

Galileo and Creationism
Is there a Contradiction between the Two Creation Accounts?
The Origin of Genesis
The Credibility of Genesis 1-11
Music: Evolution or Creation?
What is Religion?
The Leaning Tower of Pisa
Creation and Judgement
Evolution and the Sexual Revolution
Is there a Christian Art?



Thomas Schirmmacher (*1960) is professor of ethics and of world missions, as well as professor of the sociology of religion and of international development in Germany, Romania, Turkey and India, and is president of Martin Bucer Theological Seminary with 11 small campuses in Europe (including Turkey).

As an international human rights expert he is board member of the International Society for Human Rights, spokesman for human

rights of the World Evangelical Alliance and director of the International Institute for Religious Freedom (Bonn, Cape Town, Colombo). He is also president of Gebende Hände gGmbH (Giving Hands), an internationally active relief organization. He has authored and edited 74 books, which have been translated into 14 languages.

He earned four doctorates in Theology (Dr. theol., 1985, Netherlands), in Cultural Anthropology (PhD, 1989, USA), in Ethics (ThD, 1996, USA), and in Sociology of Religions (Dr. phil., 2007, Germany) and received two honorary doctorates in Theology (DD, 1997, USA) and International Development (DD, 2006, India).

Thomas is married to Christine, a professor of Islamic Studies, and father of a boy and a girl.

ISBN 978-3-928936-33-0

RVBINTERNATIONAL

Thomas Schirmmacher Legends about the Galileo Affair



Thomas Schirmmacher

Legends about the Galileo-Affair

and other Creationist Essays

with an appendix: Is there a Christian Art?

RVBINTERNATIONAL

Thomas Schirrmacher

Legends about the Galileo-Affair

RVB International

- 1 Thomas Schirmmacher: GOD Wants You to Learn Labor and Love
- 2 Thomas Schirmmacher: Legends About the Galileo-Affair
- 3 Thomas Schirmmacher: World Mission – Heart of Christianity
- 4 Thomas Schirmmacher: Law or Spirit – an alternative View of Galatians
- 5 Thomas Schirmmacher: Human Rights Threatened in Europe
- 6 Thomas Schirmmacher: Be keen to get going – William Carey's Theology
- 7 Thomas Schirmmacher: Love is the Fulfillment of the Law
- 8 Thomas Schirmmacher: Studies in Church Leadership
- 9 Monte Wilson: The Most Important Rule for Living
- 10 Monte Wilson: Principles of Success in Business
- 11 Th. Schirmmacher (Ed.): A Life of Transformation – From Politician to Good Samaritan – A Festschrift for Colonel Doner
- 12 Thomas Schirmmacher DIOS Quiere Que tu Aprendas, Trabajes y Ames
- 13 Christine Schirmmacher La Vision Islamica de Importantes Enseñanzas Cristianas

Thomas Schirrmacher

Legends about the Galileo-Affair
and other Creationist Essays

With an appendix: Is there a Christian Art?

RVB

International

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by Die Deutsche Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.ddb.de>

ISBN 978-3-928936-33-0

2., corrected edition 2008

© Copyright 2001 by
Reformatorischer Verlag Beese

Umschlaggestaltung und Gesamtherstellung:
BoD Verlagsservice Beese, Friedensallee 76, 22765 Hamburg
www.rvbeese.de / info@rvbeese.de
Printed in Germany

Verlagsauslieferung:
Hänssler Verlag / IC-Medienhaus
D-71087 Holzgerlingen, Tel. 07031/7414-177 Fax -119
www.haenssler.de / www.icmedienhaus.de

Privatkunden:
www.genialebuecher.de

Content

Preface	7
“But it Does Move!”, and Other Legends About the Galileo-Affair (1990)	8
Galileo and Creationism.....	8
Galileo-Legends	10
The Leaning Tower of Pisa.....	12
16 Theses on the Galileo-Affair.....	13
Is There a Contradiction Between the two Creation Accounts?	31
A. Two Sources? Two Creation Accounts?.....	31
B. The supposedly contradictory verses Genesis 2:4-15	32
C. The supposedly contradictory verses Genesis 2:18-19	34
The Origin of Genesis	35
The ‘toledoth’ of Genesis.....	37
The Credibility of Genesis 1-11 in the Light of the Old and New Testaments	43
Music: Evolution or Creation? (1979)	47
The History of Music	47
The Criticism of Music	50
Contemporary Music.....	51
Music as Practiced	52
The German Creationist Movement (1985)	53
History of Creationism in the German-speaking World.....	53
Problems of Creationism in the German-speaking World.....	57
What is Religion?	59
Why Does Paul Speak So Much About Creation and the Judgment (Romans 1-3)?	65

Creator and Judge.....	67
Evolution and the Sexual Revolution.....	69
The Myth of Matriarchy.....	73
Cannibalism and Human Sacrifice Vindicated?.....	79
1. Common human knowledge.....	79
2. Is cannibalism a myth?.....	81
3. Nobel Prize winners “offside”.....	83
4. The researches of Erwin Frank an example.....	85
5. Vindication of cannibalism?.....	87
6. Cannibalism in the Old Testament?.....	91
7. Sources for evidence of cannibalism.....	92
8. Cannibalism and evolution.....	94
9. Human sacrifice vindicated?.....	96
10. The widespread incidence of human sacrifice.....	98
11. Christian human sacrifices?.....	105
German Creationism: Two Reviews (1983/1994).....	111
Appendix: Is There a Christian Art?.....	113
Art and Artists in the Old Testament.....	114
Abstract Art in the Old Testament.....	115
All Art is Christian.....	118
Specifically Christian Art.....	118
The Christian View of the Abuse of Art.....	120
The Dangers of Art.....	121
The Example of Picasso: The Destruction of the Creation.....	122
We Need Christian Artists.....	124
Vain Repetition?.....	125
Songs.....	127
The Lord’s Prayer.....	128
Literature on Christian Art.....	129
Other Literature.....	130
About the Author.....	131

Preface

This is a selection of my creationist articles published since 1979, which were originally written in English or translated from German into English. The articles have been published in Reformed journals such as *Christianity and Society* (Great Britain) and *Contra Mundum* (USA) others in creationist journals like *Creation Research Society Quarterly* (USA), and *Acts, Facts, Impacts (Institute for Creation Research)* (USA). The first article was published in a Festschrift.

All articles are reprinted in their original form, with only minor changes where mistakes had to be corrected. This explains the different style of quotations, footnotes, headings and Scripture verses (e. g. with the German comma between chapter and verse). As several articles have been reprinted by different journals with different styles, I had to choose one version which is always the first mentioned when the source is quoted. The footnotes do not always follow the original numbering.

As the articles have not been updated, readers are asked to keep the year of publication of a certain article in mind. In most cases a German version with updated footnotes exists but only in much longer articles or in books. As most literature quoted is German literature only readers who can read German would have appreciated fuller footnotes in this volume. (See the list of my books at the end of this volume.)

The older articles have been translated by myself, the articles published after 1994 have been translated by Cambron Teupe, M.A. Rev. Mark E. Rudolph has read all essays and gave valuable advise. I thank both for their efforts!

All articles may be reprinted if you send two copies of the original printed volume to my address. You also can order a file if you want to publish an article in the Internet.

“But it Does Move!”, and Other Legends About the Galileo-Affair (1990)¹

“The bland scholar and the bland university is similarly a myth, as is the apparent United Nations ideal of the bland man. No person or institution possesses the ability to be neutral and objective, to transcend itself and its historical context. This is no less true of science. Some would claim for the instruments of science, if not for scientists, this capacity for neutrality. But do scientific instruments make for objectivity? They are the refinement of a perspective, namely, that the truth or utility of a thing rests in measurement, a highly debatable proposition. Scientific instruments are helpful, towards accuracy for a perspective, but they do not thereby give it truth, objectivity or neutrality.” (Rousas John Rushdoony)²

Galileo and Creationism

The process against Galileo Galilei in the 17th century is frequently used as an argument against Creationist scientists and theologians, who make their belief in the trustworthiness of the Bible the starting point of their scientific research. Absolute faith in the Bible, critics say, blinds Creationists for scientific progress and hinders science. Thus, Hansjörg and Wolfgang Hemminger wrote in their book against Creationism:

“Today’s Creationism, in rejecting the radical experimental orientation of Scriptural research, turns against the great Christian naturalists of the 15th and 16th century, against Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler and Newton. It repeats the proceeding against Galileo and argues in principle with the Inquisitors, for the issue at the trial was, among other things, whether the natural scientist had the freedom to set experimentation and observation above Scripture, which was understood to be natural history and was interpreted according to Aristotelian principles. Today’s Creationists in principle have the same standpoint as the Inquisitors because they follow their empirical-biblicistic method.”³

¹ Updated translation of “‘Und sie bewegt sich doch!’ und andere Galilei-Legenden”. Factum 3/4/1990: 138-145; reprinted from “But it does move!”, and other Legends about the Galileo-Affair”. S. 153-173 in: Andrew Sandlin (Hg.). A Comprehensive Faith: An International Festschrift for Rousas John Rushdoony. Friends of Chalcedon: San Jose (CA), 1996. Shorter version in “The Galileo affair: history of heroic hagiography?”. Creation ex nihilo Technical Journal (Australia) 14 (2000) 1: 91-100

² R. J. Rushdoony, *The Nature of the American System* (Fairfax, VI, 1978/1965), 76-77

³ Hansjörg Hemminger, Wolfgang Hemminger, *Jenseits der Weltbilder: Naturwissenschaft, Evolution, Schöpfung* (Quell Verlag, Stuttgart, Germany, 1991), 201-202

This, of course is nonsense. One could view the situation just the other way round in favor of the Creationists, even though this probably would be just as one-sided: *Galileo was a scientist believing in the trustworthiness of the Bible and trying to show that the Copernican system was compatible with it. He was fighting against the contemporary principles of Bible interpretation, which, blinded by Aristotelian philosophy, did not do justice to the Biblical text. Galileo was not blamed for criticizing the Bible but for disobeying Papal orders. Even today, most Creationists are natural scientists who allow themselves to read the Bible differently from the contemporary school of Biblical interpretation, i. e. higher criticism, and therefore are criticized by the theological establishment, especially by the huge liberal churches and by other established natural scientists.* (Hansjörg Hemminger, quoted above, is, for example, paid by the German liberal state churches to fight sects and fundamentalist endeavors.)

But here we will discuss a different topic. *The picture of the Vatican process against Galileo Galilei, used by the Hemmingers and others is not drawn from historical research but from heroic hagiography. The picture of a life-and-death battle between a completely narrow-minded Christian Church and the ingenious and always objective natural science in the Galileo-affair depends on too many legends.*

Examples of hagiographies on Galileo full of legends are the biographies of the Anthroposophical author, Johannes Hemleben⁴, the official Galileo-biography of the former GDR by Ernst Schmutzer and Wilhelm Schütz⁵, and the chapter on Galileo in Fischer-Fabian's book "The Power of Conscience"⁶.

⁴ Johannes Hemleben, *Galileo Galilei, mit Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten dargestellt*, rowohlts monographien 156 (Rowohlt Verlag, Reinbek, Germany, 1969). Hemleben in the end regards the line from Galileo through Newton up to modern times detour and offers the line to Novalis and Goethe up to the occultist and founder of Anthroposophy, Rudolf Steiner. Hemleben has written several volumes in the famous biographical series 'Rororo-Bildmonographien'. Especially his volumes on Biblical persons are heavily influenced by Anthroposophy. Probably the publisher is very close to Anthroposophy himself, which is true for many other German publishers and book stores, as one can see looking into their bookshelves.

⁵ Ernst Schmutzer; Wilhelm Schütz, *Galileo Galilei, Biographien hervorragender Naturwissenschaftler, Techniker und Mediziner 19* (B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig, Germany, 1983)

⁶ S. Fischer-Fabian, *Die Macht des Gewissens* (Droemer Knauer, Munich, Germany, 1987), 149-200 (chapter 4: "Galilei oder 'Eppur si muove'"). Fischer-Fabian starts his chapter on Galileo with examples of legends on Galileo, which have long been disproved (p. 149). Nevertheless he wants to use them as anecdotes, which are not his-

There are many examples of a virtually religious “adoration”⁷ of Galileo, in juvenile⁸ as well as in scientific literature⁹.

I know of only one printed answer by a Creationist to the misuse of Galileo’s trial by Evolutionists, in the Doorway Papers by Arthur C. Custance¹⁰. An even more extended comment by Creationists on the Galileo-affair is necessary. This article will give a first evaluation and list important literature, but can only help to start discussion, because Koestler is right when he states:

“Few episodes in history have given rise to a literature as voluminous as the trial of Galileo.”¹¹

In view of more than 8000 titles on the Galileo-affair and the 20 volumes of the complete works of Galileo himself, one article cannot discuss all aspects of the whole issue.

Galileo-Legends

“The most popular Galileo-legend, which put the courage saying ‘But it does move!’ into the mouth of the Florentine scholar, after his denial under oath of the teaching of the moving earth in 1633, dates back to the time of Enlightenment. Apart from this glorifying picture, every epoch created the Galileo it needed: Galileo, the pioneer of truth, or the renegade, the martyr of

torical but contain a grain of truth (p. 150). Even though he frequently speaks about Galileo-legends (e. g. on p. 193 he shows that Galileo never was tortured), his chapter on Galileo is a pure hagiography full of heroism.

⁷ Hans Christian Freiesleben, *Galilei als Forscher* (Darmstadt, Germany, 1968), 8

⁸ E. g. the hero-worship with many legends on Galileo in the book for the youth by the French professor of physics Jean-Pierre Maury, *Galileo Galilei: Und sie bewegt sich doch!*, Abenteuer – Geschichte 8 (Ravensburg, Germany, 1990) (cf. my review in *Querschnitte* Jan/Mar 4 (1991) 1 (*Jan-Mrz*), p. 23). Galileo is said to have discovered through his telescope “irrefutable proofs for the Copernican world-view” (viz. back-cover)!

⁹ E. g. viz. (the whole book); Hans Mohr, “Naturwissenschaft und Ideologie”, *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte (Beilage zur Wochenzeitung Das Parlament)* Nr. B15/92 April, 3, 1992, pp. 10-18, especially 11-12

¹⁰ Arthur C. Custance, “The Medieval Synthesis and the Modern Fragmentation of Thought”, in Arthur C. Custance, *Science and Faith*, The Doorway Papers VIII (Grand Rapids, MI, 1978), pp. 99-216, here chapter 3: “History Repeats Itself”, 152-167

¹¹ Arthur Koestler, *The Sleepwalkers: A History of Man’s Changing Vision of the Universe* (London, 1959), 425

science, or the cunning and tactical zealot, in short: the positive or negative ... hero”¹².

With these words, Anna Mudry starts her introduction into the German collection of works and letters by Galileo Galilei¹³. She goes on:

“In reality, the biography of the co-founder of modern science contains many shifts, inconsequences, and withdrawals, which had already been realized by Galileo’s contemporaries. On the one hand they praised the ‘Columbus of new heavens’, on the other hand they reacted openly against his inner conflict. ‘A clever man he will be, wanting and feeling what the Holy Church wants and feels. But he ignites himself on his own opinions, has irritable passions in himself and little power and wisdom to overcome them ...’ This reports the Tuscan ambassador of the prince, Piero Guicciardini, on the 4th of March 1616 to Florence with little benevolence, but with an intelligent awareness of Galileo’s inner conflict.”¹⁴

Similarly, Arthur Koestler starts the section on Galileo in his famous and much discussed history of astronomy, “The Sleepwalkers”¹⁵:

“The personality of Galileo, as it emerges from works of popular science, has ever less relation to historic fact than Canon Koppernigk’s. In his particular case, however, this is not caused by benevolent indifference towards the individual as distinct from his achievement, but by more partisan motives. In works with a theological bias, he appears as the nigger in the woodpile; in rationalist mythography, as the Maid of Orleans of Science, the St. George who slew the dragon of the Inquisition. It is, therefore, hardly surprising that the fame of this outstanding genius rests mostly on discoveries he never made, and of feats he never performed. Contrary to statements in even recent outlines of science, Galileo did not invent the telescope; nor the microscope; nor the thermometer; nor the pendulum clock. He did not discover the law of inertia; nor the parallelogram of forces or motions; nor the sun spots. He made no

¹² Anna Mudry, “Annäherung an Galileo Galilei”, editors introduction, in Galileo Galilei, *Schriften, Briefe, Dokumente*, 2 vol., (Berlin and Munich, Germany, 1987), 1:7-41, quoted p. 8

¹³ Galileo Galilei, *Schriften, Briefe, Dokumente*, 2 vol., (Berlin and Munich, Germany, 1987)

¹⁴ A. Mudry, op. cit., 8; see a further quotation of the ambassador in the explanation to Thesis 4

¹⁵ A. Koestler, op. cit. Koestler discusses Copernicus, Kepler and Galileo and formulated many new heavily discussed theses; cf. the literature in favor or against Koestler in J. Hemleben, op. cit., 159 and A. C. Custance, op. cit., 152f, especially footnote 106. Custance often appeals to Koestler and views his book as an excellent discussion of the original records. He does not agree with Koestler’s philosophical starting point, that Galileo was the first one really to grasp and promote the incompatibility of faith and reason.

contribution to theoretical astronomy; he did not throw down weights from the leaning tower of Pisa, and did not prove the truth of the Copernican system. He was not tortured by the Inquisition, did not languish in its dungeons, did not say ‘*eppur si muove*’¹⁶; and he was not a martyr of science. What he *did* was to found the modern science of dynamics, which makes him rank among the men who shaped human destiny.”¹⁷

Gerhard Prause, author of several books and articles on famous legends in historical research¹⁸, writes about the view that the Galileo-affair was the greatest scandal of Christianity and proof for the backwardness of the Church:

“The truth is that this is a primitive stereotype, a falsifying story book tale, a legend which seems to be immortal, even though it has long since been corrected by historians. These corrections have been made widely known by bestselling authors – most impressively by Arthur Koestler.”¹⁹

The Leaning Tower of Pisa

The best example of a Galileo-legend aside from the never-uttered legendary sentence ‘But it does move!’ is Galileo’s supposed experiment on the leaning tower of Pisa. Alexander Koyré has written an article “The Experiment of Pisa: Case-History of a Legend”²⁰, in which he shows that Galileo never carried out this experiment, yea, he even could not have done so! He writes: “The average reader of today connects Galileo’s name firmly with the picture of the leaning tower”²¹. “The history of the ‘experiments’ of Pisa meanwhile is part of our heritage. It can be found in

¹⁶ ‘But it does move!’

¹⁷ A. Koestler, op. cit., 353. But K. Fischer, *Galileo Galilei*, (München, 1983), 34 shows, that even if all of Galileo’s doubtful inventions and discoveries really would be Galileo’s, this would not match the real Galileo and his importance.

¹⁸ Especially Gerhard Prause, *Niemand hat Kolumbus ausgelacht: Fälschungen und Legenden der Geschichte richtiggestellt* (Düsseldorf, Germany, without year⁷)

¹⁹ Gerhard Prause, “Galileo Galilei war kein Märtyrer”, *Die Zeit* Nov, 7, 1980, p. 78; cf. the whole article and the full version in Gerhard Prause. op. cit. chapter 7: “Galilei war kein Märtyrer”, pp. 173-192

²⁰ chapter heading in Alexander Koyré, *Galilei: Anfänge der neuzeitlichen Wissenschaft*, Kleine kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliothek (Berlin, 1988), 59 (cf. p. 59-69); cf. also William A. Wallace, “Galileo’s Concept of Science: Recent Manuscript Evidence”, in ed. G. V. Coyne, M. Heller, J. Zycinski, *The Galileo Affair: A Meeting of Faith and Science: Proceedings of the Cracow Conference 24 to 27 May 1984* (Vatican City, 1985), pp. 15-40

²¹ A. Koyré, op. cit., 59

handbooks and guides."²² Even scientific literature is no exception²³, although E. Wohlwill already in 1909 proved the legendary character of the experiments beyond doubt²⁴.

The battleground pro and con on this legend is a text of the early biography of Galileo by Vincenzo Viviani²⁵, which was written 60 years after Galileo's death. Alexander Koyré writes:

"Neither Galileo's friends nor his enemies mention it [i. e. the experiments]. Nothing is more improbable than such a silence. We would have to suggest that Galileo, who describes experiments he had only thought about as experiments which he carried out, at the same time purposely concealed a glorious actual experiment."²⁶

Koyré has shown, that Galileo could not even have imagined such experiments, as he held to a physical theory different to the one those experiments would have proved (and did prove later on).

16 Theses on the Galileo-Affair

The following 16 theses will show why the Galileo-affair cannot serve as an argument for any position on the relation of religion and science. Thereby I mainly follow Galileo's own writings²⁷, K. Fischer's biography²⁸, A. Koestler's research on the original documents of the Galileo-process²⁹, the Creationist essay by A. C. Custance³⁰ and the scientific research of the Czech author Zdenko Solles³¹.

²² Viz. 68, footnote 1

²³ examples in viz. 59-62

²⁴ Emil Wohlwill. "Die Pisaner Fallversuche", *Mitteilungen zur Geschichte der Medizin und Naturwissenschaft* vol. 4 (1905): 229-248; Emil Wohlwill, *Galilei und sein Kampf für die copernicanische Lehre*, vol. 1: *Bis zur Verurteilung der copernicanischen Lehre durch die römischen Kongregationen* (Hamburg, 1909), 115; vol. 2: *Nach der Verurteilung der copernicanischen Lehre durch das Decret von 1616* (Hamburg, 1926), 260ss

²⁵ A translation of the original text can be found in Alexander Koyré, *Galilei*, op. cit., 63

²⁶ Viz. 64

²⁷ Galileo Galilei, *Schriften, Briefe, Dokumente*, op. cit.

²⁸ K. Fischer, op. cit. Fischer discusses very well how far Galileo produced real scientific progress in his times.

²⁹ A. Koestler, op. cit., 352-495; cf. footnote 15.

³⁰ A. C. Custance, op. cit.

³¹ Zdenko Solle, *Neue Gesichtspunkte zum Galilei-Prozeß, (mit neuen Akten aus böhmischen Archiven)*, ed. Günther Hamann, Österreichische Akademie der Wissen-

The intent of the theses can be summarized with Koestler's judgment:

“In other words. I believe the idea that Galileo's trial was a kind of Greek tragedy, a showdown between ‘blind faith’ and ‘enlightened reason’, to be naively erroneous.”³²

It goes without saying that the 16 theses neither intend to defend the Inquisition nor aim at denying any scientific value of Galileo's thinking or research. But Solle is correct, when he writes:

“The picture full of contrast, showing a heroic scientist in front of the dark background of Inquisition will develop many different nuances.”³³

1. The Ptolemaic system had been denied by many high officials and Jesuit astronomers even before Galileo was born. Many of them followed the Copernican system.

An open defense of the Copernican system in principle was without danger, as the example of the Imperial Court astronomer, Johannes Kepler, proves³⁴.

“The Jesuits themselves were more Copernican than Galileo was; it is now well recognized that the reason why Chinese astronomy advanced more rapidly than European astronomy was simply because Jesuit missionaries communicated to them their Copernican views.”³⁵

“While Martin Luther called the author of ‘De revolutionibus orbium coelestium’ [i. e. Nicolaus Copernicus] a ‘fool’, which will turn ‘the whole art of *Astronomiae* upside down’, the book had not been fought by the Vatican. It was seen as ‘mathematical hypothesis’, but had already been used as an aid in astronomical calculations for a long time. Only some time after leading Jesuit

schaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 361, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Geschichte der Mathematik, Naturwissenschaften und Medizin 24 (Vienna, 1980). A very good introduction (without footnotes) into an alternative view of the Galileo-affair can be found in the mentioned texts of Gerhard Prause. Catholic historians have produced several refutations and justifications on the Galileo-affair which have not been used in our article, although they argue similarly, see e. g. several articles in G. V. Coyne, M. Heller, J. Zycinski, op. cit., and Walter Brandmüller, *Galilei und die Kirche: Ein ‘Fall’ und seine Lösung* (Aachen, Germany, 1994)

³² A. Koestler, op. cit., 426

³³ Z. Solle, op. cit., 6

³⁴ cf. A. Koestler, op. cit., 355-358

³⁵ A. C. Custance, op. cit., 154 with further literature; cf. the addendum in A. Koestler, op. cit., 495

scientists like Pater Clavius had agreed to the trustworthiness of Galileo's observations, Copernicus and his followers became 'suspicious'.³⁶

The book by Copernicus was not placed on the Vatican Index until 1616 to 1620 and was readmitted to the public after some minor changes³⁷. Only Galileo's 'Dialogue' remained on the Index from 1633 till 1837³⁸.

2. Until the trial against him, Galileo stood in high esteem among the Holy See, the Jesuits and especially the Popes of his lifetime. His teachings were celebrated.

"The visit" in Rome in 1611, after he had published his 'Messenger from the Stars', "was a triumph"³⁹. "Pope Paul V welcomed him in friendly audience, and the Jesuit Roman College honored him with various ceremonies which lasted a whole day."⁴⁰ Jean-Pierre Maury writes about this visit:

"Now Galileo's discoveries have been acknowledged by the greatest astronomical and religious authorities of his time. Pope Paul V received him in private audience and showed him so much reverence, that he did not allow him to kneel down in front of him, as was usual. Some weeks later the whole Collegio Romano gathered in the presence of Galileo officially to celebrate his discoveries. At the same time, Galileo met all the Roman intellectuals, and one of the most famous among them, Prince Federico des Cesi, asked him to become the sixth member of the Accademia dei Lincei (Academy of the Lynxes), which he had founded."⁴¹

Galileo's first written statement in favor of the Copernican system, his 'Letters on Sunspots', were met with much approval and no critical voice was heard. Among the cardinals who congratulated Galileo, was Cardinal Barberini, the later Pope Urban VIII, who would sentence him in 1633⁴². In 1615 an accusation against Galileo was filed but denied by the Court of

³⁶ Anna Mudry, op. cit., 29

³⁷ A. Koestler, op. cit., 457-459. Koestler shows that in Galileo's time many books were put on the 'Index' without any disadvantages for the authors. He proves that even books from the cardinals and censors judging Galileo were on the 'Index'.

³⁸ J. Hemleben, op. cit., 167

³⁹ A. Koestler, op. cit., 426

⁴⁰ viz. 426; cf. 426-428; cf. about the visit E. Wohlwill, op. cit., 1:366-392

⁴¹ J.-P. Maury, op. cit., 96. Totally wrong is the outlook of H. C. Freiesleben, op. cit., 8, who writes, concerning the time after 1610: "From this time on Galileo tried to get the Copernican system to be acknowledged especially by representatives of the Church. Unfortunately he had the opposite result."

⁴² A. Koestler, op. cit., 431+432

Inquisition. From 1615 till 1632 Galileo enjoyed the friendship of many cardinals and the different Popes⁴³.

3. The battle against Galileo was not started by Catholic officials, but by Galileo's colleagues and scientists, who were afraid to loose their position.

The representatives of the Church were much more open to the Copernican system than the scientists and Galileo's colleagues. Galileo did avoid and delay an open confession in favor of the Copernican system in fear of his immediate and other colleagues, not in fear of any part of the Church⁴⁴.

This was already true of Copernicus himself. Gerhard Prause summarizes the situation:

“Not in fear of those above him in the Church – as is often wrongly stated –, but because he was afraid to be ‘laughed at and to be hissed off the stage’ – as he formulated it himself – by the university professor, did he refuse to publish his work ‘De revolutionibus orbium coelestium’ for more than 38 years. Only after several Church officials, especially Pope Clemens VII, had requested it, did Copernicus finally decide to publish his work.”⁴⁵

Only few scientists living in Galileo's time confessed publicly that they followed Copernicus. Some did so secretly, but most denied the Copernican system⁴⁶.

“Thus, while the poets were celebrating Galileo's discoveries which had become the talk of the world, the scholars in his own country were, with a few exceptions, hostile or skeptical. The first, and for some time the only, scholarly voice raised in public in defense of Galileo, was Johannes Kepler's.”⁴⁷

Beside this, the Church represented not only the interests of theologians but also the interests of those scientists who were part of the orders of the Church. The Order of the Jesuits, who were behind the trial against Galileo, included the leading scientists of that day.

Galileo's case confronts us with the heaviness and clumsiness of scientific changes due to the social habits of the scientific community, which

⁴³ viz. 442-443

⁴⁴ So especially G. Prause, *Niemand hat Kolumbus ausgelacht*, op. cit., 182-183

⁴⁵ G. Prause, “Galileo Galilei war kein Märtyrer”, op. cit., 78

⁴⁶ cf. David F. Siemens, “Letter to the Editor”, *Science* 147(1965), 8-9. His authority is Bernard Barber, “Resistance of Scientist to Scientific Discovery”, *Science* 134(1961), pp. 596 ss; cf. A. C. Custance, op. cit., 157. The best argument for this thesis can be found in E. Wohlwill, op. cit. vol. 1.

⁴⁷ A. Koestler, op. cit., 369-370

Thomas Kuhn has described in his famous book 'The Structure of Scientific Revolution'. *More than once, it was not the Church withholding scientific progress but the scientific community!*

4. Galileo was a very obstinate, sensitive, and aggressive scientist, who created many deadly enemies by his harsh polemics even among those who no longer followed the Ptolemaic world-view.

Galileo had already earned the nickname 'the "wrangler"⁴⁸' during his student days. Koestler repeatedly demonstrates that this personal aspect of many of Galileo's battles made it impossible for other scientists to work with him⁴⁹.

Koestler writes about Galileo's answer to the critics of his 'Messenger from the Stars':

"Galileo had a rare gift of provoking enmity; not the affection alternating with rage which Tycho aroused, but the cold, unrelenting hostility which genius plus arrogance minus humility creates among mediocrities. Without the personal background, the controversy which followed the publication of the *Sidereus Nuncius*⁵⁰ would remain incomprehensible."⁵¹

A. Koestler adds more generally:

"His method was to make a laughing stock of his opponent – in which he invariably succeeded, whether he happened to be in the right or in the wrong. ... It was an excellent method to score a moment's triumph, and make a life-long enemy."⁵²

Z. Solle states it similarly:

"Galileo was not afraid of personal attacks and mockery against others, but this was the easiest way to create enemies."⁵³

Koestler comments on an immoderate answer by Galileo against an anti-Ptolemaic writing of the leading Jesuit astronomer Horatio Grassi:

"When Galileo read the treatise, he had an outburst of fury. He covered its margin with exclamations like 'piece of asinity', 'elephantine', 'buffoon', 'evil poltroon', and 'ungrateful villain'. The ingratitude consisted in the fact that the treatise did not mention Galileo's name – whose only contribution to

⁴⁸ E. Schmutzer, W. Schütz, op. cit., 28

⁴⁹ cf. beside the quotations in the text further examples for Galileo's fury in A. Koestler, op. cit., 431-432+433-436+362-363

⁵⁰ 'Messenger from the Stars'

⁵¹ viz. 368

⁵² viz. 452.

⁵³ Z. Solle, op. cit., 9

the theory of comets has been a casual endorsement of Tycho's views in the *Letters on Sunspots*.⁵⁴

K. Fischer comments on the same event:

"It is hard to decide what the most remarkable side of this debate is: the open proceeding of the Jesuits against the Aristotelian physics of the heavens, the almost devote bowing of Horatio Grassi before Galileo's authority, Galileo's measureless aggressiveness, which destroyed everything that Grassi had said, or Galileo's genial rhetoric, which he used with a great skill against Grassi and Brahe, so that especially Grassi seemed to be a pitiable figure, who did not know what he was talking about ..."⁵⁵

Koestler writes on a vile and vulgar writing by Galileo against B. Capra⁵⁶:

"In his later polemical writings, Galileo's style progressed from coarse invective to satire, which was sometimes cheap, often subtle, always effective. He changed from the cudgel to the rapier, and achieved a rare mastery at it ..."⁵⁷

A. C. Culance mentions as an example for Galileo's oversensibility his reaction against the rumor that a seventy-year old Dominican had cast doubts on his thesis in a private conversation. Galileo wrote a harsh letter and called him to account. The Dominican answered that he was too old and would not have enough knowledge to judge Galileo's thesis, and that he only had made some private remarks in a conversation in order not to be called ignorant. Galileo still felt that he had been "attacked"⁵⁸.

The Tuscan ambassador in Rome, under whose protection Galileo lived, characterized Galileo in a letter to the Prince of Tuscany:

"... He is passionately involved in this quarrel, as if it were his own business, and he does not see and sense what it would comport; so that he will be snared in it, and will get himself into danger, together with anyone who seconds him ... For he is vehement and is totally fixed and impassioned in this affair, so that it is impossible, if you have him around, to escape from his hands. And this business which is not a joke but may become of great consequence, and this man is here under our protection and responsibility ..."⁵⁹

⁵⁴ A. Koestler, op. cit., 467

⁵⁵ K. Fischer, op. cit., 128-129; cf. Thesis 10 on this battle

⁵⁶ A. Koestler, op. cit., 363

⁵⁷ viz.

⁵⁸ A. C. Culance, op. cit., 153

⁵⁹ A. Koestler, op. cit., 452-453; cf. the quotation of the Tuscan ambassador in the quotation from Anna Mudry (with footnote 14)

5. Galileo ignored all other researchers, did not inform them about his discoveries and believed that he alone made scientifically relevant discoveries. As a result, some of Galileo's condemned teachings were already out of date, especially because of the progress made by Kepler's writings.

"Judging by Galileo's correspondence and other records of his opinion of himself, he was fantastically selfish intellectually and almost unbelievable conceited. As an illustration of the former there is the now well-known fact that he refused to share with his colleagues or with acquaintances as Kepler any of his own findings or insights; he actually claimed to be the only one who ever would make any new discovery! In writing to an acquaintance he expressed himself as follows: 'You cannot help it, Mr. Sarsi, that it was granted to me alone to discover all the new phenomena in the sky and nothing to anybody else. This is the truth which neither malice nor envy can suppress'."⁶⁰

Galileo's relationship to Johannes Kepler is a good example for this thesis (as well as an example for Thesis 4). Galileo had shared his belief in the Copernican system with Kepler at an early stage of their acquaintance and Kepler had blindly, without proofs, accepted Galileo's book 'Messenger from the Stars'⁶¹. But Galileo refused to give Kepler one of his telescopes, although he gave them to many political heads of the world⁶². Kepler could only use a Galilean telescope after the Duke of Bavaria lent him one⁶³. Galileo wrote his discoveries to Kepler only in anagrams, so that Kepler could not understand them but Galileo later could prove that these were his discoveries⁶⁴. After this, Galileo broke off all further contact with Kepler. He totally ignored Kepler's famous book 'Astronomia Nova' even though it was only a further development of Copernicus and of Galileo's discoveries⁶⁵ (cf. Thesis 10).

"For it must be remembered that the system which Galileo advocated was the orthodox Copernican system, designed by the Canon himself, nearly a century before Kepler threw out the epicycles and transformed the abstruse paper-construction into a workable mechanical model. Incapable of acknowledging that any of his contemporaries had a share in the progress of astronomy, Galileo blindly and indeed suicidally ignored Kepler's work to the end,

⁶⁰ A. C. Custance, op. cit., 153

⁶¹ A. Koestler, op. cit., 370

⁶² viz. 375

⁶³ viz. 378

⁶⁴ viz. 376-377

⁶⁵ K. Fischer, op. cit., 169

persisting in the futile attempt to bludgeon the world into accepting a Ferris wheel with forty-eight epicycles as ‘rigorously demonstrated’ physical reality.’⁶⁶

6. Galileo contradicted himself not only during the trial. In oral discussion he denied the Copernican system, which he had defended in earlier writings.

A. Koestler writes on the trial and on Galileo’s defense:

“To pretend, in the teeth of the evidence of the printed pages of his books, that it said the opposite of what it did, was suicidal folly. Yet Galileo had had several month’s respite in which to prepare his defense. The explanation can only be sought in the quasi-pathological contempt Galileo felt for his contemporaries. The pretence that the *Dialogue* was written in refutation of Copernicus was so patently dishonest that his case would have been lost in any court.’⁶⁷

“If it had been the Inquisition’s intention to break Galileo, this obviously was the moment to confront him with the copious extracts from his books – which were in the files in front of the judge – to quote to him what he had said about the sub-human morons and pygmies who were opposing Copernicus, and to convict him of perjury. Instead, immediately following Galileo’s last answer, the minutes of the trial say: ‘And as nothing further could be done in execution of the decree, his signature was obtained to his deposition and he was sent back.’ Both the judges and the defendant knew that he was lying, both the judge and he knew that the threat of torture (*territio verbalis*) was merely a ritual formula, which could not be carried out ...’⁶⁸.

But these discrepancies and even hypocrisy can be found during the whole of Galileo’s life. In the beginning, about the years 1604/1605, when a highly visible supernova soon became weaker and it was not possible to show a parallax any longer, Galileo sometimes even doubted the Copernican system himself⁶⁹. In 1613, in his 50th year, Galileo for the first time stated in printed his conviction that it was true. But in 1597 he had stated the same in a private letter to Kepler. For 16 years “in his lectures he not only taught the old astronomy of Ptolemy, but denied Copernicus explicitly”⁷⁰. This was the case even though there would have been no danger at all in presenting the Copernican system⁷¹. He confessed his belief in Co-

⁶⁶ A. Koestler, op. cit., 438; cf. the next paragraph 438-439

⁶⁷ A. Koestler, op. cit., 485

⁶⁸ viz. 492

⁶⁹ K. Fischer, op. cit., 94

⁷⁰ A. Koestler, op. cit., 357-358; cf. 431

⁷¹ viz.; cf. Thesis 1

pernicious in private discussions and letters only. Several authors have correctly explained this by his fear from mockery of other scientists. Only after Galileo had become famous through his discoveries in the area of mechanics, dynamics and optics, did he admit his Copernican position in print.

K. Fischer occasionally indicates that Galileo could write things contrary to his own opinion⁷², namely in order to harm other people.

7. Galileo was not a strictly experimental scientist.

K. Fischer writes on Galileo's book 'De Motu' ('On motion'):

"One can doubt whether Galileo had made many experiments to prove his theories. If that had been the case, it is hard to understand why he never changed his position that light objects are accelerated faster in the beginning of their natural motion than heavier ones. According to Galileo's own understanding, such tests were neither necessary to prove his theory nor enough to disprove it. His proceeding was axiomatically orientated."⁷³

Koestler refers to Professor Burtt, who assumes, that it was mainly those who stressed empirical research, who did not follow the new teaching, because of its lack of proof (cf. Thesis 8).

"Contemporary empiricists, had they lived in the sixteenth century, would have been the first to scoff out of court the new philosophy of the universe."⁷⁴

8. Galileo did not and could not have proofs for his theory, as the first real proofs were found 50 to 100 years later. But Galileo always acted as if he had all proofs, but did not present them, as he said, because no one else was intelligent enough to understand them.

Koestler writes:

"He employs his usual tactics of refuting his opponent's thesis without proving his own."⁷⁵

As Galileo did not work empirically (cf. Thesis 7), but regarded the Copernican system as an axiom, he did not feel the need for proofs. Not until he was put under pressure because he presented the Copernican system as proven, did he get into difficulties.

When Cardinal Bellarmine, who was responsible for the Court of Inquisition, asked Galileo in a friendly way for his proofs, so that he could accept

⁷² e. g. K. Fischer, op. cit., 138

⁷³ K. Fischer, op. cit., 53

⁷⁴ quoted by A. Koestler, op. cit., 461

⁷⁵ A. Koestler, op. cit., 478

his theory as proven theory, and asked him otherwise to present his Copernican theory as hypothesis only, Galileo answered in a harsh letter, that he was not willing to present his evidence, because no one could really understand them. Koestler comments on this:

“How can he refuse to produce proof and at the same time demand that the matter should be treated as if proven? The solution of the dilemma was to pretend that he had the proof, but to refuse to produce it, on the grounds that his opponents were too stupid, anyway, to understand.”⁷⁶

Galileo reacted in a similar way after the Pope himself asked for proofs⁷⁷.

Koestler writes about an earlier letter from 1613:

“But Galileo did not want to bear the burden of proof; for the crux of the matter is, as will be seen, that he had no proof.”⁷⁸

Virtually all researchers agree that Galileo had no physical proof for his theory⁷⁹. Some parts of Galileo’s theory even could not be proven at all because they were wrong and already outdated by Kepler’s research (cf. Theses 10 and 5).

Fischer summarizes:

“He did not have really convincing proofs such as the parallax shift or Foucault’s pendulum.”⁸⁰

One must not forget that the Copernican hypothesis itself was never denied by the Inquisition, but that it only was not allowed to be presented as a scientifically proven theory or as a truth.

“In fact, however, there never had been any question of condemning the Copernican system as a working hypothesis.”⁸¹

The Copernican system was just “an officially tolerated working hypothesis, awaiting proof”⁸².

As Galileo came more and more under pressure, he finally invented a “secret weapon”⁸³, the totally erroneous theory that the tides were caused

⁷⁶ viz. 449; cf. 445-451, especially 449-450 for the whole debate

⁷⁷ K. Fischer, op. cit., 148

⁷⁸ A. Koestler, op. cit., 436

⁷⁹ cf. K. Fischer, op. cit., 123; cf. A. C. Custance, op. cit., 157+154-155

⁸⁰ K. Fischer, op. cit., 122

⁸¹ A. Koestler, op. cit., 437

⁸² viz.; cf. the whole paragraph

⁸³ viz. 464

by the turning of the earth. This easily disprovable theory was said to be the absolute secure proof of the Copernican system!⁸⁴

"The whole idea was in such glaring contradiction to fact, and so absurd as a mechanical theory – the field of Galileo's own immortal achievements – that its conception can only be explained in psychological terms."⁸⁵

William A. Wallace used recently discovered manuscripts to show⁸⁶, that Galileo knew exactly that the final proof for the Copernican system was lacking and that he was covering this under his rhetoric. Jean Dietz Moss has done research on this kind of rhetoric⁸⁷ and makes clear how Galileo's own texts show, that Galileo knew that he had to fill the missing evidence with rhetoric.

9. In Galileo's time science no longer had to decide between Ptolemy and Copernicus. Ptolemy was no longer a real option. Rather it is important, "that the choice now lay between Copernicus and Brahe"⁸⁸, because everybody believed that the earth was moving around the sun. The question was, whether or not the earth was moving itself or was staying in the center of the universe.

"Nearly no expert believed in Ptolemaic astronomy any longer. The conflict was between Tycho Brahe and Copernicus."⁸⁹

Tycho Brahe, predecessor of Kepler as German Imperial Court astronomer, held to the central position of the earth, while at the same time integrating the observation of the earth moving around the sun.

"The arguments and observations which Galileo referred to, were acknowledged, but they denied only the Ptolemaic system, but did not favor in the same way the Copernican system. They were compatible with the Tychonian system, which had the advantage that the central position of the earth was maintained."⁹⁰

⁸⁴ viz. 464-467; cf. Thesis 10 on the tidal theory

⁸⁵ viz. 454

⁸⁶ W. A. Wallace, op. cit.

⁸⁷ Jean Dietz Moss, "The Rhetoric of Proof in Galileo's Writings on the Copernican System", in ed. G. V. Coyne, M. Heller, J. Zycinski, op. cit., pp. 41-65

⁸⁸ A. Koestler, op. cit., 427

⁸⁹ K. Fischer, op. cit., 139; cf. 123

⁹⁰ viz. 121

Galileo never took a position on this issue nor presented arguments against Tycho Brahe with the exception of his polemical and totally distorted description of Brahes system in his work against Horatio Grassi⁹¹.

10. Galileo fought very stubbornly not only for the Copernican system but also for several hypotheses, which, compared to other scientists of his time, were out of date and a relapse into the old system.

This thesis was already contained in Theses 5, 8 and 9. Galileo defended the ‘epicycloids’ of Copernicus, even though Kepler already had presented a much better theory.⁹²

His already mentioned erroneous explanation of the tides was used as his major proof for the Copernican system, even though it was untenable and Kepler had discovered the real cause of the tides in the power of attraction of the moon⁹³.

In 1618, Galileo explained some visible comets in a fiery work as reflections of light, so that nobody believed the Jesuit astronomer Grassi, who realized that the comets are flying bodies⁹⁴.

Many further examples have been discussed by A. Koestler and K. Fischer⁹⁵.

11. Under Pope Urban’s (VIII) predecessor and his successor no trial against Galileo would have taken place.

The arguments for this thesis can be found under Theses 3 and 16. We should not forget, that in 1615 a first trial against Galileo before the Court of Inquisition was decided in favor of Galileo, because of a benevolent expert evidence of the leading Jesuit astronomers⁹⁶.

12. Galileo was the victim of the politics of Pope Urban VIII, who had been very much in favor of him earlier. This was due to the political situation as well as to Galileo’s personal attacks on the Pope, never to religious reasons. The Pope had initiated the proceedings, while the Court of Inquisition calmed the whole matter down instead of stirring up the flames.

⁹¹ cf. viz. 128-129; see the quotation from this section under Thesis 4; cf. A. Koestler, op. cit., 467-468

⁹² To expand Thesis 5, cf. A. Koestler, op. cit., 378 and A. C. Custance, op. cit., 154

⁹³ A. Koestler, op. cit., 464-467+453-454

⁹⁴ Z. Solle, op. cit., 14; cf. A. Koestler, op. cit., 467

⁹⁵ A. Koestler, op. cit.; K. Fischer, Galileo Galilei, op. cit.

⁹⁶ A. Koestler, op. cit., 441-442

Thesis 12 discusses the personal aspect, Thesis 13 the political one, although it is not easy to distinguish between them.

Galileo's process took place under a ruthless and cruel Pope. A dictionary on the Popes says:

"Within the Church the pontificate of Urban was burdened with unlimited nepotism. Urban VIII was a tragic figure on the Popal throne. His reign was full of failures, for which he was himself responsible."⁹⁷

Koestler writes at the end of his description of Pope Urban VIII, the former Cardinal Barberini, who for Koestler was "cynical, vainglorious, and lusting for secular power"⁹⁸: He

"was the first Pope to allow a monument to be erected to him in his lifetime. His vanity was indeed monumental, and conspicuous even in an age which had little use for the virtue of modesty. His famous statement that he 'knew better than all the Cardinals put together' was only equaled by Galileo's that he alone had discovered everything new in the sky. They both considered themselves supermen and started on as basis of mutual adulation – a type of relationship which, as a rule, comes to a bitter end."⁹⁹

This Pope also was a danger to science:

"The Pope paralyzed scientific life in Italy. The center of the new research came to the Protestant countries in the North."¹⁰⁰

Thus the Galileo-affair was mainly an inner-Catholic and inner-Italian problem, but surely no gigantic battle between Christianity as such and science as such. The Court of Inquisition did not accuse Galileo of teaching against the Bible, but disobeying a Papal decree.

Urban VIII had favored Galileo as Cardinal (cf. Thesis 1) and had even written an ode to Galileo¹⁰¹. After he had become Pope in 1623, his love for Galileo even increased¹⁰².

Only a short time before the trial Urban's friendship turned into hatred. This was not only due to the political situation (cf. Thesis 13), but to Galileo's personal carelessness, not to say insults. Galileo obtained the right to print his major work 'Dialogue' from the Pope personally in case some mi-

⁹⁷ Rudolf Fischer-Wollpert, *Lexikon der Päpste* (Verlag Friedrich Pustet, Regensburg, Germany, 1985), 118

⁹⁸ A. Koestler, op. cit., 471

⁹⁹ viz. 471; similarly K. Fischer, op. cit., 145-146

¹⁰⁰ Z. Solle, op. cit., 58

¹⁰¹ A. Koestler, op. cit., 472

¹⁰² viz.

nor corrections were to be made. Galileo cleverly circumvented this censorship, and put Urban's main argument for the Copernican system (!) into the mouth of the fool 'Simplicio', who, in the 'Dialogue' of three scientists, always asks the silly questions and defends the Ptolemaic view of the world.

"But it did not require much Jesuit cunning to turn Urban's perilous adulation into the fury of the betrayed lover. Not only had Galileo gone, in letter and spirit, against the agreement to treat Copernicus strictly as a hypothesis, not only had he obtained the imprimatur by methods resembling sharp practice, but Urban's favorite argument was only mentioned briefly at the very end of the book, and put into the mouth of the simpleton who on any other point was invariably proved wrong. Urban even suspected that Simplicius was intended as a caricature of his own person. This, of course, was untrue; but Urban's suspicion persisted long after his fury had abated ..."¹⁰³

L. Pastor, a defender of Papal infallibility, has tried to show that the Pope only played a minor role in Galileo's trial and that the (anonymous) Inquisition judged harsher than the Pope as a good friend of Galileo's would have liked them to do¹⁰⁴. Z. Solle has given convincing proof that, in reality, it was just the other way round¹⁰⁵. The Pope initiated the trial for personal reasons, while the Inquisitors were quite lax. Some of the ten judges seem to have been mainly interested in their own forthcoming, while others applied the brakes. In the end, the final decision lacked three signatures, at least two of them out of protest. The only Cardinal who zealously pushed the trial forward was the Pope's brother.

"That the whole trial was questionable could not be hidden to insiders. There was much resistance by high Church officials and from the Jesuit party."¹⁰⁶

Koestler also comes to the conclusion that the Pope initiated the process:

"There is little doubt that the decision to instigate proceedings was Urban VIII's, who felt that Galileo had played a confidence trick on him."¹⁰⁷

13. Galileo was the victim of the politics of Pope Urban VIII, whose tactics in the Thirty Years' War were totally confused, who tried to bring the Italian cities under his control, who fought against all oppo-

¹⁰³ viz. 483

¹⁰⁴ according to Z. Solle, op. cit., 38-39

¹⁰⁵ viz. 64 and the whole book of Solle; cf. Thesis 6

¹⁰⁶ K. Fischer, op. cit., 126 (with additional literature)

¹⁰⁷ A. Koestler, op. cit., 482

sition within the Catholic Church, and who failed in all of this in 1644, although he had made some progress in the beginning.

The situation in the Holy See was totally dependent on the political battles of the times. Z. Solle writes:

“The council of the General-Inquisitors became a reflection of the battles between the different parties within the Church. Neither under Borgia nor under Urban was the issue astronomy or the faith of the Church, but always politics.”¹⁰⁸

“We have to return to the political situation in Rome, which lead to the transformation of an unpolitical astronomer into a criminal.”¹⁰⁹

Fischer holds a similar viewpoint:

“Now the care for the people’s souls surely was not the only motive for the Church’s actions. The Thirty Years’ War had begun in 1618 and finished the time of verbal debate. The Church found itself in the hardest battle over its existence since its earliest history.”¹¹⁰

In the beginning Pope Urban VIII supported the Catholic German Emperor, but switched over to Catholic France and Protestant Sweden after the two had become allies. He took as an example the ruthless French Cardinal Richelieu and was responsible for the prolongation of the war.

In 1627-1630 Italy underwent the additional Mantuan War of Succession. At the same time the two Catholic powers, Spain and France, which both were allies of the Pope, started to fight each other. The head of the Spanish opposition in the Holy See, Cardinal Borgia, came into conflict with the Pope over political topics in 1632, because a peace treaty was in view, while the pope wanted the war to go on¹¹¹. A tumult among the Cardinals resulted, after which the Pope began a great political purge in the Vatican, which more or less by chance struck all those favorable to Galileo¹¹². The Pope initiated many trials by the Inquisition and became an increasingly cruel ruler.

The following connections probably became fateful to Galileo, because they were in opposition to those of the Pope:

¹⁰⁸ according to Z. Solle, op. cit., 45

¹⁰⁹ viz. 22

¹¹⁰ K. Fischer, op. cit., 144

¹¹¹ Z. Solle, op. cit., 25; cf. K. Fischer, op. cit., 144

¹¹² Z. Solle, op. cit., 26-27

– The close connection to the family of the Medicis, from which the Tuscan prince came, and which, together with Venice¹¹³, fought against the Pope and were only rehabilitated after his death in 1644¹¹⁴;

– The connection with Austria¹¹⁵ and Emperor Rudolf II through Kepler, as the Pope together with France and Sweden fought against the Catholic German Emperor. The Prince of Tuscany and the German Emperor were close friends¹¹⁶.

Z. Solle has shown in detail that it was the beginning of ‘modern’ nationalism, which left Galileo between the fronts of the nationalistic Pope, the Italian cities and the parties of the Thirty Years’ War¹¹⁷.

“Thus it was not the shadow of a dying and dark night, which put pressure on the scientist (i. e. Galileo) ... but the beginning of modern times.”¹¹⁸

J. Hemleben, who favors Galileo, has argued, that he would not have had to undergo any trial, if moved from Padua to Florence, since Padua depended on Venice, but Florence on Rome¹¹⁹. Padua allowed great freedom for scientific research, because Venice was independent of Rome¹²⁰. Even Protestants studied there¹²¹, which was impossible in Florence. One of Galileo’s best friends, Giovanni Francesco Sagredo (1571-1620), had already warned Galileo in 1611 against moving to Florence, because there he would be dependent on international politics and on the Jesuits¹²². But Galileo ignored this and all later warnings.

14. Galileo died in 1642, two years before the death of his great enemy, Pope Urban VIII, in 1644. In 1644 the whole situation in Italy changed and the family of the Medicis came back to honor. Galileo would surely have been rehabilitated¹²³ (cf. Thesis 13).

¹¹³ about the open resistance of Venice cf. K. Fischer, op. cit., 144

¹¹⁴ Z. Solle, op. cit., 54

¹¹⁵ viz. 55

¹¹⁶ viz. 57

¹¹⁷ viz. 64-64

¹¹⁸ viz. 65

¹¹⁹ J. Hemleben, op. cit., 62-64 u. a.

¹²⁰ viz. 62

¹²¹ viz. 32

¹²² viz. 63-64

¹²³ Z. Solle, op. cit., 64-71

15. Galileo was not a non-Christian scientist of the Enlightenment, but a convinced Catholic¹²⁴. It was indeed his endeavor to show the compatibility his teachings with the Bible, which among other things brought him into conflict with the Catholic establishment.

Galileo's thoughts on the relation of faith and science can be seen in the quotations cited by K. Fischer under Thesis 7. Solle adds:

"As a deeply believing scientist, Galileo could not live with a discrepancy between science and faith, which seemed to arise when he started to interpret the Bible. As layman, he experienced much resistance by theologians ... His attempts to interpret the Bible were one of the reasons which led to the trial. Another reason was his attempt to popularize the Copernican system."¹²⁵

Because Galileo interpreted the Bible as a layman and wrote his books in everyday-Italian, and thus was a forerunner of Italian nationalism (cf. Thesis 15), he experienced the same resistance Martin Luther had experienced one hundred years earlier when he started to use German in his theological writings.

The preface of his major work 'Dialogue' contains clear statements that Galileo did not want to stand in opposition to the Bible¹²⁶ or to the Catholic Church. Albrecht Fölsing writes:

"Many of Galileo's admirers in the 19th and 20th century could understand this preface only as a concession to censorship. Some interpreted it as a roguish by-passing of the Decree, others as unworthy submission, again others as a mockery of the authority of the Church ... We, on the other hand, want to suggest this text to be an authentic expression of Galileo's intention under the existing conditions. The content is more or less the same as in the introduction to the letter to Ignoli in 1624, which needed no approval from a censor, as it was not written for print, but which was intended to test how much freedom for scientific discussion the Pope and the Roman See would allow. Even if one takes into account those tactical aspects of these texts (the letter of 1624

¹²⁴ This has been proved most clearly by Olaf Pedersen. "Galileo's Religion", in ed. G. V. Coyne, M. Heller, J. Zycinski, op. cit., pp. 75-102, especially pp. 88-92 on Galileo's faith in God and pp. 92-100 on his Catholic faith and his rejection of all non-Catholic 'heresies'.

¹²⁵ Z. Solle, op. cit., 9.; cf. the judgment by K. Fischer, op. cit., 114-115, quoted in the explanation to Thesis 7

¹²⁶ cf. on the positive attitude of Galileo to Scripture E. Wohlwill, op. cit., 1: 485-524 + 542-555, especially 543

and the preface to the *Dialogue*) there is no reason to doubt the honest intentions of the faithful Catholic Galileo.”¹²⁷

As a defender of Papal infallibility, L. Pastor has stated that the Pope saw a Protestant danger in Galileo, but others have doubted this¹²⁸. On the one hand one of Galileo’s first critics was a Protestant pastor from Bohemia¹²⁹, on the other hand Galileo’s writings were published and printed in Protestant states and thus became known. Besides, Galileo himself was a declared enemy of Protestantism¹³⁰.

16. Result: Galileo was not a scientist who denied any metaphysics or favored the separation of faith and science (cf. Thesis 15).

Discussing a quotation in Galileo’s ‘Letters on Sunspots’, Fischer speaks in more general terms:

“In those last sentences, one can hear a somewhat different Galileo from the picture of Galileo which the traditional interpretation paints. The main line of the historiographs of science from Wohlwill to Drake presents Galileo as an anti-metaphysician and anti-philosopher, as the initiator of a physics based on experiment and observation, as the defender of science against the illegitimate demands of religion, as the promoter of a separation of faith and science. And now we hear a confession of love to the great Creator being the final goal of all our work, thus including our scientific work! Science as perception of God’s truth! ... The ruling historiography of science cannot be freed from the reproach that they have read Galileo’s writings too selectively.”¹³¹

A little later Fischer writes about the misinterpretation of Galileo’s work:

“This misinterpretation led to the inability to evaluate correctly Galileo’s early writings (‘Juvenilia’), to ignoring many sections with speculative and metaphysical content scattered all over Galileo’s writings, yea, even to a misinterpretation of Galileo’s understanding of the relationship between science and faith ...”¹³²

¹²⁷ Albrecht Fölsing, *Galileo Galilei, Prozess ohne Ende: Eine Biographie* (Munich, Germany, 1983), 414; cf. also 414-415

¹²⁸ Following Z. Solle, op. cit., 38

¹²⁹ viz. 7

¹³⁰ E. Wohlwill, op. cit., 1:552-555; O. Pedersen. “Galileo’s Religion”, op. cit., 92-100

¹³¹ K. Fischer, op. cit., 114

¹³² viz. 115

Is There a Contradiction Between the two Creation Accounts?¹³³

A. Two Sources? Two Creation Accounts?

The alleged contradiction between the two reports in Genesis 1 and 2 has unfortunately become the prevailing opinion of our society. Even various translations of the Scriptures have adopted it. The historical-critical theory assumes, on the basis of the names of God used in them, that the two narratives originated from separated sources, an elohistic one and a yahwistic one, and believes them to be two completely irreconcilable conceptions.

This kind of differentiation of sources cannot be generally refuted here,¹³⁴ but note that there is no justification for a differentiation on the basis of the names of God. 'Elohim' is a title, 'Yahweh' (usually translated 'LORD'), a personal name. The so-called 'second' account in Genesis 2:5-25 makes this clear, for 'Yahweh' is not a substitute for 'Elohim', as many believe. Rather, the narrative continually speaks of "Elohim Yahweh" (the LORD God).¹³⁵ This corresponds to the name, 'Jesus Christ', which also consists of a personal name and a title. Besides, deities and rulers in the ancient Near East frequently had several names. There were Egyptian pharaohs, for example, with 300 different ones.¹³⁶

The question is, whether or not the two narratives essentially contradict each other. We assume that they form a unit, and will investigate the possibility that the writer's knowledge of the first report explains the second.

¹³³ Reprinted from "Is There a Contradiction between the Two Creation Accounts?". *Christianity and Society* 7 (1997) 2: 16-17

¹³⁴ See Samuel R. Külling. *Zur Datierung der Genesis-P-Stücke*. Kok, (Kampen, 1964), Immanuel Verlag (FETA); (Riehen, Basel, 1987); R. K. Harrison. *Introduction to the New Testament*, IVP, (London, 1969), pp. 493-662; Gleason Archer., *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* Vol 1, Verlag der Liebenzeller Mission, (Bad Liebenzell, 1987), pp. 97-227 (Engl. A Survey of Old Testament Introduction); Raymond B. Dillard, Tremper Longman III, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, Zondervan, (Grand Rapids, 1994), pp. 38-48.

¹³⁵ See verses 5, 7-8, 15-16, 21-22. The name 'Yahweh' does not appear alone until Gen. 4:1.

¹³⁶ Donovan Courville. *The Exodus Problem and its Ramifications*, Challenge Books, (Looma Linda, Cal., 1971).

This discussion will translate and comment on the relevant verses, using the arguments of three excellent articles by Samuel R. Külling.¹³⁷

If the two chapters are indeed complementary accounts, the first describes the creation of the cosmos, while the second narrates in detail the preparation of Man's environment, and the creation of Woman. The second report mentions God's creative activity, but only in verses 7 and 22. Otherwise, it refers to the Creation in its completed state.

A brief review of Genesis 1:1-2,25 will demonstrate this:

Review of Genesis 1:1-2,25
1:1 Proclamatory Title: God created the heavens and the earth
1:2-31 How God created the heavens and the earth (The six days)
2:1 Summary
2:2-3 The seventh day
2:4-25 How God provided for Man
2:4-7 A garden planted for Man's home
2:8 Man brought to the garden
2:9-17 Description of Man's home
2:18 The necessity of a helpmeet
2:19-25 The creation of the helpmeet

It is typical of the style of the Bible and of other ancient Middle Eastern literature to first relate only the essential details of an event, and then to describe the details and the results in a second narrative. Jonah 3:3-9 is a good example. The first three verses, which describe the prophet's message and the people's fast, are followed by the narration of king's decision to decree the fast.

The second Creation account is thus not a repetition, but a resumption, a more detailed report of the events, and is also a necessary transition to the narration of the Fall in Genesis 3.

B. The supposedly contradictory verses Genesis 2:4-15

We will now turn our attention to the verses in Genesis 2 which are believed to contradict Genesis 1.

¹³⁷ Samuel R. Külling. "Sind Genesis 1,1-2,4a und Genesis 2,4b ff zwei verschiedene, widersprüchliche Schöpfungsberichte?", *Bibel und Gemeinde* 76 (1976), pp. 217-220: "Der Schöpfungsbericht und naturwissenschaftliche Fragen", ob. cit., "Das Verständnis von Gen 2,4ff. und sein Verhältnis zu Gen 1,1-2,3; Genesis 13. Teil", *Fundamentum* 4/1983, pp. 4-16.

“This is the history of the heavens and the earth when they were created.” (Gen. 2:4a).

In spite of many discussions on the subject, it is trivial to ask whether this text is the conclusion of the preceding narration (“This is the account”), as D. J. Wiseman believes, or the introduction to the following one (“This is the history”) ¹³⁸ as long as the verse is taken by itself and not connected chronologically with verse 4b ¹³⁹. The contents seem to indicate that the expression, ‘toledoth’, means ‘that which became of’. If this is the case, then Genesis 2:4a, as a transition, makes it clear that the following account does not repeat the Creation account, but asks what became of the Creation of the heavens and the earth.

“At the time (or: on the day) that God created the heaven and the earth ¹⁴⁰,
(5) there was not yet any plant of the field on the ground, and no green herb had grown out of the ground,
for the LORD God had not yet caused it to rain upon the earth,
and there was not yet any man to till the ground” (Gen. 2:4b-5, Author’s translation).

These verses do not speak of plants in general, but only of cultivated plants which would grow out of seeds already in the ground. Two things are lacking, water and mankind. The time is therefore between the third and the sixth days of Creation. God then continues by providing water and by creating Man, so that the requirements for planting of the Garden of Eden (not the creation of the plants) are fulfilled:

“Then the water table rose and watered the whole surface of the ground. (7)
And the LORD God formed Man, (from the) dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and so the man became a living soul. (8)
And the LORD God planted a garden in Eden in the east, and put the man which He had made into it” (Gen. 2:6-8, Author’s translation).

It becomes clear in the following text, that the narrator is describing the growth, planting and cultivation of the ground, not the actual creation of plantlife.

“And the LORD God caused all sorts of trees to grow out of the ground ...
(10) And a river came out of Eden, to water the garden ... (15) And the LORD

¹³⁸ See Thomas Schirmacher. “Die Entstehung der Genesis”, *Factum* 5, 1985, pp. 12-15 (English version reprinted as next chapter of this book).

¹³⁹ See Samuel R. Külling’s three articles above for detailed arguments against taking the two statements together.

¹⁴⁰ Hebrew uses the same word for ‘ground’ and ‘the earth’

God took the man and put him in the garden, to tend it and to keep it” (Gen. 2:9, 10, 15, Author’s translation).

C. The supposedly contradictory verses Genesis 2:18-19

The following text contains another problematic passage:

“And the LORD God said, ‘It is not good that man should be alone; I will make him a helper comparable (or appropriate) to him.’ (19) And the LORD God brought all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the air, which He had made out of earth, to the man, in order to see what He would call them.” (Genesis 2:18-19, Author’s translation).

This text narrates in detail the creation of the woman from the man, while Genesis 1 only sketches the creation of mankind (vs. 27). A problem exists only if one interprets the conjunction in Genesis 2:19 as an indication of a chronological order. “And God formed every beast ... and brought them to the man ...” This would mean that mankind had been created before the animals.

Carl Friedrich Keil¹⁴¹ and Samuel R. Külling give serious arguments from Middle Eastern literature in favor of the first translation, which would indicate that God brought Man animals which He had already created. Keil notes, since only the “beasts of the field” and the “birds of the air” are mentioned, the creatures indicated are domestic animals. This would correspond to the introduction of the cultivated plants in Genesis 2:5ff.

If we assume that the account given in Genesis 2 presupposes the one in Genesis 1, we can see that there are no contradictions between them. Whoever, of course, takes it for granted that the two chapters contradict each other, will continue to maintain his position on the basis of the grammatical uncertainty.

In conclusion, we agree with the Old Testament expert, Gustav Friedrich Oehler:

“The contents of Genesis 2:4ff, the introduction to human history, is not a second account of Creation, but rather a supplement of the first and describes the completion of the earth in order to provide mankind with a home, a sphere of activity and a place for the revelation of God.”¹⁴²

¹⁴¹ Carl Friedrich Keil. “Genesis und Exodus”, *Biblischer Kommentar über das Alte Testament* 1/1, (1878; reprint, Giessen, Brunnen Verlag, 1983).

¹⁴² Gustav Friedrich Oehler. *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, J. F. Steinkopf, (Stuttgart, 1891), p. 74.

The Origin of Genesis¹⁴³

The origin of the Pentateuch has been disputed for the last four hundred years¹⁴⁴. The so-called ‘historical-critical’ method has committed itself to the opinion that the material contained in the five books was collected out of various ancient sources and assembled by several generations of editors. Too many of these theories, however, contradict each other much too often.

Conservative¹⁴⁵ and Fundamentalist¹⁴⁶ students emphasize that such a pieced-together work would be unique in the context of ancient Middle Eastern literature. Most of them, particularly the Fundamentalists, suggest as an alternative the authorship of Moses, which the Pentateuch itself, as well as the New Testament, confirms.¹⁴⁷ This is not as easy to prove for Genesis, however, for it does not mention Moses, who could not have been a witness to its events, as he was in the other four books (except Deut. 34:1-12).

¹⁴³ Reprinted from “The Origin of Genesis”. *Christianity and Society* 7 (1997) 4: 15-17

¹⁴⁴ See Samuel R. Külling. *Zur Datierung der Genesis-P-Stücke*, pp. 5-130; Samuel R. Külling. *Was lehren uns 250 Jahre Quellenforschung*. (FETA: Basel), 1961, pp. 1-10 (Fundamental interpretation); Raymond B. Dillard, Tremper Longman III, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, Zondervan, (Grand Rapids, 1994), pp. 38-48.; Hans Joachim Kraus. “Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments”, Neukirchener Verlag, (Neukirchen, 1982) (historical-critical view), as well as current introductions to the Pentateuch.

¹⁴⁵ B. Kenneth A. Kitchen. *Alter Orient und Altes Testament*, Brockhaus, (Wuppertal, 1965); Kenneth A. Kitchen. *The Bible in its World*, Paternoster, (Exeter, 1977), A. R. Millard. *Essays on the Patriarchal Narratives*, InterVarsity Press, (Leicester, GB, 1980).

¹⁴⁶ See Samuel R. Külling. *Zur Datierung der Genesis-P-Stücke*, op. cit.; Josh McDowell. *More Evidence that Demands a Verdict*, Campus Crusade for Christ, (San Bernardino, 1975); Wilhelm Möller. *Grundriß für alttestamentliche Einleitung*, Evangelischer Verlag, (Berlin, 1958); Wilhelm Möller. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, (Zwickau, 1934); Gleason Archer. *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*, Moody, (Chicago, 1974); Edward J. Young. *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, Eerdmans, (Grand Rapids, 1964).

¹⁴⁷ See the works above. The opinion of the New Testament is particularly important for Fundamentalists, because it represents a divinely inspired interpretation. Others believe that Jesus and the New Testament writers only repeat the views typical of their time. Is this opinion not too simple? Is the opinion of Jesus’ contemporaries not of great historical significance?!

It is often assumed that Moses was transmitting a ‘backwards prophecy’. Such an interpretation should not be rejected out of hand, but it does seem to be a last-ditch attempt to explain the phenomenon of Genesis. Beginning with the Fundamentalist position, I would like to try to present a model for a ‘natural’ origin for Genesis, by using the text of the book itself and contemporary knowledge about ancient Middle Eastern literature, without, however, explaining away Genesis’ divine inspiration.

Paul J. Wiseman, an archaeologist at the British Museum in London, presented this model for the first time in 1936.¹⁴⁸ He was a conservative Christian, but did not attempt to refute Biblical Criticism, which he used himself.¹⁴⁹ Meanwhile, his theory has been disseminated widely, not only in new editions of his own work, but also in various text books and in theological journals.¹⁵⁰ The following study will filter the slack out of his material and present the relevant conclusions.

First, it is important to note that alphabets and writing are older than often supposed. According to the evolutionist interpretation of history, the alphabet must have developed over thousands of years. Earlier historians believed that Moses and his contemporaries had not yet known how to write. We know, however, that mankind developed an very complicated alphabet very early in his history. The ancient Middle East produced such a wealth of material that hundreds of researchers are presently involved in reading and evaluating it. Should our model fit the facts, it is then clear that mankind has been able to write ever since his creation, or at least shortly afterwards, just as he was always, according to Scripture, able to speak.

The ancient Middle Eastern scribes wrote on clay tablets and employed many literary conventions, which Wiseman and others have investigated closely. Wiseman discovered certain rules in the collection and arrangement of texts:

¹⁴⁸ Paul J. Wiseman. *New Discoveries in Babylonia about Genesis*, 1936, (reprint: Paul J. Wiseman, *Clues to Creation*, compiled by D. J. Wiseman, Marshall, Morgan and Scott, (London, 1977).

¹⁴⁹ Not in the work cited above, but in the second part of the compilation by D. J. Wiseman, he supports the theory of theistic evolution and the theory of the ‘Days of Revelation’ (= the six days of creation are days of revelation of what came into existence during a long time), as well as other historical-critical views.

¹⁵⁰ Not only in the work mentioned above, but in others, as well. In the second part of the new edition, he represents the theistic view and the ‘Day of Revelation’ theory, along with other historical-critical interpretations.

1: The tablets were collected in chronological order, (in family chronicles, for example) and sorted, with key words at the beginning and the end of each tablet.

2. Title, author, date and location stood at the end of the text, not at the beginning.

3. Family chronicles, mostly of the royal families, were continued by the successor or the descendant, who took over and added to the narrative.¹⁵¹

The 'toledoth' of Genesis

The Hebrew expression, '*toledoth*' occurs eleven times in Genesis. It means "This is the history, or chronicle of"¹⁵². The formula apparently structures the whole narrative. Wiseman assumes that the *toledoth* ended each tablet, as he found key words, location and time close to it, material which he believed to be unnecessary in the text itself, unless for literary reasons. (See below).

Let us take a look at the individual cases, which we will then evaluate, starting with the end and working backwards.

Comments on the following outline: The story of Joseph (Gen. 37:2b-50), according to Wiseman, contains not Babylonian words, as does the section before it, but Egyptian ones. Its conclusion is also different. Perhaps it was collected by Moses, in order to create a transition to the events which he had witnessed. Joshua then added Moses' death and continued the account, which had become the chronicle of the people of Israel. His death was then recorded by another (Joshua 24:29-33), and the history of Israel was then further recorded by other writers.

Tablet XI, written by Jacob ("This is the history of Jacob"), supplements Esau's Tablet X and Tablet IX, which describes Isaac's life

and was written by both brothers. The description of location and the time is obvious.

¹⁵¹ This principle, which can be observed in the whole Old Testament, refutes the usual argument against Moses' or Joshua's authorship, that they could not have reported their own deaths.

¹⁵² Samuel Külling. op. cit., pp. 216-225. By using the formula to clarify Genesis' structure, Külling demonstrates how the *toledoth* formula refutes the theory of multiple sources for the book.

The Tablets and the Family Chronicles of Genesis

Tablet I: 1:1-2:4a

Title 2:4a "This is the history of the heavens and the earth"

Date 2:4a "when they were created"

Key Word 1:1 "God created" = 2:3

Tablet II: 2:4b-5:1a

Title 5:1a "This is the book of the history of Adam"

Date 4:26 "Then men began to call on the name of the LORD"

Key Word 2:3 "God created" = 2,4a

2:4 "In the day that God created" = 5:1

Note Adam was a witness to the planting of the Garden of Eden, the creation of the woman, the Fall (literal quotes!), and the murder of Abel. He knew Cain's descendants. (4:17-22)

Tablet III: 5:1b-6:9a

Title 6:9a "This is the history of Noah"

Date 5:32 "And Noah was 500 years old" (hardly his age at the birth of his sons).

Key Word 5:32 "Shem, Ham and Japheth" = 6:10

Note Noah recorded his account before the Flood and took the tablets with him into the Ark.

Tablet IV: 6:9b-10:1a

Title 10:1 "This is the history of the sons of Noah"

Date 9:29 Noah dies at the age of 950.

Key Word 6:11-13 = 6:5-7

Note Is this a combination of 3 separate accounts or a single one? The individual days were recorded by witnesses.

Tablet V: 10:1b-11:10a

Title 11:10a "This is the history of Shem"

Date 11:9 After the desertion of the Tower of Babel

Key Word 10:1 "After the flood" = 10:32

10:32 The nations scatter over the face of the earth. = 11:9

10:31 "in their nations" = 10:32

Note Shem added the confusion of language to the account.

Tablet VI: 11:10b-11:27a

Title	11:27	“This is the history of Terah”
Date	11:26	“Now Terah was 70 years” (hardly his age at the birth of his sons. Compare 5:32).
Key Word	11:26	“Abram, Nahor and Haran” = 11:27
Note		Terah repeated and continued the account (11:21ff). His father either died at the age of 69, which would fit, or at the age of 119, which would be too late, but is the better documented reading. This is problematic for the model.

Tablet VII: 11:27b-25:12a

Title	25:12a	“This is the history of Ishmael”
Date	25:12a	“And Isaac dwelt at Beer Lahai Roi”
Key Word	25:11	“Abraham’s son” = 25:19
Note		Ishmael (and Isaac?) wrote about Abraham. They buried him together. = 25:9

Tablet VIII: 25:12b-25:19a

Title	25:19a	“This is the history of Isaac”
Date	25:18	Ishmael’s descendants lived “from Havila as far as Shur”
	25:17	After Ishmael’s death
Key Word	25:19	“his sons” = 25:12
Note		Isaac added the death of his older brother.

Tablet XI: 25:19b-36:1

Title	36:1	“This is the history of Esau”
Date	35:29	The death of Isaac
Key Word	35:29	“His sons buried him” = 25:9
Note		Accounts which include both Jacob and Esau: Chapter 33 and 35:29

Tablet X: 36:2-36:9

Title	36:9	“This is the history of Edom”
Date	36:8	“Esau dwelt in Mount Seir”
Key Word	36:1	Esau is Edom = 36:8
	36:9	“The father of the Edomites”
Note		This part was written by Esau after leaving Jacob. It names his new home.

Tablet XI: 36:10-37:2a

Title	37:2a	“This is the history of Jacob”
-------	-------	--------------------------------

Date	37:1	“And Jacob dwelt in ... Canaan”
Key Word	36:9	“The father of the Edomites”
Note		Jacob added his brother’s history. Compare Tablet VIII.

Usually the oldest son wrote the continuation of the family chronicle, which was then taken over by the second son, so that the responsibility for the Genesis account reverts twice to the line of salvation history (Heilsgeschichte). This also occurs in Tablets VII and VIII. Ishmael took over the responsibility for the chronicle directly from his grandfather, Terah. Terah’s account poses a problem for our model. If his father died at 119, the better documented reading, he died too late to appear in the account. The age of 69 for his death would fit better. Genesis 11:26 is interesting. The report of Terah’s age, 70 years old, can hardly be his age at the birth of his sons, for they would then be triplets. It is mathematically impossible, as well, as Genesis 5:32 demonstrates. According to our model, the text indicates the time at which the chronicle was passed on to the next generation.

In Tablet V, Shem adds the account of the three books (Tablet IV). Tablets III and IV contains the history of the Flood. Noah recorded his account before entering the Ark and passed it on to his sons, who witnessed the Flood themselves. This explains not only the wealth of details and the exact recording of the days, but also the source of all of the written accounts of the Creation and of the Flood. Noah and his sons passed their accounts on to their children, who later became the ancestors of the nations, who corrupted reports they had received. In Genesis 5:32, we again find an inexplicable notation of age. As with Terah, 500 years can hardly be Noah’s age at the birth of his sons, but it could indicate the date of the tablet, shortly before the Flood, when the sons already had families of their own.

Tablet II is also most interesting, as it deviates from the usual pattern, “This is the book of the history of Adam”! It is clear that the *toledoth* formula is a literary method of indicating the transmission of a tradition. Adam wrote a “book”, in which he recorded the facts of the Creation which he had witnessed: the planting of the Garden of Eden, the creation of Eve, the Fall and the history of his oldest children, as far as he experienced it.

If Tablet II is difficult, Tablet I is explosive. If our model is accurate, the first tablet should be dated “the day of the creation of the heavens and the earth”. Who, besides God Himself, could have recorded this account? Note

that the text names no author, in spite of the definite date. Did God give Adam a written account of the Creation, which included all the facts which Adam had not witnessed?

This is, of course, only a model. It explains many of the details of the texts and their circumstances, but its greatest problem is the question whether the *toledoth* formula belongs to the previous text (according to our model) or to the following one (the theory of most interpretations). It is also possible that Moses modified some aspects, as the description of some locations would seem to indicate. In any case, the model demonstrates that there are indeed scientifically credible alternatives to contemporary theories of multiple sources for Genesis, and that Fundamentalists need not sacrifice their belief in the infallibility of Scripture to scientific research.

The Credibility of Genesis 1-11 in the Light of the Old and New Testaments¹⁵³

The fact that God created the world plays such an important role in the Bible, that we should investigate to what extent the rest of the Bible deals with the first eleven chapters of Genesis – the descriptions of the Creation, of the Fall of Man, the Flood, the Tower of Babel and the ancestors of Abraham. A short review of relevant Scriptures will demonstrate that the theory of evolution cannot be considered Biblical, even without using the first chapters of the Bible as evidence. *The theological questions cannot be separated from those of history and science.*

One example out of the book of Romans makes this clear. According to Romans 5:12-21, all men live under original sin, for all are descended from Adam, the first sinner. What if Adam were not the first man after all? What if the Fall of Man were not an historical event? What if Man were not descended from Adam? Paul's arguments are so closely bound with the historical truth of the first chapters of the Bible, that his theological dogma depends on them.

The following sketch will first demonstrate that both Testaments assume the historical reliability of these reports, and then point out the aspects of these chapters which contradict the theory of evolution.

A. God's creation of the world is used continually in both Testaments as arguments for various teachings:

In the Old Testament: Gen.4:11, Deut. 4:32, Job 12:1-9, 15, 32:22, 35:10, 36:3, Ps. 29:10, 33:6, 9, 89:11, 47, 90:2, 102:25-27, 104:1-11, 148:5, Prov. 4:31, 8:22, 17:5, Eccles. 12:1, Isa. 22:11, 40:26, 28, 41:20, 42:5, 43:1, 5, 45:7, 9, 12, 18, 54:9, 65:17, Amos 4:13, Mal. 2:10. (Further references are given below.)

Psalms 33:9 teaches, just as does Genesis, that the world was created instantly by God's word: "For He spoke, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast." The message of Hebrews 11:3 is similar: "By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are seen were not made of things which are visible." The

¹⁵³ "The Credibility of Genesis 1-11 in the Light of the Old and New Testament". Chalcedon Report Nr. 377 (Dec 1996): 24-25. Translated out of the authors German book "Galilei-Legenden" (Bonn: 1996) by Cambron Teupe

question is, therefore, not how God created the world in only six day, but why he let a whole day go by between the individual events. The actual creative act lasted only as long as the speaking of a few words, not several days.

In the New Testament: Mk. 13:19 (refers to Gen. 2:4), John 1:1-4, Acts 4:24 (Gen. 2:2), Acts 14:15, 17:24, 26 (Gen. 10:32), Rom. 1:20ff, 1 Cor. 15:45, 47 (Gen. 2:7, 3:23), Eph. 3:9 (Gen.2:3), Col. 1:16, 1 Tim. 4:4, Heb. 1:10, 2:10, 3:4, 4:10, 9:11, 11:3, James 3:9, 1 Pet. 4:19, Jude 14-15 (Gen.5:21-24), Rev. 3:14, 4:11 (Gen. 2:3), 10:6 (Gen.2:1), 14:7 (Gen. 2:4). (Further references given below.)

B. All New Testament writers refer to Genesis 1-11.

All books of the New Testament, except 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon, 2 John and 3 John, contain references to the first eleven chapters of Genesis.

Everyone of the first eleven chapters of Genesis is mentioned in the New Testament. Jesus mentions each of the first seven.

We must ask ourselves, what the consequences for our beliefs on the following subjects would be, if the events of Genesis 1-11 were not historical fact:

1. Noah and the Flood: Matt. 24:37, Luke 17:26, 1 Pet. 3:20, 2 Pet. 2:4-5, Heb. 11:7 (Gen. 6-8).
2. The creation of the species: 1 Cor. 15:39-40, (Gen. 1:11, 21, 24).
3. The creation of light: 2 Cor. 4:6 (Gen. 1:3-5).
4. Man the image of God: Col. 3:10.
5. The serpent's deception of Eve: 2 Cor. 11:3 (Gen. 3:16), 1 Tim. 2:13-15 (Gen. 2:23-24), Rev. 20:2, 3, 7.
6. The tree of life: Rev. 2:7, 22:2-3.
7. The rules for the Sabbath: Ex. 20:11, 31:17, Heb. 4:3b-4, 10 (Gen. 2:2-3).
8. Creation of the sexes and the institution of marriage: Matt. 19:4-8, Mk. 10:7-9, Acts 17-26, 1 Cor. 6:16, 11:7-9, Eph. 5:31. 1 Tim. 2:13 (Gen. 2:22-24, 5:2).
9. Death as punishment for sin: Rom. 5:12-21, 6:23, 1 Cor. 15:21-22, 45 (Compare Rom. 8:19) (Gen. 2:17, 3:19).

10. Cain: 1 John 3:12, (Gen. 4:8, 24), Jude 10-11 (Gen. 4:16).
11. Abel: Matt. 23:35, Luke 11:51, Heb. 11:4, 12:24 (Gen. 4:3-5).
12. Enoch: Heb. 11:5, Jude 14-15 (Gen. 5:21-24).
13. The ancestry of Jesus: Matt. 1, Luke 3, Heb. 1:4-7 (Gen. 5:3-29, 11:10-24).
14. Descent of all mankind from Adam: Acts 17:26, Rom. 5:12-21.
15. The Last Judgment: Matt. 24:37-41, Luke 17:36-36, 2 Pet. 3:3-8 (Gen. 6-8).
16. The religions: Rom. 1:20-28, Acts 14:11-18, 17:16-34 (Gen. 4:3, 26)

C. Statements from Genesis 1-11 which disagree with the theory of evolution (in the order they appear).

- 1:1 Creation of time and matter.
- 1:3 Light created before the existence of the sun.
- 1:5 Evening and morning first day of the Creation.
- 1:6-8 Belt of water above the atmosphere (Compare 2:5, 9:12-17).
- 1:9-10 Geological processes in historical time.
- 1:11 Species created in their final form.
- 1:14-17 Sun, moon and stars younger than the earth.
- 2:1-3 The seventh day as day of rest not instituted by Man.
- 2:18-25 Monogamy not gradually developed, but as old as Man.
- 3 Death did not exist until Fall of Man.
- 3:21 Clothing a sudden break with the past, not a gradual development.
- 4:2 Sheep-herding and farming began with the second generation of mankind.
- 4:3-4 Monotheism original religion; polytheism developed later.
- 4:17 Cities existed at a very early period in history.
- 4:20 Early existence of herds of livestock.
- 4:21 Music an early part of culture.

- 4:22 Iron tools existed from the very beginning.
- 4:26 Worship of Yahweh existed from the very beginning.¹⁵⁴
- 5:1 Existence of a book as old as humanity.
- 5:1 Man could write from the very beginning.
- 5+11 Man recorded genealogies from the very beginning.
- 5+11 The existence of genealogies from the creation of mankind up to the birth of Christ, proves that the earth is only hundreds of generations old, not thousands.
- 6:3-4 Giants existed in historical times.
- 6:14ff Noah's ark.
- 6:19ff There is a fixed number of animal species.
- 7:11 Exact date for the beginning of the Flood.
- 7:21 All species became extinct, except those on the Ark.
- 8:2 The belt of water above the atmosphere rained out.
- 8:22 Seasons did not exist until after the Flood.
- 9:12-17 The rainbow did not exist until after the Flood.
- 10:1 The separation of mankind into nations is only a few thousand years old.
- 10:8ff Founding of the city of Nineveh.
- 10:25 The fissure of the earth (continental drift?).
- 11:1-9 Division of human speech into different languages only a few thousand years old.
- 11:9, 31 Early founding of the cities of Babel and Ur.

¹⁵⁴ The historical-critical view teaches that Israel's worship of Yahweh had developed out of the worship of other gods.

Music: Evolution or Creation? (1979)¹⁵⁵

Received 24 January, 1979

We all know that the theory of evolution has influenced not only every part of science but also every aspect of life, and all branches of art.¹⁵⁶ In musicology as a study, and music as an art, a threefold influence can be seen. The first has to do with theories about the origin of music and musical instruments, the second with the criticism of music, and the third with contemporary composition and playing of music.

The History of Music

The opinion about the history of music, found in most books, is that vocal music had its origin in the imitation of animals¹⁵⁷, while musical instruments were developed from commonly used tools or weapons. *The Larousse Encyclopedia of Music*, for instance, says:

“It is probable that the gong originated from a simple cooking pot, while the earliest harp may have been a modified hunting bow.”¹⁵⁸

The music of primitive tribes, then, is interpreted as a young state in the evolution of music. From those primitive forms of music, it is said, evolved a higher music, just as the abilities and knowledge of man are said to have evolved. According to this view, the music of today would have to be on a higher level than, for instance, that of the Middle Ages.

Since we do not believe in the evolution of man, we need to test all theories of evolution very carefully.

First of all, music is a human activity and ability. The gap between anything like music, practiced by apes, and music as practiced by man, is even

¹⁵⁵ Reprinted from “Music: Evolution or Creation”. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 16 (1979/80) 1 (Jun 1979): 73-74+84 and updated in “Music: Evolution or Creation?”. *Chalcedon Report* Nr. 358 (May 1995): 27-30

¹⁵⁶ Morris, Henry M., 1974². *Evolution im Zwielficht*. Berlin. pp. 11-33; Morris, Henry M. & Gish, Duane. “The Importance of Creationism”. pp. 175-187 in: *The Battle for Creation: Acts/Facts/Impacts*. 1977. vol. 2. San Diego

¹⁵⁷ Michels, Ulrich, 1977. *Atlas to Music (Atlas zur Musik)*. dtv Munich. vol. 1. p. 159. From the end of the eighteenth century there have been in fact four major theories. Herder traced music back to language, Darwin to sounds of animals, especially birds, Stumpf to wordless shouts, and Spencer to emotional interjections.

¹⁵⁸ Hindley, Geoffrey, 1978. *The Larousse Encyclopedia of Music*. Havilyn New York. p. 18

greater than the gap in regard to language. Of course, birds sing. The animal with the highest musical ability is said to be the nightingale, which can imitate more than twenty melodies. But it can only imitate; and this imitation has the same function as the cry of another animal. Man, on the other hand, can compose his own music, can sing or play together with others, for instance in a choir, can use musical instruments and design them, can compose music without any immediate function, and can think about and discuss his music!

The second thing to be noticed is that all the theories about the origin of music are speculations, for there are no records older than from the third millennium B. C. Indeed, a few reindeer boilers with holes, which some believe to have been flutes, have been found; and bows, like hunting bows, shown in some paintings, have been said to be music bows. So the theory of the early evolution of music has as little basis in fact as has that of language.¹⁵⁹

From about the third millennium B. C., however, onward until the present, we find instruments, pictures, descriptions of pieces of music, writings on the theory of music, and even some written music. The *Atlas to Music*, while maintaining the evolution of music, states:

“Moreover the time of antique high civilizations begins only after the natural catastrophes with floods (Bible and Gilgamesh epics) assumed around 3000 B. C.”¹⁶⁰

Many historians deny that there was music on a higher level before the Flood. However the Bible requires a different conclusion. God created man with all his faculties and abilities, including that of making music. It did not take thousands of years to get man singing, so it is no problem when we read in Genesis Chapter 4 about Jubal, who was a descendant of Cain in the seventh generation¹⁶¹: “... Jubal, the ancestor of all musicians who play the harp and the flute”¹⁶². Jubal was displaying the same pioneering attitude as his brothers did who were the first to live in tents, and to use bronze and iron.¹⁶³

¹⁵⁹ Morris, Henry M. Language, Creation, and the Inner Man. pp. 286-298 in: The Battle for Creation: Acts/Facts/Impacts. 1977. vol. 2. San Diego; Wilson, Clifford, 1978. Monkeys Will Never Talk ... or Will They?. San Diego

¹⁶⁰ Reference 3, p. 159, also pp. 158 & 160-173

¹⁶¹ The fact that Jubal was a descendant of Cain does not mean, as some seem to have supposed, that instrumental music is an invention of the devil.

¹⁶² Genesis 4:21

¹⁶³ Genesis 4:20 & 22

Many scientists believe that music, like language, has one source, and in this they agree with what the Bible seems to teach. But the fact that cultures living thousands of miles from one another use almost identical instruments is remarkable and curious, as the *Atlas to Music* says.¹⁶⁴

The music of the third millennium B. C. was not primitive, as if it were just evolving. In India, more than twenty different instruments have been found, as well as a complicated staff system, and no sign of a long evolution at all. It seems that a high standard was there all at once, a standard, incidentally, which in India has not been reached since.

In Mesopotamia archaeologists have found what is probably the oldest musical culture, which influenced painting and the religion. By Babylonian times, music there had long since declined.

In China there are written works, supposedly to dating back to 2300 B. C. At that time every learned person was supposed to be educated in music. Emperor Tschun wanted them to know the staff system, based on mathematically calculated basis notes, and the rich history of the Chinese music.¹⁶⁵ Later, Confucius said: "Morals and music decide about the life of a community"¹⁶⁶.

Music was likewise very important in Egypt, where there seem to have been large orchestras maintained by the State. That instrumental music and song played a large part in Hebrew life is clear from the Bible. This is true also of times long before David and Solomon, who, incidentally, were not the only singing rulers of those days.

One thing is to be seen in all these cultures. Without any long delay or preparation, music appears on a very high level, widespread among the people, and playing a very important role in religion and social life. But the rise of music is always followed by a long decline. Just compare the music of Israel in the time of Christ with that of the psalms. Or what happened to Greek music, about which quite a lot is known from paintings on vases¹⁶⁷ and other sources of information, during Roman times? In both cases a decline is apparent. Cultures still decline today, as Dr. Francis Schaeffer

¹⁶⁴ Reference 3, pp. 158 *et seq.*

¹⁶⁵ Reference 4, pp. 26 & 27

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 27

¹⁶⁷ Thomas Schirmacher, 1977. *The Art of Greek Vases (Die Kunst der griechischen Vasen)*. Giessen (unpublished)

has shown in his commendable book *How Should We Then Live? The Rise and Death of the Modern Culture*¹⁶⁸.

The Criticism of Music

The influence of a belief in evolution is to be seen not only in modern music, but also in what is said about that music. If everything is evolving, there is no point in evaluation or criticism, because music, like everything else, is in precisely that stage of development which is now needed. To one who believes thus, that stage has, of course, no further justification than its existence; therefore it cannot be classified as good or bad. All that matters is how the composition came into being and the reasons why it has to be as it is; in other words, its mechanistic aspect. If this be so, there could be no standards for the evaluation of music.¹⁶⁹

Of course, one could find in any composition elements taken from what has gone before. Even in modern music, nothing which had been part of music for centuries could be forgotten. But if one considers only how it arose and why it arose in that way, it is possible to forget that it was personally composed by some composer. The mechanistic viewpoint leads to ignoring the personal aspect. H. R. Rookmaker calls one of his books *Art Needs No Justification*¹⁷⁰. He maintains that because God created life, and man's faculties and abilities, art is justified. Art is not something which was just there in another form before. Rather, it is a sign of Creation through a personal God. To one who does not believe that God created man, art has no justification, unless it helps somehow in preserving the species man. But to a believer in Creation, art and music might be called living documents of a living relationship with a personal God. Then music has its meaning, or should have; and one can judge whether or not it fulfills its meaning.¹⁷¹

Music, then, is not a product of a mechanistic process, not a by-product of evolution. It is the product of a personal activity which is as close to a true act of creation as finite man can come. And it depends on abilities and

¹⁶⁸ Schaeffer, Francis, 1977. *How Should We Then Live?* London

¹⁶⁹ This is not to say, of course, that every criticism written today is utterly without standards. But the fact that critics can so often disagree so completely shows that there is no generally accepted set of standards.

¹⁷⁰ Rookmaker, H. R., 1978. *Art Needs No Justification*. Inter-Varsity Press, Leicester

¹⁷¹ For instance, music which increases the chaos, or destroys, or is inspired by the devil, can be recognized for what it is, and called what it is. And one thing which it is, is dangerous.

faculties created by God. Only from this viewpoint can one really say: “Soli Deo Gloria”¹⁷²; and only from it can one look for a set of values for music.

The Bible, incidentally, has something to say about this matter. The Biblical standards are to be found in some hundred (!) verses concerning music.

Because man is a fallen being, affected by sin, sin surely also influences music. So a decline is what would be expected; it can be avoided only by a living relationship with our Lord Jesus Christ following God’s Law.

Contemporary Music

One who follows evolutionary notions to their logical conclusion would always have to call contemporary music better than the older works. Or, if he could not deny a decline, he would have to inquire how the older music inspired another culture where the evolution went on. But is the whole level of music improving? Usually one will see a decline in one part of music (or of another art) while another part is improving. Consider an example. H. R. Rookmaker shows that in earlier times everyone made music and was, in some sense, an artist. But as art became more complicated, not only music but also other arts became an occupation for specialists. On a lower level (of performance) everyone is a musician; on a higher level, only a few. Who will decide which is better: that everyone make music, or that music be complicated? Well, I do not want to say that music is worse for being the occupation of a few skilled ones. But the evaluation of such a change depends on what is considered to be most important.

This shows why some people are annoyed by references to some music as primitive. Is it primitive because it is on a level which has to be the lowest level of evolution or because it is not according to contemporary Western standards? On questions like this, many people have been influenced by evolutionary views without even noticing it. If music is to be called primitive at all, the only valid reason would be if it was a result of the decline which is found at any place or time where God is forgotten. On that point the Bible can tell us something, but then we had better ask ourselves whether the music of our own places and times reveals any knowledge of a relation to God.

¹⁷² “S. D. C.”, meaning “To God alone the glory”, was written by Johann Sebastian Bach on every piece of music which he wrote.

Music as Practiced

The evolutionary viewpoint has influenced not only musicology, the theoretical and philosophical consideration of music, but also the composition and performance are affected by the philosophy of the composer or performer. As Os Guinness, Francis Schaeffer, H. R. Rookmaker and many others have shown, in a world without meaning (as it would be according to the evolutionary view), art (including music) also becomes meaningless. Indeed, that has happened in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; and one need not to cite examples. But a believer in Creation should recognize and point out the difference between meaningless music and music which has something to say. The one destroys, as is the will of the devil; the other edifies, as is the will of Jesus Christ. If a rock group sings about love or God, it may mean nothing; but if we, as Christians, sing about it, it means everything. Music which is just the result of a mechanistic process has lost its worth. But when it is the result of an activity akin to true Creation, it is a part of being in the likeness of God.¹⁷³ It is a fulfilling of God's will to bring the earth under man's control, and to defeat the chaos. Such music proclaims the glory of God's Creation. Read Psalms 148 and 150!

¹⁷³ Genesis 1:26 & 27

The German Creationist Movement (1985)¹⁷⁴

History of Creationism in the German-speaking World

Biblical criticism expanding in the German world in the early nineteenth century concentrated mainly on the Five Books of Moses, especially Genesis. One theory followed the other until nearly all held that these Five Books were merely the history of man's thoughts about God. The dialectical theology of Barth, Brunner and Bultmann originated during World War I, and while reemphasizing the role of the Bible, it still did not need any historical foundation for its theology. Books by Evangelicals concentrated on the question of whether Jesus lived and was resurrected, etc., but offered no arguments against evolution.

Higher criticism avoided any discussion against evolution. Coming from Kant and Schleiermacher, German theology had no interest in Creation or the Creator. Creation was only an appendix to salvation and the Cross, as Wilhelm Lütgert criticized in 1934¹⁷⁵. The Pietists did not correct this fault. Theistic evolution was accepted even in conservative circles.¹⁷⁶

The Creationist movement was initiated by the British Professor Dr. Dr. Dr. Arthur Ernest Wilder-Smith. Dr. Wilder-Smith came to Germany after World War II, and lectured in Marburg and other cities in circles of the German Evangelical student awakening¹⁷⁷ (which today again supports

¹⁷⁴ Reprinted from "The German Creationist Movement". Impact (Acts-Facts-Impacts): Institute for Creation Research: Nr. 145 (Jul 1985): 1-4 and Gemeinde Konkret Magazin 1/1986: Schöpfung Konkret S. 1-2. A fuller version more up to date is to be found in: "Die Geschichte des deutschsprachigen Kreationismus". Factum 3/4/1990: 152-15. After the publication of this article Tom McIver published an enormous annotated bibliography of anti-evolution literature – mainly in English language, as he relays more or less on our article for German speaking creationists (Tom McIver, Anti-Evolution: A reader's Guide to Writings before and after Darwin, The John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore & London, 1992² [Erweiterung von 1988¹], esp. p. 243 [No. 1455 Schirmmacher])

¹⁷⁵ Wilhelm Lütgert (1934), Gütersloh, Mohn (Brunnen, Giessen, repr. 1984), p. 1. pp. 3 et seq

¹⁷⁶ E. g., a book of radio lectures given by 13 professors: J. Schlemmer, ed. (1955), Schöpfungsglaube und Evolutionstheorie, Kröner, Stuttgart

¹⁷⁷ The "Studentenmission in Deutschland" founded in Marburg belonging to ISCF

theistic evolution¹⁷⁸). As a chemist he had come to the conclusion that life could not originate by chance and fought against materialism and the theory of evolution in leaflets¹⁷⁹ and sermons. In 1966, his first book *Origin and Destiny of Man*¹⁸⁰ appeared, the first book of its kind in Germany (the publishing house later changed its position¹⁸¹). He also used the early books of Henry M. Morris. Dr. Wilder-Smith fought for years against bitter rejection and produced a flood of articles and books.¹⁸² He is still active and surely the best known 'German' Creationist, as he speaks fluent German and lives in Switzerland.

Although not as well publicized, early German Creationism had begun with an apologetically society called 'Bibelbund', founded in the last century (1894). Year after year, nearly every article published against higher criticism, materialism and the theory of evolution appeared in its journal 'Bibel und Gemeinde' (Bible and Church).¹⁸³ When Professor Dr. Samuel Külling, who wrote his dissertation on Genesis 17, refuting higher criticism,¹⁸⁴ took over the presidency in 1965, he started to publish Creationist articles from all over the world, especially from the United States.¹⁸⁵ In 1966, Dr. Wilder-Smith became that journal's correspondent for the natural sciences. That same year also saw the translation of Dr. Morris' book *Twilight of Evolution*.¹⁸⁶

The following years were marked by the translation of many smaller books from America and new books by Dr. Wilder-Smith. In the early seventies, a few scientists in the German-speaking world wrote booklets

¹⁷⁸ Edith Gutsche, ed. (1984), *Zur Diskussion um Schöpfung und Evolution*, Porta Studie 6, SMD, Marburg; see also, Dr. Schirmacher's refutation in *Factum* 11/12/1984: 9-10

¹⁷⁹ Arthur Ernest Wilder-Smith (1949), *Die Problematik der Deszendenzlehre*, Wuppertal

¹⁸⁰ Arthur Ernest Wilder-Smith (1966), *Herkunft und Zukunft des Menschen*, Brunnen, Giessen (translated into English in 1968)

¹⁸¹ Later the book was taken over from Brunnen Verlag to Hänssler Verlag, which became the leading Creationist publishing house in Germany.

¹⁸² See Ref. 5, pp. 505-506

¹⁸³ The quarterly journal started in 1899 and is published by the Bible League ("Bibelbund", Narzissenweg 11, D-35447 Reiskirchen).

¹⁸⁴ Samuel Külling (1964), *Zur Datierung der Genesis-P-Stücke*, Kok, Kampen

¹⁸⁵ One of the first was by a biology professor from Budapest: F. Kiss (1965), "Kreislauf gegen Entwicklungstheorie", *Bibel und Gemeinde* vol. 65 (1965) 3: 242-243

¹⁸⁶ Henry Morris (1966), *Evolution im Zwielficht*, Verlag Lebendiges Wort, Augsburg (the publisher has gone out of business)

rephrasing published Creationist material.¹⁸⁷ The translation of *The Genesis Flood* marked a turning point, as this volume was published by the largest Evangelical publishing house, Hänssler, which had also taken over the production of books written by Dr. Wilder-Smith and became the leading Creationist publisher.¹⁸⁸

Although Creationist thought was widely accepted in Evangelical circles, the theologians among them refused it, and there were nearly no scientists interested. The only society bringing together Christian scientists was mostly pro-evolution, following the conservative theologian Karl Heim¹⁸⁹, who somehow still accepted higher criticism. At the same time the student movement lost interest when other problems became prominent at German universities. Only the new Evangelical theological seminaries in Basel (founded 1970 by Prof. Külling) and Giessen (founded 1976) presented a platform for further studies.¹⁹⁰

It took until the year 1978 to change the situation.¹⁹¹ Dr. Wilder-Smith published the first scientific book against evolution in a secular, well-known publishing house with the provoking title *The Natural Sciences Know Nothing of Evolution*¹⁹². At the end of the year Dr. Horst W. Beck became a Creationist.¹⁹³ Both an engineer and theologian, he was a leading figure in the already mentioned ‘Karl-Heim-Gesellschaft’ and had previously published articles and books defending theistic evolution. Together with other members of the society, which they soon left,¹⁹⁴ he followed the arguments of Dr. Willem Ouweneel, a Dutch biologist lecturing in Ger-

¹⁸⁷ E. g., Alexander Seibel (1974), *Relativitätstheorie und Bibel*, Schwengeler Verlag, Berneck (CH); Christoph Bluth (1972), *Der Ursprung des Menschen*, Verlag Lebendiges Wort, Augsburg

¹⁸⁸ Hänssler Verlag, see Ref. 23

¹⁸⁹ Therefore called “Karl-Heim-Gesellschaft”

¹⁹⁰ The seminary in Basel is now called *Staatsunabhängige Theologische Hochschule Basel* and has its own postgraduate studies in Geneva, leading to a State approved Th. D.

¹⁹¹ Of course, this only corresponds to the public situation. It is impossible to know who changed his view privately.

¹⁹² Arthur Ernest Wilder-Smith (1978), *Die Naturwissenschaften kennen keine Evolution*, Schwabe Verlag, Basel

¹⁹³ Horst W. Beck & Thomas Schirmacher (1979), “Die Naturwissenschaften kennen tatsächlich keine Evolution”, Interview vom 14.12.1978, *Bibel und Gemeinde* vol. 79 (1979), Heft 1, pp. 43-45. See also the first Creationist book of Horst W. Beck (1979), *Biologie und Weltanschauung*, Wort und Wissen 1, Hänssler Verlag, Neuhausen

¹⁹⁴ After writing several Creationist articles in its information leaflet, the Creationists left the society in peace. Later the society published sharp attacks on the Creationists.

many.¹⁹⁵ Dr. Beck soon found other scientists who had changed their view or were ‘secret’ Creationists. Under his leadership, the first Creationist society was founded (‘Wort und Wissen’ – Word and Knowledge). Three book series were soon published¹⁹⁶. In the same years 1978/1979 an independent Creationist monthly journal started (‘Factum’)¹⁹⁷, and the first articles in the Creation Research Society Quarterly written by Germans were published.¹⁹⁸

In 1979 the first Creationist lectures at State universities were given and media discussion of the Creationist movement began. Contacts with the United States were begun¹⁹⁹ and the first summer institutes on Creationism were held. In the years that followed, some outstanding scientists found a platform at ‘Wort und Wissen’, like Professor Dr. Hermann Schneider, a physician, Professor Dr. Erich Blechschmidt and Dr. Joachim Scheven, both biologists, and Dr. Horst W. Beck, to name a few.

As a theologian and engineer, Dr. Beck was competent to reach other theologians, and has lectured at many Evangelical theological conferences. Some theologians have changed their position, but higher criticism is still a great problem among Evangelicals today.

Dr. Beck also organized many discussion series at State universities, which received a great deal of public reaction. When the well-known Professor Dr. Werner Gitt took part in the discussions, the reaction was even greater, as he is a director of the well-known Physical Technical Federal Institute (Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt) in Braunschweig. He organized a Creationist colloquium at this Federal institution, and its transcripts²⁰⁰ were sent free (State-paid) to hundreds of scientists and was even

¹⁹⁵ Willem J. Ouweneel (1975), Gedanken zum Schöpfungsbericht, Paulus Verlag, Neustadt

¹⁹⁶ See Ref. 20. The society is “Studiengemeinschaft Wort und Wissen”, Sommerhalde 10, D-72270 Baiersbronn-Röt. See the scientific series “Wort und Wissen”, the public series “Wissen und Leben” and the monograph series “Fachberichte Wort und Wissen” (see. Ref. 28)

¹⁹⁷ “Factum”, Schwengeler Verlag, Postfach 263, CH-9435 Heerbrugg. It also publishes articles relating to other scientific problems and together with “Fundamentum” and “Bibel und Gemeinde” is the best Evangelical journal to be found in the German language.

¹⁹⁸ By Joachim Scheven and Thomas Schirmacher (see Ref. 29)

¹⁹⁹ See Horst Beck, ed. (1980), Die Debatte um Bibel und Wissenschaft in Amerika, Wort und Wissen Band 8, Hänssler Verlag, Neuhausen

²⁰⁰ Werner Gitt, ed. (1982), Struktur und Information in Technik und Natur, Vorträge des 37. PTB Seminars, PTB-Bericht, PTB-ATWD-18. Oktober 1981, printed as manu-

discussed on State television. Other books were soon published which started to bring contribution from the German-speaking world to the worldwide Creationist movement.²⁰¹

Problems of Creationism in the German-speaking World

As we have seen, the German Creationist movement is very young. The turning points were the years 1966 and 1978/1979, and, in reality, as a movement it is only five years old and is still seeking its way. At present one may see the following problems, which must be solved soon and may be deciding factors in the future of the movement.

1. *The hermeneutical problem.* The German Creationist movement still lacks the support of fundamentalist theologians. Often the discussions are not a problem of science but of biblical hermeneutics. Discussions with non-Christian scientists are often easier than with Christian scientists or theologians. Only a few tiny fundamentalist churches take a stand for Creationism. The few German books against higher criticism and the small number of non-critical commentaries on the Bible demonstrate the lack of support from theologians.

2. *The educational problem.* The German school and university system is almost totally State owned. Alternatives are sometimes allowed, but there are only four Evangelical private schools. Germany needs private high schools in order to offer an alternative.

3. *The international problem.* Most German-speaking Christians are not acquainted with international Evangelical literature. The contacts with Creationists in other countries started in 1979-1980 and must be continued. The first European Creationist Congress in Belgium in 1984 was a good step. The German movement is too small to be independent. Resources from the Institute for Creation Research, for example, are necessary.

4. *The academic problem.* In the German-speaking world, more than in any other country, evolutionary thinking has infiltrated all of science. The small Creationist movement is still concentrating on the natural sciences, but history, sociology, education, cultural anthropology, etc., are full of antibiblical thinking. German Creationists are needed to present their views

script, PTB: Braunschweig; later edition: Werner Gitt (1982)², Am Anfang war die Information, Resch-Verlag, Gräfelting

²⁰¹ E. g., Siegfried Scherer, 1983, Photosynthese, Wort und Wissen, Fachberichte 1, Hänssler Verlag, Neuhausen

in these and other areas. Otherwise, there will still be the division of life between the biblical area and the academic areas.²⁰²

²⁰² E. g., Creation Research Society Quarterly vol. 16 (1979): 1, pp. 73-74+84 author's article on "Music – Evolution or Creation", was revised and started a series in Factum to stimulate the cultural area of research.

What is Religion?

In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus Christ says, “No one can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will be loyal to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and mammon” (Mt. 6:24). Careful reflection makes clear that Jesus is criticizing more than people who live only for Mammon; he compares it with a religion contrary to Biblical faith.

Had He considered Mammon to be only a non-Christian god, He would have said that we can worship only one God, either the God of the Bible or the divinity, ‘Mammon’. Mammon represents, however, not a divinity, but money, wealth and capital. In Luke’s narration, Jesus had just identified Mammon with money used in business (Luke 16,9-10), indicating that The ‘Religion of Mammon’ can supplant faith in the God of the Bible. How is that possible? The faith in money has no gods, no priests and no temple – at least none that we would recognize as such. It is, however, an ‘a-theistic’ religion, a religion without (a-) a god (theos). Is the Lord equating two things which are not comparable? Isn’t ‘God’ a religious matter, ‘Mammon’ an economic one?

The answer implies serious consequences, for it concerns the further question, “What is religion?”. In the Bible, religion is no theoretical concept. Whether a movement, an ideology or a life-style considers itself a religion or not is insignificant; the question is, what absolute values actually (not merely formally) determine our lives.

This is equally true for the belief in the God of Scripture. The question is not whether one ‘believes’ that God exists. In both Testaments, the concept ‘to believe’ signifies ‘to trust’, ‘to have faith in’, ‘to consider reliable’. If we believe in God, we consider Him absolutely reliable, take seriously all He has said and done as Creator and Savior, and establish our lives according to His existence and His commandments.

Consequently, religion is anything that competes with Scriptural faith. What do I rely on completely? What gives my life its significance and meaning? What governs my heart? What is the ultimate authority for me? What is my standard? What do I love most? What is the basis of my wishes?

In the light of these questions, it becomes clear that Mammon can compete with God. Not money in itself, nor its use distinguish Mammonism, but “love of money” (2 Tim. 6:10). Money – or possessions in general –

determines our lives. The road to wealth calls the tune in this religion. Wealth determines everything – morals, our relationship to other people, everyday life. All one's hopes, as well as the meaning of one's life is centered on money. It doesn't matter how much one really owns – the poor are often fanatical members of this faith.

We have now seen that, in the Bible, a belief need not have gods, priests, temples or services, or even call itself a religion, in order to be one. Mammonism is an inconspicuous cult, which would seem to be merely a lifestyle, an attitude to economic matters, a personal issue. In reality, it is a camouflaged religion, as Carl Bry once said, a religion that teaches that impersonal Material, a principle, or an atheistic ideology can supplant the God of the Bible in our hearts.²⁰³

The most detailed text in the Bible on this issue is the first chapter of Romans. Paul explains why there is a condemnation from which we must be saved and why all, without exception, are liable. He begins, "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness" (Rom. 1:18). God's anger is directed towards 1. man's lacking relationship to Him, Atheism (godlessness) and 2. man's missing relationship to each other, unrighteousness. This double aspect of sin corresponds to the Ten Commandments, which first deals with man's relationship to God and then his relationship to his fellow man. Mankind – already under divine wrath, not just in the Last Judgment – suppresses the truth by unrighteousness. Which truth does Paul mean? How can he accuse all mankind of suppressing the truth? "... because what may be known of God is manifest in them, for God has shown it to them" (Rom. 1:19). The truth depends on the fact that something about God can be recognized.

But how is that to be understood? What is it that everyone can recognize about God? The Bible teaches that God is invisible, doesn't it? Paul knew this, of course, and continues, "His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead" (Rom. 1:20). Paul does not mean that God is physically visible, but that there is still something that we can perceive about Him. Ever since the Creation, Man can see and know (The Greek word speaks about 'thinking') that a divine personality with infinite power must be behind Creation. As the saying goes: 'Nothing comes from nothing'. This wonderful universe, subject to Time and Space as it is, must have an origin. Physics

²⁰³ Carl Christian Bry. *Verkappte Religionen: Kritik des kollektiven Wahns*. Ehrenwirth: München, 1979 (reprint of 1924)

demonstrates that information always originates with a sender, a person. The person behind the immense amount of information in the universe cannot be subject to Time, but must be beyond it, must be eternal. The power of this personality must be far above that of the whole creation.

But what does that have to do with God's anger? Paul continues, "... so that they are without excuse, because, although they knew God, they did not glorify Him as God, nor were thankful, but became futile in their thoughts, and their foolish hearts were darkened. Professing to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like corruptible man – and birds and four-footed animals and creeping things" (Rom. 1:20-23). Paul is clearly not merely concerned with the question of God's existence, but questions whom we honor, whom we serve, who determines our thinking. Man, refusing to thank God for what he receives, rejects not a theoretical concept, but a real, extant Creator. In order to avoid thanking the Creator, Man must invent a substitute religion.

In Paul's opinion, mankind thinks up nowhere else so much nonsense as when he tries to concoct religions in order to not have to thank God. Man prefers to worship dead images of animals, thus sinking even deeper in the hierarchy of Creation. Paul notes that idolatry often subjects the individual not merely to an animal, but to its image. Man worships things which he could himself destroy and that are actually subject to him. He worships other things instead of God, but he must have something to worship.

Can the individual really recognize the eternal Creator in His Creation? Yes and No. Yes, since God condemns him for failing to do so. No, for Paul also demonstrates that all mankind refuses God the honor due Him. The fact that all men can conceive of a Creator is proven by the fact that every human being has a substitute for Him. There are no people without any religion, which, according to the Bible, is the result of the necessity of grappling with the issue.

In Romans 1:25, Paul summarizes, "... (they) exchanged the truth of God for the lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen." Paul speaks of others who do not honor God, which he can do, however, because he has received forgiveness of sins through Jesus Christ, and adds praise to his argumentation. The question about God is never merely a theoretical topic which one can consider objectively, but always an issue which affects us personally. It is not surprising that the question of thankfulness and honor is decisive.

Man 'exchanges' the Creator for Creation. One could also say, that we 'pervert' them or 'turn them upside down'. The Old Testament uses the expression to describe Israel who "changed their glory into the image of an

ox that eats grass” (Psalm 105:20. Compare Jer. 2:11). Man perverts the worship of the Creator into the worship of the Creation, making a religion of his own, by ascribing divine attributes, such as ‘eternal’, ‘powerful’ or ‘creative’, to some part of the Creation. It doesn’t matter whether he elevates himself to the ‘measure of all things’, honors another human being as divine, whether he worships an image of a dead person, such as Mary, whether he worships an animal or its image, whether he substitutes the Creation itself under another name (‘Matter’, ‘Nature’ or ‘Being’) or whether he devises a religion like Mammonism. Whatever he chooses, he has substituted a part of Creation for the Creator.

The question, who or what is worshipped, is also decisive, according to Paul, for ethics. Ethics teaches what is Good and Evil, Right and Wrong, Acceptable and Not Acceptable, what is to be desired and what is to be avoided. Whoever invents a new religion must also create a new ethic (Rom. 1:24-27). Paul uses the same term, ‘exchange’ or ‘pervert’ to describe the substitution of the Creation for the Creator, and to describe the substitution of an unnatural system of ethics of religions for the divine order of Creation. Homosexuality is a good example (1:26-27), although all sin can be explained in the same way (1:29-31). A perverted ethic is possible because God gives man up to uncleanness (1:24, 26). The worst judgment for mankind is to be “left to himself”, for he is incapable of self-control. He destroys himself and others. Only a Christian, who has received forgiveness of sin and has the aid of the Holy Spirit, can develop the self-control which the New Testament considers the mark of the believer (2 Pet. 1:6, Gal. 5:23). Man’s sin is thus not just the cause of judgment, but judgment itself. Man is his own worst enemy.

A new religion implies a new ethical system. No one acts by chance, but according to his value system, whether he honors a deity or not. State laws are determined by values just as is grocery shopping – or how else do we decide what to buy? Advertising tries to persuade by promising us happiness, success and recognition; political movements try to influence our decisions as well. No one can ignore his view of humanity, his attitude to wealth and his social attitudes (to world hunger, for example) when shopping. We can only fail to consider these things by making our own well-being our personal standard. Paul speaks of those, “whose god is their belly ...” (Phil. 3:19). The same is true of science and of philosophy. Many philosophers reject ethics in general, but particularly the Christian system, only to develop their own rules as to what man may and may not do. And what terrible consequences some scientific theories have had for mankind! Think, for example, about the unbiblical opinion that only white people, or that only men are human. Or consider the theory of evolution, which is

indirectly responsible for millions of victims of National Socialism or Communism, which both dreamed of a higher development of humanity.

Paul takes another major step. Up to this point, he has claimed that every man can recognize the eternal Creator behind Creation, so that no one has an excuse for rejecting God. This he believes to be the origin of religions and of their moral systems. Now, he continues, "... knowing the righteous judgment of God, that those who practice such things are deserving of death, (they) not only do the same but also approve of those who practice them" (1:32). Now it becomes clear why Man needs to be saved. On the one hand, having been left to himself, he can neither control himself nor protect himself from damage. On the other, he is under the death penalty.

What reasons does Paul give for his assertion that Man, even if he practices the ethical system of a substitute religion, knows God's righteous expectations? The second chapter of Romans is dedicated to this question. We will restrict ourselves to one argument.

Paul says, "Therefore you are inexcusable, O man, whoever you are who judge, for in whatever you judge another you condemn yourself, for you who judge practice the same things" (2:1). Man knows that everyone must answer for his actions. No one, even the atheist, can live without judging others. We are moral beings and prove this every day in our unkind remarks about our neighbors, just as much as in our state laws and courts. Even the worst dictatorship has a legal system, not to mention the harsh, unwritten laws of anarchic groups which want to eliminate all state authority altogether. Who doesn't know what the politicians may and may not do? Who doesn't continually feel unjustly treated? Paul sees this as proof that Man knows that he is not an animal, but that he is responsible to a higher authority. But who is this higher authority? Paul later mentions the conscience, "... their conscience also bearing witness, and between themselves their thoughts accusing or else excusing them (2:15). The 'con' in 'conscience' means 'with'. The conscience is an authority in our decision-center (the heart), which registers our thoughts and deeds and tries them according to certain criteria. These standards are exchangeable, but the function of the conscience remains, and according to Paul, is inseparable from our thinking. The way a person thinks is, for Paul, evidence that Man is an ethical being, who continually answers to himself, for what we call 'thought' is actually an inner discussion: our thoughts "accuse" each other or "excuse" themselves, as Paul writes. We discuss the ethics of even the smallest details with ourselves. When shopping, we deliberate continually, what to buy or why not to buy. When we read, we evaluate the text. When we plan, we weigh the arguments for and against our schemes. We can

only discuss with each other, because we discuss with ourselves. We accuse ourselves and excuse ourselves. For Paul this is proof that every person knows that he is responsible for his thoughts and deeds. But to whom? The only answer can be a higher authority. Paul has already identified this authority in the first chapter as the Creator.

Why Does Paul Speak So Much About Creation and the Judgment (Romans 1-3)?

In contrast to the often preferred evangelistic practice of emphasizing the ‘positive’ and explaining the advantages of faith in Christ as quickly as possible, Paul postpones a concrete description of redemption in his systematic representation of Biblical faith and salvation in Romans. In the first two chapters, he describes Christ only as Judge, and discusses the Creator, God’s wrath, the judgment and sin.

This is not just due to the fact that he is writing to Christians who already knew the other aspects of the faith. In both Testaments, the prophets, Jesus, the apostles and others frequently explain God’s judgment before mentioning salvation and sometimes end their public addresses before speaking of it. Jonah (Jonah 3:4-5) preaches only judgment, but the people of Nineveh respond, because they know that God is only threatening judgment in order to give them the opportunity to repent. At Pentecost (Acts 2:14-36), Peter’s audience does not respond until he speaks of those who had crucified Christ. Not until they are convicted and ask, “What shall we do?”, do the apostles explain how they can be saved (Acts 2:38-40). In his sermon at the Areopag in Athens (Acts 17:22-31), Paul preaches on the Creator and calls for repentance (vs. 30), for God will judge the earth “by a man”, whom Paul does not even identify as Jesus.

While many today would not even consider such a sermon evangelistic, the Bible includes the proclamation of the Creator, of the Law, of God’s wrath and of His judgment as necessary elements of evangelization. Wilhelm Lütgert criticizes the evangelistic practice of modern Pietism for addressing the hearer’s conscience rather than beginning with Creation and objective revelation.²⁰⁴ Man can sin objectively without disturbing one’s conscience, unless it is molded by Christian principles, so that only a person raised on Christian principles will respond to the Pietistic method. Lütgert accuses Pietism of an Revivalist theology, which substitutes conscience for the theology of Creation, recognition of God in His Creation, and judgment.

We can learn from the Epistle to the Romans the importance of beginning with the basic questions of: the Creator and Creation, the origin of religion and of ethic systems, God’s Law and its definition of righteous-

²⁰⁴ Wilhelm Lütgert. *Schöpfung und Offenbarung*, Brunnen Verlag, (Giessen, 1984).

ness, judgment and the wrath of God original sin and man's completely sinful nature.

Perhaps we will then no longer find it so difficult to include the full spectrum of our lives as well as the relevant questions of the day (conservation, human rights, economic lifestyle of the Christian, for example) in our conversations and to discuss them on the basis of our faith.

Paul's sequence of themes in explaining salvation to non-Christians is obviously meant to be a logical sequence of ideas not a legally binding one. We must, however, make it clear that only a person who believes on the Creator of heaven and earth and on His judgment, can believe in the Savior.

Nor is it necessary to leave the Savior out of the conversation until we have clarified the significance of Creation, sin and judgment. Jesus is not just the Savior – but the most marvelous fact of all is that He is also Creator and Judge. Colossians 1:15-23, for example, presents Him as the Image of God, and therefore God Himself, by whom and for whom everything was created. Thus, He is also the highest Authority – He has priority over all things, and nothing could exist without Him. It is this very Lord, in Whom the fullness of God dwells, Who has become Head of the Church, by reconciling His enemies to Himself on the Cross. In verses 21-22, Paul writes that this reconciliation is valid for “you”, thus emphasizing the personal aspect of Salvation. Just as he had begun with Jesus, the Origin and purpose of the Creation, and then, after discussing the Church and the individual believer, he returns at the end to the perspective of Creation as a whole, for the Gospel must be preached “to every creature under heaven”.

In witnessing to those who do not want to heed God's Law, we must be sure not to allow ourselves to cajole them instead with complementary pleasantries that have nothing to do with their basic problem, the fact that they are under God's wrath (See Rom. 1:16-18). “That this is a rebellious people, lying children, children who will not hear the law of the LORD; who say to the seers, “Do not see.” and to the prophets, “Do not prophesy to us right things; Speak to us smooth things, prophesy deceits.” (Isa. 30:9-10).

Creator and Judge

The Creator is not subject to our opinions or discussions about Him. It does no good to speak about Him, as long as we do not speak with Him, Who created our own life and judges it. Isaiah says, “Woe to him who strives with his Maker!” (Isa. 45:9).

God says, “All the earth is Mine.” (Ex. 19:5). He is “LORD of all the earth” (Josh. 3:11), “the Most High over all the earth” (Ps. 83:18) and reigns over all (1 Chr. 29:12). With this declaration, He raises Himself above all other rulers, religious, political or otherwise. God’s claim to absolute dominion derives from His role as Creator. “The earth is the LORD’s, and all its fullness, the world and those who dwell therein. For He has founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the waters.” (Ps. 24:1); “The heavens are Yours, the earth also is Yours; the world and all its fullness, You have founded them. The north and the south, You have created them.” (Ps. 89:11-12).

God is not only a general Creator, Ruler and Judge of the world, but also our personal Creator. He is the “God of the spirits of all flesh,” (Num. 27:16). Job thus confesses, “The Spirit of God has made me,” (Job 33:4).

Because God is Lord of all and our personal Creator, and because we are responsible to Him, we cannot think neutrally about Him. All that we think about Him automatically includes an ethical decision.

True wisdom, perception and reason originated with the Creator as an aspect of His Creation. “The LORD by wisdom founded the earth; by understanding He established the heavens; by His knowledge the depths were broke up, ...” (Prov. 3:19-20. See also Jer. 51:15). Proverbs 8:22-31 describes Wisdom as having belonged to God from the beginning. She appeals to mankind to heed her, for she was already present at Creation. The Old Testament continually demonstrates God’s wisdom by using the Creation as a concrete example. (See Isa.40:12-13, 22, 26-28. Prov. 30:1-4. Job 38-41).

In speaking of the Creator, we must always consider His Law. Deuteronomy 10:12-15 justifies the necessity of God’s Law because of His role as Creator: “What does the Lord require of you, but to. .. keep the commandments of the LORD. .. Indeed, heaven and the highest heavens belong to the LORD your God, also the earth with all that is in it.” This applies to the complete Law of God, not just to concrete statutes. Murder is made punishable in Genesis 9:6 because God made Man “in the image of God.”

Oppression of the poor and the weak is forbidden, because they too are His creation: “He who oppresses the poor reproaches his Maker, He who honors Him has mercy on the needy.”(Prov. 14:31), “He who mocks the poor reproaches his Maker; (Prov. 17:5). Job did not wrong his servants or discriminate against them in legal affairs, because he could not otherwise stand before God (Job 31:13-14), for, “Did not He who made me in the womb make them? Did not the same One fashion us in the womb?” (Job 31:15).

Thus it is impossible to evangelize without speaking about the Creator and about his perfect Law.

Evolution and the Sexual Revolution²⁰⁵

The evolutionist view of the family is a good example of the influence exercised by secular *Weltanschauungen* on ethics.²⁰⁶ The question of the division of a species into male and female, and particularly of the significant role of marriage and the family in human life, has always been one of the insoluble problems in the theory of evolution. Irenäus Eibl-Eibesfeldt, in a widely noticed article in a German newspaper, explains the phenomenon of the human family by deriving it from the breeding habits of animals.²⁰⁷ He rejects all other explanations, including those of Konrad Lorenz²⁰⁸: “Neither sexuality nor aggression nor fear suffice.”²⁰⁹ His reliance on speculation, and the substitution of ‘invention’ for explanation becomes repeatedly obvious:

“The invention of care for the young is certainly the essential origin of differentiated higher social systems.”

or:

“The essential invention for us as humans was the supplementary development of the individualized ties between mother and child.”²¹⁰

Naturally, Irenäus Eibl-Eibesfeldt is probably the “most consistent behavioral scientist”²¹¹, as his book, *Lehrbuch der Humanethologie*²¹², clearly demonstrates. Behavioral psychology considers man a being most strongly programmed by innate, non-conditioned behavior and by instinct. Yet, biology and sociology hold quite similar ideas when they handle this pre-

²⁰⁵ Reprinted from “Evolution and Sexual Revolution”. *Christianity and Society* 7 (1997) 1: 9-12

²⁰⁶ As best seen in a lecture by a professor of anthropology: Ch. Letourneau. *The Evolution of Marriage*, Walter Scott, (London, 1891).

²⁰⁷ Irenäus Eibl-Eibesfeldt. “Wie Liebe in die Welt gekommen ist”, *Die Welt*, Nr. 205, Sept. 1, 1984, p. 1 of “Die Geistigen Welt”.

²⁰⁸ On criticism of Lorenz from a Christian point of view, see: Klaus Berger. *Abbau des Göttlichen*, Schwengeler Verlag, (Berneck, 1990); Klaus Berger. *Evolution und Aggression*, Schwengeler Verlag, (Berneck, 1981). From a secular point of view, see Hugo Moesch. *Der Mensch und die Graugans: Eine Kritik an Konrad Lorenz*, Umschau, (Frankfurt, 1975).

²⁰⁹ Irenäus Eibl-Eibesfeldt. op.cit.

²¹⁰ Ibid.

²¹¹ Ibid. Subtext to photograph, Column 1.

²¹² Irenäus Eibl-Eibesfeldt. *Lehrbuch der Humanethologie*, (Munich, 1984).

carious subject. The impression arises that, while the scholars are unable to agree on any even insignificant details, they are united in insisting that the human family must have originated in the behavior of its animal ancestors. The most distinguished, easy to read *dtv Atlas zur Biologie* describes the origin of the human family as following:

“Sexuality and integration into the family: The non-humanoid ancestors of Man probably had a social organization similar to that of the apes. In polygamous relationships, natural selection preferred the sexually active male and the passive female, but the energies of the most active, highest ranking male would be exhausted by competition with rivals and the defense of his group against enemies, so that the raising of the young would be left to the females. This social organization was only profitable in tropical biotopes, which provided sufficient food for the female and for her offspring. With the transition to the omnivorous or carnivorous lifestyle of the steppe or the savannah, which required hunting and food-collecting, natural selection preferred a different division of labor. The female’s perpetual sexual readiness, unique to human beings, made monogamy possible and liberated the male from the incessant necessity of defending his rights from rivals. He could then concentrate on activities outside his territory and transform suppression and rivalry into cooperation, which required exchange of information, and so encouraged the development of speech.”²¹³

According to this explanation, assumed without a shred of evidence, monogamy developed before man was even able to speak. Thus, conversation in marriage is at best a later product of evolution. Parents’ love for their children is purely a product of evolutionary pressure:

“Parental care and domestication: The chance distribution of a high mortality rate among animal young, which reduces the directive effect of selection, is limited by parental care. The ability to provide for offspring is increased with expanding brain capacity. Both factors seem to be closely related to each other through feedback. As the brain became larger, the child’s development decelerated, the period of his dependency lengthened ... : this increased the value of parental care and encouraged the selection of animals with larger brains. Lorenz discovered that disruption of a child’s development resulted primarily in a continuation of childish characteristics (neotony): the human being retains an open-minded curiosity for the rest of his life. The value to natural selection is obvious.”²¹⁴

I do not wish to take the time to refute the theory of the evolution of man and of the inclusion of his supposed ancestors-this has been repeatedly and

²¹³ Günter Vogel, Hartmut Angermann. *dtv-Atlas zur Biologie*, Vol. 2, dtv, (Munich, 1975), p. 501.

²¹⁴ Ibid.

successfully done elsewhere.²¹⁵ The discrepancies in the article cited above are obvious. It repeats six contradictory theories about man's departure from his animal ancestry, and, as always, cites no evidence of the transition from animal to human.²¹⁶ Even if we assume that evolution did occur, this explanation of the origin of the human family is weak. It silently assumes what it wishes to explain; why the woman, unlike the animal female, is always able to have sexual relations, or why the period of time between birth and adulthood is so much longer for humans than for animals, for example. The statement, "The female's perpetual sexual readiness, unique to human beings, made monogamy possible ...", is circular reasoning, comparable to Eibl-Eibesfeldt's 'invention'. (The perpetual availability for sexual activity, by the way, also makes possible other forms of human social life which are forbidden by God, and which restrict the increase of the human race.)

As unfounded as the theory of the evolution of the human family is in its details,²¹⁷ it is still the basis for many modern currents of thought, for such theories clearly have great consequences for man in his everyday life, particularly when he holds his philosophy for unassailable science. Ever since Friedrich Engels rejected research into the family prior to 1860 as being "still under the influence of the five books of Moses"²¹⁸ – an influence now considered tabu – there have been no classical alternatives to the evolutionist view of the family.

As a result, we forget that the idea of an evolution of marriage and the family is the basis of many world-transforming, philosophical systems. Whether National Socialism,²¹⁹ Marxism, the sexual revolution or the Frankfurt school, all assume that the family and marriage have developed in mankind unconsciously by natural selection, and that the responsible

²¹⁵ See for example, Duane Gish. *Fossilien und Evolution*, Hänssler, (Neuhausen, 1983) (English original: *Evolution? The Fossils Say No!*); M. Bowden. *Ape-Men: Fact or Fallacy*, Sovereign Publ., (Bormley, GB, 1981); Reinhard Junker and Siegfried Scherer. *Entstehung und Geschichte der Lebewesen*, Weyel Lehrmittelverlag, (Gießen, 1988); Reinhard Junker. *Stammt der Mensch von Affen ab?: Die Aussagen der Bibel und die Daten der Naturwissenschaft*, Hänssler, (Neuhausen, 1993).

²¹⁶ Günter Vogel, et al., op. cit., pp. 492-493.

²¹⁷ See E. L. Hebdon Tylor. "Theoretical Approaches to the Study of Family, Marriage, and Sex", *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction* 4 (1977/1978), 2: *Symposium on the Family*. pp. 149-169.

²¹⁸ Friedrich Engels. *Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigentums und des Staates*, Soziale Klassiker 12, Marxistische Blätter, (Frankfurt, 1973), p. 11.

²¹⁹ Wilhem Schmidt. *Rassen und Völker*, Vol. 1, (Luzern, 1946), pp. 69-96.

human being can and must shake off the tyranny of the roles it prescribes. Whenever one reads a book on the sociology of the family,²²⁰ or the wide-ranging literature of the Frankfurt School, whose influence can be observed in politics, education and child raising, one recognizes the doctrine of the family's evolution, which is equally the doctrine of the sexual revolution.

We are often unaware how closely opinions about the family are related to religion?²²¹ An 'enlightening' article in the popular youth magazine, *Bravo*, was written by a Dr. Goldstein under the pseudonym, Korff and Sommer.²²² That the writer is employed by the Lutheran Church in the Rhineland as counselor for child-raising and a professor for psychology and sociology, demonstrates the extent to which this problem has penetrated the protective walls of ecclesiastic circles. The German State Churches no longer endorse lifelong monogamy, but has adopted evolutionist ideas of sexuality.

A significant early work on the subject, *Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigentums und des Staates* (The Roots of Family, Private Ownership, and the State), was written by Friedrich Engels.²²³ Engels, in an historical outline, mentions Bachofens 1861 "Mutterrecht", as the first evolutionary history of the family.²²⁴ He then enlarges on Karl Marx's personal notes on Lewis H. Morgans "Ancient Society" of 1877²²⁵ and relates it to his economic ideas. He believes that man practiced "uncontrolled sexual relations" in the beginning. He contradicts himself, however, by suggesting that the "original communistic community knew a maximal size for the family."²²⁶ The development of the family itself and of monogamy resulted, according to Engels, from the condemnation of incest in sibling marriage. At the same time, Engels believes, the developing awareness of 'yours and mine' led to the concept of private property.

²²⁰ On the Frankfurt School, see Wolfgang Brezina. *Die Pädagogik der Neuen Linken*, Reinhardt, (Munich/Basel, 1981); Immanuel Lück. *Alarm um die Schule*, Hänssler, (Neuhausen, 1979); Joachim Cochlovius. *Ideologie und Praxis der Frankfurter Schule*, Krelingen, 1983; Georg Huntemann. *Die Zerstörung der Person*, VLM, (Bad Liebenzell, 1981).

²²¹ See Günther Kehr. *Religionssoziologie*, Berlin, 1968, pp. 107ff.

²²² Reiner Roedhauser. "In Bravo nichts Neues", *Concepte* 8, 1977, pp. I-X.

²²³ op. cit.

²²⁴ Ibid., p. 12.

²²⁵ Ibid.

²²⁶ Ibid., p. 43.

Engels derives his arguments from ethnological studies into the societies of 'primitive' peoples. Assuming that the cultures of 'primitive' peoples are identical with those of early man,²²⁷ he makes the same mistake made in other studies on the development of culture. One can assume certain wide-ranging changes in these societies, even if one does not accept the possibility of the alternative concept of degeneration. The influence of Engels' work should not be underrated. It contains the one aspect of Communism which has perhaps been most widely adopted in modern thinking.

The Myth of Matriarchy

Since Engels bases his interpretation of history on the supposed matriarchy of earlier epochs, we should investigate the idea. A matriarchy is a society in which the women rule, in contrast to the patriarchy, in which the men rule.

It is not only feminists who propagate the idea of prehistoric matriarchal societies. It is common to 1. feminists; 2. feminist writers who wish to create a feminist religion with a maternal deity; 3. Marxist philosophers, particularly in the official ethnology of socialist states; 4. psychoanalysts who build on Sigmund Freud and Sandor Ferenczi; and 5. some journalists, such as Klaus Rainer Röhl,²²⁸ who take up the subject of the Amazons, which is apparently fascinating to fans of popular science.

Hans-Jürgen Heinrichs²²⁹ has demonstrated in a well-documented work, that Bachofen's theories are experiencing a renaissance in radical left, as well as in radical right camps, according to which consequences are drawn from his interpretation of history.

A standard book on ethnology describes the matriarchy as following:

"J. J. Bachofen's book, *Das Mutterrecht*, was published in the year 1861. Since then, the treatment of the question of matrilinear societies²³⁰ continues to be an issue in anthropological research. Early scholars, such as McLennen, Tylor, Morgan and Engels, believed that the period of the so-called patriarchy had been preceded by a period of matriarchy ... They assumed promiscuity to have been common to primeval society, so that a child's biological father

²²⁷ See Will Durant. *Kulturgeschichte der Menschheit*, Vol. 1, Ullstein, (Frankfurt, 1981), pp. 43ff, 48ff.

²²⁸ Klaus Rainer Röhl. *Aufstand der Amazonen: Geschichte einer Legende*, Econ Verlag, (Düsseldorf, 1982)

²²⁹ Hans-Jürgen Heinrichs. "Einleitung". in Johann Jakob Bachofen. *Das Mutterrecht*, Suhrkamp, (Frankfurt, 1982⁴; 1990⁶)

²³⁰ 'Matrilinear' means that ancestry is determined by the line of the mother.

could not be traced. Since the case was different with the biological mother, who could be undeniably determined, society developed, according to the earlier theorists, the complex of the matriarchal system, which was later, with the development of private property, given up in favor of the patriarchy. This reconstruction of social evolution can not hold its ground against the results of ethnological studies, but is still widely upheld, particularly in feminist literature.²³¹

There has never been a matriarchal society, as the quote from Barganski's work shows. The *Taschenwörterbuch Ethnologie* defines the matriarchy as following:

“A political-legal system conceived by early theorists, who postulated that those societies who recognize only matrilineal descent were ruled by women. No society, as ‘primitive’ as it may be, knows a matriarchal order in the sense of this definition.”²³²

The *Wörterbuch der Ethnologie* says:

“There are so many myths about woman's original superiority, that they have given rise to the thesis that there must have been an period of history in which matriarchal power existed (Bachofen, 1861; Morgan, 1877; Reed, 1975; Davis, 1977). Actually, contemporary ethnology has been unable to find any evidence of any purely matriarchal system. Women do have significant influence in matrilineal and matrilocal societies, in which the husband leaves his ancestral home to move to that of the wife. In these societies, however, the men still retain most of the political power ...”²³³

For this reason, the conservative ethnologist, Uwe Wesel, chose the title, *Der Mythos der Matriarchat* (The Myth of Matriarchy) for his excellent, comprehensive study of the subject.²³⁴ J. Bamberger²³⁵ and Hartmut Zinser²³⁶ use similar titles for their works. The Marburg ethnologist, Horst

²³¹ Thomas Bargatzky. *Einführung in die Ethnologie*, H. Buske, (Hamburg, 1985), p. 79.

²³² Michel Panoff and Michel Perrin. *Taschenwörterbuch der Ethnologie*, Dietrich Reimer Verlag, (Berlin, 1982), p. 201.

²³³ Gisela Maler. “Geschlecht”, in *Wörterbuch der Ethnologie*, ed. by Bernhard Streck, DuMont Buchverlag, (Cologne, 1987), p. 65.

²³⁴ Uwe Wesel. *Der Mythos der Matriarchat: Über Bachofens Mutterrecht und die Stellung von Frauen in frühen Gesellschaften*, Suhrkamp, (Frankfurt, 1980).

²³⁵ J. Bamberg. “The Myth of Matriarchy: Why Men Rule in Primitive Society”, in *Women, Culture and Society*, ed. by M. Z. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere, (Stanford, 1974).

²³⁶ Hartmut Zinser. *Der Mythos des Mutterrechts*, Ullstein Materialien, Ullstein Verlag, (Frankfurt, 1981). Compare with Zinser's comments at the end of the essay.

Nachtigall originally gave his article, “Das Matriarchat aus der Sicht der Völkerkunde und der Verhaltensforschung” the title, “Das Reich der Amazonen hat es nie gegeben” (There Never Was a Kingdom of Amazons).²³⁷

Nachtigall’s judgment is devastating:

“A government by women, in the sense that in certain societies women played the same role played by men in Bachofen’s time – that only women took part in the communal bodies which passed laws, made decisions or determined public affairs – exists nowhere on the earth.”²³⁸

Clearly all theories about matriarchal societies meet opposition from exactly those who ought to know best: the ethnologists. Ethnology has grown out of its evolutionistic stage. This does not mean that ethnologists generally view evolutionist ideas critically, but they do consider all concrete theories of a succession of evolutionary stages outdated, since any single theory can only consider a fraction of known nations or cultures, but can not do justice to all.

Ethnological materials are devastating for the advocates of the matriarchy. The question is not whether women acted as warriors (Amazons), whether they played a dominating role in the family tree or in inheritance of property, whether a couple’s home was located according to the mother’s residence (matrilocal) or according to the wife’s (uxorlocality). Nor is it whether individual women played a dominating role in positions of authority²³⁹ or were worshipped as maternal deities. Ethnology has discovered all of these in past and present cultures. The question is, whether there has ever been a society comparable to a patriarchy, in which women continually ruled on principal (matriarchy or gynarchy).

The rejection of the historicity of the matriarchy reaches beyond ethnology. Neither archaeology nor classical philology accept Bachofen, which is a serious consideration, since he based his theory almost exclusively on Greek and Roman sources (mythology).²⁴⁰ On the subject of the derivation of the matriarchy from the existence of maternal deities, Kippenberg simply says:

²³⁷ Horst Nachtigall. “Das Reich der Amazonen hat es nie gegeben: Zum Streit um das Matriarchat”, *Die Welt*, Nr. 177/1986, August 2, 1986, “Geistige Welt”, p. 15.

²³⁸ Ibid.

²³⁹ See for example, Walter Hischberg, (ed.), *Neues Wörterbuch der Völkerkunde*, Dietrich Reimer Verlag, (Berlin, 1988), p. 195).

²⁴⁰ See B. A. Bäuml. *Das mythische Weltalter: Bachofens romantische Deutung des Altertums*, (Munich, 1965).

“... the classical construction of Bachofens ‘maternal deities as a reflection of the matriarchy’ has been annihilated.”²⁴¹

The theologian, Helen Schüngel-Straumann, who writes about the image of God from a feminist point of view, and who believes that she can derive matriarchal structures from ancient mythology even without historical sources, says about Bachofen:

“His study is, however, not historical, but ideological, his background is philosophical Platonism, which holds the masculine (mental or spiritual) principle to be superior. The feminine matriarchal stage serves only as contrasting emphasis to the higher masculine age.”²⁴²

She speaks of a “masculine self-justification”²⁴³ and admits:

“Feminist research into matriarchy do not work with historical sources in the strictest sense of the word, but only with myths, since these often retain or reflect the conditions of the social level of society ...”²⁴⁴

That needs to be proven. Whether, for example, a myth represents reality or a mythical contrast world-which also reflects on reality-can only be determined when historical sources are available as a basis.²⁴⁵

One of the best refutations of the various theories of the matriarchy is the already cited book by Hartmut Zinser, *Der Mythos des Mutterrechts*,²⁴⁶ which, however, does not address their evolutionist roots. Zinser accuses Bachofen’s, Engels’ and Freud’s theories of historical war between the sexes of representing ideals without any basis in reality, of merely supporting the idea of male superiority in a new fashion. Although all three ideas are now being used to defend equal rights, Zinser sees them as a derogation and disparagement of women.

Under the title, “The mind is masculine”, Zinser refutes Johann Jakob Bachofen in masterly manner. Bachofen considered the transformation of the matriarchy into the patriarchy to be progress, for now the mind reigns!

²⁴¹ Hans G. Kippenberg. “Einleitung: Bachofen-Lektüre heute”, *Johann Jakob Bachofen. Mutterrecht und Urreligion*, ed. by Hans G. Kippenberg, Alfred Kröner Verlag, (Stuttgart, 1984), p. XXXVI.

²⁴² Helen Schüngel-Straumann. “Matriarchat-Patriarchat”, *Lexikon der Religionen*, ed. by Hans Waldenfels and Franz König, Herder, (Freiburg, 1987), p. 393.

²⁴³ Ibid.

²⁴⁴ Ibid.

²⁴⁵ Thomas Schirrmacher. “Sozialhistorische Aspekte der Märchen und Sagenforschung”, *Zur Kritik der marxistischen Märchen-und Sagenforschung und andere volkswissenschaftliche Beiträge*, Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft, (Bonn, 1991).

²⁴⁶ Hartmut Zinser, op. cit.

Under the title, “Labor is masculine”, Zinser opposes Engel’s work, “The origin of the family ...”. Under the title, “The Drives are masculine”, Zinser refutes Freud.

Clearly, Bachofen, who himself drew no conclusions from his theories, has been used by others to prove their long-held *Weltanschauungen*, which widely contradict each other, as can be seen in the renaissance of his ideas in conservative, as well as in liberal circles.

I would extend Zinser’s conclusions even farther: not the matriarchal theories give the woman new dignity, but only assume the biblically unjustified essential superiority of the man. The ‘war between the sexes’ cannot be ended by assuming improvable stages of evolution, but, in my opinion, only by accepting the absolute standards given in the Bible, which reveals the position of man and woman in Creation. Indeed, the ‘war between the sexes’ can become true love, which ends all uncontrolled domination of mankind over mankind and clarifies the role of true authority. This prevents the distribution of duties between the sexes from becoming a question of relative value, as in the case with Bachofen, Engels and Freud, for, created in the image of God, man and woman are equal in value, but not in nature. Because of these very differences, they can and should become one. On the basis of forgiveness, true love enables both to give up false claims to authority. The denial of self makes proper authority possible, which never goes beyond the limits set by God, “submitting to one another in the fear of God” (Eph. 5:21).

Cannibalism and Human Sacrifice Vindicated?²⁴⁷

1. Common human knowledge

As far as many are concerned it goes without saying that cannibalism is widespread among so-called primitive people, that early human beings, Teutons and Aztecs similarly fed upon those of their own species, and that cannibalism still exists today. The charge of cannibalism against foreigners is universal and goes back to antiquity.

Of course the charge of cannibalism is not in itself any proof of its existence. Thus, for instance, the African explorer and missionary David Livingstone discovered that almost all blacks were convinced that whites were man-eaters,²⁴⁸ a charge that the first explorers of the River Gambia had countered as early as 1455.²⁴⁹ Similarly, the first Christians were suspected by the Romans of being cannibals,²⁵⁰ as were the Irish by the Roman historian Strabo and the Scythians by the Greek historian Herodotus.²⁵¹ There are numerous other teachings and assumptions concerning cannibalism,

²⁴⁷ Reprinted from *Christianity and Society* Vol 10 (2000) No 1: 11-17 + No 2: 4-9 (www.kuyper.org/main/publish/journal.shtml). Translated by Cambron Teupe and revised by Spehen C. Perks from “Ehrenrettung von Kannibalismus und Menschenopfer?”. *Factum* 6/1994: 46-50 and 7/8/1994: 36-41. This contribution represents a revision of my earlier article “Die Kannibalen”. *Factum* 5/1988: 184-188, which translation was presented in the first edition of this book.

²⁴⁸ Cf. David Livingstone, *The Last Journal of David Livingstone in Central Africa from 1865 to his Death*, ed. Horace Waller, vol. 2 (London: John Murray).

²⁴⁹ Charles Verlinden, Eberhard Schmitt (ed.), *Die mittelalterlichen Ursprünge der europäischen Expansion*, *Dokumente zur Geschichte der europäischen Expansion* 1 (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1986), pp. 300—303.

²⁵⁰ Cf. Friedrich Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, *Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten* 15/3 (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1915), pp. 193—195; Hans Dieter Stöver, *Christenverfolgung im Römischen Reich: Ihr Hintergründe und Folgen* (Düsseldorf: Econ, 1982), p. 86 *et passim*. Cf. also the examples below of ethnologists bracketing together cannibalism and the Lord’s Supper, thereby indirectly removing blame from antiquity.

²⁵¹ Cf. the examples given by Erwin Frank. “‘Sie fressen Menschen, wie ihr scheußliches Aussehen beweist ...’ (*They eat human beings, as their hideous appearance indicates ...*): Kritische Überlegungen zu Zeugen und Quellen der Menschenfresserei”, pp. 199—224 in: Hans Peter Duerr (ed.), *Authentizität und Betrug in der Ethnologie* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1987), pp. 200—203.

and it is even suggested that cannibalism and war might have accelerated the extinction of peoples involved in them.²⁵²

But what is cannibalism? The *Taschenwörterbuch der Ethnologie* [*Pocket Dictionary of Ethnology*] defines “cannibalism” thus: “Ritual consumption of human flesh. Sometimes, but very seldom, cannibalism appears to have been practiced with the sole aim of providing sustenance, whether from necessity (cannibalism through hunger) or inclination (sometimes called ‘gastronomic cannibalism’).”²⁵³

The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* states further:

Cannibalism, also called anthropophagy, is the eating of human flesh by men. The term is derived from a Spanish form of the language of the Carib, a West Indies tribe who were well-known for their practice of cannibalism. A widespread custom going back into early human history, it has been found among peoples on most continents.

Though many early accounts of cannibalism probably were exaggerated or in error, cannibalism is still practiced [*sic*] in interior New Guinea. It prevailed until recently in parts of West and Central Africa, Melanesia (especially Fiji), Australia, among the Maoris of New Zealand, in some of the islands of Polynesia, among tribes of Sumatra, and in various tribes of North and South America.²⁵⁴

Thus the ethnological understanding of cannibalism is not individual cases such as occur from time to time following an accident, when the surviving victims eat the bodies of their dead companions. Still more infrequent are cases in which the victim has actually been murdered for that purpose, as was the case in a spectacular trial in England in 1884.²⁵⁵

The knowledge of what cannibalism is, and the belief that it is practiced by “primitive” tribes throughout the world, is taken for granted by our society. In the scientific field, too, cannibalism seems not to be questioned.

²⁵² Contrary to this e.g. Herbert Tischner (ed.), *Völkerkunde*, Das Fischer Lexicon 13 (Frankfurt: Fischer Taschenbuch-Verlag, 1959), p. 282.

²⁵³ Michel Panoff, Michel Perrin, *Taschenwörterbuch der Ethnologie* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1982²), p. 155.

²⁵⁴ “Cannibalism”, p. 511f. in *Encyclopedia Britannica*, vol. II (of 30 vols) (Chicago/London: Encyclopedia Britannica Inc., 1982¹⁵) (9th Edition).

²⁵⁵ A.W. Brian Simpson, *Cannibalism and the Common Law: The Story of the Tragic Last Voyage of the Mignotte and the Strange Legal Proceedings to Which it Gave Rise* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984).

Scientific surveys both ancient²⁵⁶ and modern²⁵⁷ verify the worldwide incidence of this phenomenon.

2. Is cannibalism a myth?

When, in 1979, the New York professor of anthropology William Arens in his book, *The Man-Eating Myth*, presented the public with his view that there had never been such a thing as habitual cannibalism, it seemed at first that this was the untenable opinion of an outsider.

Since then anthropologists and ethnologists have been changing sides in ever increasing numbers, as shown last month in an investigative article in the US journal *Science*. But the debate about consumption of one's own kind continues. "I believe Arens is right," declared the anthropologist Lyle Steadman of Arizona State University, suggesting the reason why the scholar continued to be opposed by those in his own discipline: "He is a real danger to a whole number of anthropologists."²⁵⁸

Arens had been asked by his students whether he could not sometimes go into more interesting subjects, such as witchcraft or cannibalism.

Consequently, in preparing for a lecture, I turned to the study of man-eaters, which was eventually transformed into this study of the myth of man-eating. I mention this to make it clear to readers that, like themselves, when I began to

²⁵⁶ E.g. Richard Andree, *Die Anthropagie: Eine ethnographische Studie* (Leipzig: Verlag von Veit, 1887); P. Bergemann, *Die Verbreitung der Anthropagie über die Erde und Ermittlung einiger Wesenszüge dieses Brauches: Eine ethnographisch-ethnologische Studie* (Bunzlau: G. Kreuzschmer, 1893); Rudolf S. Steinmetz, "Endokannibalismus", *Mittheilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 26/NF16 (1896), pp. 1—60; Ewald Volhard, *Kannibalismus*, Studien zur Kulturkunde 5 (Stuttgart: Strecker und Schröder, 1939) (although he has the remarkable theory that cannibalism stems from "identification with the plants" [p. 485]); as well as from the years 1884/1887 (see Erwin Frank ... *y se lo comen: Kritische Studie der Schriftquellen zum Kannibalismus der panosprachiger Indianer Ost-Perus und Brasiliens*, Mundus Reihe Ethnologie 7 (Bonn: Mundus, 1987) XXVIII), or from the year 1939 (see Annegret Nippa, "Nahrung", pp. 145—149 in Bernhard Streck [ed.], *Wörterbuch der Ethnologie* [Cologne: Du Mont Buchverlag, 1987], p. 146).

²⁵⁷ E.g. Peggy Reeves Sanday, *Divine Hunger: Cannibalism as a Cultural System* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Reay Tannahill, *Fleisch und Blut: Eine Kulturgeschichte des Kannibalismus* (Munich: W. Goldmann, 1979); Christian Spiel, *Menschen essen Menschen: Die Welt der Kannibalen* (Munich: C. Bertelsmann, 1972); Garry Hogg, *Cannibalism and Human Sacrifice* (London: Robert Hale, 1958); cf. also Ioan M. Lewis, *Schamanen, Hexer, Kannibalen: die Realität des Religiösen* (Frankfurt: Athenäum, 1989), esp. pp. 93—104; and from the year 1983 P. Brown, D. Tuzin (ed.), *The Ethnography of Cannibalism* (Washington, 1983).

²⁵⁸ "Kannibalismus Zäher Mythos", *Der Spiegel* (Hamburg) 28/1986, pp. 154—156.

think about the subject I was already of the opinion that cannibalism in the past and present was a fairly common phenomenon. The essay which follows is the result of a conversion process.²⁵⁹

Arens' thesis could not be expressed more plainly: "I am dubious about the actual existence of this act as an accepted practice for any time or place. Recourse to cannibalism under survival conditions or as a rare instance of antisocial behavior is not denied for any culture."²⁶⁰

Thus Arens does not rule out the possibility that under certain unusual circumstances humans have eaten human flesh. This is something which he considers possible in any culture. But he fundamentally denies that there are proven incidences of habitual cannibalism, i.e. cannibalism which might have been accepted as an integral part of religion, culture, warfare or social custom. As a scientist, moreover, he points out that no anthropologist can ever confirm that a practice has never taken place. He can only confirm that there is no proof of its occurrence. And this is also the case with cannibalism.²⁶¹ As far as he is concerned all the evidence is inconclusive, so that cannibalism remains unproven. In the light of the fact that thousands of scientists have assumed and continue to assume that there is thousand-fold evidence of cannibalism, this is a very far-reaching thesis to put forward.

Arens sees cannibalism as a myth which in almost all cultures has provided an excuse for blaming other peoples. It is to be found in the case of Herodotus with regard to the barbarians, and similarly Columbus with regard to the Indians, the Spaniards with regard to the Aztecs, colonialists with regard to the "natives" and the latter with regard to whites. Almost everywhere cannibalism constitutes the high point of the moral reprehensibility of the enemy. It gives grounds for a mixture of hatred and fear.

As early as 1874 the African explorer, anthropologist and prominent missionary *David Livingstone* came to a similar conclusion concerning Africa. He travelled through large parts of Africa, among other things in order to find evidence of cannibalism. To his surprise he discovered that there was no evidence which would stand up in a Scottish court, but that on

²⁵⁹ William Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth: Anthropology and Anthropophagy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), p. v.

²⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

²⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 180f.

the other hand the blacks were convinced that white men were cannibals.²⁶² However, Livingstone was the only missionary to hold this view.²⁶³

Arens has made an exhaustive survey of the sources of cannibalism:

This conclusion is based on the fact that, excluding survival conditions, I have been unable to uncover adequate documentation of cannibalism as a custom in any form for any society. Rumors, suspicions, fears and accusations abound, but no satisfactory first-hand accounts. Learned essays by professionals are unending, but the sustaining ethnography is lacking. The argument that a critical re-examination is both a necessary and a profitable exercise is based on the premise that cannibalism by definition is an observable phenomenon.²⁶⁴

3. Nobel Prize winners "offside"

It should be pointed out here that the fact that different peoples accuse each other of cannibalism is no argument against the existence of cannibalism. A worldwide phenomenon²⁶⁵ can naturally also be used as a worldwide accusation. Back in 1932 a specialist was able to write:

... though the present range of the practice is somewhat restricted, it was much more widespread within even recent times, and there is every probability that all races have, at one period or another, passed through a cannibalistic stage,

²⁶² David Livingstone, *The Last Journal of David Livingstone ...*, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 98 and elsewhere; cf. William Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth*, *op. cit.*, pp. 85—87, and "Kannibalismus Zäher Mythos", *Der Spiegel*, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

²⁶³ As a modern evangelical counterexample to Livingstone the account of the missionary Don Richardson (also the subject of a film), *Das Friedenskind* ("The Peace Child"), *Wandlung einer Dschungelkultur grausamer Tücke in Neuguinea* (Bad Liebenzell: Verlag der Liebenzeller Mission, 1979) is often put forward. Without wishing to doubt the existence of cannibalism in the tribe where Richardson was a missionary, this must be treated with some reservation. Don Richardson, who is known to me personally and whose foundational book *Eternity in Their Hearts* I was responsible for publishing through the same publishing house, does believe the tribe successfully evangelized by him to have been formerly cannibalistic, but has not been an eye-witness to cannibalism, and does not refer to any eye-witnesses, but portrays cannibalism as something which had ceased before his time. Typical are p. 170f, where he records how astonished he was, in a society which he thought to be characterized entirely by headhunting and man-eating, to become acquainted with the peaceful implement of a child of peace.

²⁶⁴ William Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth*, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

²⁶⁵ Cf. Paula Brown, "Cannibalism", pp. 60—62 in Mircea Eliade (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Religion* (New York: Macmillan, 1987), vol. 3; J.A. MacCulloch, "Cannibalism", pp. 194—209 in James Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1937), vol. 6.

which survived occasionally in ritual or in folk custom, or was remembered in legend or folk tale.²⁶⁶

Even those many examples where the charge of cannibalism is falsely laid mean nothing. Many nations also accuse one another of murder. Does that disprove the existence of murder and genocide?

In Germany *Der Spiegel* has taken upon itself the role of spokesman for those who deny the existence of cannibalism:

It would be “beneath his dignity” to involve himself in scientific controversy, angrily stated the American doctor D. Carleton Gadjusek, who had received a Nobel Prize in 1976 for his work on kuru, a brain disease occurring in New Guinea. Gadjusek claimed that the virus, which caused fits of shaking, was located in the victim’s brain, and was transmitted through cannibalistic eating habits. Gadjusek had come across the allegedly cannibalistic roots of this disease in the 1950s among the Fore, a tribe native to the mountains of New Guinea. 20 years later, in 1977, *Science* published photographs from Gadjusek’s Nobel Prize dissertation, which were intended to confirm his thesis of systematic consumption of human flesh on the Pacific island. One of the pictures portrayed a victim of this fatal shaking disease. The photo also showed members of the Fore tribe preparing a large amount of meat for a meal. According to the conclusion stated on the caption, the kuru victim would end up in the hungry stomach of his comrades. The US doctor reacted angrily to scholars who questioned his claim, stating that “the whole of Australia” knew that the Fore were cannibals. Anthropologists who criticized his theory were accused by him of being bound to their desks. If they “got up off their behinds and went to New Guinea,” he brusquely informed the doubters, they would be able to find evidence of ritual cannibalism “in hundreds of cases.” However, those explorers who followed the Nobel Prize winner’s advice came back empty-handed. Lyle Seaman, for example, stayed with the Fore for two years. He was constantly hearing reports of cannibalistic eating rituals, but none of them was reliable. At the end the results drawn by the scientist from his investigations were unequivocal: “There is no trace of man-eating in New Guinea.” Gadjusek’s own proofs also showed themselves to be untenable. The Fore men in the *Science* photo who were sitting in front of a mountain of meat were in fact, as the doctor had to admit when questioned, feasting on a pig. On the other hand Gadjusek would not on any account produce authentic photos of a cannibal feast. The reason he gave for his strict ban on this was that members of the tribe would be discriminated against on account of the explosive nature of the material. Since Gadjusek’s reports of the alleged cannibalistic practices of the Fore first appeared scientists from numerous countries have made the very difficult journey to research in the mountains of New Guinea. It is astonishing enough that, as the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* ironically

²⁶⁶ J.A. MacCulloch, “Cannibalism”, *op. cit.*, p. 194.

remarked, not one of them concluded his field studies by becoming a meal. It is clear that the idea that human beings could eat their own kind not only in cases of necessity, but as a matter of routine, is universally held as an ineradicable legend about those uncivilized, barbarian “others.”²⁶⁷

4. The researches of Erwin Frank an example

In 1987 Erwin Frank presented an investigation of sources on the subject of cannibalism in a specific region for the first time in the German language.²⁶⁸ Frank investigates the sources for the accusation of cannibalism with regard to 14 or 16 peoples of all kinds of languages. He traces every scientific or popular assertion back into the sources, until there is a source which names no other, or even a source which itself turns out to be an eyewitness account. It would take us too long to go over the individual examples. Frank comes across eyewitnesses who were still in Europe at the time of the alleged incident, earwitnesses who had heard reports in languages which they had never learned, and most of all misinterpretations. Thus it was evident to him that many rituals were the drinking of the cremated ashes of the dead or interment in pots. Both these might have led eyewitnesses to believe they were seeing cannibalism. Frank categorizes 5 of the 60 resulting sources as unquestionable. But they refer only to these practices. He categorizes 25 sources as totally worthless, while the remaining range between “uncertain” and “extremely doubtful.”²⁶⁹

Frank further accuses the explorers and missionaries of always only finding what they had already determined to find.²⁷⁰ In conclusion Frank emphasizes: “We must hold on to the fact that with regard to both exocannibalism and endocannibalistic consumption of meat there is only one

²⁶⁷ “Kannibalismus Zäher Mythos”, *Der Spiegel*, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

²⁶⁸ Erwin Frank, ... *y se lo comen*, *op. cit.*

²⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 178.

²⁷⁰ Frank further concludes that cannibalism, if he came to be convinced of it, would not be a matter of dishonor (*ibid.*, p. 166). He is thus free of any suspicion, even now in reversing his conclusion, of wishing to save the honor of the people he is investigating, although this motive still keeps coming to the surface. It would have been good to have a comprehensive consideration of the international discussion. Also, although in 1979 Arens' work was only available in manuscript, it would by 1987 have been possible to quote extensively from it, cf. *ibid.*, p. XXVIII. Again, it would have been useful to discover whether Frank was the student extensively referred to by William Arens (*The Man-Eating Myth*, *op. cit.*, p. 173f), who with his final dissertation stood by his professor in the face of sharp criticism. Although I am familiar with the Bonn Ethnological Seminary, where Frank studied, I have not so far been able to ascertain this.

credible eyewitness account, and only two or three dubious indirect indications of the existence of the latter practice (self-accusation of those involved).”²⁷¹

In explanation of these facts he writes:

Cannibals who in the light of concrete experience over a period of time turned out to be non-cannibalistic were then more likely to be given as an example of the healthy effect of the contact of these “savages” with their Christian conquerors than evidence that cannibals did not exist. Cannibalism remained an assured element of the generally accepted “knowledge” irrespective of any contemporary experience of an individual case. As a logical possibility cannibalism is ... too compelling to allow space for the hypothesis that the certainty with which we usually regard this practice as an existing (or formerly existing) behavior pattern of other peoples might lack a basis in fact. But it is possibly the very powerful appeal of cannibalism as a logical alternative to non-cannibalism, which cannot actually be proved ... which has made it into a universal theme of not only European fantasy, into an ideal metaphor for being “different,” a negative self-definition.²⁷²

In a later article in the anthology *Authentizität und Betrug in der Ethnologie* [*Authenticity and Deception in Ethnology*] Frank, in a similar way to W. Arens although with completely different arguments, substantiated his thesis that so far no indubitably historical sources of cannibalism have been produced,²⁷³ referring to Latin American scientists who had for a long time maintained this thesis. In this Frank again goes over the question of which rituals were misinterpreted as cannibalism by outsiders. It is well-known that these included the Lord’s Supper of the first Christians, which many Romans could not understand in any other way. In addition he refers to the political aspect of the accusation of cannibalism. Was not the horror of cannibalism the reason for many a crusade and many a colonial war? He asks: “How many peoples of Central and South America probably owe their reputation of once having been man-eaters ... to the well-known fact that the Spanish crown allowed their overseas governors to engage in hunting free Indians as slaves *only* if these were cannibals?”²⁷⁴

²⁷¹ Erwin Frank, ... *y se lo comen*, *op. cit.*, p. 180f.

²⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 190f.

²⁷³ Erwin Frank, “Sie fressen Menschen, wie ihr scheußliches Aussehen beweist ...”, *op. cit.*

²⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 205.

5. Vindication of cannibalism?

It is certainly salutary if those cases can be revealed in which peoples of this earth have been unjustly charged with cannibalism. It must be questioned, however, whether such examples go so far as to prove that there was never any such thing as habitual cannibalism.

It is also evident in too many places that the criticism of Arens and Frank is essentially linked with their view of Christian mission. Since a majority of the sources stems from the writing of Christian missionaries, and it was taken as read that in many places cannibalism was driven back by Christian influence, the battle against the credibility of the countless sources is predominantly a battle against Christianity.²⁷⁵

It is puzzling that the aforementioned ethnologists and many of their colleagues above all reproach others, in particular Christians and missionaries, for rejecting cannibalism lock, stock and barrel. Instead they try to explain cannibalism, and in so doing to excuse it. As far as they are concerned cannibalism has nothing to do with murder, and no mention is made of the human rights of the victim. It is made out as if the only men to be eaten were those who had already died of themselves, although in most cases of cannibalism the victims are killed, or rather murdered, for the sole purpose of eating them.

Hans Helfritz writes, for instance: “Cannibalism, which of all people the cruel Spanish conquerors described as ‘most extremely horrible’ and regarded as the consequence of the Indians’ heathenism, has long been radically divested by modern psychology of its horror and incomprehensibility.”²⁷⁶

Just in order that another religion should not be criticized, it is also absolutely excluded that cannibalism should be called into question. Thus Nigel Davies writes about another researcher: “Ewald Volhard stresses that if there was any such thing as non-ritual cannibalism, then it was an inferior

²⁷⁵ Roger M. Keesing, *Cultural Anthropology: A Contemporary Perspective* (New York: CBS Publishing Japan, 1981²), p. 154, criticizes Arens’ position, appealing to the eye-witness account by his great-grandfather, also an ethnologist, of a cannibal feast in the islands of Fiji. Arens’ view is also rejected by Ioan M. Lewis, *Schamanen, Hexer, Kannibalen*, *op. cit.*, p. 100f, although in many cases he does not regard the accusation of cannibalism as being historically tenable, and is cautious because he was himself once thought to be a cannibal (*ibid.*, p. 94).

²⁷⁶ Hans Helfritz, *Amerika: Inka, Maya und Atzeken* (Vienna: Ueberreuter, 1979), p. 259 (on the cannibalism of the ancient Indian tribes in the Cauca Valley, in what is now Colombia).

type of ritual man-eating. Therefore such a practice cannot be condemned out of hand without at the same time damning the religion whose rituals were based on it.”²⁷⁷

Also typical are the vast variety of attempts to explain cannibalism. Michael Harner was right to point out that the Aztec human sacrifices are the focus of interest, while the parallel incidence of cannibalism is seldom mentioned or investigated.²⁷⁸ It is well-known that the hearts of the victims were cut out and sacrificed to the sun god. It is less well-known what happened to the rest of the body. On the basis of contemporary Spanish sources Harner comes to the conclusion that as a rule arms and legs were eaten.²⁷⁹

But the explanation which Michael Harner has to offer for Aztec cannibalism is both terrible and wrong. Harner, who has made himself a name as an ethnologist,²⁸⁰ has formulated the thesis that human sacrifices are the consequence of population density and lack of protein because of the absence of domestic animals.²⁸¹ This is typically evolutionary.

On the other hand it seems that it is thought to be a good thing that cannibalism is in the process of dying out. Christianity is attacked because of its anti-cannibalistic attitude. But it is generally not mentioned that it was this very attitude which caused the retreat of cannibalism.

²⁷⁷ Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer: Glaube, Liebe und Verzweiflung in der Geschichte der Menschheit* (Düsseldorf: Econ, 1981), p. 192f, referring to Ewald Volhard, *Kannibalismus* (Stuttgart: Stricker und Schröder, 1951).

²⁷⁸ Michael Harner, “The Ecological Basis for Aztec Sacrifice”, *Ethnology* 4 (1977), pp. 117—135.

²⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 120.

²⁸⁰ Especially through his book on the Jivaro, their head-hunting and their famous shrunken heads: Michael J. Harner, *The Jivaro* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1973); cf. Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, *op. cit.*, pp. 313—316.

²⁸¹ Michael Harner, “The Ecological Basis for Aztec Sacrifice”, *op. cit.* His thesis is supported by: Marvin Harris, *Kannibalen und Könige: Aufstieg und Niedergang der Menschheitskulturen* (Frankfurt, 1978), pp. 153—159 (in English: Marvin Harris, *Cannibals and Kings* [New York: Random House, 1977]). His thesis is rejected by: B.R. Ortiz de Montellano, “Aztec Cannibalism: An Ecological Necessity?”, *Science* 200 (1978), pp. 611—617; M. Sahlins, “Reply to Marvin Harris”, *New York Review of Books* 28 (1979), June: p. 52f.; Nigel B. Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, *op. cit.*, pp. 9, 262—267; G.W. Conrad, A.A. Demarest, *Religion and Empire: The Dynamics of Aztec and Inca Expansionism* (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 165—170; Peggy Reeves Sanday, *Divine Hunger*, *op. cit.*, pp. 15—20; W. Haberland, “Das Hochtal von Mexico”, pp. 19—86 in *Glanz und Untergang des Alten Mexico: Die Azteken und ihre Vorläufer* (Mainz, 1986), here pp. 80—82.

We find a typical example as long ago as 1932 in J. A. MacCulloch. In dealing with the question of why cannibalism has declined in many places, he discusses every possible theory,²⁸² mentions “the presence of a higher civilization, and especially of a higher religion”,²⁸³ refers to the fact that Islam brought an end to cannibalism in North and East Africa, and only at the end, almost in passing, states that: “Christianity, together with other European civilizing influences, has also put an end to it in many parts of S. America, in New Zealand, and many islands of the South Seas, once hotbeds of cannibalism, as well as in large tracts of the African continent.”²⁸⁴

In line with this there is little in the way of memories of cannibalism. In 1977 in New Guinea Queen Elizabeth II received a framework of skulls (an “ariba”) which came from the Goariba Islands, “the only place of which it is known that missionaries there fell victim to cannibals. In 1901 the pastor James Chalmers, his assistant preacher and eleven young Papuan converts were slain.”²⁸⁵ The Queen accepted the present without protest,²⁸⁶ and presented the framework with its two human skulls to the British Museum in London.²⁸⁷ There was never any mention of the fact that this object was clear evidence of murder.

The intervention of the missionaries against cannibalism, human sacrifice and headhunting was in those days considered to be an intervention in support of human rights. Nowadays it is regarded by so-called human rights organizations as being a violation of human rights. Then the rights of the victim were considered most important, now it is the rights of the perpetrator.

Some authors even want to turn things on their head. Thus we read the following in a book by a journalist and an ethnologist, which is striking in its hatred for Christian mission:

In any case, it was missions which began the process of cultural decline in the primitive peoples ... This is true not only in the breaking of their ancestral chain of succession ... but also in their prohibition of headhunting and cannibalism, a

²⁸² J.A. MacCulloch, “Cannibalism”, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

²⁸³ *Ibid.*

²⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁸⁵ Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, *op. cit.*, p. 318.

²⁸⁶ In contrast to this, right up to the present century missionaries were still profoundly shocked by such phenomena. A classic example of this is Wilson S. Naylor, *Daybreak in the Dark Continent*, The Forward Mission Study Course (New York: Laymen’s Missionary Movement, 1908), p. 90f. (human sacrifice) and p. 92f. (cannibalism).

²⁸⁷ Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, *op. cit.*, p. 318.

prohibition which to us too seems obvious and humane. But even the prohibition of the inhuman can have effects which are themselves inhuman. Thus in 1950 in her book *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies* the well-known American anthropologist Margaret Mead reported concerning the Mundugumor, a Papuan tribe of New Guinea, that the prohibition of head-hunting and cannibalism had completely destroyed the essential character of the life of the tribe, "like a watch with a broken spring." Thus the incomprehensible nature of such a prohibition for the cannibals and head-hunters stems not only from their own imagination as if someone suddenly forbade us to slaughter and eat pigs and cattle but also from their own experience of us white people.²⁸⁸

So forbidding the slaughter of cattle would be the same as forbidding the slaughter of human beings! What do these ethnologists actually think about the victims? In any case, it was established a long time ago that Mead's researches were nothing but wishful thinking. Mead found what she wanted to find, and in so doing completely misunderstood the harsh reality of the tribe she was studying.²⁸⁹

Accordingly the authors agree with the decision of an Australian judge who acquitted headhunters, when they pointed out to him that there was no difference between tribal feuds and the wars of the western world.²⁹⁰ How right they are! And since the authors would probably condemn any war of aggression, they ought also condemn and punish tribal feuds. Will the next thing be the justification of murder before a court, by reference to the existence of wars? Would the authors also have been minded to maintain National Socialism in existence, because the Nazi culture would be destroyed if they were forbidden to kill Jews and other opponents? A culture which makes murder essential to its existence will, according to biblical teaching, inevitably die. "*For all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword*" (Mt. 26:52).

But back to the book we have chosen as our example:

It was, however, only in the nineteenth century that the inhabitants of the Fiji archipelago gained the dubious reputation of being particularly terrible cannibals. This reputation was spread by missionaries, who were not exactly delighted by the persistent resistance of the islanders to the scarcely convincing examples of Christian "gentleness and tolerance." However we know also, dating from the year 1847, the statement of an old Fijian chief that the bloody wars and constant

²⁸⁸ Peter Baumann, Helmut Uhlig, *Kein Platz für "wilde" Menschen: Das Schicksal der letzten Naturvölker* (Vienna: Molden, 1974), p. 220.

²⁸⁹ Thus especially Derek Freeman, *Liebe ohne Aggression: Margaret Meads Legende von der Friedfertigkeit der Naturvölker* (Munich, 1983).

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 220f.

cannibalism were recent, and had not been known to such an extent in the time of his youth. The sacral cannibalism of ancient times had turned, as a result of the campaigns to eradicate the tribes, into unrestrained man-eating that was the observation and conclusion of contemporaries on the spot.²⁹¹

What sort of argument is that? Nineteenth century cannibalism was not so bad, because earlier it was not so widespread and had a religious basis! Not only that, but an example like this contradicts the evolutionary view of cannibalism. Cannibalism is not necessarily the early stage of a culture, but can also take shape only at a much later stage.

There was also human sacrifice and cannibalism after the Second World War.²⁹² In New Guinea the cannibalism described by Fredrik Barth²⁹³ did not come to an end until Australian police patrols occupied the inaccessible areas in the interior of the islands in 1964.²⁹⁴

6. Cannibalism in the Old Testament?

In this connection every Bible-believing Christian will naturally be interested in the question of whether cannibalism is known to the Old Testament, or at least whether it speaks of such peoples. The answer to this question is surprising:

(1) Cannibalism is known to the Old Testament. But nowhere is another nation blamed for this cannibalism, as we have discovered throughout history. It is always the nation of the Jews itself which is the target. The Old Testament does not need to ascribe to other nations things which they have not done or at least reject.

(2) Cannibalism is never regarded as normal or right, but is always seen as the worst kind of transgression. This is the view even of apostate kings:

In Lev. 26:29 (see vv. 27—29) and Dt. 28:53 and 57 (see vv. 53—57) one of the high points of God's judgment on the people's transgression of the law is declared to be that women will eat the flesh of their own children. The fulfillment of both declarations is to be found in Lam. 2:20 and 4:10 and in 2 Kings 6:28f. (see vv. 25—30). Here, too, it is only a matter of mothers eating their children in the course of a dramatic famine. In 2 Kings 6:25—30 even the king, who himself does not keep the law, is terri-

²⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

²⁹² Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, *op. cit.*, pp. 312—323.

²⁹³ Fredrik Barth, *Ritual and Knowledge among the Baktaman of New Guinea* (New-haven [USA]: Yale University Press, 1975).

²⁹⁴ Thus Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, *op. cit.*, p. 316.

fied when he learns of it. In Ezk. 5:10 we are told that as a judgment “*the fathers shall eat the sons*” and “*the sons shall eat their fathers*,” which could however also be understood as a general description of mutual killing. In Jer. 19:9 similarly there is a general description: “And I will cause them to eat the flesh of their sons and the flesh of their daughters, and they shall eat every one the flesh of his friend in the siege ...”

In Ezk. 36:13f we read about Israel restored by the Spirit: “Thus saith the Lord God: Because they say unto you, Thou land devourest up men, and hast bereaved thy nations; Therefore thou shalt devour men no more, neither bereave thy nations any more, saith the Lord God.” It is not clear whether the text is to be understood figuratively or not. In any case, here as always in the Old Testament cannibalism is linked to those belonging to its own people. This is significant in the light of the previously described situation where cannibalism was always an accusation made by one nation against another.

So in the Old Testament cannibalism is not tolerated, but features as one of the principal characteristics of a perverse society. It is always the people themselves who are involved in such transgression in circumstances of most severe famine. It is typical of the Old Testament, which condemns other nations in the sharpest terms and places them under the judgment of God, that it directs the charge of cannibalism, and we do not mean cannibalism that is encouraged and approved, only against its own people.²⁹⁵

7. Sources for evidence of cannibalism

Astrid Wendt, in the first part of her Tübingen ethnological dissertation on the historical sources for cannibalism in Brazil,²⁹⁶ examines the portrayal of the ritual cannibalism of the Brazilian Indians in Italian, Portuguese, German, English and Dutch sources from the period from 1500 to 1654. The writer brings out clearly the varying interests of the different European nations, but (rightly) considers the numerous records of and references to cannibalism to be fundamentally credible.

Particularly interesting is the second part of the study, dealing with allegorical portrayals of America in carvings, atlases and travelogues of the same period, with illustrations reproduced in a comprehensive appendix. It

²⁹⁵ For further study, cf. the commentaries of Carl F. Keil and Franz Delitzsch in their series of commentaries on the relevant texts.

²⁹⁶ Astrid Wendt, *Kannibalismus in Brasilien: Eine Analyse europäischer Reiseberichte und Amerika-Darstellungen für die Zeit zwischen 1500 und 1654*, Europäische Hochschulschriften XIX B (Ethnologie) 15 (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1989).

is evident that the portrayal of cannibalism was part of the archetypical European portrayal of America.

Compared with the excellent portrayal of the actual material, the introduction and conclusion, which deal with the problem of cannibalism in general, seem to me to be weak, only referring to what every ethnologist must and does know about cannibalism. (Incidentally, to assume a “relationship in terms of ideas” between cannibalism and Eucharist,²⁹⁷ without going into it any further, seems to me to be somewhat out of place.)

Wendt’s final verdict entirely contradicts that of Arens and Frank:²⁹⁸

The fact that ritual cannibalism is mentioned and in some cases described in detail by all the writers, whatever their nationality, status, or relationship to the indigenous people, leads to the conclusion that this sort of anthropophagy did indeed exist. This is all the more probable when even those authors whose aim it was to portray the way of life of the Brazilians as an example to be followed (even for Europeans) describe cannibalistic rites of this sort.²⁹⁹

The most significant German source is undoubtedly the account of 1556—1557 by Hans Staden,³⁰⁰ who gives an eye-witness description “in sensational richness of detail of the events which eventually reached their climax in the consumption of the slain.”³⁰¹ So it is that D. Forsyth made use of Staden as a powerful argument against William Arens, and produced a detailed rejection of Arens’ criticism of Staden.³⁰²

Staden, a peasant from Hessen³⁰³ who was born between 1525 and 1528, served under Portuguese and Spaniards throughout the world. In about 1553 in Brazil he was captured by the Tupinamba. Before being ransomed

²⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 6. Also Ioan M. Lewis, *Schamanen, Hexer, Kannibalen*, *op. cit.*, p. 101f. sees in ritual cannibalism “a special form of communion” (*ibid.*, p. 101), like that to be found in the eucharist.

²⁹⁸ The discussion of William Arens and his pupils consists unfortunately only of remarks made in passing (*ibid.*, pp. 79, 219) and brief disparaging comments. Here one might have expected a thorough discussion of the matter. Wendt does, however, counter Arens by appealing to Donald W. Forsyth, “Three Cheers for Hans Staden: The Case for Brazilian Cannibalism”, *Ethnohistory* 32 (1985) 1, pp. 17—36.

²⁹⁹ Astrid Wendt, *Kannibalismus in Brasilien*, *op. cit.*, p. 152. (On pp. 227—230 there is an excellent table setting out what details of cannibalistic rites have been recorded from which sources between 1500 and 1654.)

³⁰⁰ Hans Staden, *Brasilien: Die wahrhaftige Historie der wilden, nackten, grimmigen Menschenfresser-Leute* (Tübingen: G. Faber, 1982).

³⁰¹ Astrid Wendt, *Kannibalismus in Brasilien*, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

³⁰² Donald W. Forsyth, “Three Cheers for Hans Staden”, *op. cit.*

³⁰³ Cf. Astrid Wendt, *Kannibalismus in Brasilien*, *op. cit.*, p. 74f.

over a year later by some Frenchmen, he had the opportunity to witness at first hand every aspect of the ritual of cannibalism. All attempts to discredit this witness³⁰⁴ may be regarded as having failed.³⁰⁵ In addition, Astrid Wendt has pointed out that Staden, although a convinced Protestant, was not in the position of a spiritual or colonial leader (he was, after all, a German peasant) who had an interest in portraying the Indians in a particularly negative light.³⁰⁶ On the contrary, he was surprised by the kind treatment he received as a prisoner:

First he had to submit to the ritual which was required of him as a future human sacrifice. It was only by feigning toothache that he succeeded in escaping the jaws of death. This prevented him from eating, and made him too skinny to be worth putting in the cookpot. He went on to make some shrewd predictions, and in this way attained the status of a tribal oracle, and from then on was too valuable to be killed.³⁰⁷

8. Cannibalism and evolution: cannibalism in pre-humans and early humans

Anyone venturing to say anything about cannibalism will also be required to say something about the cannibalism of the alleged pre-humans and early humans.³⁰⁸ Cannibalism in pre- and early humans or the links between animal and human is, for many, something which goes without saying.³⁰⁹ Yet all the discoveries can either only verify the fact that those of the same species died or were killed, or else that the flesh of those who had just been killed was cut off. The prominent prehistorian and evolutionary scholar K. J. Narr emphatically rejects these assertions:

These findings have in part been connected with cannibalism; but such an assumption can neither be directly deduced from the findings, nor be supported by ethnological analogies taken from cultures which are in some way structurally comparable ... And other putative instances of man-eating are at best ambigu-

³⁰⁴ Especially William Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth*, *op. cit.*, p. 25f.

³⁰⁵ Cf. especially D. Forsyth, "Three Cheers for Hans Staden", *op. cit.*; cf. Astrid Wendt, *Kannibalismus in Brasilien*, *op. cit.*, pp. 79—81.

³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

³⁰⁷ Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, *op. cit.*, p. 303.

³⁰⁸ Critical of this is William Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth*, *op. cit.*, pp. 116—136; Erwin Frank, "Sie fressen Menschen, wie ihr scheußliches Aussehen beweist...", *op. cit.*, p. 205f.

³⁰⁹ E.g. *Encyclopedia Britannica*, *op. cit.*, vol. 8, p. 1034 declares the cannibalism of *homo erectus*; *ibid.*, vol. 14, p. 985 the cannibalism of the neolithic and paleolithic ages,

ous. That applies not least to findings relating to “Australopithecines,” to whom at the same time cannibalism and a “particular interest in the skull” were ascribed, although it is more likely that the smashing up and distribution of skeletal parts was the work of predatory and scavenging animals. Cannibalism as a “distinguishing” characteristic of early man which elevates him above the animals together with the consequent anthropological conclusions about the removal of inhibitions etc. remains, despite its constant repetition, a conjecture without any real foundation.³¹⁰

He goes on to explain in detail the most often quoted discoveries:

The question of cannibalism is linked with that of intentional killing; but “intra-species killing” does not constitute proof of anthropophagy. The discovery of Chukutien, where Peking Man was found, cannot be regarded as evidence, because there it was almost entirely skull-tops which were discovered (four of them in a stratum which contains almost nothing else: there seems to be no secular explanation of their being set down there). If it was a matter of remains of a meal, then the victims must have been consumed elsewhere and their skulls brought later to this store-place: the assumption of cannibalism in this case is arbitrary and unnecessary. The incompleteness of the skeletons, a feature which is mentioned with enthusiasm in respect of other sites, can be ascribed to the activities of predatory or scavenging animals; and the fairly frequent occurrence of individual skulls or parts of skulls can be explained either in this way or by other reasons for their being deposited. (The best evidence is a skull from a cave in Italy, which lay inside a circle of stones and bones.) The most ancient show-piece of Old Stone Age man-eating is the discoveries made in Krapina (Croatia), where fragments of skulls and other bones together with the remains of animals lay, partly burned and randomly distributed, in the stratum, something which can be entirely explained by digging-up of graves, biting into pieces by scavenging animals, penetration into new excavation strata, and the like.³¹¹

In parentheses Narr adds the real reason for the attempt to discover cannibalism in evolutionary precursors to man: “It is basically older than the discoveries and essentially relies upon an outdated evolutionary reconstruction of the history of civilization.”³¹²

³¹⁰ K.J. Narr, “Beiträge der Urgeschichte zur Kenntnis der Menschennatur”, pp. 3—62 in Hans-Georg Gadamer, Paul Vogler (ed.), *Kulturanthropologie, Neue Anthropologie* 4 (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag and Stuttgart: Georg Thieme Verlag, 1973), this quotation p. 32.

³¹¹ *Ibid.*

³¹² *Ibid.*; cf. also the critique of cannibalism in Cro-Magnon Man in H. Helmut, “Kannibalismus in Paläoanthropologie und Ethnologie”, *Ethnographisch-Archäologische Zeitschrift* (1968) 5, pp. 101—119, this quotation p. 101f., and Gunther Pilz, Hugo Moesch, *Der Mensch und die Graugans* (Frankfurt: Umschau Verlag, 1975), p. 159f.

Here we might draw attention to the real problem, which is that Narr merely substitutes another evolutionary reconstruction for the old one, whereas I see in this problem a general criticism of any attempt at evolutionary reconstruction. The quest for primitive man, occupying a lower level of culture, provided fruitful ground for every rumor of cannibalism. By going on to assume that the “primitive” tribes of the world occupied the same level as pre-humans and early humans, it was possible with the aid of ethnological investigations to reconstruct the everyday scene of early man. (This gains popular expression in such sensational reports as “With the Stone Age men of Brazil.”) It was a short step from this to the cannibalism of pre-humans and early humans. Even if this comparison was only openly shared by a few, its results are still often encountered at an unconscious level.

In fact, however, there is not only no proof of the evolution of mankind, but also no special connection between the evolution of man and cannibalism. J. A. MacCulloch points out that “the worst forms of cannibalism”³¹³ are to be found not among the people on the lowest cultural level, but among people “with a certain amount of culture.”³¹⁴

9. Human sacrifice vindicated?

The phenomenon to which we have already referred, whereby the bias against the Christian religion not only rejects out of hand as incredible innumerable Christian sources—and which sources until the century before last were not in some measure Christian?—but also in consequence takes under its wing cannibalism as something which is not reprehensible and which can be explained in terms of religion and culture,³¹⁵ becomes much more evident in dealing with the example of human sacrifice.

Let us take an example. According to the ethnologist Michelle Zimbalist, among the Ingolots of New Guinea the last beheading in the context of headhunting took place in 1972.³¹⁶ Nigel Davies comments: “The anthropologist declares that the killing was of a purely ritual nature, and not influenced by politics.”³¹⁷ So a ritual, religious killing is not bad, whereas a

³¹³ J.A. MacCulloch, “Cannibalism”, *op. cit.*, p. 205.

³¹⁴ *Ibid.*

³¹⁵ Explanations of and excuses for cannibalism are discussed by Christian Spiel, *Menschen essen Menschen*, *op. cit.*, pp. 201—212, 217f.

³¹⁶ Michelle Zimbalist Ronaldo, “Skulls and Causality”, *Man* (London) 12 (1977) 1, p. 168f.

³¹⁷ Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, *op. cit.*, p. 319.

political one would be. The ethical system capable of making judgments of this nature is not revealed to us.

Friedrich Schwenn writes similarly concerning the ancient human sacrifices, for which he puts forward many explanations,³¹⁸ “that the human sacrifices were by no means the result of cruelty or anthropophagy.”³¹⁹

Against this view, the folklorist K. Beth objects:

The fact that human sacrifices may be the result of sheer cruelty is adequately witnessed by such incidences of cruel slaughter of human beings as those carried out by Nero. But in general they are so strongly linked to a ritual religious observance that both their origin and their continuance find their psychological explanation in the most diverse forms of heathen religion which share a particular attitude to faith.³²⁰

The professor of ethnology Hanns J. Prem writes: “Meanwhile the view of life which motivates human sacrifices has been increasingly understood.”³²¹

In this “understanding,” naturally the theory of evolution plays an important role.³²²

This understanding constantly leads to special treatment of Indian tribes and other groups when it is a question of deeds of violence. This is true of the once very warlike Kaiapos in Brazil. Chief Paulinhi Paiacan, formerly a shining example for the Brazilian Indians and the environmentalists, lost his reputation first through his involvement in multi-million-pound industries in mahogany, gold and chestnut oil, and finally as a result of his rape of an 18-year-old girl.³²³ He refuses to give himself up to the authorities.

³¹⁸ Friedrich Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, *op. cit.*, p. 317

³¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 5, summarizing the convictions of Euaristus Mader.

³²⁰ K. Beth, “Menschenopfer”, columns 156—174 in Hanns Bächthold Stäubli (ed.), *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*, vol. 6 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987 [reprint from 1935]); this quotation col. 158.

³²¹ Hanns J. Prem, “Geschichte Altamerikas”, *Oldenbourg Grundriss der Geschichte* 23 (Munich: E. Oldenbourg, 1989), p. 172. His principal reference is to M. León-Portilla, “Die Religion”, pp. 236—258 in Hanns J. Prem, U. Dyckerhoff (ed.), *Das Alte Mexiko* (Munich, 1986).

³²² Particularly blatant in A.A. Demarest, “Overview: Mesoamerican Human Sacrifice in Evolutionary Perspectives”, pp. 227—243 in E.H. Boone (ed.), *Ritual human sacrifice in Mesoamerica* (Washington, 1984).

³²³ According to *Die Welt* No. 140 (18/6/1992), p. 3.

He said, “I despise the law of the white man,”³²⁴ and because of this he does not consider them to apply to him. His tribe, the Kaiapos, supports him, so that the government is undecided what it should do. Finally, the tribe is known to be very warlike, and in 1981 was responsible for the massacre of twenty farm-workers. Anyone who does not lend his support to Paiacan is regarded as having antiquated ideas. But the fact is constantly overlooked that this is a matter of a violent crime, and protection is enjoyed only by the surviving protagonists, not their victims. And it has long been proved that these victims suffer, fight for their rights, and have need of state protection just as much as in other cultures.³²⁵

10. The widespread incidence of human sacrifice

Let us now turn briefly to the distribution of incidences of human sacrifice. Human sacrifices were spread throughout the world.³²⁶ This is especially true of the particular form of the sacrifice of human beings on the occasion of the laying of a foundation stone: “The building sacrifice is a custom to be found throughout the whole world, and among people of every stage of culture ... Doubtless the original building sacrifices were men who were entombed alive in the foundations of the building. In this case the sacrifice of children is remarkably common.”³²⁷

Unlike cannibalism, human sacrifice is widespread, and not restricted to particular cultures. “There are only a few races and a few religions with a history which is free of human sacrifices.”³²⁸

At the same time its existence is constantly covered up. “It is an essential feature of religious historical writing that mention of human sacrifices is

³²⁴ *Ibid.*

³²⁵ Cf. especially Derek Freeman, *Liebe ohne Aggression: Margaret Meads Legende von der Friedfertigkeit der Naturvölker*, *op. cit.*

³²⁶ Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, *op. cit.*; Kay A. Read, “Human Sacrifice”, p. 515f. in Mircea Eliade (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Religion* (New York: Macmillan, 1987) vol. 6; A.E. Crawley *et al.*, “Human Sacrifice”, pp. 840—867 in James Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 6 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1937); Karl Bruno Leder, *Todesstrafe* (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch-Verlag, 1986), pp. 49—56 (although this includes some disputed Old Testament examples).

³²⁷ Stübe, “Bauopfer”, sec. 962—964 in Hanns Bächthold Stäubli (ed.), *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*, vol. 1 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987 [reprint from 1927]), this quotation sec. 962 (along with further literature).

³²⁸ A.E. Crawley, “Human Sacrifice (Introductory and Primitive)”, pp. 840—845 in James Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 6 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1937), this quotation p. 840.

suppressed. Nonetheless the fact that they frequently took place is undisputed.”³²⁹

The world-wide incidence of human sacrifice can be demonstrated by a number of examples from history.

Greeks and Romans: We may begin our collection of examples with the human sacrifices of the Greeks³³⁰ and Romans.³³¹ “When we take into account all the works of art of our literature which deal with human sacrifices, together with the sagas of classical antiquity, human sacrifices constitute a relatively not insignificant proportion of our intellectual property.”³³²

In the case of the Romans it was only the spread of Christianity which brought an end to human sacrifices: “Cæsar Commodus (180—192 a.d.), for instance, killed human beings in rites which belonged to the cult of Mithras. This had become very popular in Rome, before Christianity became the official religion.”³³³

Certain human sacrifices were forbidden for the first time by the Roman Senate in 97 b.c., but it is not clear which human sacrifices these were. Cæsar Augustus forbade Roman citizens to take part in human sacrifices. Not until Cæsar Claudius was the ban made universal. Then under later emperors it was included in the *corpus iuris*, the imperial legal code.³³⁴ “But it was difficult to get rid of something which had once been a living faith.”³³⁵

³²⁹ Patrick Tierney, *Zu Ehren der Götter: Menschenopfer in den Anden* (Munich: Droemer Knauer, 1989), p. 13. (Sadly, by this Tierney means, as we shall see, also the Bible.)

³³⁰ Friedrich Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, *op. cit.*, pp. 18—139; A.C. Pearson, “Human Sacrifice (Greek)”, pp. 847—849 in James Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 6 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1937).

³³¹ Friedrich Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, *op. cit.*, pp. 140—196; R. Wüch, “Human Sacrifice (Roman)”, pp. 858—862 in James Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 6 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1937).

³³² Friedrich Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

³³³ Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

³³⁴ In all cases sources in Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, *op. cit.*, p. 186f.

³³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 187; examples *ibid.*, pp. 188—193.

America: A well-attested example is that of the “human sacrifices of the Skidi-Pawnees, formerly inhabitants of Nebraska.”³³⁶ The last human sacrifice took place in 1838.³³⁷ The sacrifices were well-known, because in 1817 and 1818 a chieftain and his son Petalesharro prevented two human sacrifices.³³⁸ In 1827 an Indian agent succeeded in obtaining the freedom of a captured Cheyenne girl.³³⁹ In 1838 for the last time men lost their lives in trying to escape from sacrifice at the hands of the Skidi-Pawnees.³⁴⁰

In the case of North America it is, however, essentially true that “Among North American Indian cultures evidence of human sacrifices is less easy to find.”³⁴¹

Africa: In Africa human sacrifices were specially widespread in connection with the burial of kings. Just to give one example: “The Barundi slaughtered vast numbers of men, so that the spirit of the king should not seek vengeance; even many a leading Barundi was killed in order to calm down the king’s courtiers.”³⁴²

China: At the death of many Chinese emperors various servants, wives and concubines, soldiers or members of the royal household had also to die.³⁴³

Incas: The sun maidens were chosen throughout the whole kingdom at the age of ten years. They were brought up in their own convents, either to become brides of the sun god, or else to become wives and concubines of the officials. The Inca was the only man allowed to enter the convent at any time, in order to select concubines for his harem. It was also he alone who decided whom they should marry, presenting the sun maidens as a mark of honor to officials, artists and others.³⁴⁴ “Human sacrifices were

³³⁶ Sonja Brigitte Ross, *Das Menschenopfer der Skidi-Pawnee*, Völkerkundliche Arbeiten 1 (Bonn: Holos, 1989), p. 7. The whole of the book discusses the evidence, sources and background of individual cases.

³³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

³³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 8f.

³³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 10f.

³⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

³⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

³⁴² K. Beth, “Menschenopfer”, *op. cit.*, col. 160.

³⁴³ Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, *op. cit.*, pp. 37—40; J. Dyer Ball, “Human Sacrifice (Chinese)”, pp. 845—847 in James Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 6 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1937).

³⁴⁴ Cf. the excellent short brief study by my teacher, Wilfried Westphal, *Unter den Schwingen des Kondor: Das Reich der Inka Gestern und Heute* (Gütersloh: C. Ber-

much more rare among the Incas than among their well-known contemporaries in Mexico, the Aztecs. In Tahuanti-suyu humans were sacrificed above all when the health of the ruler or the success of a military campaign was at stake, or with a view to averting an epidemic and driving it out of the country.³⁴⁵

Aztecs:³⁴⁶ The best-known human sacrifices in history are doubtless the human sacrifices of the Aztecs, which we have already referred to in connection with cannibalism.

The scale of human sacrifice is appalling. Some 70—80,000 victims were sacrificed at the dedication of the main pyramid in Tenochtitlan in 1487. Whereas earlier estimates had pointed to an average annual sacrifice of about 15,000 human victims in central Mexico (out of a population of two million), recent population estimates push the total as high as 25 million, and suggest that as many as 250,000, one percent of the total population were sacrificed each year.³⁴⁷

telsmann, 1985), pp. 85—88 (with further literature and sources), and also Miloslav Stigl, *Inka: Ruhm und Untergang der Sonnensöhne* (Leipzig: Urania-Verlag, 1989²), pp. 197—199.

³⁴⁵ *Ibid.* p. 197. Cf. on the human sacrifices of the Maya: Klaus Helfreich, *Menschenopfer und Tötungsrituale im Kult der Maya*, Monumenta Americana 9 (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1973); Wilfried Westphal, *Die Maya: Volk im Schatten seiner Vater* (Herrsching: Manfred Pawlak, 1986) (reprinted by C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh [Mayas, see Register p. 398]); Paul deParrie, Mary Pride, *Ancient Empires of the New Age* (Westchester: Crossway Books, 1989), pp. 103—120.

³⁴⁶ Cf. on human sacrifice in ancient Mexico, especially the Aztecs, the standard work by Y. González Torres, *El sacrificio humano entre los Mexicanos* (Mexico, 1985). Intelligible to all is Nigel B. Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer* (Düsseldorf: Econ, 1981); cf. also Hanns J. Prem, *Geschichte Altamerikas*, Oldenbourg Grundriss der Geschichte 23 (Munich: E. Oldenbourg, 1989), p. 172f.; Michael Harner, “The Ecological Basis for Aztec Sacrifice”, *op. cit.*; M. Harris, *Kannibalen und Könige: Aufstieg und Niedergang der Menschheitskulturen* (Frankfurt: 1978) (English version *Cannibals and Kings* [New York: Random House, 1977]); David Carrasco, “Human Sacrifice: Aztec Rites”, pp. 516—523 in Mircea Eliade (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Religion* (New York: Macmillan, 1987), vol. 6. On cannibalism of the descendants of the Incas, Aztecs, etc., i.e. of the South American Indians, cf. Alfred Métraux, “Warfare, Cannibalism, and Human Trophies”, pp. 383—410 in Julian H. Steward (ed.), *Handbook of South American Indians*, vol. 5: “The Comparative Ethnology of South American Indians”, Smithsonian Institution: Bureau of American Ethnology: Bulletin 143 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949) (with bibliography).

³⁴⁷ Roger M. Keesing, *Cultural Anthropology: A Contemporary Perspective* (New York: CBS Publishing Japan, 1981²), p. 153, referring to Michael Harner, “The Ecological Basis for Aztec Sacrifice”, *Ethnology* 4 (1977), pp. 117—135. The older estimate comes from S.F. Cook, “Human sacrifice and warfare as factors in the demogra-

This involved above all the offering of the heart: “The Mesoamerican human sacrifices were mainly carried out by the excision of the heart.”³⁴⁸

The Latin-Americologist and journalist Patrick Tierney underwent great dangers to unearth contemporary evidence for human sacrifice in the Andes.³⁴⁹ He states that the authorities and judiciary seek to ignore the problem.

Teutons:³⁵⁰ In the case of the Teutons, human sacrifices were the highest sacrifices offered to almost all the important gods: “So the most important and highest sacrifices are human sacrifices: there are numerous testimonies to their being offered to Zeus, Woden, Donar, Odin, Thor, Freyr, Foiste, Thorgerd and Hölgabrud.”³⁵¹

First of all by way of evidence we have archaeological discoveries. The well-known marsh corpses may well, for instance, have been closely connected with human sacrifices.³⁵² In addition there are many descriptions by Roman and other authors. Friedrich Schwenn summarizes the report of Tacitus, generally regarded as reliable, in his *Germania*:³⁵³ “Among the

phy of pre-colonial Mexico”, *Human Biology* 18 (1946), pp. 81—102. The later estimate by Harner refers to Borah. Hanns J. Prem, *Geschichte Altamerikas, op. cit.*, p. 273, refers to a letter from Borah stating that Harner’s interpretation is a mistaken one.

³⁴⁸ Hanns J. Prem, *Geschichte Altamerikas, op. cit.*, p. 173. Cf. the contribution by a heart surgeon, F. Robicsek Hales, “Maya Heart Sacrifice, Cultural Perspective and Surgical Technique”, pp. 49—90 in E.H. Boone (ed.), *Ritual Human Sacrifice in Mesoamerica* (Washington, 1984).

³⁴⁹ Patrick Tierney, *Zu Ehren der Götter, op. cit.*

³⁵⁰ Cf. Eugen Mogk, *Menschenopfer bei den Germanen*, Abhandlungen der Königlich-Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Philologisch-historische Klasse 27 (1909), pp. 601—643 (= No. 17, pp. 1—43); R.L.M. Derolez, *Götter und Mythen der Germanen* (Wiesbaden: VMA, n.d. [reprinted Einsiedeln: Benzinger, 1963]), pp. 103, 105, 149, 193, 226—228, 236—239, 242—243, 249; Wolfgang Golther, *Handbuch der germanischen Mythologie* (Kettwig: Magnus, 1985² [reprint of 1908 edition]), pp. 561—565; K. Beth, “Menschenopfer”, *op. cit.* (with further literature); Eugen Mogk, “Human Sacrifice (Teutonic)”, pp. 865—867 in James Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 6 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1937).

³⁵¹ Wolfgang Golther, *Handbuch der germanischen Mythologie, op. cit.*, p. 561 (examples for sources, *ibid.*, pp. 561—565). As the oldest compilation of such sacrifices Golther cites P.G. Schütze, *De cruentis Germanorum gentilium victimis humanis* (Leipzig, 1743).

³⁵² Cf. especially the famous marsh corpse Tolland (Jutland), depicted e.g. in R.L.M. Derolez, *Götter und Mythen der Germanen, op. cit.*, plate 28 (next to p. 241).

³⁵³ Friedrich Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern, op. cit.*, p. 32 (p. 32f. note 2, also Latin text from *Germania* 40).

Teutons in springtime the priest of the Nerthus would drive the goddess's carriage, bedecked with hangings, through the land, and everywhere there were joyful feasts in the amphictyony. After that the carriage was washed in the holy lake, and the servants who had been involved in the ceremony were drowned."³⁵⁴

R. L. M. Derolez outlines Strabo's reliable account:

For which god the extremely gruesome human sacrifice was intended, which Strabo ascribes to the Cimri, this author does not tell us. But he gives a precise account of the ceremony: "The women who went into battle with the men were led by priestesses who could foretell the future. These priestesses were grey-haired women robed in white garments ... With sword in hand they marched through the camp towards the prisoners of war, crowned them with wreaths, and led them to a bronze cauldron with a capacity of about twenty bucketsful. By the side of this cauldron there stood a ladder. They climbed up it, cut the throat of each prisoner of war as he was passed up to them. According to the way in which the blood flowed into the cauldron, they prophesied the future. Others cut up the bodies of the prisoners of war, and after examining their entrails declared in a loud voice that their people would win the victory."³⁵⁵

Wolfgang Golther mentions another Teutonic custom which lacks none of the cruelty of the Aztecs' practice of excising the heart: "The cruel Nordic custom of the cutting of the blood eagle, whereby the victor would cleave his opponent's ribs asunder with his sword the length of the spine, and remove the lungs through the opening thus formed, was a cultic act."³⁵⁶

Sometimes the victims could be prominent people, even though it was mainly prisoners of war and criminals who were sacrificed by the Teutons: "Thus the Swedes sacrificed Olaf, their king, to Odin in order to obtain a good year."³⁵⁷

In 743 at the Synod of Liftinae (Belgium), presided over by Boniface, the still performed practice of human sacrifice was forbidden.³⁵⁸ But for a long time after that building sacrifices and the walling up of children re-

³⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

³⁵⁵ R.M.L. Derolez, *Götter und Mythen der Germanen*, *op. cit.*, p. 227f. Derolez considers that the sacrifice was intended for Woden.

³⁵⁶ Wolfgang Golther, *Handbuch der germanischen Mythologie*, *op. cit.*, p. 562.

³⁵⁷ M. Beth, "Kinderopfer", col. 1361—1364 in Hanns Bächthold Stäubli (ed.), *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*, vol. 4 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987 [reprint of 1932 edition]), this quotation col. 1361. On the saga of the Swedish King Aun, who sacrificed his sons, cf. R.L.M. Derolez, *Götter und Mythen der Germanen*, *op. cit.*, p. 104f.

³⁵⁸ K. Beth, "Menschenopfer", *op. cit.*, col. 161.

mained common practice.³⁵⁹ In Oldenburg children were offered in building sacrifices as late as the seventeenth century.³⁶⁰

It is always the introduction of Christianity which spells the end for human sacrifices. Thus it is stated of the Normans: "The practice of human sacrifice continued unabated among the Normans, until in the tenth century they were converted to Christianity."³⁶¹

And concerning Iceland we are told: "On the occasion of the introduction of Christianity to Iceland, at the Althing in the year 1000, the heathen offered to their idols two men from each quarter of the country. In contrast the Christians decided to dedicate the same number of men of excellence and ability to the service of the Lord."³⁶²

However, this role of Christianity is not always appreciated. Thus Nigel Davies writes quite "neutrally": "Human sacrifice in the conventional sense will doubtless disappear, as forms of Western culture penetrate to every corner of the world."³⁶³

In reality the abolition of human sacrifices was mostly the result of the courageous intervention by men wishing to introduce Christian standards or justice and order. Anyone who criticizes this once again forgets about the countless innocent victims, only for the sake of not offending some religion and culture. But something which is based on human sacrifices and murder has no right to exist, however religious and respectable the justification for it may be made out to be. This is something which everyone, even down to the researcher, will at last realize when he is himself cast in the role of the victim.

From the thirteenth century a.d. at the latest, when for the first time a Sultan had a thousand of them incarcerated in Delhi, the Thugs ("stranglers") in India offered sacrificial victims to the cruel goddess Kali, whereby they were throttled (strangled) in an extensive ritual involving a noose. The thousands of victims were hunted down in a series of raids. It was not until 1799 that the British became suspicious, but despite this very few "stranglers" were captured before 1830. Eventually Captain William Sleeman was commissioned to put an end to the evil which continued to

³⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, col. 166.

³⁶⁰ Eugen Mogd, "Human Sacrifice (Teutonic)", *op. cit.*, p. 867, referring to L. Strackerjan.

³⁶¹ Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

³⁶² Wolfgang Golther, *Handbuch der germanischen Mythologie*, *op. cit.*, p. 563.

³⁶³ Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, *op. cit.*, p. 312.

claim thousands of innocent victims each year. By 1837 Sleeman had captured 8,000 of the about 10,000 “stranglers,” each of whom had killed up to 250 people. When in 1876 the future King Edward VII visited India Thuggery had been destroyed, and all he could do was speak to an old Thug in prison.³⁶⁴

The burning of widows (called “suttee,” literally “faithful wife”), i.e. the cremation of wives on the occasion of their husband’s death, in India was also gradually restricted by the English. It is true that they at first tolerated this ritual, which Alexander the Great had discovered in the Punjab in 326 b.c., contenting themselves with official registration of the cases, but they finally made up their minds in 1829 to forbid the burning of widows. But in those regions of India not directly under the control of the English the importance of the prince continued to be measured by the number of wives who were cremated at his burial.³⁶⁵

In contrast to this there were always those researchers and ethnologists who spoke out against the abolition of human sacrifices, for the sake of maintaining the previously existing culture. The English explorer Sir Richard Burton was opposed to the abolition of a mass sacrifice which took place in an annual ceremony involving 500 to 1,000 victims in order to produce a medicine in Dahomey (West Africa), because this would amount to destroying the land.³⁶⁶ Is the maintenance of the culture more important than the protection of human life? Ought one equally to have maintained at any price the National Socialist culture, which similarly cast its spell over millions of people?

11. Christian human sacrifices?

The main Old Testament report concerns the heathen human and child sacrifices to Moloch, if one leaves out of account the fact that the king of the Moabites sacrificed his son before the eyes of the Israelites, at which the Israelites were so infuriated and shocked that they immediately departed from the battlefield (2 Kings 3:27).

The word Moloch (or Melech, Melek, Malik) meaning *king*, is a misvocalization of the name of a pagan, the consonants of *king* being retained and the vowels of *shame* used. Human sacrifices were made to this god, who is identified with the god of Ammon in 1 Kings 11:7, 33. There are references to Moloch in Jeremiah 49:1, 3; Amos 1:13—15; Zephaniah 1:5; Leviticus 18:21;

³⁶⁴ All *ibid.*, pp. 104—15, 91, 93, 96, 159, 134.

³⁶⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 133—141.

³⁶⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 173—178, esp. p. 176.

20:2—5; II Kings 23:10; Jeremiah 32:35, etc., and the location of Moloch worship in Israel was the Valley of Hinnom (Jer. 32:35; II Kings 23:10). Moloch worship was not limited to Ammon.

Moloch is “the king” or “kingship.” The name of Moloch is also given as Milcom (I Kings 11:5, 7, 33) and Malcam (Jer. 49:1, 3, RV; Zeph. 1:5). Moloch was an aspect of Baal (Jer. 32:35), *Baal* meaning *lord*. Under the name of Melcarth, king of Tyre, Baal was worshipped with human sacrifices at Tyre.³⁶⁷

Children passed through the fire,³⁶⁸ which resulted in their death (2 Kings 16:3; 21:6; Ezk. 16:20f). This happened especially in the Valley of Ben Hinnom (Jer. 7:31; 19:5) near Jerusalem, which consequently became a name for hell (Heb. “*gehenna*”). Named as the gods which received these child sacrifices were Moloch (Lev. 18:32; 20:2; 2 Kings 23:10; Jer. 32:35; 1 Kings 11:7; Zeph. 1:5), “*Baal*” (Jer. 19:5; 32:35), and “*idols*” in general (Ezk. 23:37; 16:20f). To make children pass through the fire counted as a particularly reprehensible combination of murder and idolatry, which was therefore subject to the death penalty (Dt. 18:10; Lev. 20:2—5).

It has long become the practice to “discover” numerous human sacrifices by the Israelites themselves, with the obvious purpose of undermining the idea that the biblical faith has contributed throughout the world to the stemming of the practice of human sacrifice.³⁶⁹ In connection with the human sacrifices in the Andes Patrick Tierney refers to alleged parallels to be found in the Old Testament and in Christendom.³⁷⁰ Moloch, the offering of Isaac, various prophecies and not least the Supper instituted by Jesus are made to serve as evidence of the suppressed desire for human sacrifice. Moloch? Yes, Moloch, however unlikely that sounds. Tierney writes: “It is true that Moloch has been stylized as one of the greatest demons of Judaeo-Christian literature, but there are conclusive proofs that this Moloch was in fact far from being a demon, but simply the name for child sacrifices to Yahweh.”³⁷¹

It is biblical criticism which makes this possible! Moloch, the embodiment of all that is evil, whose place of sacrifice near Jerusalem became the

³⁶⁷ Rousas J. Rushdoony, *Institutes of Biblical Law* (Philipsburg: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1973), p. 32.

³⁶⁸ Cf. Paul Volz, *Die Biblischen Altertümer* (Wiesbaden: Fourier, 1989 [reprint of 1914 edition]), p. 180f.

³⁶⁹ Z.B. Reay Tannahill, *Fleisch und Blut*, *op. cit.*, pp. 31—41.

³⁷⁰ Patrick Tierney, *Zur Ehren der Götter*, *op. cit.*, pp. 360—445.

³⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 391.

source of the biblical concept of “hell,” was allegedly none other than the Creator God Yahweh himself. Sometimes one has the feeling that historical-critical research means nothing other than that everything was exactly the opposite of what it appears to be. In reality, Tierney’s observation constitutes nothing less than the worst of blasphemies, uttered in the name of science.

Paul Volz³⁷² includes under the heading of human sacrifices in the Old Testament the redemption of the first-born in Ex. 34:19; 13:12f; etc.; the offering of Isaac in Gen. 22; the offering of Jephthah’s daughter in Judg. 11:34f; as well as 2 Sam. 21:9; 1 Kings 16:34; Ps. 106:37; Mic. 6:7; and mixes these up together with the human sacrifices to Baal and other heathen gods in Jer. 3:24; Ps. 106:38; 2 Kings 3:27.

Undoubtedly the favorite parallels are those of the redemption of the first-born³⁷³ and the offering of Isaac, which from the viewpoint of the biblical critics allegedly naturally had its origin in an actual human sacrifice.³⁷⁴

Friedrich Schwenn even understands the crucifixion as a human sacrifice: “This is how a practice of heathenism or of unenlightened Jewish religion was spiritualized.”³⁷⁵ But he has to go on: “Since then there has been no more offering of animal, or indeed human, sacrifices anywhere where faith in Christ really influenced the whole of a nation. But the spiritual powers which it sought to suppress all too often remained clandestinely alive, and often enough Christianity was only outwardly the victor.”³⁷⁶

There has been a long tradition of anti-Semitism, according to which the Jews were allegedly “committed to ritual murder”³⁷⁷ on the basis of the

³⁷² Paul Volz, *Die Biblischen Altertümer*, *op. cit.*, pp. 177—181.

³⁷³ M. Beth, “Kinderopfer”, *op. cit.*, col. 1363.

³⁷⁴ Thus Patrick Tierney, *Zu Ehren der Götter*, *op. cit.*, p. 368, referring to Rabbi Hyam Maccoby.

³⁷⁵ Friedrich Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

³⁷⁶ *Ibid.* Cf. the rejection of such accusations in Hermann L. Strack, *Der Blutaberglaube in der Menschheit, Blutmorde und Blutritus*, Schriften des Institutum Judaicum in Berlin 14 (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1892).

³⁷⁷ Friedrich Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, *op. cit.*, p. 3. Schwenn rejects this viewpoint, but names proponents from the nineteenth and twentieth century (*ibid.*, p. 3, note 3) and opponents (*ibid.*, p. 4, note 1).

law. Even the Romans accused both Jews³⁷⁸ and Christians³⁷⁹ of offering human sacrifices, which in fact they themselves practiced.

But let us now turn to the particular texts and accounts which are put forward in support of human sacrifices in the Old Testament.

In 1 Kings 16:34 it is merely stated that, in fulfillment of Joshua's curse in Jos. 6:26, that anyone who rebuilt Jerusalem would lose his oldest and youngest son, and in fact two sons of Hiel did die. There is no question of human sacrifices, even if it had involved a Canaanite sacrifice. For Hiel to lose his sons through human sacrifice would probably not have been understood as a curse, whereas the undesired loss of his children was.

In Mic. 6:7f. God replies to the question whether human sacrifice would be acceptable (Mic. 6:7), that man knows what is good and is required, i.e. to practice justice, mercy and humility (Mic. 6:8). Jer. 7:31; 19:5 *state expressly that God has never commanded that the first-born should be actually sacrificed.*

In Ps. 106:37 it is reported that the Israelites sacrificed their children "*to demons,*" because they worshipped the idols of the heathen. Here the divine criticism of human sacrifices is clearly spelt out. In 2 Sam. 21:9 we have only the report of the carrying out of the death penalty. It is only by importing a mysterious background that any human sacrifice can be suspected here.

It is often questioned whether the judge Jephthah in Judg. 11:31—39 is described as actually having sacrificed and killed his daughter. In Judg. 11:31 Jephthah makes a vow that if victory is obtained the first person who then meets him "*shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up as a burnt offering.*" In the event the first to meet him after the victory is his only child, his daughter (Judg. 11:34), and he says to her: "*You have brought me very low. You are among those who trouble me!*" (Judg. 11:35). The result was that his family had to become extinct. The daughter keeps the vow made by her father, and consequently a lament is sung for her each year (Judg. 11:39f). But she asks for "*two months*" to "*bewail [her] virginity*" (Judg. 11:37, repeated in Judg. 11:38). Judg. 11:39 goes on to report the fulfillment of the vow: "*and he carried out his vow with her which he had vowed. She knew no man.*" Does this mean that he offered his

³⁷⁸ This accusation was known to Josephus, *Contra Apion*, II, 8, 95; cf. Friedrich Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

³⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 193—195.

daughter as a “*burnt offering*”? That this was not the case is indicated³⁸⁰ by the fact that the text speaks of a burnt offering before the Lord, which would have been a sacrifice on the altar of the Tabernacle. In addition the Tabernacle was in Shiloh, in the territory of the Ephraimites, with whom Jephthah was in dispute, so he would have been unable to go to Shiloh. But above all, the fulfillment of the vow excludes its being understood as a sacrifice of the daughter on the altar of Yahweh. How would the vow then be fulfilled? The text states: “*and he carried out his vow with her which he had vowed. She knew no man*” (Judg. 11:39). Thus the vow involved the daughter not knowing a man throughout her lifetime, thus remaining celibate and being entirely consecrated to the Lord (“*shall surely be the Lord’s*”). That makes sense of the daughter wanting to bewail her “*virginity*.” You don’t bewail your virginity because you are to die as a virgin, but because you have to live as a virgin. In addition, Jephthah was a God-fearing man (Judg. 11:11), who knew the books of Moses (Judg. 11:15—18). For this military campaign and this vow “*the Spirit of the Lord came upon*” him (Judg. 11:29). All this makes it unlikely that here he commits one of the greatest crimes of Israelite history, which is what the sacrifice of a child to the Lord would have been. James Jordan makes the assumption that Jephthah wanted to set up a hereditary royal dynasty in opposition to the will of God, and this God prevented through the vow, whereby his daughter did not marry and therefore could not bear an heir to the throne.³⁸¹

In the case of the *offering of Isaac*, which was commanded by God (Gen. 22:1—19), it must be very clearly emphasized that it did not in fact take place, which is evidenced by the fact that the historical figure of Isaac continued the history of Israel. The “*offering of Isaac*” was indeed a foreshadowing of the sacrifice of Jesus, the only Son of God. Isaac could not have taken away the guilt of mankind, which only the later descendant (“*seed*”) of Abraham, Jesus Christ, was able to do.

*The only actual sacrifice of a human being according to the will of God is the death of Jesus.*³⁸² And this does not apply to the Lord’s Supper,

³⁸⁰ Thus especially Carl Friedrich Keil, *Biblischer Commentar über die Prophetischen Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments*, vol. 1: *Josua, Richter und Ruth* (*Biblischer Commentar über das Alte Testament*, Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1863), pp. 293—301; Robert Jamieson, “Judges”, pp. 70—127 in Robert Jamieson, A.R. Fausset, David Brown, *A Commentary, Critical, Experimental, and Practical, on the Old and New Testament*, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids (MI): Wm B. Eerdmans, 1990), vol. 1, part 2, this reference pp. 103—105; James B. Jordan, *Judges: God’s War Against Humanism* (Tyler (TX): Geneva Ministries, 1985), pp. 199—204, 190—192.

³⁸¹ James B. Jordan, *Judges*, *op. cit.*, pp. 199—204, 190—192, 329—334.

³⁸² Thus also Rousas J. Rushdoony, *Institutes of Biblical Law*, *op. cit.*, pp. 49, 79.

which is not a repetition of the sacrifice, but a remembrance of it. In the first place it must certainly be established that Jesus was killed by those who opposed him, who on that account rendered themselves liable to punishment. No human being is, or ever will be, called upon to offer human sacrifice. God used the death of his Son at the hands of his enemies in a way which cannot be explained to provide atonement for sin. By human sacrifice we normally understand something quite different, i.e. that human beings sacrifice a human being to God. Even in the case of the crucifixion, there can be no question of that. *C&S*

German Creationism: Two Reviews (1983/1994)³⁸³

Siegfried Scherer, Photosynthese: Bedeutung und Entstehung, Wort und Wissen, Fachberichte vol. 1, Hänssler Verlag, 1983, 74 pp.

For a long time German Creationists were few in number and just reproducing what their American teachers had given to them. It was good that, after first publishing translations of the major Creationist books in a series called *Wort und Wissen* (Word and Knowledge), the growing number of German Creationists repeated the facts in a German manner.

Fortunately, those scholars have now started to publish their own research work and will contribute to the growing movement in the whole world. After a government-paid symposium led by Professor Werner Gitt, a printed version of which was distributed all over Germany and contained Creationism ‘made in Germany’, *Wort und Wissen* has now started a third series of books (the first was a scientific presentation of American arguments, the second was popular presentation) which will publish only original material. This series starts with a book on photosynthesis by Siegfried Scherer of Konstanz State University – and it is a good start. In the first half of the book, Scherer describes major principles of photosynthesis. The leaf of a beechtree is taken as an example for complexity. Here already, Scherer can show that evolutionary principles cannot explain the origin of life. In the second part of the book he goes deeper into his research projects at Konstanz University on bio-energetic processes, especially on the electron transport in photosynthesis. For this complex operation, an evolutionary origin is for more than one reason impossible. Several diagrams and five color pictures help to explain his topic.

Werner Gitt (ed.), Am Anfang war die Information: Forschungsergebnisse aus Naturwissenschaft und Technik, Resch Verlag: Gräfe-ling/Munich, 1982²

This book originated as the report on the 37th seminary of the Federal Physical-Technical Institute (Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt, Braunschweig), which is the highest German institute for technical issues. The nine scientific lectures were sent free of charge to many institutions. The second edition contains not only the former summaries in German and

³⁸³ Reprinted from “German Creationist Books?”. *Contra Mundum* No. 11 (Spring) 1994: 54, itself being a reprint of reviews published as manuscripts in 1983

English but also a second summary before each lecture with biographical remarks by the editor.

Prof. Blechschmidt, Göttingen, shows that the “biogenetic law” is wrong as far as human embryos are concerned. Instead of this, he offers a “law of the maintenance of individuality”.

Prof. Trinchler, Wien, also disproves the evolutionary view of embryogenesis which builds on dissipative structures as means of self-organization. He explains the growing cell in the framework of the fundamental law of thermodynamics.

Dr. Scheven, Ennepetal, refutes the philosophical generalizations on fossil-studies. He answers the question, as to what information we can obtain from fossils and gives examples for the rapid burial of most fossils. Added to the lecture are 30 full-color photographs from his own collection.

Prof. Gutmann, Wien, shows that a system without hierarchic order would be incapable of existence. Rubik’s cube is used as illustration.

Prof. Vollmer, Karlsruhe, gives evidence that natural macromolecules like proteins and nucleic acids are only formed with the aid of enzymes or/and matrix-macromolecules.

Prof. Schneider, Heidelberg, examines the most important radiometric clocks and shows their physical irrelevance.

Prof. Locker, Wien, shows with system-theoretical, meta-mathematical and meta-theoretical analyses that the idea of self-organization falls short of evidence.

Prof. Gitt, Braunschweig, then gives a qualified lecture on order and information in nature and technology. He shows the fallacy of the evolution model by use of information theory.

The book containing scientific studies against the theory of evolution by German and Austrian authors was the first which was not just an interpretation of American literature. It is possibly the first real contribution of the German-speaking world in the evolution/ creation debate.

All articles are richly illustrated and quote much literature. The English summary makes it useful for English speaking scholars too.

Appendix: Is There a Christian Art?³⁸⁴

The Bible, Art and Christian Culture³⁸⁵

*Dedicated to my teacher, Prof. Dr. Arthur Hofmann, who introduced me to a Christian view of art, and my alma mater, the FETA Basel, which made this possible through lectures on art history during my theology studies.*³⁸⁶

“On the one hand, Christianity has nurtured art as no other philosophical or religious system ever has,”³⁸⁷ on the other hand, Christianity has viewed at least certain elements of art with great suspicion. How can we explain this tension? Is there some sort of Christian art, which Christianity recognizes, and a non-Christian art, which it rejects? Does the Bible, the Old Testament or the New, the holy writings of the Christian religion, welcome art or reject it? Yes and No!

The Dutch professor of Art, H. R. Rookmaaker, has answered the question on the Biblical justification of art with the statement, because “the supreme justification of all creation is that God has willed it to be”³⁸⁸. It needs no justification. He rightly includes art as a part of Creation and creativity.³⁸⁹

God Himself is the greatest artist; while Man’s talents produce, in the Old Testament as well as in the New, great achievements in only a few

³⁸⁴ Paper presented at the Christian Week of Art, “Kunst Er Leben” of the Präsenz Galerie (Chairperson: Inge Simon) Kloster Gnadenthal, Sept. 29-Oct. 10, 1993. German version originally published by Idea, the Newsservice of the German Evangelical Alliance.

³⁸⁵ Translated by Cambron Teupe, M.A.

³⁸⁶ Born 1911. Studied architecture, theology, philosophy, psychology, religion and art history. Professor of educational psychology and art history at FETA, Basel since 1970. Dr. Dr. Friso Melzer also introduced us to Christian attitudes towards questions of art. See their dissertations: Arthur H. Hofmann. *Vincent van Goch: Eine charakteriologische Studie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Wandlung seiner Persönlichkeit* (Diss. Leipzig, 1943); Friso Melzer. *Die Kunst als theologisches Problem* (Diss. Tübingen, 1934).

³⁸⁷ Gene Edward Veit. *The Gift of Art* (Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1983) p. 11. Compare the almost complete denial of Christian art in the wake of Karl Barth in: Hans Vogel. *Der Christ und das Schöne* (Stuttgart, 1947).

³⁸⁸ H. R. Rookmaaker. *The Creative Gift: Essays on Art and Culture* (Westchester, Ill.: Cornerstone Books, 1981) p. 113.

³⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 113-115.

areas. While Man is otherwise dependent on the abilities of others, God is a universal genius, the master and mastermind of all genres of art – He is architect, poet, fashion designer and color composer.³⁹⁰ Both mankind and the Christian are His work of art to begin with (see the Greek word ‘poema’ in Eph. 2:10).³⁹¹

God loves beauty, and as Psalm 104:1-2 tells us, is Himself beautiful, because His robe is light, “Bless the Lord, O my soul! O Lord my God, You are very great: You are clothed with honor and majesty, Who cover Yourself with light as with a garment ...”³⁹²

Art and Artists in the Old Testament

Let’s look at some concrete examples of art in the Bible. Naturally, we could talk about poetry, which shapes the Old Testament to a large extent, or about music; doesn’t the Psalmist exhort, “Sing to the Lord a new song, play skillfully with a shout of joy” (Ps. 33:3)? We could discuss the artistic aspects of dress, the special robes, “for glory and beauty” which were designed for Aaron’s sons, the high priests (Ex. 28:40). I will restrict myself, however, to the fine arts.

Most of the Old Testament references to artists (Ex. 31:6; 36:1-2, 4,8) artistry or workmanship (Ex. 26:1, 31, 28:6, 15, 39; 31:4-5; 35:32-35; 36:8, 35; 39:8; compare the Second Temple, 2 Chron. 2:13; 3:10) deal with the decoration of the Tabernacle and the Temple. A longer text, which Calvin cited in this context,³⁹³ will serve to illustrate the Old Testament’s high evaluation of art:

“Then the Lord spoke to Moses, saying: See, I have called by name Bezalel, the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah. And I have filled him with the Spirit of God, in wisdom, in understanding, in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship, to design artistic works, to work in gold, in silver, in bronze, in cutting jewels for setting, in carving wood, and to work in all manner of workmanship. And I, indeed I, have appointed

³⁹⁰ Compare Jo. H. Kennison, Robert L. Arend. “God the Artist”, *Education for Eternity* 4 (1981) 7(Oct/Nov): 1-4; 5 (1982) 1 (Dec.1981/Jan 1982): 1-4.

³⁹¹ *Ibid.* 4 (1981) 7 (Oct/Nov): 1-4, p. 2.

³⁹² All quotes from Scripture from *New King James Version* (London: Thomas Nelson Publishers,1985).

³⁹³ John Calvin. *Institutes of the Christian Religion* Vol II. 2. 16. trans. Henry Beveridge. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1989) p. 236. See also Gene Veith. *The Gift of Art*, op. cit., pp. 17-28. The chapter title speaks of the “Gifts of Bezalel” (compare the other chapter headings about Bezalel).

with him Aholiab the son of Ahisamach, of the tribe of Dan; and I have put wisdom in the hearts of all the gifted artisans, that they may make all that I have commanded you: the tabernacle of meeting, the ark of the Testimony and the mercy seat that is on it, and all the furniture of the tabernacle – the table and its utensils the pure gold lampstand with all its utensils, the altar of incense, the altar of burnt offering with all its utensils, and the laver and its base – the garments of ministry, the holy garments for Aaron the priest and the garments of his sons to minister as priests, and the anointing oil and sweet incense for the holy place. According to all that I have commanded you they shall do.” (Ex. 31:1-11)

Moses repeats the text a few chapters later: “Moses said to the children of Israel: See the Lord has called by name Bezalel the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah; and He has filled him with the Spirit of God, in wisdom and understanding, in knowledge and all manner of workmanship, to design artistic works, to work in gold and silver and bronze, in cutting jewels for setting, in carving wood, and to work in all manner of artistic workmanship. And He has put in his heart the ability to teach, in him and Aholiab, the son Ahisamach, of the tribe of Dan. He has filled them with skill to do all manner of work of the engraver and the designer and the tapestry maker, in blue, purple and scarlet thread, and fine linen, and of the weaver – those who do every work and those who design artistic works. And Bezalel and Aholiab, and every gifted artisan in whom the Lord has put wisdom and understanding, to know how to do all manner of work for the service of the sanctuary, shall do according to all that the Lord has commanded.” – “Then Moses called Bezalel and Aholiab, and every gifted artisan in whose heart the Lord had put wisdom, everyone whose heart was stirred, to come and do the work.” (Ex. 35:30-35; 36:1-2)

Abstract Art in the Old Testament

These texts demonstrate clearly that God has given men various artistic abilities by His Spirit. The same is true for the later Temple, for David’s plans were “by the Spirit” (1 Chron. 28:11-12). Artistic gifts are gifts of the Spirit (Gr. ‘pneumata’) and of grace (Gr. ‘charismata’), to use two New Testament terms.

This also means that not everyone is an artist. Both texts show that art requires ability, intelligence, knowledge and workmanship (Ex. 35:31).³⁹⁴ God gives men various gifts, but gives each different ones, and out of the combination and cooperation of gifts and abilities arise society, brotherly love and culture worthy of humanity. Both Paul and Peter expressly insist

³⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp.22-25.

that in the New Testament Church not all believers have the same gifts, but that only the cooperative use of all the gifts of the Spirit enables the church to experience fellowship (1 Pet. 4:10-11; Rom. 12:3-8; 1 Cor. 12-14; Eph. 4:1-16).

Not that this evaluation is obvious. Whereas many artists act as if they were invulnerable – not only in their own field³⁹⁵ – others declare every human being a superior artist. Joseph Beuys, for example, claimed that man could pronounce uncontradicted everything he does and produces to be art. Helmut Schoeck, Professor of Sociology, protests that in that case, anyone can consider himself an art critic, and that artists ought not to react so sensitively to the rejection of their work!³⁹⁶

At this point, we must also consider the opinion that real (expensive) art may exclusively be the work of the one artist. Why should art preclude a division of labor according to ability? Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640) led a painting company – rather in the manner of an assembly line. Modern art critics can hardly distinguish Rubens' work on the 1200 paintings produced from that of his assistants.³⁹⁷ What could be objectionable about that? Medieval man considered art a craft. Not until the fifteenth century did painting's status rise to the high position long held by poetry.³⁹⁸ Not until the eighteenth century was the artist considered "to be a genius, one of the great leaders of humanity, a seer, a prophet, a high priest of culture".³⁹⁹ Only recently have critics begun to ridicule the artist who profits by others' assistance. Ought he then not refuse any assistance at all, and produce his own paints, brushes, frames and canvas?

Similarly, Nicholas Wolterstorff⁴⁰⁰ Bruce Charlton⁴⁰¹ rightly have criticized "The cult of originality"⁴⁰². "In his autobiography, Karl Popper

³⁹⁵ See Jürgen Claus. *Theorien zeitgenössischer Malerei in Selbstzeugnissen. rowohlts deutsche enzyklopädie* 182 (Reinbek, Germany: Rowohlt, 1963).

³⁹⁶ See the criticism by Helmut Schoeck. *Die 12 Irrtümer unseres Jahrhunderts* (Munich, Germany: Herbig, 1985) pp. 85-93.

³⁹⁷ Rousas J. Rushdoony. "The Meaning and Greatness of Christian Art", *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* 10 (1983) 1, pp. 3-13.

³⁹⁸ Nicolas Wolterstorff. *Art in Action: Toward a Christian Aesthetic* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm B. Eerdmans, 1980); H. R. Rookmaaker. *The Creative Gift*, op. cit., pp. 109-110.

³⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 109.

⁴⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 67-68

⁴⁰¹ Bruce Charlton. "Rationalism and 'Modern Art'." *The Salisbury Review* 13 (1994) 1 (Sept), pp. 4-7

points out the fallacy which underlies the most prevalent myth of modern art: the cult of original genius. The idea is that the distinguishing feature of genius is to break the bounds of tradition. One important corollary of this notion is that the genius, to be genius, must always be ahead of his time (avant garde), and the true genius will not be appreciated by the unenlightened public until after many years ...⁴⁰³

The work on the temple and the tabernacle demonstrates two further aspects of art; first, that it exists for its own sake and for the sake of beauty without any direct practical use. Secondly, it may be abstract, without any sort of photographic function. It exists for the sake of “beauty” (2 Chron. 3:6; Ex. 28: 2-3,40), that is, beauty in itself is its own purpose.⁴⁰⁴ Art serves “for glory and for beauty.” (Ex. 28:2)

In front of the temple stood two huge decorated pillars (1 Kings 7:15-22; 2 Chron. 3:7,16-17), which had no specific architectural purpose.⁴⁰⁵ They did, however, have symbolic meaning, for they were called ‘Jachin’, (‘God founds’) and ‘Boas’ (‘He comes in power.’), expressing God’s nature artistically and symbolically.⁴⁰⁶ Symbols play an important role in Biblical revelation⁴⁰⁷ and, as a result, have continually served as inspiration for art. The language of art is the language of symbols.

In the decorations of the temple, God commanded the use of colors not known in nature.⁴⁰⁸ Apparently, artistic liberty includes the right to design flowers in ‘unnatural’ colors, to combine natural elements in new ways, even to depict things which do not appear in nature at all. The angels which guard the Divine throne, the Cherubim, are represented in various ways, without any visible model. These abstract images appeared on the Ark of the Covenant (Ex. 25:18-22), and embroidered and stylized on the

⁴⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁴⁰³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰⁴ Francis Schaeffer. *Art and the Bible: Two Essays* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1973) p. 15; Jo. H. Kennison, Robert L. Arend. “God the Artist”, op.cit., pp. 1-4.

⁴⁰⁵ Francis Schaeffer. *Art and the Bible*, op. cit., p. 16; Gene Edward Veith. *The Gift of Art*, op. cit., p. 44-47

⁴⁰⁶ See James B. Jordan. *Thoughts on Jachin and Boas*. Biblical Horizons Occasional Papers 1 (Tyler, Tex.: Biblical Horizons, 1988) for a detailed discussion

⁴⁰⁷ See James B. Jordan. *Through New Eyes: Developing a Biblical View of the World* (Niceville, Fla.: Transformation Press, 1993) and Ray R. Sutton “Clothing and Calling.” *The Reconstruction of the Church. Christianity and Civilization* Vol 4, Ed. James B. Jordan. (Tyler, Tex. Geneva Ministries, 1985); Ray R. Sutton. “Oath and Symbol.” *Covenant Renewal* 3. no 4 (1989) pp. 1-4.

⁴⁰⁸ Francis Schaeffer. *Art and the Bible*, op. cit., p. 14.

ten curtains of the Tabernacle: “You shall make the tabernacle with ten curtains of fine woven linen and blue, purple, and scarlet thread; with artistic designs of cherubim you shall weave them” (Ex. 26:1). The bronze pedestals which supported the basins in the court of the Temple were decorated with “lions, oxen, and cherubim ... below the lions and oxen were wreaths of plaited work.” (1 Kings 7:29).

Above all, God revealed Himself to the apostles and prophets through His ‘Word’ in Scripture and in His ‘Word’, His Son – in a language of high artistic quality. Language is preferable for the imparting of the elements of faith,⁴⁰⁹ but God also presents Himself in imagery and symbols.

All Art is Christian

The Biblical-Christian justification of art is, therefore, that God has given Man the ability to create and to enjoy art. Christianity does not distinguish between the religious-invisible and the neutral-visible, but knows only oneness under one Creator. Francis Schaeffer thus writes, “The Lordship of Christ over the whole of life means that there is no platonic areas in Christianity, no dichotomy or hierarchy between the body and the soul.”⁴¹⁰

For this reason, we must understand that, on the one hand, because all art was made possible by God, there is such a thing as Christian art. In fact, all art is, in principle, Christian. According to the Christian perspective, even the artist who does not know God or even rejects Him, can create art, because he is God’s creation made in the image of God, and because God in His grace does not deny the rebel His gifts.

Therefore, all which is true of culture is also true of art. Because God created Man as a cultural being, Christian culture includes not only those elements directly related to Christianity, but everything which results from Man’s employment of his God-given abilities according to the Will of God.

Specifically Christian Art

There is, of course, a kind of specifically Christian art used in and for worship, as we have seen in the descriptions of the Tabernacle and the Temple. This does not, however, mean that art must be limited to this purpose, only that Christianity has always reserved the best of artistic work for the service of God. Indeed, only the best is good enough for the worship of

⁴⁰⁹ Gene Edward Veith. *The Gift of Art*, op. cit., pp. 102-103.

⁴¹⁰ Francis Schaeffer. *Art and the Bible*, op. cit., p. 7.

the Lord. Neither the Evangelicals nor the Reformed, of which I count myself, have always taken this to heart, and have employed no art at all or only third class work, even if Calvinism has many celebrated exceptions.⁴¹¹

The fact that the best artistic work should be reserved for worship may sometimes mean that non-Christian artists may be preferred to artists belonging to the people of God.⁴¹² Gene Edward Veith, a Lutheran, writes, “When building the Temple, Solomon thus chose the best artists known in his day, the Phoenicians” (see 1 Kings 5 and 7; 2 Chron. 2).

Since, as Rousas J. Rushdoony has realized, “Art is most surely a form of communication”⁴¹³, Christian concepts can be expressed by art, but it would be just as ridiculous to restrict art to such ideas, as it would be to restrict communication to purely Biblical subjects. On the other hand, the more important a message is, the more carefully its framework must be chosen, the more beautiful and artistic it should be.

The same is true of the art used in the worship service. Discussions of the significance of the Sunday service often refer to Romans 12:1, which reminds us that a Christian’s whole life should be a “worship service”. To be sure, our whole life is either a life of service to God or a life of rebellion against Him, but Scripture mentions both aspects – the fact that the Christian church meets to hear God’s word together, to pray together, to sing together and to celebrate Communion as a Covenant sign together expresses the fact that all life is worship, according to God’s commandment. *Let us never contrast elements which the Bible combines!* The Church celebrates an ordered worship service once a week *because*, not in spite of the fact, that the six day work week is worship. Because the Church is the Body of Christ, we celebrate in the Lord’s Supper our creation and preservation through the death of Christ. For the same reason, worship is the most important element of the service, for worship should govern our daily lives.⁴¹⁴ The term ‘liturgy’, (Gr. ‘leiturgia’) has been used since the Early Church to designate not only the artistic structuring of the worship service, but also the ordered life of prayer and worship during the whole week, and

⁴¹¹ See Henry R. Van Til. *The Calvinistic Concept of Culture* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1959) for a Calvinistic, positive view of art and culture. See also: John Calvin. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, II.2, op. cit., pp. 15-17.

⁴¹² Gene Edward Veith. *The Gift of Art*, op. cit., p.127.

⁴¹³ Rousas J. Rushdoony. “The Meaning and Greatness of Christian Art.” op. cit., p. 8.

⁴¹⁴ John MacArthur. *The Ultimate Priority: On Worship* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1983).

one's whole life as service for God.⁴¹⁵ At the same time, the fact that the particular, ordered, collective worship service, the 'holy congregation' is required by God's commandment only once a week, means that the service demanded by God every day does not intend that we sing, pray or meet continually. The restriction to one day of the week shows that our daily labor also conforms with God's will, and that not only a cloistered life can be considered continual worship service.

The Christian View of the Abuse of Art

The fact that all art has been made possible by God raises the second aspect of our issue: art is subject to the Creator and opposes His will when it attacks Him or His Creation.

Besides the many positive aspects of art, we need to consider the Bible's warnings about its misuse. Francis Schaeffer states, "It is not the creation of art that is wrong, but the worship of art"⁴¹⁶. Jeremiah describes the way artists collect their valuable materials and use them to create – idols, but in the end, their idols are nothing more than "the work of skillful men" (Jer. 10:9). Preaching at the Areopagus in Athens, the art capital of his day, Paul turns to the Old Testament warning against idolizing art, "Therefore, since we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Divine Nature is like gold or silver or stone, something shaped by art and man's devising" (Acts 17:29). In Romans 1, he explains that mankind's original sin consisted in worshipping parts of Creation – images (artwork) of animals, human beings – instead of the Creator (Rom. 1:25).⁴¹⁷ Art's value lies in the fact that it is Creation, but neither art nor the artist may be considered the Creator. Gene Edward Veith writes, "Art is not sacred, according to the Second Commandment"⁴¹⁸.

Of course art does not automatically and necessarily lead to idolatry. The Bronze Serpent, for example, was cast according to God's command as a religious symbol. Anyone who looked at it was saved from the poisonous effects of snake bite (Num. 21:4-9). Later, God commanded Moses to store the image in the Ark of the Covenant in the Tabernacle (and later in the

⁴¹⁵ Ray R. Sutton. "The Saturday Night Church and the Liturgical Nature of Man." *The Reconstruction of the Church*. ed. James Jordan. *Christianity and Civilization* Vol 4., (Tyler, Tex.: Geneva Ministries, 1985) pp. 177-208.

⁴¹⁶ Francis Schaeffer. *Art and the Bible*, op.cit., p.11.

⁴¹⁷ See Nicholas Wolterstorff. *Art in Action*, op. cit., 87.

⁴¹⁸ Gene Edward Veith. *The Gift of Art*, op. cit., p. 56.

Temple) as a memorial of this deliverance.⁴¹⁹ In 2 Kings 18:1-4, however, we read that God commanded the destruction and irrevocable removal of this very same image, because the people had begun to worship the beautiful symbol of God's salvation as if it were itself divine⁴²⁰. The danger lay not the object itself, but the people's attitude towards it.

Both aspects of the Christian view of art – art as God's charge and art as a danger – belong together, as we see in Exodus 31 and 32.⁴²¹ Chapter 31 describes the instructions for the artistic decorations of the Tabernacle. In the very next chapter, the High Priest misuses art to cast a beautiful golden calf, which the people then worshipped. In one breath, music, dance and other arts are abused both to worship Creation (a calf) instead of the Creator, and to justify irresponsible sexual relationships. Art thus has an ethical aspect: it either contributes to human well-being or instigates the destruction of mankind or of Creation, as we can see in the art of National Socialism.

It is always ultimately a question of “the art of our time caught between God and Satan” (to use the title of an article by Arthur H. Hofmann).⁴²² Art serves either the Creator and Creation or the one who wishes to supplant the Creator and destroy His Creation.

The Dangers of Art

Art must deal with four dangers. *First*, the artist may see himself as God, a transgression of the First Commandment. His pride may express itself in the refusal to recognize his dependence on the gifts of others. *Secondly*, the work of art itself may be worshipped, or even made with that intent, which transgresses against the Second Commandment. *Thirdly*, art may rebel against God directly, a violation of the Third Commandment. *Fourthly*, art may degrade or injure Mankind, God's Creation, thus turning against Creation as a whole, destroying instead of benefiting it, which transgresses the rest of the Ten Commandments.

Art, made possible by God, does not become un-Christian when it fails to depict specifically Christian themes, is produced by a non-Christian

⁴¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 80-83.33 .

⁴²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 107-110.

⁴²¹ See *Ibid.*, p. 29 and Francis Schaeffer. *Art and the Bible*. op.cit., p. 12

⁴²² Arthur H. Hofmann. “Bildende Kunst unserer Zeit im Spannungsfeld zwischen Gott und Satan.” *Theologie unter dem Wort: Beiträge der FETA zur Lehre und Forschung*, ed. Samuel R. Külling (Riehen, Germany: Immanuel Verlag, 1984) pp. 11-136.

artist or introduces new variations and styles, but when it loses the awareness that Man's creative ability can only be sensibly used in submission to the Creator, never in opposition to Him or to His Creation.

The painter Paul Gauguin (1848-1903) for example wrote in 1883, that artistic effort is the only way for Man to ascend to God,⁴²³ a statement which Nicolas Wolterstorff rightly describes as the identification of the artist's creative ability with God's.⁴²⁴

The Example of Picasso: The Destruction of the Creation

Pablo Picasso (1881-1973) serves well as an example of the ethical dimension of painting. His work is considered areligious, but both his life and his work have influenced the ethics of many and reflects the ethical systems of our day.

A. S Huffington, whose monumental biography⁴²⁵ of the painter demonstrates great sympathy for him, surprisingly also suggests his darker aspects, described in the book's subtitle, "Genius and Violence". How negative would the book have been, if it had been written by a critic of Picasso's art or world and life view (Weltanschauung)? Even so, it is "the story of a man incapable of love,"⁴²⁶ who frequented brothels as early as at the age of fourteen, who continually had sexual affairs even as an old man, playing one lover off against another and even driving them to suicide, "not, however, out of a desire for love or possession, but due to an inner compulsion to destroy."⁴²⁷ Picasso formulated it himself in one of his few interviews, "For me, a picture is the sum of destruction. I make a painting – and then destroy it."⁴²⁸

Huffington continues, "Picasso saw all of Creation as an opponent, and had not become a painter in order to devise works of art ... but weapons. a manifest of his destructive view of art."⁴²⁹ Art was for him an "orgy of

⁴²³ Cited by Nicolas Wolterstorff. *Art in Action*, op. cit., p. 51.

⁴²⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴²⁵ Arianna Stassinopoulos Huffington. *Picasso: Genie und Gewalt* (Munich, Germany: Dreomer Knaur, 1988).

⁴²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁴²⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴²⁸ Pablo Picasso. Interview with Christian Zervos (*Cahiers d'Art*, 1935), p. 29. Cited by Arthur H. Hofmann. "Bildende Kunst unserer Zeit im Spannungsfeld zwischen God und Satan", op. cit., p. 118.

⁴²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

destruction.”⁴³⁰ One lexicon describes Picasso’s Cubism as the “elementary demolition of the human figure.”⁴³¹ Art, however, does not remain mere theory: either it reflects reality or influences it. How could a man who expresses such scorn of mankind, particularly of women, in his art, then advocate human rights?

Despair, destructive passion, hate and anger drove Picasso’s life. From his father, who revered him, but whom he checkmated, to his children, whose claims could only be asserted in a court of law, he left behind him a trail of women, relative and friends whose lives he had ruined. He never regretted his generally ignored support for Stalin and his ‘Peace Movement’, for which he devised the popular symbol of the Dove of Peace. He employed his monumental genius in a war against the Creation. His destructive *Weltanschauung* shaped the artistic style of his day. “Genius and Violence”⁴³² describe him perfectly. Should we not pause to consider the implications of the fact that the “greatest artist of our century” reflects our century so perfectly?

The art historian Gerlinde Volland has investigated the artist Francisco José de Goya (1746-1828) in a similar fashion in *Männermacht und Frauenopfer: Sexualität und Gewalt bei Goya*⁴³³ (Male Power and Female Victims: Sexuality and Violence in Goya’s Work). Using his cycles “Caprichos” and “Desastres de la Guerra”, she asserts that Goya’s attitude was neither enlightened nor emancipated, but that he depicted and defended men’s sexual power over women.

We see that art cannot withdraw into an neutral ivory tower, in which no one can question its ethics or its consequences. Art forms *Weltanschauung*, and modern artist have so consciously striven to do so, that no further

⁴³⁰ *Ibid.*.

⁴³¹ *Meyers Großes Handlexikon* (Mannheim, Germany: Bibliographisches Institut, 1974) p. 647.

⁴³² See also the title of John Berger’s book, *Glanz und Elend des Malers Pablo Picasso* (The Glory and Misery of the Painter Pablo Picasso) (Reinbek, Germany: Rowohlt, 1988) and Wieland Schmied. “Genie mit Sex und Tabak” (Genius with Sex and Tobacco) *Die Welt* Nr. 51 (Feb. 29, 1992) p. 21. The first volume of the latest monumental Picasso biography; John Richardson. *Picasso* Vol. 1, 1881-1906 (Munich, Germany: Kindler, 1992) confirms Huffington’s details.

⁴³³ Gerlinde Volland. *Männermacht und Frauenopfer: Sexualität und Gewalt bei Goya* (Berlin, Germany: Dietrich Reimer, 1993).

proof should be necessary.⁴³⁴ Just as Picasso did, art reflects the *Weltanschauung* of its time, but also impresses itself on it.

We Need Christian Artists

The Christian faith will thus never be able to take a neutral position towards art, but will refine it in many ways, expressing man's nature as creature and as image of God, but continually opposing the deification of art and reminding artists that they are just as responsible for the consequences of their work as any politician, theologian or scientist.

I would like to conclude with a challenge. Even though we have seen that Christian art can be produced by non-Christians, believers are still challenged to do their part in the artistic world, so that the Creator will be glorified. The question will always be the same: who shapes whom? Will Christians shape the values, and thus the art, of others, or will they allow themselves to be influenced by others? For many centuries, the best art was the work produced to glorify God; this specifically Christian work was the standard for all other art. Nowadays things are usually the other way around. Christians copy what others have done and seldom have anything of worth to oppose the destructive suggestions of modern art.⁴³⁵ The influence of once widespread Christian culture is still visible in the work of many artists who have no official connection with Christianity, but our civilization's resources of Christian values seems to be exhausted. We need believers and artists who make a conscious effort to express the all-comprehensive aspect of our faith and are prepared to influence their culture through art. Periods of spiritual awakening have always been prepared, strengthened and followed by wonderful art. The Reformation,⁴³⁶ for example, was prepared by Albrecht Durer's (1471-1528) fifteen wood-prints on the Apocalypse (1498), and the Reformation itself led to further artistic renewal⁴³⁷, for "without a Luther, there could never have been a Bach."⁴³⁸

⁴³⁴ Francis Schaeffer. "Kunst und Weltanschauung". *Ethos* (1990) 1, part 1 (March, 1990) pp. 32-34, Part 2, (April) pp. 56-59, Part 3: (May), pp. 30-33, Part 4, 6 (June) pp. 34-37; Part 5 (July) pp. 48-51, Part 6 (August), pp. 48-51).

⁴³⁵ Douglas Floyd Kelly (Editor). *Symposium on the Media and the Arts. Journal of Christian Reconstruction* 10 (1983) 1; and H. R. Rookmaaker. *Modern Art and the Death of a Culture* (1973. repr. London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1975).

⁴³⁶ H. R. Rookmaaker. *The Creative Gift*, op. cit., pp. 160-169.

⁴³⁷ See Gene Edward Veith. *The Gift of Art*, op. cit., pp. 73-74 (about changes in the painting of countryside's and portraits); Francis Schaeffer. "Kunst und Weltanschauung". *Ethos* (1990) 6 (June) pp. 34-37; Francis Schaeffer. *Wie können wir denn*

Because “Art is an inescapably religious activity,”⁴³⁹ art exists as art initiated by God or it is no art at all.⁴⁴⁰

Excursus: Is Liturgy Vain Repetition?: A Reply to Arnold G. Fruchtenbaum (Mischkan No 25, 2,1996)

Vain Repetition?

Dear Dr. Fruchtenbaum: Before even beginning your discussion on the use of the *siddur*, you forbid – in passing – any sort of repetition or liturgical elements in the Christian worship service. According to you, Lutherans, Anglicans and all Christians of the first 1500 years of church history have served God “in vain”. Although I do not think that public worship may employ only liturgical elements, I do consider both liturgical and extemporaneous prayers for legitimate elements in the worship of the Father of Jesus Christ, because both elements can be found in the Old Testament as well as in the New.

As a non-Jewish Christian, I have always considered the liturgical elements of the Old Testament part of my Christian heritage. I am astonished to hear a Messianic Jew objecting to fixed prayers, etc., for this would seem to indicate an attack on the Old Testament, especially on the Book of Psalms. As far as I know, there has never been any doubt that the Old Testament worship service was liturgical in nature. We find liturgical texts commanded by God – the best known is perhaps the High Priest’s benediction in Numbers 6:22-27. There are also numerous texts by Spirit-inspired poets composed for use in the Temple worship services, The Psalms being the most obvious example of Old Testament liturgy.

Opponents of liturgical worship services generally argue by assuming a fundamental difference between the Old Testament and the New. Whereas

leben? Aufstieg und Niedergang der westlichen Kultur. Hänssler: Neuhausen, 1991³. S. 74-114 (Engl. Orig.: How Should We Than Live?)

⁴³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 88. Francis Schaeffer notes that the early work of Michelangelo (1475-1564) reflected Humanism’s fiction of the perfect human being (“There is no human being like his *David*.”), but that his later works, his *Pietas*, for example, demonstrate an apparent change in his attitudes due to contact with Reformation thought.

⁴³⁹ Rousas J. Rushdoony. “The Meaning and Greatness of Christian Art.” op. cit., p.5.

⁴⁴⁰ See also Dorothy L. Sayers. *In die Wirklichkeit entlassen: Unpopuläre Ansichten über Glaube, Kunst und Gesellschaft*, (Moers: Brendow, 1993) pp. 48-94, esp. pp. 58-59

they hold the Old Testament service to have been legalistic and formal, New Testament worship, being led by the Holy Spirit, was supposedly more spontaneous. The New Testament Church, however, adopted many elements of the Old Testament liturgy.⁴⁴¹ Let me offer a few examples of the New Testament adoption of Old Testament liturgy.

The first Christian congregation, the church in Jerusalem, continued to attend the Jewish, liturgical services at the Temple (Acts 2:46: “So continuing daily with one accord in the temple ...”; Acts 3:1: “Now Peter and Joahn went up together to the temple at the hour of prayer ...”; Luke 24:53: “... and were continually in the temple praising and blessing God.”). The Old Testament worship services of the Temple and the synagogue served as a model beyond Jerusalem and in the home church services, as well.⁴⁴²

The New Testament expressly commands the congregation to sing psalms (Eph. 5:19, Col. 3:16, James 5:13; in the worship service 1 Cor. 14:15,26). The church also adopted the responsory hymn (Mt. 26:30, Mk. 14:26) and the responsory prayer between the congregation and the leader.⁴⁴³ Singing in the service was taken over directly from the Old Testament, and the New Testament church can be found singing the “Song of Moses (Rev. 15:3 taken from Deut. 32) and the “Song of the Lamb” (Rev. 15:3-4) without any restrictions. The reading aloud of Scripture also originated in the Old Testament (1 Tim. 4:13, Col. 3:16, Acts 13:27).

The New Testament church used not only texts from the Old Testament, but its liturgical style as well. We find further repeated elements of the service, which are often dropped in non-liturgical services; the blessing at the beginning of the service, the benediction, many praise songs and prayers (which are frequently used in Revelations, for example), the public confession of sin, the collection of tithes (1 Cor. 16:1-2), the Lord’s Prayer (Mt. 6:9-13) or the prayer for authority (1 Tim. 2:2). Communion, baptism, the laying on of hands, ordination and the anointing of the sick (James 5:13-16) are also rituals with specific prayers, actions and procedures.

⁴⁴¹ Frieder Schulz: “Die jüdischen Wurzeln des christlichen Gottesdienstes”, *Jahrbuch für Liturgik and Hymnologie* 28 (1984): pp. 39-55.

⁴⁴² W. O. E. Oesterly. *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1965).

⁴⁴³ Günther Hinz and Alexander Völker. “Vom Singen der Psalmen”, *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* 33 (1990/1991), pp. 1-94.

David Chilton has analyzed the liturgical nature of the heavenly worship service in Revelations 4:1-11.⁴⁴⁴ This heavenly worship 1. is a communal service, not a private meeting, in which the congregation sings various texts together, etc.; 2. includes a dialogue consisting of the church's praise and a divine response; and 3. is ordered, ceremonial and well-planned, not spontaneous confusion.

The Revelation of John demonstrates clearly that liturgical forms of worship were common to the New Testament church. The book repeatedly describes heavenly worship service (Rev. 4:8-11; 5:8-14; 7:9-12; 11:15-19; 14:1-3; 15:2-5). The visions are embedded in doxologies (Greek 'doxa' = glory, 'logos' = word) and responsories (Rev. 1:4-8; 5:9-14; 11:15-19; 15:3; 21:1-8; 20:10,17-20). The services generally follows the liturgy used in the Temple until the destruction of Jerusalem.⁴⁴⁵ "Thus the entire Revelation of John from the peace and grace greetings in 1:4 to its concluding prayer, "Even so, come, Lord Jesus," in 22:20, and the benediction in the last verse is full of allusions to the liturgical customs of the early church."⁴⁴⁶ "New Testament scholarship long recognizes that the Revelation of John contains much liturgical material used in the early church's worship ..."⁴⁴⁷

Songs

Singing in the worship service was taken from the Old Testament. The New Testament church adopted the "Song of Moses", as well as the opinion that singing is a part of life. "The most terrible judgment promised by the prophets to the sinful nation was an existence without music"⁴⁴⁸ (Jer. 7:34, 25:10, Isa. 16:10, Ez. 26:13, Am. 8:3, Lam. 5:14-15).

⁴⁴⁴ David Chilton. *The Days of Vengeance: An Exposition of the Book of Revelations*, (Fort Worth, Tex.: Dominion Press, 1987) pp. 162-164.

⁴⁴⁵ Alfred Edersheim. *The Temple: Its Ministry and Services as they were in the Time of Christ* (repr. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm B. Eerdmans, 1987), pp. 75-76, 141-142 etc. (See index).

⁴⁴⁶ Oscar Cullmann. *Urchristentum und Gottesdienst* (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1950²), pp. 11-12. On the liturgy in Revelations, see Philipp Carrington. "The Levitical Symbolism of Revelation", *Days of Vengeance*, ed. David Chilton, op. cit. Originally in Philipp Carrington. *The Meaning of the Revelation* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1931) p. 381-394. Carrington demonstrates that Revelations follows the liturgy of the Jewish Temple.

⁴⁴⁷ Oscar Cullman. *Urchristentum und Gottesdienst*, op. cit., p. 38.

⁴⁴⁸ Alfred Sendrey. *Musik in Alt-Israel* (Leipzig: Deutscher Verlag für Musik, 1970) pp. 62-3.

Every hymn is a liturgical text designed for repetition! If a prayer, then it is a prayer accompanied by music. If it is admonition and a reminder of divine wisdom then it is a repetitive sermon accompanied by music. He who opposes the use of liturgy in the Christian worship service must not only restrict himself to spontaneous prayer, but also to spontaneously composed hymns!

The Lord's Prayer

“The Lord's Prayer,” you say, “was not given for the purpose of being recited regularly.” Who says so? Is the word for word repetition forbidden in Scripture? If it was “simply intended to be a model or outline”, what was it a model or outline for? For new, spontaneous prayers which always stick to the outline without ever using the same words?

You quote Jesus' warning against not praying “in vain repetition” (A better translation would be, “their many words”), but you fail to realize that the Lord's Prayer is intended to be the alternative! “And when you pray, do not use vain repetitions as the heathen do. For they think that they will be heard for their many words. Therefore do not be like them. For your Father knows the things you have need of before you ask Him. In this manner, therefore, pray: Our Father in heaven: ...” Jesus designs his prayer as model to be recited (“In this manner, therefore, pray ...”) so that His disciples learn not to babble, which is not the result of repetitive prayers, but of the use of phrases devoid of content or meaning, statements one does not mean, or public demonstrations for the purpose of impressing others, as the Pharisees did (Mt. 6:5). All of things can occur in spontaneous prayer just as well. Neither here, nor elsewhere in the Bible, is there any example for a well-composed model prayer leading to babbling. On the contrary, both testaments include numerous prayers and hymns designed to be repeated.

Certainly there is nothing wrong with a spontaneous prayer, but there is neither Biblical nor practical justification for the premise that it is necessarily better or more spiritual than a composed one.

The early church thus used the Lord's Prayer frequently. The ‘Didache’ (8.2) speaks of its being recited three times daily.⁴⁴⁹ The first mention of the use of the Lord's Prayer in the worship service is found in Tertullian, along with its recitation three times daily (according to the Jewish times of

⁴⁴⁹ Leonhard Fendt. *Einführung in the Liturgiewissenschaft*, Sammlung Tölpelmann, 2: Reihe: Die Theologie im Abriß (Berlin: Alfred Tölpelmann, 1958), p. 19.

prayer),⁴⁵⁰ but the Lord's Prayer was most certainly used in the services much earlier.

Both testaments include many prayers of varying lengths.⁴⁵¹ Many, spoken by men and women in concrete situations, appear at first to be completely original. In reality, they consist in part or entirely of verses from the Psalms and other Old Testament texts. Jonah's prayer in the belly of the fish (Jon.2:1-11), Habbakuk's psalm of praise (Hab. 3:1-19), Mary's praise (Luke 1:39-55), Zacharias' praise (Luke 1:68-79) and the hymn of Simeon (Luke 2:28-32) are examples.

There has never been any contradiction between the spontaneous modification and the liturgical adoption of Biblical texts. They are not inconsistent, but complement each other to the glory of God. To drop liturgical elements in the Christian service altogether would cut the Church from a rich Jewish heritage!

Literature on Christian Art

- Hoffmann, Arthur H. "Vincent van Goch: Eine charakteriologische Studie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner Persönlichkeit" Ph.D diss., Leipzig, 1943.
- Hoffmann, Arthur H. "Bildende Kunst unserer Zeit im Spannungsfeld zwischen Gott und Satan," in *Theologie unter dem Wort: Beiträge der FETA zu Lehre und Forschung*, edited by Samuel Külling. Riehen: Immanuel Verlag, 1984.
- Kelly, Douglas Floyd (ed.), Symposium on the Media and the Arts. *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* 10 (1983).
- Kennison, Jo. H. and Arend L. Robert. "God the Artist," *Education for Eternity* 4 (1981) 7 (Oct./Nov.) El Cajon, Cal.: Christian Heritage College. 1-4.
- Kennison, Jo. H. and Arend L. Robert. "God the Artist," *Education for Eternity* 5 (1982) 1 (Dec. 1981/Jan. 1982). 1-4.
- Meijer, Willem L. "Moderne Kunst de School in?". pp. 7-39 in: *Moderne kunst in onze Maatschappij*. Doorn (NL): Stichting tot Bevordering van Bijbelgetrouwe Wetenschap, 1978.
- Melzer, Friso. *Die Kunst als theologisches Problem*. PhD. diss., Tübingen, 1934.
- Rookmaaker, H. R. *Modern Art and the Death of Culture*. London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1975.
- Rookmaaker, H. R. *The Creative Gift: Essays on Art and Culture*. Westchester, Ill.: Cornerstone Books, 1981.

⁴⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁴⁵¹ See the list in Julius Boehmer. *Die neutestamentliche Gottesscheu und die ersten drei Bitten des Vaterunser* (Halle, Germany: Richard Mühlmann, 1917) pp. 11-180 (OT) and pp. 174-176 (NT).

- Rushdoony, Rousas J. "The Meaning and Greatness of Christian Art," *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* 10 (1983) 1:3-13.
- Schaeffer, Francis. *Art and the Bible: Two Essays*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1973.
- Schaeffer, Francis. *Wie können wir denn leben? Aufstieg und Niedergang der westlichen Kultur*. Neuhausen, Germany: Hänssler, 1991.
- Schaeffer, Francis. "Kunst und Weltanschauung." *Ethos* (1990) Part 1: 3(March): 32-34; Part 2: 4(April): 56-59; Part 3: 5(May): 30-33; Part 4: 6(June): 34-37; Part 5 7(July): 48-51; Part 6: 8 (August): 48-51.
- Veith, Gene Edward. *The Gift of Art*. Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1983.
- Vogel, Hans. *Der Christ und das Schöne*. Stuttgart, Germany, 1947.
- Wolterstorff, Nicholas. *Art in Action: Toward a Christian Aesthetic*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm B. Eerdmans, 1980.

Other Literature

- Berger, John Berger. *Glanz und Elend des Malers Pablo Picasso*. Reinbek, Germany:rororo. Rowohlt, 1988.
- Claus, Jürgen. *Theorien zeigenössischer Malerei in Selbstzeugnissen*. rowohlts deutsche enzyklopädie. Reinbek, Germany: Rowohlt, 1963.
- Huffington, Arianna Stassinopoulos. *Picasso: Genie und Gewalt*. Munich, Germany: Droemer Knaur, 1988.
- Jordan, James B. *Thoughts on Jachin and Boaz*. Biblical Horizons Occasional Paper. Tyler, Texas: Biblical Horizons, 1988.
- Jordan, James B. *Through New Eyes: Developing a Biblical View of the World*. Niceville, Fla.: Transformation press, 1993.
- Meyers Großes Handlexikon*. Mannheim, Germany: Bibliographisches Institut, 1974.
- Richardson, John. *Picasso*. Vol. 1: 1881-1906. Munich, Germany: Kindler, 1992.
- Schmied, Wieland. "Genie mit Sex und Tabak." *Die Welt* 51 (Feb. a29, 1992).
- Schoeck, Helmut. *Die 12 Irrtümer unseres Jahrhunderts*. Munich, Germany: Herbig, 1985.
- Sutton, Ray R. "Oath and Symbol." *Covenant Renewal* 3 (1989) 4: 1-4.
- Sutton, Ray R. "Clothing and Calling." in *The Reconstruction of the Church*. Christianity and Civilization Vol 4. ed. James B. Jordan. Tyler, Texas: Geneva Ministries, 1985.
- Sutton, Ray R. "The Saturday Night Church and the Liturgical Nature of Man." in *The Reconstruction of the Church*. Christianity and Civilization Vol 4. ed. James B. Jordan. Tyler, Texas: Geneva Ministries, 1985.
- Volland, Gerlinde. *Männermacht und Frauenopfer: Sexualität und Gewalt bei Goya*. Berlin, Germany: Dietrich Reimer, 1993.

About the Author

Biography

Thomas Schirmmacher holds a chair in theology (ethics, missions, world religions), is rector of Martin Bucer Theological Seminary (Bonn, Hamburg, Berlin, Zurich, Innsbruck, Prague, Zlin, Istanbul), director of the International Institute for Religious Freedom (Bonn, Cape Town, Colombo) of the World Evangelical Alliance and president of Gebende Hände gGmbH (Giving Hands), an internationally active relief organisation, as well as owner of a publishing house and co-owner of a consulting company.

Born in 1960, Schirmmacher studied theology from 1978 to 1982 at STH Basel and since 1983 Cultural Anthropology and Comparative Religions at Bonn State University. He earned a Drs. theol. in Missiology and Ecumenics at Theological University (Kampen/Netherlands) in 1984, and a Dr. theol. in Missiology and Ecumenics at Johannes Calvin Foundation (Kampen/Netherlands) in 1985, a Ph.D. in Cultural Anthropology at Pacific Western University in Los Angeles (CA) in 1989, a Th.D. in Ethics at Whitefield Theological Seminary in Lakeland (FL) in 1996, and a Dr. phil. in Comparative Religions / Sociology of Religion at State University of Bonn in 2007. In 1997 he got honorary doctorates (D.D.) from Cranmer Theological House, in 2006 from Acts University in Bangalore.

He was pastor of the 'Protestant Society of Germany' in Bonn and Erftstadt, 1982 to 1986, co-theologian of the 'Evangelical Free Church' in Bonn 1992-1998, and 1998-2000 pastor of the Free Reformed Church in Bonn. Nowadays he is active in the 'Church on the Rhine' in Bonn.

Schirmmacher taught Missions, World Religions and Cultural Anthropology at FTA Giessen (Germany) from 1983-1989 and from 1990-1996 ethics, missiology, comparative religions and cultural anthropology at 'Independent Theological Seminary' in Basel ('Staatsunabhängige Theologische Hochschule Basel' – STH Basel). He held and holds different chairs, e.g. 1994-1999 'Philadelphia Theological Seminary' (PA, USA) (professor of missions), 1995-2000 at Cranmer Theological House (Shreveport, LA) (professor of missions and ethics), since 1996 at Whitefield Theological Seminary (Lakeland, FL) (professor of Systematic Theology and Apologetics), since 2000 at William Carey University (Bangalore, India) (professor of International Development), and since 2006 at State University of Oradea, Romania.

He is internationally active pro family and against abortion (as director of the Institute for Life and Family) and against persecution of Christians (as director of the Institute of Religious Freedom of the World Evangelical Alliance and as director of the Commission for Religious Freedom of the German and the Austrian Evangelical Alliance and member of the same commission of the World Evangelical Alliance).

He also is involved in all kinds of publishing activities. He has been editor of 'Bibel und Gemeinde' and editor of 'Evangelikale Missiologie', co-editor of 'Contra Mundum: A Reformed Cultural Review', and of 'Reflection: An International Reformed Review of Missiology'. Since 1986 he owns the publishing house 'Culture and Science Publ.' ('Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft'), which publishes scientific books on language, culture, religion and missions, and co-owns Consulting Schirmmacher GbR, a business and educational business company.

He has written or edited 74 books on ethics, missiology and cultural anthropology, which were translated into 14 languages. In 2002 he was named 'Man of Achievement' by the International Biographical Center Oxford for his achievements in the area of the ethics of international development.

He is listed in Marquis' Who's Who in the World, Dictionary of International Biography, International Who is Who of Professionals, EU-Who is Who, Who is Who in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, 2000 Outstanding People of the 21st Century, 2000 Outstanding Intellectuals of the 21st Century, International Who's Who in Distance Learning, and other biographical yearbooks.

He is married to Dr. Christine Schirmmacher, professor of Islamic Studies and director of the Islam Institute of the German Evangelical Alliance, and author of a two-volume standard introduction to Islam. The couple has two children.

Books by Thomas Schirmacher in chronological order (With short commentaries)

As author:

Das Mißverständnis des Emil Brunner: Emil Brunners Bibliologie als Ursache für das Scheitern seiner Ekklesiologie. Theologische Untersuchungen zu Weltmission und Gemeindebau. ed. by Hans-Georg Wüch and Thomas Schirmacher. Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Weltmission und Gemeindebau: Lörrach, 1982. 54 pp.

[The misunderstanding of Emil Brunner] *A study and critique of Emil Brunner's ecclesiology and of the bibliology and hermeneutics of dialectical theology.*

Mohammed: Prophet aus der Wüste. Schwengeler: Berneck (CH), 1984¹, 1986², 1990³, 1996⁴. VTR: Nürnberg, 2006⁵. 120 pp.
[Muhammad] *A short biography of the founder of Islam and an introduction into Islam.*

Theodor Christlieb und seine Missionstheologie. Verlag der Evangelischen Gesellschaft für Deutschland: Wuppertal, 1985. 308 pp.
[Theodor Christlieb and his theology of mission] *A study of the biography, theology and missiology of the leading German Pietist, professor of practical theology and international missions leader in the second half of the nineteenth century. (Thesis for Dr. theol. in missiology.)*

Marxismus: Opium für das Volk? Schwengeler: Berneck (CH), 1990¹, 1997². 150 pp.
[Marxism: Opiate for the People?] *Marxism is proven to be a religion and an opiate for the masses. Emphasizes the differences between Marxist and Biblical work ethics.*

Zur marxistischen Sagen- und Märchenforschung und andere volkskundliche Beiträge. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1991¹, 2003². 227 pp.
[On the Marxist View of Sagas and Tales and other essays in folklore and cultural anthropology] *10 essays and articles on the science of folklore and cultural anthropology in Germany. Includes a critique of the Marxist interpretation of tales and sagas, and studies on the history of marriage and family in Europe from the 6th century onward.*

„Der göttliche Volkstumsbegriff“ und der „Glaube an Deutschlands Größe und heilige

Sendung“: Hans Naumann als Volkskundler und Germanist unter dem Nationalsozialismus. 2 volumes. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 2 volumes, 1992¹, in one volume 2000². 606 pp.

[Hans Naumann as Anthropologist and Germanist under National Socialism] *Discusses the history of German cultural anthropology and folklore under Hitler, especially the leading figure Naumann, professor of German language, whose scientific theory is shown to be very religious in tone. (Thesis for a PhD in Cultural Anthropology.)*

War Paulus wirklich auf Malta? Hänsler: Neuhausen, 1992, VTR: Nürnberg, 2000² (together with Heinz Warnecke). 254 pp.

[Was Paul Really on Malta?] *The book shows that Paul was not shipwrecked on Malta but on another island, Kephallenia, and that the report in Acts is very accurate. The Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles is defended with theological and linguistic arguments against higher criticism.*

Psychotherapie – der fatale Irrtum. Schwengeler: Berneck (CH), 1993¹, 1994²; 1997³; 2001⁴ (together with Rudolf Antholzer). 150 pp.

[Psychotherapy – the Fatal Mistake] *A critique of secular psychotherapy, showing that psychotherapy often is a religion, and that most psychotherapists call every school except their own to be unscientific.*

Paulus im Kampf gegen den Schleier: Eine alternative Sicht von 1. Korinther 11,2-16. Biblia et symbiotica 4. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1993¹, 1994², 1995³, 1997⁴ 168 pp. Revised: VTR: Nürnberg, 2002⁵
[Paul in Conflict with the Veil!?] *Exegetical examination of 1. Corinthians 11,2-16, following an alternative view of John Lightfoot, member of the Westminster assembly in the 16th century.*

„Schirmacher argues that from the biblical teaching that man is the head of woman (1 Cor 11:3) the Corinthians had drawn the false conclusions that in prayer a woman must be veiled (11:4-6) and a man is forbidden to be veiled (11:7), and that the wife exists for the

husband but not the husband for the wife (11:8-9). Paul, however, rejected these conclusions and showed in 11:10-16 why the veiling of women did not belong to God's commandments binding upon all the Christian communities. After stating the thesis and presenting his alternative translation and exposition of 1 Cor 11:2-16, he considers the difficulties in the text, presents his alternative exposition in detail (in the form of thirteen theses), discusses quotations and irony in 1 Corinthians, and deals with other NT texts about women's clothing and prayer and about the subordination of wives." (*New Testament Abstracts* vol. 39 (1995) 1, p. 154).

Der Römerbrief. 2 vol. Neuhausen: Hänssler, 1994¹; Hamburg: RVB & Nürnberg: VTR, 2001². 331 + 323 pp.

[The Letter to the Romans] *Commentary on Romans in form of major topics of Systematic Theology starting from the text of Romans, but then going on to the whole Bible.*

Der Text des Römerbriefes: Für das Selbststudium gegliedert. *Biblia et symbiotica* 7. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1994. 68 pp.

[The Text of the Letters to the Romans] *The text of Romans newly translated and structured for self study.*

Ethik. Neuhausen: Hänssler, 1994¹. 2 vol. 883 & 889 pp.; Hamburg: RVB & Nürnberg: VTR, 2001². 3 vol. 2150 pp.; 2002³. 8 volumes. 2850 pp.

[Ethics] *Major Evangelical ethics in German covering all aspects of general, special, personal and public ethics.*

Galilei-Legenden und andere Beiträge zu Schöpfungsforschung, Evolutionskritik und Chronologie der Kulturgeschichte 1979-1994. *Biblia et symbiotica* 12. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1996. 331 pp.

[Legends of Galileo and other Contributions to Creation Science, Criticism of Evolution and Chronology of the History of Culture 1979-1994].

Völker – Drogen – Kannibalismus: Ethnologische und länderkundliche Beiträge 1984 – 1994. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1997. 218 pp.

[Peoples – Drugs – Cannibalism] *A collection of articles on cultural anthropology, especially on Indians in South America, cannibalism and the religious use of drugs.*

Die Vielfalt biblischer Sprache: Über 100 alt- und neutestamentliche Stilarten, Aus-

drucksweisen, Redeweisen und Gliederungsformen. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1997. 130 pp.

[The Diversity of Biblical Language] *A hermeneutical study, listing more than 100 specific language techniques in the Bible with several proof texts for each of them.*

Gottesdienst ist mehr: Plädoyer für einen liturgischen Gottesdienst. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1998. 130 pp.

[Church Service is More] *An investigation into biblical proof texts for liturgical elements in Christian Sunday service.*

Gesetz und Geist: Eine alternative Sicht des Galaterbriefes. Reformatorische Paperbacks. Reformatorischer Verlag: Hamburg, 1999. 160 pp.

[Law and Spirit] *This commentary emphasizing the ethical aspects of Galatians wants to prove that Galatians is not only fighting legalists but also a second party of Paul's opponents, who were totally opposed to the Old Testament and the Law, and lived immorally in the name of Christian freedom, a view especially endorsed by Wilhelm Lütgert's commentary of 1919. Paul is fighting against the abrogation of the Old Testament Law as well as against using this Law as way of salvation instead of God's grace.*

Law and Spirit: An Alternative View of Galatians. RVB International: Hamburg, 2001. 160 pp.

English version of the same book.

God Wants You to Learn, Labour and Love. Reformation Books: Hamburg, 1999. 120 pp.

Four essays for Third World Christian Leaders on Learning with Jesus, Work Ethic, Love and Law and Social Involvement.

Dios Quiere que Tú Aprendas Trabajos y Ames. Funad: Managua (Nikaragua), 1999¹; 2000²; RVB International: Hamburg, 2003³. 70 pp.

[God Wants You to Learn, Labour and Love] *Spanish version of the same book.*

37 Gründe, warum Christen sich für eine Erneuerung unserer Gesellschaft auf christlicher Grundlage einsetzen sollten. Die Wende, 1999. 40 pp.

[37 reasons for Christian involvement in society and politics].

Christenverfolgung geht uns alle an: Auf dem Weg zu einer Theologie des Martyriums. Idea-Dokumentation 15/99. Idea: Wetzlar, 1999. 64 pp.

[The Persecution of Christians Concerns Us All: Towards a Theology of Martyrdom] *70 thesis on persecution and martyrdom, written for the International Day of Prayer for the Persecuted Church on behalf of the German and European Evangelical Alliance*

World Mission – Heart of Christianity. RVB International: Hamburg, 1999. 120 pp. *Articles on the Biblical and systematic fundament of World Mission, especially on mission as rooted in God's being, on 'Mission in the OT', and 'Romans as a Charter for World Mission'. Shorter version of German original 2001.*

Eugen Drewermann und der Buddhismus. Verlag für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft: Nürnberg, 2000¹; 2001². 132 pp. [Drewermann and Buddhism] *Deals with the German Catholic Author Drewermann and his propagating Buddhist thinking. Includes chapter on a Christian Ethics of Environment.*

Ausverkaufte Würde? Der Pornographie-Boom und seine psychischen Folgen. Hänssler: Holzgerlingen, 2000. (with Christa Meves). 130 pp. [The Selling Off of Dignity] *The psychological results of pornography.*

Eine Sekte wird evangelisch – Die Reformation der Weltweiten Kirche Gottes. Idea-Dokumentation 11/2000. Idea: Wetzlar, 2000. 56 pp. [A Cult Becomes Protestant] *Detailed report on the reformation of the Worldwide Church of God (Herbert W. Armstrong) from a sect to an evangelical church.*

Legends About the Galilei-Affair. RVB International: Hamburg, 2001. 120 pp. *Shorter version of the German book 'Galilei-Legenden' mentioned above with essays on the Galilei-affair and creation science.*

Human Rights Threatened in Europe: Euthanasia – Abortion – Bioethicconvention. RVB International: Hamburg, 2001. 100 pp. *Updated Lectures on euthanasia and biomedicine at the 1st European Right to Life Forum Berlin, 1998, and articles on abortion.*

Menschenrechte in Europa in Gefahr. RVB: Hamburg, 2001... 110 pp. [Human Rights Threatened in Europe] *Updated Lectures on euthanasia and biomedicine at the 1st European Right to Life Forum Berlin, 1998, and articles on abortion. See slightly different English version above.*

Aufbruch zur modernen Weltmission: William Careys Theologie. RVB. 64 pp.

[Be Keen to Get Going: William Careys Theology] *First discussion of Carey's theology in length, explaining his Calvinistic and Postmillennial background.*

Be Keen to Get Going: William Careys Theology. RVB: Hamburg, 2001. 64 pp. *Same book in English.*

Darf ein Christ schwören? RVB: Hamburg, 2001. 140 pp.

[May Christians Take an Oath?] *On Swearing and on its meaning for covenant theology. Taken from 'Ethik', vol. 1.*

Christus im Alten Testament. RVB: Hamburg, 2001. 84 pp.

[Christ in the Old Testament] *On Christ and the Trinity in the Old Testament and on 'the Angel of the Lord'. Taken from 'Ethik'.*

Wie erkenne ich den Willen Gottes? Führungsmystik auf dem Prüfstand. RVB: Hamburg, 2001. 184 pp.

[How to know the will of God] – *Criticizes the inner leading of the Spirit. Taken from 'Ethik'.*

Love is the Fulfillment of Love – Essays in Ethics. RVB: Hamburg, 2001. 140 pp. *Essays on ethical topics, including role of the Law, work ethics, and European Union.*

Mission und der Kampf um die Menschenrechte. RVB: Hamburg, 2001. 108 S.

[Mission and the Battle for Human Rights] *The relationship of world missions and the fight for human rights is discussed on an ethical level (theology of human rights) as well as on a practical level.*

The Persecution of Christians Concerns Us All: Towards a Theology of Martyrdom. zugleich Idea-Dokumentation 15/99 E. VKW: Bonn, 2001. 156 pp.

70 thesis on persecution and martyrdom, written for the International Day of Prayer for the Persecuted Church on behalf of the German and European Evangelical Alliance

Irrtumslosigkeit der Schrift oder Hermeneutik der Demut? VTR: Nürnberg, 2001. 82 pp.

[Inerrancy of Scripture or 'Hermeneutics of Humility'] *Debate with Dr. Hempelmann on the inerrancy of scripture.*

Beiträge zur Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte: Heiligenverehrung — Universität Gießen — Reformation / Augustin – Böhl — Spurgeon — Brunner. VKW: Bonn, 2001. 200 pp.

[Essay on the History of church and Dogma] *Articles on topics from church history like 'The beginning of the veneration of saints' and on the named theologians.*

Weltmission — Das Herz des christlichen Glaubens: Beiträge aus 'Evangelikale Missiologie'. VKW: Bonn, 2001. 200 pp.

[World Mission – Heart of Christianity] *Articles on the Biblical and systematic fundament of World Mission, especially on mission as rooted in God's being, on 'Mission in the OT', and 'Romans as a Charter for World Mission'. Shorter version of German original 2001.*

Säkulare Religionen: Aufsätze zum religiösen Charakter von Nationalsozialismus und Kommunismus. VKW: Bonn, 2001. 140 pp.

[Secular Religions] *Articles on the religious nature of National Socialism and Communism. Includes texts of prayers to Hitler.*

Paulus im Kampf gegen den Schleier!? VTR: Nürnberg, 2002⁵. 130 pp.

Revised version. See commentary on first edition 1993¹.

Paul in Conflict with the Veil!? VTR: Nürnberg, 2002¹; 2007². 130 pp.

Same book in English.

Hoffnung für Europa: 66 Thesen. VTR: Nürnberg, 2002

Official thesis and study of hope in the Old and New Testament for Hope for Europe of the European Ev. Alliance and Lausanne Europe.

Hope for Europe: 66 Theses. VTR: Nürnberg, 2002

Same book in English.

Also available in Czech, Dutch, Spanish, Rumanina, Portugese, French, Russian, Italian, Portugese, Hungarian, Lettish, Latvian.

ABC der Demut. RVB: Hamburg, 2002

[ABC of Humility] *Notes and bible studies on humility in alphabetical order.*

Führen in ethischer Verantwortung: Die drei Seiten jeder Verantwortung. Edition ACF. Brunnen: Gießen, 2002

[Leading in ethical responsibility] *An introduction into ethics for economic and other leaders for the Academy of Christian Leaders.*

Der Papst und das Leiden: Warum der Papst nicht zurücktritt. VTR: Nürnberg, 2002. 64 pp.

[The Pope and Suffering] *A study of the writings of Pope John II. on suffering and an evaluation of their exegetical basis. Gives reasons why the pope does not resign.*

Erziehung, Bildung, Schule. VTR: Nürnberg, 2002. 88 pp.

[Instruction, Education, School] *The chapters on rising of children, example, education, and Christian school from 'Ethics'.*

Thomas Schirmmacher, Christine Schirmmacher u. a. Harenberg Lexikon der Religionen. Harenberg Verlag: Düsseldorf, 2002. 1020 pp.

[Harenberg Dictionary of World Religions] *In a major secular dictionary on world religions, Thomas Schirmmacher wrote the section on Christianity ('Lexicon of Christianity', pp. 8-267) and Christine Schirmmacher the section on Islam ('Lexicon of Islam', 'pp. 428-549).*

Studies in Church Leadership: New Testament Church Structure – Paul and His Co-workers – An Alternative Theological Education – A Critique of Catholic Canon Law. VKW: Bonn, 2003. 112 pp.

Contains the named five essays. The first essay is translated from vol. 5 of 'Ethics'.

Im Gespräch mit dem Wanderprediger des New Age – und andere apologetische Beiträge. VKW: Bonn, 2003. 210 pp.

[In Discussion with the Itinerant Preacher of the New Age] *Essays and reports on non-Christian religions, New Age, reincarnation, manicheism from two decades of apologetic debates.*

Verborgene Zahlenwerte in der Bibel? – und andere Beiträge zur Bibel. VKW: Bonn, 2003. 200 pp.

[Secret Numbers in the Bible?] *Essays and articles on Bible Numeric's, the importance of Hebrew studies, Obadiah, the Psalms and other Bible related topics from 2 decades of studies.*

Feindbild Islam. VKW: Bonn, 2003. 111 pp.

[Bogeyman Islam] *May Arab Christians call God 'Allah'? Is Allah the Father of Jesus? How Political Parties in Germany misrepresent Islam.*

Religijos mokslas. Prizmės knyga. Siaulai (Litauen): Campus Fidus, 2004. 106 pp.

[Secular Religions] *In Latvian: Essays on Religions, Marxism, National Socialism and the devil in Art and Literature.*

Bildungspflicht statt Schulzwang. VKW/VTR/idea: Bonn et. al., 2005. 90 pp.

[Compulsary Education or Compulsary Schooling] *A scientific evaluation of homeschooling.*

Der Ablass RVB/VTR: Hamburg, 2005. 144 pp.

[The Indulgences] *History and theology of the Catholic view on indulgences.*

Die Apokryphen RVB/VTR: Hamburg, 2005. 92 pp.

[The Apocrypha] *History and theology of the*

Catholic view on the apocrypha and an apology of the Protestant position.

Thomas Schirrmacher et al. *Christ und Politik: 50 Antworten auf Fragen und kritische Einwände.* VKW: Bonn, 2006. 125 pp.
[Christians and Politics] *Schirrmacher and three members of parliament from Switzerland answer questions around the relation of church and state and the political involvement of Evangelicals.*

Der Segen von Ehe und Familie: Interessante Erkenntnisse aus Forschung und Statistik. VKW: Bonn, 2006. 125 pp.
[The Blessing of Marriage and Family] *Introduction to 200 scientific studies and statistics, that prove the blessing of longterm marriage and stable family.*

Multikulturelle Gesellschaft: Chancen und Gefahren. Hänssler: Holzgerlingen, 2006. 100 pp.
[Multicultural Society] *A history of multiculturalism (especially Muslims and Russian-Germans) in Germany and its political, economic and religious implications for the future of Germany.*

Die neue Unterschicht: Armut in Deutschland? Hänssler: Holzgerlingen, 2007. 120 pp.
[The New Low Cast] *A sociology of low cast people in Germany, the differences in culture to low cast people one hundred years ago, tasks for churches and the State.*

Hitlers Kriegsreligion: Die Verankerung der Weltanschauung Hitlers in seiner religiösen Begrifflichkeit und seinem Gottesbild. 2 vol. VKW: Bonn, 2007. 1220 pp.
[Hitlers Religion of War] *A research about the religious terms and thoughts in all texts and speeches of Hitler of Hitler, pleading for a new*

way of explaining Hitlers worldview, rise and breakdown.

Moderne Väter: Weder Waschlappen, noch Despot. Hänssler: Holzgerlingen, 2007. 96 pp.
[Modern Fathers] *Presents the result of international father research, explains the necessity of the father's involvement for his children and gives practical guidelines.*

Sheria au Roho? Trans-Africa Swahili Christian Ministries: Mwanza, Tanzania, 2007. 96 pp.
Kiswahili-Version of 'Law and Spirit' about Galatians.

Koran und Bibel: Die größten Religionen im Vergleich. Hänssler: Holzgerlingen, 2008. 96 pp.
[Quran and Bible] *Compares the differences between the Muslim of the Quran as the 'Word of God' and the Christian view of the Bible as the 'Word of God'. A classic on the inspiration of the Bible.*

Christenverfolgung heute. Hänssler: Holzgerlingen, 2008. 96 pp.
[The Persecution of Christians today] *Gives an overview over the persecution of Christians worldwide and presents a short theology of persecution as well political reasons for the fight for religious freedom.*

Internetpornografie. Hänssler: Holzgerlingen, 2008. 156 pp.
[Internet pornography] *Intense study of spread of pornography, its use amongst children and young people, its psychological results and dangers, including steps how to escape sex and pornography addiction.*

As editor (always with own contributions):

Patrick Johnstone. *Handbuch für Weltmission: Gebet für die Welt.* Hänssler: Neuhausen, 1987², newest edition 1993⁶ (together with Christine Schirrmacher). 811 pp.
[Handbook on World Mission] *Adapted German version of 'Operation World', a handbook and lexicon on the situation of Christianity and missions in every country of the world.*

Gospel Recordings Language List: Liste der Sprachaufnahmen in 4.273 Sprachen. *Missiologica Evangelica* 4. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1992. 120 pp.
List of 4273 languages in the world, in which evangelistic cassettes are available.

„Die Zeit für die Bekehrung der Welt ist reif“: Rufus Anderson und die Selbständigkeit der Kirche als Ziel der Mission. Edition afem: mission scripts 3. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1993. 134 pp.

[The Time of Conversion is Ripe: Rufus Anderson and The Independence of] *Articles by Schirrmacher and by theologians from the 19th century about Rufus Anderson, leading American missionary statesman, Reformed professor of missions and postmillennial theologian – together with the first translation of texts of Anderson into German.*

William Carey. Eine Untersuchung über die Verpflichtung der Christen [1792]. Edition afem: mission classics 1. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1993 (together with Klaus Fiedler). 100 pp.

[An Inquire into the Means ...] *First German translation of the book by the Calvinist Baptist William Carey of 1792, with which the age of modern Protestant world missions started.*

Bibeltreue in der Offensive: Die drei Chicagoerklärungen zur biblischen Unfehlbarkeit, Hermeneutik und Anwendung. Biblia et symbiotica 2. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1993¹; 2000². 90 pp.

German translation of the three Chicago-Declarations on biblical inerrancy, hermeneutics and application.

Im Kampf um die Bibel – 100 Jahre Bibelbund. Biblia et symbiotica 6. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1994 (together with Stephan Holthaus). 168 pp.

[The Battle for the Bible] *'Festschrift' for 100 years of „Bibelbund“.* Articles on biblical inerrancy and on the history of the major German organization fighting higher criticism, the „Bibelbund“ (Bible League), and its theological journal „Bibel und Gemeinde“, edited by Schirmacher 1988-1997.

Eduard Böhl. Dogmatik. Hänssler Theologie. Hänssler: Neuhausen, 1995; 2nd ed.: Hamburg: RVB & Bonn: VKW, 2004. 508 pp.

[Dogmatic Theology] *A Reformed Systematic Theology from the last century edited by Thomas Schirmacher; with an lengthy introduction on Böhl's life and work.*

Der evangelische Glaube kompakt: Ein Arbeitsbuch. Hänssler: Neuhausen, 1998; 2nd ed.: Hamburg: RVB & Bonn: VKW, 2004. 246 pp.

[The Protestant Faith in Nuce] *German translation of the Westminster Confession of Faith, adapted and with commentary and changes in Presbyterian, Congregationalist and Baptist versions.*

Werden alle gerettet? Referate der Jahrestagung 1998 des AfeM (with Klaus W. Müller). Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1998. 160 pp.

[Will All Be Saved?] *The proceedings of a missiological consultation on the relationship between Christianity's mission and other religions.*

The Right to Life for Every Person / Lebensrecht für jeden Menschen. Abortion – Euthanasia – Gen Technology: Proceedings of

the 1st European Right to Life Forum Berlin, 1998. Abtreibung – Euthanasie – Gentechnik: Beiträge des 1. Europäischen Forums Lebensrecht Berlin, 1999 (with Walter Schrader, Hartmut Steeb). Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1999. 310 pp.

Basic articles on biomedical topics, includes reports on the prolife movements in most European countries.

Kein anderer Name: Die Einzigartigkeit Jesu Christi und das Gespräch mit nichtchristlichen Religionen. Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Peter Beyerhaus. Verlag für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft: Nürnberg, 1999. 470 pp.

[No Other Name: The Uniqueness of Jesus Christ ...] *Festschrift for Prof. Peter Beyerhaus, the leading evangelical authority on missions, ecumenical issues and on other religions and an evangelical elder statesman. Covers all aspects of the relationship of Christian faith to other religions.*

Missionswissenschaft im Zeichen der Erneuerung: Ehrengabe zum 70. Geburtstag von Peter Beyerhaus. Sonderausgabe = Evangelikale Missiologie 15 (1999) Heft 2 (together with Klaus W. Müller und Christof Sauer) (1999) afem

Shorter version of the former Festschrift for mass distribution

Ausbildung als missionarischer Auftrag: Referate der Jahrestagung 1999 des AfeM (with Klaus W. Müller). Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 2000. 210 pp.

[Theological education as World Mission] *Lectures on the relation of missions and theological education by leading representatives of theological schools, alternative programs, missions and third world churches.*

Mission in der Spannung zwischen Hoffnung, Resignation und Endzeitenthusiasmus: Referate der Jahrestagung 2000 des AfeM (together with Klaus W. Müller). Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 2001. 240 pp.

Lectures on the relation of eschatology and missions in history and in present reality.

Märtyrer 2001 — Christenverfolgung vor allem in islamischen Ländern. (with Max Klingberg). Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 2001. 140 pp.

[Martyrs 2001] *Documentation on the present status of persecution of Christians in Islamic countries.*

Anwalt der Liebe – Martin Bucer als Theologe und Seelsorger: Zum 450. Todestag des

Reformators. Jahrbuch des Martin Bucer Seminars 1 (2001). VKW: Bonn, 2001. 160 pp. [Advocate of Love: Martin Bucer as Theologian and Counselor] *Yearbook of the Martin Bucer Seminary on Life and Theology of the reformer Martin Bucer.*

Die vier Schöpfungsordnungen Gottes: Kirche, Staat, Wirtschaft und Familie bei Dietrich Bonhoeffer und Martin Luther. VTR: Nürnberg, 2001. 110 pp. [The four Creation Orders] *Three lengthy essays discuss the importance of the four major creation orders family, church, work and state in the Bible, and in the work of Martin Luther and Dietrich Bonhoeffer.*

Baumeister bleibt der Herr: Festgabe zum 80. Geburtstag von Prof. Bernd Schirrmacher (with Klaus Schirrmacher und Ingrid von Torklus). VKW: Bonn, 2001. 33300 pp. [God Stays the Master Builder] *Festschrift for Thomas Schirrmacher's father on his 80th birthday. Essays mainly concentrate on Christian education and Evangelical schools.*

A Life of Transformation: Festschrift for Colonel V. Doner. RVB International: Hamburg, 2001. 350 pp. *Festschrift for one of the giants of international Christian relief work and social involvement.*

Märtyrer 2002 — Jahrbuch zur Christenverfolgung heute (with Max Klingberg). Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 2002. 140 pp. [Martyrs 2002] *Yearbook with documentation of the present status of persecution of Christians with special emphasize on Indonesia, Pakistan, Turkey and Vietnam.*

Patrick Johnstone. Gebet für die Welt. Hänssler: Holzgerlingen, 2003. 1010 pp. [Prayer for the World] *Adapted German version of 'Operation World', a handbook and lexicon on the situation of Christianity and missions in every country of the world.*

Märtyrer 2003 — Jahrbuch zur Christenverfolgung heute (with Max Klingberg). Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 2003. 180 pp. [Martyrs 2003] *Yearbook with documentation of the present status of persecution of Christians, featuring Cuba, Japan, North Korea, Vietnam.*

Wenn Kinder zu Hause zur Schule gehen (with Thomas Mayer). VTR: Nürnberg, 2004. 260 pp. [When Children Go to Scholl at Home] *Docu-*

mentation and scientific essays on homeschooling in Germany and Europe.

Menschenrechte für Minderheiten in Deutschland und Europa: Vom Einsatz für die Religionsfreiheit durch die Evangelische Allianz und die Freikirchen im 19. Jahrhundert (with Karl Heinz Voigt). Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 2004. 120 pp. [Human Rights for Minorities in Germany and Europe] *Research articles on the history of the defence of religious freedom by the Evangelical Alliance in Germany and Great Britain in the 19th century.*

Herausforderung China: Ansichten, Einsichten, Aussichten: Eine Dokumentation von idea und China Partner (with Konrad Brandt). Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 2004. 214 pp. [Challenge China] *A collection of reports, lectures and opinion on the the situation of religions and the Christian faith in China, combining reports on persecution and reports on huge progress for public Christianity.*

Europa Hoffnung geben: Dokumentation (with Thomas Mayer). VTR: Nürnberg, 2004. 197 pp. [To Give Hope to Europe] *Lectures of a theological conference in Budapest by John-Warwick Montgomery, Thomas K. Johnstone, William Mikler, Bernhard Knieß on the future of Europe and how to defend the gospel of hope in Europe.*

Märtyrer 2004 – Das Jahrbuch zur Christenverfolgung heute. (with Max Klingberg). Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 2004. 160 pp. [Martyrs 2004] *Yearbook with documentation of the present status of persecution of Christians, with two longer studies on the situation in Nigeria and Iran.*

Tabuthema Tod? Vom Sterben in Würde. (with Roland Jung, Frank Koppelin). Jahrbuch des Martin Bucer Seminars 4 (2004). VKW: Bonn, 2004. 220 pp. [Death as Taboo?] *8 major Evangelical ethicists discuss topics around counseling serious ill and dying people, death, euthanasia, counseling to relatives.*

Mission verändert – Mission verändert sich / Mission Transformes – Mission is Transformed: Festschrift für Klaus Fiedler. (with Christof Sauer). Nürnberg: VTR & Bonn: VKW, 2005. 572 pp. *Festschrift for African missionary and doyen of*

African and German mission history Klaus Fiedler.

Märtyrer 2005 – Das Jahrbuch zur Christenverfolgung heute. (mit Max Klingberg). Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 2005. 170 pp.

[Martyrs 2005] *Yearbook with documentation of the present status of persecution of Christians, featuring Nigeria, China, Indonesia, Vietnam, Turkey.*

Ein Maulkorb für Christen? Juristen nehmen Stellung zum deutschen Antidiskriminierungsgesetz und ähnlichen Gesetzen in Europa und Australien. (with Thomas Zimmermanns). VKW: Bonn, 2005

[A Muzzle for Christians?] *Studies in religious hate laws, antidiscrimination laws and their influence on Christian communities.*

Scham- oder Schuldgefühl? Die christliche Botschaft angesichts von schuld- und schamorientierten Gewissen und Kulturen. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 2005. 99 pp.

[Shame- and Guiltfeeling] *This study explains the difference between shame- and guilt-oriented cultures and shows, that the 'Biblical' message emphasizes shame and guilt equally and thus can be applied to cultures in the West, the East, in modern and in Third World cultures.*

Scham- und Schuldorientierung in der Diskussion: Kulturanthropologische, missiologische und theologische Einsichten (mit Klaus W. Müller). VTR: Nürnberg & VKW: Bonn, 2006

[Shame- and Guiltorientation] *A selection of experts from all continents on the difference between shame- and guilt-oriented cultures and its implications for world missions.*

Familienplanung – eine Option für Christen? . Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 2006. 170 pp.

[Family Planning – An Option for Christians?] *A Protestant view of family planning.*

Märtyrer 2006 – Das Jahrbuch zur Christenverfolgung heute. (with Max Klingberg und Ron Kubsch). Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 2006. 170 pp.

[Martyrs 2006] *Yearbook with documentation of the present status of persecution of Christians, concentrating on Iran, Iraq, Turkey and North Korea.*

Martin Bucer als Vorreiter der Mission. VKW: Bonn & VTR: Nürnberg, 2006. 110 pp. *[Martin Bucer as Forerunner of World Mission] Essays from the 19th century to the present on Martin Bucer being the only Reformer arguing in favor of world mission.*

Märtyrer 2007 – Das Jahrbuch zur Christenverfolgung heute. (with Max Klingberg und Ron Kubsch). Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 2007. 200 pp.

[Martyrs 2007] *Yearbook with documentation of the present status of persecution of Christians, concentrating on India, Turkey, Iraq, Indonesia and Germany.*

HIV und AIDS als christliche Herausforderung 1: Grundsätzliche Erwägungen. (mit Kurt Bangert). Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 2008. 211 pp.

[HIV and AIDS as Christian Challenge 1: General Discussion] *Essay on how the Christian church should react to HIV and AIDS and how it does react. Published together with World Vision Germany.*

HIV und AIDS als christliche Herausforderung 2: Aus der praktischen Arbeit. (mit Kurt Bangert). Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 2008. 280 pp.

[HIV and AIDS as Christian Challenge 2: What Is Done and Can Be Done] *Volume 2 of the same*