

THE CLERGY BULLETIN



PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY
OF THE GENERAL PASTOR-
AL CONFERENCE OF THE
NORWEGIAN SYNOD OF THE
AMERICAN EVANGELICAL
LUTHERAN CHURCH.

THE CLERGY BULLETIN

Editor:

R. M. Branstad, 321 N. Farwell St.
Eau Claire, Wis.

Assistants: A. Gullerud, R. Ude

Vol. XIV

September 1954

No. 1

EXEGESIS OF

psalm II

— Geo O. Lillegard

The Christian Church has never enjoyed outward peace in this world. Enemies within and without have made it like a frail boat on a stormy sea,— which is a traditional and a most fitting picture of the Church. Yet through all storms and stress it has been kept safe, because the Head of the Church is in the boat. He might sleep for a time, seemingly unaware of the danger, but in His own time He speaks the mighty word, "Be still," and the storms pass to give the Church rest and peace again, the peace which passeth all understanding and which the world cannot give nor even perceive.

In our day, the Christian Church is suffering some of the most open and violent attacks, as well as the most insidious and treacherous conspiracies against its welfare, that history has seen. We need only to name the growing power of Communism and anti-Christian Socialism in every part of the world, not excluding our own, and its open persecution of the Church; the rising tide of hostility to the Christian Gospel in Mohammedan and pagan lands, like India and Africa, where a century of missions under the protecting arm of Western governments is drawing to perhaps a bloody close; the machinations

of Roman Papism everywhere and the no less anti-Christian schemes of a Protestantism gone to seed in the dry deserts of Modernism and the Social-Gospel, so-called. The forces arrayed against the Lord Jesus Christ and His Gospel of salvation by faith alone without the works of the law are so mighty and so numerous, and their attacks are so varied,—from the most blasphemous denials of elementary religious facts to the most pious perversions of Christian truth,— that one might well be tempted to cry out with the disciples: "Master, carest thou not that we perish?" At such a time it is well to consider the Second Psalm, one which gives the best expression that could be found to the faith and hope of the Christian Church. This Psalm has been called the epitome of history, to which all the events from the Fall to Judgment Day form but a great "Solid Declaration." All writers agree that it is one of the greatest compositions in the Bible. For this reason it is more frequently referred to or quoted in the New Testament than any other Psalm. Cf. John 1,41; Acts 13,33; Heb. 1,5; Acts 4, 25ff., etc.,. And who can forget, once he has heard it, the dramatic use that is made of this Psalm in such musical compositions as Handel's Messiah?

The Second Psalm is one of the so-called "orphan psalms", the fifty psalms which lack a title. But we are not left in doubt as to its authorship. In the first place it, together with the First Psalm, heads the first book or division of the Psalms (1 to 41), all of which, except 10 and 33, have David's signature. Then in Acts 4,25 it is expressly ascribed to David: "Lord-- who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said,"--.. This settles the matter for Christians. Delitsch and others object that this does not mean more than that the psalm appears in a Davidic book of psalms, but the definite language is against them; there can be no doubt that Peter meant to say that David was the author inspired by God to write these words. But we may add also that we would expect David to write a psalm based on the great Messianic prophecy which was made to him in 11 Sam. 7,12-14, a prophecy which stamped his family as the true line of Messianic succession and pledged eternal duration to his kingdom.

The Psalm treats the theme: "Jehovah's Messiah versus the rebellious world," in four strophes, each consisting of three verses: I. vv.1-3: The poet with scornful astonishment beholds the nations and kings of the earth united in rebellion against the Anointed One of Jehovah. II. vv.4-6: The heavenly sovereign views their conspiracy with quiet contempt and puts them into a panic by showing them that He has Himself made the Messiah His co-regent in Zion. III. vv. 7-9: The Messiah Himself speaks and reminds the rebels that Jehovah, whose eternal Son He is, has given Him sovereignty over the entire earth and the power to assert it. IV. vv. 10-12: The poet therefore counsels the rebellious world to submit to Jehovah and to hail the Messiah as their divine King, that they may be blessed in Him.

Verse 1. "Why do the heathen rage, and the people meditate a vain thing?"

The astonished "lamah", "why", with which the singer introduces us to the wonderful scene appearing before his spiritual vision covers both lines of the verse. In the first line the verb

"ragah", "rage", is in the perfect tense, denoting that which has begun and is not yet finished. Here then, the "why" asks indignantly for the reason of that which is taking place. What reasonable ground can there be for this tumultuous thronging, this massing together, or raging, of the heathen nations? In the second member of the parallelism the imperfect, "jehgu", "meditate", is used, signifying continuance. Since this clause also is dominated by the "lamah" it must connote also "to what purpose." The second line adds a tinge of scorn to the astonished indignation of the first line. Here we learn, too, that the turbulent gathering of the "goyim" is no mere accidental commotion. No, the "leumim", the "people", who according to the parallelism must represent heathen nations, are meditating, that is, plotting. The assembly of those elements of humanity who are hostile to God's people is due to a deliberate, carefully considered plan. But even as the indignant "why" of the first line indicates that the mustering of the heathen is unreasonable and unjustified, so the pregnant "riq", "vain thing", at the close of the second scornful question contains this answer to it, that the plotting which underlies the mustering must prove vain, resultless. Though the Gentile world collects all its forces in conformity to a comprehensive plan, it is all in advance stigmatized as emptiness, nothingness, of no avail.

Verse 2. "The kings of the earth set themselves and the rulers consult together against Jehovah and against His Anointed."

Here the poet, as it were, brings us nearer to the scene, so that we learn more as to the real import of all this tumult and planning. It is clearly no mere uprising of the populace, no such stir as is caused by a mob. On the contrary, "yityazebu", "set themselves", implies in this connection; "taking a stand to fight," "forming in battle array," "rising in rebellion." And "nosedu", "take counsel", "to press close together in consultation," points to the devising of the plan of campaign. And the vast hosts who are stirring to, and fire do not lack competent generals. Kings of the earth take up the posts of

command and "rozenim", "weighty ones", influential statesmen, do the plotting. It is a well-organized revolt of the nations under able leadership. Consider the careful planning of the Communist cabal and of the Papal Antichrist! And this great conspiracy in which peoples forget their disagreements and princes merge their conflicting interests is directed against Jehovah and His Anointed One, as the third line of the verse informs us with solemn emphasis. The final word, "Messiah", is the key to the situation and determines the interpretation of the entire psalm. The word is really a passive verbal adjective from "maschach", to anoint, but is generally used as a noun denoting an anointed person, a consecrated prince, the Greek "Christos". Now we know definitely that Saul, David, and Solomon were anointed for kingship, and it is altogether probable that the same ceremony was performed at the accession of other kings of the Davidic dynasty. The oil employed in the rite was a symbol of the divine Spirit and His gifts. Cf. the story of Saul, 1 Sam. 10, f. Consequently, the act signifies that the persons anointed were invested with royal authority by Jehovah Himself and were endowed with His Spirit for the right discharge of the duties of their great office. In so far, then, as this unction was administered by the authority of Jehovah through His representatives, and in so far as those anointed were to be vice-regents of Jehovah and rulers over His people, they might possibly be termed the "messiahs of Jehovah", and rebellion against them might possibly be branded as treason against Jehovah. But in all Old Testament history there is no instance of any such universal coalition of the heathen powers against any Davidic king. Nor are any of the revolts of subject tribes against the dynasty ever characterized as direct attacks on Jehovah. In addition to this, it should be noted that the terms of v. 7 and 12 ascribe to the anointed king of this psalm a nature and a majesty which it would be blasphemy to attribute to a mere human monarch. He is called the very Son of God, and all are told to trust in Him. It may be conceded, indeed, that the imagery of this remarkable scene is taken from the wars and insurrections which occurred during the reign of David. Cf. 11 Sam.

10, 62ff. But the true germ of the poem is undoubtedly found in 11 Sam. 7, 26ff. Cf. Ps. 89, 27ff. In this majestic prophecy of an all-powerful sovereign who comes of the seed of David, but still is the Son of God, the problem of our verse is virtually solved. Jehovah's Anointed here is the ruler of whom the Davidic kings were but the types,-- the ruler who should be anointed with the Spirit without measure, and whose kingdom is described in Is. 11 and 61. It is He whom Daniel simply terms "the Messiah", Dan. 9, 25 ff. These are the only two passages in the Old Testament where "Messiah" is used as a title. It is Jesus Christ Himself. This identification of the "Meschiasch" of our psalm is expressly confirmed by the New Testament. From John 1, 41 and 49, Mark 15, 32, and Matth. 26, 63, we learn that this psalm was regarded as Messianic by the Jews, and that it is the source of the very terms: "Christ the Son of God," by which the promised Redeemer-King was known. Again, in Acts 4, 25-27; 13, 33; Heb. 1, 4 ff. the psalm is declared to be a direct prophecy of Christ. Cf. also Rom. 1, 4; Rev. 11, 15; 12, 10. In the light of these passages we understand how there can be a rebellion in which all the heathen powers unite. Cf. Luke 19, 14. Now we see why the revolt is said to be directed not only against the "Anointed", but against Jehovah as well. For the rule of God and Christ is one, not two. It is not the dominion of Jehovah exercised through the Messiah as vice-regent. No, they are co-regents and share the same throne. Cf. John 10, 30; 5, 23; 1 John 2, 23. It is not surprising that the singer is filled with indignation and scorn at this uprising and must brand it as groundless and resultless.

Verse 3. "Let us break their bands asunder and cast away their cords from us."

The strident notes of this verse constitute apparently the watchword of the heathen campaign. As it is given out by the council of the leaders from headquarters, it is taken up by the rank and file and roared out as a wild battle-cry. The keywords are: "the bands and cords", those of Jehovah and His Messiah. When the kings and their

hosts mutually exhort one another to snap these bands and fling away these cords, they themselves characterize their undertaking as rebellion against established authority. Evidently, then, Jehovah and His Messiah had claimed dominion over the nations and held them to a certain extent in subjection. Here again it is clearly seen that the Anointed of Jehovah cannot be any monarch of the Old Testament Israel. No member of the House of David ever asserted or exercised such sovereignty over the heathen powers of the earth. Such universal authority is given to Christ alone. When the Gentiles characterize His sovereignty as "bands and fetters", we are not to think mainly of the world-government of divine Providence, according to which Christ controls the destinies of men and determines the course of history. No, Christ rules primarily by His word. Through the Law He dictates to mankind a conduct in conformity with His will, condemns all transgressions and curbs the passions. But consider the attacks on morals and discipline by rebellious men in the name of liberty and the no less dangerous perversions of the law by many who parade under the Christian name today. However, that which is particularly obnoxious to the peoples who are alienated from God is the authority of grace which God vindicates for Himself through the Gospel. When Christ asserts His God-given and love-bought right to the exclusive trust, love and loyalty of men; when He endeavors to deliver them from the bondage of sin and Satan and to bind them to Himself by the bands and cords of grace, then the heathen rise in rebellion. The bands of truth by which He would subject their intellect to Himself as to the wisdom of God fill them with rage. And the cords of love by which He would keep their hearts from the service of self, they fling away with disdain. There is, in brief, no enmity like that of the unregenerate heart to the message of the Gospel.

We base our identification of the Anointed One with Jesus Christ on the New Testament references to this passage, in accordance with the hermeneutical rule stated by Dr. Fuhrbringer in the words: "When an Old Testament passage is quoted in the New Testament and is said to be fulfilled by certain events or persons,

then the interpretation of the passage is taken out of our hands (regardless of what we may think the original passage means) and is established by the inspired word of God in the New Testament." All Modernists, of course, reject this hermeneutical principle and do not hesitate to charge the New Testament writers with perverting Scripture or applying it in an arbitrary manner. Dr. G. H. Gilbert, in his "Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible," states the Modernist view of prophecy in this way: "Perhaps the most conspicuous feature (of the New Testament) is its disregard of the original context and purpose of the various Old Testament passages with which it deals. This disregard was common to all who used the Scriptures both in the Jewish and the Christian Church. It went naturally with the ancient conception of an inspired writing, a conception that separated it from the life of those among whom it made its appearance. If a book is regarded as a collection of oracles, then the relation of its different utterances to each other and their meaning for those who first heard them can be quite neglected. And this was done in a large measure by the New Testament writers." (p. 75.)—"That the apostle (Paul, in 1 Cor. 15, 3-4) went to the Old Testament for proof that Jesus was raised on the third day rather than to historical evidence for the fact, illustrates in a striking manner the importance which he attributed to the current method of demonstrating the Messiahship of Jesus." (p. 86.)

Such use of the Old Testament Dr. Gilbert condemns as "false, unhistorical and unscientific," and then praises the Modernist method of interpretation in such words as: "The influence of Historical Criticism has been to lessen, if not entirely destroy, the traditional, predictive use of isolated texts of the prophetic writings. The prophets are beginning to be read and understood in the light of their own times, as men zealous for the God of Israel, as ardent patriots, as practical reformers." (p. 278) Even such fairly conservative scholars as Delitzsch assume that the psalm before us applied in the first place to some Davidic king, and only secondarily, in some typical manner, to the Lord Jesus.

Hence the Modernist would deprecate the use made in the New Testament of the "Meschiach" of our text as a title of Jesus of Nazareth, and would insist that it can refer only to some earthly king, so far as the intention of the writer of the psalm was concerned. And many who claim to be conservative Christians likewise interpret prophecy,---not as the New Testament does, not basing their interpretations of prophecy on the New Testament interpretation,---but on the assumption that the Old Testament writers could not possibly have meant to ascribe to their statements such meanings as the New Testament gives them. Thus Dr. John P. Milton of the ELC, in his pamphlet on the RSV, entitled "God's Word to Men," denies that the Old Testament Messiah was identified with the Triune God, as orthodox Lutherans have always held that He was, and says: "There may be Messianic significance in a passage whose original reference is not to Christ, but to God," --as if Christ and God were not form eternity one and the same Being; And he ignores throughout the basic principle we

have quoted above which tells us that the New Testament settles all questions as to the meaning of an Old Testament prophecy for us. When he defends the Modernistic translators of the RSV against the charge of "rejecting the idea that there could be predictions of the deity of Christ in the Old Testament," he is only revealing either his own ignorance of what Modernists themselves publicly proclaim, (as in Dr. Gilbert's book), or his bias is in their favor. In fact, he even misrepresents the facts when he defends the RSV translation of our psalm, while ignoring the implications of the use of "you" for "thou" in v. 7, as we shall see later. For the translators have published the fact that they used "thou" when referring to the Deity, and "you" in all other cases; so that they by their use of "you" in reference to the "Messiah," or Anointed One, of v. 3 proclaim their denial of his deity.

(To be continued)

(This exegesis has been based primarily on the writer's class notes for Prof. O. E. Brandt of the old Norwegian Lutheran Seminary in Hamline, Minn., as well as on Delitsch, Hengstenberg and other standard commentaries. We enter into the mistranslations of the RSV in some detail to illustrate the manner in which this Modernistic translation forces its preconceived theories upon the Bible and denies the authority and inspiration particularly of the New Testament writings.) This paper was read at a Mixed Conference in St. Paul, Minnesota, in January, 1954.

Madison - Chicago

PASTORAL CONFERENCE

The Madison - Chicago Pastoral Conference will meet on Tuesday and Wednesday, October 12th and 13th. The place of meeting will be announced later. The program is as follows:

1. Sermon for Criticism
- Rev. Geo. Orvick
2. Critique
- Rev. A. Harstad
3. Exegesis - Ephesians 1
- Rev. R. Ude

4. "How to instruct Confirmants"-
with demonstration.
- Rev. N. S. Oesleby
 5. The History of the negotiations
with the A.L.C. and No. Synod
- Rev. C. M. Gullerud
 6. Chiasm
- Rev. Neil Hilton
- Rev. Arvid Gullerud, Sec'y.

IMPRESSIONS
of the
1954 CONVENTION
of the
SYNODICAL CONFERENCE

This presentation is not to be a detailed chronicle of the day by day proceedings of the Convention, but a record of impressions gained as an observer.

The 1954 Convention (The 45rd Regular Biennial Convention) of the Ev. Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America held in East Detroit, Mich., Aug. 9-13, had for its specific purpose the discussion of the differences which had arisen to disturb the unity of the Synodical Conference. In view of the tensions and strained relations which had marked the close of the 1952 Convention in St. Paul, it was heartening to note the spirit of calmness and affability which marked the 1954 Convention, especially at the beginning.

The officials of the various Synods, together with committee representatives and delegates had come to Detroit fully aware of the serious implications that attended this convention. They had come prepared to discuss their differences calmly, objectively, and earnestly in the light of God's Word. No doubt this bringing of everything out into the open had a marked effect on the spirit with which the convention was assembled.

It was of course generally known that the negotiations between the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod (Mo. Synod) and the American Lutheran Church (A.L.C.) had been discontinued in view of the impending merger of these four church bodies of the American Lutheran Conference (S.L.C., A.L.C., U.S.L.C., and the L.F.C.) a fact which it had often been stated, would make a big difference in the relations between the Lutheran Church - Mo. S., and the A.L.C.

It also soon became generally known,

by way of informal conversations, (and was definitely reported on Tuesday afternoon), that the Floor Comm. on Doctrinal matters had been presented with a set of proposals having the full endorsement of the Mo. S. leadership. Those proposals, it was said, committed the M.S. to a setting aside of the controverted Common Confession (C.C.), "deactivate" was the word used.

All this, together with an earnest desire to abide by God's Word, marked the spirit that prevailed that Monday evening among the delegates and representatives as they filed out of the opening service in St. Peter's Lutheran Church, where the convention sessions were held. Prof. Geo. O. Lillogard of Bethany Seminary, third V. president of the Syn. Conf. had preached the opening sermon, which had been received with many favorable comments. A large number of delegates from all Synods had also partaken of the Holy Sacrament. Officiating at the Communion were the Rev. F.A. Hertwig of the Mo. S., and the Rev. W. Pless of the Wis. Synod.

The Convention sessions began Tuesday morning. President Baepfer in his Convention message stated: The Synodical Conference for 82 years has been a wholesome and blessed association, but that there is fear for the future, because all no longer speak the same thing. Though all hold the same faith in the Bible as the inerrant Word of God there is no peace. This he stated is the work of Satan. He also admonished all to examine themselves as individuals and as synodical bodies to determine and admit the extent of their guilt if God's peace is going to prevail. It was then decided that the three essays prepared for this Convention, dealing with the C.C.

should be heard without interruption and discussion be permitted only after the three essays had been read.

The first essay by the Rev. Westland of Benton Harbor, Mich., treated "The Inadequacy of the Common Confession as A Settlement of Doctrinal Differences." It was a clear and simple summary of the material presented in the several pamphlets on this subject distributed by the Wis. Synod. Dr. N.A. Madson's topic "WHY THE NORWEGIAN SYNOD COULD NOT ACCEPT THE C.C." briefly summarized some of his experiences as a member of the Nor. Syn. Union Committee during the negotiations that had been going on since 1938. His purpose was to show that the C.C. was not the result of doctrinal unity on the part of the A.L.C. A third essay prepared in rebuttal to the first two was presented by the Rev. T. Nickels of the Mo. S. The purpose of this presentation was to show that the C.C. clearly and simply and amply states the old orthodox position of the MO.S. It treated particularly the doctrines of Justification, Inspiration, Conversion and Election. It was a convincing presentation of sound doctrine but did not prove anywhere that the A.L.C. understands the C.C. in that way, which is the real point at issue.

The impression gained from the many hours of discussion that followed the reading of the essays was that no one seriously believed there was any difference in doctrine. Officially every Synod maintained the same doctrinal position. But the question was whether the A.L.C. accepted the C.C. in the same spirit of understanding as the Mo. Synod. The Mo. S. is apparently very touchy on this matter because they were constantly making explanations or excuses for the A.L.C. The Wis. S. and the Nor. S. attempted to establish the fact that the A.L.C. held a different view point by referring to a meeting which had been held with the A.L.C. Commissioners in Milwaukee July 19th. Their testimony was not admitted in evidence it being argued by a certain segment of the Mo. S. that to have an accurate appraisal of what the A.L.C. held it would be necessary to ask a representative of the A.L.C. to address the convention. This was a puzzling aspect of the convention.

It had been stated that the A.L.C. Commissioners had studied and approved of their interpretation of the C.C. as given in the pamphlet "A Second Fraternal Endeavor" which had been prepared by the MO.S. to explain the C.C. Some disturbance resulted when it was reported that at the July 19 meeting with the A.L.C. Commission they had no knowledge of this pamphlet. Had never seen or heard of it. The question was asked: "When did the ALC Commissioners study and approve of this interpretation?" No satisfactory answer. It was also asked in what way the C.C. clarified and amplified the Brief Statement. No specific answer.

One general impression gained from these discussions which continued through Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday forenoon was that the great majority of the Mo.S. delegates were conservative, but that most of the speaking was done by a certain group of non-conformists, among them some men who are identified with the "44". Each time they spoke they seemed to stir up antagonism. It also seemed that the Wis. S. had selected its mildest men and that even those who had previously been very sharp were, with but few exceptions, very much toned down. This was true also of the N.S.

Wednesday afternoon the Floor Committee on Doctrinal Matters presented their completed report. This document listed 10 "Whereases" giving a resume of the historical development of the present difficulties and concluded with 4 Resolutions: 1) A Petition addressed to the Mo. S. asking that they set aside the C.C. as a basis of future fellowship with the A.L.C. 2) That until the MO.S. has taken action the areas of differences be openly discussed within the membership of the Syn. Conference. 3) The Synodical Conference authorize its President and Vice President to appoint Committees on Doctrina and Practice with equal representation from all synods, to whom should be assigned for study such areas of doctrine and practice as need clarification. 4) That the Synodical Conference petition each of the constituent synods to elect or appoint a doctrinal committee and that

these committees act together as a unit in all future negotiations with other Lutheran groups seeking fellowship.

These resolutions were said to be in substance the very proposals previously presented to the committee by members of the Mo. S. Someone moved for adoption. The motion was not entertained. It was moved to discuss it section by section. This was done. It soon became apparent that there was little endorsement of these proposals by Mo. S. leaders. Statements made by various members of the Floor Committee indicated they had been let down by the men who had promised to support these resolutions. The discussion came to a crashing climax when the Slovak Synod delegation let it be known emphatically, that since they had accepted the C.C. they would have nothing to do with the proposals as submitted. Several speakers pointed out that the S. Synod had accepted the C.C. only with certain reservations. But this fact received little attention. The Convention recessed late that evening with an air of depression. However the Committee on Doctrinal matters had been instructed to prepare a new draft of their resolutions embodying the suggestions made during the discussions.

The air of gloom was somewhat dissipated the next morning due to reports that the Committee was meeting with success in ironing out the difficulties. While the Committee continued to meet in executive session Thursday forenoon and well into the afternoon the Convention listened to essays on "The Military Chaplaincy" and "The Boy Scout Question," matters which constitute areas of difference in the Synodical Conference. Nothing now was presented by either side. From the discussion that followed it was evident there was no meeting of minds due chiefly to the fact that the Mo. S. considers these as practical matters which with proper safeguards can be used rightly without violating any Word of God, while the Wis. S. and Nor. S. look upon them as matters that are in themselves definitely ruled out by the Word of God which forbids unionism, syncretism, synergism, and any manner of procedure that would permit the civil powers to reach into and usurp the authority of the Church.

At 4 O'clock Thursday afternoon the Committee on Doctrinal Matters brought in their final report which was introduced by the chairman who stated that the Committee members had worked in perfect harmony of spirit and were encouraged by the fact that they had found a complete meeting of minds. This is the Report:

Report of Floor Committee on Doctrinal Matters

PREAMBLE: We humble bow before God and Lord Jesus Christ and sincerely confess our past sins in our intersynodical life and seek His forgiveness. We gratefully acknowledge that in spite of our weaknesses and sins our Lord has bountifully blessed us with the unity we have enjoyed these past eighty-two years.

WHEREAS, Further fellowship negotiations between the American Lutheran Church and the Missouri Synod have been suspended awaiting the outcome of the proposed merger of bodies of the American Lutheran Conference; and

WHEREAS, Due to circumstances, attaching no blame to anyone concerned, not all synods of the Synodical Conference had part in the negotiations between The Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church which resulted in the drafting of the Common Confession; and

WHEREAS, A number of members within the Synodical Conference believe that the Common Confession is unacceptable as a settlement of past differences with the American Lutheran Church; and

WHEREAS, Article 5 of the Constitution of the Synodical Conference states: "Without the consent of all the synods of the Synodical Conference of North America none of its constituent Synods shall be permitted to enter into actual church fellowship with any other church body,"

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this convention of the Synodical Conference assembled in East Detroit, August 1954 respectfully

petition the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod not to use the Common Confession as a settlement of the past differences with the American Lutheran Church with the understanding however that the Mo. S. in its explanation of the Common Confession Part I at this convention has clearly shown that it has not departed from its historic orthodox position, and be it further

RESOLVED, That we respectfully petition the four constituent synods to agree to act in unison in any possible future negotiations with other church bodies, and that we to this end petition each individual body of the Synodical Conference to appoint or elect a standing Unity or Doctrinal Committee and to instruct these Committees to participate in such discussions as a Synodical Conference unit, in order that each committee can report back to its church body on the development or progress, if any, of such possible discussions, and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Synodical Conference authorize its president and vice-presidents together with the presidents of the constituent synods to appoint, as soon as feasible after this convention, committees on Doctrine and Practice with equal representation from each constituent synod. To these committees they shall assign for study such areas of Doctrine and/or Practice as need clarification and settlement among us. These committees shall report to the president and vice-president of the Synodical Conference who shall make their reports available to the constituent bodies, and finally be it

RESOLVED, That in the meantime the issues which disturb the unity of the Synodical Conference be thoroughly discussed and considered on the basis of God's Word and that we to this end suggest that these matters be studied in 1) joint meetings of the Theological faculties 2) mixed pastoral conferences and 3) the sessions of the conventions of the Synodical Conference.

Time was extended to allow for debate on the Report and it became apparent that it was not going to be adopted that day. Voices from both

sides were questioning the meaning of phrases and raising suspicions as to the purpose of this or that sentence. As for example from the Missouri side it was asked "What sins did the Mo Synod have to confess in this matter" and from the Wis. side was voiced the fear that this resolution was saying much more than could be agreed to. The majority of the delegates on both sides however seemed ready to vote and it seemed quite certain that the resolutions would have been adopted if they had been voted on then. But someone made the motion that the delegates be given an opportunity to consider these resolutions until the next morning. We had the feeling that things were not going to go so well with this report.

The next morning debate on the resolutions was continued. The spirit of the meeting seemed to have changed. One speaker charged the Wis. Synod with creating an atmosphere of suspicion. No doubt there was some justification in this charge. On the other hand speeches opposing the setting aside of the C.C. and defending the procedure followed by the Missouri Synod definitely provoked the feeling that there was not willingness to admit failure in bringing the ALC around to the Mo. Synod viewpoint or that the C.C. failed to rule out the false teachings previously held in the ALC. The discussion turned principally around the phrase stating that the Mo. Synod at this convention "had clearly shown that it has retained its historic orthodox Scriptural position." Some wanted this to refer only to the doctrinal essay presented at the convention, specifically to that portion which had been discussed involving the doctrines of Justification, The Scriptures, and Conversion. Others wanted it to be a blanket endorsement of the orthodoxy of Mo. in all points. The situation became quite tense when the leading man of the Wis. Synod contingent, Prof. Reim withdrew his endorsement because of the confusion that has arisen when some were led to believe that his endorsement constituted and approved of all that the Mo. Synod had done. He would not be a party to such confusion. This led the President of the Missouri Synod to state that he was deeply saddened by the turn of events,

He had assumed from statements made that the Mo. Synod had not been accused of false doctrine, and now it appeared that they were being looked upon as false teachers. That they were being accused of unorthodoxy in some doctrines, and he demanded to know what these doctrines were. (No one had actually accused the Mo. Synod of false doctrine but it has been stated several times that in the areas of doctrines which had not been discussed at this convention such as "The AntiChrist" and "Prayer Fellowship" there was reason to disagree with the stand taken by the Mo. Synod.)

A suggestion that the controversial words be eliminated by shortening the Resolution to read: "Resolved that this convention of the Synodical Conference respectfully petition the Lutheran Church - Mo. Synod not to use the C.C. as a settlement of the past differences with the A.L.C." was immediately moved as an amendment and seconded. It is difficult to understand why this suggestion (which seemed to find such ready acceptance) aroused such resentment among some of the leading Missourians. Dr. Behnken again made an impassioned speech in which he asked: "If you adopt this what will the world think of us? Bretheren, what shall we tell the American Lutheran Church?" With this question one felt the bottom drop out of the whole meeting. Further confusion developed when someone proposed an amendment to the amendment. Confused discussion followed. Someone called for the question. The chair called for a vote.

No one seemed to know anymore what they were voting for. The amendment to the amendment was adopted, which virtually meant the same as adopting the paragraph in its full and original form. Then when the vote was called to adopt the Paragraph, protests and objections were raised. In the midst of this confusion a motion was made to recess the convention until a future date to be set by the Executive Officers of the Synodical Conference. This motion was quickly adopted and relieved a tense situation.

It was quite apparnot that no one actually wanted to see the Synodical Conference dissolved. There is also an

encouraging note in this that when the President of our Synod and Prof. Lillegard, our Synodical Conference vice-president, arose in the closing moments of the convention to state what had been resolved by our Synod if we got no answer to our appeals, this was taken soberly, and seriously by the whole convention. Certainly these proposed resolutions did not give us an answer to everything that had been asked for, but it was generally agreed this was a step in the right direction and if adopted could form a basis for arriving at an understanding on the other matters. There is therefore still reason to hope that matters can be settled on a satisfactory basis. Everyone should make this a matter of earnest and serious prayer. We felt convinced our testimony is being listened to. Also that there are things we need to listen to.

It was sad to think that at a time when so many new mission opportunities are presenting themselves to the Synodical Conference that so little of the Convention time was available for reports and discussion on these matters which are directly related to the great commission the Lord has given His Church. It is therefore also necessary that we earnestly pray the Lord that He will restore the Spirit of unity and harmony to the Synodical Conference so that we can go ahead with this work which glorifies and exalts the Savior our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ.

H. A. Theiste

(Editors note: The foregoing article is the personal impression of an observer at the recent Synodical Conference Convention. We have had requests for a review of the Convention, & since we have no official report we print these unofficial observations.)

NOTICE

The deficit in the Armed Services Commission fund has risen since the Treasurer gave his annual report in June. This fund is not in the budget of the synod, but must be supplied by special collection. Kindly take a special collection in your parish for this fund soon.

A NOTE TO OUR READERS

Have you wondered whether the C. B. is defunct? We shouldn't wonder, for your editors have wondered, too! However, we offer no apologies to the pastors of the Norwegian Synod! We were elected to put the paper out, not to write all the material. We cannot put out that which we do not have.

But we do offer apologies to those outside of our Synod who have subscribed to our journal. We can only try to explain the situation to you and assure you that we have not forgotten your subscriptions. They will be extended the number of months in which you received no copy.

As we explained in the last issue we published, there was a question about the future of the CLERGY BULLETIN. There were plans to start a full-fledged theological quarterly and material which ordinarily might have come to the C. B. was being gathered for that purpose. While the C. B. was ordered to continue until further notice, we were unable to get any material.

In June the Synod Convention turned down the idea of a theological quarterly for our Synod at the present time. At the same time the C. B. was urged to continue and expand. But by this time the summer vacations were upon us. We had no back-log of material for the summer months and we could per-

suade no one to provide any. So that is the story. We hope the fall months will bring a change to all that.

Our experiment in multilithing the CLERGY BULLETIN also had to be given up under these circumstances. So once again we are cranking the mimeo machine.

Now, brethren, you helped to vote the C. B. back into existence. More than that, you also ordered it to expand. We will do our part, but you must also do yours. We MUST have material and YOU must provide it. With fall pastoral conferences coming up, at least some of you must be preparing papers. Send us a copy for publication. We would like varied material—exegetical, historical, practical, homiletical. How about a sermon on which you have spent time working and reworking for some special occasion? Or what about some new book, recently off the press which you read during your summer vacation? We would be happy to have a review of it. Help us to make something of the CLERGY BULLETIN and it will develop naturally into a theological journal worthy of printing. This was the intent of the Synod's resolution.

—THE EDITORS

Litt av Hvert

We have not been any more fortunate in securing news than we have in securing articles. However we shall endeavor to recall that has taken place in the intervening months. Some of it may be well known to most of you. But we shall include whatever we have on hand.

* * *

The Rev. George Orvick, formerly of Amherst Junction, Wisconsin, accepted the call to Holy Cross in Madison, Wis., and was installed there during June.

* * *

The Rev. Rueben Stock most recently had the call to the Amherst Junction parish, but has returned it, and as of this writing no new call has been issued.

Candidate Richard Newgard, who graduated from the Bethany Seminary this spring, was in possession of three calls at one time this summer we are told. He had the call to Amherst Junction, the call to a mission field at Bagley, Minn., and the call to the Northwood, Iowa, parish. He accepted the call to Northwood where he was ordained in August. His marriage to Miss Hazel Johnson will take place on September 19.

* * *

The Rev. Robert Preus of Boston, Mass., has accepted the call to the Bagley mission field, but he has agreed to remain with his present congregation until it has secured a pastor.

The Rev. H. A. Theiste has returned the call which he received to the Boston congregation.

* * *

The Rev. Julian Anderson returned the call which he received to become a teacher at Bethany College. However he did accept the position as teacher of Greek on a part time basis. Meanwhile he will continue as pastor of the Hiawatha congregation in Minneapolis.

* * *

Mr. Vernon Gerlach of Red Wing, Minn., has accepted the call to Bethany College and will replace Prof. Galstad who accepted the call to Dr. Martin Luther College at New Ulm.

* * *

Mr. Calvin Minke has been secured to fill the vacancy in the business department at Bethany College.

* * *

As yet we have not received any news at to the enrollment at Bethany. However we were at the College a short time before school opened and we would like to report that we cannot recall seeing the school in such excellent condition. We are certain that it must have made a splendid impression on the students and their parents as they arrived for the new school year.

* * *

The newly elected Committee of Committees held its organizational meeting at Bethany College on August 29. Its first full meeting will be held in Minneapolis, November 12 and 13. This Committee has a tremendous task before it, particularly this first year of its existence.

The new church building of the Pinehurst congregation of Eau Claire, Wis., is progressing rapidly. The cornerstone of the building will be laid at a ceremony on Sunday afternoon, Sept. 19. The building is scheduled to be ready for the Christmas festivities, if all goes well. The Rev. Arvid Gullerud is pastor of the congregation.

* * *

The Concordia congregation of Eau Claire had one of the largest confirmation classes in its history this summer. 26 boys and girls were confirmed. The congregation is also 26 years old. The Rev. R. M. Branstad is the pastor.

* * *

The Rev. G. A. R. Gullixson of Cottage Grove, Wis. who is a member of the Synodical Conference Mission Board, represented the Synodical Conference at the convention of the colored missions held in Florida during the month of August. Pastor Gullixson preached for the opening and the closing services of the convention.

* * *

We are able to announce the following births since the last issue appeared. The Rev. and Mrs. R. M. Branstad are the parents of a daughter, Judith Anne, born June 28. The Rev. and Mrs. C. M. Gullerud are also parents of a daughter, Karen Sarah, born in April.

What would you think of a rose that would say to itself: "I cannot afford to give away all my beauty and sweetness. I must keep it for myself. I will roll up my petals of beauty. I will withhold this fragrance for myself. It is wasteful extravagance to give these things away?"

But behold, the moment it tries to store up, to withhold these things from others, they vanish. The fragrance, the beauty, do not exist in the unopened bud. It is only when the rose begins to open itself; to exhibit its petals, to give its secret, its life, to others, that its beauty and fragrance are developed.

Translated into Christian life, it is a fine illustration of the Savior's word: "It is more blessed to give than to receive." Selfishness always defeats its own ends. He who refuses to give himself for others, who closes the petals of his helpfulness, and withholds the fragrance of his sympathy, and love and sacrifice, finds that he loses the very things he hopes to gain.

As long as Mary's spikenard remained in the alabaster box its fragrance was wasted; but when it was released it "filled the whole house." So it is always with the grace of giving. If you really want to have, you must give.

THE CLERGY BULLETIN



PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY
OF THE GENERAL PASTOR-
AL CONFERENCE OF THE
NORWEGIAN SYNOD OF THE
AMERICAN EVANGELICAL
LUTHERAN CHURCH.

THE CLERGY BULLETIN

Editor:

R. M. Branstad, 321 N. Farwell St.
Eau Claire, Wis.

Assistants: A. Gullerud, R. Ude

Vol. XIV

October 1954

No. 2

PASTORAL CALLING A CONFERENCE STUDY

The word PASTOR, is, in my estimation, the one all-inclusive and perfect name by which a minister is known. "Pastor" means shepherd, a provider or feeder. Everybody knows that the work of a pastor is to care for his people, usually in the individual sense of personal love and especially in the spiritual sense. I say, everybody knows that, and certainly we pastors must know it best of all, for, in all probability the letter of Call which we received as we began the work in our present parishes, contained a paragraph something like this: "We (i.e., the members of the calling congregation) authorize and OBLIGATE you to proclaim to us, jointly and SEVERALLY the Word of God in its full truth and purity as contained in the canonical writings of the Old and New Testaments and professed in the confessional writings of the Lutheran Church; to discharge toward all the members of our congregation the functions of a pastor and curate of souls in an evangelical manner, in particular, to visit the sick and the dying and to admonish indifferent and erring members." Even if several sheep are dealt with at once, always at its heart pastoral work is personal. That is why it takes us from house to house, to the lowliest cottage or cabin or basement apartment where the pinch of poverty is keenly felt, as well as to the more palatial homes, where the temptations of prosperity are continually testing the Christian faith of those who dwell therein. Wherever immortal souls are to be found there we must go to speak to them

privately and individually as Jesus did in that Bethany home where He sat down and discussed with Mary "the one thing needful," at the same time, making use of that occasion to reprimand Martha, who mistakenly imagined that other things were of superior importance. In spite of all the emphasis that is being placed these days on psychiatric techniques and psychological approaches I still am convinced that the simple procedure used by Jesus in dealing with those two individuals might well serve as a pattern for us in our pastoral calling. Generally speaking we might say that the whole human race is made up of Marys and Marthas; that is, those whose eagerness to feed upon the green pastures of God's saving Word knows no bounds, and those whose appetites for the truth have become jaded by an over-indulgence of secular sweetmeats. Personally, I am not going to worry too much about neuroses and psychoses and a lot of other scientific, diagnostic nomenclature. Rather, I believe, that if we will only use the common sense bestowed upon us by our Creator, sanctified, of course, by God's Holy Word, and will pray for the Holy Spirit's guidance and direction in all that we do and say, our ministrations to the individuals will be a blessing, both to them and to us, and will redound to the greater glory of our God and to the upbuilding of the Kingdom of Christ.

Some centuries ago a shepherd boy sang on the pastures of Bethlehem, "The

Lord is my Pastor." Ages afterward a chorus composed of celestial voices came down to sing over the same place the answer of the eternal God. To that sacred spot God Himself had come, to be the Shepherd of all human sheep forever and ever. Like antiphonal music across half the Bible, Jesus answers David's psalm with one of His own. David had sung from the side of the sheep, and Jesus, the Shepherd, says: "Ego sum pastor bonus." That is why to be a good pastor is to be like Jesus.

But, as Arthur Wentworth Hewitt says in his book, "Highland Shepherds," that "is no easy thing. Let us go on with that translation in the Vulgate. There is a great thrill and a life-long burden in the very next words. 'Bonus pastor animam suam dat pro ovibus suis.' Whether this best translates the Greek, let scholars say. We have been used to read, 'The good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep' and that is right, but the Vulgate with merciless finger points out that the good shepherd gives his SOUL for the sheep. Not in one flash of glorious death may He be done with it. 'Animam suam dat.' Patiently through all His life, 'animam suam dat.' You learned in your first year Latin that this word for soul meant all the thinking powers... We must give all our best thought to the pastoral care of our people. We may not make a few calls absent-mindedly as a sidelining. Pastoral work must be the center of all our plans. We must think of it more deeply, more sincerely, more constantly than of any other thing. 'Animam suam dat.'

- This is the "sine qua non" in our service to the Savior. Jesus is the good Shepherd. As the Father sent Him, so He has sent us, commissioned us to feed His lambs. To us also applies the command issued by our Savior shortly before His ascension into heaven, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to EVERY CREATURE." Without personal pastoral care it is impossible to lead anyone to Jesus. The most impressive pulpit oratory will not do it, neither will well attended picnics or outings do it. The intimacy of the outing may have provided an opportunity for the shepherd to approach a tender, timid lamb; the pulpit oratory may have contained some exceedingly persuasive and appealing

passages, but even that brought no surrender until personal, pastoral guidance was applied to the individual. The sheep do not flock into the fold in great droves, they must be brought in one by one. That is why I say that our pastoral work is "sine qua non" in our service to Jesus. Like His, our supreme business is to be a good, faithful, solicitous shepherd.

I am going to invite you to hear Hewitt again. He says: "Do we mean then that pastoral work is more important than preaching? I am about to say a far more startling thing than that. But first, listen. You might, of course, interpret that question so that a negative answer would thunder like Thor. If on the one hand you mean by preaching such a tender and passionate invitation to Christ as cannot be resisted, while on the other you mean by pastoral work mere social gossip, then of course the answer is obvious. But let us not be silly in this sacred chapter. Here is the thing I want to say: Pastoral work is not to be asked whether it is more important than this or that. It is our only business."

"Now . . . for convenience only, we shall consider pastoral work in its ordinary meaning of personal contacts, usually in home visiting; but let us never lose sight of its larger meaning. All phases of our work are for one end, pastoral guidance. All that is good in parish organization is good only for this end. All that is good in our preaching is really pastoral. We may not be pulling a lamb out of the brambles, but we are leading a flock. If by chance there is in our preaching anything good which has no pastoral quality, then it was not our business to say it; it might have been the business of the professor or the politician, it was not ours. Our sole business is pastoral, and our shepherds crook is the cross. If you have any scorn of pastoral work, get out of the pulpit. If you have any notion that true preaching is not pastoral, drain your brain and refill. The sermon on the new birth was preached to one man who came by night. The sermon on the water of life was preached to one sinful woman."

But now then getting back to the

common distinction between preaching and pastoral work, I would like to spend a little time in pointing out how greatly the former depends upon the latter.

Our pastoral calling, particularly the visits we make to the present membership of our parish, will provide us with prolific material for our pulpit work. Observation and experience have often been cited as the best sources of illustrations. But the personal intimacy of the pastoral rounds does far more than merely supply illustrations for the sermon. As Dr. Fritz says in his "Pastoral Theology": "When making his visits the pastor learns to know the spiritual needs of his people. His sermons will then be freshening, pointed, interesting, helpful." Unless we visit our people and thus learn to know their needs, their troubles, their temptations, their shortcomings, their sorrows, how shall we be able to preach to them with the greatest effectiveness or how shall we know which channel to flood with the water of life? If sermons; good, timely, beneficial sermons can be preached without visiting our people then by the same token we might just as well give a physician a pop-gun and let him pepper pills around at random without his bothering to see the patients. There is also another respect in which the peripatetic pastor is richly rewarded in his sermon preparation. If we get out and familiarize ourselves with the sheep grazing in our pasture we will soon discover the type of food which they are best able to digest. A sermon filled with heavy, "professional", theological terminology might be perfectly proper when preaching to preachers or to those who are thoroughly "at-home" in the presence of such highly specialized expressions, but such sermons are decidedly out of place among those whose education along these lines have been limited. Calling on our people will help us to aim at the right intellectual level as we speak from the pulpit. In other words, let us not be invisible six days of the week and incomprehensible on the seventh.

There is an old cliché which I profoundly believe is as applicable today as ever. It is this: "a housegoing pastor makes a churchgoing people." Perhaps we pastors could profitably take a leaf out of the book of most any pro-

gressive and successful salesman of our day. They do not sit in their cosy offices waiting for customers to come to them. On the contrary, they are so enthused over the superior quality of their product that they travel up and down the highways and byways eagerly and earnestly soliciting additional prospective users. No doubt, at some time or other we have all met such a salesman. Perhaps we have even been a bit put-out because of his almost invincible insistence that we take and try what he has to sell. But I believe we could well adopt, in a reasonable measure, of course, some of his effervescent enthusiasm, in our pastoral calling. We have indeed "the one thing" the whole world needs, the Gospel of forgiveness through Christ Jesus, without whom there is no hope, nor peace, nor life. Many, to be sure, will not "come and buy" even though the blessings of the Gospel are meant for everyone "without money and without price." To a large part of the world the Gospel is still regarded as antiquated "foolishness." But let us not be discouraged. The salesman isn't received kindly by everyone he approaches. He doesn't "make a sale" at every stop he makes. Neither will we. Neither did the apostles. Neither did Jesus. We do have, however, the unfailing promise of the almighty God who said: "My Word will not return unto Me void." Some will gratefully embrace and accept this "foolishness" we are privileged to bring, and by it will be saved. If we are going to obey the command to preach the Gospel to every creature, there is only one way to do it, and that is to go with our precious message to every kitchen and cornfield in our neighborhood. I know all about the advisability of not hindering a farmer, for example, in his work, but he won't get too nervous about it if you take another hoe and dig potatoes in the next row. Pastoral visitation is the only way to reach all the people. And on the other hand, pastoral inattention is one of the most frequently repeated excuses for non-churchgoing.

Just what properly constitutes a pastoral call might be rather difficult to define. I have read of one pastor who sets himself the goal of one hundred pastoral calls a month. If he rings a doorbell and finds no one at home, he leaves a card indicating that he has been

there and marks that down in his book as being a pastoral call. When he calls following a death and sees the whole family that is counted as one call. If he has lunch with two men he counts that two calls because he has been in touch with two different families. Another minister does not consider a conversation he may have on the street corner with a parishioner as a call, regardless of the content of the conversation, yet if he calls upon the same parishioner in his office he regards it as a pastoral call. If a member of his congregation comes to his study for five minutes it is a pastoral conference; yet a thirty-minute telephone conversation, no matter what subject is discussed, is not counted. Another clergyman regards as a pastoral contact every person he greets during the whole day.

The time consumed in a call is something also that will definitely have to be determined by the nature of the call and the circumstances surrounding it. There might conceivably be cases where ten minutes would be too long and other cases where an hour or two would be too short. To say the least, a stop-watch will never be an essential part of a pastor's equipment. Russel Dicks, in his treatise on "Pastoral Work and Personal Counseling," tells of a certain Boston pastor who was reported to have followed a precise timing in his pastoral calling, giving himself exactly ten minutes, no more, no less, for each call in each home. He never took off his coat, he never sat down. And Russell Dicks declares, rather significantly, that never, or hardly ever, did people seek his help when they were in trouble. Time is an important factor in fellowship; it cannot be hurried, neither must it become a burden.

As to the kind of calls a pastor will make, the variety is vast. It goes without saying that the soul-shepherd will go first of all to the sick and the dying. The need in such cases is immediately apparent. Sickness and death are a result of sin, and in the sick room the opportunities for bringing both Law and Gospel to the sinners are especially favorable. Those who are ill, and as a rule, more receptive to spiritual ministrations. Through their ill-

ness they have learned that a man is "as grass," a perishable pilgrim, a fragile, mortal being, and they are more ready to look to Him "from Whom cometh our help." Then the pastor will visit the bereaved. Bereavement is a personal crisis. It is characterized by loneliness and a longing for solace. There is a craving for comfort and consolation which the Christian pastor can well supply. Many of the questions and thoughts which rise in the minds of the mourners have to do with God's justice, His Love, the hereafter and related subjects. Here is an opportunity for the pastor to be of real service. The aged and shut-ins are oftentimes likely to be forgotten, because they are there day after day, but they, too, must be placed high on the pastor's calling agenda. If they cannot come to church, to hear the sermon from the pulpit, then the pastor must, as often as possible, bring the "bread of life" to them, for they, too, need to be fed. If a congregation has a tape or wire recorder, the instrument could not possibly be put to better use than to make a recording of the entire Sunday service that could then be taken to the homes of those unable to be present in person. If it is granted that the shut-in complex is one of the pastor's real concerns in his house-to-house ministry, this becomes a real help in solving a difficult problem. While the aged and the incapacitated are frequently forgotten, inasmuch as they are unable to participate in the regular activities of the congregation and consequently are not often seen, a pastor who sincerely loves his people will certainly never neglect them nor cast them off in their old age. In most areas there will always be calls to make on prospective members. People are on the move these days. The population picture is constantly changing. When our Savior said: "Go ye into all the world," He was not overlooking the fact that a part of that world which is right in our own "backyard", so to speak, right in our very vicinity, in our own block or even in our own family or circle of friends. If these people are without church connections they merit a pastoral visit. There is another type of call which we shall simply refer to as the "every-day call." In some respects this is the most ef-

The History of the NEGOTIATIONS between the A.L.C. and the L.C. - MO. SYNOD.

Negotiations between the A.L.C. (org. in 1930) and the Missouri Synod were initiated by the A.L.C. when it issued an invitation to other Lutheran bodies to confer with them with the object of establishing "pulpit - and altar - fellowship". The answer of our Norwegian Synod to this invitation is to be found in the theses known as "Unity, Union, and Unionism" approved by the Synod at its 1936 convention. (History has since proved how valid were the warnings set down in those theses.) On the basis of these theses our Synod did not accept the invitation, but the Missouri Synod did accept the invitation and in its 1935 convention instructed the President of the synod to appoint a standing committee of five, to be known as the Committee on Lutheran Church Union. The Committee was instructed to confer with the other members of the Synodical Conference and keep them informed in the matter. Subsequent history has shown that this conferring took place in such way that our Synod was usually confronted by an accomplished fact.

The following men were appointed to this committee: Drs. Wm. Arndt, Theo. Engelder, C.F. Bronner and the Pastors E. Kretzmann and F.H. Brunn.

During the following triennium the committee held six meetings with the A.L.C. Fellowship committee. The Brief Statement was used as a basis of the discussions. The unqualified acceptance of the Brief Statement on the part of the A.L.C. was not obtained. Accordingly they summarized their reactions and their qualified acceptance of the Brief Statement in what is known as the Declaration. This was presented to the Missouri Synod for its consideration. The Committee appointed to review the work reported that it found agreement had been reached in doctrines disputed in the past particularly in the doctrines of inspiration, predestination and conversion, Sunday, and the office of the public administration of the means of grace. However, it was also reported that the Declaration of the American Lutheran Church represent-

atives asked tolerance for certain teachings and interpretations on the doctrine of the last things which had been rejected in Missouri Synod circles. Also reference was made to the Declaration's speaking of "a visible side of the church." The Missouri Synod went on record as declaring that the Brief Statement together with the Declaration and the provisions of the Synod's action be regarded as the doctrinal basis for future Fellowship between the Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church. While the committee on Lutheran Church Union was instructed to attempt reaching agreement in the non-fundamental doctrines pertaining to the last things, it was stated that these differences need not be regarded as divisive of church fellowship. It was also resolved that the Missouri Synod should get the consent of the sister synods in the Synodical Conference to this basis and that the A.L.C. was to get the approval and agreement of the other members of the American Lutheran Conference. Members were also warned not to take any action which would overlook the fact that union had not been established.

In the same year, 1938, in October the American Lutheran Church met in Sandusky and adopted a number of statements which caused alarm. The now well-known statement "It is neither possible nor necessary to agree in all nonfundamental doctrines" was adopted at that convention. At the same time the A.L.C. declared that it was unwilling to give up its membership in the American Lutheran Conference. And in its acceptance of the Union basis it declared that it believed that the Brief Statement viewed in the light of the Declaration was not in contradiction to the Minneapolis Theses.

Between the 1938 convention of the Missouri Synod and the 1941 Convention a number of things happened. Members within the Missouri Synod and also sister synods expressed their dissent to points in the doctrinal basis as for instance on inspiration, Objective justification, Predestination, the Ministry,

the Church, and regarding the question that certain differences in non-fundamental doctrines need not be divisive of church fellowship. The ALC in 1939 adopted the Pittsburgh agreement with the U.L.C. which embraced a paragraph on inspiration to which also the Missouri Synod committee took exception.

The Detroit Convention of the American Lutheran Church held in 1940 was asked to clarify its stand on certain points but satisfaction was not gained. For instance, the ALC was asked to subscribe to the simple statement "God has already in Christ absolved all the world of its sins" But all the convention did was to adopt the following which confuses objective and subjective justification: "Concerning the so-called objective or universal justification we state that we adhere to this doctrine without excluding, however, the declarative nature of the individual justification in the moment of faith of which Scripture speak so often." There was no acceptance of the simple statement referred to them.

The Synodical Conference of 1940 asked the Missouri Synod earnestly to consider the possibility of framing one document of agreement.

A.L.C. committee members had notified the Missouri Committee members that they objected to certain points of the Brief Statement, namely that "Adam before the Fall was endowed with a truly scientific knowledge of nature; that the Word of the Gospel and the Sacraments are the means of grace, (they want it to be stated thus — the Word and the Sacraments are the means of grace); that the only effect of the Lord's supper is the communication and sealing of the forgiveness of sins (they contended that the realm of sanctification must be included and that there may be certain physical effects of the Lord's Supper.) and also they objected to this that the Brief Statement declares that a definite number is elected from eternity. They declared that not all the Scripture passages in par. 21 of the Brief Statement apply to the case of condemning unionism. Also the ALC members declared that prayer-fellowship is wider than church fellowship. It became clear later that there was also disagreement in the Missouri Synod on this.

The Missouri Synod Committee of the Lutheran Union held three meetings with the ALC Committee in the triennium culminating in 1941. The Missouri Synod Committee reported having met with Norwegian and Wisconsin Synod brethren Jan. 3 and 4, 1941 and that at this meeting the sister synod representatives asked the Missouri Synod to discontinue their negotiations. However, memorials to continue the negotiations were received from 27 congregations, 11 pastoral conferences, the English District, one men's club, one circuit, and the Lutheran Laymen's League. There were a couple of memorials asking that the St. Louis Articles of Union be withdrawn. The Missouri Synod resolved to continue negotiations with the A.L.C. because "a. They have requested us to strive together with them to attain doctrinal unity, for which the need exists, and it is in accordance with the Lord's will that Christians should strive for doctrinal unity. (I Pet. 3,15; I Cor. 1,10.) b. The efforts made between our Synod and the American Lutheran Church have not been barren of good results and we have the Lord's promise that the testimony of His truth will not be vain. (Is. 55; 10,11.)" The Committee's name was changed to "The Committee on Doctrinal Unity in the Lutheran Church of America." Sister synods were asked to send their representatives to the joint meetings of this committee. It was resolved to work toward the framing of one document. The Committee was also instructed to consider also the matter of unity in practice.

The Missouri Committee now asked the committees of the sister synods to join them in seeking to draw up this one document with the ALC Commissioners but only the representatives of the Slovak Lutheran Church agreed to cooperate in this. In the 1942 Convention of the ALC at Mendota, resolutions were passed to continue the Commission on Fellowship with the understanding that the ALC was offering to establish pulpit and altar fellowship with the U.L.C. on the basis of the Pittsburgh agreement on the one hand and on the basis of the Brief Statement and the Declaration with the Missouri Synod on the other hand. No mention was made of Missouri's request that one

document be formed to replace the Brief Statement and the Declaration. During the Triennium the Missouri Synod Committee met only once with the ALC Commissioners, and that only lasting a half a day. No resolution regarding the framing of one document was passed. But later arrangements were made for subcommittees of the two commissions (ALC and Missouri Synod) to meet for the framing of one document.

The 1944 Convention of the Missouri Synod had before it many memorials calling for a rescinding of an annulling of the St. Louis Articles of Union. Among them was the memorial of our Synod which asked that the St. Louis Articles of Union be revoked particularly because of the false doctrine "God purposes to justify those who have come to faith" contained in the Declaration and because the Articles did not call for full agreement regarding the doctrine of the Church and the Last Things as a prerequisite for church fellowship. --- At this Convention the personnel of the Committee was set to include three theological professors, three pastors in office and two laymen. The committee was instructed to work for the completion of the one document which then would clearly supersede all doctrinal documents and resolutions adopted in 1938 and 1941.

In the closing weeks of the triennium ending with the 1944 convention the one document "Doctrinal Affirmation" was formulated. It was made accessible to the pastors and congregations of the Missouri Synod as well as to sister synods of the Synodical Conference, to the ALC and to presidents of the other Lutheran Church bodies in our country. After the framing of the one document the Missouri Synod Committee met on two occasions (for two days each time) with representatives of sister synods and heard the numerous objections of the Wisconsin and Norwegian synods. On the basis of these objections and the objections of Missouri Synod members the subcommittee of the Missouri Synod prepared a list of such changes as they deemed advisable under the head of "Clarifications" and submitted them to the clergy of their synod and to the fellowship Committee of the ALC. The Missouri Committee was not able to arrange a meeting with the ALC Committee until Aug. 23, 1946 in which it was reported that the Doctrinal Affirmation had received some negative treatment.

some indifferent reception and that only three districts approved it but not enthusiastically. In one district the Missouri Synod had been accused of "The old Missouri heresy" in the doctrine of election and of errors in justification in conversion, and in other doctrines. The ALC fellowship Commission reported that this unfavorable action was due to the fact that the Doctrinal Affirmation was more favorable to the Brief Statement than to the Declaration and because it virtually cancelled out the position of the ALC as contained in the Declaration. The "Clarifications" were considered to be even less acceptable because they nullified what little had been brought into the Doctrinal Affirmation from the Declaration. ALC fellowship commission told the Missouri committee that "The Brief Statement and the Declaration presented two trends of thoughts, that they expressed differences in doctrine which do not exist, but which in the opinion of the Fellowship Committee do not preclude fellowship. Such differences were said to exist in the doctrines of election, of conversion, of the Church and regarding the Last Things. The Fellowship Committee held that in respect to our two bodies the phrase: 'doctrinal agreement' should not be used, because doctrinal agreement does not exist." Proc. of Missouri Synod Conv. 1947. p. 495. ---The ALC convention held at Appelton Oct. 1946 stated that they did not find the Doctrinal Affirmation acceptable and that they despaired of attaining Lutheran Unity by way of additional doctrinal formulations and reformulations. They stated that the documents at hand show that there are no differences in doctrine standing as obstacles but mainly differences of background, approach, spirit, and attitude which can be resolved in an atmosphere of candor, mutual understanding and love. For these reasons the convention decided to continue the fellowship Commission and to instruct them to explore the measure of agreement existing with other Lutheran bodies and to further such agreement toward the goal of true unity. The American Lutheran Church adapted the principle of selective fellowship in order to promote unity with the Missouri Synod and the U.L.C.

On May 9, 1947 a plenary meeting of the committees of the ALC and Missouri

was held in which the ALC Committee disavowed as unfortunate the statements made in the August 23rd meeting of 1946, and reiterated its position of 1938 that the Brief Statement and the Declaration are sufficient basis for union.

At the 1947 Convention of the Missouri Synod the Committee on Doctrinal Unity reported three difficulties standing in the way of fellowship with the ALC. 1. The manifest lack of doctrinal unity. 2. The difference in conviction regarding the degree of doctrinal unity required for fellowship. 3. The membership of the ALC in the American Lutheran Conference. The Committee reported that in view of ALC action no action by Missouri on the Doctrinal Affirmation was called for, but suggested that negotiations be continued. The Convention rejoiced over whatever progress had been made, declared that it was not yet ready for fellowship with the ALC, but declared its willingness to continue doctrinal discussions with the ALC and arranged for the appointment of a committee. Quite a number of memorials were before the convention asking that the St. Louis Articles of Union of 1938 be rescinded. The action of the Convention was this that the synod declared the 1938 resolutions should no longer be considered as a basis for the purpose of establishing fellowship with the American Lutheran Church. The Committee on Doctrinal Unity was encouraged to continue discussion on a soundly Scriptural basis, using the Brief Statement and such other documents as were already in existence or as it might be necessary to formulate. The Committee was instructed to make every effort to arrive ultimately at one document which is Scriptural, clear, concise, and unequivocal. —Whereas objections had been raised to the Saginaw (1944) resolutions on prayer fellowship (which allowed for prayer at intersynodical meetings even before fellowship relations have been established or doctrinal unity has been reached) the convention was asked to take some action. The action was taken to reaffirm the Saginaw Resolutions. Prayers were now being offered up in the official meetings of the Committees of the ALC and the Missouri Synod.

During the next triennium the following things took place: January 30, 1948 the Missouri Synod committee invited the Union Committees of the sister synods of (Clergy Bulletin XIV, 2)

of the Synodical Conference to a meeting, the purpose of which was to endeavor to formulate a mutual agreeable policy of procedure in future negotiations. No policy was adopted. The objections of the Wisconsin and Norwegian Synods to the negotiations under present circumstances were reiterated at this meeting. Several meetings between the Missouri synod committee and the ALC committee were now held which culminated in the Common Confession. The ALC at its 1948 Convention had caused its committee to be divided into three subcommittees, one of which was charged to "work on a single statement of faith of the church" with the Missouri Synod Committee. The subcommittee of the ALC consisted of Drs. Edward C. Fendt and Bernard J. Holm. The Missouri Synod Committee authorized two of its members to work with them, namely Dr. Fritz and Pastor Jurgens. The outcome of meetings of the subcommittees and the full committees was the now well-known "Common Confession." This was completed Dec. 5 and 6, 1949. Representatives of the Missouri Committee delivered a copy to representatives of Wisconsin and Norwegian Synods in Feb. 1950, and at that time essentially the same objections were raised in their presence as were raised later by the respective synods. The Common Confession was circulated among the pastors and congregations of the Missouri Synod before the 1950 Convention, although scarcely more time was available to study the document than was later available to study the Part II presented at the Houston Convention. There were, however, memorials on hand from Missouri Synod members, raising objections to the "Common Confession" and asking that it not be adopted as a basis for union with the ALC.

The action of the Missouri Synod in 1950 at Milwaukee was this that the "Common Confession" by a majority vote resolved that the "Common Confession" showed agreement had been achieved in the doctrines treated by the two committees. It accepted the Common Confession as a statement of these doctrines in harmony with Scripture and resolved that if favorable action was obtained in the Convention of the ALC then it, the "Common Confession" should be recognized as a statement of agreement on these doctrines between the Missouri Synod and the ALC. Provisions were made that if further developments showed that

there was need of clarification or expansion of the "Common Confession" that such might be originated in the same way as the Common Confession had been born. (An amendment was offered from the floor reading: "That is to be understood that the acceptance of this document does not in any way affect our position as expressed in the Brief Statement" was rejected. The chair put the question: "Does anyone by his vote in favor of rejecting the amendment repudiate the Brief Statement." No one arose in answer.) The Committee on Doctrinal Unity was continued and asked to meet with the ALC to discuss and arrive at agreement in practice. The Common Confession and the whole matter was to be placed before the Synodical Conference in order to secure the consent of the constituent synods to the action outlined in these resolutions, and the ALC was asked to present it to its sister synods for approval and acceptance. The Committee on Doctrinal Unity was designated as steering committee and clearinghouse for all questions with regard to the "Common Confession."

In accordance with the latter resolution, the Committees of Wisconsin and Norwegian Synods directed some pertinent questions to the Missouri Committee, namely, if the Common Confession constituted a settlement of the differences on doctrines there treated as of 1950 (and the answer was unequivocally "yes") then the resolution leaving room for further clarifications and expansion simply referred to differences which might arise with the ALC after 1950. Since the "Common Confession" had been presented to the constituent synods for their approval, the sister synods took action. The Norwegian and Wisconsin Synods pointed out their Scripture grounded objections while the Slovak Synod voted its approval, however, adding a number of suggestions for change. The Norwegian Synod asked Missouri Synod to reconsider its acceptance of the Common Confession, to reject it as a settlement of its doctrinal differences with the ALC. Also the Norwegian Synod asked the Missouri Synod to discontinue its negotiations with the ALC and quoted Titus 3,10 as the Scriptural basis for insisting on such a breaking off of negotiations. The Wisconsin Synod also in 1951 reviewed the Common Confession and resolved to ask the Missouri Synod to

repudiate its stand that the Common Confession is a settlement of the doctrines treated by the two committees. It further asked the Missouri Synod to suspend its negotiations with the ALC. The Missouri Committee took up with the ALC Fellowship Commission objections that had been raised. ALC men were not in favor of making any changes in the Common Confession as such but suggested that clarifications should be included in the planned Part II. At no point was it admitted by either Missouri or the ALC that the Common Confession as accepted was unacceptable as a document of agreement in the doctrines treated. The Common Confession Part II in a tentative form was presented to the ALC Convention in Waverly Iowa. This was only reported as a progress report and no action was taken. The Union Committee of the Norwegian Synod met with Missouri Committee upon the latter's invitation. At these meetings our Synod's committee did not enter upon a review of Part II but consistently held that our Synod had taken its stand on Part I and that we would let the matter rest there awaiting the action of the Houston Convention.

The Houston Convention of the Missouri Synod of 1953 had before it the Common Confession Part II, a number of memorials asking for repudiation of the Common Confession as adopted in Milwaukee, besides the memorials of the Norwegian and Wisconsin Synods. It will be noted that both synods asked for the repudiation of the Common Confession as a settlement of differences and earnestly called upon Missouri Synod to cease negotiations with the ALC. The action of the Houston Convention shows that the Missouri Synod did not repudiate the Common Confession adopted in Milwaukee and instead of calling for a cessation of negotiations called upon its committees to continue its meetings with the ALC. As an answer to the Synods with regard to the Common Confession, Part II was recommended to their study with the understanding however, that the Missouri Synod had not adopted it.

At the Synodical Conference meeting in Detroit in August of 1954 it was reported that meetings with the ALC commissioners had by mutual consent been discontinued. This was explained as having taken place because of the fact (Continued on page 26)

EXEGESIS OF

PSALM III

by C. O. Lillegard

(PART II)

The Second Strophe: 4 - 6.

Verse 4: "He who sitteth in the heavens laughs; the Lord mocks at them."

In verses 1-3, the stage is the earth with its tumultuous and insolent defiance of Jehovah and His Anointed. Now the scene is suddenly shifted. The portals of heaven itself are opened to our vision, and we are permitted to see what the attitude of God is to all this stir on earth. The Lord against whom the kings take their stand and these war-cries are directed is by the opening word represented as "the enthroned one." The participle, "josheb", "sitting", with its intimation of that which is a settled and permanent state contrasts fittingly His serene and tranquil majesty with the confused din and frenzy of the rebels. He need not rise from His throne, but regards calmly the commotion of the earth. And it is "in the heavens" - "bashshemajim" - He thrones, as the almighty and infinitely exalted One. Consequently, all earthly attempts at hurling Him from His throne must self-evidently prove vain. The third word describes the one action appropriate under these circumstances. He, the all-powerful One, can but laugh at these puny mortals who presume to defy His authority. The imperfect "jis-chaq" points to the habitual recurrence of this laughter, whenever men hazard such futile insurrection. The second line of the verse intensifies the contrast. He whose dominion these earth-worms imagine they can overthrow is "edonaj", the Supreme Sovereign, the absolute ruler, in whose hand are all things. The more desperate and furious the efforts of these children of the dust are at overthrowing Him, the more constantly must they inspire contempt. The rebellion against Him is not only so absurd and nonsensical as to provoke His laughter, but it is also a symptom of iniquity and treason, so that His laughter passes over into energetic scoffing and derision. No more striking and dramatic presentation could be given

of the sheer impotence and folly of all human brag and bluster than the serene scorn of the heavenly sovereign as depicted in these daring anthropomorphisms. Jehovah does not yet proceed to crush the revolt. He coolly suffers the rebels to do their worst. Laughter and contempt are the only indications that He has noticed the insolent schemes of His enemies. When the powers of the world appear to be on the point of sweeping the kingdom of God on earth out of existence, it is comforting to think of God as merely laughing at it all. As Luther says: "Who should have imagined, when Christ was suffering and the Jews were triumphant, that God was all the time merely laughing them to scorn? So when we suffer and are oppressed by men, then we believe that God is laughing at and mocking at our adversaries; especially if to all appearance we are mocked and oppressed both by God and men." Upon the expression, "He that is enthroned in the heavens," Luther especially remarks: "As if it were said, He who cares for us dwells quite secure, apart from all fear; and although we are involved in trouble and contention, He remains unassailed, whose regard is fixed on us; we move and fluctuate here and there, but He stands fast, and will order it so, that the righteous shall not continue for ever in trouble. Psalm 55, 22. But all this proceeds so secretly that thou canst not well perceive it, unless thou wert in heaven thyself. Thou must suffer by land and sea, and among all creatures; thou mayest hope for no consolation in thy sufferings and troubles, till thou canst rise through faith and hope above all, and lay hold on Him who dwells in the heavens--then thou also dwellest in the heavens, but only in faith and hope. Therefore must we stay and fix our hearts, in all our straits, assaults, tribulations, and difficulties upon Him who sitteth in the heavens; for then it will come to pass that the adversity, vexation, and trials of this world, can not only be taken lightly, but can even be smiled at."

Verse 5. "Then shall Jehovah smite them in His anger, and His Majesty will He thunder at them."

The time at last arrives when Jehovah passes from mere scornful contemplation of the heathen doings to the manifestation of His wrath in word and deed. This crisis is marked simply by "az," then, or thereupon. According to the context, the point of time would seem to be meant when the contemptuous inaction of Jehovah has not induced His enemies to perceive the absurdity and guilt of their opposition. Then, when they have become insolently confident of defeating Him, then His patience is exhausted, then He must take action to assert His own majesty and to guard the welfare of His elect. This divine interference with the course of the heathen world is represented as taking place in speech merely. But with God, speech and action are one. His angry utterance comprises not only warnings and threats but crushing judgment as well. It is not only thunder but lightning. Therefore the manifestation of His anger and wrath does not only "vex" His opponents in the present sense of the word; "hahal" signifies to disconcert, to cause consternation, a flashing forth of the divine indignation, which puts them to a panic, terrorizes the boldest and most defiant enemy. The verse has fittingly been compared to a crash of thunder introduced by a blinding flash.

Verse 6. "Yet I have set my king upon Zion, my holy hill."

Even as the words of the rebels were given at the close of the first strophe, so the closing verse of the second strophe contains the utterance of Jehovah. It is, then, the ultimatum of the heavenly sovereign in reply to their defiance. The construction is very abrupt, marking the indignation of Jehovah. The "ani" is emphatic and together with the copulative, "waw," shows that an introductory clause must be supplied. "Ye renounce allegiance to my anointed,-- and I have installed Him!" Every term in the divine address is also fitted to disconcert the rebels by showing them how absolutely wrong and futile every attempt to cast off the Messiah's authority must be. The majestic "ani" in itself interposes the personality and will of the Omnipotent One as an insur-

mountable barrier to their schemes. And this "ani" has set firmly, "nassak," "installed for good," the king whose authority they would reject. In fact, Jehovah terms Him "my king;" His rule is identical with that of Jehovah. He wields the authority of omnipotence. The Messiah is, moreover, installed as king upon Jehovah's mount; the foundation of His throne is immovable as the rock. This hill is, furthermore, a holy one, consecrated to divine use exclusively. Accordingly, it is sacrilege to attack it. Finally, this mount is Zion itself, the seat of the Ark, the dwelling-place of Jehovah, His throne on earth. A revolt against the king whose seat of government is Zion is an attempt to destroy the very kingdom of God. Zion, which in the Old Testament was the site of Jehovah's sanctuary and of the place of the theocratic king, often represents the Church. In this spiritual Zion, the Messiah thrones. From the Church He stretches forth the irresistible sceptre of His word, subjecting to Himself the whole world. Cf. Is. 2,3.

The Third Strophe: 7 - 9.

Verse 7. "I will announce a decree. Jehovah said unto me: My Son art thou. I have this day begotten thee."

In the preceding two strophes, the speakers have been described before their words were adduced. In this strophe the words of a third speaker are given without any preliminary notice as to his person. But he needs no specific introduction. It is apparent from the context of his address that He is the king whom Jehovah has installed upon Zion. It is fitting that we should hear from Him. For the rebels has included Him in their adjuration of allegiance to Jehovah. In fact, it is His rule to which the heathen particularly object, as Jehovah's words in the 6th verse imply. And the Messiah's proclamation to the rebels is presented immediately without preliminaries also for the reason that it takes up and unfolds the declaration of Jehovah. The manifesto is marked at the outset by dignified solemnity. Over against the defiance of the heathen, the Messiah will make formal announcement regarding a decree or law which has an important

bearing upon the insurrection. This decree, we should naturally expect, must be the official statement by which Jehovah installed the Messiah on Zion. And this proves to be the case. The very words of Jehovah to the Messiah constitute the opening of the decree. He has declared to the Messiah: "My Son art Thou." Is this sonship to be regarded as metaphorical? Does Jehovah term the Messiah His son only in the sense that He is the object of His special favor, and that He owes to Jehovah His selection for the royal office and His authority? In such a figurative sense, Israel is spoken of as a son of Jehovah, e.g. in Ex. 4,22. But to no individual Israelite king has Jehovah ever addressed the statement: "Thou art my son." Only the promised Prince of the House of David is honored by the title "Son of Jehovah," cf. 11 Sam. 7, 14ff. And to show conclusively that He terms the Messiah His son in a real and unique sense, Jehovah adds, "This day have I begotten Thee." Not to any angel, much less to a mere man, has Jehovah ever addressed these words. Heb. 1,5. When did Jehovah make this declaration? Almost all modern interpreters including such conservative scholars as Hengstenberg, Delitsch, Bugge, etc., reply: At the resurrection of Christ. That was the day on which Christ was publicly appointed king of Zion by Jehovah Himself. The begetting spoken of would, accordingly, be used in a figurative sense. Maclaren paraphrases it: "A birth of Christ's humanity into the exercise of divine, royal glory." But this explanation is hardly satisfactory. In the first place, it appears rather strange that investiture with royalty should be spoken of as a birth. Our imagination is subjected to a severe strain, when we are to conceive of a person as begotten, not for kingship, but for the ascent to the throne, not for the crown, but for coronation. In the second place, as the words "Thou art my Son" were addressed to Christ at a much earlier period, at His baptism and Transfiguration, while He still was in the State of Humiliation, the interpretation of the Church Fathers and earlier Lutheran commentators is far preferable. According to them, the term "begotten", this day, in our verse is the day of God which knows no beginning or end, the eternal day. The begetting, then, is the eternal begetting of Christ according to the 11 Article, "begotten of

the Father from eternity." The verse is a divine declaration of the essential and eternal divinity of the Messiah. This view is confirmed by the preceding statements of the psalm. Jehovah terms the Messiah, "my king", a king reigning for and together with Jehovah. And we readily understand this striking statement when we learn that the Messiah is the Son of Jehovah. Again, it is upon Zion that the Messiah is constituted king. Naturally He shares the throne and the dominion of the Eternal One, since He is begotten of Him from eternity. Furthermore, it is not surprising that the revolt of the world-powers against the Messiah is characterized in advance as absurd and weak and futile, when He is the very Son of God. Our interpretation, then, makes this divine declaration the key-note of the entire psalm and is borne out by the following verses as well, as will appear later. The passage upon which modern commentators base their theory of a metaphorical birth of Christ for coronation at His resurrection is Acts 13,33: "God hath fulfilled the same unto us, their children, in that He hath raised up Jesus again. As it is also written in the second psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee." But the apostle does not say that these words of Jehovah were addressed to Christ at the resurrection, nor does he say that the resurrection was a direct fulfilment of this divine oracle. The apostle rather quotes our verse to establish the divinity of Jesus, to show how self-evidently God must raise up Jesus, since Jesus is His eternal Son. This establishes the deity of the Messiah. In the following verses the apostle quotes another psalm, the 16th, as the prophecy which was directly fulfilled in the resurrection. It is true that in the resurrection Jesus was declared, i.e., manifestly proclaimed as the Son of God. Rom. 1,4. But He was not then begotten of the Father. He was the Son of God from eternity. And that our verse is a divine attestation of this eternal sonship is definitely established by the Epistle to the Hebrews, where our verse admittedly is adduced to establish the godhead of Christ. Cf. Heb. 1,5; 5,5.

The new RSV translates this verse: "I will tell of the decree of the Lord; He said to me, 'You are my son, today I

have begotten you." According to their own public announcement, the RSV translators have chosen to use "thou" and "thee" when speaking of the deity, but "you" in all other cases. Consequently they in this obvious way proclaim that they look upon the Anointed One in this as a mere man, not as in any sense divine. They continue using the form "you" through the rest of the Psalm which ascribes to this Anointed One such honor and power as surely never has been given to any man, nor could possibly by any stretch of the imagination ever be given to any mere man.

The King of God's holy Zion is to have all the Gentile nations as His heritage even unto the ends of the earth; He is to destroy all those who rebel against Him. And (by every reasonable exegesis) He is to be given divine honor and homage. Yet an alleged conservative theologian like Dr. Milton of the EUC can ignore this flagrant attack on the word of God and state that the RSV translation "does not affect the teaching of the psalm as a whole." He says: "Whatever is done with v. 12, the statement in v. 7 remains; and it is this verse which is quoted so often in the New Testament, in relation to Christ." This he says, although the RSV publicly and openly denies that the New Testament writers had any right to quote Ps. 2,7. as evidence for the deity and eternal shoship of Jesus Christ. In the New Testament, they are forced to translate Heb. 1,4 correctly: "For to what angel did God ever say, 'Thou art my Son, today I have begotten thee?'" Similarly in other such passages; for they cannot deny that the Apostles

regarded Jesus as divine. But they do deny that the Old Testament prophets could possibly think of the Messiah as divine, as even Dr. Milton does. According to him, that was not revealed to them but became known only in the fulfillment of history. He and all Modernists assume that a prophecy is not clear or cannot be understood aright, until it is fulfilled in history. But the apostles rather interpreted history in the light of prophecy, being unable to understand even such elementary facts of history as Christ's death and resurrection until the light of prophecy was cast upon them.

Cf. The story of the two disciples on the way to Emmaus and Christ's words to them: "O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken. ... And beginning at Moses and all the prophets he expounded unto them in

all the scriptures the things concerning himself." Modernists may scold the apostles for attacking more vigorously to the prophecies of the Old Testament than to the historical facts concerning Jesus to which they were witnesses, but there is no question but that they did so so, as Peter shows so clearly by his words: "We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts." "A more sure word," -- more sure than his own experience on the holy mount at the Transfiguration of Jesus, more sure than any voice from heaven which he heard with his own ears. It is when we learn to share the apostles' views concerning the Old Testament prophecies that we will learn also to abhor the Modernistic perversions of the Bible which higher critics have now succeeded in foisting upon a gullible public-- not merely in commentaries on the Scriptures and other writings,-- but in the very sacred records themselves, stooping even to arbitrary emendations of the text and unhistorical and unscriptural changes in the meaning of some of the most important prophecies and promises in the Bible.

Verse 8. "Ask of me, and I shall give thee heathen for thine inheritance, and thy possession shall be the ends of the earth."

Here the divine decree proper is promulgated, the "choq" of v. 7. Jehovah's attestation of the divine, eternal sonship of the Messiah is apparently a preamble to this majestic proclamation, or the basis upon which it rests. For here Jehovah offers the Messiah universal dominion. Every term in this offer shows that it is founded upon the relationship of the Messiah to Jehovah as His Son. It is an inheritance which is offered as by a father to a son. And this inheritance to which the Messiah is heir by birth is nothing less than "the nations", "goyim". They belong to the Messiah and owe Him homage because He is the son and heir of their owner, their maker and God. And that all the goyim are meant appears from the second section of the divine manifesto, according to which the Messiah is to possess

"the ends of the earth." This term always denotes the entire earth. For He who controls the uttermost bounds of the earth must possess all within these bounds. Cf. Ps. 22,28; 72,8; Zech. 8,10. Only such a magnificent, universal domain is a fitting gift from the sovereign of the universe to His Son. And this territory is to be declared to be His real possession. He has not only a title to it as the heir of Jehovah, but shall enter into the enjoyment of His rights. But what does it mean that the Messiah is told to ask for the dominion which is His by right? That He has accepted the offer, that He has asked and received dominion appears already from vv. 1 - 3, where the rising of the nations against the Messiah is characterized as rebellion. Also v. 5, which declares that He has been constituted king on Jehovah's holy mount, and the present verse in

which He confronts the rebels with God's offer of the Father's, show clearly that He has asked for universal dominion. How, then, did the Messiah demand the nations for His inheritance and the whole earth for His possession? The answer lies in the proclamation which issued when He had redeemed the world: "All power is given unto me." He asked and received universal dominion by giving His life a ransom for mankind, by purchasing and winning the world from sin, death and the power of the devil. He is the only king who ever has established or will establish a universal dominion; and He does so by the Cross.

(To be continued.)

NEGOTIATIONS (Continued)

that such meetings would be pointless at this time because of the four-way merger being planned by the ALC which if consummated would mean that there would be no body of the ALC for the Missouri Synod to establish pulpit and altar fellowship with. It was specifically stated that the passage Titus 3,16 had nothing to do with the cessation nor did the meetings cease because of the ALC's position that it is neither necessary nor possible to agree in all non-fundamental doctrines. It was also made clear that there is no disposition on the part of the Missouri Synod as such to admit that there is anything wrong with the Common Confession as charged by the Norwegian and Wisconsin Synods.

(Delivered at the Chicago-Madison Pastoral Conference, Oct. 12,13,1954, by Pastor C. E. Gullerud)

SENTINEL ENVELOPES

Special envelopes for collecting "Sentinel" subscriptions from your members may be had at your request. Send your request to the business manager, the Rev. Paul Petersen, Thornton, Iowa.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The General Pastoral Conference of the Norwegian Synod of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church will meet in regular session, January 25th (10 A. M.) to 27th (P. M.), in Our Savior's Lutheran Church, Belview, Minnesota.

D. L. Pfeiffer, chairman

SYNODICAL CONFERENCE

The postponed meeting of the Synodical Conference is to be held at the Morrison Hotel at Chicago, Nov. 16 to 19. The opening service will be held at the First St. Paul's Lutheran Church, 1300 N. LaSalle St, Tuesday, 9:00 A. M. The sessions will follow at the hotel. The convention will close on Friday, 11:30 A. M.

Litt Hvert

Candidate James Hanson who graduated from Bethany Seminary this summer has accepted the call to the Amherst Junction --Manitowoc parish. He will be ordained into the Holy Ministry at a service in Our Savior's Lutheran Church, Amherst Junction, on November 7, at 3:30 P.M. Candidate Hanson was united in marriage with Miss Marianne Pfeiffer, Watertown, Wisconsin, last June 27. Mrs. Hanson taught in the Christian Day Schools of the Missouri Synod previous to her marriage.

* * * *

The Rev. M. Dale returned the call which had been sent to him by the Boston congregation. It was then sent to the Rev. N. Oesleby of Madison who also returned it.

* * * *

President Otto is visiting the congregations on the West Coast at the time of this writing. He is also representing the Mission Board, of which he was formerly the Field Secretary, in making a survey of a new mission field. We shall be looking forward to a report of his trip for our paper.

* * * *

The Bethany Day Homecoming brought one of the largest crowds in its history. In addition to the usual Bethany Day events, Bethany's new organ was dedicated. It is truly a magnificent instrument, one of which Bethany, our Synod, and all who love Bethany can be proud. Also, Miss Sophia Anderson was honored for 20 years of teaching at Bethany. The size of Bethany's alumni list has become impressive. It is large enough to do big things for Bethany in many ways.

* * * *

The Annual Reports of last summer's Synod Convention are now available at the Book Store. We overheard this remark by one of the older pastors when he learned the Report was ready: "Splendid! I was just getting at my Christmas list!" Perhaps we are stepping on somebody's toes, but it is our opinion that some toes need the stepping. This must be almost a record of some kind.

* * * *

The Committee of Committees will hold its first regular meeting in Minneapolis, November 12th and 13th. An organizational meeting was held late in August and at that time sub-committees were elected to study various matters before the Committee and bring the results of such studies to this meeting. The "C. of C." is also the Finance Board under the new set-up of committees in the Synod.

* * * *

On October 31, the Ascension Lutheran Church of Eau Claire will confirm a class of ten adults. This is the fourth adult class for the congregation within two years with a total of 29 adults. This brings the total communicant membership of this new congregation to 112. Ruben Ude is the pastor.

* * * *

Mt. Olive congregation of Mankato is building a new and larger parsonage on the property adjacent to the church. It will be a two story home of colonial style. The present parsonage has been purchased by Bethany College for a teacherage. The Rev. C. M. Gullerud is the pastor.

* * * *

NOTE: We turned about the order of the calls announced above. The Rev. Dale most recently had the call.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200

201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300

THE CLERGY BULLETIN



PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY
OF THE GENERAL SYNODICAL
ALBANY CONVENT OF THE
NORTH DISTRICT OF THE
AMERICAN EVANGELICAL
LUTHERAN CHURCH.

1000000
1000000
1000000
1000000

THE CLERGY BULLETIN

Editor:

R. M. Branstad, 321 N. Farwell St.
Eau Claire, Wis.

Assistants: A. Gullerud, R. Ude

Vol. XIV

November 1954

No. 3

Report on the

CHICAGO CONVENTION

by C. M. Gullerud

The Chicago convention of the Synodical Conference by a majority vote decided to ask the Missouri Synod not to use the Common Confession as a functioning union document. It did not pass judgment pro or con on the doctrinal content of the document. All the differences (none of which were settled during the eight days of sessions in Detroit and Chicago) were referred for study to a special committee on Doctrine and Practice which is to have equal representation from all bodies of the Synodical Conference. Also the differences are to be studied by larger and smaller groups in the Conference. This was adopted by a majority vote after a substitute motion to ask the Missouri Synod to reject the Common Confession as a settlement of differences with the A.L.C. was lost. That is to say the motion even to consider the substitute motion was lost. Many objected because this whole report did not ask for the rejection of that which has long been studied by all bodies and because a settlement was extended into the future. Objections were furthermore raised against the device of putting the matters into the hands of still another committee after all these years of study in other committees. A minority report was introduced by Prof. Walter Schumann (Wisconsin Synod) who dissented from the floor committee report. His report states that the issue is unionism involving the Common Confession, joint prayer, scouting, chaplaincy, communion

agreement with the National Lutheran Council, cooperation with unorthodox church bodies in matters clearly not in the field of externals. Prof. Schumann proposed a resolution calling for all constituent synods to study the essays delivered at the Synodical Conference as well as other pertinent documents and come to a final settlement in their synodical sessions in 1955. This minority report was not adopted but was ordered to be printed in the minutes and in the Synodical report.

An overture signed by fifty Missouri Synod pastors and laymen was delivered to the chairman at the opening of the convention and was referred to the floor committee for consideration. These Missouri Synod members cited eleven facts as reasons why they rejected the Common Confession and petitioned the Synodical Conference to rescind the 1950 resolutions regarding the Common Confession. A request from the floor that the memorial be distributed in the convention sessions was denied. However, upon motion by one of our Synod's delegates the convention decided to have the memorial read. This memorial was disposed of in this way that it was turned over to the presidents of the constituent synods for assignment to the committee to be created to deal with the Common Confession as outlined in the report of the floor committee of the convention.

Earlier in the convention a resolution

by a layman, calling for the Synodical Conference to take a stand against scouting and to ask the Missouri Synod to discontinue its scout program, was tabled. At the end of the convention the mover of the resolution sought to have it taken off the table, but since the session was drawing to a close this was not accomplished. This is another issue then which, after years of study by various committees, is now to be referred to another committee for study. The whole thing remains in status quo (the existing condition) and though it was asked for, no assurance was given that Missouri Synod would in the meantime cease organizing more scout troops.

The Conference adopted without debate the definition of objective justification proposed by our synod. This was by unanimous vote. However, also after this adoption Missouri Synod defenders of the Common Confession continued just as fervently to defend the Common Confession's paragraph on justification. Our Synod's request for adoption of the Concordia Cyclopedia's definition of unionism was also adopted. This was by majority vote, showing that there was a division on this matter of accepting the proposed definition. Missouri Synod leaders said that the adoption of this definition could not be used now to accuse the Missouri Synod of unionism in connection with prayer-fellowship and endeavors in which they are engaged with other bodies, since those matters are referred to a committee for study. The proposals of our synod for the rejection of the Common Confession, of the St. Louis Resolutions of 1938, and of the Missouri Synod Saginaw resolution on Joint Prayer were not adopted but referred to the special committee for study. It is notable that all of the proposals for rejection of things that are wrong were not acted on other than to refer them to committee for study. Bible passages were adduced to support the request for rejection but the continued refrain was that the Bible passages do not apply. Expressions were heard stating that these were such complex matters that it might take years to conclude the studies now proposed.

Each Synod will not have to evaluate results of this convention and determine its future course.

DEDICATION

On Sunday, November 28, Edgumbe Hills Lutheran church, Fairview and Edgumbe Road, St. Paul, was formally dedicated as a house of worship in a special service at 3:00 p.m.

The Rev. H.A. Theiste, pastor of Fairview Lutheran Church, Minneapolis, preached the dedicatory sermon, using as his text I Kingd 8: 22-30, showing from Solomon's prayer on the occasion of the dedication of the temple at Jerusalem that the purpose of dedicating this new edifice is to set it apart as a gathering place for the people of God, as a house of prayer and as a dispensary of God's forgiveness.

After the service the Rev. David Dale, Sr., under whose leadership the Edgumbe Hills church was built and organized, was installed as its first pastor by the Rev. Julian G. Anderson of Hiawatha Lutheran church, Minneapolis.

The choir of Hiawatha Lutheran church sang several appropriate anthems, and the Rev. F.R. Weyland of Ernaus Lutheran church in North Minneapolis served as liturgist.

Mr. Elmer Ericson took moving pictures of the service, bringing the pictorial history of the founding of this new congregation to completion.

After the service the Ladies' Guild served a delicious luncheon.

Edgumbe Hills Lutheran church is affiliated with the Norwegian Synod of the Lutheran Synodical Conference.

Ground-breaking ceremonies were held on October 18, 1953, and the first service was held by Pastor Dale on Christmas Day, 1953.

-- F.R. Weyland



It is sometimes bothersome to come across an unfamiliar word or phrase. For instance, "rotation of crops", "desegregation", and "unilateral action" may be unfamiliar to some of us, but they are quite commonly used and understood by, respectively, the farmer, the politician and the diplomat. The concepts represented by these terms are easily intelligible; what makes them seem difficult to one not used to them, is just that to him they are strange.

The phrases "ideographic writing" and "alphabetic writing" may be strange to such of us as have not had occasion to look into the history of writing. There is, however, nothing mysterious in the concepts represented by these phrases. The concepts involved are quite familiar to such Chinese -- even Chinese children -- as have to study Chinese writing at the same time as they have to study the writing of English or of any other Western language. Ideographic writing might be called "picture writing" because the letters or characters used have developed from pictures representing the idea or meaning of the word they stand for. Thus the Chinese ideograph for man still has the two strokes representing two legs. They are called ideographs because they represent the idea. Ideographic writing was used by the Ancient Egyptians, by the American Indians, and by others. The most important ideographic script is that which has been used by the Chinese for several centuries. Let us put ourselves in the place of the Chinese child and look at what he would have to learn when studying Chinese writing, on the one hand, and English writing, on the other hand.

There are more than 20,000 Chinese ideographs or characters, which are formed with 214 root characters as bases. The ordinary reader of Chinese newspapers knows, perhaps, about 1,000 characters, while a Chinese scholar with the old-fashioned literary education would know about 5,000. At the best, Chinese writing preserves the meaning of the word;

but, not necessarily, its sound. Experience shows that even the meaning, in the course of time, becomes obscured. There are, for instance, several variations in the different English translations of Chinese classics, such as the works of Confucius -- the translators sometimes disagreeing as to the exact meaning of an ideograph or of a combination of ideographs. The Chinese boy starting out to learn how to write his mother tongue is faced by an enormous task. Now let us look at what he would have to learn in order to write in a Western language, English, for instance.

The word alphabet is derived from the first two letters of the Greek alphabet, namely alpha and beta. Alphabetic writing is so called because in it are used the letters of the alphabet of the language being written. Alphabetic writing, such as ours, attempts to represent the sounds of words. When a language is first reduced to alphabetic writing, the writing is approximately phonetic. The reason that English spelling is no longer phonetic is simply that English is, by and large, spelled as it was pronounced, and not as it is pronounced. We return to the Chinese desiring to learn to write English; -- how many letters or characters would he have to learn?

It is held by some authorities that all alphabetic scripts, which have spread throughout the area from Iceland to India, and are in use wherever there are civilized Westerners, are related to the Hebrew script, whose alphabet has 22 letters and according to how they are counted, 10 or 14 vowel points. Greek has 24 letters, including both consonants and vowels; modern English has 26; and Norwegian 29. The Chinese student will find it much easier to learn to write a foreign language using some 30 alphabetic characters (only 26 in English) than to learn hundreds of ideographic characters in order to write his own language. It has been maintained that the effort and time spent on the intricacies of

their writing have hampered the Chinese in the building up of their civilization.

When we consider the literary monuments in alphabetic script that have been handed down to us from past ages, we meet with a very significant fact. By means of some 30 or so symbols the sounds of the words have been preserved, so that a scholar reading the Bible in the original languages (Hebrew for the Old Testament, Greek for the New Testament) can pronounce what he is reading so that Moses would understand his Hebrew and St. Paul his Greek. The writing and preservation of the Bible in alphabetic script has enabled us to understand what the words and sentences in the Bible mean because the preservation of the sound of the words has been accompanied by the preservation of their meaning. Owing to the amount of material preserved, scholars have been able to make dictionaries and grammars, by the use of which students can find out what is meant by the written Word. The simplicity and convenience of alphabetic script have helped Westerners very effectively in the building up of their civilization.

If the Holy Scriptures had originally been written in Chinese ideographs, our theologians would have to learn hundreds of ideographs, and, even then, they would probably have the same difficulty in getting at the exact meaning of some of the ideographs in the writing of Confucius.

In His providence, God has provided us with a Word, whose original text is preserved not only in writing, but in alphabetic writing. Owing to the convenience and simplicity of the alphabetic scripts in which the Holy Scriptures are preserved, it is relatively simple (though it does take some effort) to get at the exact meaning of the original.

The motto on the seal of the Old Norwegian Synod was the Greek word, ΓΕΓΡΑΦΤΗ, "It is written". This Greek word appears in the Gospel accounts (Matt. 4:1-11, Luke 4:1-13) in each of the three answers wherewith our Lord, Jesus Christ, withstood the three temptations of the Devil.

We do not, for our faith and life, have to build upon such sand as the decrees of church councils or church bodies or popes, nor upon human traditions, nor upon the conclusions arrived at by a weak and fallible so-called "Christian consciousness". We thank God, in the name of Our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, that we have, in all the vicissitudes of our church life and of our personal life, an infallible, firm, and unmistakable foundation to build upon: the written Word.

Note:

The remarks on Chinese writings in the above include information kindly supplied by Professor Lillegard.

PASTORAL CALLING (We are sorry that we inadvertently omitted this conclusion to the above named article in the last issue)
Editors note.

In some respects this is the most effective and the most appreciated call a pastor can make because it comes of his own volition; not because someone is sick or bereaved, and not to promote some program or to make some special request. When older parishioners bemoan the passing of "the good old days" in the church or when they speak of "the grand old pastors," it is no doubt this kind of a call they are talking about. There are many, many other types of calls a pastor must make but we cannot take the time to enumerate them here.

In all of our calling let us always

keep uppermost in our minds that we are pastors, shepherds, feeders of the flock and that immortal souls have been committed to our care. Our calls are not visits, in the ordinary sense of the word. Together with Isaiah we too may say: "The Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek...to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives...to comfort all that mourn...to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness; that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord, that he might be glorified." Is. 61. Like Paul we are to teach publicly from house to house. Acts 20, 20. Indeed, the end of any effective ministry inevitably begins when the shepherd forgets or neglects his sheep.

(Continued from October)

Verse 9: "Thou shalt break them with a sceptre of iron; like a potter's vessel thou shalt dash them in pieces."

The recitation of the divine decree in regard to the Messiah closes with the announcement that He shall have might to assert His right. With the authority over the earth and the inhabitants thereof, there is combined full power to enforce it. From the succeeding verses, we learn that the Messiah proposes to make a merciful use of this power. His real aim is to exercise it in such a way as to win the loving homage of the people. But here the rebellious heathen are addressed and therefore emphasis is placed first on that aspect of the divine decree according to which the Messiah is endowed with strength to destroy those who are not won for Him. We have here a central teaching of Scripture, that Christ is a rock placed in the way of all men. No one may pass by Him. Everybody must either build his life upon Him in faith, or be shattered against Him through unbelief. Those who will not bend before Him must break. If they will not let Him break their hearts to repentance in mercy, He must break them as vessels of wrath. Cf. Matth. 21,42 ff. Rom. 9,33; 1 Pet. 2,6 ff. In ascribing to the Messiah all-conquering power, the psalm represents Him as wielding a rod of iron. The rod or sceptre is the symbol of sovereignty. And the material of which it is made represented in antiquity the character of the rule, the manner in which it was exercised. In this case, the sceptre is of iron, the hardest metal then known, symbolizing the sternness with which the Messiah crushes every revolt against His authority. The rebellious subjects are fittingly pictured as fragile pottery, to show the ease with which the iron-sceptred Messiah shatters them, and the completeness of the destruction which awaits them, if they persist in rebellion. This representation of the Messiah as a destroyer recurs in Daniel's vision of the stone cut out without hands, which shatters the

colossal image of the world powers. And even in the New Testament, which dwells preferably upon the mercy of Christ, we are continually reminded that His grace does not obliterate His justice, that His wrath must destroy where His love cannot save. In fact, the imagery of our verse is repeatedly applied to Christ in Revelation. Cf. 2,27; 2,5; 19,15. The address of the Messiah to the rebellious princes of the earth is majestic in its terseness and becomes particularly impressive because He merely quotes the eternal decree of Jehovah. The rebels are not to remain ignorant of the heavenly origin and divine character of the Messiah's rule. They are to know that an attack directed against Him is directed against Omnipotence itself.

Fourth Strophe, vv. 10-12.

Verse 10: "And now, O kings, be wise; be warned, O judges of the earth!"

The Psalmist himself again appears and addresses an earnest, though kindly appeal to the rebels. He employs the argumentative "veattah," "therefore," to show that he points a lesson from the divine addresses which have just been heard and which the rulers are to heed. "Ve-attah" may be paraphrased: "Since these things are so," since the rule of the Messiah is founded upon an eternal, inviolable decree of Jehovah; (vv. 6-8), so the revolt against Him inevitably must bring destruction, (v. 9). He addresses his practical advice to the kings as being representatives of the nations and leaders in the revolt. The term "judges" is here synonymous with "kings," seeing that oriental monarchs commonly exercised the supreme judicial functions. Still the term, "judges," implies that the singer would have the rulers listen to him with the same unprejudiced and calm consideration which they should give to legal problems. The rulers are termed "judges of the earth," not as though they were to judge the earth, but to intimate that they belong to that domain over which the divine decree has given the Messiah full jurisdiction. In

this verse, then, the exhortation is general in character, urging the leading rebels to weigh the import of the divine decree with the calm judgment which their position of trust and responsibility demanded. "Haskelu" means to show insight, that is, cease from your brag and bluster and act wisely. "Hivaseru" means "heed the warning" which is contained in the divine decree. The singer by this kindly plea shows that the words of v.9 are not to be considered an absolute and unconditional threat. No, the purpose of v.9 is to induce reflection on the part of the noisy rebels, in order that they may escape destruction. God threatens in order to save.

Verse 11: "Serve Jehovah with fear and rejoice with trembling."

The general call to reflection in v. 10 is here succeeded by more specific instruction as to the conduct which reflection should point out. In the first place, the singer says that a calm view of the situation should induce the rebels to change their attitude towards Jehovah. Instead of rebelling against Him, they should "serve Him," according to verse 11, and such loyal submission and obedience should be accompanied by fear. The psalmist does not inculcate a slavish fear of Jehovah. He has in mind the fact that fleshly zeal for Jehovah often is tempted to presume upon its formal services in His cause, and to base upon them self-righteous claims which are tantamount to rebellion. The sure antidote against such a tendency is holy fear, the constant recognition of Jehovah's infinite exaltedness, the wholesome awe of His righteousness, which makes our service of Him humble, and makes us deem it a privilege to be His. That this fear is not to be a cringing, tormenting terror appears from the second line, whichever of the various interpretations we adopt. For the term "gil", literally, "going in a circle," contains an element of joyous exaltation. According to the one chief interpretation, the sense is "rejoice" that the glorious sovereign against whom ye have rebelled is willing to pardon you and accept you into His service again. But let this joy be accompanied by trembling at the thought of the terrible doom ye have so narrowly averted by your submission to him. To
(Clergy Bulletin: XIV, 3)

this rather labored explanation, a more simple one is to be preferred, according to which "gil" represents the shout of acclaim with which loyal subjects hail a beloved king. Cf. for this sense of "gil" : Num. 23,21, "the shout of a king." This acclamation of Jehovah is to be tempered by trembling, by emotions of reverence in the presence of so sublime and righteous a king. This interpretation is favored by the parallelism. It contains the great truth that reverent fear of God does not cast out love, but perfects it; that the exultation in God's grace is dignified by veneration of His holiness and power.

Verse 12: "Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish in the way; for his anger may easily be kindled. Blessed are all they who put their trust in him."

Submission to Jehovah would not be real and sincere unless it implied the renewal of allegiance to His Anointed. For the psalm has throughout represented the rule of Jehovah and of His Messiah as one. In fact, the Messiah has steadily been placed in the foreground. It is His authority which the nations primarily have defied. Their conspiracy has not been aimed directly at Jehovah. It has been a revolt against God only in so far as He rules in, with, and through the Messiah. The psalm would consequently miss its point altogether, if it did not urge the rebels to seal their repentance by doing homage to the Messiah. It is, then, a fitting and necessary climax to the exhortation of the singer when he makes this solemn appeal to the rebels that they must "kiss the Son." In view of the facts and the plain meaning of these words, the history of the interpretation of this verse comes as a surprise. Not only modern rationalistic commentators, but even the ancient versions, with the exception of the Syriac Peshitto, give anything but a true rendering. The LXX and the Targums translate: "Take hold of instruction." The Vulgate renders: "Worship purely." The American Jewish Version reads: "Do homage in purity." And almost every critic proposes some separate curious emendation. All clearly ignore the text. As Delitsch puts it: "They miss its meaning as though blinded by its clearness." The term "nashsheku" cannot mean anything else than "kiss ye." It is used in 1 Sam. 10,1 to betoken

homage, fealty. And certainly this fits very well into the context here. The term was selected probably to indicate that the homage required of the rebels was not to be political or civic, but religious. Cf. 1 Kings 19,13; Hos. 13,2; Job 31,27. The word "bar" admittedly signifies "son". And it obviously points back to Jehovah's declaration in v.7, that the Messiah is His Son from eternity. Because He is Jehovah's Son in this unique sense, the article is omitted before the word, so that it has the force of a proper noun. But it is urged that the word "bar" is Aramaic. The Hebrew equivalent is "ben." Why has the Psalmist discarded the domestic word in favor of a foreign term? One reason may be that "ben" before "pen" would produce dissonance. Another reason may be that the foreign name would arrest attention and indicate the uniqueness of the Messiah's relation to Jehovah. Hengstenberg says with regard to this, that "the rare use of bar instead of ben for Son is to be explained as a case of using the loftier poetic dialect in Hebrew, which has much in common with the Chaldaic (Aramaic); the higher style delights in old words which no longer occur in common life."

At all events, the claim that the psalmist could not possibly have used this word is absurd. For this very name occurs again in Prov. 31,2, and many words of Aramaic origin occur in passages of Hebrew literature from the pre-exilic era. The exhortation to worship the Son is enforced by the warning, "lest he become angry." Here even those commentators who identify the Son with the Messiah hold in the main that Jehovah becomes the subject and remains the subject to the close of the verse. The only reason for this supposition is the assumption that the Old Testament could not possibly ascribe divinity to the Messiah. Certainly "the Son" is here the logical subject. And the iron-sceptred king of v. 9 certainly can manifest an anger which causes those who reject Him "to perish in their way," in their defiant course. Cf. Rev. 6,16. The proud rebels may imagine that this peril from the anger of the Messiah is not an imminent one, but they must not delay submission in order to save their dignity. For soon and easily, "kimoat", shall His wrath kindle. Then utter perdition will

be the lot of those who believe not in Him. That the Psalmist wishes us to draw this lesson appears not only from the reference to v.9, but also from the closing benediction. For this benediction ascribes blessedness to those only who hide themselves or take refuge in the Messiah. Here the picture of the Messiah as a stern judge passes beautifully into that of a loving Savior. And particularly does this blessing make it evident that the Messiah is no mere earthly king. For the Psalter expressly forbids trust in princes, in human rulers. Cf. Ps. 118, 9; 146, 3. Besides, "choso bo", "take refuge in him," is the usual term for "faith in Jehovah," which is indeed a flight of the soul to Him. The anointed king, then, is not a mere man, but the Son of God. He is not only a king, but the King. Therefore all those, and those only, who believe in Him are safe and attain blessedness.

The new RSV renders this passage: "Serve the Lord with fear, with trembling kiss his feet, lest he be angry, and you perish in the way; for his wrath is quickly kindled. Blessed are all who take refuge in him." In the foot-note, the translators give as a reason for their "correction" of the original text, that "the Hebrew of v. 11 b. and 12 a. is uncertain." But the uncertainty can be due only to their prejudice against the idea that the Psalmist should want to give divine homage to the Son. So they maltreat the text, substituting their own conjectures for the undisputed text. They leave out the word "rejoice," (ve-gilu) and substitute "kiss his feet," (referring to Jehovah) for "kiss the Son." Thus they destroy what is left of Messianic significance in the psalm, after they have emptied v.7 of its reference to Jesus as the Anointed One who is the very Son of God from eternity. As surely as we are to honor the Son even as we honor the Father, (John 5,25), so surely must we insist that it is a blasphemous perversion of the word of God to translate Old Testament Messianic passages so as to destroy their connection with the New Testament. And there is not a single one of the direct prophecies in the Old Testament which the RSV has not succeeded in perverting in some such way as has been done in the case of the 2nd Psalm.

But this Modernistic attack on the

word of God, this attempt at foisting a new Bible upon the Church, (not merely a new version of the Bible), as Dr. Van Til of Westminster Seminary puts it, is but another vain, ineffectual plot of raging unbelievers against the Lord and against His Anointed. And we may be sure that the Lord Jesus who thrones in heaven will hold them in derision and will in His own time and way save His true Church from the treacherous attacks of all enemies within and without, and bring His children safely to the heavenly kingdom where they shall with Him sit on thrones and judge the nations by His omnipotent, indestructible word.

PRINTING OF OBITUARIES IN SENTINEL

1. Obituaries of pastors and teachers of the Synod will be printed in the future, as has been the custom in the past.

2. Instead of the present practice of printing obituaries of some members of the Synod, when sent in by the local pastor, Sentinel would like to print a brief notice of all deaths in the Synod. This notice, of necessity, will have to be very brief. The notice will contain the person's name, dates of birth and death, date and place of funeral.

The reasons for this policy are as follows: There is not room in our paper to print full obituaries of all members. Printing the obituary of one, and not of another, can cause much misunderstanding and hard feeling. Some may feel that those members who have done much work in the Synod and are known to many, should have special mention in the Synod's paper. But let us also remember that there are others, many others, working quietly and diligently in some corner of the Synod without recognition from the Synod. Fairness and consistency can both be achieved if all pastors will send in notices of all deaths in their congregations. This policy will also serve the purpose of informing individuals throughout the Synod of the death of a friend or acquaintance in some distant congregation. All death notices are to be sent to Pastor T. Aaberg, Scarville, Iowa.

PEWS AVAILABLE

Our Savior's Lutheran Church, Madison,

Ø Clergy Bulletin: XIV, 5)

Wisconsin, announces that they have the following pews available:

One curved pew 12 ft. 4 in. long with two ornate ends,

One curved pew 4 ft. 6 in. long with two ornate ends,

One curved pew 24 ft. 6 in. long with two ornate ends. This latter pew is divided into two equal sections each twelve ft. 3 in. long.

These pews are of elm. They are in good finish. Varnish and/or shellac, just the same as the other pews in our church. If any one wants these pews and applies within two weeks from now, he can probably have them, and for nothing. We are now paying storage on them.

Nils C. Oesleby

LITT AV HVERT

Our Savior's congregation of Madison redecored its church this fall. An artistic design in painting sets off the chancel. The floors and pew were refinished and new carpeting laid. The pipe organ was also rebuilt

* * * *

According to the latest information we have, the Rev. Geo. Schweikort of Okabena received the Boston call.

* * * *

A massed choir composed of members of the church choirs of Ascension, Concordia, and Pinhurst congregations of Bay Claire, Wis., will present a Christmas concert in each of the three churches. The massed choir consists of about 60 voices. The concert will include a group of numbers by the Concordia Quartette. The choir will also make a broadcast on the radio on Christmas Day.

* * * *

A son was born to the Rev. and Mrs. R. Ude on Nov. 13. He has been named John Mark. The baby weighed 9 pounds, 9½ ounces at birth. The Ude's also have two girls.

THE CLERGY BULLETIN

Editor:

R. M. Branstad, 321 N. Farwell St.
Eau Claire, Wis.

Assistants: A. Hüllerud, R. Ude

VOL. XIV.

December 1954

No. 4

INTRODUCTION TO REVELATION

by D.L. Pfeiffer

One of the most misused, and yet neglected books of Scripture is the one with which we now intend to become better acquainted, - the Book of Revelation. Ignorant of the rules for its interpretation, millennialists in particular run wild in it. However, also orthodox teachers have offered some interpretations which, though not contrary to clear Scripture, are nevertheless contrary to Revelation itself.

Widespread misuse of the Apocalypse has made many a Christian shun the book for fear of misusing it. Preachers avoid it, at least in their public teaching, for the same reason. As a result, Revelation is also a much neglected book. This is evident already from the various series of pericopes in use among us. And this neglect is not right either.

Revelation should indeed be approached with caution. "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." (22,18,19.) Yet the caution which is proper here is only

that caution with which one should deal with the parables of our Lord or with other figurative passages of Scripture. Indeed, it is only that caution with which we should study any part of God's Word.

Treading on the holy ground of Revelation with bared feet, we can expect only good from it. "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein" (1,3).

God wants the contents of this revelation brought to the attention of His people. "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches" (2,7,11,29; 3,6,13,22; see also 22,16). We ought to study and teach the Apocalypse more than we do, not merely in order to refute its manifold and widespread misuse, but also in order to receive and to pass on its rich treasures of divine grace in these days of its fulfilment. If this presentation does not encourage us to do these things, it will have failed of its main purpose.

Revelation must have been written late in the Apostolic Age, undoubtedly after the death of Paul. For the book was immediately addressed to seven churches of Asia Minor, at least some of which Paul claimed as his own; and it is un-

likely that anyone else of the same faith would have addressed such an important writing to them during Paul's ministry. It was not Paul's way, nor Peter's, to interfere with the work of others. And undoubtedly the other apostles and their disciples were of the same mind. Furthermore, some rather prominent false teachers as well as other persons are named for the first time in Revelation, a fact which indicates that the book was not written early in the apostolic age.

Revelation was most likely written where its writer saw the visions of the book. This was on Patmos (1.9), a tiny island in the Aegean Sea, opposite the city of Miletus. The writer seems to have been exiled there for his preaching.

The writer was a man named John (1.4.9; 22.8). We assume that he was the apostle John, if we also assume that this apostle wrote the gospel and the epistles which are ascribed to him. For there are some points of similarity between these writings. For example, they call Jesus the Word of God.

The book was immediately addressed to seven churches in Asia Minor (1.4.11), but then to all churches (2.7) and to all servants of God (1.1).

The book was written in order to reveal the future. It is therefore described as "the revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him, to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass" (1.1). God has done this, not in order to satisfy curiosity, but in order to comfort them in their afflictions. The book therefore includes special promises and exhortations. A promise is given in the message to each of the seven churches, a promise which always begins with the words, "to him that overcometh," "him that overcometh," or "he that overcometh," indicating that the messages are intended for people who are contending against an enemy, and are in danger of surrendering to him. In the book are also exhortations such as this one: "Here is (that is, here is the place for) the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus."

A general summary of the contents of
(Clergy Bulletin; XV, 4)

the book has already been given in the description of its purpose. As a whole, it is a revelation of "things which must shortly be done" (22.6). More specifically, it deals with "the things which are, and the things which shall be hereafter" (1.19), that is, with things already existing at the time of its composition, and with things which were still in the future at that time. The book clearly indicates where it passes from John's time to the future time after him. We can safely assume that the messages to the seven churches describe conditions prevailing in time at that time, even though these conditions, also in various combinations, would prevail in the Church after that time. But chapter 4, verse 1, quotes the Sender of the messages as saying to John, "Come up hither, and I will show thee things which must be hereafter," thus marking the start of visions purely of the future. (We shall refer to this again when we consider the interpretation of the book.) For that matter, the book as a whole is intended to describe the future, so that the messages to the seven churches are exceptional, insofar as they describe conditions prevalent in John's day. (This may explain why their contents were not revealed to him in the form of visions, but were dictated by the voice of the Christ-like figure, which first appeared. Let those take note, who ridicule dictation as one method of divine revelation!) (See outline attached. Ed.)

It is highly important to note that Revelation as a whole does not follow a chronological path, as though each chapter predicted events which were to follow those foretold in the preceding chapter. Chapter 6 describes events which, according to clear Scripture, will occur on the last day; but so do chapters 16 and 20. The fall of Babylon is announced in chapter 14, but again in chapter 18. A world-wide battle is foretold in chapter 16, but also in chapters 19 and 20. The diligent student of Revelation observes that one vision covers the same period of time as another, always from at least a slightly different viewpoint, and that therefore the same event, especially if it is very important, is mentioned in more than one vision. Evidently,

chapters 11, 12, and 13, while recording different visions, speak of the same era. For the era foretold in chapter 11 is described as 42 months or 1260 days, but the era foretold in chapter 12 is also described as 1260 days, and the era foretold in chapter 13 is described as 42 months. Revelation thus uses the parallelism peculiar to Hebrew literature, especially to its poetry. In fact, this may well be regarded as a rule which must be observed in the interpretation of Revelation. It may help to keep the student from falling into the Millennialistic error of thinking, for example, that chapter 19 foretells events which were to precede those foretold in chapter 20.

But there are other rules for the interpretation of Revelation. And if we would avoid the curse of this book, and insure its blessing for ourselves and our hearers, we must diligently observe these rules.

Rule 1: Revelation is a figurative description. It is a literal description of the visions which John saw on Patmos. He "bare record ... of all things that he saw" (v.2). This was in accordance with the command of the Christ-like figure: "What thou seest, write in a book." (1,11). In the last chapter (v.8), the writer again affirms: "I John saw these things, and heard them." But what he saw and heard and describes in his book was not reality, but symbols of reality. He informs us already in the first verse of the book: "He (Jesus) sent and signified it (what must shortly come to pass) by his angel unto his servant John." The Greek word, which describes the mode of revelation, is "sēmainō," and denotes symbolizing. Thus, what John wrote, the Book of Revelation, is a gigantic parable or series of parables of a sort, in which not realities, but their representations under other forms, are described as he witnessed these on Patmos. The island itself (1,12), the sea around it (13,1), and the sky above it (12,1), became as it were a huge screen, upon which the angel of God projected moving and taking pictures, not of realities, but of unrealities symbolic of them. For example, John did not see Jesus. (Paul was the last to see the risen Christ, 1Cor. 15,8, .

-- a fact which, incidentally, disqualifies the pope as a successor to Peter, inasmuch as only a man who saw the risen Christ was eligible for the apostolate.) John saw a Christ-like figure (1,13), a lamb (5,6), and a horseman (19,11), all of which only symbolized Christ. Not the Devil, but an imaginary dragon which represented him, appeared to John (12,9). He did not see hell, but a lake of fire symbolizing it (20,14). The Church did not become visible to him, but he beheld a persecuted woman (chapter 12) and a new Jerusalem (ch.21) instead. Even numbers do not have their face value here, but rather a purely symbolic meaning. The Holy Spirit, for example, was represented by seven spirits (1,4), because of the symbolic value of the number seven. 1260 days or 42 months are the same as "a time and times, and a dividing of time." (12,6,14), so far as their symbolism is concerned, since each can be resolved into $3\frac{1}{2}$ units.

Millennialistic interpreters of Revelation certainly recognize its symbolic character, which is as plain as the nose on their face, and no doubt mean to remember it. Yet they ignore it repeatedly, and take certain symbols literally. They thus follow the example of inconsistency, which we have witnessed in synergistic Lutherans: the later renounce rationalism, and yet reject our doctrine of election and conversion on rationalistic grounds. Indeed, we are all prone to be inconsistent. Consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds in indifferent matters, but a jewel in fundamentals. Let us not only recognize the symbolism of Revelation, but always remember it when we are studying the book.

A good deal of Scripture does not need to be interpreted, except in that broad sense in which the sound or appearance of a word needs to be interpreted. But figurative or symbolic language must be interpreted in that narrow sense, in which anything with a double meaning has to be explained, if one is to arrive at its most important significance. This is true, for example, of Christ's parables. The Bible translator needs to interpret them only in the broader sense; but the preacher must interpret them also in the narrower

sense. The same thing is true of Revelation. John interpreted the visions in the broader sense simply by describing what he observed. He did not interpret them in the narrow sense of telling what they symbolized. In isolated cases, they were interpreted to him (1,20; 17,18) But once, when he did his own interpreting, he fell into error, and gave the revealing angel occasion to state what we may call the second rule for the interpretation of Revelation.

A most glorious vision is described in 19,1-9. Coming after so many terrible visions, it swept John off his feet figuratively and literally, because he ignored an important rule of interpretation. He fell at the angel's feet to worship him (v.10). But the angel said, "See thou do it not: I am thy fellow-servant and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus: worship God: for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." John's interpretation of the vision moved him to worship the angel, because he did not follow the rule that "the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." At the time when this was said to John, Revelation itself had not yet become a part of that testimony which his brethren already had. It was yet to become a part of it. But the testimony which they already had at that time is that which we have in the rest of Scripture. And this is "the spirit of prophecy," literally, "of the prophecy," namely, that in Revelation. For us, then, all Scripture, except Revelation, is the spirit of Revelation. The rest of Scripture gives spirit, life, meaning to Revelation. In the light of the rest of Scripture, Revelation's symbols are to be understood and explained. Any interpretation, which is not based on some passage in the rest of Scripture, is uncertain; and if it is contrary to the rest of Scripture, it has robbed Revelation of its spirit, life, meaning, and is false already for that reason, however plausible it appear. Even such isolated interpretations, as are given in Revelation itself, are not without foundation elsewhere in Scripture. Its interpretation is found there, and nowhere else!

This rule is of great importance. It implies that the beginner in Bible study should not start with Revelation, but

first must become well acquainted with the rest of the Bible. It implies that the best interpreter of Revelation is the one who is the most familiar with the rest of Scripture. It does not imply that we teachers in the Church must avoid Revelation unless and until we feel that we have mastered the rest of Scripture. It implies and demands that we study and teach Revelation with constant reference to the rest of Scripture, and that we offer only a guess any interpretation, which, though not contrary to the rest of Scripture, nevertheless is not connected by us with any solid foundation there.

However, in doing all this, we should seek also to avoid interpretations which make Revelation self-contradictory. For it is a general rule of interpretation that a writer or speaker himself also be given a voice in the interpretation of his own words. Indeed, he should be their first interpreter. Great injustice and harm have been done outside of Scripture, too, where this rule has been violated. Especially we, who are concerned about pure teaching, should beware of transgressing it. In the excitement of controversy, false statements are sometimes made by an opponent. If they do not represent his views, but contradict all that he has ever said on the same subject, it is contrary to the Eighth Commandment to seize upon them as sure evidence of a false position. We ought rather to interpret them according to their context. This is putting the best construction on them. It is following the same general rule as compels us to judge the Common Confession inadequate for its purpose. We have to interpret it according to its context, all that the A/C has stood for.

The context of Revelation makes it necessary to reject certain interpretations which are traditional among us, even though they do not contradict the rest of Scripture, but seem to find foundation there. The first resurrection, foretold in Rev. 20, is not conversion. Such a view is contrary to the context, both immediate and remote. The first verse of chapter four warns us that whatever follows belonged to the future after John. If we make

exceptions, we must produce sound reasons for doing so. No tenable reason for the traditional interpretation can be advanced. Those who would experience this resurrection would "live" for a limited period of time, called a "thousand years" which was to end with a "little season" before the last day. But the life, which originates in conversion is not so limited. Exceptions, as found in people who believe for a while, and then fall away, are certainly not symbolized here.

The first resurrection is the raising up of true witnesses of God, who come in the spirit and power of His earlier witnesses, the ones who testified in the days of the beast's supremacy, the 42 months. This symbolism has a parallel in the prophecy concerning the return of Elijah (Mal. 4, 5, 6). He returned figuratively in John the Baptist. Had Elijah died upon departing this life, the prophecy could have spoken of his first resurrection rather than simply of his coming, and the parallel would have been complete. A fine interpretation of the first resurrection is given in Hymn 259 of the Lutheran Hymnal: "Flung to the heedless winds Or on the waters cast, The Martyr's ashes, watched, Shall gathered be at last, And from that scattered dust, Around us and abroad, Shall spring a plenteous seed Of witnesses for God. The Father hath received Their latest living breath, And vain is Satan's boast of victory in their death. Still, still, though dead, they speak, And, trumpet-tongued, proclaim To many a waking land The one availing Name." The first resurrection came with the Lutheran Reformation, in which the voices of past witnesses of God, all of them, were again heard far and wide.

"The thousand years," which began with the binding of Satan and the first resurrection, were ushered in, not by the first coming of Christ or by His Ascension, but by the Reformation. To say that this period began with Christ's Ascension, or earlier, is to make Revelation contradict itself. Visions recorded from chapter 4 on deal with the future after John. This is true also of Revelation 20. All that it describes belonged to that future. It recognizes

three periods of time: a period of worldwide deception preceding "the thousand years" and similar to the Old Testament era, during which the Gentile world lay in heathen darkness (vv. 1-3), this period being described in detail already in chapter 13, — then "the thousand years" during which Satan was bound, and the souls of past witnesses lived and reigned with Christ (vv. 4-6), and finally "a little season" of worldwide deception ending with the dawn of the last day (vv. 7-10).

So then, chapter 20 recognizes two different periods of worldwide deception, both of which lay in the future after John. Now, such a period is implied already in chapter 11 (see especially verses 9 and 10). It is foretold in chapter 13 (see especially verses 7 and 14). It is clearly mentioned again in chapter 18, which describes the fall of Babylon at great length. Verse 23 of this chapter quotes an angel as saying to fallen Babylon: "By thy sorceries were all nations deceived." Certainly, this describes a period of worldwide deception, and one which lay in the New Testament era after John. It is variously called 42 months, 1260 days, a time, and times, and half a time, and even $3\frac{1}{2}$ days (11, 2; 13, 5; 11, 3; 12, 6; 12, 14 compared with 12, 6; 11, 9, 11). Now, this period of worldwide deception on the part of Babylon is either the period before the thousand years, or the little season following them. It cannot be identified with the little season. For chapter 18, which accuses fallen Babylon, of already having deceived all nations, only predicts its annihilation on the last day. The angel, who describes the fall of the city at great length, speaks of its utter destruction in the same description as an event still in the future. We read in 18, 21: "A mighty angel took up a stone like a great millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more." Fallen, but not destroyed, Babylon has already deceived the nations at the time of its fall. Therefore, its fall does not coincide with the last day, when it will be utterly destroyed; and the period of worldwide deception preceding its fall is not to be identified with the

"little season," but rather with the period preceding the "thousand years." This is in agreement with chapter 16, which depicts the divine judgment of Babylon and its henchmen. The first vials symbolize the visiting of severe judgments upon the city as one which has already provoked God's wrath. The sixth vial symbolizes a resurgence of those foes in a period of worldwide deception, which is terminated by the utter destruction of Babylon on the last day according to the symbolism of the seventh vial.

Historically speaking, chapter 20 foretells the Reformation period and the last evil days of the world, but implies in its picture of the binding of Satan what has already been symbolized repeatedly and at great length as forty-two months, 1260 days, etc., the dark ages before the Reformation.

This interpretation also takes care of the statement in chapter 20,5: "The rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished." Although this statement, by itself, need not mean that they lived after the thousand years, the context plainly shows that they lived and reigned with the dragon during the little season in much the same sense as those other dead lived and reigned with Christ during the thousand years.

Whether we are already living in the little season, or not, is a question which perhaps only the Judgment Day will answer. The alarming spread of Communism with its unparalleled attack on Christianity, and the exaltation of the papacy in the eyes of the world and of an apostate church as a champion against Communism make us feel that the little season is upon us, and that the last great battle between Christ and Belial, foretold already in Psalm 11, the battle of Armageddon, has begun. And it is good that we have this feeling, lest we succumb to the enemy.

The Battle of Armageddon, which is so named in 16,16, is also described in chapters 19 and 20. In all three passages, a worldwide struggle is foretold, which ends on the last day. In the first passage it is only briefly fore-

told, in the second it is described as a battle against the beast and the false prophet or Babylon, and in the third as a battle against the dragon. This same parallelism is used already in chapters 11 to 13, which describe the activity of Christ's enemies during the 42 months, first, in a general way, then as instigated by the dragon, and finally as carried on by the two beasts.

There is one more rule, which the interpreter of Revelation must observe: he must look for the fulfilment of its prophecy in past history, if at all possible. John was repeatedly told, "The time is at hand," namely, the time of fulfilment (1,3; 22,10), that the things symbolized in the visions were to be done "shortly" (1,1; 22,6). And the expressions "at hand" and "shortly" should be taken in their ordinary, historical sense. For the voice of the Christ-like figure told him (4,1): "I will shew thee things which must be hereafter." And the word "hereafter" is not to be taken in the sense of a long period of time. The Greek is meta tauta, and this same expression is used at the beginning of the verse, in the phrase, "after this I looked," where it certainly denotes a very short period of time. It would be strange, indeed, if the same expression were used in two different senses in the same verse without any indication of a change in sense. In fact, this same expression or its equivalent (meta touto) is used repeatedly in the book to denote a short period of time (7,1,9; 18,1; 19,1). Therefore, we said that the word "shortly" and the expression "at hand" are to be taken in their ordinary, historical sense. John could rightly expect all his prophecies to be fulfilled, or at least to begin to be fulfilled, already during his lifetime. He could never be sure but that the Lord would appear for final judgment before his death.

This is strongly emphasized in chapter 22: "Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: for the time is at hand." The full significance of the command not to seal the book dawns when one compares Daniel. John leans heavily upon that earlier prophet. The beasts, the time, and times, and half a time, and other features of Revelation find their parallels in Daniel's visions. Now, Daniel

THE SCHEME
OF
REVELATION

Dedication (1,1-8): general (1-3); specific (4-8).

The Visions (1,9-22,20a) { Introduction (1, 9-11).
The present (1,12-3, 22)

{ The Sender of the Messages to the seven churches (1,12-20)

{ The messages (2, 1-3, 22).

{ Introduction (4,1-5,14)

{ The source of the visions (4,1-11).
The Mediator of the visions (5,1-14).

The future (4,1-22,5)

{ The first six seals (6,1-17).
Preparation for the seventh seal (7,1-17).

{ The seven seals (6,1-22,5)

{ Introduction (8,1-6).

Conclusion to the whole book (22,20b) { Conclusion to the visions (22,6-20a)

{ The seventh seal (8,1-22,5)

{ The seven trumpets (8,7-22,5)

{ The first four trumpets (8,7-12).

{ Warning (8,12).

{ The fifth trumpet (9,1-11).

{ warning (9,12).

{ The sixth trumpet

{ Preparation for the seventh trumpet (10, 1-11,13).

{ The seventh trumpet (11,14-22,5).

{ Introduction (11,14-16).

{ Activity of the Church's Foes (11, 19-13, 18)

{ Of the dragon (12,1-17)

{ Of the two beasts (13,1-18)

{ Judgment of the Church's Foes (14,1-20,15)

{ Summary (14,1-20).

{ The seven vials (15, 1-16,21).

{ Explanation (17,1-20,15).

{ Triumph of the Church (21,1-22,5)

{ Introduction (21, 1-8).

{ Its glory (21,9-22,5).

LITT AV HVERT

At long last this periodical appears again. But we make no apologies to the brethren. Without material we can not go to press.

* * *

The General Pastoral Conference will meet at Belview, Minn., January 25 - 27. Your editors look forward to this meeting because their term of editorship has long since expired—last August, to be exact.

* * *

The call to the Boston congregation has now been extended to the Rev. R. M. Branstad of Eau Claire.

* * *

If any one is interested in duplicating machines, we suggest that you see the "Gestetner". Up until recently the A. B. Wick led the field, but in your editors' opinion, it must now take a back seat. We suggest you see it before you buy. It is handled by the Farnham Office Supply Co, Minneapolis. This is not a paid advertisement.

* * *

WHAT IS RALPH REINKE'S LAST ADDRESS? Please notify D. L. Pfeiffer.

* * *

In case you wish to get in contact with the Home Mission Board, please note the following information: Chairman—Oscar Wilson; corresponding secretary—The Rev. E. G. Unseth; field secretary—The Rev. H. A. Theiste. Meetings are held at Fairview Lutheran Church, Minneapolis, on the second Tuesday of the following months: January, March, May, July, September, and November. Address all communications to the field secretary.

* * *

NOTICE: The Committee of Committees will meet immediately following the Pastoral Conference January 28 and 29, at Bethany College.

SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY

Observed by Boston Parish

On November 7, 1954, the Harvard St. Lutheran Church of Cambridge, Mass., celebrated the 70th anniversary of its founding. The morning festival service was conducted by the Rev. Robert Preus. At noon a smorgasbord was served after which an anniversary program was held. The Rev. C. A. Moldstad, a former pastor of the congregation, spoke as well as other neighboring pastors and members of the congregation. A thankoffering of over a thousand dollars was contributed by the members of the congregation. The following historical sketch of the congregation is taken from the "Church Bulletin", the parish paper published by the congregation.

"Before the founding of our congregation in 1884, Norwegian Lutherans in the Boston area were served periodically by pastors from New York and Portland. When it was seen that there was a real need of a resident pastor, Rev. John Koren, son of J. V. Koren, long time president and theological leader of the Old Norwegian Synod, was called from Cleveland and very soon a small congregation was organized. For many years the congregation worshipped in the Old Zion Lutheran Church on Shawmut and Waltham Streets. In 1891, Rev. Koren was forced to resign because of sickness. He was succeeded by Rev. E. Brock, who was pastor for less than a year. The following year Rev. B. E. Bergeson, who had been serving a congregation in Worcester, was called. During his pastorate a lot was bought on Bartlett St., Roxbury, and in 1898 a church built. Only the basement was fully completed, and in 1907 the entire church was finished. In 1906, Pastor Bergeson accepted a call to Chicago and Rev. H. Nielsen was called in his place. He served the congregation until 1908, having started work in East Boston. After being served temporarily by Prof. M. K. Bleken of Luther College, the congregation called Rev. C. A. Moldstad, who served for almost 20 years. In 1928, Rev. Moldstad accepted a call to a church in Minneapolis and installed as his successor Rev. G. O. Lillegard. In

1935, it became clear that the congregation would have to relocate. The Boston Elevated Railway wished to erect motor bus garages on the lots adjoining our church. The old church was sold and a committee elected to look for a new location. It was then that our present edifice, a former Unitarian Church, was purchased. On June 21st, 1936 the new church building was dedicated and later at our 60th anniversary the entire indebtedness was paid off. In August 1952 the present pastor was installed by Rev. Lillegard who accepted a call as professor at Bethany Lutheran Seminary in Kan-kato, Minn. During the past 70 years there have been 1328 baptisms, 685 marriages, 521 burials, 5940 services, 297 confirmations and 10,439 have been communed. The congregation has not always had an easy time of it during these 70 years. A division occurred in 1918 after most of the Norwegian Lutherans in the country merged on the basis of nationality rather than unity of doctrine, and some of the members chose to leave the church to be a part of this sinful union. Another setback was sustained when the unscriptural practice of woman suffrage was abandoned. Furthermore, Boston has not been a place where sound Lutheranism has flourished. These were crosses of God's sending. We are perhaps tempted to complain that the success of our church over these years has been meagre and that we are really quite weak. But we are not able to measure success nor should we try to do so. And remember that this congregation with all its sins and weaknesses and unbelief is a divine institution. Not the Norwegian Synod or any human efforts established this congregation, but God, who has established us all in our faith. And if we consider ourselves small and weak, remember that God chooses to work through weak things. But really we are not weak; in the Lord we are very strong. We have the gospel, the pure word of God, and this makes us better off than practically any other church in the city. And we have a future (which is what we ought to think of at an occasion like this), not based on brick and mortar or financial statements

OUR VETERANS OF THE CROSS

According to a recent report, \$2,039.87 are still needed to meet the budget request of our Charities and Support fund. This is the fund which supplies our incapacitated and retired pastors or their widows and children with the financial support which they could not get otherwise. Many of our retired veterans of the cross are too modest to ask for anything, though they could certainly use it. However, they usually receive their daily bread at the hands of their children. And that is as it should be, for thus the children are granted the privilege of honoring and serving their aged parents according to the Fourth Commandment.

However, there are those who are in dire need of our support. Let us not forget those who have labored among us in the Word and doctrine. They have sacrificed much in order to bring the Word of salvation to us when they were in the prime of life. As our pastors and servants of the Word in our pulpits, none of them were over-paid, neither was their compensation up to the living standard of others, so that they could possibly lay by for their retirement. In their quiet way they are looking to the Church--to us--whom they have served. It is in their modest behalf that we come to you, dear members of the Synod! Let us show our gratitude to our spiritual fathers by at least supplying their expressed needs.

Since the manner of giving varies in our Synod from coast to coast, we cannot prescribe a method of raising the necessary funds. May we suggest that you take this matter up at your voters' meeting. A special offering for this purpose would be deeply appreciated at this time. Individuals in the Synod are also encouraged to remember this fund.

The Apostle Paul says in 1 Corinthians 9, 11: "If we have sown unto you in spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?" We must confess that we have received many spiritual blessings from our fathers in the faith, who are now retired veterans of the cross. The least we can do is share with them our earthly goods. (Georgy Bulletin, XIV, 4)

REVELATION

-- Con't from page 41.

foretold the coming of the Messiah. And although this event was to occur only about six centuries after his time, he was commended: "Shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end." He was to seal his book, because its fulfillment lay in the more remote future. But John was not to seal his book, because its fulfillment lay in the immediate future. How foolish, therefore, for modern people, living twenty centuries after John, to relegate the fulfillment of his prophecies to the future still before them, except where this must be done, as, for example, in the case of the prophecy concerning the last judgment (20, 11-15), which, however, plays a minor role in Revelation! We should look into past history for the fulfillment of Revelation, as the book itself requires.

With this, we conclude our introduction to Revelation, in the hope that it has given us all a keener appetite for the Bread of life which is offered in this last word of God to men. "Behold, I come quickly; blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book.... He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still. And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his works shall be.... I am the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.... Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

NOTE: The above paper was written as a basis for discussion at the Northwest Pastoral Conference, Dec., 1954.

ANNIVERSARY, continued from page 44

or large memberships, but on a promise of God, "On this rock will I build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," Matt. 16, 18, a future under God's grace in Boston, and a glorious future in his presence in eternity."

THE CLERGY BULLETIN

Editor:
R. M. Branstad, 331 N. Farwell St.
Sau Claire, Wis.

Assistants: A. Gullerud, R. Ude

VOL. XIV

January 1955

No. 5

LUTHER AS A

HOMILETICIAN

(Note: The undersigned lays no claim to any originality in this essay. Indeed, it is not an essay, but a rather unsystematic arrangement of quotations. May the reader be edified, and possibly entertained by the quotations!)

Luther's preaching made a deep impression on his contemporaries. Felix Ulscenius wrote to Wolfgang Capito from Wittenberg, Jan. 13, 1521: "The man of God, Luther, mightily expounds the Scripture. I often hear him; he preaches very freely. My pupils do not miss a single one of his sermons, by which they direct their life, and they consider themselves superlatively fortunate to live in a time when they can see a man like Luther and hear his evangelic doctrine. There is nothing here at Wittenberg to keep anyone from studying; the place is pleasant, the people well-behaved, board is good, and drunkenness, so hurtful to the Muses, is here unknown. Even if my pupils desired to live a dissipated life, they would, I feel safe in affirming, be withheld by the example of others, both sons of the nobles and of commons, so perfect is the discipline and the love of the sciences at Wittenberg." (Luther's Correspondence, Smith-Jacobs, Vol. I, No. 376)

Albert Burer to Beatur Rhenanus, from Wittenberg, March 27, 1522: "On March 6 Luther returned to Wittenberg in equestrian habit, accompanied by several horsemen. He came to settle the trouble stirred up by the extremely

violent sermons of Carlstadt and Zwingli. For they had no regard for weak consciences, whom Luther, no less than Paul, would feed on milk until they grew strong. He preaches daily on the Ten Commandments. As far as one can tell from his face the man is kind, gentle and cheerful. His voice is sweet sonorous, so that I wonder at the sweet speaking of the man. Whatever he does, teaches, and says is most pious, even though his impious enemies say the opposite. Everyone, even though not a Saxon, who hears him once, desires to hear him again and again, such tenacious hooks does he fix in the minds of his auditors. In short there is nothing lacking in that man which makes for the most perfect Christian piety, even though all mortals and the gates of hell may say the contrary." (Smith-Jacobs, Vol. II, No. 541)

The preaching usual at that day must have been quite bad. Erasmus, writing to Albert of Meyence, Nov. 1, 1519: It tortured pious minds to hear in the universities not a word of the gospel, and to learn that the ancient and approved Fathers of the Church were considered superceded, and that even in divine service not a word of Christ

was spoken, but a great deal of the power of the Pope and of the opinions of modern doctors. Their whole speech was nothing but open avarice, ambition, flattery and guile. I think it is their fault if Luther has written too intemperately." (Smith-Jacobs, Vol. I., 242). - Luther himself once said: "I can swear at my time at Erfurt not one right Christian sermon was preached; not one gospel or Psalter did one get to hear."

If we are inclined to think that Luther's and Erasmus's characterizations are a trifle steep and sweeping, it might be reassuring to have a look at a sample. At that time there was in Erfurt a famous preacher by the name of Jenser von der Feltz. He put out a collection of sermons in 1516. In it there is a "model sermon." The sermon sets out to show "how Mary, in her humility drew God from heaven, took the three cloister vows for all monks and nuns, founded all convents, and instituted the entire Christian faith." It tells how Mary grew up in the temple and never prayed for anything with more ardor than for the birth of the Saviour, and how she, in order to serve Him without hindrance during her entire life, solemnly vowed eternal virginity, absolute poverty, and un-reserved obedience. At last her prayer is heard. On account of her humility she was ordained from all eternity to be the mother of the Saviour. The sermon contains a conversation between the Father, Son and Holy Ghost on the problem stated by the Father: "What shall we do with this maiden? In order the better and more devoutly to serve Us she has vowed virginity, poverty and obedience. But we have ordained from all eternity that she shall be the mother of Our Son, and this seems to be a contradiction, to be a true mother and yet remain a virgin." The Spirit answers: "That ought to cause Us no difficulty. She herself has taught Us what We should do, when so often she reminded Us of Our Omnipotence. We will apply this. Then she can cling to her determination and We to Our resolution." Then the Son speaks: "That is the best counsel. But one thing I ask of her, since I am to be born of her and through my bitter suffering and death redeem the world, namely that her prayer concerning (Clergy Bulletin, XIV, 5)

these three vows be heard not only as concerns her, but also concerning all others who take upon them the same vows. They, too, shall live in voluntary celibacy. And in honor of her there shall be cloisters at suitable places, in which persons of the same resolution are admitted, to imitate her to the end of the world." The Father answered: "My Son, Thy will be done, for Thy will is the same as Mine." And the Holy Ghost spoke in like manner. -- The preacher's conclusion: "Thus humility drew the Son of God down from heaven, and through her own example she caused the Son of God, even before His birth, to indicate the way of the cloister as the true way of salvation."

Luther as a preacher has been given the palm by both friend and enemy. We'll let his friends speak first:

John George Walch: "The sermons in the Church Postil are simple and not formed according the rules of more affected art, so that as he recommended to others a simple style of preaching, he bequeathed to posterity many glorious examples for imitation. They are very spiritual and embody the most precious and the most important truths of our salvation; they are founded alone upon the Holy Scriptures and often present in a very special and deep manner the sense of the Spirit. They are very powerful sermons and offer the erring full power for reformation, the weak a stimulating admonition, the godless a penetrating warning, and the distressed a strong consolation. His address and expression measure up to the importance of the theme. We meet there more demonstration of the spirit and of power, than art and persuasion of human wisdom. It could not be otherwise, Luther was a giant in the Scriptures; he wrote and spoke out of the heart; he stood through the power of his faith in his own self-denial, as a principal characteristic of a truly good preacher; he did not seek his own, but the things of the Lord Jesus, and he had his eye only on edification." (Old Walch edition of Luther's Works, XI, preface, p. 25; Lenker's translation, Vol. XIII, p. 13).

Schrieber, p. 633: "Luther proved to be a naturally gifted preacher. Without exaggeration he may be called one of the greatest preachers of all time. His mastery of the Bible, his originality and depth of thought, his dramatic yet simple form of expression, all enabled him to hold a congregation in the hollow of his hand. Throughout his life time people journeyed for miles to hear his preach. He seems to have possessed the unusual ability to express the most profound truths in an original and yet simple manner so that even the man in the street grasped their meaning. His physical features, intellect, memory, voice, easy manner, and sincerity all contributed to the effectiveness of his preaching. At Wittenberg he might preach as many as three or four times a day, and each time the audience crowded into the STADTKIRCHE to hear his powerful exposition of the Word of God. After Worms his reputation spread to all Germany; and clergymen everywhere were anxious to preach like Luther. That his sermon material was regarded with respect and widely used was shown by the many publications of his Postillon. These volumes contained sermonets with text ready to be read to the congregation. Luther expected them to be used only by those ministers unable to prepare their own sermons."

William Dallmann: "We rate Luther the world's greatest preacher not because he was a powerful preacher as usually understood, but because he was the first again to preach Christ crucified, justification by faith, the dynamite of God unto salvation, to everyone that believeth, and because he taught this to the whole Protestant world for four hundred years."

Now we give a couple of Romanists the floor:

Varillas, French Historian (died 1696): "To robustness, health, and industry of a German, nature seems to have added the spirit and vivacity of an Italian. Nobody exceeded him in philosophy and scholastic theology, nobody equalled him in the art of speaking. He was a most perfect master of eloquence. He had completely discovered where lay the strength or the weakness of the human

mind, and accordingly he knew how to render his attacks successful. However various and discordant might be the passions of his audience, he could manage them to his own purposes, for he presently saw the ground on which they stood; and even if the subject was too difficult for such argument, he carried his point by popular illustrations and the use of figures. In ordinary conversation he displayed the same power over the affections which he had so often demonstrated in the professorial chair and the pulpit. No man, either of his own time or since, spoke or wrote the German language, or understood its niceties better than Luther. Often, when he had made his first impression by bold strokes of eloquence, or by a bewitching pleasantry of conversation, he completed his triumphs by the eloquence of his German style."

William Samuel Lilly, Secretary of the Catholic Union of Great Britain: "Luther departed wholly from the established type of sermon, founding himself not upon the Scholastics, but upon the Bible, and especially upon the Epistles attributed to St. Paul."

French Catholic Audin: "Staupitz ordered Luther to preach. This was a new mission for Luther, who was alarmed by its responsibility. He was afraid of sinning under it, and he told his friend what apprehension beset him. Staupitz forced him to obey. Luther then ascended the pulpit. He erred in being diffident of his powers, for his success was great. His voice was clear and sonorous; his attitudes graceful and free. He had said to Staupitz that he would not imitate his predecessors, and he kept his word. For the first time, a Christian preacher was to abandon the schoolmen, and draw his texts and illustrations from the writings of inspiration... Salvation by faith constantly recurs in his discourses... Best the diamonds which fell from the lips of the preacher should be lost, there were under the pulpit able reporters, who collected them as they fell, to set and arrange them afterwards under the artist's eye.. Luther took language such as came to his lips, without troubling himself about its origin or etymology, without taking any pains to adorn it; like those

old German chiefs of the time of Har-
mann, who throw themselves on to their
enemies in disorderly troops, and illus-
trated the tactics of Polybius. We must
not expect to find in his phraseology the
graceful drape of a Grecian statue. He
despised art; he spoke because he required
to speak...He treated his language as he
did the Papists. Provided that he hit
the monks, he cared not how; provided he
excited his hearers, it was of no moment
to him that he violated all the rules of
grammar, or the precepts of rhetoric.

"Luther is the great preacher of the
Reformation. He possessed almost all the
qualities of an orator; an inexhaustible
store of thought, an imagination as
ready to receive as to produce its im-
pressions, and inexpressible abundance
and flexibility of style.....With him
it was the thought which produced the
language; if the thought was grand or
common, the expression which conveyed
it was noble or familiar. As he re-
quired to live with people, because he
perceived that every lasting revolution
proceeds from the masses, he borrowed
from the different occupations of the
citizens a technical language which at-
tracted the multitude, and from their
old German idiom numerous expressions of
startling simplicity. He was at once
Rabelais and Montaigne; with the droll
humor of the former, and the polished and
brilliant elegance of the latter.

"Sometimes Luther had to preach thrice
a day; but he was never unprepared.....
You must not expect from him a discourse
conformable to the rules of art; it is
not a sermon that he will give you, but
a familiar conversation, in which the
laws of rhetoric will perhaps be vio-
lated, but which will be warmed by the
glow of inspiration; in which all will
proceed from the heart, and nothing from
the lips; where the language will not be
required to conceal the sterility of the
writer under vulgar ornaments; where the
speaker will never hunt after novelty and
yet where everything that will drop from
his lips will possess the freshness of
originality.

"If he ascended the pulpit, the people
expected with anxiety the words which
were to drop from his mouth. His eye,
(Clergy Bulletin, XIV, 5)

which seemed to hold in a tube of fire,
his large brow, his flushed face, as after
high excitement, his threatening gesture,
his voice which roared like thunder,
the burning breath with which his bosom
was charged cast his hearers into terror
or ecstasies. It was known when Luther
was in the pulpit by the suspended
breathing of his audience, 'who hesi-
tated as if the Lord,' says Calvin,
'were thundering by the lips of the
preacher.' Boze says, 'Luther is an ex-
cellent organ of God, divinely inspired;
he that does not sense the Spirit of God
in him does not sense anything.' He
returns to the strife impassioned with
that language in which he is so powerful
and unrivaled; to that fiery eloquence
which inflames, excites, and electrifies
like a war song, and which alarms even
his disciples.

"God forbid that we should seek to
obscure the literary glory of Luther. It
has never been so nobly celebrated as by
Catholic authors."

Audin is a trifle extravagant maybe,
But he has lots of Catholic company in
his veneration of Luther's powers. Simi-
lar statements by Florimond de Remond,
Johannes Janssen, Imbart de la Tour, and
Friedrich von Schlegel. Just one more
quote from that camp:

Friedrich von Schlegel: "As to Lu-
ther's power of mind and greatness...It
seems to me none of his modern followers
and admirers have properly valued and
praised him in respect to the power he
really had. Luther was epoch-making for
European science and intellectual cul-
ture in general."

The acclaim the Catholic writers give
Luther reminds us of the high-school girl
who judges the value of the car by the
brilliance of its color. But their
claim that Luther's "modern followers
and admirers have not properly valued
and praised him" ought to be arresting.
We suspect that many modern Lutherans
(perhaps some among us) have not learned
from Luther either the what or the how of
good preaching. In our striving for
freshness of presentation we are inclin-
ed to look in the wrong places. Some-
thing like some cows we used to have

which were constantly breaking out of lush meadow pasture to look for grass on the summer-fallow.

Up to this point we have been hearing what others have said about Luther's preaching. Essayist was interested in finding out what Luther himself had to say about the art of preaching in general and about his own methods and ideals and ambitions in preaching. Most of what Luther had to say in that line is found in his "Tischreden." In what follows the numbered paragraphs are the numbers of talks found in the Old Walch Edition, Vol. XXII, p. 976 ff., under the general heading: "Von den Predigtent order Kirchendienern." The translations are by the undersigned, unless otherwise indicated.

WHAT TO PREACH:

"Therefore a good preacher should preach (vertragen) nothing but Christ alone, that people may learn to know Him, what He is and what He gives: that no one will depart from His Word, but learn to regard Him alone as the Shepherd who has laid down His life for His sheep. This one must preach to the people so that they learn to know their Shepherd. Then he must also preach Him as the example, that, as Christ for our sakes has done and suffered everything, so we too for the sake of the Word should do and suffer everything. These two things one should preach in Christendom. He who hears it and understands it is called "a sheep of Christ," as He said above, "My sheep hear My voice." He who preaches and teaches this is called a good shepherd, except that he cannot lay down his life for the sheep, as Christ did." (Walch XIII, 1219. Sermon on John 10, 12-16, 2nd S. Edt. Easter).

128. "Thinking it over, I come to the conclusion that one can do no better than preach on Baptism, Lord's Supper, Faith, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments of God, and the stations in life that God has instituted and ordered. Is it not a great comfort for a housewife, a man-servant, a maid, a government official, etc., to know what the station is in which God has place him?

21. EQUIPMENT OF A PREACHER WHO WOULD PLEASE THE WORLD.

"Six things should belong to the preacher if he is to be in demand in the world:

1. That he be learned;
2. That he have good articulation (ein fein Aussprechen);
3. That he be eloquent;
4. That he have a handsome person, such as the maids and young ladies can go for (lieb konnen haben);
5. That he take no money, but rather give it;
6. That he speak what people like to hear."

CHARACTERISTICS OF A GOOD PREACHER.

20. "A good preacher should have these characteristics and qualities:

1. That he be able to teach correctly and in order;
2. That he have a good head;
3. That he have a good power of speech (wohl beredt sein);
4. That he have a good voice;
5. That he have a good memory;
6. That he know when to quit;
7. That he be sure what he means to say, and study dilligently;
8. That he be ready to stake his body and life, goods and honor on it;
9. That he suffer himself to be vexed and criticized by everybody.

121. "A preacher should be a Dialecticus and a Rhetor, that is, he must be able to teach and exhort. When he is going to teach any article he should:

1. Fully understand the subject matter;
2. Define, describe, declare what it is;
3. Adduce other passages from Scripture to establish and bolster it;
4. With examples amplify (ausstreichen) and clarify;
5. Adorn with illustrations;
6. Admonish and cheer the lazy, earnestly rebuke the disobedient, as well as false doctrines and those who propound them. But he should see to it that this is done

not out of ill-will, hatred or envy, but
alone to the glory of God and to the pro-
fit and salvation of the people."

"Denn das sind die drei Stück, wie man
sagt, so zu einem guten Prediger gehören:
Zum ersten, dass er auftritt. Zum andern,
dass er das Maul aufthut, und etwas
sage. Zum drittem, dass er auch Können
aufhören."

Which is, being interpreted: "these
three things belong to a good preacher,
1. That he come forward; 2. That he
open his mouth and say something; 3. That
he also be able to stop."

Or the rather more vulgar current
paraphrase: "That he stand up, speak up,
and then shut up."

Old Welch, VIII, 534 - Intro-
ductory comments to Matt. 5, 1, 2.

ON THE ART OF PREACHING

153. "Whoever understands a matter well
and has really absorbed it, can easily
speak about it. For the art-work, i. e.,
to write and speak correctly about it,
comes after the understanding of the
matter. Therefore these people fool
themselves who busy themselves with the
theory (artificium), who immediately
want to do everything according to the
art as they have learned it from Dialectic
and Rhetoric, before they have
understood a matter rightly. They go
according to the plumb-line, high up and
nowhere at all (gehen daher auf dem Seile,
hoch aus und nirgend an). I can neither
make nor preach a sermon according to
the art."

LONG PREACHING

Luther occasionally preached long. We
gather that he wasn't particularly
pleased with himself when it happened.
At the close of one of the longer ones
he says: "You will see from my Gesch-
wätz how immeasurably greater God's Word
is than man's word." We are told that
Luther once left the church "during one
of the interminable sermons of Bugenhagen,"
who often preached two hours. Luther
often ran down the long-winded boys, as
witness:

38. Dr. Luther's wife told Luther
that she had heard his cousin, John
Bolner, who at that time was waiting on
Luther, preach in the Pfarrkirche: She
could understand him much better than
Dr. Pommeranus (Bugenhagen) who digressed
so far from the subject and brought in so
many other things. Luther answered:....
Dr. Jonas used to say: "You don't have
to talk with every soldier you meet."
But Dr. Pommeranus even takes along a
few whom he meets. - He is a foolish
preacher who thinks he must say every-
thing that occurs to him.

"A preacher should stay by the propo-
sition and accomplish what he sets out
to do so that people will understand the
matter well. The preachers who want to
say everything that occurs to them re-
mind me of the girls going to market.
When they meet another girl they hold a
little market or a little congress.
After while another girl meets them and
they have another little talk. Ditto
with a third and a fourth. - And so
they're pretty slow in getting to market.
That's the way it is with the preachers
who too much get away from the subject
and think they'd like to say everything
at one time. But it's no good."

12. "Preachers should not make nar-
turs out of the people with long sermons:
Because the desire of the hearers fades
out, and thus the preacher applies
force with long sermons." Luther re-
buked Dr. Pommeranus for his long preach-
ing. "He doesn't do it intentionally,
he said, but out of eagerness (Irrthum)
and habit."

64. "Some plague the people with
much too long sermons. Ability to
listen is a delicate thing and people
soon get tired and bored. Dr. Pommer-
anus quotes a Bible passage as a sort of
defense for his long preaching, i. e.,
"He that is of God heareth God's words,"
John 8, 47. But there is a limit to
every good thing even."

96. "It is an indication of a good
preacher if he stops while the hearers
are still listening with great interest
or are thinking that he just got start-
ed."

PREACHING SHOULD BE ZEINGEBIASS.

130. "One should preach what is suitable and opportune, according to the time, place and persons involved. Not as when one pastor once preached thus: It is unright and against God that a wife should put out her child to a wet-nurse, and his whole sermon was occupied with that, though his parish was made up of nothing but poor spinsters, whom this exhortation didn't fit. - Or as it was with the preacher who, in a home for old women, spoke much about the marital state, praised it highly, and exhorted them thereto."

LUTHER HAD A WORD OF ENCOURAGEMENT FOR NEW PREACHERS:

11. Magister Ferstenius complained to Luther that his preaching was a burden, his sermons were always short, he often made mistakes, and that he might better have stayed in his former profession. Luther said to him: If Peter and Paul were here, they would scold you because you wish right off to be as accomplished as they. Crawling is something, even if one is unable to walk. If you cannot preach an hour, then preach half an hour, or a quarter of an hour. Do not try to imitate other people. Center on the shortest and simplest points, which are the very heart of the matter, and leave the rest to God. Look solely to His honor and not to applause. Pray that God will give you a mouth and to your audience ears. I can tell you preaching is not a work of man. Although I am old and experienced, I am afraid every time I have to preach. You will most certainly find out three things: first, you will have prepared your sermon as diligently as you know how, and it will slip through your fingers like water; secondly, you may abandon your outline and God will give you grace. You will preach your very best. The audience will be pleased, but you won't. And thirdly, when you have been unable in advance to pull anything together, you will preach acceptably both to your hearers and to yourself. So pray to God and leave all the rest to Him.

(Translation, Brinton, "HERE STAND I", P. 350)

75. Luther had a word to strengthen and encourage the new and faint hearted preachers so that they shouldn't despair

and give up. He said: "When one for the first time gets into the pulpit, no one realizes how scared he is. He sees so many heads in front of him. When I climb into the pulpit I don't see any people, but I think of them as so many blocks of wood in front of me, and I preach my God's Word to them."

SIMPLICITY IN PREACHING.

112. "I spoke with Bucor at Gotha in 1537 about how he and Osiander held forth with such high art. I told him that I read or preach not for their sakes but for the sake of the simple, poor, un-understanding people. Christ could have taught loftily, but He preached in a most simple manner so that the common man understood. Lieber Gott! To church come maids of 16 years and housewives of 30 years, and old people, townsmen, and farmers who do not understand the high, sharp sermons. But the one who can use good illustrations (at which Dr. Link is a master,-- he holds the common man. Therefore the one who makes it straight-forward, childlike and simple,--he is the best preacher. So I'd like to make it simple and plain, too. - But when it comes to disputation, let a man come to school for me. I'll make it sharp enough for him and answer him though he makes it ever so involved. - I must write a book sometime against the wise preachers."

What follows would have made up a part of the book Luther never got around to writing:

105. "The proud wise-acres and self-sufficient fellows who let themselves think they are very learned are like Icarus of whom the poet says that he wanted to fly to heaven. He was advised: If you want to get along well and safely, don't fly too high. If you fly too high you'll get your feathers burned."

124. "Boy! I'm agin those people who use many languages in the pulpit, as Zwingli, who spoke Greek, Hebrew, and Latin in the pulpit at Marburg. That's the custom of L.R. at Jona and many others."

37. Dr. Erasmus Alberus, before going on a trip, anticipating that he

might be preaching before a prince, asked Luther to give him a few pointers on the manner of preaching before princes. Luther said: "All your sermons should be most simple, taking no particular regard for the prince but for the simple, coarse, unlearned people, and that will be fit for the prince, too. If I should consider Philip Melancthon and the other Doctors in my sermon, I'd do no good; but I preach in a simple way to the unlearned, and it suits everybody. Though I know Greek and Hebrew, I save it until we learned fellows get together; and then we can make it so intricate that the Lord God Himself is amazed."

41. Luther said once: There are many preachers of eloquence with nothing behind it but words. They chatter a lot, but teach nothing. Then Phil Melancthon said: The world has had vainglorious renters like that in every age. Cicero, the most eloquent in the Latin language, once said he had heard one of the most eloquent speakers of the day, but he had never in his life heard anyone say nothing with such force and authority. - Erasmus of Rotterdam had been at Bonn and heard a man deliver a triumphant and very showy oration. Erasmus was asked what he thought of the oration. Well, said Erasmus, he certainly far exceeded my expectations. How so? Quoth Erasmus: I hadn't thought there was such a fool in him. - To speak is not an art; but to speak plainly and in order is given to few. No one can be anything except it is given him from above. John 3, 27.

66...."I'm an enemy of such who direct their sermons toward the highly learned, instead of to the common people whom they despise. To launch forth with high and beautiful words offends and breaks down more than it edifies. To be able to teach much in a few brief words is an art and a great virtue; but it is foolishness to talk much and say nothing. Therefore St. Peter well says; "As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the Word, that ye may grow thereby." 1 Pet. 2, 2.

74. "One should direct himself to the hearers. That is something preachers generally fail to do. They preach so that the poor people get very little out

of it. As Luther and Zingel did at Harburg, with great pomp and in the most ingenious manner - in order that they might be praised, as if to say: Look, Dr. Martin and Philip! See what learned companions you have! To preach simply is the greatest art. Christ did that. He speaks of field-work, the "corn of wheat", etc., and uses real plain farmerish illustrations."

77. Luther complains of the evil and sorrow that is going to come of the pride and arrogance of preachers, especially the novices, who want to preach everything according to dialectics and rhetoric. They make their sermons so intricate and adorned (bunt) that neither the people nor themselves understand anything of it.

78. "In public preaching we should not use Hebrew and Greek or other foreign languages. In the church we should speak as we do at home, in the simple mother-tongue which every body can understand. In the court, it may be OK for the Jurists and Lawyers and Orators to use flowery language and to talk prettily. They make hay that way (denenselbigen gehets vol hin). Osiander and Mathesius are those fellows. Dr. Staupitz, a really learned man, was a disgusting preacher, though, and the people would rather hear one of the plain brothers and preachers who made it so simple that people could catch on. See how child-like Christ spoke. In illustrations in church no pomp and glory should be sought. There it should be plain, and simple, and straightforward."

97. "When I get into the pulpit I think only of preaching to servants and maids. If it were only for the sake of Dr. Jonas or Philip or the whole university, I wouldn't once hold forth, because they can read the Scriptures. But if one wants to preach to the highly learned and toss out Rabins and masterpieces, the poor people will be left standing there like a cow."

123. "We must not instruct the common man with high and heavy things and with veiled words, because he can't grasp it. To church come poor little children, maids, and old men and women to whom

the high doctrine is of no use, nor do they catch on. And if they do say: My! but he said precious things and made a good sermon, and you ask them, What was it?, they say, I don't know. You must say to the poor people, white, white, black, black, in very simple plain words, - even then they hardly catch on. - O how diligent our Lord Christ was to teach simply. He used parables of the vine, the sheep, the trees, etc. - all in order that the people could understand, grasp and retain."

141. Luther remarked that Osiander, who is a learned man, ought to set to work with the Bible and put out some popular notes (Glossam Ordinarium). Then some one said: Herr Doktor, Osiander can't teach the lowly things. Yes, said Luther, it is true, and it amazes me that he cannot let himself down to the understanding of the hearers. When children, man-servants, and maids come to church one must preach to them. They, not the learned, need our sermon. If I should preach to Dr. Hieronymus or Philip, I would not give a sermon in a lifetime, because they understand things well. But when we have to do with the poor youth and the un-understanding man, we must get down to them. That's what the Lord Christ did, who preached everything as if He had my little Martin, and Paul and Magdalene before Him. - But when He came to the Pharisees; He gave them a carving knife (Schnitzer). One should preach to the small children for whose good the office of preaching is instituted.

143. Said Luther: "Cursed and anathema (Verflucht und vermalodet) all the preachers who strive after the high, difficult and subtle things in the churches, bringing them before the people and preaching about them, seeking their own honor and glory, wanting to do a favor to one or two ambitious fellows (wollen einem oder zweien Ehrgeizigen zu Gefallen thun). - When I and Magisters, of whom there are about 40 present, but paying attention to the multitude of young people, children and servants, who are there in the hundreds or thousands. Preach to them. They need it. If the others don't want to hear it, the door is open. Therefore,

my dear Bernhard, be diligent to preach and teach simply, audibly, clearly and purely."

147. Doctor Cruetziger said to Magister Philip that he didn't like to see him present at his lectures. Dr. Luther said: I don't like to have him at my lectures and sermons either. But I just make the sign of the cross before me and imagine that Philip, Jonas, and Pommeranus aren't there, and then I imagine that there isn't anyone there wiser than myself.

THE FOLLOWING GIVES US an interesting glimpse of Luther's preaching. We are not here recommending that all and sundry follow the example of Luther in this particular, - It would depend somewhat upon how many marbles a man has. And it might be wise not to depend on our own count. Anyway, here is the exhibit:

13. Once (it was in 1532) Luther preached at Worlowitz before the Prince of Anhalt and the young margraves. The text was 1 Tim. 1, 5, 6, 7. Later the sermon was printed. Magister Vitus asked him whether he had worked out (begriffen) all the parts of the sermon before-hand (It was an exceedingly good and beautiful admonition to the foremost service of God, namely, to hear God's Word. Luther answered: "I'm not accustomed to writing out the particular parts, but only the main point on which the whole sermon rests. And so in this sermon I directed an admonition to the highest and greatest service of God, namely, to hear God's Word. Then in speaking, things occurred to me that I had not especially thought of before. If I should have said everything that occurred to me in every part I would not have been able to go through the sermon so briefly." . . . When Luther read that particular sermon he was surprised at the way he had spoken, and praised Dr. Cruetziger for his skill in getting down the words according to Luther's manner of speaking. Luther said: "I hold that Dr. Cruetziger made it better than I preached it."

The sermon referred to is to be found in the Old Walch Edition, Vol. IX, p. 522ff. It covers 19 pages, - 55

paragraphs. You might profit by looking it up and studying the outline of it at least.

We would like to have added some statements of Luther to show how seriously he took his preaching. Also his counsel to preach slowly, etc. But, as Luther often closed his sermons: "Enough of this. Amen."

T. H. Teigen

LITT AV HVERT

R. M. Branstad, Eau Claire, Wis., has returned the call extended to him by the Boston congregation.

* * *

The new church of the Pinehurst congregation of Eau Claire is nearing completion. Services are now being held in the basement of the new church. The first service in the basement was held on Christmas Day. It is expected that the church will be completed before Easter.

* * *

Additional work has been completed on the new Ascension Lutheran Church of Eau Claire. The exterior was stuccoed last fall, a tile floor was laid in the nave, a church office was added, and staging built in the chancel.

* * *

The Concordia congregation of Eau Claire voted at its annual meeting to dispose of its present property and to relocate and build anew as soon as the present property can be disposed of. In view of that, a building committee was elected and a campaign to gather funds was inaugurated.

* * *

With this issue we come to the end of the editorship of the Eau Claire ministerium. There is nothing so bad that it does not have a good point in it. It has brought the Eau Claire pastors together often---more often than they could afford the time, infact. But all three of the pastors now have extensive building programs and it will be impossible for them to continue this work. The election of the new editors will take place at the General Pastoral Conference to be held in Belview, Minnesota, next week.

* * *

We wish the new editor, or editors, well. We do hope that they have better luck in getting material. Brethren, take pity on your C.B. editors! You elect them to put out a monthly magazine. In fact you have decided that it should be enlarged. Yet you do not produce anything for it. The quality (and quantity) of this paper depends upon the extent of your cooperation.

* * *

May we suggest that each pastoral conference select all suitable material delivered at the conference and have its secretary send it to the Clergy Bulletin editors?

* * *

Our thanks to all those men who have answered our appeals for material. Keep up the good work!

* * *

THE CLERGY BULLETIN

Vol. XIV

February 1955

No. 6.

THE PASTOR'S APPROACH TO NEUROSIS & MENTAL CASES

The dictionary defines "neurosis" as "a nervous disorder or disease, especially one without organic change." It is a milder form of nervous disorder than that which is called "psychosis." The latter is defined as "any severe form of mental disturbance or disease." The neurotic patient may not need to be institutionalized while the psychotic patient usually does.

Mental disease cripples one out of 20 persons. More than half the hospital beds in this country are occupied by its victims. The number is increasing every year. (14th Annual Convention of Associated Lutheran Charities, 1947, p.55.) It has been estimated that one out of every ten persons now living will need psychiatric care at some time during his life. (F.R. Knobel in "Pastoral Counseling.") Therefore, the spiritual care of the mentally ill is and will be an important part of a pastor's work.

And now as regards the pastor's approach to neurosis and mental cases, we can only speak a few words in general. No two cases will be exactly alike, and a pastor must study each individual case and seek, with God's help, to find the

right way to minister to the afflicted person. If the patient is under a doctor's care, it is well for the pastor to confer with the doctor who may be able to give him some good suggestions based on the nature of the disease.

The master Teacher as well as the master Curate of souls was the Lord Jesus. We must learn of Him and try to follow His example. Jesus was always loving, kind, and friendly. He was filled with compassion. In Matt. 14,14 we read: "And Jesus went forth, and saw a great multitude, and was moved with compassion toward them, and He healed their sick." Jesus had compassion upon people both in their spiritual and physical needs or afflictions. Cf. Matt. 9,36. So must we have love and compassion not least of all toward those afflicted with mental illness. Instead of using the word "sympathy," we would use the stronger word "empathy." We want to try to put ourselves into their situation, to try to understand them thoroughly. We cannot emphasize too much the therapeutic value for both the mental and spiritual health of the patient of an attitude of understanding, of

friendliness and trust on the part of those who minister to him. While emphasizing this point in his article on "Spiritual Care for the Mentally Ill," Pastor F. William E. Wolter adds this warning (Proceedings of Regional Conferences of Associated Lutheran Charities, 1950, p.63):

"On the other hand, we must be on guard against exhibiting a false sympathy and weak sentimentalism. Patients suffering from certain mental or physical symptoms may be looking constantly for confirmation of the thought that they are seriously ill, and may be experts in interpreting a chance remark to mean more than the speaker implied. The 'illness' or the 'pain' or the 'terrible ache' about which the patient is complaining may be altogether functional in character; it may have no organic basis whatsoever. For one reason or another, consciously or unconsciously, they may want to be ill and will utilize every opportunity to block or retard recovery. They may want to gain certain secondary ends by being ill and the worker must exercise care and understanding lest he become an agent for the accomplishment of unhealthy purposes. We must learn to distinguish between the patient who ought to be given sympathy and the patient who will be harmed by sympathy. For this reason, I believe, it were well for our clergy who visit mental hospitals on a part time basis and who do not have free access to case histories, ward notes, etc., to cultivate the acquaintance and co-operation of some doctor on the staff whom he could consult regarding the nature and symptoms of a certain patient's illness. He may then be able to exhibit true sympathy, a sympathy which helps the sufferer to forget himself and face the future with resoluteness, courage and confidence. True sympathy may awaken in the patient an awareness of the possibilities of recovery and kindle new hope in his heart."

Attention, affection, and assurance have been called the three A's of good counseling. We want to give attention, i.e. we want to be good listeners. The pastor should not talk too much, but give the patient every chance to talk, to unburden himself, to tell all his troubles and grievances, his anxieties and worries. It has great therapeutic value if the patient will just unburden himself to the pastor. There is that type of counseling which is called "non-directive" counseling, that is, letting the patient do the talking, and by his talking analyze his own problem, and possibly arrive at his own solution. The pastor may offer some suggestions, but care must be exercised lest the pastor hinder the full unburdening on the part of the patient by breaking in too soon.

The pastor must not be in a hurry. Jesus took the necessary time in dealing with souls. He was not too busy to give the woman of Samaria at Jacob's well ample time. And He took leisurely time, apparently, in dealing with His nocturnal visitor, Nicodemus. So must we be willing to "hear the patient out."

And let it be said that we must never be shocked by anything the patient says or does. The pastor wants to maintain his poise at all times. He never knows what he may hear or what may happen when he approaches a mental patient. He certainly must not ridicule the patient or argue with him, but always be ready to understand.

Let it also be said that one cannot expect to cure a neurotic person by simply telling him to "buck up," and "get your mind off yourself," and "stop worrying." They simply may not be able to do that. To say these things to them may tend to make them worse.

Let the second of the three A's

be kept constantly in mind: affection. And then, finally, the third A: assurance, the assurance which the Gospel of Jesus Christ gives. Where there is confession of sinfulness and admission of one's lost condition, there the way is prepared for the certainty of forgiveness through the Gospel. A good conscience in Jesus Christ is the very foundation for a life free from anxiety, a life that is able to cope with life's difficulties and

unpleasantnesses, a life that is worth living. "In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world," John 16,33. "Wait on the Lord; be of good courage, and He shall strengthen thine heart; wait, I say, on the Lord," Psalm 27,14.

A.M. Harstad

(Note: The above essay was delivered at the General Pastoral Conference at Melview, Minn., in January 1955.)

THE GOSPEL MINISTRY AND HUMAN RELATIONS

(Note: The following paper by our sainted Justin A. Peterson was delivered at the General Pastoral Conference in Mankato in July 1951. Herewith published by request. - Editor.)

"For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins: Who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity." Heb. 5,1-2.

We wish to place this passage as the inscription over this contribution. It is as stimulating as it is sharing, exalting as it is humbling. Correctly understood and properly practiced, it should strike the tone and direct the trend of The Gospel Ministry and Human Relations. The original wording of the subject assigned to me read: "The Holy Ministry and Human Relations," but the final formulation was left to the essayist. I substituted Gospel Ministry for Holy Ministry, feeling that the Gospel should be the deep overtone in our every approach to human relations. Gospel-imbued, we cannot miss the mark by much, despite our limitations, erring wisdom, faltering courage, and, at times, blundering tact.

Would it be presumptuous on my part to redefine the Gospel to pastors, a number of you with many years of Gospel ministry back of you? If we so imagine, it is evidence that we still understand the Gospel only in part, and practice it far too poorly. (Diamond -- Many facets).

The word Gospel, or grace, is a good word. As no other word it is heavy with the sweet dew of heaven. The Gospel is good, not harsh, tidings from Holy God in heaven to fallen sinners here on earth -- good tidings of grace, pardon, forgiveness of sins, without money and without price, freely imparting help and hope, supplying staff and stay, giving grace and glory to sinners, such as have completely missed the mark, bankrupt sinners who in the banking-house of Heaven never could pay as much as a fraction of a cent on a dollar; the Gospel which has no limitations, makes no conditions, which inquires into one thing only, namely, the sinner's need, and makes urgent haste to supply that need. (Can not re-

frain here from quoting a definition of the Gospel by Dr. F. Pieper: "Where there is forgiveness of sins, there is also life and salvation." This one gift is the key to all other gifts. It opens the vast treasure-house of all the mercies and favors of God. It causes the pearly gates of heaven to swing on their starry hinges, opened wide for pardoned sinners to enter.") The Gospel of grace which is diametrically opposed to works, aye, that automatically excludes every work of man, be it small or great, be it physical or spiritual, excluding all works of man, including only the work of our God-man substitute-Savior, Jesus Christ -- and that for the simple reason that the Gospel is nothing but the proclamation, aye the impartation of His work of grace for us. Rom. 4,4-5; Eph. 2,8-9.

Now if the Gospel as to its inherent essence be just that, then does it not inseparably follow that its application should be in keeping with the Spirit of the Gospel? We think at once of our Savior's -- here too, as always, our great and in reality only example -- application of His Gospel of grace to sinners. Before our mind's eye rise, among others, the Samaritan woman, Zacchaeus, the dying thief on the cross, Peter, aye even Judas, that son of perdition who would not be reclaimed -- examples to whom we shall refer later.

True, our Lord, the great soul-physician, applied the Law and that in all its condemning sternness, but always as a foreign work, only as an absolutely necessary preparatory means to prepare the heart for the reception of His Gospel grace.

If we ever keep the Gospel before us as our sole help and hope, our highest treasure and pleasure, then we are ready, aye anxious to hear and heed, preach and practice

the Gospel Ministry in our human relations. And then that Gospel Ministry will be truly blessed and highly fruitful -- how can it be otherwise?-- then human souls will be comforted and cheered by our ministry, and then the God of all grace will be glorified among men on this sin-cursed earth.

Another word we do well in stressing in our subject is the word "ministry." Now ministry by no means signifies mastery, personal power, prerogative, and prestige. No, ministry means just one thing, namely, service, loving, sympathetic, self-sacrificing service. Here too the Master is our example: "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister." Mt. 20,28.

To repeat: Only he who has seen himself as a poor, lost, helpless, hopeless sinner, seen himself in need of the merits of this Savior, and who has been brought to receive, rest in, and rejoice over the Gospel of grace -- only he can sympathetically understand and most effectively serve fellow-sinners with this same Gospel-grace. Then we can really "have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that we ourselves also are compassed with infirmity."

And for emphasis sake, we again also repeat: In the highly important, blessed, and soul-satisfying work of ministering to dearly redeemed souls with the Gospel, we have no better example and incentive than that of our Master. "Learn of me," He exhorts; "for I am meek and lowly in heart." Mt. 11,29.

And why can we learn only from Him? First, because as very God of very God none ever understood God's heart as He. Cf. John 1,18. Therefore none could preach and apply the Gospel, which is nothing but the heart-beat of God, as He. Secondly, none know the human heart

as He, who was and is very man of very man, none could fool with and for humans as He, "For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." Heb. 4,15.

No wiser psychologist, no more sympathetic psychiatrist than our Lord Jesus Christ Himself. Psychology and psychiatry are not something new. The Master and His disciples practiced it, and effectively, long ago. Without doubt many a backwoods pastor in his soul-cure has proved himself a better psychiatrist than this world's moderns with their complicated theories, manifold degrees, and high-sounding terminology. (This not said in deprecation of these or other 'ologies. Believe there are a number of things we as pastors can learn from them -- negatively as well as positively.)

Now we proceed to our subject: The Gospel Ministry and Human Relations, and on

- I. The Individual;
- II. The Congregational;
- III. The Synodical;
- IV. The Inter-Synodical level.

And may the Head and Lord of our Church guide us in our development and deliberations!

I.

If we are to start aright in our study of human relations, or any thing else for that matter, we must start with the individual. In the individual we have the basic unit. From the individual develop the home, the Church, and the State. As the individual is, so the home, the Church, and the State will be. Where the individual is lost sight of, or even slighted, -- as he or she is far too often -- witness Marxism's march (Nietzsche) thru the world with its deep inroad upon the thinking even of Democratic nations, our own not excepted; lost sight of not least by the Anti-Christ Papacy,

despite all its pompous, pious pronouncements about the dignity of the individual and human rights. Wherever and whenever this occurs, namely, the slighting of the individual, there both Church and State suffer proportionately, and especially then the home, in which both Church and State have their roots, if they have any.

Our Lord and Master never lost sight of the individual. True, He also mingled with and ministered to, the crowds, but it was upon the individual that He concentrated His concern. You will recall His many interviews with individuals: Nicodemus, Nathanael, John the Baptist, Peter, Zacchaeus, the woman caught in adultery, the woman at the well, Saul of Tarsus, and many more. How blessed these interviews proved to be! And how fruitful too! (Frau Gotta, Frau Bartells; Prof. Sihler.)

The Son of God, the Savior of sinners, loved the individual, and "with an everlasting love." From very eternity He thought in love upon every single soul, and in the fulness of time redeemed every single soul with His holy life and His innocent sufferings and death, and through His Gospel Ministry He would have each and every single soul "to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." 1 Tim. 2,4. And to every sanctified soul He whispers this assuring promise: "Fear not; for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by name; thou art mine." Is. 43,1. Note the extravagant use of personal pronouns in this passage. You will recall what Luther says about the Gospel and personal pronouns.

Because the Son of God and Son of man loved not only the whole world of sinners, but every single sinner, He saw in every soul a candidate (rightly understood) for eternal life. How lovingly, how tactfully, He wooed and won the woman at the well --

"From heaven He came and sought her
To be His holy bride;
With His own blood He bought her,
And for her life He died." --
the woman of the world who later
turned missionary, and a very
faithful and fruitful one.

And loving every soul, He also understood each soul--('tis ever so)--their soul-life, their thought-processes, their sins, their shortcomings, their temptations, their weaknesses, their strength, their possibilities. The All-Loving and All-Knowing One understood as no one else ever understood, or ever could understand.

And because He loved and understood, He was thoughtful, tactful, patient, long-suffering, and self-sacrificing. He took all things into consideration. His eye embraced the whole circle, not only one small segment of it; All things, the spiritual, mental, and even physical make-up of each disciple, as well as his heredity and environment. He also took into consideration the "erkjendelsestrin" of each believer of His (Cf. Walther's "Law and Gospel" on Temperaments.)

As none other, the Master respected and took into account the individuality of His every disciple. He didn't try to press all into the same mold. Had He not created that very individual with His own individuality? And He treated each individual accordingly. He did not treat a Peter like a Paul, nor a Martha like a Mary. He didn't expect as much of one as the other, for in His wisdom and love He hadn't given as much to one as to the other. To some He had given five, some two, and some one talent.

He was a man of not only deep, but also broad sympathies. He knew that His disciples were all broken vessels, and He treated them as such. Yes,

There's a wideness in His mercy
Like the wideness of the sea.
There's a kindness in His justice
That is more than liberty.

He was pleased with the good, the noble, the promising in His disciples--it was His own work in them--but He also bore over with the base, the bad, the discouraging in them, that He might be able to correct same in due season.

He knew how and when to time things. He could abide His own and His disciples' time. He did not expect fruit before the blossom appeared, nor the blossom before the bud, nor leaves and branches before the roots had set. And even when the fruits were totally and long lacking, did not the Divine Dresser of the vineyard plead with the Heavenly Owner to let it alone, "spare it, this year also, till I dig about it, and dung it"? Lk. 13,8-9. What a lesson for teachers and preachers who labor with the Word, especially in stony fields!

How patient, how long-suffering, how self-sacrificing He was! He did not soon give up hope of the Prodigal's return. Just what would have happened to a Peter, or a Saul, or a Thomas, or an Augustine, or to you or me, if our Savior had lacked long-suffering patience? Aye,

"None of the ransomed ever knew,
How deep were the waters crossed
Nor how dark was the night that
our Lord went thru
'Ere He found His sheep that
was lost."

I realize that we must be on our guard against painting a weak, wavering picture of our Lord, or as one who looked through His fingers at sin. That would not be a true picture, by any means. Far be it from such! He, the Holy One of God, hated every sin, even the smallest, with a holy, whole hatred. I need not cite instances.

Never did He silence the truth, never did He compromise the truth, no, not in the least, though at times He suspended it. How could He who was and is the TRUTH? But He always spoke and applied the

truth "in love." Even when pronouncing the awful but just judgment which Jerusalem, the Holy City, had brought down upon itself, that judgment was pronounced through unexpressed sobs and tears. (Cf. Mt. 23,24.)

Love, understanding, sympathetic, deep, broad, patient, seeking, long-suffering love, undorgirded everything that He said and did in His every dealing with His every disciple. His was a love, the love, that "beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things." 1 Cor. 13,7. His was a love far higher, infinitely deeper than that of the mother who was asked which of her 13 children she loved the most. Her reply: "I love the child best that is absent as long as he is absent, and I love the child best that is sick, as long as she is sick."

Originally my intention was to apply the Savior's spirit, interweaving it, as we went along, with the spirit we should show in our dealings with fellow-Christians, and especially then the souls committed to our spiritual care. But as I went along, I became so taken in with, and overwhelmed by, our Master's spirit, that I well-nigh forgot the disciple's spirit. Perhaps it is just as well. I could so easily have spoiled both pictures.

Then I got to thinking: Should it really be necessary, right here anyway? Surely, each one of us will draw his own conclusions and make his own applications-- all in the light of Christ's lustrous example! Furthermore, I concluded that this could be brought out better in the discussion that likely will follow.

But this much we must not fail to accentuate: the mind which was in Christ Jesus should also be in us. Phil. 2,5. The spirit of the Chief-Shepherd should be the spirit

of the under-shepherd, in some degree at least. May our heavenly Father through His Holy Spirit grant us this in ever-increasing measure! "The same Lord over all, who is rich unto all that call upon Him, is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think." (Cf. Rom. 10,12 and Eph. 3,20.)

II.

We proceed to the "Gospel Ministry and Human Relations" on the congregational level. If we but follow the Head and Lord of the Church in His relations with the individual soul, the human relations problems arising in the Congregation, the Synod, and even Inter-Synods will really be quite well solved.

When we look at the Congregation, or the Church of Christ, with the physical eye only, we see little that is holy, perfect, lovely, but much that is imperfect, sinful, and ugly.

Yet when viewed with the spiritual eye of faith, in the light of God's own description of His Church in His Holy Word, how diametrically different! There are so many passages that we could quote here, both from the Old and New Testament, but shall call attention to just one here, the one from the 45th Psalm: "The king's daughter is all glorious within: her clothing is of wrought gold. She shall be brought unto the king in raiment of needlework..." vv. 13-14.

But even the Church, or Congregation, as it is, with all its imperfections and unattractiveness, this Church Christ loved and gave Himself for; that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing.

Christ loved the Church, far from lovable in itself, and gave Himself for it. Should it not follow that we His disciples will love the Church and give ourselves to it?

And since the Church is made up of individuals, if we do not love the brethren whom we see, how then can we love our God and Savior whom we cannot see?

So fundamentally essential, absolutely necessary, is love for the brethren that the Apostle makes it a condition of Christian discipleship: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren," 1 John 3,14. "By this shall ye know that ye are my disciples, that ye love one another." A *conditio sine qua non*, then, is brotherly love.

How repeatedly, how emphatically Scripture stresses love, and especially brotherly love. And how can it be otherwise since love is the first fruit, ay, the fairest fruit of faith, --without which there can be no other fruits,

Consider also the relationship of Christians to one another, sons and daughters of one Heavenly Father, brothers and sisters all in Christ Jesus. How much too the Brethren have in common! "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one Hope of your calling: one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Eph. 4,4-6. It is this verse that must have inspired Ingemann to pen his model congregational hymn:

"One is our God and Father!
The flock and all its shepherds
cry;
One Spirit us doth gather,
One is our Lord, who reigns
on high;
One well of life doth lave us,
One hope our souls inspires,
One faith, our stay, doth save us,

One love us ever fires,
One peace our spirits blosses,
One fight for our reward,
One end of all distresses,
One life in Christ our Lord.

One in the Spirit's union,
We onward march, a pilgrim
throng,
And sing in sweet communion
The ransomed Zion's victor-song;
Thru night and tribulation,
With hope and expectation
To see our journey's end--
The cross, the grave, death's
prison,
We leave behind, and rise
To meet our Savior risen,
And enter Paradise."

This love of which Scripture speaks is not a sign of weakness, as often regarded by heathen peoples. (False Philosophies - Nietzsche.) Rather it is a sign of strength, God's strength in our weakness. Nor is this love a sickly sentimental thing. (Ibsen's Brand.)

Where there is the right kind of love, brethren "called by one vocation" will not in the long run resent constructive criticism, even when seemingly unjustified, reproof, correction. Yet, due to the old man in us, how quickly tempers often flare, especially at first. Rather we should thank the brother or sister that rebukes us.

Where there is the right kind of love, the spirit which was in Christ Jesus, even trying cases of church discipline, the ultimate and sole purpose and goal of which is not to harm but help, not to shame but save, even instances of this true love in action will not in the end be resented, but welcomed.

But Church discipline, to be truly effective, must be conceived, born, and effected thruout in LOVE!

It would not be out of place to speak at length about church discipline here, especially the spirit

of it, but that would be an essay all by itself.

In speaking with the individual brother, or in the congregations dealing with an erring brother, the law must not only be applied in its full spiritual force, but the pastor especially should strive to make his parishioner and parishioners feel that he is imbued with loving concern and compassion, a love that seeks but one thing, the spiritual welfare, the eternal salvation of the erring member. Unless altogether hardened, people sense this quite soon. Therefore two can do the same thing and still not be the same thing, and two can say the same thing and still meet with different receptions.

God grant us all, some, at least, of the spirit of a Moses who prayed: "Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sins--; and if not, blot me, I pray Thee, out of Thy book which Thou hast written." Ex. 32,32. Of a Paul who could wish that he himself "were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh," Cf. Rom. 9,3. Above all of the Son of God weeping over Jerusalem.

Let us pray for grace to be gentle, "tender as nurses." Let us not forget that He who strikes the gentlest often hits the hardest. Bishop Hough gives us good counsel when he pleads: Do not rebuke anyone unless it really hurts and grieves you to rebuke him.

How much we need here of the mother of virtues--HUMILITY, over remembering that we too are but dust, and sadly soiled dust. "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted." Gal. 6,1.

Nor is it out of place to remind one another that our own personal and family life should be such that people cannot justly

counter: "Sweep before your own door, pastor."

Now if the spirit of brotherly love should rule among the members of the same congregation, how much more should this be the case among brother pastors of the congregations of the same Synod, among pastors who are to be "ensamples to the flock"!

How fervent the Love between members of the congregation, and especially between shepherd and flock, each member of it, should be! But, alas! Here also we must confess with shame and pain the contrasting, oft conflicting clash between Christ's doctrine and our practice of it, between what should be and what too often is.

It will not hurt here to remind ourselves of the ancient exclamation of heathen people when they beheld the love of the early Christians one to another: "See how they love one another!" Too often today the world is constrained to exclaim in disgust: "See how the Christians hate one another." We need to pray: Misereere Domino!

Thank God we have a gospel of forgiveness also for these sins. God grant us grace to grasp it, and to live it.

(To be continued.)

NORTHWEST PASTORAL CONFERENCE

Date - April 12 - 13, 1955

Place - Bethany College.

Opening time - 10:00 a.m.

Program -

1. The Clarity of Scripture, with reference to its application. Hugo Handberg.
2. The Dangers besetting Faithful Adherents of Orthodoxy. Christian Anderson.
3. Exegesis of Rev. 14:6ff. T.H. Teigen.
4. Exegesis of Rev. 20:1-10. H.A. Thoiste.
5. Principles & Methods in starting New Congregations. D. Dale. A. Schulz, Secy.

A FAITHFUL CONFESSOR
LAID TO REST.

Funeral services were conducted for the Rev. John Hendricks at Fairview Church in Minneapolis on Tuesday, February 1.

The services were conducted by Pastor Theiste of Fairview Congregation who also preached the sermon on the basis of John 12:26, setting forth "The Precious Treasure We Possess in Christ's Doctrine of God's Free Grace." The congregation sang the Norwegian Hymn: "Min Død Er Mig Til Gode" and in English "I Know of A Sloop in Jesus' Name." Brorson's Norwegian Hymn: "Den Store Hvide Flok Vi Se" and the so called Crusader's Hymn: "Beautiful Saviour" were sung by Mr. Marshall Handberg, and the "Lord's Prayer" in musical setting by Malotte was sung by Mrs. Dorothy Theiste. Pres. D.W. Teigen of Bethany College, Mankato, extended greetings and condolences on behalf of this Synodical institution and its personell. Dr. W.A. Madson, Dean of Bethany Seminary, represented the President of the Synod and delivered an address on "The Significance of The Ministry of the Rev. John Hendricks."

Crystal Lake Cemetery was the scene of the committal service, where the body was laid to its final resting place beside the body of his wife and faithful helpmeet of many years, who died October 21, 1948.

THE REV. JOHN HENDRICKS was born in Selbu, N. Daleno, Norway, of Parents Henrick Pederson and wife Karen (Hammer) on Sept. 10, 1865. Baptized and confirmed into the Christian faith he remained a staunch confessor of this faith all his life. He attended the Trenderheim Real Skole where he was trained in Architecture. In 1885 he immigrated to the United States, coming to Oshkosh, Wis. Here he attended Business College for one

year, then the State Normal School and in 1891 graduated from St. Ansgar Seminary. He taught school 2 years, then entered Lutheran Seminary in Robbinsdale from which he graduated as a candidate of theology in 1896. He served parishes in Michigan and in Wisconsin before coming to Minneapolis as city missionary in 1912. He also established and served, the Prospect Park Mission until 1917. Unable for conscience reason to follow his church body into the church union which was then formed, he elected to remain with the small remnant of the Norwegian Synod. He served this church body faithfully as a missionary at large traveling about in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and the Dakotas serving scattered parishes and families isolated from their church group. He also contributed extensively to the publications of the Synod and to the doctrinal discussions in Pastoral Conferences and at Synod meetings.

In 1893 he was married to Julia F. Grøndalen. To this union were born 8 children: 4 sons and 4 daughters. Two sons preceded him in death.

Many memorial wreaths were contributed in his memory for the work of the Church and the Synod he loved. Remembered were Bethany Seminary, the Pastors' Support Fund, the Church Extension Fund and Fairview Congregation.

May the Spirit which rested upon Pastor John Hendricks and made him a faithful confessor of God's Free and Complete Grace and Favor in Christ Jesus fall in increasing measure upon them who must carry on the work and support of the Church which was so dear to his heart.

Blessed be his memory.

H.A. Theiste

* * * * *

LITT AV HVERT

A recent issue of the Minneapolis Tribune carried an item which should be of interest to all of us as pastors and supporters of Bethany College. The item was headed: Church Colleges Face Fund Crisis, Pastors are Told.

It went on to say: "Church-related colleges, which always have been in a 'precarious' financial position, now are having a desperate time. The words are attributed to Robert Mortvedt, president of Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kan., who addressed the Minnesota State Pastoral Conference meeting in St. Paul stating: "Ministers can help with a consistent and assured voice in the support of the colleges." "All too often" he said, "the voices which are heard are only those of the college president. Token-giving is the consequence, and on token-giving no college can flourish." "Church related colleges must be supported mostly by the bodies which control them." We certainly can agree with Pres. Mortvedt when he says "Christian education should be considered a mission of the church in the same sense as foreign and home missions." There is also much food for thought in his statement that church colleges are not merely educational institutions - "they are the church in action in one of its most distinctive fields of endeavor. They are the only institutions of higher learning concerned in a dominant way with Christianity."

We might also ask ourselves: DO WE SPEAK WITH A CONSISTENT AND ASSURED VOICE whenever we discuss Bethany with our members and fellow Lutherans? Again MAY IT NOT BE SAID THAT TOO MUCH OF OUR PERSONAL GIVING AS WELL AS THAT OF OUR CONGREGATIONS IS SIMPLY TOKEN-GIVING? And surely we will agree: "On token-giving no college can flourish."

H.A. Theiste

. . . On Sunday, Jan. 23, Fairview Congregation "exploded" their surprise party on the Theists with a vesper service at which J.A.O. Proulx of Luverne, Minn., preached and presented the celebrants of 25 years of wedded life with a "jolly good" purse. The sending out of the invitations to all the pastors of the Synod was a complete surprise to the Theists, and Hans and Dorothy Theiste want to thank everyone for the many wonderful greetings and encouraging fraternal greetings received.

. . . A recent letter from Gerhart Becker, missionary in Nigeria, tells that he is serving the District served by Paul Anderson in 1949 or so. An excerpt: "I usually visit 2 congregations each day; have Communion exams on Saturday (and during the week) at 2 or 3 congregations and have Communion services for those congregations the following Sunday.... There are teachers meetings twice a month. Congregations send representatives to one central congregation, and there we hold meetings discussing congregational problems and District problems.... Once in a while the car needs repairs and sometimes means 1-2 days interruption in my schedule. I don't know the mechanics of a car, hence I take it to the garage in town." - Also adds that he feels badly at the meagre amount of "further study" he gets done. The Gerhart Becker's address is:

Lutheran Mission
Ikot Ibritan
Abak P.A.
Nigeria, W. Africa

Note that this is different from the address given in the Synodical Report and in the Lutheran Annual.

. . . For the benefit of the brethren who were not present at the General Pastoral Conference in Belview, Minn., Jan. 25-27, it is in place to report here that the Conference put the task of getting out the Clergy Bulletin on the con-

science and in the hands of the pastors of what has been unofficially called the Southwest Circuit, T.H. Teigon being designated by the Conference as Editor-in-chief. Until said pastors can get together for a little more definite organization, Arthur Schulz of Tracy is in charge of the mimeographing (So he'll have to take the blame - A.S.) and D.L. Pfeiffer of Cottonwood is taking care of the purse and the mailing.

Without a great deal of effort the Editor has come by sufficient material for one issue. As he sends this batch to Printer Schulz he can report that the bin is empty. He is confident that the Lord will provide material for the next issue, and the next, and the next, with the same regularity as He provided manna to the Israelites. He has no reason to believe that the manner of the providing will be as the manna came to the Israelites, but rather as food came to Elijah at Cherith, the Lord having commanded the ravens to bring it. The ravens in this particular case being etc.

. . . A recent letter from Dr. S.C. Ylvisaker deep in the heart of Texas has this very good suggestion: "I believe that the pastors, as a token of their studying, should be required to prepare a paper about once a year, or even two years, on a subject of their theological interest. But they should be required to do this in any case as a part of their ministry." SCY adds that he does not want this to be understood in a legalistic manner. The above, and several other suggestions he makes in an effort "to devise some scheme by which this temptation (i.e. to neglect further study) may be removed from our married pastors."

. . . We suppose that, as that lady from Chicago, all our pastors manage to find time to foster a few "outside interests." Don't make that "outside" too broad, however. Treatises on golf wood-work, Mexican, Colonial or Frontier History, or wheat-gorm you can send to such magazines as "Sports Afield," "Popular Mechanics," "The Westerners," "Our American Heritage," or "Betty Crocker," etc., and maybe get a little money for them. But if you are reading a book in the field of theology and you see an item or two that you think might be of interest; or if you have been doing a little study on the meaning of a word in Scripture, etc., get the results on paper and send them to -

T.H. Teigon
917 S. Grange
Cherith
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

On this end we will try to keep our eye peeled for any "bugs" that might fly in, but don't let the "censor-ship" deter you.

. . . We'd like to add a little note to the announcement of the N.W. Pastoral Conference that appears on another page. The conference will take place during the Easter vacation of the Bethany students. Some ladies of Mt. Olive church have been kind enough to donate their time to prepare dinners on the two days as well as one supper. They'll also have coffee for inbetween. Breakfasts will have to be found somewhere else. Very likely housing will be available at the College (we'll tell you more definitely later) so be prepared with linen etc. - A.S.

. . . D. L. Pfeiffer, Cottonwood, Minn., recently received a call from the Harvard Street Lutheran Church, Cambridge, Mass.

THE CLERGY BULLETIN

Vol. XIV

March 1955

No. 7

THE GOSPEL Ministry & Human Relations

(Note: This is a continuation of an essay by our sainted Justin A. Petersen. The first part was included in the February issue.)

III.

We come now quite naturally to the "Gospel Ministry and Human Relations" on the Synodical level. Much of what has already been said in the two preceding sections applies also here, so brevity can well be exercised in this section of our essay.

A Synod is nothing but a coming together, a gathering, of Christian congregations, banded together for a common purpose. This we need not develop further here.

By and large, congregations of the same faith get along quite well together, but even here the plant of perfection never grows. At times larger congregations show inconsistency over against smaller congregations, and the reverse also occasionally happens. Instead of all being for one, quite often each one is for self. This selfishness of some congregations can be quite discouraging and damaging. Take the matter of financial support of the church body, or Synod. How often some congregations, the pastor himself quite often mainly to blame, stubbornly, and without valid grounds, refuse to release members to other sister congregations. It even happens that large mother congregations insist upon practicing birth control, and grown upon, if not out-

right hinder the birth of daughter congregations.

When we turn to the relationship obtaining between pastors of the same Synod, the picture doesn't always brighten. Rather, it quite often darkens, alas!

Need we go further than to ourselves? When we reflect upon the suspicion, envy, jealousy, feuding, carping, criticism, and bitterness which at times exist between brother pastors, even neighboring pastors, of our own Synod, we are just tempted - that's all. I shall never forget the accusation of one brother pastor against a neighbor brother pastor, a timid soul, to the effect that he had not only tried to steal individual members from him, but even a whole congregation. What about the lack of cordiality and magnanimity that sometimes exists between predecessor and successor of the same flock? Of the thinly, and not always so thinly, veiled innuendoes and suspicions directed by one brother pastor against another brother - usually behind the other's back? Haven't we all heard more than one brother's orthodoxy drawn into question, yes even his Christianity? There might be grounds for such questions and doubts in very rare cases, but surely this isn't the way to correct such serious

things. Who would deny that here we have a duty, a holy duty, but a duty which should be done in love? I have even heard, in this very building, one of our oldest, now deceased, pastors brand our Bethany College as "a child of Satan," thereby lodging a severe indictment against most of his brother pastors, and especially those who in faith and hope and love took the pioneering lead in securing and building up our one institution of higher learning. I have never regretted that God gave me the courage sharply to rebuke this older brother and father in the faith.

When we further think back upon some of the Synod meetings that we have had over the years, when some of the things to which we have just called attention have broken out into the open, when brother clashed with brother, with others of us taking sides, some of which spirit even crept into our Sentinel. Now the above picture may be overdrawn, and some of the charges directed by one brother pastor or brother pastors may have been, likely were, justified, but some, I am quite sure in my own mind, were unjustified. At any rate, bad blood has been caused to flow, and is still flowing, in the veins of our dear Synod, between brother pastors, who should be "ensamples to the flock," and the work of Christ's Kingdom among us has suffered accordingly.

Brothron, this is not as it should be, not as our God and Savior would have it, not as we as fellow-Christians and companions-in-arms would have it.

If we will exercise but a measure of self-examination in the light of God's holy Law, can any single one of us say that I am without sin? What need for us to pray daily: "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me" I Ps. 51,10. Help me, O Lord, ever more clearly to understand and deplore the depravity of my own heart. Help me to behold the beam that is in mine own eye before I concern myself too much with the

motō that is in my brother's eye. Cf. Mt. 7,3-5. Set a watch, O Lord, over my mouth; keep the door of my lips, Ps. 141,3.

But we want to close this section with a gentle, brighter touch. God the Holy Ghost, through the Apostle Paul writes: "Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honor preferring one another." Rom. 12,10. And through the Psalmist: "Behold, how good and pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!" Ps. 133,1.

IV.

When we now proceed a step further and enter, with considerable fear and trembling, the intersynodical sphere, we do not cease to be what we were and are in our human relations on the individual, congregational, and synodical level. We take the same hearts with us into all these various relations, and at times in aggravated degree.

Before we proceed any further on the intersynodical path, we believe it would be well to remind ourselves of Walther's burning, and honest, zeal for one truly united Lutheran Church in this country. This goal, we too, should never lose sight of, though often sorely tempted to do so, due to the many steadily accumulating aggravations and violations of doctrinal purity and practice - within our Synodical Conference even.

Whereas we should never cease - which God forbid! - earnestly to strive "for the faith once delivered unto the saints," we should at the same time strive to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." Eph. 4,3.

Isn't there such a thing as going so far in our justified aversion to union at any price, that we are in danger of developing a union-at-no-price attitude? There is such a thing as "having zeal of God, but not according to knowledge." Rom. 10,2.

Now the chapter on intersynodical controversies has not been the happiest chapter in the history of the Church Militant. Or has there been not the slightest justification for the expression "rabies teologorum"?

Carried on as these controversies are by humans, burdened to the very edge of the grave with the Old Adam, with all his sins and shortcomings, trigger temper, set prejudices, "parti-vason," proneness to extremes, etc., this is not at all to be wondered at. The wonder almost is that this chapter on intersynodical relations isn't darker than it actually is.

The personal element has undoubtedly played a prominent, far too prominent, part in these civil wars. Our own Koren often calls attention to this deplorable fact in his doctrinal essays and synodical messages. In one place he points out that disgruntled pastors who have become peeved because they didn't receive the recognition they felt was due them, were not placed on certain important committees, or relieved from same, - had given rise to no little dissatisfaction and disharmony. (Dr. Schmidt). How one seemingly little thing can at times lead to a whole chain of larger things, we can realize full well.

Then we have the extremely delicate and dangerous use of caustic, cutting sarcasm. Now some sarcasm, at times, rightly timed and aimed, can be a powerful weapon both of offense and defence, but used too often, and by the same persons, has a destructive way of backfiring.

Furthermore, that leaders of the Church, and also privates in the ranks, have in their zeal gone to unnecessary, and unwise, even harmful, extremes, cannot be doubted, we believe. We had it in the early Church, the Reformation Church, witness the dissensions among the theologians of that day, as evidenced in our Lutheran Confessions, and especially then in the Formula of Concord.

Even a Walther, balanced and exact though he usually was, admitted that he had used statements that could easily be misunderstood, and was humble enough, and honest enough, to withdraw them. It takes a truly big man to do this. Surely it isn't wrong to admit we have overstepped, or even erred. We can and do sin with the saints; may our repentance be as sincere as theirs!

Quite often though, once we have taken a position, committed ourselves to certain definite statements, it is very hard for most of us to change, or even soften them.

There are also likely other factors that interplay in doctrinal controversies, some seemingly small, but in the aggregate oftentimes great, even of decisive import. What a thing this human heart we harbor!

This, by no means, means that we would underestimate the absolute need and importance of polemics. Witness the apostle Paul in his epistles, even the lovable John in his, witness above all the example of Christ Himself, especially in His controversies with the Scribes and Pharisees. How burning His hatred of falsehood! How seathing His denunciation of hypocrisy! Without polemics the truth would soon be lost. And "Truth loosely held is worse than falsehood." But, oh, what sins, we fear, have been committed under the protective mantle, and burning, otherwise praiseworthy, zeal for "the faith once delivered unto the saints."

"Speaking the truth in love" should always be our watchword, as it was in Christ's and His apostles in all our controversies. Speaking the truth, yes, but always in love. Love? Yes, but only that is true love that tallies with the truth. But we must have both, truth and love, or both will suffer.

'Tis tellingly true what Ibsen writes in Brand:

There's not a word so much misused,
And by the world at large abused,
As that which men call CHARITY.
Men use it with satanic skill
To veil the weakling's lack of will,
To make of life, o'cn at its best
What joking actors treat in jest.
(Trans. by Dr. Madson)

And then the same Brand's words to his wife Agnes:

Hvad verden kalder kjærlighed,
Jeg ikke vil og ikke ved.
Guds kjærlighed jeg kjender til,
Og den er ikke vok og mild;
Den er til dødsens rådsol haard,
Den byder klappe, saa det slaar.
Hvad svarte Gud i oljelunden,
Da Sønnen laa i sved og skræk,
Og bad og bad: Tag kalken væk!
Tog Han Ham smertens kalk fra
mundten?

Hei, barn, den naaer ud til bunden.

But how about our intersynodi- cal relations in the light of what has been stressed in this section of our essay? What about our spir- it here? Have we been as wise, tactful, and charitable as we might have been? I, for one, do not think we have. At once someone will think, if not say: "This is serious. Be specific." I want to avoid that, though I believe there have been a number of such cases. To start enumerating may only serve to swerve us from the main matter here - our spirit, our strategy.

What about some articles that have appeared in our Sentinel, and earlier in Tidende? What about our remarks at times at synod meetings? At Conferences, our own and Mixed Conferences? Have we been as care- ful in the halls of Bethany as we should? How about our sermons, especially funeral sermons, when we have spied Herger people in the audience?

We have been accused of being "negative and loveless," of being "separatists," while others, I fear, have ceased to take us too seriously.

I have often wondered if those who make these charges have weigh- ed their grave implications? "Neg- ative" excludes the positive, of course. "Loveless" is still more serious. "Det er at døme os fra livet." "Loveless," without love, is the same as to say "without faith," i.e. unbelievers. Serious minded Missouri brethren are aware of the scope and unfairness of such serious accusations, and have frankly admitted it to me. But the soul-searching question re- mains: Have we never given the slightest provocation for such charges?

And our strategy? Has it been the wisest at times? Have some- times doubted it. I have even questioned the strategic widdom of our Union Committee, and a few of our actions, adopted upon their recommendations. How it is easy to make such a statement, but harder to prove it. Nevertheless, the feeling persists. For example: Those over-the-years long-drawn-out committee meetings, several of which have been fruitless, accord- ing to statements of the members of this committee. For example also: This one long memorial after the other over these last years.

In defense of our union commit- tee, I believe that I can well un- derstand their impatience, discour- agement, even disgust - all of which tend to breed sarcasm; for they have no doubt met up with dis- illusionment and aggravation. As to memorials, of course it has been necessary to memorialize, and thus to enlighten, exhort, awe, even warn our brethren. To have failed to do so would have been faithlessness and lovelessness on our part. Testify we must, and testify we have; but to testimony too there must be a limit. It is very possible to testify so often and so much that the witness or witnesses get to be regarded as troublesome puppies that run after us and constantly snap at our trouser cuffs.

For some time it has been my opinion that at a certain point it would have been wise, and effective, for us to state in kind but firm language: "Again and again we have testified. This is our conviction, Word and Confession-bound. There it stands. For the time being we are through with our testimony, though our testimony stands." Several of you will likely not agree with me, but I am of the opinion that at times such testimony is the most telling testimony.

We return to our strategy, almost ad nauseam. Has it been such that it gives us hope that it might win over opponents? Certainly we gain little by extreme conclusions, and waspish statements.

(We have wondered if we conservative Lutherans in all the Synodical Conference bodies always succeed in the difficult task of maintaining our balance, of directing our attention too much toward minor, though by no means unimportant, objectives and operations, instead of concentrating more on the triple: The Word Alone, Grace Alone, Faith Alone.)

Our oft too highly developed Synodical loyalty, our inbred suspicions, our pet prejudices, even bitterness - witness the spirit of some of our Missouri and Wisconsin brethren ever against one another - do not all these factors aggravate instead of healing the wounds on our Synodical Conference body? I am of the opinion that, in the face of the onrushing flood of unionism and liberalism (are we entirely exempt, in the incipient stage at any rate?) that is threatening to engulf our beloved Synodical Conference, we are in danger of fideling while Rome burns."

Oh, if all true Confessional Lutherans within the whole Synodical Conference would only stand, and not only stand, but also fight shoulder to shoulder for "the faith once delivered unto the saints" -

just think what a power, under God, we could be!

I believe that God has placed us of the Norwegian Synod in a strategic position in the Synodical Conference. Even bold enough, presumptuous enough, to think, at least, of Herodotus's words to Queen Esther: "And who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?" Let not our size scare us. Only let not smallness of spirit accompany our smallness of size!

Are we measuring up? Are we always mindful, and careful, of our mission? Have we always been considerate of the many brethren, who in their hearts are in agreement with us, brethren who want to "walk in the old paths, wherein is the good way," men who perhaps have been made to pause, wonder, even hold back because of our at times ill-weighed, ill-timed words?

And it is to win that we are striving and struggling, is it not? Win as many souls, preachers and teachers too, as possible for the full truth of God's Word - for the present as well as succeeding generations. God make us humble! God make us strong, never once forgetting that our only weapon in the fight is the old, ageless Gospel Ministry, the truth of God, spoken in love.

At times we almost lose hope. The prospects, at present, are far from bright. The mind wearies, the heart grows faint, but we must not lose courage. God's hour may not be here yet, and let us not, as we continue to testify the truth of God in love, let us not for a moment forget that "in quietness and confidence shall be our strength," persuaded that even he who seems to go down to defeat in the Lord's battles, actually conquers, conquers gloriously. Does not our Lord rule, even in the midst of His enemies? And will not His truth abide forever? And if the

Lord be for us, who can be against us?

We often think of the closing sentence of one of Dr. Keron's polemical essays: "Our Lord has chast-

ened the Norwegian Synod, and that she has richly deserved; but He has not forsaken her, for His mercy endureth forever."

Sursum Corda!

Justin A Petersen, 1951

THE PASTOR & HIS OTHER VINEYARD

In the spring a young man's fancy might also turn to thoughts of gardening. The seed catalogs are out in all their splendor. Get one, read it, use it.

On page 21 of his pastoral theology, Dr. Fritz has some mighty fine things to say with respect to physical fitness. I wish he had said more. I wish I had taken to heart what he did say. A most baffling fact about us human beings is our contemptuous and systematic disregard for health.

The last word on page 21 of "Pastoral Theology" is "gardening." Gardening has great value for the pastor,

It has lessons of nature which the pastor may carry into the pulpit, as when he preaches on the sower and his seed, or on the vine and the branches, or on the unfruitful fig tree.

Gardening provides exercise in fresh air and sunshine. It is a good "hobby" and "conversation piece." Gardening may serve to introduce an understanding of the nature and purpose of food, of the relationship of food and health, of food and life.

Last year I had a garden in the back yard of a member of the congregation. We are still eating carrots which grew in that garden. Carrots are a yellow vegetable, bringing carotene, the precursor

of Vitamin A, a most important item in the diet. We eat them raw to a large extent, or steamed. But whether raw or steamed, they have a taste and a nutritive value which far exceeds any carrots that I can buy in store or restaurant.

Last year I had also a garden seven miles from home. It was a plot 50 feet square in a community garden next to the municipal golf course. It was thick with quackgrass, turned once by a plow. I paid two dollars for a season's use. And I got my money's worth, not only in fresh air and sunshine for the family, but in the many tomatoes which we ate fresh off the vine, unspoiled by insecticides or synthetic fertilizers.

Last year I ate grapes from a vine in our backyard here in the heart of Madison. Just one vine, just a few grapes, but a great deal of joy and satisfaction.

"There is a time to plant."
Eccl. 3:2.

Hils Oesloby

The Clergy Bulletin is published by Authority of the General Pastoral Conference of the Norwegian Synod. Editorial Committee: Pastors of Southwest Circuit. Editor: T.H. Toigon, 917 S. Grango, Sioux Falls, S. Dak. Subscription price per year: \$1.50.

FUNCTIONAL CHURCH BUILDING

There are many ways to proceed when putting up the building for a new mission station. The one I saw this week was one I really liked. If true simplicity be great art, this is it.

It is a ranch style house in a new suburb. Next door, the whole end of the block lies vacant, waiting for the large church that may someday stand there.

The house itself is in the modern style and will someday consist of living room, kitchen and bath, one large study and three small bedrooms, all on the one floor. There is a basement below.

But at present the large study and the large living room are not divided, but form one large room, though not perfectly rectangular. This large room is the chapel, containing an altar, lecturn, small

organ, coatrack and 47 folding chairs.

In the basement there are four tables for the Sunday School with four benches at each table.

The young pastor and his wife and two children have thus at present an apartment with two bedrooms, kitchen, bath, and another room which is combination study and living room. The bathroom is available to the Sunday School and congregation.

Yes, here is simplicity. Here is a mode of procedure which allows for the gathering of the nucleus of the new congregation at moderate cost, and with no obsolete property to be disposed of at some future time.

Nils Oesloby

COMMUNICATIONS FROM SYNODICAL BOARDS

I. An Open Letter to all our Brethren from the Board of Charities and Support.

Greetings to all our ministerial brethren from shore to shore and from pole to pole!

Before you lay aside this issue of "THE CLERGY BULLETIN" please do us a mutual favor by devoting your attention to a few items which should have been taken care of long ago. I know, this is Lent, and we don't find time for much else besides. But it's Lent over here too.

First of all, what are you doing about the special offering for our much-in-need Charities and Support Fund, which was pleaded for in the January 12th issue of the "Sentinel" and also in "The Clergy Bulletin" under the heading, "Our Vot-erand of the Cross"? This offering is necessary, else we would not have made the plea. Here at Emmaus in

Minneapolis we are sending out blank envelopes with the words "For our Retired Pastors and Their Widows" (stamped on) right after Easter. That was decided on. Has your congregation decided on any method of ingathering for this Fund? If not, please present the plea at your earliest convenience. Contrary to popular belief in some quarters, the Old People's Home is not in a position to cover the needs of the Support Fund, or any other fund of the Synod, for that matter. May the Lord bless your efforts in this behalf.

Secondly - If you have not already done so, would you please do it now? Namely, write down on a U.S. postal card the amount which your congregation remitted to brother Lee for Kasota Valley Home Seals last Christmas. Many of you have done so already, but we would like to get a complete picture. You see, we put out a new seal

this last year, and we'd like to find out if we made enough to pay for them. Your cooperation in this matter will be greatly appreciated by your elected board of directors.

Thirdly, and lastly - I am being plagued with a host of well-meaning philatelists and charity seals collectors. Everyone of them wants sheets of seals from our Kaskaskia Valley Home dating back to 1951 and 1952. And I simply don't have any of those left, with the exception of one lone sheet of each for my files (and I ain't gonna give them up!). For the refreshment of your memory, the 1951 seals were yellow with a brown background with "Holy Night" and the Nativity scene in the yellow scroll. The 1952 were the same, except that the yellow scroll was on a blue background. I have enough 1953 and the new 1954 seals to supply about 100 philatelists. So ... if any of you kind brethren have any 1951 and/or 1952 seals left, please send them to me. Somehow or other we got registered with charity seals collectors.

Thank you most kindly, and may the Lord grant all a blessed Lenten season and a Joyous Easter.

F.R. Weyland

II. Notice from the Committee of Committees.

The Synod adopted the plan of the pastors' equalization (Synod Report, 1954, p. 90) for delegates' equalization. On the basis of it, equalization of delegates' traveling expenses to the convention will take place this year. The Committee of Committees, to whom this matter was referred, requests that the delegates shall be prepared to pay this equalization at the convention. To do this the congregations should act on the matter before the convention, and send the delegates prepared to pay the equalization. It is estimated that the average will be about \$20.00. All congregations are requested to share in this equalization whether they send delegates or not, or whether they re-

quest equalization or not. Requests for equalization must be in the hands of the equalization committee by Friday noon, June 24, of the next convention. It is understood that this plan may apply to no more than two eligible and duly elected delegates from each congregation. If representation to the convention is divided up among several delegates, only the expenses of the original delegate or delegates may be equalized. Equalization for the two delegates should be presented only if two delegates are attending the convention simultaneously. By cooperating in this plan we will make it possible financially for our distant congregations to send delegates to the convention. PLEASE DO NOT NEGLECT TO PRESENT THIS MATTER TO YOUR CONGREGATION.
Ray Branstad

III. Notice from the Youth Board.

The Youth Board is again preparing publicity for summer camps for our youth. The Board is doing this because the Synod has approved and encouraged such camps. However publicity will be a waste of money unless it is distributed. When the material reaches you, will you see to it, please, that this material is distributed? Do so even though you may not think that you have any young people who are interested. At least the material will let our people know what we are doing for our youth. Last year at the Y.P.A. convention a number of young people reported that there were congregations where the material was never seen. We hope that will not happen this year. Won't you please cooperate and distribute the folders as soon as you receive them? Thank you.

Ray Branstad

OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

I. From the Manager of the Synod Book Company:

"Would you be so kind as to insert a notice asking that any of our Pastors or Congregations that have extra copies of the pamphlet '100 Questions' put out by the

Chicago Area group, to contact me at the book store. It is out of print and we still have a fair demand for it. It may be reprinted someday, but at present no idea when. Thank you. Respectfully,
Stan."

Ed: It is inserted. And you're welcome.

II From Bob Holdstad, Secretary of the Seminary Association:
"The student body of the seminary has mimeographed one of Madison's sermons that he read to us in class. We thought it was worthwhile and should be made available to others. You might make an announcement in the Clergy Bulletin or so. The sermon is available at the bookstore at the following prices: List 10¢, not 9¢; 1.00 per dozen; 100 copies, \$7.25."

Ed: 'Tis done. And we add:
The title of the sermon is "REWARD OR REBUKE - WHICH SHALL IT BE?"
Text: Matt. 25:14-30. Neatly done up in pamphlet form the size of your Sunday Bulletins.

SLEUTHING For Bulletin Material.

We are always on the lookout for good material for this Bulletin. Last month we printed SCY's suggestion that each pastor prepare a paper once every year or so on a subject of his particular theological interest. That should have at least a double appeal: 1. Production of thoughtful and helpful material for your embryo theological journal; 2. Good exercise in self-discipline. - Then there is also that little kick that we mortals get out of seeing our own stuff in print, even if it is only mimeograph print. The suggestion could conceivably stimulate at least 25% of our number, so we are looking forward to about one dozen articles in the next few months by that road. Won't you get busy on that idea, dear 25% of the brethren?

We know a pastor who, after every conference, large or small, goes home and digs and digs for a

couple of days on a subject that has been discussed at the conference and left a trifle fuzzy. Unfortunately, he doesn't always write down the results of his digging, but he retains a lot in his head, and has become quite an oracle. Try it, but write it up and send it hither. That suggestion ought to appeal to another 25% of our number. - Don't worry, we'll find a way of getting the stuff printed.

About a month ago a brother wrote this suggestion: "Ask the men to name the book they'd not like to do without and to tell why in as many words as they might choose to use. Run these one or two a month, as their length might dictate. You might get some rather readable stuff. And all of us might get some good hints as to what to buy for our limping libraries." The man adds: "Well, it's costing me only 3¢ to say this, and it's costing you nothing; so consider the suggestion and do with it what you will." - We are glad to print the suggestion and to attach an underlined and capped "AMEN!" - (It is not too much to assume, we suppose, that everybody already has and uses the Bible and the Triglott and knows very well why.) - We anticipate that this suggestion will appeal to and bring concrete results from at least 25% of our number. - We also look forward to seeing Suggestor Dorr's nomination in our mailbox before the end of May. Who will volunteer to share the boards with him?

Let's see! The above reasonably assures material from 75% of our number. Surely, not 25% want to find themselves in the 25% not accounted for. It isn't normal that we want to be in the minority if it isn't necessary. Could be that there may be one here or there like the sailor in HAM's story. The sailor was ship-wrecked and was cast upon an unknown and apparently desert island. As he walked up the beach he announced very loud: "If there is a government on this is-

land, I'm against it."

After-thought: Looking over what we have written, we see that both the ideas and the vocabulary suggest that we are going to have a pretty well "stuffed" Clergy Bulletin. - Undskyld!

TNT

P.S. Will someone please write the Editor and tell him what to do should he learn that he does not have the gift or prophecy and that his arithmetic is all wot?

T.

LITTE AV HVERT

D.L. Pfeiffer has accepted the call to Harvard Street Lutheran Church, Cambridge, Mass., and intends to move there in June after the school year closes.

Report has it that Bob Prouss will be moving to northern Minnesota soon after Easter. Vacaney pastor in Cambridge will be Pastor J. F. Pfeiffer.

Some of our readers who are not too much up on their Norse have asked what the words at the head of this little column mean. The words mean "A little of everything." So if there are any little items of interest (now additions etc.) that the brethren might like to know, put it on a postcard and drop it in the mailbox.

INTER NOS

On March 14 the Clergy Bulletin Committee got together in Luvorne, Minn., to discuss ways and means of getting out the Bulletin. Among other things, the idea was broached that we need a place in addition to our Conferences where we can discuss matters without what we say being interpreted as final or official. "Open Forum," you understand, or "Forum and Agin'om," as one foller had it.

We realize that "Open Forum" has its dangers as well as its advantages. Even so, it was decided that we would inaugurate such a thing in connection with our "Clergy Bulletin." The discussion will be kept "Inter Nos." What comes in of such a nature will be printed on sheets of a different color and will be sent only to those on our roster. The Editor will have to exercise some control according to his discretion, but does not intend to burb free speech. The writers will be expected to exercise some control also. If you are inclined sometimes to "let your hair down" in Conference, you can do the same here. The assumption is that a man doesn't write as fast as he talks.

We all know that the matter of our relations with the Missouri Synod is going to be discussed at our next Synod meeting. Being realists, we know that we do not all see eye-to-eye on what is the thing to do. Here is a place you can discuss it before the Synod meeting.

Putting it realistically, here are two questions:

1. Why do you want to break with the Missouri Synod?
2. Why do you not want to break with the Missouri Synod?

You have thoughts on the matter? Write them down and send them hither.

Material in that line, however, will have to get here soon if it is to be of any profit.

It may also be that you will have a "gripe" about the idea of an open forum in connection with the Clergy Bulletin. Go ahead, write it down and send it.

TNT.

THE CLERGY BULLETIN

Vol. XIV

April 1955

No. 8

Facing The Facts

by C. M. Gullerud

In the year 1935 the Missouri Synod resolved to accept an invitation of the American Lutheran Church to meet with a committee of that body which had been appointed for the purpose of seeking to establish "pulpit and altar-fellowship." A standing committee of five was appointed by the Missouri Synod President to conduct these conferences. (Proc. of the 36th Reg. Conv. of the Missouri Synod. 1935. p. 221.)

Since a similar invitation had been received by the Norwegian Synod, the 1936 convention of this body studied and adopted theses expressing the principles which must guide us in seeking fellowship relations with other bodies. These theses and the studies based on them were presented to the convention under the heading: "Unity, Union, and Unionism." In December of 1938 this subject matter was published in pamphlet form and sent to all pastors of the Synodical Conference. The theses are as follows:

Thesis I.

The spiritual unity of the Holy Christian Church, which is the body of Christ, is not dependent upon any such externals as a common organization or language, but alone upon the possession of the saving faith in Jesus Christ. True Christians will, however, "endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," Eph. 4:3, and will therefore also seek to establish and maintain church fellowship with all who are one

with them in confessing the true faith.

Thesis II.

We acknowledge one, and only one, truly unifying influence and power in matters both of doctrine and of practice, namely the Word of God; and only one God-pleasing procedure in striving for unity: That "the Word of God is taught in its truth and purity, and we as the children of God lead holy lives according to it."

Thesis III.

Through such teaching of the Word, unity and (when deemed desirable) union have been attained in the past: Examples: the early New Testament Church, the Lutheran Reformation, and the Synodical Conference.

Thesis IV.

We hold that inter-synodical committees are useful in promoting Christian fellowship only: a) when the various groups or synods have, through their public ministry of the Word, given each other evidence of an existing unity in spirit, and it remains merely to establish the fact of such unity and to arrange for some public recognition and confession of that fact; b) or where it is clear that those in error sincerely desire to be taught "the way of God more perfectly." Acts 18:26.

Thesis V.

Where such evidence of unity is lacking, or where it is clear that those in error do not sincerely desire to be "taught the way of God more perfectly," but such committees nevertheless are elected to

confer with them with the view to church fellowship, there is grave danger that the work of these committees will result in indifference and in compromise of Scriptural doctrine and practice. (For examples of this, consider the mergers and unions of recent years among Lutherans.) The duty of testifying to the truth of God's Word and thus promoting unity, rests at all times upon all Christians. Cf. I Peter 3:15.

Thesis VI.

Scripture warns us clearly and emphatically against entanglements with errorists (Romans 16:17; Titus 3:10; I Tim. 6:3-5). Any reluctance to heed these warnings and commands of Scripture is unionism already conceived in the heart, which if allowed to develop, will result in full-fledged unionism, as history also attests.

In accordance with these considerations the Norwegian Synod did not join in the proposed committee meetings which, according to the American Lutheran Church invitation, were to be held for the purpose of seeking to establish "pulpit and altar-fellowships." The futility of approaching the establishment of fellowship relations in this manner and the dangers involved had been impressed upon the Norwegian Synod in connection with the negotiations carried on with the Hauge Synod and the United Church which negotiations culminated in the adoption of Opgjør (The Madison Settlement) by a majority vote. The merger of 1917 followed. The bodies thus united formed what is now known as the "Evangelical Lutheran Church." The very history of the small minority which reorganized on the old foundations cried out against becoming involved once more in an arrangement which before had given birth to a compromise document which brought so much confusion and division into the ranks of the old Norwegian Synod. Subsequent history in the recent committee meetings has shown that the fears and anxieties of 20 years ago have been realized.

I. The St. Louis Union Resolutions of 1938.

The Missouri Synod committee on Lutheran Union reported to the 1938 convention of that body that six meetings had been held with the A.L.C. commissioners and that these meetings had resulted in a "Declaration" by the A.L.C. representatives in which they summarized the result of their deliberations. (Proc. of the 37th Reg. Conv. of the Mo. Synod, 1938, p. 221ff.) By resolution the Missouri Synod offered thanks to God for His guidance "by which the points of agreement have been reached" and asked divine guidance toward the consummation of efforts to bring about church relations with the A.L.C. As a doctrinal basis for future church fellowship with the A.L.C., the Mo. Synod adopted a complicated resolution which later became the subject of varied interpretations among its members. Some believed that they had only adopted a basis for future negotiations. But the facts are these: 1. The Mo. Synod in a resolution of thanks to God did state that points of agreement had been reached. 2. The Mo. Synod did adopt a doctrinal basis for future church fellowship with the A.L.C. The resolution reads as follows:

"Resolved that Synod declare that the Brief Statement of the Missouri Synod together with the Declaration of the representatives of the American Lutheran Church and the provisions of this entire report of Committee 16 now being read and with Synod's actions thereupon, be regarded as the doctrinal basis for future church fellowship between the Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church." (Proc. of 37th Reg. Conv. of the Mo. Synod, 1938, p. 231.)

The actual establishment of fellowship relations with the A.L.C. was made dependent on the approval of the bodies affiliated with the A.L.C. on the one hand and on the approval of the bodies affiliated

with the Mo. Synod on the other hand.

The report of the Convention Committee No. 16 which became a part of the doctrinal basis (see above) made the observation that agreement had been reached in the so-called fundamental doctrines of Holy Scripture (f. inst. Inspiration, Conversion etc.) It also observed that the Declaration of the American Lutheran Church "asks tolerance for certain teachings and interpretations which have been rejected in our circles." (pp. 228-229.) However, in each instance the Committee number 16 declared that such deviations "need not be divisive of church fellowship." These deviations were listed as pertaining to the following doctrines: the doctrine of the Anti-Christ, the Conversion of the Jews, the Physical resurrection of the martyrs before judgment day, and the time of the fulfillment of the thousand years of Rev. 20 (whether in the past or in the future). The A.L.C. representatives declared that it is permissible to speak of "a visible side of the Church" in defining its essence "if by this visible side nothing else is meant than the use of the means of grace." This difference was also declared by the Missouri Synod to be non-divisive of church fellowship. While the Union Committee was instructed to try to reach full agreement also on all these points it was made clear that the establishment of fellowship relations was not made dependent upon the success of this endeavor. Matters of practice were also to be taken up with the A.L.C.

At its 1938 Convention in Sandusky the A.L.C. adopted the Brief Statement and the Declaration as the union basis and said furthermore: "We believe that the Brief Statement viewed in the light of the Declaration is not in contradiction to the Minneapolis Theses." With reference to the so-called four non-fundamental points of doctrine they said: "It is neither nec-

essary nor possible to agree in all non-fundamental doctrines." Later in Mar. 4 1947 the A.L.C. commissioners spoke of this as "an area where there exists an allowable and wholesome latitude of theological opinion on the basis of the teaching of the Word of God."

May 25th to 28th, 1943 the pastoral conference of the Norwegian Synod studied all matters pertaining to the "St. Louis Union Articles of 1938". This study resulted in the preparation of a letter which was in the same year adopted by the Synod and forwarded to the Missouri Synod over the signatures of its President and Secretary. The text of the letter is as follows:

The Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States,
Dear Brethren in Christ:

Whereas "The St. Louis Union Articles of 1938 (Proceedings of the 37th Regular Convention of the Missouri Synod pp. 221-233) stand as a confession on the part of the Missouri Synod so long as they are not revoked, and

Whereas the Norwegian Synod of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church accepts unreservedly the "Brief Statement" of the Missouri Synod, but cannot and does not accept the other articles of Union in all points, and considers said points church divisive for the following reasons:

a) They contain false doctrine, for instance, the statement on justification in the "Declaration": "To this end He also purposes to justify those who have come to faith --" (Proceedings p. 222). Cf. II Cor. 5:19; Rom. 5:18; Rom. 3:28;

b) They do not require full agreement regarding the doctrine of the Church and the Last Things as a prerequisite for Church-fellowship, and thus make room for the false principle that it is not necessary for a church to agree in all matters of doctrine (Matt. 28,20; I Cor. 1,10);

Therefore, in the interest of the truth committed to us by the

Lord, out of charity toward the brethren, to safeguard its own confessional position, and to clear the way for true unity in the Lutheran Church, the Norwegian Synod entreats the Missouri Synod at its forthcoming convention to revoke "The St. Louis Articles of Union", and thus let the "Brief Statement" stand unqualified and unsullied as our clear and joint confession.

On behalf of the Norwegian Synod

Signed Norman A. Madson,
President.
Geo. O. Lillegard,
Secretary.

The 1944 Convention of the Missouri Synod answered this overture by asking the Norwegian Synod to await the outcome of endeavors being made to produce "one doctrinal agreement". (Proc. of the 39th Conv. of the Mo. Synod 1944, p.251.) This had reference to the attempts being made to weld the Brief Statement and the Declaration together into one document. This was finally done and was presented under the title "Doctrinal Affirmation." But this was never accepted either by the A.L.C. or by the Missouri Synod.

At its Centennial Convention of 1947 the Missouri Synod reaffirmed its adherence to the Brief Statement of 1932 (Proc. p.476) and at the same time resolved "that Synod declare that the 1938 resolutions shall no longer be considered as a basis for the purpose of establishing fellowship with the American Lutheran Church." (Proc. p.510.) The resolution merely set aside the 1938 resolutions as a basis for establishing fellowship with the A.L.C. and did not reject them because there was anything doctrinally wrong with them. Therefore, the false doctrine there contained and the false principle on church fellowship there set down remained to plague the church and to bear the fruits which are common to error when it is permitted to remain. Although the Missouri Synod did reaffirm its adherence to the Brief Statement at the 1947 convention,

it failed when it did not at the same time reject the "St. Louis Union Articles of 1938" for proper reasons. That the 1938 resolutions were not dead and inactive after 1947 is shown in the report of the "Advisory Committee on doctrine and practice" dated Aug. 15, 1951. This report was accepted by the Praesidium of the Missouri Synod. In this report on page ten, Dr. Wm. Arndt is quoted as follows: "I do not present anything new in my essay as far as doctrinal views are concerned, but I do sponsor the position which our Synod gave expression to in 1938." This was spoken in defense of an essay which Dr. Arndt had delivered in 1949 before the So. Calif., the Calif., and Nevada Districts. This is merely one example to show what happens when a church body does not properly reject that which is wrong even though it may otherwise affirm statements which are Scripturally sound.

It was therefore not out of place when the Norwegian Synod again took up the matter of the St. Louis Articles of Union before the Synodical Conference in 1954 and asked that body to go on record as rejecting them. Although the Synodical Conference did reaffirm a proper definition on Objective Justification and by a majority vote did accept a proper definition on "Unionism" it did not reject the St. Louis Articles of Union but referred this matter to a new committee to be appointed.

What is Wrong with the St. Louis Articles of Union?

In answer to this question we shall restrict ourselves to the two points mentioned in the 1943 overture of our Synod.

1. Our Synod without qualifications did term as false doctrine a certain statement of the Declaration (which is a part of the St. Louis Articles of Union). This is the statement: "To this end God purposes to justify those who have come to faith ----" This is the

same false doctrine as the Ohio Synod espoused when it said: "We believe and confess that in the atoning work of Jesus Christ holy and merciful God has met us halfway as it were, so that now He is able to forgive and justify us; justification itself, however, is not accomplished until, by the grace of God, the spark of faith has been kindled in a poor sinner's heart; then God forgives the sinner's sins unto him." (Kirchenzeitung, January 17, 1905 -- Quoted in C.M. Zorn's Questions on Christian Topics. p. 75.) This is the same as the "Declaration" statement and makes of faith a cause of justification instead of teaching that faith alone accepts and receives the justification which has already been pronounced upon all men. II Cor. 5,19; Rom. 5,18; Rom. 4,5. The passages which say that we are "justified by faith" (Rom. 3,28) merely teach that a man comes into personal possession of God's justification through faith. But God's purpose in justification extended to all men, for "the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life".

To let the statement of the Declaration go unrejected and so to stand alongside of the definition of Justification adopted at the Synodical Conference in Chicago confronts us with a situation similar to that in "Opgjör" where the true doctrine is acknowledged alongside of false doctrine. It was a serious thing that the Synodical Conference did not reject the St. Louis Articles of Union after all these years of public testimony and admonition.

2. The other major point in our Synod's objection to the St. Louis Articles of Union is the Missouri Synod's answer to the A.L.C. when it asked for tolerance of certain teachings rejected in Synodical Conference circles. The answer given was that these differences "need not be divisive of church fellowship." This action has spread as a prairie fire to open

the way for acts of unionism throughout the Missouri Synod. Thus in 1945, forty-four leaders in the Missouri Synod adopted "A Statement" which finds its support in the 1938 resolutions as follows: "Thesis eleven: We affirm our conviction that in keeping with the historic Lutheran tradition and in harmony with the Synodical resolution adopted in 1938 regarding Church fellowship, such fellowship is possible without complete agreement in details of doctrine and practice which have never been considered divisive in the Lutheran Church." The 1949 essay of Dr. Wm. Arndt found its support from the same source. "The Advisory Committee on Doctrine and Practice" report (accepted by the Missouri Synod Praesidium) reveals the work of the leaven, when it departs from the orthodox teaching that it is Scriptural doctrine to say that the pope is the Anti-Christ. (p.14)

Nowhere in Scripture is there found a basis for teaching that differences in certain doctrines are non-divisive of church fellowship. On the other hand Scripture says: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Matt. 28,20. Cf. also I Cor. 1,10 and Rom. 16,17.

II. The Common Confession.

In spite of the fact that the Norwegian and Wisconsin Synods had protested against the Missouri Synod's continued negotiations with the A.L.C. under the prevailing circumstances, the Missouri Synod at each convention made provisions for further meetings. (The Wisconsin Synod had said: "Under existing conditions negotiations for establishing church fellowship would involve a denial of the truth and would cause confusion and disturbance in the church and ought therefore to be suspended for the time being." -Proc. of the 25th Conv. of the Wisconsin Synod, 1939.p.61. The Norwegian Synod, in conformity with its 1936 theses,

had steadfastly warned the Missouri Synod that its continued committee meetings with the A.L.C. under the prevailing conditions, was a disobedience of Titus 3,10: "An heretic after the first and second admonition reject."

After it became evident that the Doctrinal Affirmation (The document uniting the contents of the Brief Statement and the Declaration) was not acceptable to the A.L.C., the Missouri Synod gave the following instructions to its committee on Doctrinal Unity: "That Synod encourage its committee on Doctrinal Unity to continue discussion on a soundly Scriptural basis, using the Brief Statement and such other documents as are already in existence or as it may be necessary to formulate and that Synod's Committee on Doctrinal Unity be instructed to make every effort to arrive ultimately at one document which is Scriptural, clear, concise, and unequivocal." (Proc. of the 40th Conv. of the Missouri Synod, 1947. p.510.) During the following three years the Missouri Synod committee and the A.L.C. commissioners worked on a unit document. This document entitled "The Common Confession" was adopted by the two committees, Dec. 6, 1949 as a report to their respective Synods. In Feb. of 1950 this document was presented to our Synod's Union Committee which examined it and registered essentially the same objections as were finally raised by the synod itself in 1951. In spite of this, however, the Common Confession (unchanged) was adopted by the Missouri Synod at its 1950 convention at Milwaukee. The adoption of the Common Confession was expressed in these words: "Resolved, That we rejoice and thank God that the 'Common Confession' shows that agreement has been achieved in the doctrines treated by the two committees; and be it further resolved, That we accept the 'Common Confession' as a statement of these doctrines in harmony with Scriptures; and be it further Resolved, That if the American Lutheran Church, in

convention assembled, accepts it, the 'Common Confession' shall be recognized as a statement of agreement on these doctrines between us and the American Lutheran Church." (Proc. of the 41st Conv. of the Missouri Synod, 1950. p.585.) Provisions were made for clarification or expansion of the Common Confession in case further study or future developments should show the need. The following is quoted from the minutes of June 29, 1950. "An amendment was offered, reading: 'That it be understood that the acceptance of this document does not in any way affect our position as expressed in the Brief Statement.' This amendment was rejected. The Chair then put the question: 'Does anyone by his vote in favor of rejecting the amendment repudiate the Brief Statement?' No one arose in answer." (Proc. 1950. p.586.) That the acceptance of the Common Confession did indeed affect Missouri's position as expressed in the Brief Statement is a fact which the historian will find little difficulty in demonstrating. (cf. Reviews on Lutheran Cyclopedia in "Lutheran Sentinel".) The Missouri Synod Unity Committee was designated as the clearing house for all questions regarding the Common Confession. Upon questions raised by Wisconsin and Norwegian Union Committees, Missouri's official committee made it clear that the Common Confession did not constitute just one rung in reaching doctrinal agreement with the A.L.C., but that it had indeed been adopted as an agreement in the doctrines treated in the Common Confession. It was therefore clear that the sister synods had not acted prematurely when, in their 1951 conventions, they gave their official reactions to the document after it had been officially presented to them by the Missouri Synod President.

At its 1951 Convention the Norwegian Synod, after careful study in pastoral conferences, circuit meetings, and congregation meetings, unanimously adopted the following

overture to the Missouri Synod:

WHEREAS, the matter of the Common Confession has been placed before our Synod by our sister synod, the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, for our consent to the course of action outlined in the resolutions of the Missouri Synod, BE IT RESOLVED, that we cannot give our consent to the Common Confession as a settlement of doctrinal differences between the Synodical Conference and the American Lutheran Church, for the following reasons:

The Common Confession does not reject the errors of the American Lutheran Church. The document does not reject the false doctrine which has been expressed in the American Lutheran Church, that some parts of Scripture are not divinely inspired. John 10,35; II Tim. 3,16. On the contrary, when describing the origin of Scripture, the Common Confession uses the expression "content and fitting word," which is acceptable to many of those who also accept the false doctrine aforementioned.

Secondly, although the justification of all mankind in Christ (objective justification, Rom. 4,5, Rom. 5,13) has been openly denied within the American Lutheran Church, yet the Common Confession does not definitely state that God has declared all mankind to be righteous in Christ.

Thirdly, the error of the American Lutheran Church, that some people are converted to Christ while others are not, because the converted offer only a natural resistance, while others offer willful resistance--this error is not rejected in the Common Confession. Rom. 3,22-23.

Fourthly, the Common Confession does not reject the error taught in the American Lutheran Church, that God elected His people to eternal life in view of their foreseen faith (Acts 13,48).

Fifthly, the Common Confession does not wholly reject such errors in the doctrine of the Last Things as the American Lutheran Church is tolerating, as for example, that

the Papacy may not be the Antichrist until the last day (II Thess. 2,8), that an unusually large number of Jews will be converted to Christ in the future, (Acts 7,51; Rom. 8,7) and that there will be some kind of millennial reign of Christ, (II Tim. 3,1). These are examples, sufficient to show that the Common Confession is not a settlement of the differences.

We therefore earnestly entreat our sister synod, the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, to reconsider its adoption of the Common Confession and to reject it as a settlement of its doctrinal differences with the American Lutheran Church.

We further entreat the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod to discontinue negotiations with the American Lutheran Church except on the basis of a full acceptance of the "Brief Statement," (Titus 3:10).

Concern for the truth and for the continuation of our fellowship with the Missouri Synod on the doctrinal basis which we have enjoyed in the Synodical Conference through these many years moves us to draw up these resolutions. We desire our fellowship on the basis of right doctrine and practice to continue. God grant that the unity which once prevailed in the Synodical Conference may be restored by a steadfast adherence to the Scriptural principles that have united us. (Syn. Report for 1951, pp. 54-55.)

At the 1952 convention of the Synodical Conference the whole matter was discussed for many hours before the Convention Committee which reported to the floor a resolution which asked the Missouri Synod to take under renewed consideration its adoption of the Common Confession and to give a hearing to all objections of the sister synods. Adoption of this fair report was blocked by a substitute motion from the floor of the convention which asked for postponement awaiting the outcome of the preparation of a part II to the

Common Confession which was to be an expansion and supplement to the document adopted in Milwaukee. This substitute motion was adopted by a majority vote, an action which later resulted in this that the Wisconsin Synod delegates in a special meeting declared themselves to be maintaining their membership in the Synodical Conference only under protest (in statu confessionis). This action of the Wisconsin Synod delegates was later ratified by their synod.

In its 1953 Convention the Norwegian Synod reaffirmed its 1951 resolutions on the Common Confession and resolved to send its president to the Houston Convention of the Missouri Synod to represent the Synod. The answer given to our overture by the Missouri Synod at Houston was very similar to that given our Synod in 1944 when we had asked for a rejection of the St. Louis Articles of Union. At that time we were asked to await action on the "Doctrinal Affirmation" which ultimately was never adopted. At the 1953 convention at Houston our Synod and the Wisconsin Synod were referred to Part II of the Common Confession which, however, the Missouri Synod itself was not ready to adopt at this convention. (Proc. of the 42nd Conv. of the Missouri Synod, 1953, p. 539) The Missouri Synod did not act on our Synod's plea that negotiations with the A.L.C. should be discontinued in obedience to Titus 3,10. Instead, the Missouri Synod urged its committee "to continue its discussion with the representatives of the A.L.C." (ib. p.535) The action of the Houston Convention caused the Wisconsin Synod to declare that the Missouri Synod had brought about a break in relations which threatened the existence of the Synodical Conference and the continuation of her affiliation with the sister Synod. Our own Synod adopted a series of resolutions addressed to the Synodical Conference in which that body was asked, among other things, to reject the Common Confession as a

"satisfactory doctrinal statement" (Synod Report for 1954, p.45)

The 1954 Convention of the Synodical Conference refused to entertain a motion to reject the Common Confession, but instead passed a motion asking the Missouri Synod not to use the Common Confession as a functioning union document. It was specifically stated that the convention was not passing judgment pro or con on the doctrinal content of the document. Our Synod's resolution calling for rejection of the Common Confession was referred to a new committee of all Synods of the Synodical Conference. This will be the third committee which has had this matter under consideration. Former committees were: the union committees of the respective synods and then the intersynodical relations committee. On the part of the Missouri Synod there was no indication of a change as regards its adherence to the Common Confession. For in the essay dealing with this particular subject and in the discussions, Missouri Synod speakers throughout defended the union document as to its doctrinal content. The resolution on the Common Confession passed by a majority vote with many nay votes and protests being recorded.

The most optimistic observer can hardly look for anything more from the Missouri Synod now than that she may accept the plea of the Synodical Conference which falls far short of rejecting the Common Confession for proper reasons. This will leave the document to plague the church even as the 1938 St. Louis Articles of Union have remained to work untold harm because they were not properly rejected. Our Scripture-grounded objections to the Common Confession are a matter of record in the Synodical Reports of our Synod, in the "Sentinel" as well as in essays on file from the pastoral conference held in the fall of 1950. These issues have been discussed in public meetings in our circles

ever since the Common Confession was adopted in Milwaukee, Wisconsin in 1950. What remains to be said that has not been said already many times through the years? The facts indeed speak a story, the significance of which no impartial observer can miss.

III. Prayer Fellowship.

When two or more people pray together this is a practise of fellowship and therefore should be engaged in only by those who are of the same faith and confession. Agreement in doctrine should be a prerequisite of prayer, otherwise the two parties to such prayer would be found praying against each other; for sincere people would naturally pray God to convince the opposite party of his error. Any agreement to omit such subjects from our prayers and come before the Lord in a neutral manner would be a denial of the truth and constitute a wrong confession. Indeed "mixed prayer among those who confess the truth, and those who deny any part of it, is sinful unionism!" In accordance with this declaration from a Missouri Synod publication of 1927, our Synod resolved to ask the Synodical Conference at its last convention to reject a certain resolution adopted by the Missouri Synod in 1944. This was asked because the specified resolution of the Missouri Synod excuses certain prayers with those who hold to other doctrines, while we believe that these prayers are unionistic, sinful, and contrary to Romans 16, 17. Here is the Missouri Synod resolution: "We reaffirm the position taken at the Fort Wayne Convention page 303, par. 11, 'that in the meantime it be understood that no pulpit, altar, or prayer fellowship has been established between us and the American Lutheran Church; and until such fellowship has been officially declared by the synods concerned, no action is to be taken by any of our pastors or congregations which ignore the fact that we are not yet united.' However, joint prayer at intersyn-

odical conferences, asking God for His guidance and blessing upon the deliberations and discussions of His Word, does not militate against the resolution of the Fort Wayne Convention, provided such prayer does not imply denial of truth or support of error. Local conditions will determine the advisability of such prayer. Above all, the conscience of a brother must not be violated nor offense be given." (Proc. 1944. p.251-252)

The occasion for this resolution was the following: The Synodical Conference in its 1940 convention in Chicago had asked the Missouri Synod not to enter into fellowship (Prayer-, altar-, pulpit-fellowship) with the American Lutheran Church until all matters objected to by members of the Synodical Conference be settled. The original resolution as presented in Chicago did not contain the reference to prayerfellowship, but this was added by amendment offered by those who saw the need of this added safeguard. (Proc. Syn. Conf. 1940. pp.88-89.) Accordingly the Missouri Synod in its 1941 convention incorporated the reference to prayer-fellowship in its own resolution. (See above.) In the meantime it happened here and there that prayer was offered in joint meetings between Missouri Synod and A.L.C. pastors. They were challenged as violating the resolution of the Synodical Conference (1940) and of the Missouri Synod (1941). The point made, of course, was that the pertinent resolutions were based on such passages as Rom. 16,17 and that prayer fellowship with the A.L.C. would then be an act of unionism in view of the disagreement existing. The matter of opening intersynodical meetings with prayer had been discussed by the Missouri Synod already at its convention in 1941 with the report showing that there was a divided opinion. Dr. Behnken's plea at that time was: "This question should be discussed by local conferences throughout the entire triennium." (Luth. Witness, June 1941).

The result of this study was the adoption of the 1944 resolution which we reject and which we asked the Synodical Conference to reject with us.

The resolution which was adopted in 1944 made a distinction between what is called "joint-prayer" and "prayer-fellowship", thus exempting prayers at certain Inter-synodical Conferences from the prohibitions spoken by the Synodical Conference in 1940 and by the Missouri Synod itself in 1941. This is but a man-made distinction without any foundation in Scripture. The 1944 resolution which sets forth a false doctrine on the matter of fellowship relations had the effect that joint prayers with other bodies not affiliated with us were engaged in with ever greater frequency. One of the results was no doubt this, that 44 prominent leaders in the Missouri Synod included in their Chicago "Statement" of 1945, a paragraph on prayer reading as follows: "Thesis Eight--We affirm our conviction that any two or more Christians may pray together to the Triune God in the name of Jesus Christ if the purpose for which they meet and pray is right according to the Word of God. This obviously includes meetings of groups called for the purpose of discussing doctrinal differences." The 1944 resolution opened the way for a practice that went so far that even the official Missouri Synod Committee on Doctrinal Unity began to open its meetings with the A.L.C. commissioners with prayer. The leaven spread so far that the President of the Missouri Synod, in a Chicago meeting with the Presidents of other Lutheran bodies in America, joined them in prayer. The effect of the 1944 resolution is seen in the Common Confession where no reference is made to prayer in its paragraph on fellowship. Read the paragraph and notice the omission: "We dare not condone error or have altar and pulpit fellowship and unscriptural cooperation with the erring individual, church bodies,

or church groups that refuse to be corrected by God's Word." This is indeed a record in history that sounds out a warning as to how rapidly the leaven spreads when once it is given a place and is permitted to remain without purging.

A great deal of testimony has been laid down in this matter in numerous meetings of the Inter-synodical Relations Committee which on several occasions was instructed to study this matter and come in with resolutions. Testimony has been borne in Synodical Conference meetings ever since 1940. Overtures have been presented to the Missouri Synod by its own members. (Proc. 1947, pp. 514-522.) (Proc. 1950, pp. 644-651.) These have been earnest pleas based on the Holy Scriptures. The net result has been that the Missouri Synod did not reject but on the other hand specifically reaffirmed its 1944 resolution at its convention in Chicago (Proc. 1947, p. 517) and again at Houston. (Proc. 1953, p. 552.) There has been a persistency in this that one cannot fail to recognize.

Now the Synodical Conference (largely controlled by Missouri Synod votes) instead of rejecting the Missouri Synod resolution of 1944 on Joint-Prayer, referred the matter to still another committee. The hour is later than we think.

IV. Romans 16,17. Its Meaning And Application.

"Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them." Rom. 16,17. This Scripture passage from early days occupied a prominent place in Missouri Synod literature as a proof text against all unionism, that is, against all joint worship and church work with adherents of false doctrine. It was one of the five Bible passages referred to in the

Missouri Synod's Constitution, where it was and is used as a proof to show that one of the Synod's objectives must be a united defense against scism and sectarianism. (Art. III. page 1.) Rom. 16,17 is listed in Concordia Cyclopedia (1927) in the section on Unionism where we read: "In the light of these texts all joint ecclesiastical efforts for religious work (missionary, educational, etc) and particularly joint worship and mixed (promiscuous) prayer among those who confess the truth and those who deny any part of it, is sinful unionism." (pp. 774-5). Rom. 16,17 occupied a prominent place in the Brief Statement's paragraph on "Church-fellowship," where it was used to prove that one must leave a heterodox church body and again, to show that church fellowship with adherents of false doctrine is disobedience to God's command and causes divisions in the church. (par.28.) So long as the Missouri Synod remained faithful and true to the clear principle laid down in that bastion against all unionism, Rom. 16,17, she remained strong in her testimony and exerted a tremendous influence for good among other Lutherans in this country. Whatever acts of unionism occurred in her midst were only casual deviations which were promptly and effectively dealt with. Thus through the exercise of doctrinal discipline, applied certainly in an evangelical manner, Missouri maintained a strong confession and her orthodox character was preserved in spite of casual intrusions of error.

Some of the first signs of crumbling in the official stand of the Missouri Synod on this point came into evidence in the St. Louis Convention of 1938 where certain differences in doctrine were declared to be not necessarily divisive of church fellowship. (Cf. the First Section of "Facing the Facts.") Thus was introduced a false and unscriptural principle on church fellowship, namely, that there are some doctrinal differences which need not be divisive of church fel-

lowship and other doctrinal differences which are divisive of church fellowship. While Scripture indeed teaches that we are to have great patience with brethren who in weakness or ignorance err even in fundamental doctrines, it nowhere distinguishes between doctrines which need not be divisive of church fellowship and doctrines which are divisive of church fellowship. An ever-increasing stream of unionistic acts and false teachings walked through the door which had been opened at the Convention in 1938. Some of these acts and statements were by individuals (Ex. J.H.Gockel in Minneapolis) and groups of individuals (Chicago Statement) and as time went on, by the Synod itself. (Prayer-fellowship with errorists, cooperation with the National Lutheran Council and Lutheran World Federation, also the Communion Agreement with other Lutheran bodies for men in the armed services.)

In 1945 forty-four Missouri Synod clergymen (some of them professors at the Seminary) met in Chicago and drew up twelve theses which were released to the public and were immediately welcomed by liberal Lutherans from coast to coast. This statement of principles became known as the "Chicago Statement" and drew some supporters from the rank and file of Missouri Synod pastors. In fact, there was a determined campaign to gain subscribers as may be seen from a letter (April 26, 1946 and on file) from the chairman of the Continuation Committee of the Statementarians. As a result many names besides those of the original forty-four were added to the roster of those who expressed their agreement with the "Chicago Statement." That the principles enunciated on Church Fellowship in the "Chicago Statement" flowed through the opening in the dyke made in the 1938 Convention of the Missouri Synod may be seen from Thesis XI: "We affirm our conviction that in keeping with the historic Lutheran tradition and in harmony with the Synodical resolution adopted in 1938 regarding

church fellowship, such fellowship is possible without complete agreement in details of doctrine and practice which have never been considered divisive in the Lutheran Church." (Speaking the Truth in Love, p.9.) How this all resulted in a breakdown in the proper acceptance and application of Rom. 16,17 may be seen from Thesis V: "We affirm our conviction that sound exegetical procedure is the basis of sound Lutheran theology. We therefore deplore the fact that Romans 16:17 has been applied to all Christians who differ from us in certain points of doctrine. It is our conviction, based on sound exegetical and hermeneutical principles, that this text does not apply to the present situation in the Lutheran Church of America..." (Speaking the Truth in Love, p.8.) Closely connected with this statement is Thesis IX: "We believe that the term 'unionism' should be applied only to acts in which a clear and unmistakable denial of Scriptural truth or approval of error is involved. We therefore deplore the tendency to apply this non-Biblical term to any and every contact between Christians of different denominations." (Speaking the Truth in Love, p.8). In accordance with these public theses, adherents of the "Chicago Statement" did in many instances practice fellowship with those not agreed with the Synodical Conference in all points of doctrine. Attempts were made through a special committee of ten to deal with this problem, but nothing came of it. Instead, the Praesidium of the Missouri Synod made a separate agreement with the Forty-four -- "It has therefore been agreed in a meeting of the Praesidium and of the representatives of the Signers that in the interest of peace and harmony in our midst and for the furtherance of the Kingdom of God at large, 'A Statement' and the 'Accompanying Letter' be withdrawn as a basis of discussion so that the issues involved may be studied objectively on the basis of theses prepared under the auspices of the President of Synod. The withdrawal

of 'A Statement' as a basis of discussion shall not be interpreted as a retraction." (1947) No retraction was obtained and none has been obtained to this day. Instead of effective discipline being exercised, certain signers of the "Statement" have been retained at the Synod's Seminary and others have been elevated to positions of trust and responsibility in the Missouri Synod.

Many overtures were presented to the 1950 Convention of the Missouri Synod asking that the "Chicago Statement" be repudiated, that a clear stand on Rom. 16,17 be expressed and that effective action be initiated against those who had departed from the right teaching and application of the passage. No resolution was adopted by way of repudiating the "Chicago Statement," but this was postponed under the plea that more study was necessary. (Proc. 1950, p.658.) With regard to the matter of Rom. 16,17 the convention Committee came in with a recommendation which specifically stated: "Resolved that Synod adopt the following statement: 1. We reaffirm as Scripturally correct the use of verse 17 in the Constitution of Synod, the synodical Catechism, and the Brief Statement; 2. Verse 17 clearly warns against all who cause divisions and offenses by teaching anything contrary to the Word of God, condemns every kind of unionism and the tolerance of error; 3. Verse 17 is a general warning against all errorists, be they Christians or non-Christians; 4. Verse 17 requires the denial of church fellowship, that is joint religious work and worship, to all who persistently adhere to false doctrine; 5. Verse 18 emphasizes the warning given in verse 17 and strengthens the Apostle's command." (Proc. 1950, p.655). This most acceptable and sound report was vigorously opposed particularly by those who had supported the "Chicago Statement." This original report was not adopted, but instead a report in which the application of Rom. 16,17 to church fellowship

was tied to the definition of church fellowship as given in Synodical Resolutions of 1944 and 1947 (Proc. 1950, p.657). Furthermore, the point on joint church work was left out of the application of the passage and instead it was said that this matter is to be judged according to local conditions. This resolution settled nothing, even though it reaffirmed the use of Rom. 16,17 in the Synod's Constitution, synodical Catechism and the Brief Statement. Statementarians expressed their great satisfaction over the resolution. The fact that they had vigorously opposed the original resolution, but approved the final resolution shows that they found the latter more palatable and not critical to their position.

That the Statementarian view of Rom. 16,17 and the whole subject of unionism is not dead but very much alive may be seen from recent expressions in the "American Lutheran" magazine of January and February, 1955. The "Lutheran Witness" as late as Feb. 1, 1955 (p.45) shows that it is not willing to refer Rom. 16,17,18 to those within the Christian fold who teach falsely. In answer to a question asking if Rom. 16,17,18 can be applied to Reformed Christians, the answer is given in part: "You are right in saying that V.18 should be taken along and that for this reason we must think of people outside of the church, since those within the Christian fold who teach falsely in some respects still serve the Lord Jesus." And the question of whether or not the passage refers to all divisions and offences or to specific people and specific divisions and offenses is left open as the statement is made: "The matter is not so simple." This all shows how the matter of the proper meaning and application of Rom. 16, 17 is veiled in uncertainty in the Missouri Synod today.

This is also reflected in the Missouri Synod's cooperation and joint activity with the National Lutheran Council and Lutheran World

Federation. There is cooperation in the Service Commission, Welfare Work, Refugee Work. While the excuse is made that these are matters of "externals" it is quite patent that the church cannot engage in such activities without definite spiritual implications. The Joint Communion Agreement with the National Lutheran Council which permits inter-communion under certain conditions shows how also the matter of joint worship is involved. If such inter-communion under certain conditions be permitted among men in the service, then what is to hinder a similar agreement in civilian life. Furthermore, the "Common Confession" does not refer to Romans 16,17 in the paragraph on church fellowship. The whole chapter of Rom. 16 is referred to at the end together with a number of other lengthy Scripture portions.

The whole matter of unionism and the meaning and application of Rom. 16,17 was referred to the Intersynodical Relations Committee for study and for report to the Synodical Conference. This was done and a rather detailed definition of "Unionism" was presented to the Synodical Conference Convention in 1950 at Fort Wayne. This was adopted without opposition. However, when the definition from the Concordia Cyclopedia was presented for adoption by the Chicago Convention in 1954 there was much opposition voiced and the definition was adopted only by a majority vote which was so close in the judgment of the chairman that he called for the voice vote a second time before he announced the adoption. This shows certainly that the stand on Rom. 16,17 in the Synodical Conference has deteriorated since 1950 and that the leaven has spread and is permeating the whole lump.

The fundamental error of Missouri today is in the doctrine of church fellowship, which in turn involves the clarity of Scripture, inasmuch as there is even now toleration of conflicting doctrines. If Missouri would today promise to cease all of its so-called coopera-

tions with the National Lutheran Council and the Lutheran World Federation while the matter is being studied, then there might be some hope. But this she has not promised to do, but continues to this day in all its cooperative endeavors with these false-teaching churches and so is causing offences. If the Missouri Synod would promise to proceed with doctrinal discipline against those who even to this day propound the views of the "Chicago Statement," then there would be some hope, but this she has not promised to do, but she leaves signers in positions of trust in its seminary, its colleges and in Public Relations Offices. If the Missouri Synod would promise to ask its congregations not to organize any more Scout troops while the matter is being studied, then there would be some

reason to hope for a change. But this she has not promised to do. These offences contrary to the doctrine which we have learned are persisted in and continued in. These are the facts and we must face them. The only solution for us in the face of these facts is to act in obedience to God's Word according to Romans 16,17. Only then will we proceed with a good conscience and preserve our own orthodoxy. We are by no means immune to the leaven. The deterioration which has taken place in such a strong body as the Missouri Synod should stand as a warning to us all.

(See also the special edition of the Lutheran Sentinel: "In the Interest of the Truth," of August 27, 1943.)

* * * * *

LITT AV HVERT

Dedication services at Pinehurst Lutheran Church, Eau Claire, Wis., Arvid Gullerud, Pastor, will take place on Sunday, June 5. Special services will be held at 9:30 a.m. and 2:30 p.m. Guest speakers at the services will be Pastors M. H. Otto and G. M. Gullerud. We want to wish God's gracious blessings upon this congregation in its new house of worship,

is that the organ is now for sale and that bids can be sent to the College for consideration. The organ is in good shape with two manuals, and needs only routine repairs.

English Lutheran Church of Cottonwood, Minn., has sent a call to Pastor Joseph Petersen of Cornwall, England.

We received a card from Brother Dorr concerning the old chapel organ at Bethany College. The card describing the organ has been lost in the shuffle, but the gist of it

Rev. Robert Preus was installed at two congregations in northern Minnesota on Sunday, April 24. His address is now Trail, Minn.

THE CLERGY BULLETIN

71.

Vol. XIV

May 1955

No. 9

A Study of 'Heresy' and 'Heretic'

by J. A. O. Preus

This little study was completed a couple of years ago, but is here presented to our pastors for their criticism and comment. It is the opinion of this writer that Titus 3:10-11 will become a battleground, just as Rom. 16:17 has been, in our war against unionism. Our Synod, following Luther, has quoted this verse to Missouri in our pleas against their continued negotiations with the ALC. In our use of this verse we were criticized by Missouri and the Slovak Church. A paper was presented at a meeting of the Intersynodical Relations Committee by a Slovak representative in which he attempted to show that Titus 3:10 referred only to those who stir up commotions in congregations about non-doctrinal matters. Dean Madson answered him correctly. Likewise Prof. Faye presented a paper a couple of years ago in which he made a very thorough study of the matter. This paper is presented in the hope that further light may be thrown on the matter. It is a serious matter, since one of our strongest charges against Missouri has been that in continuing these negotiations she has violated this passage. The reason for presenting this paper for criticism and comment is that the approach is quite different from that taken by many others, including our own Faye. It would be a good thing if, in contending for this passage, we all present a united front and all speak the same thing. If the passage does not apply to Missouri's negotiations with

the ALC, we should be men enough to admit our error in quoting it. It is the conviction of this writer that we have been within Scriptural rights in using this passage, however.

Certain principles have guided the writing of this paper:

1. That the meaning of a word is determined by its usage in its context.
2. That in dealing with a hapaxlegomenon the meaning can only be determined by its context and the meaning of related words.
3. That a hapaxlegomenon of a language two thousand years removed from our time constitutes a particularly difficult problem.
4. That commentaries and lexica are of only relative value in such a study.
5. That the study of such a word as 'heretic' in its historical setting, that is, as it has been used by different men under different circumstances and in controversies, is almost valueless. Only the Scripture itself will help us. It would be better entirely to dismiss a verse from our polemical usage rather than to use it in a dogmatic way, only to find that the meaning of the original is so obscure that we can't be sure what it means.
6. That it is better to put too little into the meaning of a word rather than too much, especially when using the word in controversies.

The point in this paper which takes issue with most writers of the past is found in # 8, re the meaning of the hapaxlegomenon AUTOKATAKRITOS. Most writers, including Faye and Gerhard et. al. contend that the man must know that he is condemned by his error, know that he is outside the Church. My contention is that since we cannot judge hearts and minds, this verse would become impossible to put into practice, if before we could apply it we had to know that the person in question actually knew himself to be condemned by God. We cannot say that all heretics are damned, but we can say that all are to be rejected after they have been admonished. Further comment is invited in the pages of the Clergy Bulletin. The writer suggests that the following be studied with Bible at hand.

I. HAIREISIS.

Occurrences:

- Acts 5,17: "The sect of the Sadducees."
 Acts 15,5: "The sect of the Pharisees which believed."
 Acts 26,5: "The most straitest sect of our religion."
 Acts 24,5: "The sect of the Nazarenes."
 Acts 24,14: "The way which they call heresy." (RSV, "sect")
 Acts 28,22: "Concerning this sect ... spoken against."
 1 Cor. 11,19: "There must be heresies", outgrowth of schismata.
 Gal. 5,20: "The works of the flesh ... heresies."
 2 Pet. 2,1: "False prophets... false teachers...privily...damnable heresies...donying the Lord that bought them...swift destruction."

Comments:

1. All the NT instances of the word HAIREISIS indicate a group or the thinking of a group which of its own choice has separated itself from others and is following its own chosen opinion.

2. HAIREISIS is used in two ways in the NT: 1) a party or sect; 2) the belief of a party or sect, heresy.

3. 1) HAIREISIS as "sect" is used in what appears to be a neutral way, Acts 5,17; 15,5; 26,5; and in a tone of reproach, Acts 24,14 (sometimes translated "Heresy," AV) Acts 24,5; 28,22.

2) HAIREISIS as "Heresy" is always in the NT treated in a tone of reproach:

- a) 1 Cor. 11,19 - an outgrowth of SCISMATA.
- b) Gal. 5,20 - "works of the flesh."
- c) 1 Pet. 2,1 - "False prophets" etc.

4. Acts 15,5 indicates that a member of a sect may be a believer though in error.

5. HAIREISIS is always used of doctrine, not morals; Cf. the moral character of those termed a "sect" - Sadducees, Pharisees, Christians, cf. also 1 Cor. 11,19; 2 Pet. 2,1.

6. HAIREISIS coupled with DIXOSTASIA in Gal. 5,20 as "works of the flesh"; cf. Rom. 16,17 which commands us to "mark them and avoid those that cause divisions," DIXOSTASIAS is doubly true of HAIREISIS, since the latter is more serious, cf. 1 Cor. 11,19.

7. False prophets come in "sheep's clothing", Matt. 7,15; bring in HAIREISIS APOLETIAS "privily", PAR-EISAKOUSI, 2 Pet. 2,1.

II. HAIRETIKOS

Occurrences:

Titus 3,10-11: "A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition reject; knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself." Hapaxlegomenon.

Comments:

1. HAIRETIKOS is an adjective de-

noting one who holds a HAIREISIS.

2. The meaning of an adjective must be determined by the meaning of the noun from which it is derived, esp. in the case of a hapaxlegomenon.

3. While HAIREISIS may be used in a neutral way, cf. above 3,1), HAIRETIKOS which occurs only here in the NT is derived from the meaning of HAIREISIS in *malem partem*, cf. Tit. 3,10-11 - *PARAITOU, EKSESTRAPTAI, HAMARTANEI, AUTOKATAKRITOS*.

4. 2 Pet. 2,1 and Matt. 7,15 show that "false prophet" and "heretic" are essentially synonymous, that both operate secretly, that both do great harm, cf. above 7.

5. One who accidentally or unknowingly teaches error is not a heretic, cf. Tit. 3,10, *META MIAN KAI DEUTERAN NOUTHESIAN*, but only when he persists after admonition; cf. 2 Tim. 2,18 "their word doth eat as a cancer"; of such Paul says "avoid" namely Hymeneus and Philetus. In Acts 15,5 members of a "sect" are called believers and when they yield to instruction are received as brethren, but Paul in Gal. 1, 7-8 pronounces a curse upon those who teach the same error, cf. Gal. 5,3-12.

6. From the above as well as 2 Tim. 2,16-18 we see that false doctrine which we are commanded to avoid and which is cursed may not be what we call "fundamental", e.g. in 2 Tim. Hymeneus and Philetus taught that "the resurrection is past already," yet Paul says that "their word doth eat as a cancer," *GAGGRAINA*, "Gangrene," cf. Thayer s.v. In other words, it is not the enormity of the error which makes a man a heretic, but his persistence in it after due admonition.

7. Whether a false teacher is saved or not does not decide whether he is to be avoided. Conversely we are not obliged to determine his state of grace before deciding to embrace or avoid him, cf. 2 Tim. 2,18 and the literature re *KOILIA* in Rom. 16,17-18, Koehler; also

point 5 above re Paul's treatment of such a case.

8. *AUTOKATAKRITOS* in Tit. 3,11 is a very strong term (for while a hapaxlegomenon in eccl. lit. its derivation from *KATAKRINO* is obvious) indicating that, while it is not our place to judge hearts, false doctrine is a very serious thing and brings down God's wrath. Likewise, *EKSESTRAPTAI*, "subverted," is very strong, cf. Septuagint of Deut. 32,20, "a froward generation" Meyer, p.320, says of this word: "It shows the total perversion of thought and endeavor." And of *AUTOKATAKRITOS* he says: "The meaning is: he sins with the consciousness of his guilt and of his own condemnation, so that there is no hope of his return." In view of the fact that this word occurs only once we feel constrained to question Meyer's statement that a heretic is necessarily conscious of his guilt. He may be, but not necessarily. The prefix *AUTO* can just as well mean that the heretic is condemned by his own persistence in error, not of his own knowledge, as Meyer's statement implies. Moulton-Milligan, s.v., say that the word "is, for all we know to the contrary, a genuine new coinage in Tit. 3,11. It is built on a model which any writer or speaker was free to use at will." We question Meyer's statement on the basis of such passages as 2 Tim. 3,13.

9. Thus a false teacher, however, need not be conscious of his error, only persistent in it, cf. 2 Tim. 3,13 where *PONEROI* are described as "being deceived." Paul's admonition that Timothy "continue in the things which thou hast learned" etc. in 3,14-15 shows that these "evil men" must be regarded as false teachers, not people morally evil.

10. It seems clear from Scripture that the term "sect" may be applied to an entire group which separates itself in one or more points from God's truth (for from the above we see that 'sect' is not as strong a word as "heretic" or even the translation "heresy"). However the term

"heretic" cannot be applied to every member of a sect, but only to those who create the sect, the leaders, promoters, propagators of a heresy, and then to them only when they persist in their error, Tit. 3,10. Note that in 2 Tim. 2 Hymeneus and Philetus are singled out as those who "overthrow the faith of some"; also in Tit. 3,10 the term HAIRETIKON ANTHROPON is used indicating a man who creates such a sect; likewise Matt. 7,15; 2 Pet. 2,1; 2 Tim. 3,13 where "false prophets" and "evil men," the leaders who corrupt others, are singled out.

11. Therefore, in calling the Roman church, the ELC, ALC or any other a "sect" or "erring church" we are not thereby calling all members thereof "heretics," nor calling into question their salvation.

12. Further, in using Tit. 3,10 against negotiations with the ALC we are fully conscious that not the entire church body is made up of heretics, that the church body is a sect in which there may be and certainly are many believers. Yet we feel justified in so applying this verse, first because of God's very strong warnings against all false doctrine (which by common consent is taught in the ALC); second, because God warns us particularly against the promoters of false doctrine (and Scripture and history abundantly show that it is the religious leaders, the theologians who become false teachers, not the laity); and third, because the negotiations with the ALC, carried on for so many years, have produced no change in the doctrinal status or affiliation of the ALC. Nor is there any evidence that the ALC is endeavoring to teach its fellow members of the ALC anything it might have learned from its instruction at the hands of Missouri. Do we thereby say that the leaders of the ALC are heretics? We do. They may be "deceived" as the men in 2 Tim. 3,13; but they hold to false doctrine involving fundamental and serious matters, they have resisted all attempts to admonish them and

correct them, they have persisted in teaching their followers things which are contrary to Scripture, and they have remained in fellowship and sought fellowship with those who are far worse doctrinally than themselves. Do we say that the terrible adjectives of Tit. 3,11 can be applied to these men? Our experience in dealing with Lutheran theologians has shown a very great perversity and unwillingness to bow to clear Scripture. Do we say that these men are conscious in their false teaching? We do not judge: they may be "deceived," 2 Tim. 3,13.

13. Luther, the dogmatists, and others have always stated that a heretic cannot be saved. In this they may be correct most of the time. But our study of the passages involved here makes it manifest that it is the persistence in holding to a false doctrine rather than anything else which damns. In all of these matters we must let God be the judge. It is not our place to determine whether they are saved or not, nor to base our decisions re negotiating and fellowship with sects on whether or not they are or can be saved. God's mercy is greater than He wants our fellowshiping to be. Our position is to be faithful to God's Word. After speaking of the seducers and evil men who will fill the world, Paul tells Timothy: "But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned...." That is our task.

14. In answer to the argument that we must testify to these errorists, or weak Christians, or sectarians, or heretics, whatever they may be called, we simply state that God's command to avoid false doctrine and reject heretics must come first. Then we also reply that Paul sometimes testified by shaking off the dust from his feet. This whole subject needs study, but is beyond the confines of this paper.

Norwegian Synod Memorial Library

Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary Library
Mankato, Minnesota

THE PASTOR'S LIBRARY - Note I.

SCANDINAVIAN DICTIONARIES by EINAR HAUGEN, Thompson
Professor of Scandinavian Languages, University of Wisconsin.

Norwegian-English

The great problem in Norwegian dictionaries is to keep them up to date. The changes in spelling made in 1907, 1917, and 1938 have gradually altered Norwegian spelling from being practically identical with that of Danish to being purely Norwegian. For anything written before 1907 it is, therefore, possible to use a common dictionary for Danish and Norwegian. This is the reason that many of the older dictionaries were called Dano-Norwegian. The best of these was A. Larsen, Dansk-Norsk--Engelsk Ordbog (Copenhagen 1897, 3rd edition). The most complete dictionary of Norwegian with English equivalents is J. Brynildsen, Norsk-Engelsk Ordbok (Oslo, 1927, 3rd edition). But this is in the spelling of 1907, so that in order to use it with materials written either earlier or later, one has to know something about the changes in spelling. The only dictionary with contemporary spelling is H. Scavenius, Norsk-Engelsk Ordbok (Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, Oslo). This dictionary has been somewhat revised and adapted for school use by Theodore Jorgenson, whose Norwegian Dictionary for School Use was published by the St. Olaf College Press, Northfield, Minn. Either of these last two is well worth having, but they do not contain most of the difficult words that one would like to look up. As for the New Norse or Landsmal Norwegian, there is no dictionary at all which would be helpful to English-speaking people. The only thing one can refer to is Ivar Aasen, Norsk Ordbog (1873), in which the words are translated into Danish.

English-Norwegian

There is a very good all-purpose English-Norwegian dictionary: Th. Gleditsch, English-Norwegian Dictionary, published originally in Oslo in 1948 but republished in this country. A much more complete one is J. Brynildsen, A Dictionary of the English and Dano-Norwegian Languages (2 vols., Copenhagen, 1902), but this has of course the older spelling which is identical with Danish; and besides, it lacks most of the modern terms. There is also a small English-Norwegian dictionary by B. Berulfesen, Engelsk-Norsk Ordbok (Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, Oslo, 1938) which is the equivalent of the Norwegian-English one by Scavenius, mentioned above. There are other dictionaries on the market, but I would not recommend any of them since they are either too small or antiquated, or both. There is a good English-Landsmal dictionary by Ola Raknes, called Engelsk-Norsk Ordbok, (Oslo, 1927).

Swedish-English

There is one good dictionary that can be heartily recommended: Walter E. Harlock, Svensk-Engelsk Ordbok (Stockholm, 1947). This has over a thousand pages and contains everything except very recent terms and specialized scientific vocabulary. Another one is Ernolv-Petterson-Angström, Svensk-Engelsk Ordbok (Stockholm, 1942).

English-Swedish

There is a corresponding Engelsk-Svensk Ordbok by Kärre-Lindkvist-Nöjd-Redin. There is also

an English-Swedish and Swedish-English dictionary by Tornberg and others, Stockholm, 1940.

The Norwegian items above can be purchased from Norwegian News Company, 6515 Fifth Ave., Brooklyn, New York. The Swedish can be bought from the Augustana Book Concern, Rock Island, Illinois. All are probably available from Stechert-Hafner, Inc., 31 East Tenth Street, New York 3. Current prices can be secured upon request.

So far Prof. Einar Haugen (author of Spoken Norwegian, N.Y., Holt (1946); Beginning Norwegian, N.Y., Appleton-Century-Crofts (1937) and Reading Norwegian, N.Y., Appleton-Century-Crofts (1939)). We are grateful to Prof Haugen for the above bibliographic note, and we hope it will be helpful to such as are contemplating the purchase of a Scandinavian dictionary. It is the intention to make this the first of a contemplated series, The Pastor's Library. The plan is to go on with Dictionaries in other languages, Encyclopedias, Hebrew and Greek grammars, Bible Texts, Commentaries, etc. -- if possible, the standard Theological books will be dealt with. The Seminary Library will try, as far as our funds allow, to acquire the books favorably commented upon in these bibliographical notes.

In his covering letter to me Prof. Haugen has this comment: "It (a Norwegian-English dictionary) is the chief need of our profession." He intimates that, if the necessary support is forthcoming, he will make such a dictionary. Needless to say, Prof. Haugen is eminently qualified for compiling such a work. We hope to announce its publication, if and when it is published.

C.U. Faye

P.S. It is planned, in the above-mentioned series, to include Notes by our own professors, each to comment on the books in the field he teaches.

C.U.F.

LITT AV HVERT

Dedication services at Bethlehem Lutheran Church, Ellsworth, Minn., J.A.O. Preus, Pastor, were held on Sunday, May 15, at 3:00 p.m. The congregation bought and reconverted a former country school house.

St. John's Lutheran Church at Okabena, Minn., Geo. Schweikert, Pastor, celebrated its 60th anniversary on Sunday, May 8. Pres. K.L. Schweppe of Dr. Martin Luther College in New Ulm delivered the address in the morning service, and Pastor J.A.O. Preus preached in the special afternoon service. Offerings received will go toward the purchase of a new organ.

We located Brother Dorr's card which was reported lost in the shuffle in the last issue of C.B., and here is the announcement:

The old Bethany chapel organ is to be sold. If there are those within the Synod who wish to purchase it, they are requested to advise Bethany College of the fact; they should also state their bid. The organ is a Moeller with five manual ranks, four of them duplexed between the Great and the Swell, the Diapason playing on the Great alone, and one rank of Pedal pipes (Bourdon). While the chests will need the routine reconditioning, they and the pipes are in excellent condition.

The Clergy Bulletin is published monthly by Authority of the General Pastoral Conference of the Norwegian Synod. Editorial Committee: Pastors of Southwest Circuit. Editor: T.N. Teigen, 917 S. Grange, Sioux Falls, S.D. Subscription price per year: \$1.50, payable to Rev. Arthur Schulz, Tracy, Minn.

INTER NOS

In the March 1955 issue of the C.B. an Open Forum column was introduced in which the pastors of our Synod might air their views on various matters. These pages on different-colored paper are being sent only to our Synod pastors and students at the Seminary. The following articles were received:

I.

CHURCH THREATS and REBELLION - Quitting a Synod

The delay of the Wisconsin and Norwegian synods in cutting off fellowship with the Mo. organization as such may rightly call for what men call threats. A member of either synod may say to his fellows: If you do not cut off fellowship with official Missouri, I cannot stay with you. Of course that should be an honest declaration, not a blundering bluff. Such a declaration is a good one if the circumstances call for it. Calling such a declaration hot-headed and irrational may be evidence that the second party is in rebellion against God's order of fellowship.

Instead of condemning the man who makes such a so-called threat of leaving a synod, he who is spiritual should carefully examine the reasons for a contemplated severance. Neither party should come into court with conclusions like the Jews who said of Jesus: If He were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered Him to you. In the church, there must be Scriptural reason for severance and also Scriptural reason for condemning any threat of separation. Hasty condemnation of every threat may in fact be an added reason for eventual severance.

A man may have good reason to say: If my synod continues to string along with the disorderly way of the "x" synod, I must withdraw from my synod as a last step of admonition, and because I must be free to preach the Word of God so that it alone rules. The Gospel does not have free course when it is bound as, e.g., by Army regulations, human public opinion, ecumenical notions of the WCC, or current practices of Mo. Synod domination in the Synodical Conference.

God's Moral Law carries with it threats for all who desire to transgress it. Together with the preaching of the Gospel we use the words of Christ: "He that believeth not shall be damned." The steps of Matthew 18 are essential threats to the impenitent. The admonitions to an heretic should certainly impress him with the threat of rejection. In general social and civil life, parents, teachers, police officers and armed forces use threats by virtue of God's Moral Law. Jonah threatened Nineveh. Many other examples could be listed from Scripture.

Pouncing on the man who makes a so-called threat nowadays may be a common occurrence. But such pouncing may be engendered by the spirit of Antinomians, rebellion against God's order for church discipline; it may in effect upset the Biblical order of church government in favor of human rule, mass psychology, or what have you.

If a man would in no way indicate his belief that he must leave a synod for reasons he believes Scriptural, others would most certainly condemn him afterwards for stealing away. Far better it is for all concerned to speak up, even if it sounds like a horse deal, than to put on muzzles right and left. In any case, we should not become guilty of furor about how a man expresses himself and at the same time forget the issue itself.

The cases of Pastors Buhl and Koch were purely internal Mo. Synod affairs. In the first case I know that the issue itself was not used,

even synodical order was not followed. - In these jittery days, it is so easy to find ourselves arguing about discussion that is caused by basic troubles, and the cause itself is forgotten. May God have mercy on us!

Geo. Schweikert

II.

Editor of Clergy Bulletin:

You invite our members, in an Open Forum to express their views concerning matters which are of vital importance to our Church at the present time. To make it as realistic as possible, you suggest two questions, which should be answered. The way these questions are put, it would appear as if the answer should be an "either-or;" but would it not be more in harmony with the real situation to make it a "both and?"

When you ask: "Why do you want to break with the Missouri Synod," I could answer that I have no desire to break with a church body which for nearly a century has stood firm in testifying to old conservative Lutheran principles, and has thereby wielded a great influence upon the whole Lutheran Church in this country, which up to the middle of the last century had hardly deserved the Lutheran name. And when I remember that when a few of us had to break with our brethren in the old Norwegian Synod because of new alignments made on the basis of questionable so-called Settlements, with all indications that a more liberal spirit would prevail, we found in the Missouri Synod true brethren, who stood firmly on the ground on which we wanted to remain. When I think of these things, I have no desire to break with such a body, and I feel certain that all the members of our Synod feel the same way. And it would be heart breaking if it had to be done.

But this now belongs to the past, and we are confronted with the serious problem of what position we are in duty bound to take now and in the future. Sad to say, developments have taken place within the Missouri Synod which change the picture. In the over-zealous attempts to become reconciled with former opponents, "Articles of Agreement" have again and again been formulated and accepted, which instead of being a real settlement have, consciously or unconsciously, smoothened over differences in such a way that they can well be explained as favoring both sides of the former controversies. No former errors have definitely and directly been rejected. Here we have again the same situation with which we were faced when we for conscience sake had to break with our former brethren. Did we take the right course then? What shall our position be now? Divine truth never changes. We have tried to testify against the change in the official stand of our sister synod, but our testimony and our protests have not been heeded. As late as the sessions of the Synodical Conference last year, every point criticized by us has been vigorously defended. Besides this, a large number of leading members have openly assailed the former definite stand of their Synod without any effective reprimand on the part of the synod officials. Some of them have even been promoted to higher positions of trust in their church. And many kinds of more or less veiled forms of Unionism are practised under the guise of "Cooperation in Externals."

Can we continue to fellowship with those who take this position any more than we could continue to fellowship with our brethren of former years under similar circumstances? If our stand was Scriptural then, as we are convinced that it was, it becomes our duty to obey God's admonition to "avoid", "depart from" etc. those who persist in or tolerate error. If there is no change in the situation, then in

obedience to God's Word we want to break. In this respect, I do not believe there is any difference of opinion among us.

The serious question confronting us now is what action we should take at our forthcoming Synod convention. Here there might be a slight difference of opinion. If we had to deal only with those who at present have usurped the leadership in the Missouri Synod, our course would be clear. There is no indication that they will listen to our testimony any more. But there are still no doubt a large number in the church body who honestly want to walk in the old paths; but through ignorance of the real issues and misinformation they have been led to believe that their leaders are still of the old school.

Is there anything we can do to help them to see the light? It is not easy. But is it not worth while to make another attempt to reach them with our testimony? We should pass resolutions making it plain that the time has come when we no longer can continue negotiations through committees. We have already made our stand perfectly plain, and further negotiations of this kind will only cause more confusion. We stand on the ground on which the Missouri Synod stood for over three quarters of a century and testified valiently to a full, unconditioned Gospel and Scriptural practices. And it was because of this stand that we sought closer affiliation with them through membership in the Synodical Conference when we were forsaken by our former brethren. If our sister synod does not show unmistakable proof that it will continue on this ground, we cannot continue our fellowship any longer.

Our resolutions should state clearly the former stand of the Missouri Synod and the reason why we decided officially to join them. I think it is important to stress this at the very outset, because it makes it easier for our own people as well as many members of the Missouri Synod who are not so well informed about the controversial points to understand the real situation.

Then we should enumerate in as few words as possible the points in which the Missouri Synod officially is straying away from its former position. And finally we should state briefly the only condition on which we can continue our fellowship.

I think this procedure has a parallel in our Savior's parable of The Barren Fig Tree. For many years we have held forth our former common stand; but up to now it has failed to bear fruit. The dresser of the vineyard pleads for a reprieve of one more year. He promises to dig about it and dung it. The digging and dunging we can do is to show examples of how the former stand of our sister synod is not in harmony with the official stand taken today. I feel certain that this will have more of an appeal to our true brethren in the Missouri Synod than to continue in our periodicals to add to the already long list of aberrations.

These are suggestions I have to make with reference to the action which we ought to take at our convention. I do not insist on that they be followed. Let us realize fully the seriousness of the situation. And when we are gathered for joint deliberation, let us discuss the matter calmly and without prejudice or suspicion, and pray God to lead us in uniting our efforts to find a solution which will be pleasing to Him and for the best interest of His Church.

Chr. Anderson.

III.

One brother proposes that the reason for breaking now with the Missouri Synod is its un-Scriptural practice of church government. It operates to control matters of doctrine and conscience by force of majority votes.

IV.

While attending Concordia Seminary in St. Louis I was fortunate enough to acquire a copy of Engelder's mimeographed notes on "Unionism." By studying these notes and comparing them with things that were being taught and done in the Seminary at that time, I came to the conclusion that God's Word directed me to leave the Seminary and the Synod in obedience especially to Rom. 16:17. It was then that I thanked God for the existence of Bethany Seminary.

At Bethany our Dogmatics course was based chiefly on Pieper's exposition of Scripture. I was anxious to find out if my previous actions at St. Louis were in accord also with what Pieper said. It was heartening to find that Pieper presented the same position even more clearly than Engelder, if that is possible. And I feel that Pieper also shows the way that our Synod should go at its coming convention with regard to our relations with the Missouri Synod. For that reason I would like to quote a few sentences from Pieper's Dogmatics, III, 422-427.

Pieper says: "A congregation or church body which, in spite of the divine order, tolerates false doctrine in its midst is properly called a heterodox church." (p.422.) I believe there are no doubts but that the Missouri Synod now fits this description. Witness: the 1938 St. Louis Articles of Union, the signers of the "A Statement," the "Common Confession," the B.D. thesis denying Christ's descent into hell, as well as innumerable instances where fellowship has been practised by Mo. Synod pastors together with members of other heterodox churches.

Pieper also has a section titled: "Church Fellowship with Heterodox Churches (Unionism) Is Prohibited by God." This section also meant a lot to me, since I was leaving the Synod to which all of my relatives without an exception belong. But our Savior said: "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me," Matt. 10:37. And Pieper, in accordance with Scripture, said this: "It is common knowledge that the presence of children of God in heterodox churches is urged to prove that it is right, even demanded by charity to fellowship heterodox churches. This is the exact opposite of what Scripture teaches, for Scripture says, 'Avoid them.'" (p.425)

Pieper then mentions the 200 men who followed Absalom "in their simplicity" in his rebellion against David (2 Sam. 15:11). Pieper says: "Just as the fact that the 200 citizens of Jerusalem in their ignorance joined Absalom did not give the rest of Israel the right to desert their king and join the rebels, so the circumstance that some Christians, from ignorance and contrary to God's orders, follow false teachers does not give license to other Christians to do the same thing."

I am convinced that this applies also to our present situation. No doubt there are many in the Mo. Synod who are following their leaders "in their simplicity." But because there are such people, we cannot say that we will continue fellowship with the heterodox church to which they belong. And Pieper again says: "To say that love demands such a practice is a misuse of that word. Love of God and love of the brethren rather requires the opposite practice. He who loves

Christ loves also Christ's Word, and Christ commands us to avoid all who teach anything that is contrary to His Word."

Permit me to bring one final quotation from Pieper: "God permits false teachers to arise in order that Christians may show their obedience by avoiding them, not in order that Christians may fraternize with them (Deut. 13:3; 8:2; 1 Cor. 11:19). If Christians, against the divine prohibition, fellowship false teachers and tolerate false doctrines, they commit the sin which the Church calls 'unionism.'"

We are tempted to quote much more of Pieper, but it would be better if each one would read this entire section for himself. This is the way that Scripture directs us to go, and it is the way that is suggested in the proposed Union Committee report.

Arthur E. Schulz

THE CLERGY BULLETIN

Vol. XIV

June-July 1955

Nos. 10 & 11

G N O S T I C I S M

A Seminary Term Paper

By

Robert A. Moldstad

(Note: This paper is a brief discussion based on the chief points to be found in a number of reference books listed at the end of the paper. Quotation marks have been used where material has not been changed sufficiently to exclude the use of quotes. Numbers found in parenthesis in the paper refer to one of the numbered books in the appended Bibliography.)

I. Introduction

The Greek word "gnosis" is defined in our dictionaries as "a seeking to know," and "inquiry," or in the abstract sense, "knowledge," "wisdom." Our study of Gnosticism centers around this word "gnosis," and so it is only proper to study it briefly. In all Hellenistic writings, when the word "gnosis" was used in its usual abstract sense of "knowledge," it implied a knowledge obtained supernaturally. To the Gnostics, "gnosis" meant "revelation" rather than "knowledge." They regarded this "gnosis" as a higher knowledge communicated to the individual by a being from the heavenly world. But while they considered this knowledge a revelation, it was not a revelation as we generally use the term. We think of revelation as the simple disclosing of some information through an agent or some means. The Gnostic idea was rather a reaching up with one's own intellect and through a process of concentration and proper ritual to arrive at a higher degree of knowledge. This "gnosis," then, as they had it, was superior to faith.

Paul in his epistles also speaks of "gnosis." He views this knowledge as a function of the spiritual man (1 Cor. 2, 11 ff.), and as with all gifts of the Spirit, there were diversities of know-

ledge also (1 Cor. 12, 4 ff.). In a narrow sense Paul regarded "gnosis" as the discerning of the divine ways of salvation and as such could be gained only from Scripture. But some held other ideas of knowledge which Paul seeks to correct. He probably has Gnostics in mind in 1 Tim. 6, 20.

Although Gnosticism attempted to grapple with such problems of philosophy as the creation of the world, and the origin of evil, it is not to be considered a philosophy. The best authorities connect Gnosticism with religion rather than philosophy. Some have termed it: "The decline and fall of philosophy and the rise and progress of syncretism." (3) Harnack defines Gnosticism as "the acute.. .. Hellenizing of Christianity." (5).

During the early years of the Apostolic Age, Gnosticism was to find support in the prevalent ascetic view and the powerful influence of free prophecy. It also had several important attractions: Gnosticism adopted the most brilliant parts of Platonism. It was a choice delicacy for the imagination and the vanity of secret wisdom. Since it was often characterized by austere precepts and care for the soul's well-being, even good men favored it. And not the least attractive was the fact that the Gnostics were the pietists of the early centuries.

The investigation of Gnosticism is still in its rudiments, but advances have been made. For a time the only information available was via the polemical writings of the Church Fathers. Today, however, there are several complete Gnostic writings, and many excerpts and apocryphal writing showing Gnostic tendencies.

Gnosticism is not to be thought of as one united faction. There were almost as many Gnostic Sects as there were prominent Gnostic leaders. Each sect differed in one way or another from the rest, but a common system ran through them all. Often the founders of the Gnostic sects were considered manifestations of God rather than just philosophers.

An interesting question to keep in mind in reviewing Gnosticism is this: Did Christianity pick up Gnosticism in turning to syncretism, or did Gnosticism turn to Christianity in the progress of its syncretism?

II. Common Characteristics of Gnostic Sects.

The object of Gnosticism in all cases was the same, the individual's salvation and assurance of a fortunate destiny for the soul after death. The central object of worship is a redeemer deity who has already trodden the difficult way which the faithful have to follow.

"Though salvation lies at the root of all existence and all history, salvation as conceived in Gnosticism is always in myth, a history of bygone events, an allegory or figure, but not an historical event." (2). The moral element is subdued, the whole system is more or less cosmological. For instance, the conflict between the world and the kingdom of God, and the flesh and the spirit is not religious but a physical conflict of vast cosmic forces. To help understand this, let us look at the Gnostic idea of the creation of the world.

All systems of Gnosticism agree that matter was eternal and not created. The world and the human race were created out of matter by either one aeon called a Demiurgus, or by several aeons or angels. The Supreme God, or Good Principle was not the Creator of the world, but this Supreme God, produced from himself a succession of aeons or emanations, which dwelt with him in the pleroma, the highest good, what we might

call heaven. The succession of aeons or emanations each created a world, with each world in turn inferior and further removed from the kingdom of light, the pleroma. Our world is the lowest of the worlds and is number seven. The creator of our world is called by some "Jehovah", the God of the Jews and Old Testament. (This may have been to spite the Jews.) From the eternal matter, the aeons made the bodies or the sensual souls of men. Hence the origin of evil in man. The Supreme God gave man a rational soul; hence the constant struggle of reason with sense. What are called gods, are merely such aeons, or creators, under whose dominion men became more and more wicked and miserable. To destroy the power of these aeons and free men from matter, the Supreme God sent the most powerful of all aeons, Simon Magus of Acts 8 pretended to be this. Later, Menander, a Samaritan, pretended to be such. Both of these were enemies of Christianity. Cerinthus, a Jew, combined these speculations with Christian doctrines and maintained that the most elevated aeon was Christ who had descended upon Jesus, a Jew, in the form of a dove and through him revealed Christianity. (1) Those that followed this, said that the God of the Old Testament was not the father of Jesus Christ, and that there was no resurrection or final judgment. "Christ was sent into the world to remedy the evil which the creative aeon, or Demiurgus, had caused. He was to emancipate men from the tyranny of matter, or the evil principle, by revealing to them the true God, who was hitherto unknown, to fit them by a perfection and sublimity of knowledge, to enter the divine pleroma. To give this knowledge was the end and object of Christ's coming upon earth; and hence the inventors and believers of this doctrine later assumed to themselves the name of 'Gnostics'" (3)

"Earth is thus a world distantly remote from the world of light by several worlds. Going from earth to the world of light, each world becomes better, and the Gnostic having no part in the lower world ruled by these spirits must by his knowledge raise himself above them to the God of the world of light. (The influence of the late Greek religion is very dominant in this.)" (2)

Two common tenets are to be found in Gnosticism which were extremely prevalent in the pagan religions of the day. "In

most Gnostic systems there is a "Great Mother" appearing in various forms. This *Μητρίτις* finds her prototype in the figure of the great mother-goddess of heaven worshipped throughout Asia under various forms and names (Astarte, Beltis, Atargatis, Cybele, the Syriac Aphrodite.)" (2). "Another characteristic figure borrowed is the Primal Man, the man who existed before the world, the prophet who goes through the world in various forms, and finally reveals himself in Christ. The Gnostic Sophia represents this Primal Man. It represents that divine power which has descended into the darkness of this material world and then is victorious in ascending to the world of light. From him has come the light that we have and through him others derive power to ascend to the world of light." (2)

Gnosticism is mystical; through mysticism the Gnostic enters into communion with God. There is some belief in magic. Worship is very ritualistic, being full of sacred formulae, names, symbols, initiations, consecrations, sacraments, etc. For example, to leave the world and get to the heavenly home, one needs to know all the names of the demons blocking the way and the necessary formulae to clear the way.

Gnosticism is essentially dualism. This dualism is Oriental. Men are considered to be of two classes, although there are some that permit a third class. The first class is called the "pneumatic" or "spiritual," *πνευματικῶν*, constitutionally receptive of Christ's revelation and life everlasting. The second class is the "cyclicli," *ὕκλι*, "material", doomed to perish. This second class is bound to the material and as the material is to perish, they shall perish also. But some add a third group, the "psychici," *ψυχικῶν*, or men of the "soul", not capable of apprehending a divine revelation, but only capable of popular faith (*πίστις*), yet thereby attaining a degree of knowledge and salvation.

Man was said to have a dual human nature, body (matter), and spirit. As the acts of the body had no influence on the spirit, there is to be found prevalent in Gnostic sects both asceticism and libertinism. The highest duty of man was to become united to the first source of spirit through "gnosis" and to attain to the absolute alienation of the human spirit from

the body.

Gnostic principles were in existence before the time of Christ. Most Gnostic systems were anti-Jewish. Since Paul advocated the universality of Christianity, Paul later became a favorite of the Gnostics, (e.g. Marcion). Gnosticism adapted its presentation of Christianity to the forms of the ancient mysteries. Christianity was believed to be the full revelation of the deeper truth embedded in all other nature religions. The intervention of Christ is thought to be the crisis both of the religious history of mankind, and of the whole development of the universe.

The question often raised in the study of Gnosticism is whether the idea of a *σωτήρ* is of Christian origin. The writers referred to in this paper are of the opinion that the idea of a savior did not originate with Christianity. They reason this way: The savior-aspect of Gnosticism exhibits peculiarities of a time previous to the rise of Christianity. This shows then that the idea of a savior did not arise in Gnosticism at the time of Christ. It must be pointed out, however, that all these writers speak of Christianity began with Christ's life here on earth. But Christianity began in the Garden of Eden, not at Bethlehem. And so the Gnostic idea of a savior, though by a remote and round about way via early pagan religions, probably did stem from the promise of Gen. 3, 15. There is no direct connection, however. The Gnostics merely incorporated Christ as the perfect and final appearance of the Primal Man.

Other aspects of Christianity were assimilated until it was not uncommon to have former Christian teachers speaking Gnostic errors. And even after the church had routed out gross Gnosticism, there were still free-thinkers that wanted to make use of certain Gnostic ideas while yet remaining within the pale of the church.

Even the names chosen for some of the aeons show that the Gnostics borrowed heavily from Christianity. Logos, Monogenes, Zoe, Ecclesia, and at length even the Holy Ghost and Christ have been designated as names for the successive emanations from the Supreme God. Other things the Gnostics changed. Christ as the final and perfect aeon was to be distinguished from his visible manifestation on earth. His

visible sojourn on earth was thought of in three ways: (1)

- 1) A real human life with which he was connected for a time.
- 2) A heavenly or "psychical" creation.
- 3) A mere phantasm.

The dualism of Gnosticism became even more evident in its dealing with Christianity: (1)

Dualism in theology and cosmology: The Supreme God was God of the New Covenant. The Creator of the world was the God of the Old Testament, Old Covenant.

Dualism in Christology: Sharp distinction was made between Christ and the historical Jesus, with the three views as mentioned above.

Dualism in anthropology: Men were a combination of Spirit and matter, in which the divine portion lived bound to the material portion.

Dualism in soteriology: Separation of spirit from matter. a. Beginning at present: Hence asceticism or libertinism. b. To be complete in the future: Hence a rejection of Christian hope of a resurrection of the body.

It is a mistake to think that Gnostics were the more educated or cultivated ones in the church. Actually there is a gross inconsistency in Gnosticism. "God must have been conceived to be more powerful than matter, or an emanation from God could not have shaped or molded it into form: yet God was not able to reduce matter to its primeval chaos, nor to destroy the evil which the Demiurgus had produced.... What God could not prevent he was always endeavoring to cure." (3)

Clement of Alexandria quotes Theodotus as defining "gnosis" as "the knowledge of who we were, what we have become, where we were, into what place we have been thrown, whither we are hastening, whence we are redeemed, what is birth, what is rebirth." (§). This definition belongs to later Gnosticism. As Christians we are interested in pretty much the same things. The difference is that we have Scripture, to enlighten us. The Gnostics, not following Scripture, would have only speculative thinking, this to be attained only by mystical enlightenment.

III. Individual Gnostic Systems

The principles outlined above were further refined, extended and systematized into many sects. These can be grouped into Judaistic Gnostics, Anti-Judaistic, Gnosticizing pagans, Ophites, Manichaeans and New Manichaeans. Here are a few of the many varieties: (1)

1) Saturninus, a Syrian, who taught an unknown god who generated seven aeons which became the creators of the world. One of these aeons became Jehovah. He called Christ the Savior of the World, Son of God, but said He did not have a real body. His followers were called "Docetists" and "Phantasiasts."

2) Carpocrates, a contemporary with Saturninus, claimed Christ was a mere man whose ore powerful soul had more accurately remembered what it had seen with God before its union with the body. He is accused by the Church Fathers of destroying all distinctions between good and evil, and of indulging sensual appetites.

3) Valentinus. His party lasted from about 150 A.D. till after 300 A.D. in Rome. It was the most numerous of the sects. He is distinguished by his austere manners. He claimed there was only one creating aeon. He has three main characteristics: Mythological and ritual elements were exaggerated. The speculative tendency predominated. His beliefs assimilated more closely those of the orthodox Christian church.

4) Marcion, and Cerdo of Syria. These renounced many earlier absurdities, and formed a distinct system characterized by the rejection of the Old Testament. Marcion stands apart from other Gnostics. He reduced his speculations to justice contrasted with love. He claimed that the God of the Old Testament and the God of the Christians was not the same.

5) Bardesanes, a Syrian; and Hermogenes, an African. These apostacized from Christianity, and established sects bordering on Gnosticism in regard to the origin of good and evil.

IV. Origin of Gnosticism

The groundwork of Gnosticism was

supplied by a number of mythologies which had become fused together in the process of syncretism. Gnosticism is definitely a blend of Jewish and pagan elements, and falls into the category of mystic religions so characteristic of the religious life of decadent antiquity, the two distinguishing points being the mystic revelation and a deeply veiled wisdom.

Here and there a specific belief may be traced to a definite origin. For example, in the seven aeons may be seen an origin stemming from the fusion of Babylonian and Persian beliefs resulting in a degradation of the seven Babylonian deities into half-angelic, half-demonic beings, infinitely remote from the Supreme God of Light. "But in spite of Egypt's influence of mysticism through Pythagoras, Oriental doctrines of Babylon midst the Jews, and more direct metaphysical or mystic contacts with Eastern Magi, it is the opinion of some that Plato has given the impetus to Gnosticism, and that Platonist, Phionist, and Gnostic, are but emanations at different distances from the "gnosis" of Plato." (3).

The many varieties of Gnosticism didn't think of calling themselves by a common name. It wasn't until Gnosticism was on the way out that the Neassenses assumed the name "Gnostics."

Gnosticism has been termed the final effort of paganism to maintain its hold on the world by allying itself with a new and vital faith. For a time Gnosticism seemed to prosper by connecting itself with Christianity. Christianity forced the movement into the boldest relief, only to have it denounced and declared heresy by orthodox Christians.

But in exposing Gnosticism the early Christian Church was not to conquer without receiving its share of the battle scars.

V. Effects of Gnosticism on the Church

Faced with excommunication from the Christian Church, many of the Gnostics claimed to have special traditions from certain of Christ's disciples. Many of the New Testament Apocryphal writers were Gnostic. Other commentaries, highly allegorical, transformed the whole

New Testament into Gnostic writings. In vanquishing Gnosticism, the Ancient Catholic Church received scars of syncretism both in faith and in manners and customs. Even such prominent later men as Augustine were to incorporate Gnostic concepts into Christianity. Gnostic ideas survive today in later mystics. It is not a popular thing to say, but even the Reformed doctrine of an immediate operation of the Holy Ghost, without any means of grace, exhibits a mystical pattern very similar to Gnosticism. After the third century, there were no more Gnostic sects, but their principles from time to time have been revived in later philosophical systems drawn from Plato. (E.g., Leibnitz, Plouquet, St. Martin.)

(3)

There were several direct consequences of the overthrow of Gnosticism:

- 1) The catholic-universal idea of Christianity was strengthened.
- 2) The development of an episcopal form of consolidation as a church organization was hastened. There was an increasingly strong movement towards unity and a firm inelastic system of authority and tradition.
- 3) regula fidei became necessary. This later formed the basis for the oecumenical creeds.
- 4) Since the Gnostics were such terrific forgers, the formation of the New Testament canon became necessary. Marcion himself gave impetus to this when he listed a canon which met with his approval.
- 5) The Old Testament received a permanent place as a sacred book.

Several side influences are also apparent:

- 1) Asceticism was strengthened. This later developed into the monastery and convent seclusion.
- 2) The sacraments were given greater value or recognition. The true sacraments had to be emphasized to blot out Gnosticism's false ceremonies.
- 3) A mystical strain was introduced into Christian thought.

4) Impetus was given to theological research in all its branches.

5) A free theology also grew up which wanted to keep whatever was good in Gnosticism, but still be considered Christian.

6) Gnosticism considered salvation not as redemption. The Christian concept of redemption through Christ's blood had to be emphasized.

As is obvious, some of these results were very beneficial. And so we see again that God has made use of heresy to further His purpose.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Encyclopedia Americana, 1950, N.Y., Vol. 12, pp. 737-738. "Gnosticism."
2. Encyclopedia Britannica, 1941; Vol. 10, pp. 452-455. "Gnosticism."
3. Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopedia and Scriptural Dictionary. Ed. Fallows, 1905, Chicago, p. 718. "Gnosticism."
4. New Schaff Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. Ed. Jackson. 1952, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Vol. IV pp. 496-500.
5. Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Ed. James Hastings. 1914. Vol. VI, pp. 231-242.

ACTION OF THE THIRTY-EIGHTH REGULAR CONVENTION
OF THE
NORWEGIAN SYNOD
OF THE
AMERICAN EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH
(AS ADOPTED)
JUNE 24, 1955

"Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!" (Ps. 133, 1). Since the days of the Apostles it has always been the case that Christian men and women have sought out the fellowship of other Christian men and women who are of the same mind and the same spirit as themselves. And likewise it has always been the case that such fellowship has been highly prized and treasured by all who call themselves by the name of Christ.

Thus it was that when the founding fathers of our Norwegian Synod migrated to these American shores 100 years ago, they began to search for other Christians in their new homeland who held the same doctrines and shared the same convictions as themselves, a search which was particularly difficult and unrewarding at the time. All of the older and larger American Lutheran groups they found to be quite un-Lutheran in both doctrine and practice. Indifference to sound doctrine and apathy to the Lutheran Confessions was the rule rather than the exception. Unionism, rationalism and Reformed theology had brought the various Lutheran

groups to such a state that true confessional Lutheranism had all but disappeared -- with few exceptions -- among them the little band of Saxon immigrants in Perry County, Missouri, under the leadership of C.F.W. Walther. Here they found a group of truly kindred souls, Christians of a different nationality, it is true, but of a like precious faith.

Thus it was that the fortunes of the Missouri Synod and the Norwegian Synod were thrown together for the first time, an association which has brought abundant blessings to both groups over the years. Shoulder to shoulder they fought to establish a strong, sound, orthodox Lutheranism in America. Shoulder to shoulder they contended for a verbally-inspired Bible, for the purity of the doctrine of objective justification and all the other distinctive Lutheran doctrines. Shoulder to shoulder they testified against the evils of indifference and unionism.

In 1872 these two synods, who had grown to love and respect each other so

much, were joined in an even closer association as charter members of the Synodical Conference, an organization which was founded to be an avowed bulwark against unionism and liberalism among church groups bearing the Lutheran name. Shortly thereafter -- in the '80's -- both synods, Missouri and Norwegian, were rocked by the controversies on the doctrine of conversion and election. Our Norwegian Synod in particular suffered grievous losses, but those who remained in the synod clung to their treasured association with their Missouri brethren.

Again in 1917 our Norwegian Synod was torn asunder by controversy and division -- this time over the question of unionism -- and brought almost to the point of extinction. But again the remnant of those who wished to remain faithful to the Word of God and the Lutheran Confessions clung steadfastly to their brethren in the Missouri Synod. From this time forth the association necessarily became that of the "big brother" and the "little brother." The few pastors who re-organized our Norwegian Synod had little or nothing in the way of congregations or property. But, as always before, they found their Missouri brethren to be faithful and true friends. Loyal to the Missourians lent their encouragement and strength. Generously they opened up their schools for the training of Norwegian Synod pastors and teachers. In every way they continued to hold out a strong hand of love and fellowship.

In the face of such a long and treasured fellowship, therefore -- one which has continued unbroken through testings and trials for almost 100 years -- it is with the deepest and most heartfelt sadness that we consider the events of the past 20 years. For it is to the year 1935 that we must turn back as the time when the first noticeable rift appeared in our peaceful fraternal relations with the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. At that time the Missouri Synod first adopted an independent course by opening negotiations with the unionistic American Lutheran Church, whereas our Norwegian Synod declined this invitation, later stating their position with regard to such negotiations in the pamphlet, "Unity, Union and Unionism." The rest of the story is history -- a

tragic history to those of us in the Norwegian Synod who had grown to respect the Missouri Synod as a real bulwark of orthodox Lutheranism and to love our brethren in the Missouri Synod as deeply as our own brethren.

First it was the 1938 St. Louis Articles of Union, which were drawn up and accepted as the doctrinal basis for union with the A.L.C. When this document was delivered to us for approval, however, it was found to contain the old error of the Iowa and Ohio synods on the central doctrine of justification, as well as certain unscriptural principles on church fellowship held by the A.L.C. The result was that neither our Norwegian Synod nor the Wisconsin Synod could give approval to such a doctrinal statement, and the Missouri Synod was petitioned to revoke these 1938 St. Louis Articles (Proceedings of the Norwegian Synod, 1943, an insert between pages 68 & 69; Cf. also, Proceedings of the 39th Regular Convention of the Missouri Synod, 1944, p.241) inasmuch as they contained false doctrine (i.e. the statement on justification in the Declaration: "to this end He also purposes to justify those who have come to faith." Cf. Proceedings of the 37th Regular Convention of the Missouri Synod, 1938, p.282). Our pleas, however, were not directly nor satisfactorily answered (Cf. Proceedings of the 39th Regular Convention of the Missouri Synod, 1944, p.251).

Then came the Saginaw Resolution of 1944, which attempted to draw a distinction between "joint prayer" and "prayer fellowship" -- a distinction which the Missouri Synod previously had never made. These resolutions, accordingly, were also protested by our Norwegian Synod on the grounds that this distinction cannot be supported on the basis of Scripture and opens the door to further unionistic practices. The answer of the Missouri Synod to such protests was the re-affirmation of its 1944 Resolution (cf. Proceedings of the 40th Regular Convention of the Missouri Synod, 1953, p.552).

In 1945 the Chicago Statement appeared, signed by 44 Missouri Synod pastors and professors, many of whom held high positions of leadership in that Synod.

was a
This document which further weakened the bulwarks against unionism and laid down unscriptural principles of church fellowship. Representatives of our Norwegian Synod repeatedly asked the Missouri Synod in committee meetings either to require the signers of the Statement to retract or to exercise discipline over against them. In this case no satisfactory doctrinal discipline was exercised, nor did these signers retract their Statement.

Then came the agreement with the National Lutheran Council, a federation of liberal and heterodox Lutheran synods, by which the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod entered into joint welfare work and joint armed service work with these erroristic groups (cf. Proceedings of the 43rd Regular Convention of the Synodical Conference, 1954, pp. 99-100) -- a practice which is still being carried on, contrary to all the principles of the Synodical Conference and the "old" Missouri Synod (Cf. Directory For Service People, May-June, 1955) To these acts of unionism, as well as numerous other instances, our Norwegian Synod has repeatedly protested, but to no avail.

Then, in 1950, came the Common Confession, the most recent document between the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod and the A.L.C., which was hailed as a settlement of the past doctrinal differences between these two bodies and a sufficient basis for union between them (Cf. Proceedings of the 41st Regular Convention of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, 1950, -, 585). To this document we can only state ~~once~~ again that, in spite of numerous attempts to prove the adequacy of the Common Confession, we find it to be a document of compromise which does not in any way reject the errors of the A.L.C. and which is, therefore, inadequate as a settlement of past doctrinal differences and unsatisfactory basis for union. Once again our Norwegian Synod petitioned the Missouri Synod to "reconsider its adoption of the Common Confession and to reject it as a settlement of its doctrinal differences with the A.L.C." (cf. Report of the 34th Regular Convention of the Norwegian Synod, 1951, pp. 54-55). In this case our petition was met by resolutions calling for postponement and delay (cf. Proceedings of the 42nd Regular Convention of the Missouri Synod, 1953, p. 539)

Finally, at the last convention of the Synodical Conference in 1954, our Norwegian Synod sent an urgent and prayerful plea to that body, as a court of last appeal, to petition the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod to take some action to remedy these many offenses. Briefly we asked the Synodical Conference to vote on five resolutions dealing with Objective Justification, Unionism, Prayer Fellowship, the "1938" Resolutions, and the Common Confession (cf. Report of the 37th Regular Convention of the Norwegian Synod, 1954, pp. 43 ff.). It was our hope that, if the Synodical Conference adopted these resolutions, it would influence the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod to make them its own at its forthcoming 1956 Convention, and thus avert the threatened break in our fraternal relations.

In this memorial our Resolutions I and II covered the historical position of the Synodical Conference on objective justification and unionism. Our purpose in presenting these historical theses was to lay the basis for Resolutions III, IV and V, which covered the points on which there had been disagreement for years. The end result was that while Resolutions I and II were adopted (Resolution II with considerable opposition from Missouri Synod spokesmen), Resolutions III, IV and V were not acted on directly, but were assigned to committees for further study.

This procedure, we are convinced, will settle nothing. In the first place, these matters (prayer fellowship, unionistic activities, the Chicago Statement, negotiations with the A.L.C. and all the documents pertaining thereto) have already been discussed in one committee after the other for many years with no tangible results. As a matter of fact, the situation is that we are not only no closer together, but that we are actually drifting farther and farther apart.

What seems to be of even greater moment, however, is the fact that these issues, all of which involve unionism in one form or another, which have been discussed in committees in the past and which are now being assigned to new committees, were so vigorously and stoutly defended by the spokesmen for the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod at the 1954 Synodical

Conference. Our delegates and pastors who were in attendance at East Detroit and at Chicago were saddened by the unyielding spirit shown there by the Missouri Synod spokesmen in defending every point covered in our Resolutions III, IV and V. Our convictions on the points at issue were at times characterized as manifesting a separatistic spirit, as going beyond Scripture, or as involving a misapplication of Scripture. The many discussions demonstrated that there was no real meeting of minds, nor was there any such "unity of the spirit" as must underlie all fraternal relations in the Christian Church (cf. 1 Cor. 1, 10).

We feel, therefore, that, as matters now stand, further negotiations by committees will be fruitless; that an impasse has been reached in our fraternal relations with the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod; and that further negotiations will result in indifferentism and in compromise of Scriptural doctrine and practice. At this point we can only say that we have testified to the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod as best we know how and have tried in many ways and for many years to preserve the unity in confession and practice which we enjoyed with it for so many years.

As for ourselves we affirm that we want to remain true to the Word of God and the Lutheran Confessions. We want to continue in the old paths in which our fathers walked, together with the fathers of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. Before God, therefore, we feel that we have only one choice. Since the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod has shown us in its official proceedings that it no longer walks in the old ways with us, we must declare that the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod has broken the bond that has bound us together for 100 years. The time has come when we must testify by action against the unionism which has become so common in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod in recent years. To continue the arguments by work and pen will be more likely further to aggravate than to resolve our differences.

THEREFORE WE HEREBY DECLARE with deepest regret that fellowship relations with the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod are suspended on the basis of Romans 16, 17,

and that the exercise of such relations cannot be resumed until the offenses contrary to the doctrine which we have learned have been removed by them in a proper manner.

It is our firm conviction that we and those who stand with us represent the Scriptural principles and spirit of the Synodical Conference, and that it is the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod which has departed from them. Therefore we wish to be clearly understood that we have no desire to suspend fraternal relations with those who agree with us in our stand and who testify with us against these present errors and unionistic practices. On the contrary, we wish to continue fraternal relations with them and to labor for re-alignment of Lutherans faithful to the Lutheran Confessions on more realistic lines than those which prevail under the present chaotic conditions in the Synodical Conference.

TO THIS END WE HEREBY DECLARE our desire to maintain and establish fraternal relations with those synods, congregations, and individuals who are of one mind and spirit with us in matters of Christian doctrine and practice.

WE HEREBY AUTHORIZE our synodical officers to inform the proper Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod and Synodical Conference officers concerning our action and to attend to whatever problems may arise in connection with the work of the Synodical Conference.

We realize that in the case of cooperative schools, Bethesda Home, and other institutions of similar nature it will take time to bring about a God-pleasing solution of their problems.

THE CLERGY BULLETIN is published monthly by authority of the General Pastoral Conference of the Norwegian Synod. Editorial Committee: Pastors of Southwest Circuit. Editor: T.N. Teigen, 917 S. Grange Ave., Sioux Falls, S. Dak. Subscription price per year: \$1.50, payable to Rev. Arthur Schulz, Tracy, Minn.

That we have reprinted the recent Synodical Resolution on our relations with the Missouri Synod may seem to be like the proverbial "carrying coals to Newcastle", since most readers of this publication have likely come into possession of a copy otherwise. But because this is supposed to be our theological journal we have gone to the trouble of reprinting for the sake of the record. If some reader sees it for the first time here, we are glad to serve in that way also.

In connection with the above, we quote from a postal received from Rev. Julian Anderson of Minneapolis:

"For the CB. I have cut stencils for the resolution for distribution to my congregation - with a small margin at the right for notes. I thought that there might be some of the brethren who do not mimeograph who might like some copies for use in their cong's. If so, I have saved the stencils and will run off copies - at 10¢ per. Sounds like a lot, but each copy is 10 pages. That is 5¢ worth of paper alone, plus ink, stencils, and my time to run them and assemble them. If this is too commercial, skip it."

Perfectly OK. We are glad to get even commercials for this publication. We don't have an overabundance of anything else. (It seems that only gardens produce in the heat of summer.) - That "small margin for notes at the right" Julian speaks of should have some appeal. We don't think that his margin of profit is going to be big enough to write notes on or about, whichever way you construe the "notes." - So there's your commercial!

We have received a communication of somewhat more theological interest from "LUTHERISCHER RUNDBLICK, Informationsblatt für lutherische Kirche und Theologie, herausgegeben in Auftrag des Kollegiums für lutherisches Schrifttum von W.M.Cesch D.D. und Dr.theol.Hans Kirsten"

Oberursel(Taunus), den 17.VI.55.

...Permit me to express Dr.Kirsten's and my appreciation of your 'Clergy Bulletin' and esp.the recent study of 'Heresy' and 'Heretic'. Please mention

this to the author, who will find the 'Theolog.Wörterbuch sum N.T.' sub loco in essential agreement... W.M.Cesch."

Thank you! And we will do that.

.....

We have no vital statistics to report in this issue. Neither any official announcements of conferences, etc. Not even any gripes. No, nor any complaints from subscribers that no CB appeared in June. May we remind the brethren that this address welcomes all such,-- from which we will print according to our discretion. ... It could be that when the March issue of the CB appeared, everybody was busy with Lent and getting ready for Easter, and so didn't read our suggestions on literary production. - The editor has had to conclude that he is no prophet and that his number-work is all wet. Who would like to prove him wrong again?

T.N.T.

.....

"My friends, do you think you can control your feelings? I am sure, if I could control my feelings, I never would have any bad feelings; I would always have good feelings. But bear in mind: Satan may change our feelings fifty times a day, but he cannot change the Word of God; and what we want is to build our hopes of heaven upon the Word of God. When a poor sinner is coming up out of the pit and just ready to get his feet upon the Rock of Ages, the devil sticks out a plank of feelings and says, 'Get on that'; and when he puts his feet on that, down he goes again. Take one of these texts: 'He that heareth My Word and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation but is passed from death unto life.' That rock is higher than my feelings. And what we need is to get our feet upon the rock, and the Lord will put a new song in our mouths."

D.L.Moody

* INTER NOS *

Editor
Clergy Bulletin
S. Falls, S. Dak.

Dear Mr. Editor:

I have something for your "inter nos" page, if you care to use it.

Recently I preached on Matthew 12,1-8. In the course of the sermon I had occasion to warn against ceremonialism. By ceremonialism I mean the insistence upon just certain ceremonies in the church or insisting upon performing a certain rite in a certain way, as though this were the only right ceremony or way, etc. And ceremonialism is not dead. A person can even get all worked up against ceremonialism and, in the process, reveal that he is really just against doing things differently from his own way of doing them. I can speak against the use of this or that order of service and perhaps even say some edifying things along the way but in the end reveal that I merely believe that some other order of service m u s t be used and used in a certain way.

And I've been wondering if the fact that a congregation uses only one order of service for its Sunday morning services may not become a silent way of teaching that there is only one way, one order of service which is right and good. This sounds like saying a lot, I know, Mr. Editor; but what shall you say after one of your parishioners tells about a certain other church of your synod that uses a different order of service from yours and says: "I wouldn't go to a church that used that order if I had to drive fifteen miles past it in order to go to church"? What do you say when a parishioner of yours says: "I was in such-and-such a city for so-and-so long where there is a church of the _____ Synod (in fellowship with us); but I never went to church there because I don't like that ritual". I'm looking for the thing that makes people say such stupid things; and I'm wondering if one reason might not be the fact that Sunday morning after Sunday morning we use the same order of service. We may, indeed, from time to time include in our sermons a warning against ceremonialism; but what is the net effect upon the people when we use just one set of ceremonies year after year?

So I've been wondering what would be the matter with the idea of having among ourselves several (not just one, or just two, but three, or four, or five) good orders of service. You might, of course, begin with those we now have; but what would be wrong with our (as a synod) drawing up two or three orders of our own - evangelical, easy to understand, easy to follow? They might then, all of them, be printed in a booklet. And at the beginning of each service the minister might announce the order to be followed that day; or it might be duplicated in the bulletin for the day.

Yes, Mr. Editor, I judge that the first thing that will be said as this is read is this: "But think of the confusion that would be caused." I'm no prophet and cannot judge exactly the extent of the confusion. But I'm afraid the greatest amount of confusion would come in the heart of that person who is most convinced that there is

only one order of service to use, that all others are inferior, that tradition is more or less binding, etc. And in that case, I judge, the confusion would be a salutary thing, the beginning of a better understanding of these things. - Most of our people can read; if you said: "Today we shall follow the order of service beginning on page 17 of the booklet in the hymnal racks," most of the people could find that page and could follow the service. And ~~xxxx~~ it^{is} even conceivable that considerable spiritual edification would result from the explaining of each service prior to its first use. But I really believe that in most cases, there would be little confusion, if the matter were approached in a careful way; I would judge that good, not harm, would come..

I remember a woman who moved from one town where the Common Order was used in her church to another town where the Common Order was used. After she and her family moved still another time, this time to our church, where the Common Order was used, too, she told me about the experience she had had in moving from Place No. 1 to Place No. 2. After the first service at Place No. 2, she and her family were discussing the fact that there was something "so different" in the way the service was held at Place No. 2 from the way in which it was held at Place No. 1; but they couldn't quite lay their finger on what it was. But while she was getting dinner ready, I believe it was, she suddenly thought of it, and she told her husband: "Now I know what it was; they didn't ring the bell during the Lord's Prayer."

This was an extreme case, of course; but how many people are there not who get to thinking that fellowship is determined, not so much by profession of doctrine, but by hymnbooks, by orders of service, by ceremonies of various kinds? And might - just "might" - might not one little weapon against this kind of thinking be found in the suggestion that we have several orders of morning service in use in a congregation? - "Jeg bære spør jeg."

Stuart A. Dorr

THE CLERGY BULLETIN

Vol. XIV

August 1955

No. 12

INCULCATING A STEWARDSHIP CONSCIOUSNESS

By

M.H. Otto

People usually resent being told what to do. That applies to the Christian no less than to the man of the world. There is, however, one great difference - when dealing with the Christian we have a means at our disposal which, if properly used, will not just lead him to do something but will make him want to do it. In other words, we have a means which can influence his will, namely, the Word of God.

If there is one place where a person's will needs considerable influencing it is in the field of Christian stewardship. By stewardship we mean the proper use of what God has given him, which in the end concerns just about everything he has and is, his health, his time, his special gifts and abilities, and his material means. They are the things God has given and which he is to manage, not as one who is the owner, but as a steward over what really belongs to some one else.

Our task today is to study the matter of inculcating in our church people a stewardship consciousness with respect to their means. There are especially three reasons for wanting to make our members conscious of and faithful in their, let us call it, financial stewardship - 1) God's Word enjoins it; 2) the members need to exercise this stewardship for the sake of their own well-being; 3) the Lord hath need of their means.

I.

From the very first days of the organized Church God has asked His people to give of the means He has entrusted to them. In Exodus 25 we read of the offering the Children of Israel were to bring for the construction and the furnishing of the tabernacle. "Speak unto the children of Israel, that they bring me an offering: of every man that giveth it willingly with his heart ye shall take my offering."(2). Later we hear of the various offerings the Israelites were to bring at specified times in their lives and on the High Festivals, followed by the institution of the tithe.(Lev.27).

While the tithe is not commanded in the New Testament, there are many references where giving to the Lord is enjoined, e.g., the well-known instance by the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians relative to the Corinthians relative to the collection for the Church in Jerusalem, "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him." (I,16,2). The whole philosophy of giving in the New Testament can well be summarized in this word of Jesus, "Freely ye have received, freely give." (Matt.10,8).

Exponents of regular, systematic, and proportionate giving are therefore right when they say that if the Jew with all his burdensome ceremonies was required to give

10% of his income to the Lord, plus other offerings, the Christian of today ought not give less in view of his far greater liberty in the age of fulfillment.

Our first obligation is to get people to understand that they are stewards, not owners, of the material means with which the Lord has blessed them. The Bible also has something to say about what kind of stewards they should be, "Moreover it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful." (I Cor. 4, 2). And if we are to be effective in our teaching on this subject we have to begin with our own example. We as shepherds of the flock entrusted to us cannot afford not to give -- for if we shirk our obligation to give somewhat near the percentage of a tithe, all our instruction on this subject will be undermined. God did not excuse the Levites from the tithe (Num. 18, 26), so there is no reason to suppose He would excuse us from giving a respectable portion of our income received from the people whom we serve. We have seen it happen that a congregation told its pastor, who had tried to set the proper example in giving, that it would either have to return some of the money he gave or raise his salary. People can often be shamed to give more liberally by the unassuming example of their pastor or some not at all well to do member.

There is a negative side, too, which dare not be overlooked. If a man will not give according to his means the Lord may reduce his means to correspond to his giving. "He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly." (II Cor. 9, 6a). We are neglecting our "Seelsorge" if we do not remind people that if they withhold their gifts from the Lord they actually are robbing Him, and what the consequences thereof are, as expressed through Malachi, "Ye are cursed with a curse: for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation." (Mal. 3, 9)

However, it is not the negative but the positive which is the impelling motive for giving. Think what is implied when the Apostle says "He that spared not his own Son but delivered him up for us all" (Rom. 8, 32). God gave the best He had, all He had, in order to effect our redemption; He would not even spare His only and beloved SON if we could but be saved. A sal-

vation which we could never attain to by our own efforts or ingenuity, even if we had a 1000 lifetimes in which to attempt it, God offers us freely -- so generous He is, so free with His dearly purchased salvation. How can anyone fail to have his cold heart warmed by such a gesture! Real Bible-centered Gospel preaching will in turn help make people willing to show their gratitude for all GOD has done and is still doing for them. Here is the place to launch our most effective arrow -- at the Christian's heart; if it is touched his hands will respond too; they will have to, "for conscience sake".

Then, there is the need for the giver to exercise this stewardship for the sake of his own well-being. Church-members all too often look upon their financial obligations to their church as a burden. With such an attitude it is so easy to maintain that one cannot afford to give more than he does, and so, as the Wells Organization says, "More than 90% of our church families are making only token gifts to their churches." (W.O. adv.) Our problem is to make those 90% not only into more generous but especially into more willing givers. But how can we accomplish that?

By showing the hearer that he needs to give for his own sake. "It is the concept that Christian giving is not based on 'how much the Church needs', (and how often is not this the gauge!) but rather on 'how much a member needs to give'." (W/O). He needs to give in order to give expression to his gratitude for the wondrous and abundant grace of God that He is privileged to enjoy without interruption. He needs to give out again of what he has received in order to keep his faith alive and fresh. Only to receive and not to give out again will soon make him as lifeless spiritually as the Dead Sea is barren of all plant and animal life, because it has no outlet. He needs to see that giving of his means is the simplest, most personal and direct way of exercising this giving out again.

The giver should be led to see that he ought to give for his own protection. No, we cannot buy the Lord with our gifts, but those words of the Lord through the prophet Haggai were not recorded for naught, when He denounced the Israelites for seek-

ing their own comforts first and for neglecting the house of the Lord, "Is it time for you, O ye, to dwell in your cieled houses, and this house lie waste? Now therefore thus saith the Lord of hosts; Consider your ways. Ye have sown much, and bring little; ye eat, but ye have not enough; ye drink, but ye are not filled with drink; ye clothe you, but there is none warm; and he that earneth wages eareth wages to put into a bag with holes. Thus saith the Lord of hosts; Consider your ways. Go up to the mountain, and bring wood, and build the house; and I will take pleasure in it, and I will be glorified, saith the Lord. Ye looked for much, and lo, it came to little; and when ye brought it home, I did blow upon it. Why? saith the Lord of hosts. Because of mine house that is waste, and ye run every man unto his own house. Therefore the heaven over you is stayed from dew, and the earth is stayed from her fruit. And I called for a drought upon the land, and upon the mountains, and upon the corn, and upon the new wine, and upon the oil, and upon that which the ground bringeth forth, and upon men, and upon cattle, and upon all the labor of the hands."(Hag.1,4-11)

Perhaps here is the partial answer as to why some church-people are not prospering to any appreciable degree in a material way -- they by their more or less niggardly giving are preventing the Lord from blessing them more. And there is a very direct relation between a Christian's giving and receiving again. Jesus says, "Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again." (Luke 6,38). "The exact size of the measure which God will use in measuring to us is already fixed. He will measure with the same measure with which we measure go others"(Lenski) or to the Church. We set the size. "People may suppose that they can take a tin-cup, but that God will surely use a barrel. He will take that same tin-cup, and they ought not be disappointed when He does"(Lenski). He will bless, not only as to the amount but also as to the enjoyment of the same, in proportion to how we give, and therefore encourages us with the assurance, "He which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully."(2 Cor.9,6b).

We reapeat, to give liberally in order to bribe the Lord to bless one will never work. But to give liberally because we ought and then let the Lord stand by His promise is the spirit we are to develop and encourage. One such promise is, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you,"(Matt.6,33) remembering that these "all these things refer to such material things as food, clothing, and shelter.

I do not know how many of you are acquainted with the story of Robert Letourneau, the manufacturer of present day earth-moving machinery. There was a time in his life when he sought to look out for himself first and to give to the Church from what he had left, which in many instances was almost nothing. Somehow or other he never seemed to make any financial progress -- rather, he found himself going deeper and deeper into debt. One day when he found himself thousands of dollars in arrears and when asked to pledge something for his Church, he almost had convulsions at first; but then on doing some thinking he resolved to start at the other end -- first worry about the Lord's work and its needs, because the Lord had promised he would not lack materially if he put first things first. So, taking God at His Word, he pledged himself for a sizable sum. The result was that he found the going easier financially. He increased his support for the church and prospered even more. Today he contributes 90% of his income to the Church and retains a mere 10% for himself. Of course, his 10% is no small figure either. But it does prove that it is true when we in confidence and in the right spirit take Jesus at His Word when He says, "Give, and it shall be given unto you: good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over... For with the same measure that ye meter withal it shall be measured to you again."(Lk.6,38)

When people have absorbed that spirit and attitude they will never again speak of "paying their dues", of doing "their share", or ask "how much do I have to give rather it will be "what can I do for this or that?" and give for the sake of giving, because of the bounties the Lord has graciously bestowed on them in body and soul.

If that were achieved the Church would find it self receiving so much money that the problem would be how to put it to work for the Lord.

Many "churches have assumed a poverty complex which is not justified by the facts. (W/) Our people are not on the verge of bankruptcy, as their giving might at times seem to indicate. They have not yet learned the joy and blessing that generosity can bring them, of putting their faith to a test, i.e., of believing what the Lord says about giving in His Word. It is your and my duty to bring about that conversion, to get them to see that if they are willing to entrust their souls to the Lord for all eternity they should also be able to commit their material well-being to Him for the brief moment that they travel thru this life to the next. They need to be encouraged to put their spiritual welfare first which includes the welfare of their church, since the Lord says, "For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" (Matt. 16, 26.) He whose chief concern is his material welfare may to his eternal disappointment find himself losing the body he so feverishly sought to preserve and with it his immortal soul. On the other hand, seeking first the kingdom of God and His righteousness will in the end save the body as well as the soul for time and eternity. Your task and mine is to help save that soul, which if properly pursued, the matter of giving likewise enjoined in its proper place, will be the best insurance we can give our people for their earthly life too. For the sake of their own well-being, our people should be made very conscious of their stewardship. And let us not fail to call attention to God's promise to the cheerful and liberal soul, "God is able to make all grace abound toward you; that ye, always having all sufficiency in all things, may abound in every good work." (II Cor. 9, 8). He will bless us so that we can do even more.

III.

Finally, the Lord hath need of their means ** there is the need of the Church. The Lord does not really need our means or our help. Yet, He has given His people the joy and privilege of being co-workers with

in the winning and preserving of souls for their Saviour. When Christians, people who know what Christ has done for them, are informed of the needs of the Church to make that precious Gospel of salvation known to others and to keep it in their own midst, they will welcome the opportunity to give to the Lord --- they know the Lord asks them to return a part of their material bounty to Him, and they now know for what they give, where they can invest their means for the Lord's work, and an investment it for they are assured, "your labor is not in vain in the Lord." (I Cor. 15, 58).

More than that, as these needs are made known, they will develop a greater interest in that work which they are supporting. As their interest increases their desire to give will increase too, for it is axiomatic that one gets as much out of something as he puts into it. But, when presenting the needs of the Church, they should not be made the prime motive for giving, "the Church needs so and so much for this and that." No, it is only to direct the course of the giving which is impelled by more compelling reasons, God's asking them to give and their wanting to do so for His mercies' sake.

Churches should never lower themselves to begging for funds. Their business is to proclaim the everlasting Gospel of peace and to inform the hearer what God's will is in regard to those who accept that Gospel with joyful believing hearts. We, therefore, in striving to inculcate a stewardship consciousness in our people do not begin with the needs of the Church; that is both psychologically and Scripturally the wrong order; We first stress what God has given and done and still does for them and emphasize that He has made them stewards of all He has given them. Stress the principle of stewardship: "the why," "the how," and then the "for what." As pastors we are to explain and promote "the why" and "the how" -- the "for what" will then take care of itself.

With your indulgence we shall close with a quotation from this week's issue of THE NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN (July 24, 1955, p231ff):

"The Church is at heart no business

organization and yet must do its work with money. The real work of the Church to preach the Gospel to all nations cannot, under prevailing conditions, be done without money. But because the Church is not a business organization, it cannot assess its members and thus be sure of a certain amount of money each year. It can only inspire its members to give as liberally as possible, so that the work of the kingdom can go on. It does this by giving full information on that work, by thoroughly acquainting us with its need, and then relying on the power of the Gospel to fill the hearts of our members with the love for Christ and His Church that they willingly give up of their substance, received of the Lord, to the Lord.

"No matter how carefully we estimate our needs and how conscientiously we dole out our means; no matter what systems old and new that we employ in gathering our funds, the final appeal must rest upon the faith in the love of our Saviour for us and upon the love for Him in us. And that appeal is in effect but a Gospel appeal. Neither laws nor systems nor demands based upon law, nor reproaches and scoldings will create a willingness to give to the Lord, to sacrifice for Him. How easily we forget that in our eagerness to help the Lord's cause!

"...Manifold are the branches of our work, and while we are not all agreed, possibly, upon the urgency of the need in different places, yet we are surely all agreed that having once come to understand these needs, we shall all work to supply them gladly as far as in us lies. The work of our Lord and King must go on. The preaching of the pure Gospel is becoming increasingly more rare in a world of wars and rumors of war, of ever growing greed and selfishness. Churches upon churches have abandoned this pure Gospel for the philosophies of men. These should constitute for us an added stimulus to spread the true Word of Life more quickly and more widely: And that takes money.

"But as long as we realize our obligation toward the world that lieth in wickedness, and the more cheerfully and willingly we give of our means for the spreading and speeding of the message of

the message of salvation to the ends of the earth, the less we need to hesitate, to doubt, to fear, or even despair; for the Immanuel of old is still with us to bring victory out of defeat against all odds that the unbelieving world can bring against us. Let us put our trust in Him wholly!"

(EDITORIAL NOTE: The above essay was assigned by the Committee of Committees to its chairman, M.H.Otto, for presentation at the 1955 Gen.Pastoral Conference. Time did not permit its being read, but we call attention to the resolution of the Conference: "That President Otto's paper on stewardship be placed on the programs of the circuit conferences and circuit meetings as quickly as possible and that wherever possible President Otto be invited to present his paper in person." - President Otto calls attention to the fact that he had the conference in mind when he prepared it, and that when it is used at Circuit meetings it might be revised somewhat and its essentials presented.)

AN APPRAISAL OF LUTHER

Among all the heroes whom history extols only two have strongly attracted my attention from the first steps I took in the study of science: Jesus and Martin Luther. Both engraved themselves with moral force in the camera obscura of my mind; God and the man. The former gave us the Word, that is, the Gospel; the latter restored to it its original meaning, evaded by the bishops of Rome, who, not content with being kings, aspired to change into earthly gods, denying to others and appropriating to themselves the sole right of the interpretation of Holy Writ.

MARTIN LUTHER AND THE RELIGIOUS REFORM, by Joaquin C.Zuloaga, Madrid, 1895

Tr.by K.Knippenberg.

"The entire Scripture is throughout nothing but Christ, God's and Mary's Son; all has to do with this Son, that we might know Him." - Luther

DIGEST OF PASTORAL CONFERENCE MINUTES

Mankato, Minn.

July 26th to 29th, 1955

TUESDAY MORNING

Opening devotion - Pastor Arthur Schulz - Hebr. 12, 2; 1 Cor. 1, 18; Matt. 10, 38.

Program Committee - Pastors M.O. Dale and H.A. Theiste. They were to be assisted by Pastors T.N. Teigen and E.G. Unseth and Prof. N.A. Madson, all of whom had been elected at the previous conference.

Roll Call - Thirty-eight pastors and professors responded to roll call. A number of late arrivals increased the attendance.

Questions and Topics for discussion were listed as follows:

1. The Lutheran Chaplain - N.A. Madson
 2. Theological Library - C.U. Faye
 3. Publicity on free churches - Geo. Schweikert
 4. Laymen's and pastor's equalization - John Moldstad
 5. Time for synod convention - Paul Anderson
 6. Name of Synod * Geo. Lillegard
 7. Christian Burial - Arthur Schulz
 8. Our Practice - N.A. Madson
 9. Girl Scouts - S.A. Dorr
 10. Unity of Objectives - H.A. Theiste
 11. Sentinel News Items - Theo. Aaberg
- (The last three topics were listed later in the conference).

Announcement - The Rev. C.M. Gullerud, the chairman of the conference, announced that, due to repairs under way in the college kitchen, dinners would be served at Mt. Olive Lutheran Church. On Tuesday and Wednesday the ladies of Mt. Olive would serve; the ladies of Norseland on Thursday and Friday. (The ladies very generously also served coffee at the church during the afternoon recess of each day.) - Communion service to be held in the College chapel Wednesday morning at 8:30 a.m.

Translation of II Thessalonians. - Pastor or Julian Anderson began his translation and exposition of II Thess., part of a joint endeavor by himself, George Lillegard, J.A.O. Preus and C.U. Faye. Pastor Anderson translated and discussed the first five verses of the first chapter of II Thess.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON

Devotion - Rev. A. Gullerud - Psalm 27

Welcome - Rev. M. J. Wehausen, Wis. Synod pastor from Le Seuer, Minn., was welcomed by the chairman.

Greetings - Julian Anderson brought greetings from Rev. H. W. Romoser, Oak Park, Ill.; T. N. Teigen, from Pastor M. E. Hansen; D. L. Pfeiffer, from A. M. Harstad and A. H. Strand; H. L. Bremer, from H. A. Preus.

"Church & Ministry" - Neil Hilton continued the reading of a paper by this title. The paper had been begun at a previous conference. The paper was in the form of theses on the subject drawn up by the Chicago-Madison Pastoral Conference.

Recess

Topics and Questions:

Bethany College - R. Preus presented to the conference for discussion the policy of Bethany College with regard to the admission of students from other church bodies than our own synod and its affiliated churches. "It has always been the policy of Bethany Lutheran College to admit students from other church bodies than our own synod and its affiliated churches on the condition that they accept our religious instruction, attend chapel exercises, and conduct themselves as Christians. (Such students have felt at home in our midst and have profited by their associations here.) This is still our policy." - The Conference express by motion its approval of this policy.

Equalization - The chairman appointed D. L. Pfeiffer as a member of the equalization committee. The whole matter of equalization was discussed, with John Moldstad serving as discussion leader. The following resolutions were adopted: **RESOLVED** that for one year only the equalization for those coming to conference by car be raised from 3¢ per mile (for those driving alone) and 5¢ per mile (where two or more come in one car) to 4¢ and 6¢ per mile, respectively. **RESOLVED** that the mode of travel of the men from the more remote parts of the synod be left to their own discretion. - John Moldstad concluded by explaining the newly adopted method of equal-

ization of lay delegates to the synod convention, urging that all congregations take part in the plan and in that way assure its success.

WEDNESDAY MORNING

Communion Service - The morning session was preceded by a communion service in the college chapel at 8:30 a.m. The Rev. G. Guldborg was in charge of the service. He based his confessional address on Psalm 130. The Rev. C. M. Gullerud assisted at communion.

Translation of II Thess. - continued by Rev. Julian Anderson. After completing his presentation of the first chapter, Anderson gave the floor to Prof. Lillegard, who began the translation and exposition of chapter two.

Recess

"Predestination as taught by the 17th century dogmaticians" - Robert Preus began the reading of an essay under this title which he had prepared for this conference.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON

Opening Devotion - Rev. Arthur Schulz
"Church & Ministry" - continued by discussion leader Hilton.
Equalization - Equalizer D. L. Pfeiffer announced the equalization to be 17.00.

Recess

Topic #6 "Name of Synod" - introduced by Geo. Lillegard. Discussion revealed first of all a general desire on the part of the members to change the name. The discussion then turned to a consideration of specific names. A number of names were suggested by speakers in the discussion. "Bethany Lutheran Synod" and "Lutheran Synod" were the two names mentioned most frequently.

Topic #11 "Sentinel News Items" - introduced by Theo. Aaberg, who made a plea for more news from the congregations.

THURSDAY MORNING

Opening devotion - Rev. Arthur Schulz - 1 Peter 4, 12.
Translation of II Thess. - continued by

Prof. Geo. Lillegard.

Recess

"Predestination" - Con't - Robert Preus

Topic #2 "Theological Library" - introduced by C. U. Faye. Prof. Faye appealed for means to acquire theological periodicals and have them permanently bound.

Topic #3 "Publicity on free churches" - introduced by Geo. Schweikert, who urged the publishing of tracts publicising our synod and its doctrinal position.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON

Opening devotion - Rev. Paul Madson - Ps. 124
Finances - Treasurer S. E. Lee explained the synod's present financial picture.
Excuse Committee report - read by Pastor Theo. Aaberg and adopted by the conference.

Topic #3 "Publicity on free churches" - continued
Topic #1 "The Lutheran Chaplain" - introduced by N. A. Madson. The discussion centered about an article which had appeared in a recent issue of the "Lutheran Chaplain" (June, '55).

Topic #5 "Time of synod conventions" - introduced by R. Branstad in the absence of Paul Anderson. RESOLVED: that the Pastoral Conference request the Committee of Committees to discuss and bring recommendations to the next convention of the synod as to the time of year best suited for holding our synod's conventions. RESOLVED: that the time of meeting for the next General Pastoral Conference be determined by the officers.

Recess

"Confirmation Instruction" - introduced by the first speaker on the panel to discuss the various phases of Christian education, Pastor S. E. Lee. His presentation prompted a lively discussion on methods of teaching. Pastor Lee concluded with a brief presentation on adult instruction.

Program for 1956 - The following program for the 1956 session was proposed by the program committee and accepted by the conference:

1. Psychiatry and the Bible - A. M. Harstad
2. Introduction to the Book of Jeremiah - Paul Peterson
3. Translation & Exposition of II Thess

continued by C.U.Faye and J.A.O.Preus.

4. Excommunication - D.L.Pfeiffer
5. Evaluation of the Homiletical Productions of the 17th century theologians" # Geo.Schweikert
6. Christian Day Schools - continuation of panel discussion - M.E.Tweit
7. Continuation of discussion on Church & Ministry - Neil Hilton leading
8. Recording of a service and sermon, Grant Quill; Critic: S.Dorr
9. Fundamentalism and the doctrine of Christology - A.H.Strand

Election of Officers -

President - C.M.Gullerud
Vice Pres - W.C.Gullixson
Secretary - L.Vangen

Clergy Bulletin Editor - T.N.Teigen
Assoc.Editors - J.Preus, Schweikert,
Schulz, & N.Harstad

Welcome - The Rev.Arthur Kell, Wisconsin Synod pastor from St.Clair,Minn., was welcomed by the chairman.

FRIDAY MORNING

Opening Devotion-A.Schulz-Acts 5,40-42

Topic #8 - "Practice in our congregations" - introduced by N.A.Madson. The discussion centered upon the matter of practice in our congregations in view of our synod's 1955 action in suspending fraternal relations with the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.

Topic #9 "Girl Scouts"- introduced by S.A.Dorr. In the ensuing discussion it was stated that the same objections generally which make the boy scouts unacceptable apply to the girl scouts.

Topic # 10 "Unity of Objectives" - introduced by H.A.Theiste. Nearly everyone present took part in the discussion which followed regarding our present relations with the Synodical Conference, our relations with protesting brethren within the Missouri Synod, and the related problems confronting the pastors and congregations in our Synod.

President Otto made a plea that in the future more subjects of a practical nature be placed on the programs of our Pastoral Conference. President Otto furthermore

pleaded that in facing our synod's present financial needs each congregation really examine its stewardship.

RESOLVED: that President Otto's paper on stewardship be placed on the programs of the circuit conferences and meetings in our synod as quickly as possible and th wherever possible President Otto be invite to present his paper in person.

The Rev.Julian Anderson was elected to fill the vacancy on the three man committee to study revision of our synodical catechism.

Closing Devotion - S.A.Dorr

L.Vangen
Conf.Secretary

"PASTORAL CONFERENCES serve the purpose of establishing and maintaining a good relation among the brethren of the ministry, serve to create and maintain interest in the work of the Church, help to direct and promote it, and especially by means of doctrinal discussions, tend to keep the doctrine of the Church pure and also to increase and to enrich the theological knowledge of the pastor. Pastors should consider it both a privilege and a duty to attend such conference regularly. It is not a good sign if a pastor consistently is absent from such conferences of his brethren or attends them but irregularly. Even the busy city pastor, if he is at all interested, will take time to attend such conference meetings... It goes without saying that a pastor should cheerfully and carefully prepare doctrinal essays for conference meetings when called upon; also write articles for the church-papers and the theological journals of his church body."
- J.H.C.Fritz.

THE CLERGY BULLETIN is published monthly by authority of the General Pastoral Conference of the Norwegian Synod. Editorial Committee: Pastors of the Southwest Circuit. Editor: T. N.Teigen, 917 S.Grange Ave., Sioux Falls, S.Dak. Subscription price per year: 1.50, payable to Rev.Arthur Schulz, Tracy, Minn.

(EDITORIAL NOTE: At the recent General Pastoral Conference the discussion on the topic, "Publicity on Free Churches" brought out the proposal that we put out some convenient tracts setting forth our Synod's doctrine and practice. The following article, prepared by Pastor Geo. Schweikert, is a suggestion for such a tract. We print it herewith, suggesting that any criticisms or further suggestions be sent to the Editor of the CB.)

Come along -

YE SHALL BE FREE

"If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."
- John 8,36

This is an invitation to enjoy and proclaim the blessings of Christ in and with the fellowship of the Lutheran Synod churches. The official name of this association is "The Norwegian Synod of the American Ev. Lutheran Church."

This body of Lutherans is alive to serve, and it appeals to all who will hear to cooperate with it in its God-given work. The following major points of its position are here briefly stated.

I. THE BIBLE FREEWAY

The only free man or woman, free church, or free church body is the one made free by the Son of God. They are delivered from sin and damnation, have the liberty to work under only One Master, have freedom from fear, want and superstition, are free from the dominion and commandments of men in spiritual affairs, and are in no way under church "politics". The Bible says so.

The people of this Lutheran synod are on the Bible freeway, but on that they are bound.

"If we wish to be Christians and to have solid ground under our feet, then, we, even as the Ancient Church and as Luther and our Lutheran fathers, must hold unswervingly to the conviction that the Bible is God's Word." "If we are to be permitted to keep it, we must use it." "The Spirit of God revealed to them (who wrote the Bible) what and in what words they should write." (Koren, 1908.) This is our confession and purpose today: That the Bible is God's verbally inspired Word which must be used by all who are Christians, used as the only rule and source of faith and life.

We could not honestly begin to invite

anybody into our fellowship without first confessing that - the Holy Scriptures are the only light we have as our guide, the only power we have to use, and the only law we have to govern our work. If we were bound to anything else and if we would invite others to join us also to be bound by anything beyond Scripture or less than that we would be a bunch of Pharisees or Sadducees, deceiving and being deceived.

We condemn as false teaching anything that shifts authority in spiritual church affairs away from Scripture to men, men individually or as minorities or majorities in local congregations or in church bodies. We reject the practice of synods and councils which decides for others what they should do or believe. We reject the practice of adopting resolutions in doctrinal matters by majority vote because this binds people under the will of men and because it teaches that it is neither nor possible to be agreed in every teaching of Scripture. We want to be free under Scripture alone, and we want others to be free with us.

II. FREE SALVATION

We have and offer free salvation by authority of the Gospel which tells us that every sinner is declared righteous in Christ. Justification has come upon all men by Him who lived and died for all mankind and rose again. He commanded that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name to all mankind because forgiveness is there for them to believe in. This forgiveness is finished, all-sufficient, universal blessing, an absolute, unconditioned, objective fact revealed and proclaimed in the Bible.

There is no difference: all have sinned and come short of the glory of God, justified freely by His grace in Christ. As men are all alike sinners by nature, so men are all equally redeemed and reconciled to God in Christ.

There is nothing but this free salvation to convert men to Christ so that they have personal faith in Him, spiritual and eternal life for themselves. This Gospel is the

only truth that can move man rightly to serve God. It is the basis on which we invite others to join us. It is the Bible freeway.

III. FREE CHURCHES AT WORK

If the Bible is the only authority in the church, it must be a Book that every believer can understand by faith. It must be a Book by which the man in the pew can judge himself and others, everything they say and do. It must be a Book which is for him the supreme rule by which he himself serves God and man, and by which he together with others is guided and governed in all manner of spiritual church work.

If all men are equally redeemed and saved by grace alone, none has any higher or prior claim on God's favor, none can have any personal advantages or higher rank.

The authority under which we work and the directions we have in this work are all God-given. All the blessings we have are God's gracious gifts. All things are ours, and yet nothing we have is of our own making. Therefore - all we have to offer and all the work in which we invite others to join us is of God. Since all these matters are neither more nor less than divine kingdom business: the invitation to work with us is not a human notion: it is a Gospel-founded offer and plea in harmony with God's will.

When people join our churches, they remain God's free people. When churches join our fellowship of congregations, they remain free churches. When we co-operate with other Lutherans, we still keep our own freedom. We offer liberty and independence as God has given these blessings to us; we bind no man to any human rule

We have business arrangements for our temporal and external affairs; we set dates and places for meetings; we have a synodical order to serve the churches which make up our fellowship; in all non-doctrinal matters we accept majority vote decisions; but - none of all this is conscience-binding or binding for fellowship with us. In all our work we are spiritual bound only by the simple, expressly prescribed requirements of Holy Writ.

We reject every form of human hierarchy in spiritual matters as Pharisaic self-righteousness and popery. Those who join us do so voluntarily. They stay with us only as long as they are bound to us by free Gospel persuasion. They who join us as local churches may at any time by their own independent action dissolve their connections with us for reasons which are or seem sufficient to themselves:

We practice mutual supervision among ourselves in all our meetings, advise and consult with each other, help each other as brethren; we offer advice to individual congregations in their internal problems when they as a church request it. In case of internal problems, our congregations are free to call in whom they please, other laymen or pastors or synodical officers of our fellowship. The great point in such a matter is that we have a free fellowship under the Word of God alone.

You are invited to join us on the basis of an old but up-to-date confessional Lutheran foundation.

(Use a picture of Bethany)

Add: the names of the nine States and England where Synod churches are located; a few sentences about the Lutheran Sentinel, address, sample copies on request; a few sentences of description of Bethany college and seminary; names and addresses of Synod president, vice president and secretary. General information may be obtained also by visiting Bethany College and Seminary or simply by writing to the President, Bethany Lutheran College, Mankato, Minn. Names of president and dean of seminary could be given.

THE TIMID NORWEGIAN SYNOD

"The Norwegian Synod of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church." This name is long, but it is descriptive of the past. Now it should be changed to -

The Lutheran Synod.

This synod of Lutherans may by some be considered a trifling, struggling, runty group, having an inferiority complex. This might have been induced by some 30 years of association with the Missouri Synod which among individual bodies claims or is said to have the biggest or many things - TV show, radio program, publishing house, seminary, the only Lutheran university, and numerous new doctors and new prophets.

The Norwegian Synod has two blessings which should lift it out of untoward complexes and comparisons, the two features or possessions which give it arrangement and means to build the Kingdom of God on earth. If it does not in the future make better use of these blessings, it will die.

The quickest way to lose blessings is not to rejoice in them or by not zealously proclaiming them. The surest way to become weak and worthless is by failing to use the strength a body has.

Large groups may dethrone Christ; small groups may do that, too. The small ones become faithless and fearful when they tremble before the external power of the large ones, when they forget the promise of Christ's almighty presence for groups as small as 2 or 3 persons. Small bodies are apt to imagine that the all-sufficient Gospel of Scripture is not the complete power of God unto salvation, or at least they sometimes act as tho they do not quite believe in that Gospel alone as the only effective power and means any synod can have.

The ecumenical movement in the world today is based on the false premise that men have to add something to the Gospel and that the Master of the Church needs co-regents, vicars, or at least church councils to help Him decide matters of church government. Little synods are being taught to lean on big ones. Etc.

The Norwegian Synod has the unconditioned Gospel and the principle of Bible freedom for itself and for its congregations, the two great, God-given blessings. Looking at the names of its clergy roster and knowing where the men came from, it may be understood that the position of this synod is attractive. Its proclamation of the unconditioned Gospel and its principle of Bible freedom were the two things which attracted me to it, and I expressly said so on June 3, 1953 when the Synod convention of that year in session accepted me as a clergy member.

The congregations of this synod ought to produce more men for the ministry to propagate the blessings it has: Bible Freedom and the Unconditioned Gospel. For the sake of discussion, let me say that the Norwegian Synod weakened itself by leaning on Missouri, fouled up its sights by looking too much at former associates now in the ELC. Polemics are necessary. But the Norwegian Synod has failed in stressing its positive blessings - salvation from heaven and freedom from the dominion of men - and therefore its otherwise correct polemics have been less effective than expected. I believe that more young men in its congregations could be moved to prepare for the ministry by more general and zealous emphasis on the positive blessings this big little synod has.

I.

The Norwegian Synod has the Gospel. Its writings show how it teaches World Redemption, Universal Reconciliation, Objective Justification in Christ of the whole sinful world. These writings offer a complete and finished forgiveness of sins of mankind. They proclaim free grace for salvation and for the sanctification of man in the world.

The antitheses in these Gospel writings aim directly at self-righteousness, salvation by works and merit, as such antitheses should be found wherever salvation by grace is purely taught.

"The flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."

Ishmael the son of Hagar mocked Isaac, and Paul uses the account to picture the Judaizers who deceived the Galatians. The aim of Norwegian Synod criticism is not like the mocking of Ishmael. The antitheses in its Gospel writings are constructive, Biblical, sure-fire to counteract opinions of the flesh, desire for a bread king; they are polemics against the evil notions that rob men of eternal salvation by teaching human works as necessary for salvation.

The fault of Norwegian Synod pastors is that they are hesitant and timid; they do not rightly make themselves heard about the blessings they have. A timid man is always giving up his advantages, allowing himself to be pushed off of his platform, seeing a mysterious power in the opponent's smoke-screen, suffering himself to be misled into arguing side-issues brot up by those who err in fundamentals.

Norwegian Synod pastors are like people who, if they had a Moses, would be afraid to go thru on dry ground between ELC and Missouri walls of water. Or they are like priests who would be afraid to take up the ark and dip their feet in deep water, as in the days of Joshua when the waters of Jordan were stopped by such faith.

Norwegian Synod pastors are in the Kingdom for such a time as this to preach as on the first NT Pentecost, before kings and princes and councils, in America, England, and Africa, and to the uttermost parts of the earth. They are not living to waste time maintaining external connections with some other Lutherans; neither is it their business to maintain a nationalistic or sentimental clan. The command is given to them to preach repentance and remission of sins in the name of Christ, and in no other name. The Gospel by itself accomplishes the purposes of God wherever it is truly proclaimed.

Using the Office of the Keys, forgiving and retaining sins as the Lord directed after His resurrection, doing it faithfully and zealously - this will cause others to complain that the Nor-

wegian Synod is turning the world upside down, subverting the ecumenical plan of the love brothers, destroying human peace and modern unity. Accentuating the positive Gospel will as a matter of course arouse the opposition of those who trust in themselves, or in other people, or in organizations of men and in commandments of men. It is fear of such opposition, a cowardly feeling, that produces the mouse-like trembling in men who should be courageous. Ambassadors of the King of kings with the only message that can save here and for the hereafter have no business being timid.

It must be known and understood that all work of compelling and persuading men to believe that man is saved alone by grace in Christ will not make friends of all the world. Preaching like Jesus and His apostles stirs up opposition far more than the use of the Law alone against Communism, materialism, hierarchy, adultery, the WCC and similar plans of men large and small.

Much of what is written above is put down for the purpose of rounding out the proposition here treated. The point is that those who have the Gospel of Christ of the Bible (not a social gospel or a corruption of some kind call^{ed} gospel) must go forward and preach - without consulting flesh and blood and without going up to "Jerusalem" for credentials or directions or commissioning as tho the Lord had authorized men to govern church work by human councils.

II.

The Norwegian Synod has Bible Freedom. It can be described as having the best of arrangements, as a model of democratic organizations. It is so because of the foundation of teachings for which it exists:

that there is no difference among men, that all are equally redeemed; that all believers are kings and priests, that the Scriptures alone rule over and direct God-given church business, that there is only One Master.

Norwegian Synod pastors do not properly appreciate what they have. You cannot call them shrinking sisters or say that they are careless, indifferent. They just do not appear to realize what great things they could do if they would strike out boldly and work, e.g., as the Baptists in America did for freedom of religion in early American days (Roger Williams, Leland, Backus).

Caesar and Mammon and the American worship of bulk appear to make the little synod faint-hearted, unconsciously. The more's the pity, and the loss, and delay.

"You know we are small and conservative; when people find that out, they just say nothing and turn away." "The Norwegian Synod belongs to the Synodical Conference, which has the Mo. Synod in it - many churches and missions all over the world." Such talk or such efforts to make an impression on prospects reveal an inferiority complex.

When Paul was commissioned, he straightway preached Christ in Damascus, and until the time of his death the only credentials he offered anywhere in the wild world then were that he directly preached the Gospel, which gave him the only credentials he ever had or needed. (Such examples as in Acts 16:3 and 21:26 notwithstanding.) He never entered a place or worked among people like small synod conservatives who are self-conscious about being little, or imagine that their reason for existence is to oppose some big outfit, or spend far too much time rehearsing the past as tho that might be lived over and changed.

With all the hierarchy, centralizing and Romanizing going on among and in church bodies today, it ought to be like an offer of getting into a new world to have somebody really active in proclaiming liberty and deliverance for the captives and offering direct responsibilities for the rank and file church members.

Of course no man should imagine that people naturally want Bible freedom. They must be converted to this principle by means of Scripture which teaches it.

"Liberty means responsibility. That is why most men dread it." "Independence, like honor, is a rocky island without a beach." "The strongest man in the world is he who stands most alone." "Among people generally corrupt, liberty cannot long exist." "We are not to expect to be translated from despotism to liberty in a featherbed." "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." "The love of liberty is the love of others; the love of power is to love ourselves."

These quotations can each in its own way be applied to the church business of the Norwegian Synod pastors - whose work is the only thing that gives or can produce any kind of true freedom. One would like to say that "it beats the devil" how men can argue against true liberty. They malign men as dictators who speak up against hierarchy. Some imagine that liberty is only anarchy, or that freedom is license to do what any man pleases, or that a nonconformist cannot be anything but a lawless rebel.

And then arguments come up or the notion sneaks in that churches after all need a visible head, episcopal possession, or p^{er}ery of some kind. - Any form of hierarchy belongs to the natural religion of man. Bible freedom is God's orderly way for churches and synods to carry on Kingdom work as brethren with only One Head, together or separately, here, there and in all the world. Norwegian Synod pastors are failing to emphasize this truth. They have this great and good blessing of Bible freedom to stand for and to propagate, even to set forth as a reason for their existence.

"The Church as a whole is suffering from a division far more disastrous than denominationalism: the division between clergy and laity." Even tho the teaching is correct, custom and practice may elevate the clergy and so cause the division from the laity.

It's a dead sure thing that where church order is Biblical, the communicants of a local church need the same

knowledge, faith and understanding of the church's business as its pastor. The measure of knowledge is often different, but in kind it must always be the same. The people in the pews are not block-heads; reports and periodicals and sermons and classroom teaching are printed and delivered as to people who can learn and understand and confess and practice the truth. Clergy and laity certainly need to understand each other and be together in believing and in governing church work by means of God's Word.

In a new book on "Free Churches and Christian Unity" Dr. Bradshaw writes:

"... Christians who treasure membership in free churches must devise new protection against pressure tactics now employed in behalf of unity."

"... we are interested in arousing their members to realize that the very existence of free churches, with the unique values which they exist to serve, is involved in the current drive for 'the coming great Church.'"

"... the whittling down of congregational polity has become an urgent commandment for these leaders of the unity movement. 'Congregationalism must be destroyed' has apparently become their basic motto, although few have become openly vocal in using the slogan."

"To those who want control, it is of course obvious nonsense to claim that Christ is as truly present in a little meeting house as in an ecumenical council. Since they are his authorized ambassadors, possessing divine authority, how could Christ be present if they are not."

The book is written as "A critical view of the ecumenical movement and of the world council of churches." Published by the Beacon Press - Boston. \$3.50.

This little dissertation represents some hurriedly gathered notes. As they are set together and read, they are not exactly in the form expected by the Norwegian Synod Clergy Bulletin board. It gave me an assignment to write an article on the positive business of conservative preachers. Extra things came in by the way since two weeks ago, and so I proceeded to write as tho I were addressing some brother in a private letter.

Nevertheless, the argument stands that we need to be quickened in the business of telling the world about the Gospel we have and the Bible freedom we must maintain. And the points used above can be adapted to the Okabena congregation, to the Wisconsin Synod, and to many others.

Neither the Mo. Synod leaders nor anyone else can defend the way it is going. But chewing them to pieces is not good for the stomach. We certainly do not want to be what in the German language is called Missouriresser (Missouri devourers).

Even yesterday I heard that a tract is out which claims that the Wisconsin Synod has changed its doctrinal position and is causing the trouble in the Synodical Conference. What next?

To say the least in conclusion: the rank and file church members must be with their pastors in the Office of the Keys so that the churches are governed by the use of Scripture and so that we as free men preach salvation by grace alone.

March 28, 1955

Geo. Schweikert
Okabena, Minn.