plymouth Brethren, Churches of Christ, Roman Catholics, and Eastern Orthodox and has learned to appreciate them all without abandoning his own denominational allegiance. He hopes that something of that depth of commitment to one tradition that allows for a corresponding breadth of sympathy for others will convey itself to the reader.

Not institutional unity of every Christian denomination, but ecumenical relations among Christian churches as well as among leaders and lay people in the churches is Bray’s desire. To this end, the church should know what the church should be (chapter 7), and should recognize the fifty principles that are common to all Christian churches, as set forth by Norman Doe\(^1\) (250-252). Incidentally, the conclusion of the book—suddenly bringing up Doe, summarizing Doe, and being finished, seemed to me abrupt. It was as if the whole point of the book was: here are reasons why you should read Doe! If Doe does indeed suggest “a way forward” (249), Bray could have taken more time to elaborate on Doe’s approach.

It is time to state, in light of the Reformed confessional understanding of the church’s attributes, the book’s fundamental weakness: it assumes that the church’s attributes are visible. In fact, they are spiritual. Without question, every church must strive to manifest these attributes in her outward faith and practice. But these attributes are spiritual, and the church must manifest all four of them in harmony. This means that not every church or denomination can, nor must, visibly cooperate with every other segment of Christianity.

Consider the instances of those churches that were formed by separating from mother churches who were no longer

faithfully manifesting their holiness or apostolicity. Is this an evidence of disunity (viii)? Let not the evidence be found in the existence of yet another church. Rather, let the evidence be found in the fact that a church—the older church—is no longer truly holy or apostolic.

Consider that the apostolicity and holiness of the church both require her to be faithful to Scripture. A church that is faithful to the Scriptures does not manifest genuine unity by seeking ecumenical relations with a church that is no longer faithful to Scripture, or is departing from that faithfulness.

By some insightful comments about Rome’s departure from apostolicity and the harm she has done to Christian unity (241, 243, 249), Bray shows he understands this point in concept. But he neglects to apply this point also to Protestant denominations.

While faithful churches must work together with other faithful churches to manifest their unity, this ecumenical effort will not be, and cannot be, as broad as Bray hopes.●


It is a special treat to be living at the time of the five-hundredth anniversary of the Reformation. So many good books—a few not so good—have been published on the history of the Reformation, on the theology of the Reformation, and on the figures who loomed large in the Reformation movement. Not to be forgotten are the women of the Reformation—the women who supported their husbands and the women who made contributions in their own right. One of those women was Katharina von Bora, who became the wife of Martin Luther. A number of biographies of Luther’s “rib,” as he affectionately referred to her, have been written. DeRusha’s new biography of Katharina deserves to be ranked as one of the best.

Strictly speaking the book is
not a biography. It certainly is not a romantic novel. It is history—Reformation history. Luther’s views on marriage and family are developed. The theology of the Reformation is set forth, over against the evils and false doctrines of the apostate Roman Catholic Church. DeRusha has done her readers a great service in this regard, and Baker Publishing has done an equally great service in making this delightful book available. In this five-hundredth anniversary year of the Reformation, the Reformation’s recovery of biblical marriage and the Christian family is certainly worth celebrating. Especially do we who so highly esteem the covenant of grace and its outstanding earthly representation, which is the love relationship between a Christian man and woman in marriage, celebrate this aspect of what was restored to the church through the Reformation.

*Katharina and Martin Luther: The Radical Marriage of a Runaway Nun and a Renegade Monk* is a delightful read! DeRusha recounts Katharina’s life, from the time she was a little girl, when her father dropped her off at the Roman Catholic cloister school in Brehna, Germany shortly after her mother had died, until her death nearly seven years after the death of her more famous husband, Martin Luther. It was an eventful life, full of twists and turns, ups and downs, high points and low points. Katherina was a survivalist. In all sorts of different circumstances—some very desperate circumstances—when others would have despaired, she persevered. Early in her life she manifested a very strong, even indomitable spirit. That stood her in good stead through the challenges that she faced after forsaking her life as a Roman Catholic nun and becoming the wife of arguably the most famous person in the world at that time. As a devout nun, as a convert to the Reformation, as a runaway with only the clothes on her back, as a single woman making her own way in life, as the wife of Martin Luther, as a mother and caregiver, as the director of a large household and a vast estate, and finally as a poor widow—through it all Katharina showed herself to be a model of faith. Her diligence, her piety, her trust in God, and her use to their utmost of the gifts that God had given to her, made Katharina as much of a Proverbs 31 woman as there has ever been. That comes out clearly in DeRusha’s retelling of her story.
The book is well documented. Much of the documentation comes from Luther’s books and letters—especially his letters and the account of his sayings around the evening dinner table known as his *Table Talk*. Through Luther we are given an insight into the strength and beauty of the woman whom God gave to him as his help meet.

DeRusha pays special attention to the relationship between Martin and Katharina in their marriage. A couple of things become very plain. The first is that, although at the beginning of their relationship they were not madly (romantically) in love, their relationship developed and their love deepened over the years, to the point that they could not have been more in love with each other. This is not to say that Martin and Katharina had no feelings for one another and were not at all attracted to each other initially. Neither is it to say that their marriage was merely a marriage of convenience. But the fact is that their decision to marry did not come after months of courtship. Rather, it was the result of a surprising proposition that Katharina made to Luther, after his own unsuccessful efforts at match-making. Over time their love developed into something very special, an intimacy that not even all Christian couples develop. Though Luther confessed that in the days following his marriage, he was often surprised in the morning to find two pigtails on the pillow next to him in the bed, he very soon become accustomed to it. On the one hand, DeRusha demonstrates the honor that Luther bestowed on Katharina and the high regard he had for her on account of all that she did for him and for their family. And she makes plain the servant’s heart that activated Katharina in the years she devoted to being a wife and mother. Clearly, these were the best years of her life! And she regarded them as such!

Secondly, DeRusha holds Katharina and Martin Luther up as an example for Christians to imitate in their marriages and domestic lives. She not only documents Luther’s view of marriage, and the complete “marriage makeover” for which he was responsible (136ff.), the result of which was the emptying of monasteries and nunneries throughout Europe. He did more than anyone to restore the biblical view of marriage and revolutionize marriage practices. But DeRusha also provides us
with a view of the Luthers’ own marriage. Through them, she gives a realistic picture of all the difficulties, disappointments, and struggles that married people face, as well as the unique joys and blessings of Christian marriage. In our day, when marriage is either despised or glamorized, DeRusha presents a picture of what Christian marriage can and ought to be. And in our day in which the very definition of marriage is being challenged, under the pressures of feminism and the homosexual-rights movement, the marriage of Katharina and Martin Luther serves as a timely reminder of the will of God for marriage. At the same time, their marriage is also a powerful reminder that God has designed marriage with a view to the mutual service of husband and wife, not the advancements of their own self-interests. And ultimately, His design is not even the service of one another in marriage, but the advancement of the kingdom of Christ and the glory of God. That was certainly the fruit of the marriage of Martin and Katharina.

Thirdly, DeRusha’s account of Katharina’s life as a wife and mother reinforced something in my own mind: Katharina’s boundless energy. This was a working mother—working, that is, in her home and on behalf of her family. She was a tireless worker, who spent long days laboring in so many different ways on behalf of her family. Often she was up before dawn and did not retire until everyone else in her family was tucked in. For good reason Luther called his Katharina “the morning star of Wittenberg.” DeRusha calls her “hausfrau extraordinaire,” a title well-deserved. What she did with the Black Cloister, where she and Martin lived all their married life, to say nothing of Luther’s smelly, unkempt bedroom, was only slightly less than miraculous. But her day-to-day routine was exhausting. Lacking the modern conveniences that most housewives today enjoy, she was required to spend much more time and energy in her work about her home. Besides all the housework that demanded her attention in the Black Cloister, the forty-room monastery where they lived, she did her families’ laundry in the nearby Elbe River, where she also often fished in order to supply meat for them. She kept fowl and livestock, daily gathering eggs from sundry poultry and milking cows and goats. She churned butter and made cheese.
She butchered cows, pigs, sheep, and chickens and preserved the meat in various ways (smoking, salting, or pickling) for her family. She cared for a large garden, where she raised fruits and vegetables, from which she also harvested herbs and spices. She baked breads and pastries, made soups and various native German dishes, not just for her immediate family, but for all the guests whom they had taken in, including orphaned nieces and nephews, a good number of borders, and numerous visitors who were always staying at the Black Cloister. She was also a brew-master, who produced her husband’s favorite beer—no beer compared in his judgment to that of his Katharina. She made lard, laundry soap, and flour. She gathered firewood and honey, made ointments and salves, sewed and mended, and did so much more besides. DeRusha takes her readers into the life of a sixteenth-century housewife and gives them a good feel for all that was demanded of these exceptional women.

And fourth, DeRusha makes plain that Katharina was just the wife that Luther needed. She was a submissive wife, but she did not let Luther “walk all over her.” She was spunky enough to stand up to her husband when he exhibited character flaws or made bad judgments, as a good wife ought to stand up to her husband. In DeRusha’s words, “Feisty and strong, courageous and smart, industrious and utterly devoted, Katharina was, in fact, the perfect match for Martin Luther, and he knew it” (212). At the same time, Luther could devote himself to his studies, teaching, writing, preaching, and traveling, while confidently entrusting the care of their family to Katharina. She effectively managed the household, and Luther entrusted all, including their finances, to her.

DeRusha’s book is entertaining and informative. Her style is engaging; she retells the history in an interesting way. But we also learn from her. She includes details in the history of which I was unaware. Even the familiar history is retold in a captivating way and often with tidbits of new information. She includes Luther quotations which I had either forgotten or of which I was unaware. The man could turn a phrase! He had a way with words—he could make them say what he wanted them to say. And that is
death of Elizabeth, God had given Martin and Katharina another daughter, Magdalena. She was her father’s delight and the apple of his eye. Her sickness and death brought both Martin and Katharina to the brink of despair. What the pope and the devil could not do, the death of his daughter nearly did—brought about the spiritual ruin of the Reformer. It was only the support and encouragement of friends, especially of his dear wife, that under the grace of God brought Luther back from the brink. However, in a very real sense, Luther never fully recovered from this blow.

I highly recommend Katharina and Martin Luther by Michelle DeRusha. All who are interested in learning something of Luther’s view of marriage, as well as some-
thing of his own marriage, will
find plenty of both in this book.
All who are especially interested
in learning something of Luther’s
cHERished spouse, Katharina, and
of all that she meant to him, ought
to read this book. Theirs was a
marriage made in heaven, though
lived midst the harsh realities
of the struggles and sorrows of
earthly life. That is what the book
makes abundantly plain.

Martin Luther: the Man who Rediscovered God and Changed the
$30 (hardcover). [Reviewed by David J. Engelsma.]

Prior to the publication of this
book, the best one-volume work
on the life and labors of Martin
Luther was Roland Bainton’s
Here I Stand. In Metaxas’ pow-
erful, gripping book, Bainton has
a challenger. Metaxas’ Martin
Luther is certainly a more robust,
more lusty book, doing justice in
its style to the nature itself of the
hero of the Reformation. At the
same time, the book relates as
fully as possible the incredibly
active, boisterous, and world-
as well as church-changing life of
the Reformer. The author does
justice to the doctrinal and eccle-
siastical concerns of Luther, with
which concerns the author himself
has some sympathy. Metaxas
analyses Tetzel’s bitter response
to Luther’s godly, sincere, and
peace-seeking explanation of his
Ninety-Five Theses, Sermon on
Indulgences and Grace, thus:
‘Be silent and revoke all you
have said. Unless you do so,
the Church will crush you.
Amen’…. For Tetzel, it came
down to the simplest of all
things. Let the arguments
and the Bible be damned. The
pope cannot err. To say that
he can or that the church has
erred is to be a heretic, and
that is the end of it (127, 128).

The amazing Luther comes
to life in the book in the vivid
description of the man, as well as
in the lively, intriguing, pertinent
quotations of Luther, who wore
his heart on his sleeve. We learn,
for example, of Luther’s bouts of
constipation (which, to no one’s
surprise, Luther attributed, not to
his bowels, but to the devil).

Overall, the man himself
does not so much fade behind, as
become absorbed in, the account of his doctrine and of his ecclesiastical conflict. The book is as much a work of theology and church history as it is a biography. This is as it should be. Luther was, supremely, a theologian and the major figure in the history of the church from the death of the last apostle to the present day.

In calling attention to the sole authority of Scripture for Luther, Metaxas rightly corrects the misunderstanding that moderns have of the place of conscience in the thinking of the Reformer. Conscience for Luther was not the autonomy of the individual, not even of the religious individual.

It was not Luther’s conscience that trumped anything. It was the Word of God that trumped everything. One’s conscience was only one’s ability to understand these things, and because he [Luther] understood the Word of God clearly, he had no choice but to follow it. Luther was one of few who during that time had studied the Word of God carefully, so he had opportunity to observe that it was inerrant in a way that the church councils and popes were not. He therefore concluded that only the Scriptures spoke for God (220).

Metaxas takes hold of the essence of Luther when he states that Luther “cared about theological doctrine in a way that was sometimes ferocious and unyielding” (358). This, in contrast to “Erasmus’ indifference to theology per se.” Luther contended on behalf of many of the doctrines of grace, which were precious to him, including (double) predestination, and not only the total depravity (bondage) of humans by nature, in his great book, The Bondage of the Will. Correctly, Metaxas calls this book “Luther’s greatest work” (369). Rightly, Metaxas finds in the book “the central theological issue in all that he [Luther] did…the heart of the heart of the good news…that we cannot choose our way out of hell, nor do anything of our own accord to be freed from sin and eternal damnation, but, mirabile dictum, Christ had come to set us free” (366).

Among Luther’s many other theological insights, at the very beginning of the way of Protestantism in history, was his conviction that “faith did not come from us, who were all broken sinners, but was a free gift from God” (169).

Luther refused to countenance the “heavenly prophets,”
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who disparaged Scripture in favor of “the Spirit, the Spirit,” that is, in favor of special revelations and ecstatic religious experiences. Luther drove these “prophets” from Wittenberg, and from the newly forming Protestant church, with his forceful, “I slap your spirit on the snout.” Luther called these forerunners of the charismatic movement “fanatics” (German: Schwarmer) (285ff.). Alas, the quite un-Lutheran and anti-Reformation churches of our day have allowed the “fanatics” abundant entrance. Not even all Reformed churches slap the spirit of the charismatic movement on his snout.

By his repudiation of the peasants’ revolt against the admittedly unjust nobles and landowners, harsh though the treatment of the peasants by these employers was, Luther refused to allow the gospel to become merely the engine of social reform. For Luther, the gospel is the message of the spiritual liberty of justification and of a thankful, holy life (311ff.). Metaxas may unwisely suggest some relation between Luther and the revolutionary who made the Reformer his namesake (1). Luther would have had none of it.

To a number of events in the Reformer’s life, Metaxas adds fascinating detail that is largely omitted in other accounts of Luther. Other happenings Metaxas relates that are entirely missing in the standard biographies. He gives a detailed account of the indulgences affair that triggered the Reformation (122ff.). He relates Cardinal Cajetan’s full demands on Luther at Augsburg, one of which was that Luther recant his teaching that assurance of salvation is of the essence of faith. In fact, Luther’s teaching that “faith brought certainty of forgiveness” was one of “the two principal errors” of Luther for which the Roman representative sought repentance and recantation (147). An aspect of Luther’s life and reformatory work little noted by others is the significant happenings at Worms after Luther’s marvelous ‘here I stand’ (224ff.).

Luther’s attitude toward marriage, and specifically sex in marriage, which attitude was both intensely spiritual and equally intensely earthy, indeed bordering on the bawdy, was as Christian as the Song and as Ephesians 5 (full chapter 17). He may have married mainly “to spite the devil—and the pope too,…delivering a whirling roundhouse kick to the devil’s own snout,” but he honored, and
enjoyed, sex in marriage: “… nothing dirty about this, but the opposite was true. Luther thought unnatural celibacy to be of the devil and natural and healthy marital sex to be something that glorified God” (342).

For Luther, all of human life that God has created and that the believer devotes to God’s glory is honorable and nothing to be despised. Luther was not a sanctimonious prude. In the language of Ecclesiastes 7:16, he was not “righteous over much.”

Andreas Karlstadt, one time colleague and friend of Luther, comes off badly. Karlstadt was the classic “little man,” laboring enviously in the shadow of the “bigger man.” In his envy and desire to play a bigger part on the stage of the development of the Reformation, which part God had not given him, Karlstadt ran afoul of the judgment of God. In the process of his ambitious striving to be Luther’s equal, if not superior, always “angling to upstage Luther” (164), Karlstadt troubled the progress of the Reformation (130, 164, 252, 256, 265, 284). Lutheran’s gracious attitude and behavior toward his envious and troublesome colleague displayed the Christianity of the Reformer as much as anything else in his life.

The context of utter misery and discouragement, including a severe bout of his “depression,” what Luther called his “anfechtungen” (hellish temptations to doubt),” in Luther’s life when he wrote his hymn, “A Mighty Fortress,” bespeaks his own unconquerable faith in his Lord Jesus (386).

The Reformer knew personal sorrow. The book records these heart-breaking events. A beloved daughter, Magdalena, died at age 13. She died with Luther at her bedside. He comforted his dying girl with the assurance that she was going to “that other father.” He reproached himself, marvelous saint that he was, in that he was “unable to rejoice from my heart and be thankful to God.” As they slowly closed the coffin, Luther said, “Go ahead and close it. She will rise again on the last day” (414, 415). By this time, purgatory for Luther was as fictitious, not to say despicable wickedness, as the indulgence trade it had spawned.

At the fullest account of Luther’s own dying and death I have read, one does not know whether to laugh, to cry, or to fall on one’s knees in praise of God who enables the justified sinner to die in hope and, therefore, in peace. All three responses are in order.
Anticipating his immediate death, Luther, the irrepressible human to the last, declared to the sorrowing onlookers, “If I get back to Wittenberg (he was dying in Eisleben), I’ll lie down in a coffin and give the maggots a fat doctor to eat” (425).

Upon the death of her husband, the widowed Kathie (Katie) poured out her grief: “I am truly so deeply grieved that I cannot tell a single person of the great pain that is in my heart…And if I had had a principality or an empire and lost it, it would not have been as painful as it is now that the dear Lord God has taken from me this precious and beloved man, and not from me alone, but from the whole world” (432). The rest of Katie’s life would be hard.

After Luther had died, his last written words were found: “We are beggars. This is true” (432). This is praise of the grace of God in saving guilty sinners, who have nothing and do nothing to deserve God’s gift of Jesus Christ. One offers this praise on his knees, or lying on his deathbed.

Martin Luther—simply a great book about a great man of God, who was instrumental in a great work of Jesus Christ: the Reformation of the church. Reading it, the genuine Protestant in AD 2017 thanks God anew, and with more ardor, for that work of Christ Jesus in history now 500 years ago. And for Luther!

Metaxas, who has also recently written a riveting biography of Dietrich Bonhoeffer, has outdone himself. Of course, with this book he had a much grander subject with which to work.


Adventures is not an autobiography, although it contains much of the academic life and work—the theologically adventurous life—of the author. This life has included contact with many of the noted scholars in North America and, indeed, the world. The book is a memoir: the recounting in a somewhat haphazard fashion of significant events in this ubiquitous, influential scholar’s life, with insightful commentary on the events.
What commends the memoir to the Reformed reader is that Mouw began his illustrious career as a Christian Reformed professor at Calvin College. He moved on to become first a professor and then president at Fuller Theological Seminary in California. Mouw boldly confesses himself to be a “committed Calvinist with a special love for the Canons of Dort” (143). Of his Calvinism, he has made no secret, regardless of his strange, un-Calvinistic, and even anti-Calvinistic bedfellows over the years.

The theme that holds the memoir together is Mouw’s explanation, illustration, and defense of his avowed commitment to and practice of “civility” on the basis of “commonness,” as the book’s title expresses. Since the “commonness” derives from a common grace of God, in Mouw’s theology, which commonness is the ground of civility, an argument for common grace as taught especially by Abraham Kuyper pervades the book. Civility, particularly in theological discourse on behalf of ecumenicity, is, therefore, not merely a social virtue, but a Christian calling. The commonness in which this civility is rooted does not merely allow for contact with the purpose of Christian witness to idolaters, cultists, and heretics. It is spiritual oneness that allows for fellowship in worship and cooperation in witnessing to the gospel. Witness Mouw’s involvement in Mormon worship (200-204) and in “Evangelicals and Catholics Together” (196-198).

Mouw’s ecumenical commonness is far-reaching. It encompasses Hindus; Buddhists; Mormons; Muslims; Roman Catholics; Arminians; Pentecostals; even Protestant Reformed; and more. In all these religions and confessed manifestations of Christianity is “truth” by virtue in most cases of a common grace of God, so that fellowship with their adherents is permitted, if not commanded.

It is appropriate for evangelicals to say that Buddhism is a “false religion”…. But this is not the same as saying that there is no truth in Buddhism…We may well find many good and true elements in the Buddhist worldview. Indeed, we might even find things in the Buddhist understanding of spiritual reality that can enrich our own Christian understanding of religious truth (185).
Wholesale condemnation even of the false religions, cults, and heretical churches is forbidden.

A Reformed reviewer of the book cannot restrain himself from critiquing Mouw’s proposal and project in at least three respects. First, the proposal contradicts the Reformed confessions, by which Mouw as a Calvinist is bound. Question 80 of the Heidelberg Catechism requires him to condemn the Roman Catholic Church as a false church, guilty of denying the “one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ” and of proclaiming “an accursed idolatry.” The Canons of Dordt require Mouw to condemn Arminianism as a heresy that “bring[s] again out of hell the Pelagian error” (Canons, 2. Rejection of Errors/3). Mouw rather views Arminianism as a legitimate doctrinal expression of human responsibility, balancing Calvinism’s emphasis on divine sovereignty (151, 152). Article 7 of the Belgic Confession requires Richard Mouw, and all Calvinists, to reject with all our hearts whatsoever doth not agree with this infallible rule [Holy Scripture—DJE] which the apostles have taught us, saying, Try the spirits whether they are of God. Likewise, if there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house.

Second, the commonness that permits and requires (spiritual) fellowship and cooperation in witness is oneness in the gospel of grace in Jesus Christ, who is proclaimed as both God and man and as the only Mediator and Savior. Whatever religion or self-acclaimed Christian organization does not confess and preach this message, without compromise or corruption by false doctrine, does not possess “truth” in common with the orthodox church of Jesus Christ, but is “accursed” (Galatians 1:6-9). Indeed, whatever religious “spirit” does not confess that “Jesus Christ is come in the flesh,” as Hindus, Buddhists, and Mormons do not confess but openly deny, “is not of God,” but is “antichrist” (I John 4:1-3).

Third, Mouw’s theory of commonness, rooted as it is in a doctrine of common grace, is destructive of the antithesis, the biblical reality of the spiritual separation and warfare between the holy church and the unholy world, including the false church and the antichristian religions and cults. Mouw is well aware of this danger. Repeatedly, he expresses fear that his theory and practice
of commonness jeopardize the antithesis (which Mouw avows), particularly in the thinking and life of the churches that are influenced by his students and disciples.

There could be unintended consequences for my project—negative ones that encourage the wrong kind of thing in the long run. For all my good intentions and proper Calvinist motives, I have asked myself on occasion whether I am unwittingly giving aid and comfort to the increasingly relativism of our own day, encouraging the widespread assumption that being clear about borders [between the church and the world—DJE] is not a matter of great importance (4).

The reader of Mouw’s “adventures” will not only learn something of the fascinating academic life and work of one of the most prominent, influential, and certainly interesting Calvinists in North America, if not the world. He will also significantly advance his education in theology, church history, and philosophy. Mouw is a theologian’s theologian. He is impressively well read.

I would do a disservice to the memory of Herman Hoeksema and to the Protestant Reformed reader of this review were I to omit that Mouw states more than once that he holds Hoeksema in very high esteem and that the Protestant Reformed theologian has served both Mouw and the Reformed community well by holding them to whatever degree of the truth of the antithesis they still maintain.

I find myself in strong opposition to many points in Hoeksema’s theology, but I continue to read and study his works. He was a brilliant—and in his own way extremely creative—theologian. I see it as a tragedy in his life that, having left the Christian Reformed Church, he spent the rest of his career at the margins of North American theology, where his important scholarship has been largely ignored (217; see also 221).

Mouw also administers a sound, if civil, spanking to this reviewer (214-221). The issues, unsurprisingly, are particular grace and the doctrine that Calvin called the “decretum horrible” (the “awesome decree”), the creedally Reformed doctrine of reprobation. Whether the spanking is deserved depends on whether the dreadful sufferings
of humans, including young humans, outside of Jesus Christ, culminating in everlasting hell, are divine judgments.

Richard J. Mouw has an unfair advantage over his (few) doctrinal adversaries, among whom is this reviewer. As his picture on the book’s cover shows, his is a genial, genuinely friendly persona. His conduct in controversy accords with this persona. He kindly tempers his criticism. One hardly feels the blade that skewers him. Mouw would say that this is the practice of the civility that he preaches. After a lively debate with Mouw over fundamental doctrines of the Reformed faith, when this reviewer was looking to his family for assurance that he had not been entirely overwhelmed in the debate, his own daughter exclaimed, “I love Dr. Mouw. He is a dear grandpa.”


There have likely been more biographies written of Martin Luther than any other figure of church history, probably than nearly any other figure in all of history. And in connection with the recent celebrations commemorating the five-hundredth anniversary of the Reformation, a number of new retellings of his life have appeared. Among the more noteworthy is that of the Dutch Reformed theologian and church historian, Herman Selderhuis: Martin Luther: A Spiritual Biography. This volume is a companion volume to his biography of John Calvin, published some years ago by InterVarsity Press, John Calvin: A Pilgrim’s Life. Selderhuis is professor of church history at the Theological University of Apeldoorn in the Netherlands and director of Refo500, an international platform focused on raising awareness of the Reformation. He is also the president of the Reformation Research Consortium, as well as of the International Calvin Congress.

Like his biography of John Calvin, Selderhuis’ biography of Martin Luther is engaging, informative, and full of insights.
into the character of a man who had a giant personality. The book provides a fresh look, not just at the life of Martin Luther, but at the purposes of God realized through the life of this extraordinary man. What did God do through the work, especially the writings, of Martin Luther, not only for the church in his own day, but for all of time? That is the all-important question Selderhuis attempts to answer in this book. Along the way, he underscores the debt, theological and otherwise, that we Protestants owe to Luther—a huge debt that we must never forget. Too many theologians and churches today are willing to make concessions to Roman Catholicism and sell short the heritage of the Reformation. Hopefully, the reading of a book such as this will motivate many to treasure anew what we have and what we are as Protestant and Reformed churches because of those who have gone before—especially men like the great Reformer Martin Luther.

Selderhuis is an honest historian. His biography is no hagiography. He presents Luther with all his warts and pimples, including his flaws of personality, like his hot temper. But for all that, his biography is a sympathetic biography. It is plain that he has the greatest admiration for the Reformer whose life he retells—admiration for the man and admiration for his theology. Throughout the book, he makes every attempt to separate Luther the man from Luther the myth. While breathing life into dry bones, he dispels the mystique surrounding the larger-than-life figure that Luther is. At the same time, he presents the story of the man in all his glory.

In detail! Selderhuis’ account of Luther’s life is a detailed account of the life of the first and most prominent of the Reformers. It is an account that, like his biography of Calvin, relies heavily on Luther’s personal correspondence and less familiar shorter writings, not primarily on his exegetical or dogmatical treatises. The result is that Luther comes alive in Selderhuis’ account. Far from a cold recounting of the bare facts of Luther’s life, his biography gives us a nearly three-dimensional portrait. Selderhuis provides his own fresh translations of Luther’s German and Latin writings. From his youth to his old-age, from the time he was a monk to the time he became a leading church reformer, from his days as a bachelor scholar and seminary professor to
the time he became an annoyance both to the devil and the pope as a married man, from the time of his pursuit to find peace with God to his advocacy of the doctrine of justification by faith alone, from the time that he posted his Ninety-Five Theses on the chapel door in Wittenberg to the day of his death in Eisleben, Luther is presented as a man shaped by God to carry out a unique role that altered the course of church history.

Selderhuis documents the details of Luther’s life with copious references, references especially to his vast personal correspondence. So many of his letters survive, which give us insight into his theology as well as his personality. The many notes attached to each of the chapters not only document the content of the book, but provide the interested reader with a multitude of possibilities for further research. This reviewer found a good number of quotations—some instructive, some polemical, and some amusing—with which he was not previously acquainted.

Selderhuis breaks Luther’s life down into various periods, which he then characterizes by a single word. These words, in turn, become the titles for his chapters. The ten chapters of the book are:

1. Child (1483-1500), 2. Student (1501-1505), 3. Monk (1505-1511), 4. Exegete (1511-1517), 5. Theologian (1517-1519), 6. Architect (1520-1521), 7. Reformer (1521-1525), 8. Father (1525-1530), 9. Professor (1530-1537), and 10. Prophet (1537-1546). It strikes this reviewer that this is a fresh approach to relating Luther’s life. These chapter titles emphasize all that Luther was and all that he was able to achieve, under the grace of God. And what he achieved is absolutely incredible! It is difficult to imagine that a mere man could produce as much as he did in one lifetime. What Luther accomplished is simply astounding. The huge sets of his collected works—one of the main sets in English published by Concordia is nearing eighty volumes—is a testimony to Luther’s immense productivity. Selderhuis gives us a sense of the height, depth, and breadth of Luther’s contributions, especially through his writings, to the church of his day and our day. And although only the height, depth, and breadth of the works of God are incomprehensible, Luther’s works probably come close to occupying second place.

Selderhuis gives us a good
sense of the struggles of soul that God used to bring Luther to the recovery of the gospel of grace, the fruit of which is the assurance of salvation. Those struggles are alluded to in the opening sentence of the book: “God, the Devil, and death were everyday topics in the world into which Martin Luther was born” (21). The ever-present reality of death, including the deaths of family members and dear friends, and the church’s corruption of the truth concerning God and the Devil, led to the disquietude of soul that made Luther’s early life miserable. Along the way, Selderhuis gives one of the best descriptions of the Black Death that ravaged Europe and claimed twenty-five million lives between 1347 and 1353 that I have read. In general, he gives his readers a good feel for the world into which Luther was born and in which he lived his sixty-two-and-a-half years.

I especially appreciated Selderhuis’ treatment of the indulgence controversy and the significant role that it played in sparking the Reformation. Luther was appalled that “people think that they can be sure of their eternal salvation as long as they have bought an indulgence additionally, that their souls leave purgatory immediately the moment they have thrown their financial contribution into the box” (98). Luther reported that those who were promoting the sale of indulgences contended that there was forgiveness through the purchase of indulgences “even if someone had raped the holy Virgin Mary, the mother of God, or impregnated her” (98). Selderhuis summarizes Luther’s concerns over the sale of indulgences:

How could money and guilt be connected with each other in such a destructive way? Luther maintained that people bought indulgences because they were afraid of punishment, while in actual fact they should be afraid of sins. Indulgences provided people with a false sense of surety and strengthened self-love. Those who purchased them were concerned not about living to God’s honor but only about how they could escape God’s punishment. Indulgences created the wrong impression that punishment is the problem, rather than guilt before God. Though the original intention of indulgences meant that only the truly remorseful benefited from them, Luther argued that the truly remorseful do not require an
indulgence. Luther’s quarrel was not that German money went to Rome or that it was used for St. Peter’s or that people spent so much money on indulgences even though they had so little to begin with. He was likewise unconcerned that Tetzel’s indulgences were bad business for Frederick. For Luther it involved something far more fundamental: that people were being offered a kind of false insurance policy. Indulgences did not provide forgiveness of sins, and they did not help restore a relationship with God. Indulgences didn’t create the remorse and repentance required by God. By making grace a financial transaction, grace became external and cheap, and indulgences, a temptation to people to sin. Whether an indulgence was even necessary at all was questionable [in the mind of Luther], in light of what Christ had done on the cross. (98-9)

In “Chapter 6, Architect (1520-1521),” Selderhuis provides an excellent treatment of the three great Reformation treatises of Luther, all of which were written and published in 1520: To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation, On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church, and On the Freedom of the Christian Man. He summarizes the contents of each treatise, underscores the main point that Luther was making, and the contribution of each one to the overall message of the Reformation. It was in the last of the treatises, On the Freedom of the Christian Man, that “Luther provided a new definition of faith. Faith is not an accomplishment but a gift. I do not simply believe whatever the church believes, but I personally believe what God has revealed to me in his Word by grace” (148). He goes on to call attention to the fact that “Luther’s freedom did not mean that people were free to do whatever they wanted, but rather, Christian freedom was the freedom to want only what Christ wants” (148). He then goes on to recite Luther’s famous formula for the Christian life:

A Christian is free, lord over all things and subject to no one;
A Christian is a willing servant of all things and subject to everyone. (148)

Selderhuis’ account of the Diet of Worms is gripping. I was reminded of some things I had forgotten and learned some things of which I was not aware. Selderhuis makes clear what was at stake at Worms, both for Luther
personally and for the reform movement that he was spearheading. Luther’s dramatic defense before the emperor and leaders of the Roman Catholic Church of that day serves as a powerful reminder of the courage that he and the other Reformers displayed, the same sort of courage that will be required of God’s faithful servants in the not too distant future.

One of the highlights of Selderhuis’ *Martin Luther* is his detailed account of the relationship between Katharina von Bora, a poor, runaway nun, and Martin Luther, unquestionably the leader of the Reformation. Her life-story is fascinating, as is her and her companions’ escape from the convent at Nimbschen in April of 1523. It is clear that Luther was complicit in the escape. Later he boasted of his involvement. The subsequent turn of events, under the providence of God, led to the most significant Reformation romance, indeed, one of the great Christian romances of all time. Luther and Katie were married on June 13, 1525. Luther’s view of marriage was not only theoretically at odds with the view of the Roman Catholic Church of his day, but his life in marriage was in so many ways a beacon light for marriage midst the darkness of all the sixteenth-century abuses. Luther celebrated marriage and Christian sexuality. Selderhuis’ account of Luther as a loving, doting father is delightful—even moving. Crusty German that he was, Luther surprised even himself with the intensity of the love that he felt for his children.

Some of Luther’s greatest joys were the joys that he experienced, not as a theologian, professor of theology, or church reformer, but as a husband and father. At the same time, there were no more bitter sorrows that Luther experienced than the sorrows that were unique to him as a father. The greatest of those sorrows—a grief that nearly drove him to despair—was the death of his twelve-year-old daughter, Magdalena, or Lena, as he was fond of calling her. Prior to this, he and Katie had buried an infant daughter, after whose death Magdalena had been born. Magdalena’s sickness and passing nearly caused Luther to die from a broken heart. Only the urgings of Katie and Melanchthon brought him out of his despair and were the means of God to restore him to his work on behalf of the Reformation.

One noteworthy feature of *Martin Luther: A Spiritual Biog-
raphy is Selderhuis’ account of Luther’s interaction with many different personalities, both friend and foe alike. This was so much a part of Luther’s life and the great stage on which he lived his life. Included among these personalities were emperors and kings, popes and cardinals, monks and nuns, businessmen and farmers, lords and peasants, his fellow church members in Wittenberg and Christians living in distant lands. On one side, personalities such as Philip Melanchthon, Nicholas von Amsdorf, Johannes Bugenhagen, Frederick the Wise, Lucas Cranach the Elder, Philip of Hesse, Georg Spalatin, Johann von Staupitz, Justus Jonas, Leonhard Koppe, Martin Bucer, Heinrich Bullinger, and John Calvin. And on the other side, personalities such as Emperor Charles V, and his son, Philip II, who was king of Spain, Thomas Müntzer, Cardinal Cajetan, Andreas Carlstadt, Pope Leo X, Johannes Eck, Desiderius Erasmus, Johann Tetzel, and Duke George of Saxony. Selderhuis gives us a taste of Luther’s relationship to all these men, as well as a few prominent sixteenth-century women. Along the way, he also gives us a sense of the broader political and religious climate in which Luther labored.

The value of the book is enhanced by a three-page “Timeline of Luther’s Life,” a map of sixteenth-century Wittenberg, and some forty drawings, woodcuts, and paintings. Beside the extensive chapter end-notes, the book concludes with a helpful “General Index” and “Scripture Index.”

We owe Dr. Selderhuis a debt of gratitude for a fine biography of Martin Luther, a biography that goes far beyond a mere recounting of the facts of the Reformer’s life. Through Martin Luther: A Spiritual Biography, we come to know Martin Luther—truly. We are given a glimpse into his heart and soul, so that when we have finished the book, we have a sense of what made this man the great man of God that he was.

Highly recommended! This is a biography that is destined, no doubt, to become one of the classic biographies of the great Reformer, Martin Luther.
The title is misleading. It leaves the impression that the work is a study of amillennialism.

The sub-title expresses the nature of the book: an attempted refutation of amillennialism on behalf of premillennial dispensationalism.

The author’s thesis is that there is a lengthy, earthly, Messianic kingdom between the present age and eternity: “a millennial reign of Christ between the present age and the eternal state” (12). This kingdom will be the continuation and climax of the earthly kingdom of Israel in the Old Testament. Viewing a two-age model of eschatology as fundamental to amillennialism—the present age and the eternal state—Waymeyer attempts to demonstrate from both the Old Testament and the New Testament that Scripture allows for, indeed prophesies, the intermediate, thousand-year kingdom of premillennialism. This will be a kingdom over which the risen, exalted Jesus rules in a carnal manner from an earthly throne in physical Jerusalem. Waymeyer thus contends for, and supposes he has proved, a three-age model of the last things: the present age; the eternal age; and, in between, the thousand-year kingdom of premillennialism.

His explanation of the New Testament’s doctrine of two ages, “this age” and the “age to come,” is that the age to come has two components: the age of the millennium and the eternal age. The age to come arrives in two different stages: “two phases of the coming kingdom—the millennium (Rev. 20) and the eternal state” (20).

Summing up, having ominously proved that inter-testamental Judaism looked for a coming age of carnal Jewish glory, Waymeyer states his thesis, which he thinks to have proved:

The two-age model of first-century Judaism was considered to be perfectly compatible with a temporary kingdom of Messiah between the present age and the eternal state. For this reason, when Jesus and the New Testament writers referred to “this age” and/or “the age to come,” this terminology was understood by their original audience as
consistent with the belief in an intermediate kingdom of Messiah that would precede the final state of perfection (314).

The weakness of the book is not so much that it fails to prove three ages against amillennialism’s two ages. Its failure is its mistaken contention that the fundamental issue between amillennial and premillennial is the matter of two or three ages.

The fundamental issue between premillennial dispensationalism and amillennialism is the relation of Old Testament Israel and the New Testament church. The fundamental, indeed heretical, error of premillennial dispensationalism is that it will not acknowledge that Old Testament Israel was a type of the New Testament church. The earthly kingdom of Israel was a type of the spiritual reality of the kingdom of God in Jesus Christ. Because premillennialism denies that the church is the reality of Israel, so that the Messianic kingdom is a reality in the church, it needs a revival and restoration of an earthly Jewish kingdom yet in the future—the millennial kingdom after the “church age” and before the eternal kingdom of God.

Reformed amillennialism understands that the spiritual reality of the Old Testament, earthly kingdom of Israel is the New Testament church. God has “translated us [New Testament, Gentile believers] into the kingdom of his dear Son” (Col. 1:13). The Messianic kingdom of God’s dear Son, Jesus the Messiah, is not a future reality in a restoration of Old Testament Israel. The citizens of the kingdom are not physical Jews. The kingdom of the Christ is the church. The citizens are believing Jews and Gentiles. Jesus Christ is now and forever the King of the church. He rules His church by His Spirit and Word. He blesses the church with spiritual power, prosperity, and glory. Until premillennial dispensationalism has its eyes opened to see and acknowledge the truth of Israel and the church it will doggedly persist in its novel, absurd, and heretical theology, forcing Scripture into its doctrinal mold.

Among the errors of premillennial dispensationalism, to all of which Waymeyer is prone, are the following. The New Testament is not allowed to shed light on the Old Testament. On the contrary, the New Testament is interpreted in light of premillennialism’s literalistic interpretation of Old
Testament prophecy, which is, in fact, largely figurative and symbolic. If the Old Testament foretells Israel’s victory over her foes, the meaning must be the carnal victory of Jews over their physical enemies in the millennium. If Ezekiel prophesies a rebuilding of a grand temple in the future, with a resumption of animal sacrifices (Ezekiel 40-48), the meaning must be the building again of a material temple in Jerusalem in the millennium, regardless of the teaching of Hebrews that the risen Jesus Christ is the reality of the temple. In this shabby, pitiful structure (shabby and pitiful in comparison with the reality in Jesus Christ), devout Jews will offer animals as sacrifices to God, regardless that offering animal sacrifices after the sacrifice of Jesus as the real Passover Lamb is blasphemous denial of the gospel of the cross.

All of the New Testament is forced into compliance with the premillennial theory of a millennial age. Whereas I Corinthians 15 celebrates the victory of Christ over death, at His coming, which coming premillennialism is compelled to recognize as prior to premillennialism’s millennial age, Waymeyer asserts, to the contrary, that death will continue during the millennium that follows His Coming. During premillennialism’s millennium humans will die. Death will not be swallowed up in victory. It will retain its sting. The grave will have its victory. “Death continues to exist for a thousand years after the return of Christ” (166).

Contrary to the New Testament revelation that the kingdom of Christ is spiritual, premillennialism makes of Messianic millennial-reign a carnal, Jewish business: the Jews reign over all with earthly power; the prosperity of the kingdom will be earthly riches, long physical life (though ended eventually by death), and material delights; the glory will be earthly pomp and circumstance.

Not only is the premillennial conception of Waymeyer exegetical outrage and doctrinal heresy. It is also patently absurd. It has the risen, spiritual, exalted, heavenly, holy, glorious Lord Jesus sitting on a pathetic earthly throne in the Middle East, surrounded by sinners and sins, including His avowed enemies plotting His overthrow, Himself once again part of history, and concerning Himself with trade, economy, sewage, sickness, deaths, and graveyards (82, 87). Against Him at the end comes an army with jet
planes, tanks, and repeating rifles. He who can believe all this knows nothing of the resurrection, ascension, and sitting at God’s right hand of Jesus Christ. He knows nothing of the exalted Lord Jesus Christ, before whom the beloved disciple fell down as a dead man (Rev. 1:17).

Not amillennialism’s two-age model is the fundamental issue in the continuing controversy of amillennialism and premillennialism, but premillennialism’s two peoples of God, in history, in the millennium, and to all eternity. The people of God are one people. Their salvation is spiritual. They are the kingdom of Jesus Christ. They await His one future coming. At His coming, He will destroy all His enemies. Death will be no more. Then, He and His church, which is His kingdom, the Israel of God (Galatians 6:16), will live forever in the new creation.

A good one third of the book is devoted to proving that Revelation 20 is the prediction of future history consisting of the worldwide rule of Christ and the restored nation of Israel for a literal millennium of years, rather than the symbolic description of the present age, featuring the deliverance of the martyrs, to live and reign with Christ in their souls in heaven (175-299). “Revelation 20 has long been considered the clearest and most convincing argument for the eschatology of premillennialism” (175). Satan will be confined to a literal hole somewhere or other. There that spiritual being is subdued by a great, literal, iron chain. Imprisoned as he is, he has no influence in the world for a thousand years. Despite his absence from the world, and presumably the absence of all his demons with him, multitudes of humans, “the number of whom is as the sand of the sea” (v. 8), are ready at his loosing to attack Jesus and His kingdom. At the end of the millennium, Satan brings a vast army of rebellious humans armed with all the armaments of literal, physical war against Jesus in Jerusalem, thinking to defeat the risen, glorified Jesus in the world war to end all world wars.

The thought of Satan’s sending bombers and tanks against the risen Lord Jesus Christ, presumably surrounded by myriads of angels, would be hilarious, were it not so derogatory of the awesome glory and might of the risen Christ. Satan would know better, even though premillennial dispensationalism is ignorant.
For all the insistence by Waymeyer on a literal reading of Revelation 20, however, Satan must not be conceived as a “dragon, that old serpent”—a monstrous snake. Neither are beheaded “souls” to be explained as disembodied souls living and reigning in heaven, which is the proper sphere of the “souls” of the martyrs, but as humans with bodies as well as souls, who live and reign on the earth. Nor are “Gog and Magog” the Old Testament enemies of Israel of Ezekiel 38 and 39. The literal interpretation of symbolic passages of Scripture has its limits even for premillennial dispensationalism.

The book acquaints especially the Reformed pastor with likely one of the best contemporary, ostensibly biblical, apologies for premillennialism. This is its value. He closes the book shaking his head, in utter bewilderment, over the popularity of premillennialism among professing evangelical Protestants. What hath that eccentric John Nelson Darby wrought? Only recently in the history of Christian thought? Against the unanimous testimony of all the Reformers and all the Reformation creeds?

---


Although it was published some seven years ago, in 2010, this volume of rich, biblical theology is far too important to the Reformed theologian and pastor, as well as interested layman, to be allowed to sink into obscurity, un-reviewed and widely unknown. The book is a summary of some of the main works of John Owen with learned, sound commentary by the editor, Stephen P. Westcott. The editor describes the book as an “outline and overview” of Owen’s theology and as an “introduction” to Owen’s theology.

Since Owen was a “Puritan of the Puritans” (561), indeed, the “prince of the Puritans,” (3), and the “greatest British Reformed
theologian of all time” (ix), the book commends itself especially to Reformed pastors and teachers. It gives many strategic quotations from the works of Owen under consideration. Added by the editor, who is obviously completely at home in the entire body of Owen’s voluminous writings (no small achievement), are summaries of the thought of Owen in the various volumes of Owen under review and highlighted in the preceding quotations from these volumes.

One who reads this book will know the theology of John Owen. The alternative is reading the vast library itself of Owen’s lengthy tomes on virtually every aspect of Christian theology, an inviting, but impossible, task for most pastors, indeed for most theologians. The learned, sound commentary by the editor on all of the topics of the works of Owen that are included in the book is an invaluable help to learning Owen’s Puritan theology.

Many of Owen’s writings were polemical, refuting the various heresies that were a threat to the true church in Owen’s day, most of which are a threat to the true church still today. In the course of the refutation, Owen set forth sharply the truth of the gospel that is opposed by the heresy. Thus, the truth appeared all the more clearly, indeed unmistakably. This nature of much of Owen’s writings is evident in a major defense of the Protestant faith against Roman Catholicism, *Fiat Lux [Let There be Light].* Owen exposes the Roman doctrine of meritorious good works.

Surely the first inventors of this dogma did not sufficiently consider with whom they had to do, before whom sinners, appearing in their own strength and righteousness will one day cry “Who amongst us can dwell with devouring fire? Who amongst us shall inhabit with everlasting burning?” Not the purity, the perfection and the severity of God’s fiery law, judging, condemning, cursing every sinner for every sin without the least intimation of mercy or of compassion. If you would but consider how impossible it is for any man to know all of his own secret sins, or to make compensation to God for the least of them that he knows, and that the very best of his works come short of that universal perfection which is required in them, so that he dare not put the issue of his eternal condition upon any one good
work singly, and withal would diligently inquire into the end of God in giving his Son to die for sinners, with the mystery of his love and grace therein…I am persuaded you would seek another manner of rest and peace to your soul that all of your own good works are able to supply you with (117, 118).

The editor summarizes: “The thought that any sinner might purchase and merit salvation, or even contribute partially towards their own redemption by deeds of merit, good works, is something quite foreign and at odds with the teaching of Scriptures. The doctrine is an elaborate soul trap, a device to hold men in spiritual uncertainty and bondage…” (118).

In his criticism of Socinianism, Owen condemns the doctrine that there are two, contradictory wills in God, a will to save only some (the elect) and a desire to save all humans without exception.

Many of the affectations here ascribed unto God do eminently denote impotence, which indeed on this account, both by Socinians and Arminians, is directly ascribed to the Almighty. They make him affectionately, and with commotion of will, to desire many things which are in their nature not impossible, yet which he cannot accomplish or bring about (163).

The editor explains, applying the error to which Owen refers to contemporary theology. “Today we are repeatedly told that God has two wills, both willing and yet not willing the same thing at the same time” (163). Westcott goes on to make plain that he refers to the teaching, now popular in Reformed churches, that God both willed the damnation of some in the decree of reprobation and sincerely desires the salvation of these same sinners. This false doctrine, condemned by Owen, the editor concludes, is a “weakening of the Bible, and a modification of our Reformed, Calvinistic, Bible faith.” Owen sensed the danger, and marked out the true track of orthodoxy (165). Obvious to everyone who has the slightest knowledge of the contemporary theological scene is that Owen’s warning against the doctrine of two wills in God finds as little favor with the self-acclaimed disciples of the Puritans today (for example, the men of the Banner of Truth) as it did with the Socinians in Owen’s day.
In addition to his polemical books against Rome and against Socinianism, Owen wrote several long, powerful books against the heresy of Arminianism. These include his monumental *The Death of Death in the Death of Christ*. The editor describes Owen’s works against Arminianism as “this rather massive literature (even for Owen),” which emphasized “the danger that he believed the biblical faith to be in, and how seriously he viewed the Arminian modification of the faith” (197). Indeed, the first book that Owen wrote, at the age of 22, was *A Display of Arminianism*. In his refutation of Arminianism, Owen showed himself distinctively a biblical theologian. He was critical of systematic theology, as a form of philosophy (363ff.). Owen wanted “a biblical pattern of Christianity” (375). Owen’s display and refutation of Arminianism consisted, in part, of a statement of the Arminian doctrine followed by quotation of Scripture refuting the heresy (196ff.). An example illustrates Owen’s method.

Free Will [as taught by Arminianism]: We profess that faith is considered by God as a condition preceding election, and not following as a fruit thereof.

Sacred Scripture [refuting the Arminian heresy]: *Not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given in Christ Jesus before the world began* (2 Timothy 1:9) (202).

Although controversy was never entirely absent from any of his works, Owen also wrote many positive treatments of fundamental biblical truths, as also commentaries on biblical books and passages. His *magnum opus* was a commentary on the book of Hebrews. The commentary consists of “seven stout volumes” (256). Westcott’s excerpts from this commentary and his flowing summary and analysis of Owen’s commentary alone make the book worthwhile, if not a necessity, for the Reformed pastor, who has neither the time nor the inclination to read Owen’s massive work. Having read this summary, he will likely incline to read the entire, original work.

The reader of the Hebrews commentary will understand Owen’s plea for biblical theology and his own practice of such a theology. He will grasp the relation between the old covenant and the new. The typology of
the old covenant, as richly presented and explained in the book of Hebrews, will come alive to him. He will also discover that the Reformed tradition running through, or from, Owen, “Puritan of the Puritans,” taught that election governs the covenant of grace. “The covenant of grace in Christ is made only with the Israel of God, which is the church of the elect in all ages” (329). Owen’s earliest work against Arminianism contended that though the external administration of the covenant was given to Abraham and his carnal seed, yet the effectual dispensation of the grace of the covenant is peculiar to those who are the children of promise, the remnant of Abraham according to election, with all who in all nations were to be blessed with him and his seed, Jesus Christ (223).

In his great work on biblical theology, which develops theology in the historical order of God’s revelation of it, Owen affirmed that the covenant is unconditional. God’s covenants do not depend upon our will, or on any condition which can be fulfilled by us. They have all their effect and virtue from the authority, the grace, and the faithfulness of God himself. The promise of grace is absolute, and the covenant contains no conditions which are not included in the promise itself. Therefore, it is senseless and absurd for men to attempt to explain the nature and meaning of the divine covenant from the circumstances of human covenants, which are mutually agreed between men (408).

Owen’s treatment of “Scripture, Text & Transmission” (455-517) goes far to corroborate the editor’s claim that “John Owen was the greatest ever English theological champion of the infallible Bible” (455). It also demolishes the popular, indeed regnant, notion that the earlier Greek text of the New Testament, the text of the Nestle-Aland Bible, is the original Greek New Testament. It similarly calls seriously into question the prevailing idea that the vowel points of the Hebrew Old Testament were the (uninspired) work of the Masoretes. For Owen, the “Received or Majority [text of the Greek New Testament] is certainly the true and uncorrupted, the genuine and authentic, text of the New Testament” (503). This is the
text, translated into English, of the Authorized Version of the Bible (the King James Bible). As for the alleged contribution of the Masoretes to the Old Testament, Owen did not “price those abilities at the value of a rotten nut, much less allow their opinions to be the sole arbiter of the correct reading of all our Hebrew codices!” (510)

The biblical practical issues on which Owen wrote that the book includes are assurance, baptism, the Lord’s Supper, divorce and remarriage, eschatology, preaching as prophecy, and worship and psalmody (539-589). On the matter of the biblical doctrine of marriage and remarriage after divorce, Owen’s exegetical ability and spiritual insight failed him. The same is true of the editor, who vigorously rises to Owen’s defense in this matter (561-575).

On the basis of Matthew 19:9, and then only the first half of this text, Owen held that the married person whose mate has committed adultery may not only divorce but also remarry. If the first half of the text might allow for this interpretation, the second half proves that the text allows only for divorce on the ground of adultery. It does not allow for a subsequent remarriage. For the second part of the text forbids the innocent wife, whose husband has divorced her and married another, thus committing adultery, to remarry. Owen (and Westcott) do not interpret the more difficult text—Matthew 19:9—in light of the plainer passages, including Mark 10:1-12; Luke 16:18; Romans 7:2, 3; and I Corinthians 7:39. These passages clearly forbid remarriage after divorce, as long as the original mate is still living. They condemn all remarriage after divorce, while the original mate still lives, as adultery. These passages are perfectly plain, and conclusive.

Owen argued that adultery “dissolves the bond of marriage” (563). “This sin kills the marriage…” (566). But this view is plainly erroneous. It ascribes to adultery the power of putting asunder what God has joined together (see Matthew 19:6); so flimsy is the marriage bond that the sinful act of sex with another than one’s mate dissolves the bond. The view of Owen and Westcott makes forgiveness and reconciliation in the case of adultery, and thus the maintenance of the marriage, impossible: adultery “dissolves the bond of marriage.” In view of marriage’s being the God-instituted symbol of the covenant of grace, the im-
lication of this view is that the spiritual adultery of a member of the church, regardless of his repentance, dissolves his covenantal relation with God. Since adultery dissolves the marriage, in the thinking of Owen and Westcott, also the adulterer or adulteress now has the right to remarry. The marriage bond is broken for him or her as well as for the one sinned against.

Further, the history of the assault upon marriage in the church of the West demonstrates that the doctrine of the right of the remarriage of the “innocent party” (and of the deserted party, with appeal to I Corinthians 7:15,” which was an aspect of the marital doctrine of Owen, as it is also of Westcott) leads inevitably to the doctrine of the right also of the guilty party to remarry and then to the permission of all to remarry after divorce for any reason, that is, to marital chaos and scandal in what calls itself the church of Jesus Christ. Owen and Westcott indicate their readiness to approve this chaos and scandal in that for both of them a ground for remarriage is the natural desire of the male and the female to be married, that is, to enjoy the sexual union: “If he [the ‘innocent party’] had not the gift of continence he was exposed to sin and judgment” (563). If the natural, sexual desire determines the permissibility of remarriage, it will be impossible to deny “marriage” to two whose sexual desire can be satisfied only with another of the same sex.

The book begins with an account of the extraordinarily eventful life of John Owen (1616-1683). He was the husband of two wives, the first having died, and the father of eleven children. He was in the course of his life pastor of several churches. He lived at the time of the ecclesiastical and political upheaval in England in the seventeenth century. For a time, he was Vice Chancellor of the University of Oxford, where he did significant work. Having preached before Parliament the day following the execution of King Charles I, Owen came to the attention of Oliver Cromwell. Cromwell, who became the virtual dictator of Britain, compelled Owen to be chaplain of his New Model Army. Owen accompanied Cromwell and his army on their various campaigns, preaching regularly to the soldiers. He had influence on Cromwell personally. After the death of Cromwell and upon the accession to the throne of Charles II, who was a closet Roman Catholic and
bent on establishing the Roman Church in England once again, Owen wrote his refutation of the Roman Catholic Church, *Fiat Lux*. All the while, throughout his very active ministry, Owen was writing his many books.

This is the book for the would-be student, not only of John Owen, but also of Puritanism at its best.

---


The Reformed Free Publishing Association must be commended for publishing an English translation of the valuable commentary on the Reformed Baptism Form by Dutch Reformed minister Bastiaan Wielenga. The original work was a thorough examination of the Reformed Baptism Form used by Reformed churches in the administration of baptism. He wrote the commentary in the first decades of the twentieth century. The work long existed in only its original Dutch. Thanks to the work of the translator, editor, and publisher the English-speaking church world can now read and profit from Wielenga’s excellent commentary.

If she were alive today, I would give Annemie Godbehere my hearty thanks for applying her considerable translation skills to this book. This is Dutch theological writing that is worthy of the time and effort she expended on it. As the English poet Ben Jonson wrote, “Such bookes deserve translators of like coate, as was the genius wherewith they were wrote. And this hath met that one.”

Wielenga, a disciple of Abraham Kuyper, taught the Reformed truth of sovereign grace. Wielenga wrote for his people, not for scholars. He wrote to edify the churches, not to garner laurels from his colleagues. His commentary is clear and faithful in its exposition, simple and poetic in its expressions, moving in its exhortations, scholarly in its comment and controversy, and generally sound in theology. All of these come out clearly in an
English translation that is both accessible to the average reader and free of Dutch idioms that frequently jar English sensibilities and obscure the plain meaning. Because of this, the book reads well, and the chapters of this substantial book fly by as one reads them.

I commend the editor for his excellent work in bringing the translation to completion and seeing it through to publication. There is an obvious attention to detail that went into and must go into publishing a book, a large book, a theological work, and besides all that a translation. There is an evident concern that the reader be able to follow the argument. His skill with the Dutch and thorough acquaintance with the subject matter are all easily discerned.

This extensive labor by translator and editor is enhanced by the attractive hardcover, gilded lettering, sturdy binding, fine fonts, and easy layout of the book by the publisher.

The publication of this commentary comes at an important time in Reformed church history. Many Reformed churches are overrun by false covenantal theology, which is being and has been used to overthrow the gospel of saving grace and the salvation of many. That covenantal theology at its essence teaches that God makes His covenant with all the children of believers, elect and reprobate. Its proponents hate predestination and now have revived the old Arminian war against predestination, especially and emphatically denying that predestination must govern the covenant of grace. Besides the gross false doctrine involved in their erroneous covenantal theology, the end result of this doctrine is that the gospel truth of justification by faith alone is overthrown and the damning heresy of justification by faith and works is taught.

This commentary shows conclusively that there is only one covenantal doctrine of the Reformed Baptism Form, of the worthies who wrote and adopted the form, and of the churches that used it. The Reformed churches early taught this doctrine as their official doctrine of the covenant. The form is the oldest Reformed creed, and as such it carries great weight concerning the question of what covenantal doctrine is Reformed. The commentary proves that the Reformed covenantal doctrine is the doctrine that teaches that election governs
the covenant and the promise of the covenant. The sovereign God of the covenant makes His covenant only with the elect children of believers. He incorporates them only into Christ Jesus so that they are sanctified in Him, gives to them alone the promise of salvation in Christ, seals that promise to them by baptism, and effectually works that salvation in them until He presents them in heaven among the assembly of the elect in life eternal.

The commentary also demonstrates that this covenantal doctrine, which is the only one that harmonizes with the Reformed doctrine of salvation taught in the Three Forms of Unity (the Belgic Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Canons of Dordt), was under constant assault from Baptists and especially from the abysmal Puritan theology that infiltrated the Dutch churches from England, especially through William Ames, Willem Teelinck, and other theologians of the *nadere reformatie*, whose basic and serious theological error is that assurance is not of the essence of faith. This false theology became lodged in the Dutch church world and waged constant warfare on the doctrine of the covenant taught in the Baptism Form, insisting always that it is Reformed and seeking to claim the distinguished Reformed pedigree of the Baptism Form.

The conflict became sharpest in the practical question of whether parents were to regard their children as regenerate or unregenerate. That conflict frequently masqueraded as a conflict over presupposed regeneration. The proponents of Puritan theology often accused the Reformed of the error of presupposed regeneration for teaching that the parent must raise his child as a regenerated believer and that God ordinarily regenerates the children of believers in infancy. Behind these disputes, which were cast in the form of what view of their baptized children parents ought to take, were deeply theological issues about the nature of the covenant of grace, the objects of God’s promise, and the reality of God’s saving work in the hearts of infants, who without their knowledge are received unto grace in Christ. Wielenga shows that this strange doctrine has no basis in the covenantal view of the Baptism Form.

The form’s covenantal doctrine is still under relentless assault today. The present-day disciples of the *nadere reformatie* and of the Puritans in their cov-
enantal theology still plague the Reformed covenantal scene and still seek to latch onto the form for support and standing for their erroneous theology. In many places the covenantal view of the Baptism Form has been cravenly surrendered to its foes or mercilessly smothered by its enemies and replaced by a covenant of conditional promises made with elect and reprobate alike.

Perhaps this dreadful reality of the state of covenantal theology in the Reformed church world explains the astounding silence and lack of fanfare at the occasion of this significant publication, especially among the churches of North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council (NAPARC) and their theologians, which have the Baptism Form as part of their Reformed heritage. Apparently, there is nothing to celebrate, because even Wielenga’s comparatively mild explanation of the form’s covenantal doctrine is far from the covenant doctrine of the majority of apostatizing Reformed churches and theologians. These churches have, officially in many cases, repudiated this covenantal doctrine and the creedal doctrine of grace with which it harmonizes.

For those who still love the truth of the covenant in the Baptism Form, the translation and publication of this commentary are significant. The commentary can be read with great profit. Wielenga in the main is sound in his exposition of the Baptism Form. Take, for example, his exposition of the form’s teaching of the antithesis:

By his being incorporated into Christ, of which baptism is sign and seal, the world has become his enemy and he has become enemy of the world. The water of baptism was a sign to him of an irreconcilable antithesis (245).

This thrills and instructs the Reformed believer. Throughout Wielenga gives new life to old, familiar phrases that, if they have not bred contempt through their familiarity, are frequently read over without much thought. His practical warnings against using baptism out of custom—parents who are so concerned about the baptism gown but do not exchange a single word about the significance of the sacrament—and against parents who wait for relatives and put off the sacrament so long that the baptized child might well reach up to shake the baptizing minister’s hand should
be taken to heart and not rejected out of hand as mere opinion from a bygone era. Without doubt, the lover of Reformed covenantal doctrine who reads this commentary will come away with a new appreciation for and many fresh insights into the language of the form.

Once or twice Wielenga strays from the language of the form and gives his opinions. Then Wielenga makes statements with which the Protestant Reformed Churches and any right-thinking Reformed man would strongly disagree. Wielenga writes about Esau and God’s covenant, “The promise and seal in baptism of the washing away of sins through Jesus Christ was also to the Edomite, but he simply disregarded its admonition… God established the covenant with him also, but he brusquely broke this covenant” (54–55). This is bad and an anomaly in his commentary. Indeed, just prior to this statement and throughout the commentary, he makes clear that the object of the promise of baptism is the elect. In another instance, when he explains the upbringing of children, he strays into the error of common grace: “Clothing, cleaning, taking care of the young child are outside the promise of baptism. They are all based on creation, not on re-creation. The life of human beings, as long as they have not come to the years of discretion, reveals itself exclusively as an animal life, which belongs to the realm of common grace” (350).

These stumbles bring up a particularly helpful feature of the commentary, the editor’s footnotes. Wielenga included some footnotes in his commentary. The translator provides a few footnotes. The editor includes many more. The footnotes are a worthy, worthwhile addition to the commentary. These notes are of differing kinds. In some the editor explains some obscure Dutch phrase, idiom, or person. In others, and these are by far the most helpful, the editor comments on the covenantal theology taught by Wielenga, making clear the issues and how they bear today on questions regarding the covenant. Adding to the value of the notes is that in many of them the editor does his own original translation work or brings his knowledge of the covenantal questions and contemporary controversies to bear on the issues raised by Wielenga. For instance, when the editor responds to Wielenga’s comment about the promise being made to
Esau, he translates from Kuyper’s untranslated work, *The Doctrine of the Covenants*. Kuyper clearly contradicts the position espoused by Wielenga: “The covenant of grace is absolutely not an uncertain covenant, but on the contrary an absolutely certain covenant that only and exclusively has the elect in view.” There Kuyper also criticizes as “Arminian” the idea that the promise of baptism is given to all the baptized children (57). In other notes the editor points the reader to helpful resources for further study. The notes are an invaluable aid for the reader. They allow him to grasp easily the arguments in more difficult places and point him to the contemporary relevance of the Baptism Form and its doctrine.

Wielenga throughout the commentary deals with the text of the Baptism Form. That is the strength of his commentary. The text as it was in use in his day differed at certain points from the official text adopted by the Synod of Dordt. At places he suggests emendations and changes to the text used in his day, in order to bring it into conformity with the official text. Of note is Wielenga’s comments on the words “or witnesses” in a question to the parents. This phrase is a remnant of Roman Catholic theology and practice in the administration of baptism. This phrase is also included in the English received text. The practical relevance of his comments is that in the administration of baptism today these words should be omitted as an intrusion into the form.

Wielenga also deals extensively with disputed phrases. By means of them, those in the Dutch Reformed churches who disagreed with the doctrine of the form tried to foist another covenantal doctrine on the form. He devotes a particularly long section to the phrase in the question to parents, “sanctified in Christ.” In explaining this long-disputed phrase, he is at his scholarly, theological, and polemical best. He points out that in his day this issue was already two centuries old. It was not two centuries old because the Baptism Form was unclear on what it meant by “sanctified in Christ,” but on account of the exegetical dishonesty and dogmatical agenda of many theologians when they explained the Baptism Form. Wielenga proves that the Baptism Form can mean nothing else by this language than that the children of believers are really, internally, and savingly united to Christ and sanctified in
him and that the phrase does not mean merely to be set apart in an outward way or placed in a better position to be saved.

Wielenga also contradicts and condemns as “Arminian” the opinion that this phrase means real, internal sanctification and that it refers to “all of the children” of believers, not only to the elect children of believers (311). This position that he criticizes as Arminian is a popular doctrine of the covenant promoted today in Reformed churches, in which all the children are said to be incorporated into Christ and sanctified internally by him. Necessarily this means that the promise of God, the grace of God, the Spirit of God, and the covenant of God ultimately fail in many cases.

Wielenga accuses those who taught these things of reading their own theology into the form. About this reading of one’s theology into the form in order to deny the clear teaching of the form, he says,

Some people may have a different view of the doctrine of baptism. They may call the position of the compilers [of the Baptism Form] untenable…. Let them be frank and say, “I do not agree with it”…. But do not fudge on the matter.

Our exegetical [explaining the plain meaning of the form] conscience objects to someone’s eisegetical [reading one’s theology into the form] doctrine of baptism, in order to support it with the authority of this legacy of our fathers. This must be stopped. (320)

The dispute over the covenantal doctrine of the form has not and still today is not driven by simply explaining the words of the form, but by a “clash between system and system” (315). To interpret “sanctified in Christ” as referring to a mere objective, or outward, setting apart is the result of a dishonest imposition of a foreign system on the form. To interpret “sanctified in Christ” as referring to all children brought for baptism and not the elect only is the imposition of Arminianism on the form. These other views imposed on the form belonged to the church in her “decline” and were introduced in “the days of ecclesiastical backsliding” and espoused a sacramental and covenantal doctrine “that was openly detested and contested by our fathers,” a doctrine “that in the century of the Reformation was already held by the Socianians and Anabaptists and later by the Remonstrants and rationalists” (317).
That just such a covenantal doctrine, exposed by one’s interpretation of this crucial phrase as a mere setting apart, is in fact widely held in Reformed churches explains the strange phenomenon that churches with Reformed in their names and that use the Baptism Form have rapprochement with Baptists, who condemn the baptism of infants. And some of these Reformed churches even allow membership to those who do not bring their children for baptism. Long gone is the conviction of the Reformed faith toward Baptist theology as expressed in Article 34 of the Belgic Confession: “Therefore we detest the error of the Anabaptists, who are not content with the one only baptism they have once received, and moreover condemn the baptism of infants”—a detestation that manifests itself in a visible separation from them and vocal condemnation of their false doctrine. Wielenga points out that the covenantal doctrine of these ecclesiastically backslidden Reformed churches and the Baptists is basically the same. By teaching that the phrase means merely an external setting apart in an external covenant, they regard baptism “as some kind of confessional act…. It is nothing other than a symbol of transition from paganism to Christianity, a sign of faith and conversion or promise of obedience” (317).

Whoever would explain this phrase properly, Wielenga insists, “must consider the form from the situation in which it emerged and regard it against the background of the covenant view that it encompassed” (317). The situation out of which the form emerged was the Reformation’s and ultimately the Synod of Dordt’s teaching of salvation by sovereign and particular grace, a salvation governed by the truth of election and reprobation. Whoever will understand the form’s covenantal doctrine and will be faithful to it cannot espouse a covenantal doctrine that contradicts and ultimately overthrows the Canons’ teaching about sovereign grace, that God is gracious to His elect people alone. He does not offer in the preaching of the gospel that precedes the sacrament nor in the administration of the sacrament itself a promise of grace to the reprobate, much less incorporate them into His covenant. That situation out of which the form came gave rise to the doctrine of the covenant found in the form. This doctrine Wielenga explains by quoting Herman Bavinck: “Elec-
tion and church, the internal and external side of the covenant... held together as much as possible” (316). Wielenga explains this as the position of those “who sought as long and as closely as possible to maintain the unity of election and covenant (315). Covenant controlled by election is the covenantal doctrine of the Baptism Form. The question of one’s doctrine of the covenant is ultimately not a question only of a covenantal doctrine but a question of the doctrine of grace and the truth of God. Is the grace of God and thus also the God of that grace a failure who promises to all and fails to come through for many? Or is He the sovereign God of Scripture who sits in the heavens and does all His pleasure?

I do not pretend that Wielenga confesses with perfect clarity all the points of doctrine about the covenant as those are now confessed in the Protestant Reformed Churches. The doctrine of the covenant has been developed since Wielenga, particularly through the fierce battle for the truth of sovereign grace in the covenant that was waged in the late forties and early fifties in the Protestant Reformed denomination against the very view of the covenant that Wielenga calls Arminian, that the promise of God is made to all the baptized. By means of that painful controversy the “unhappy and largely infertile baptismal dispute” and the “wicked confusion,” which it created for centuries in Reformed churches and which is noted and lamented by Wielenga, was settled and the truth won (321). The current unhappy dispute that exists and the wicked confusion that is being created today can be settled in no other way than by adopting the covenantal view of the form: the covenant is controlled by election.

No honest reader can possibly read this book and suppose anything else than that this basic doctrine of the covenant taught in the Protestant Reformed Churches is the basic doctrine of the Baptism Form and of the worthies who adopted it. One might disagree with it, but let him be honest and say that, as Wielenga exhorts. Any other view of “sanctified in Christ” than that espoused by Wielenga, Kuyper, and Bavinck and their spiritual heirs, who teach that the words mean internal sanctification of the elect children of believers, is “out of place in the baptism form and is also not in keeping with the doctrine of the covenant.
that predominated in the church of the Reformation” (326).

May the commentary serve the promotion of the covenantal theology of the Reformation and of the Reformed fathers, and let the reader judge whether his or her theology is Reformed, like that of the Baptism Form.
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