THE CLERGY BULLETIN

Vol. XV, No. 1. September, 1955

A LETTER TO THE NORWEGIAN SYNOD PASTORS

By U.V. Koren

(Tr. by Stud. of Theol. Keith Olmanson)

Grace, mercy and peace from God the Father, and our Lord Christ Jesus!

Last summer when I was obliged to give up my very dear old office of district president and to take over the position of synod president after the death of my old friend & co-worker, Preus, I was asked if I could be expected to address the clergy at my inauguration. I then considered it unnecessary. My position in the synod was not essentially changed and it had so often been my duty to address the clergy in opening addresses & in synod speeches, that, on this occasion, I did not seem to have a reason to say anything other than what I had so often said before.

But now, when I address you, my dear co-workers in the service of the word, thru this letter, it is the thought of the conditions under which many of you live which prompt me to write. There are many of you who live far away from all your colleagues & only seldom receive the encouragement which comes from being able to assemble with some of them. And many, about whom this cannot be said, are still obliged to go it alone thru most of the year with their work & cares because of the claims which their call places upon them. And then, even where this is not so, I thought that a word of encouragement certainly would not be unwelcome for this or that one who had experienced how easily dullness and fatigue or despondency will sneak into one's disposition under the daily, recurring burdens and cares of the office.

Who of us has not experienced this? Who has not often felt out of the mood for his sermon preparation or felt careless in his own exercise of godliness, dull to prayer & intercession for the congregation & for the individual souls? Who has not been tempted to delay or neglect such duties as preparation for the Lord's Supper, meetings of various sorts, work for the spreading & use of good books & such which lead to the awakening, development & progress in the knowledge & use of the truth? Who has not felt tempted to be impatient & indifferent in those things which should further the establishment & extention of the truth thru synod matters & concern for God's Kingdom in general? Yes, who has not discovered that he not only has been tempted in these things, but even more or less overwhelmed by temptation & has neglected much which he should have done.

It would not be so difficult to remain watchful in faithfulness if there were not so many things to distract the mind, & so many things which would divert our aim. To divert is the opposite of to collect. For it is indeed the collected mind which we need. "Unite my heart to fear thy name," we pray in Ps.86:11. For "a double minded man is unsta-

ble in all his ways," as it is stated by James 1:8. It is singleness of will which our Lord Jesus would impress upon us when He says that "no man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God," Luke 9:62. We become diverted when, instead of centering our thoughts on keeping the goal of our calling in view & letting everything aim at this, we perhaps busy ourselves with such things as can be permissible, useful or even noble in themselves, but for us easily become snares which hold fast our interest but which do not stand in direct connection with our calling & therefore tempt us to forget or push it aside. "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient." St. Paul says this twice in his first letter to the Corinthians, 6:12; 10:23. In the last place he adds, "All things edify not." That which serves to rest & refresh our souls & bodies can be both useful & edifying when it serves to make us stronger & more willing in our work. Such may be working with music, gardening, occupation in agriculture etc. But if we give to such things time which a conscientious minister should give to his office, then the mind is diverted & becomes handicapped & sluggish in the principal calling. It is a poor recommendation for a minister that his yard is well kept when his parish is unkept & mismanaged.

The same holds true for reading. There are a lot of things not regarded as directly edifying reading which we rightly can & ought to read. Such reading should be governed by the things which can serve for rest & refreshment, & at the same time indirectly serve our office. If we want to know our times & be able to read its signs, then we must make use of the opportunity which we can have to ascertain thru reading what is going on at present both in the church & among its enemies. But it is necessary to give special attention to this that the reading is also useful in the service of the office. There are those who are so steady in their aim at the goal & so filled with thoughts of their office that they can use in their work everything they get their hands on & make all kinds of reading bear fruit for them. But very few have this gift. More common is the danger that all kinds of reading are able to divert rather than collect the mind. Even scholarly, theological reading itself can be misused in this way, to say nothing of reading of other kinds.

The conditions under which we live seldom hold the danger that we may become "book worms" by study. A much greater danger may be that we, by an unwise choice of literature, lead ourselves into temptation. The old saying, "Tell me with whom you keep company & I'll tell you who you are," has its meaning here too. He who usually & as a rule turns to the Reformed writers to whom the distinguished Lutheran, that is Biblical, teachings are strange, will himself easily become alienated from them. He who seeks his development & spiritual nourishment from such modern teachers, who in more than one sense are children of the times, & on whom the spirit of the time has placed its all too evident mark, will only with difficulty find flavor in the writers of Scripture who are exalted far above time's quickly fading puppets. God has given those writers of Scripture to the church to be a light for all times. Faithfulness to the eternal, unchangeable Word of God is their main trademark, while traces of their time which they show, even if they are ever so plain, still are only accidental, external & unessential. The miserable stuff which was read toward the end of the 18th century was swallowed & praised by many otherwise highly intelligent, young theologians. The wretched caricature of Christianity by which they were seduced gives a striking testimony of the necessity of being on guard in this matter. It is not much better at the end of this century (19th).

In our circles the more common temptation may be to use reading as a pastime. The word itself contains the judgment. That a person admits that he never "gets time" to do more than a little part of what he ought to do - & every minister will have to say this - & then still, day after day, looks for something with which to pass the time is certainly a judgment.

However, even if we do not let ourselves be diverted & are very diligent in our many duties, even then it cannot be said that we are faithful & wise servants as Christ admonishes us to be. Matt. 24:45; Luke 12:42.

Faithfulness demands that it is the Lord we serve & not ourselves. Wisdom demands that we do our work in such a way that it bears as much fruit as possible & that we do not deceive ourselves with good intentions whose fulfilling we put off.

I need not remind you of how many there are who have borne the name of servants of the Lord, while they have served only themselves. There is many a one who, like Demas, has found the present world to be dear, without leaving his office on account of this. There are likewise many who have sought their own honor with their service, & that usually among those to whom the greatest gifts were given. They have already received their reward. We will be surprised when we finally see how the heavenly Father has blessed the small & insignificant gifts to men when these have been used with faithfulness in His service.

Faithfulness also demands that we adhere closely to God's Word & command, that we tolerate no deviation from the truth, & that we be unafraid to confess it even if it should bring enmity, derision or earthly loss. Neither should we forget that denial of truth is not done only by outright false teaching but also by silence. Crafty self-love may find such silence handily enough at times, but the watchful and honorable conscience will not tolerate it. Since the purpose of our work is the salvation of ourselves & others, faithfulness demands that we be obedient to God's Word. Human teaching does not save, & even an apparently insignificant difference can easily have great & unforseen consequences. Here we may apply the passage concerning a little leaven, which experience has confirmed well enough also in the history of our synod.

Wisdom demands that we do not give heavy food to those who are still but delicate babes in Christ. Had St. Paul written I Cor. in a tone such as many a Boanerges in the later times of the church would like to have used toward such people as those in Corinth, he very likely would never have had the chance to write the second epistle. At any rate, it certainly would not have spoken in the way it now does. If something here should bring to mind that it was the Holy Ghost who put into Paul's mind what & with which words he should write, then this example carries only so much greater weight. God's dealing with Luther can also teach us much. How would it most likely have gone with the Reformation if Luther in 1517, when he begins with the words "the most holy Father, St. Paul III," had written in such a way as he did in 1545 concerning "The Papacy at Rome instituted by the Devil?"

Furthermore, wisdom demands that we do not make our obedience to the confession our only goal either for ourselves or for our hearers, so that they & we finally trust only in ex opere operato. For the Word is indeed the means thru which God will convert us to Himself & save us, but conversion, faith, & salvation thru faith is the goal.

This service demands intense & steady attention. And when it demands such an uninterrupted occupation with that toward which we are not inclined by nature, & when we by ceaseless self-examination become aware of errors, negligence

and shortcomings in our work, then it is no wonder that we are likely to become downcast, discouraged & unhappy. This is not a discovery which has just been made. "I do not believe," says Ambrosius, "that a minister dies happy, even if he dies blessed."

Yes, even the happy experiences we have had in our studies or thru our care for souls can make us feel pretty low, when afterwards we often find ourselves so cold, negligent or distracted. We may even fear that this is proof we have fallen away. There is so much that would confuse & divert us from the one thing which should be chief in our minds - the thinking about Jesus.

"It is," says Søren Kierkegaard, "one thing for a man to attain to the highest when he sits undisturbed in his quiet room alone with God & His Word. It is another thing for him to have to sit in the middle of a large copper kettle, with smiths hammering all over the outside - & yet have his mind collected to apprehend the highest."

The world is this great copper kettle. We are in the world. Our Savior says in His high-priestly prayer, "I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil," John 17:15. Im the world, that thing which buzzes most loudly in our ears in the mad rush for the goods of the world is money, money, money. Everything is used to make money. In these times value is measured only by money. A broken leg is used to make money. A fire is used to make money. Piety, prayers & tears, even death, are used to make money. That is as far as you can go except in the Catholic Church where they instituted purgatory to gain money & where they gain admittance into heaven with money. And why is money such an important thing in the world? It is because when they "eat & drink, buy & sell, plant & build, give in marraige & marry," when they speculate, play politics & scheme, then they have their real life. & the more money they have, the better they live this kind of life. Luke 17: 27-28.

But we are told that we should "use this world, as not abusing it," I Cor. 7:31. It is of no use for us to go into a desert. Neither is it of any use to go into a cloister.

We must remain in the world. There we have our work. But concerning the world, God's Word says that it "lies in evil," & we believe that Christ is come in order to free us from this present evil world. Gal. 1:4. But if this is the purpose of His coming into the world, then it is also the purpose of the service into which He has placed us in the congregations. Their salvation shall be our aim, because it is His aim. The souls to whom He sends us are dear to Him, & should therefore be dear to us also. He Himself has said that the mark of distinction of His disciples is that they have a mutual love. John 13:35. St. John repeats this when he says, "We know that we have passed from death to life, because we love the brethren," 1 John 3:14. The thing that concerns us here particularly is the love of the flock, & you know that they are not small demands which God's Word makes with regard to this love. Certainly these demands will never be able to call forth the shepherd spirit in us. Christ's love alone can "constrain us" to that. But we so very much need to be reminded of these demands by the examples of the Lord & the apostles, so that we do not forget what we are supposed to do. Even if we dare not think that all our hearers can be won, neither dare we forget the danger that perhaps a soul could be lost thru our indifference or negligence. In such a case, how could we answer Him who has depicted His love, as you know, in John 10 & in the parable concerning the lost sheep, whom He seeks "until he finds it."

It is indeed not seldom that we hear one or the other among us complain about his congregation. Let

us not be quick to do this, for we have the right to do it only when we can say that we have done everything we are able to do for them. And who is there among us who will not be afraid or sigh when he must answer this question? But since this is so, then we need all the more encouragement to give us new zeal in our work, to strengthen us under its pressure & to make us willing to bear the burdens of the office.

When I thought about giving you the best directions to find this encouragement, I saw in the words of our Lord Jesus, in the Gospels & in the Epistles that they wish us to strengthen ourselves by turning away from temporary, fleeting, transcient things & looking to the enduring, eternal, unchangeable things which await us. True earnestness & real cheerfulness in the outlook on life comes only thru clear vision in these things, in death & in what, according to God's Word, awaits us after this. & although I do not doubt that many of you, by the Holy Ghost thru the Word, have a better understanding than I have, still it seems to me that it was the duty of my calling to talk to you about it on the chance that, with God's help, I might succeed in being of some help or giving some support to one or the other in this manner.

Here we go along day after day with the same work, seldom really happy, sometimes very downcast and weary. What will cheer us up? We need a broader & more realistic perspective than that which the monotonous problems of daily living bring us. When we live in the deep valleys, the perspective is narrow & limited. The mountains restrict it. We must come up above the lofty mountains. It is significant that so many of the most glorious revelations in Scripture are given from mountains, from Sinai, Nebo, Carmel, the Mount of Transfiguration & the Mount of Olives.

Seen from high above, the whole landscape in all its minute details appears so strangely small & insignificant to what it seems to us, while we travel along below. The houses look like small huts or boxes, the wide fields like small rectangular dots, the tremendous rivers like small silver streaks. And how small the people appear if we can even see them. There they run about hurriedly, restlessly, eagerly, competing for money, honor & power. & all the little things seem to them so terribly large & important. But if we imagine ourselves much, much higher up, what then becomes of our neighborhood, our country, indeed, the whole earth? We see its shadow at the time of the new moon. Does it seem so big to us then? & what is it then in His eyes who "hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand & meted out the heaven with the span, & comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure?" Is. 40:12, He for whom "the nations are as a drop of a bucket & are counted as the small dust of the balance." Is. 40:15.

Yet - even as it is of importance to have a broad view over the space, so that the small things shall not seem too large & important, so it is of even greater importance that we get a correct view of the times. Luther has said, "We see time lengthwise, God sees it crosswise, so that Adam & the last man who is born before Judgment Day is to Him just as close." In another place he says "We see time as along a stretched out measuring line. Christ on the contrary sees it as a wound-up ball of string." "A thousand years in thy sight are but yesterday when it is past, & as a watch in the night." Ps. 90:4. Let us then not stare at the time or the long days until we become either near-sighted or blind.

"Tho the day be weary, tho the day be long; At last we'll be called to the even-song."

How long has it been for God since Good Friday when our Lord Jesus hung on the cross? How long ago is it since Paul sat in Rome & wrote his last letter to Timothy & asked him to be sure to come before winter? How long is it since Luther thundered from his pulpit in Wittenberg,

while Veit Dietrich, Geo. Rører & the others sat down in church & wrote "as if their lives depended on it" in order to het the mighty words on paper? How long is it since we ourselves by Holy Baptism were consecrated to belong to Christ? For God it is the same as today.

And how long will it be until our death, & till the 3 shovels of earth are thrown on our coffins? This time is close for us. For this or that one of us it is perhaps very near. Yes, how long is it until all of you to whom I write this are dead? About 50 or 60 years, in 1950 or 1960 - if the world stands - hardly a single one will be left. Where will we be then? In what circumstances? in what company?

Our works follow us. If we have been good Christians, Christians before God, & have been faithful unto the end, then we will be in the host in which "all heaven & its angel host & all the powers offer praise," in which "the glorious apostles' choir, the holy prophets' choir & the host of white-clad martyrs sing praises to God in eternity," in the great host which St. John saw "wgich no man could number, of all nations, & all kindreds, & people, & tongues, which stood before the throne, & before the Lamb." Rev. 7:9.

We want to see these great sights. But it is certainly true that they could tempt us to be despondent & to become faint-hearted. Our affairs, our work, our struggles, our efforts become so small, that we think that we can not see that they are of any meaning. But here again God's Word comes to our aid. Just as nothing is great in God's sight, so neither is anything small.

The same one who says that the "whole tribe of men is to Him as a grain of dust on a scale" has also let us know that He is concerned for every little child, & that it is not His will that a single one of them should perish. He takes upon Himself our cares. He felt pity for Epaphroditus when he was sick & near death in Rome, & was deeply concerned at the thought of how worried they were about him in the congregation at Philippi. He had pity on Paul so that he was not deprived of his co-workers & allies, & thus sorrow was not heaped upon sorrow. He even notes our small service & poor work which we do to serve Him. There was a woman who poured out a costly ointment over Jesus' head when He was sitting in Simon the leper's house in Bethany. It seems that this was not such an important incident, but yet we note that God has seen to it that wherever the Gospel is preached on earth, there her deed is spoken of to her memory. Andronicus, Junius, Amplius - what did the Christians know about the works of these men? But see how their names & deeds are noted by God & kept in His book. Rom. 16. Here we have an example of the fulfilling of the Word in Heb. 6:10, "For God is not unrighteous to forget your work & labor of love, which ye have shewed toward his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, & do minister." He has indeed said that He will not forget the cup of water with which the loving heart refreshed the tired servant of God. How lovingly He has helped us against the temptation of assuming a despondent or dissatisfied attitude toward the insignificance of our work, when He says that what we have done to the least of His brethren, that we have done for Him. And nowhere has He helped so much against the temptation of thinking lightly of any part of our work or to consider it unimportant & insignificant, as where He says, "He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much: & he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much." Luke 16:10.

Lift up your hearts, my brethren, so that we may learn both to ask & answer correctly the question, "Where shall we be when the few, uncertain days have glided away? In what company? In what relation to Jesus Christ? With what memories of our official duties, the people of our

congregations & our own household?"

These are the thoughts which alone can bring about the correct earnestness in our outlook on life & consequently in our life's work. These are the thoughts which will make us willing & happy servants of God's Word if they do not become merely a temporary stimulant or impulse in our mind, but a daily & steady call of the spirit to us.

Accordingly we will have to apply this to ourselves as St. Paul says in Rom. 2:21 concerning the Law, "Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? Thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery?" etc. We must also apply the Gospel to ourselves as we proclaim it to others. Or is it only our hearers whom we should encourage & comfort? Hasn't our Savior borne our sins? Doesn't He love us too? Doesn't He pray for us also? Doesn't He have compassion on our infirmities? Doesn't He know about the many grievous temptations to which we are exposed more than others? Do you wonder if He sees & knows that we more than others need the Holy Ghost's daily help, "in order that our faith may not expire?" Certainly He knows! And when we encourage others to honor God by believing His holy promises, then let us first believe them ourselves & comfort ourselves in that we have God's own Word that mercy is also granted to us. It is certainly true that it is God's will that we believe it. As St. Paul says to Timothy, "Thou therefore, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus," 2 Tim. 2:1. Only so strengthened - with faith that he himself has received grace - can he follow the next admonition, "Thou therefore endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ," v.3. Timothy had been a Christian & a teacher for many years when Paul wrote these words to him. & even then he needed the admonition repeated to strengthen himself with grace.

When we make use of the great, all-embracing words of comfort, for example - "My grace is sufficient for thee" and "Cast all your cares on Him, for He careth for you," - then it is certainly true that by this we are prepared once & for all. Today you comfort yourself by casting all your cares on the Lord & feel carefree & happy. Then with tomorrow come new cares which you can't bear by yourself & a new longing to realize that when you have God's grace, you have enough.

It is just this personal, daily use of the Gospel of grace which alone can give us strength to take care of our duties of office with faithfulness, wisdom & patience. And it is just ~~thi~~ for this reason that we shall be helped to look upward & forward to what awaits us even now.

Our conditions are not much suited to giving us time & opportunity for quiet meditation, as servants of the church at other times were able to indulge in & enjoy. It is much more necessary for us to use the time which we have in order that we may train ourselves always to have our work in mind & our goal before our eyes. It is for us to have the Word so instilled in our hearts that we ourselves, personally, are fit for eternal life & for being presented before Jesus Christ. If we are that, then we will certainly wish to take with us as many of our parishioners as possible. And God will not let our work be done in vain.

Thoughts of eternity will give the right direction & course to our duties of office. When one's heart is seized by one great thought or another, a great & noble purpose or some such thing, then we say that he is inspired. But there is no inspiration which completely satisfies this situation except the inspiration which is worked by the Holy Ghost. It is that by which the holy apostles have set for us such a glorious example thru their writings in the New Testament. What are their

lives, such as are revealed for us in their letters, other than "a song of praise to the honor of God." They praise God & our Lord Jesus Christ's Father who has regenerated them to a lively hope thru the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. They forget that which is past & reach after that which is ahead. They press on to the prize at the goal, which is in God's call from above in Christ Jesus. They are well acquainted with the attacks of the flesh & reason, but they take all thought captive under obedience to Christ. Faith's all-conquoring certainty is in their hearts & fills them so completely that it is their very life. Therefore they are obedient. For this reason they bear the cross of Christ with joy & consider their tribulations as fleeting & light. On account of this they can say that in all these things they are more than conquorers thru Him that loved us.

Thus, their lives are a song of praise to the honor of God. It is both correctly & beautifully said that the melody of this song of praise is on such a high level and affects so deeply because the humble, glad obedience does not value what a man understands but what he does not understand. The instrument of this song of praise is not that toy trumpet of human reason, but the heavenly trumpet of faith.

I believe it is possible that one or another of you, my brethren, may say to himself, "Yes, I will gladly be a believer; I will, God be praised, belong to my Savior, but - I should not have been a preacher. I should not have gone into this difficult office. If I had known what it was, then I would never have done it." You know well that these thoughts come to you or to others. What is the reason for this? They can be different with every individual. With some it is the flesh which shrinks at the daily cross of not being able to follow their own will unhindered. With some it could be the household afflictions of different kinds which make the preacher's work doubly heavy. Finally, with some it is thoughts that they lack the gifts which they think they ought to have.

But isn't it true that if these thoughts are heeded, it is because we forget to take our Savior, the Lord of the church, into consideration? And yet it is true that while burdened by such thoughts, it is only His call which makes the matter clear to us. Or wasn't He in on directing our lives? Didn't He know us? Didn't He have His hand in it, when we followed the advice of others & began our studies & later when we were placed in our office?

It is entirely true that not everyone is fitted for the work. There is a certain amount of gifts, partly natural, partly acquired, partly physical, partly spiritual which is required according to God's Word. Where it can be shown that these are not present, there the call is not valid because it has not come according to God's command.

But we must not mistake the original lack of those gifts with that lack which appears later thru either not using at all or not using with diligence & discretion the gifts, the talent, which God has bestowed.

Despondency caused by thinking that the gifts are very small is one cause of not using these gifts. Even if I can't point to this or that one & say that he is one, I know that there are those among us who have the sinful idea that they are incapable & have insignificant & inadequate gifts for their important office. But to such a one I will say, "Don't think that, dear brother, & don't let such despondency cripple the ability which God has given to you. God does not measure with man's measure. He does not judge like they do by outward appearances or external gifts. If there is faithfulness, diligence, singleness of purpose - also earnestness - then there is the greatest gift of the spirit, much, much greater than mere glittering capabilities. It

will finally be revealed how entirely different God's judgments are from man's. It is the same among the servants of the Word as it is among Christians in general. On earth a person may be highly regarded & appear to be superior both in insight & zeal, & even in the fear of God, but in heaven we shall see perhaps a poor overlooked old woman or a simple, plain & lightly regarded man stand highly honored & far forward, while many of those who here appeared to be somebody stand far back - indeed, may not even enter in.

Who is there that can tell us something about Epaenetus, or about the woman Persis? Church history has no place for them. It is silent. But in God's book their names stand written in indelible writing. And there they shall stand so long as the world stands, while they themselves stand & have stood for a long time among the host of the saved.

These things, my brethren, I have wanted to bring to the attention of those of you who are least known among us, who can seldom be along in meetings, who say nothing at meetings, & who appear in their own eyes (perhaps also in the eyes of others) to be rather insignificant as far as gifts or position or influence go.

Certainly many of you know the beautiful allegory about the 2 holy angels whom God called to serve Him. He sent them to earth, the one to manage the empire, the other to do the most insignificant work - to sweep the street before the feet of the first. Those 2 holy heavenly princes did not begin an arrogant & envious comparison between the two tasks. Neither was there any self-exaltation over the glorious task nor discontent with the insignificant. They showed only zeal for doing God's will. Thus our Lord Jesus taught us that it shall be among us. Cf.Matt.20:26;John 5:44 & many other places. The big thing is to be a servant of God & an heir to eternal life. The small & unimportant thing is the temporary & passing differences which can appear among servants. The objectionable, contemptible & dangerous thing is to consider these differences as being of great importance & meaning.

When death removes from earthly storm,
When grave destroys our human form,
Then let it be no longer known,
Who sat on bench & who on throne

The service we perform in common shall make us of one mind, sympathetic, charitable toward the brethren, merciful, benevolent. & the great hope we have in common shall make us humble, happy, cautious, prudent & patient, so that we do not become tired. Cf.Rom. 12:12; I John 3:2; 2 Cor. 4:16ff.

The special guidance which God has given our Synod shall strengthen us & inspire faithfulness in our work. Thru all these years of church work & struggle God has shown us clearly that we in our Synod have a difficult task to carry out, a task upon which the position of following generations toward the eternal Gospel greatly depends. This should give us strength, make us zealous & alert. It should make us "steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord." 1 Cor. 15:58.

But this task will not be completed without our experiencing much trouble. It can't be hidden from us that the position which we accept in following the footsteps of our old Lutheran fathers, both with respect to Scripture itself & to its chief teaching, justification by faith without the deeds of the Law, sola fide, hereafter just as before, will gain for us hatred & opposition from all sides so long as we continue to take the matter of this confession seriously.

It is not pleasant & easy to be reminded of this, since church strife is a heavy & bitter cross.

But woe unto those who are sick of "questions & strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men." 1 Tim. 6:4-5. "Discord & factions" which rise in this manner are certainly manifest works of the flesh. But if we, out of the fear of God, avoid questions & strife, what are we to do when God's Word is attacked & the saving truth is scoffed at? Do we have the right to remain silent? Do we have the right, for the sake of peace, to refrain from giving a clear & unmistakable testimony? Do we have the right to remain silent in the face of all these human notions which time after time raise themselves up against the Word? Do we have the right to put up with human teachings in these things which concern God's kingdom & the salvation of sinners? Do we dare in this manner to free ourselves from the accusation that we are aloof, narrow, orthodoxistic slaves of the written Word, who pay attention to doctrine & neglect life, etc.? No, certainly not! And woe be unto us if we in this manner buy friends for ourselves & good will among men! Those who would demand this of us, or would praise us if we should buy popularity at the expense of truth, have not realized what God's Word is. More correctly, they do not believe that we actually have God's own Word in Scripture. They have not thought the expression "God's Word" all the way thru.

As truly as Holy Scripture is God's Word, so truly this Word tolerates no contradiction, no deviation, no rationalizing. Our Lord Jesus has said, "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me & of my words in this adulterous & sinful generation; of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." Mark 8:38. May God grant, dear brethren, that this Word may be very deeply & indelibly inscribed in our hearts.

On account of His Word, our Savior was accused of being a rebel & a disturber of the peace. His disciples dare not expect any better. Let us then be on guard that there be no "strange burning" or carnal zeal accompanying our testimony & that we do not give unnecessary cause for strife. When it concerns us personally, there we should gladly yield. Where it concerns God's clear Word, there we shall suffer everything rather than give up one tittle of the Word. But if we are of this mind, then strife will come, even if we are the most peaceful men under the sun.

From whence will such strife come, someone may want to ask. So I will answer. Preach only Law & Gospel without holding anything back & without mixing them. Restrict yourself to exactly what God has said. Don't look for that which men prefer to hear. When you hear someone misuse God's Word, then speak as humbly & friendly as you can so that you may correct him. Do all this & you shall indeed find it to be true what the Jews in Rome said to Paul: "For as concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against." Acts 28:22.

I would very much like to have spoken to you about special demands on us which we should consider lest we hinder our proclamation of God's Word from bearing as much fruit as possible. We could continue about how we should consider & use the outward means of doing things such as the various Synod concerns require of us, money matters, etc. And finally we could consider the Norwegian Lutheran Church's position here in America as a whole & the opposing church bodies' relations to us. But if I am to get this letter into your hands soon, I must close it now.

One thing I want to add. While I have been writing this letter to you, praying God to help me with it, the thought has followed me that I really should be the last one to say anything to you in the

way of rebuke, admonition or instruction, since I myself stand in need of all these, perhaps more than anyone else among us. But here also the call has come to me as a requirement of my office. I have had to meet my own objection with a reminder that it is a duty of my office which I have to carry out as well as I am able. I want to say that I have written it out of love. I am convinced that you will also receive it in love.

May our long-suffering and faithful God follow us all in our holy work and give us the spirit of power and love and a sound mind to carry it out so that we all may be kept in the knowledge of the truth and the love of the brethren.

(This letter was written in 1895 by U.V. Koren and is found on pages 5-25 of his Samlede Skrifter, vol. II.

* * * * * * * * * *

AUTOKATAKRITOS (Titus 3:11)

by C. U. Faye

(Editorial Note: The following article comes as a result of J.A.O. Preus's study in the May,1955, CLERGY BULLETIN, on "Heresy" and "Heretic," in which Preus invited "criticism and comment." Prof. Faye suggests that Kittel's N.T. Dictionary may agree with Preus in its article on "Heresy and Heretic," but "it certainly maintains, against those that take AUTOKATAKRITOS as refering to heretics who need not be conscious of their guilt, that this word refers to such as are aware in their own hearts of their guilt." - The reader will profit by reviewing Faye's paper on Tit. 3:10-11 in the May-June, 1953, issue of the Clergy Bulletin; Faye's Translation of Kittel's article on "Heresy and Heretic" in the July 1953 issue; and Preus's article in the May 1955 issue.)

The usual interpretation of AUTOKATAKRITOS, in Tit. 3:11, is given in Theolog. Wörterbuch z.N.T.,Bd. III,p.954 (in the series of articles under the general heading KRINO). The use of the word is here restricted to the heretic conscious of his guilt: "AUTOKATAKRITOS: selbstverurteilt in sittlicher Beziehung von dem Menschen, der mit Bewusstsein sündigt, Tit. 3:11 von dem zweimal zurechtgewiessenen, also über das Unrecht seiner Haltung nicht mehr unklaren Ketzer."

The most obvious interpretation of AUTOKATAKRITOS is to take it as referring to the conscious self-condemnation of the heretic in his own heart; thus: KRITOS, judged; AUTOKRITOS, self-judged; KATAKRITOS, (judged and consequently) condemned; AUTOKATAKRITOS, (self-judged and consequently) self-condemned. The heretic tries himself in the forum of his own heart & convicts himself, in that same forum of his heart, of being guilty, that is, he is self-condemned. One may, on the other hand, take the word to mean that the heretic stands convicted (whether his heart condemns him or not) by his own words; that is, he is judged by his own words, is found guilty & condemned by his own words. The evidence that condemns him is not something outside of him, it is the testimony of his own words, thus he is self-condemned (whether he knows it or not). This interpretation implies that verse 11 must be understood thus: "Knowing that he that is such is subverted (whether he is aware of it or not - for it is true that in some cases persons with a fixed idea are unaware of being odd), & sinneth (whether he knows it or not-

it is possible to sin without knowing it), being condemned of himself (testimony from others is not necessary for condemning him, he supplies that evidence by his own words, thus he stands self-condemned - whether he himself realizes or does not realize it).

An early recorded interpretation of AUTOKATAKRITOS is that in the Vulgate (St. Jerome's Latin translation of the Bible) where the word is translated: "proprio judicio condemnatus." Since then, the commentators have, almost unanimously, followed St. Jerome. Franz Pieper, in his Christian Dogmatics, (in the English edition, Vol.I,p,90,footnote 125) has: "The meaning of the hapax-legomenon AUTOKATAKRITOS is clear beyond any doubt. It designates the inner self-condemnation, suopte (some manuscripts of the Vulgate read suopte, instead of proprio) judicio condemnatus. God's Word, with which he has been confronted, has condemned him, & he has felt this condemnation in his conscience. Huther on this passage: 'He sins, being conscious of his guilt and condemnation.'" The Huther here quoted is the commentator on I and II Tim. and Tit. in the American edition of ~~Xxxxxxxxxx~~ Meyer's Commentary on the N.T. Perhaps the most significant deviation from St. Jerome's interpretation is that of Walter Lock in the International Critical Commentary: "AUTOKATAKRITOS: Condemned "by his own action"; he can be left to Gods judgment; cf. Mt.18:17, I Cor.5:12-13; perhaps also "by his own conscience," cf. Lk.19:22;Jn.8:9-11. Lock's interpretation could be put into Latin thus: "condemnatus per verba sua, vel atque proprio judicio in corde suo."

In accepting the traditional interpretation, a difficulty is presented by the word EIDOS, knowing, in the phrase: "knowing that such a one is perverted and sinneth, being self-condemned." How can one know that the heretic is self-condemned in his own heart? Is it possible to look into his heart? It is possible in some cases, e.g. in cases where the heretic is caught & convicted of lying, of a self-contradiction, which he may ultimately deny as being a self-contradiction. Such inconsistency & self-contradiction is a common trait of heretics who also combine unionism with their heresy. A case in point is Zwingli: "Indess ward der Zwingel jämmerlich zu Felde von jenem Theil der Papisten erschlagen, und Oekolampad, viel zu schwach, solchen Unfall zu tragen, darüber vor Leide auch starb. Welches mir (Luther) auch selbst zwo Nacht solch Herzeleid that, dass ich leicht auch hätte mögen bleiben, denn ich guter Hoffnung war ihrer Besserung, und doch für ihre Seele mich aufs höchste bekümmern musste, weil sie, noch in Irrthum vertieft, also in Sünden untergingen. Aber nach des Zwingels Tode ging ein Büchlein aus, welches er sollt hart vor seinem Ende gemacht haben, mit namen: Christianae fidei expositio, ad Christianum regem etc. Solches sollte ein Ausbund sein über alle seine vorigen Bücher. Und dass es sein eigen, des Zwingels, sein musste, gab die Art seiner wilden, wüssten Rede, und seiner vorrige Meinung. Solches Büchleins erschrak ich sehr, nicht um meinetwillen, sondern um seinetwillen. Denn weil er nach unserm Vertrag zu Marburg solches hat mögen schreiben, ist's gewiss, dass er alles zu Marburg gegen uns mit falschen Herzen und Munde (underlined by the undersigned) gehandelt hat, und ich müsste (wie auch noch) an seiner Seelen Seligkeit verzweifeln, wo er in solchem Sinn gestorben ist..." (Luther's Sämmtliche Schriften,hrsg. von J.G. Walch,St. Louis,1890, Bd. 20, col. 1766.)

Once the issue has been clarified, the honest heretic either is converted to the truth, or, if continuing in his error, he does not waste time in further discussions. The dishonest heretic usually operates unionistically & is desirous of promulgating his heresy in indefinitely prolonged discussions. The apostle warns against such pro-

cedure: "A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject" (verse 10). The reason for cutting off negotiations is given in the next verse. The dishonest heretic is not acting in good faith, discussion with him is useless, and it may be dangerous for the orthodox party to lay himself open to the wiles of his dishonest opponent: "Knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself." (Verse 11.)

Common sense and the properly sensitive reverence for the truth (in addition the admonition "Reject" in verse 10) demand the cessation of indefinitely prolonged and fruitless negotiations with a persistent heretic, regardless of whether said heretic is or is not conscious of being self-condemned.

C.U. Faye

* * * * * * *

Editorial Note re U.V. Koren's letter printed in this issue: Some of our readers may remember that excerpts from this letter were run in SENTINEL during the winter of 1951-1952 in translation done by Dr. S.C. Ylvisaker. We think our readers will appreciate the opportunity of reading or re-reading it in full in English dress, and we are grateful to Mr. Olmanson for sending it to us. The translator, in an accompanying letter makes a quite unnecessary apology for the quality of his translation, but adds: "But I think enough of the thought is there to make it of value to anyone who reads it. Even my translation can't hide Koren's keeness." -- Quite right! And we will add: If Mr. Olmanson has any more stuff that in his judgment would be valuable to our readers, he is more than welcome to use this medium to pass it on. The same goes for many others... Let's make it a little stronger: An invitation, indeed, a plea.

LITT AV HVERT

INSTALLATION. The Rev. Joseph Petersen was installed in English Lutheran Church in Cottonwood, Minn., on Sunday afternoon, Sept. 18. N.B. Harstad conducted the installation service and T.N. Teigen preached the sermon (1 Thess 1,2 - 2,13). Pastors M.E. Tweit, Arthur Schulz, and J.A.O. Preus assisted in the installation. The ladies of the Cottonwood congregation served a fine supper in the High School Cafeteria, and after the supper there was a short program of speeches in the lighter vein by various under the Emceeship of Mr. Oscar Runholt, Secretary of the congregation, who also on behalf of the congregation presented Rev. Petersen with a purse. - The afternoon was warm, but so was the reception, and it was a distinct pleasure to be a witness. - Other news is that English Lutheran is going to build a new church.

------- * -------

VITAL STATISTICS: Rev. and Mrs. Robert Preus became the parents of PETER ERIK on Aug. 13.

Rev. & Mrs. J.A.O. Preus did likewise for MARGARET NAOMI on Aug. 18. If there are other statistics of such vital nature to be recorded we hope we will be informed. We're not exactly telepathic down here.

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.D. Subscription price per year: 1.50, payable to Rev. Arthur Schulz, Tracy, Minn.

CLERGY BULLETIN

Vol. XV, Nos. 2 & 3. October-November, 1955

WHY THE NORWEGIAN SYNOD?

by

Christian Anderson

This is a serious question, which is often directed to us. It is important for us to be able to answer it with a good conscience. The question is directed to us by many of those who are not with us in our work in the church. Why do we keep aloof now when most of the Lutherans of Norse ancestry have succeeded in uniting into one church body? The question sometimes arises also in our own minds, as we are engaged in the difficult work of building up again the institutions of which we are to sorely in need, & especially when we are scoffed at & ridiculed because of the stand which we take. Why could we not be spared this anxiety & trouble by following the majority, as so many of our former brethren have done, who seem to be just as conscientious & perhaps more capable than many of us are? It would make our work easier & spare us from many inconveniences.

These questions are warranted. It is therefore our duty to answer them as in the presence of God. If we find that it is only because of injudiciousness or lack of ability to think soberly that we have tried to rebuild & perpetuate the Norwegian Synod, then the censure directed at us is justified, & we should repent & amend our ways in the future. Only if we find that we are conscience bound by God's Word to take the action which we have done can we confidently continue our work & expect that the Lord will confer His blessing upon it. Keeping this in mind we shall turn to the task of answering these questions.

Why, then, the Norwegian Synod? The reason why we have not joined the merger, but still strive to maintain the Norwegian Synod, is not, as some seem to think, because we are so blind that we cannot see the advantage of working in larger groups or that we are so narrow-minded that we do not want to work together with those with whom we have formerly contended, nor because we are so self-sufficient that we cannot see anything good in others; but the reason is that we are convinced that God has given the Norwegian Synod a special task to perform among the Norwegian immigrants & their descendants, a problem which was not solved by a majority of the Norwegian Synod joining together with other bodies in the "Norwegian Lutheran Church."

What, then, was this task? From the very beginning the Norwegian Synod assumed a definite conservative Lutheran stand in doctrine & practice, which made it eminently qualified to serve as a city on a hill among those who have worked to build up the Lutheran Church in this country. The "Norwegian Lutheran Church," which has taken over all the property which formerly belonged to the Norwegian Synod & has swallowed up most of its members, is not constituted & built on such

principles that it is able to continue the work & solve the problems which God had entrusted to the Norwegian Synod. There are indeed many of our former brethren in this church body who have resolved to work towards leading the new church body into the steps of the old Norwegian Synod. We do not doubt that many have seriously tried to carry out this resolve. But the principles on which the church body is built are of such a nature, & the body is made up of such heterogeneous elements, that they, despite their best intentions, cannot expect to accomplish their purpose. According to repeated public statements by leading men within the church body, none of the parties which joined together have changed their doctrine, but the union was effected through an agreement that the disagreement in doctrine which formerly existed was not divisive of church fellowship. The theses which were adopted as a basis for the union were therefore so carefully formulated that all parties could find their doctrines expressed in them. This is especially the case with "Opgjör." Yet, since the earlier theses lack a definite rejection of the false doctrines for which the other church bodies formerly contended, these too can be interpreted so that they are satisfactory to those who formerly had made bitter attacks upon the doctrines taught by the Norwegian Synod. Besides this, the united church body is composed of such heterogeneous elements, which hold conflicting views on church work, that it is inconceivable that a small minority can gain a hearing. In addition to this, many of the old Synod's opponents work just as hard to maintain their position as our former brethren do.

This was our judgment of the situation when we for conscience sake did not dare to enter the merger. Our conviction has been strengthened by observing the development which has taken place since 1917. Therefore we not only consider ourselves justified in standing aloof from the new church body, but we deem it our sacred duty to work with the abilities given us, & to make use of the opportunities which the Lord grants us in order to continue the work of the Norwegian Synod.

In order to elucidate what has already been said, let us consider the stand which the Norwegian Synod thruout its entire history has taken. Already at the organization of this synod it was clearly evident that the founders wanted to establish a genuinely Lutheran church body. The first organization, which was effected in 1851, was dissolved the following year because it was found that the second paragraph in the constitution contained the Grundtvigian error, placing the Baptismal Confession or the Apostles' Creed on a par with the Holy Scriptures. To many this might seem to be a slight & innocent error, since these articles in all points contain the true doctrines of God's Word. Nevertheless, it was an error, inasmuch as it placed this confession, which was drawn up by men, side by side with God's own Word. But this is the way that all errors as a rule arise. To begin with, they may seem small & insignificant. But Scripture teaches that error "will eat as doth a canker" (2 Tim. 2,17). If it is allowed to enter it will soon grow & spread so that it will have the most fateful consequences. Those who organized the Norwegian Synod realized this, & therefore, in spite of the many objections which were raised, they rather dissolved the entire organization than to build further on such dangerous ground. Not before 1853 was the final organization consummated, after the constitution had been framed in such a way that it rendered the church body safe against errors in the future.

The work was continued in the same manner as it was begun. During the first years of the history of

the Synod an incessant strife was carried on against Reformed errors within other Lutheran bodies. These strifes forced our fathers into a thorough & serious study of the Holy Scriptures & the Lutheran Confessions. They thereby acquired an ever increasingly clear knowledge of the saving truths. Pastor V. Koren, who came to this country the same year the Synod was organized, & who until his death in 1910 continued to take a leading part in the work of the Synod, says: "We brought this unadulterated Gospel with us from our mother church in Norway, but we had not acquired a truly clear insight into its glory, in opposition to all errors, until we came here, where both the free church conditions & the controversies which we have had to carry on have, under divine guidance, confirmed us in the old truths. We should be ungrateful indeed if we were to remain silent about the manner in which the testimony of our German brethren in faith, & especially of that faithful disciple of Luther, our dear sainted Dr. Walther, mightily strengthened us. No one can rightfully accuse us, however, of being parroters of him or of others." Here we have in a few words described how the Synod came to assume the definite Lutheran attitude, which we still today consider so important to maintain.

There were several sometimes bitter controversies between the Norwegian Synod & other Norwegian Lutheran groups concerning important Christian doctrines. Yet that which was the underlying cause of most of these controversies was a different view of the Gospel. The teachers of the Norwegian Synod had from the beginning learned to distinguish rightly between the Law & the Gospel. They taught therefore, in accordance with God's Word, a full & unconditioned Gospel. This Gospel teaches that salvation is prepared for all sinners, & this salvation is brought to all sinners who hear the message of the Gospel, & is imparted to them by grace alone without any merits on their part. The Gospel consequently teaches that sinners are saved by grace alone, & that there is sufficient grace for all sinners. Salvation is prepared not only for those who thru faith really partake of it, but also for those who thru their unbelief reject it & are lost. The Gospel is always the same, whether it is proclaimed to good or evil, believers or unbelievers. It brings & gives the blessings of salvation, the forgiveness of sins & eternal life to all who hear its message, whether they by faith accept it or by their unbelief reject it.

It is easy to understand of what great importance it is for the poor sinner that the Gospel is proclaimed in this way. It gives real comfort to all those who by the Word have come to a knowledge of the misery of sin & anxiously seek salvation. They do not need anxiously to ask if their faith is such that they can expect to partake of salvation, or if their repentance is deep enough, & if they otherwise are such who dare to appropriate unto themselves the comfort which the Gospel gives. They need only to put their trust in the assurances of the Gospel, that "their warfare is accomplished, that their iniquity is pardoned, that they have received of the Lord's hand double for all their sins."

But thruout all these controversies the Synod was attacked by its opponents for this teaching. The teachers of the Synod were accused of making this way unto salvation a broad way, encouraging the hearers to take the matter of their salvation lightly without striving in true penitence & faith to partake of the grace offered in the Gospel. This was evidenced during the older controversies concerning Absolution & Justification as well as in the strife which later arose concerning Election & Conversion.

The opponents took offense at the fact that the pastors of the Synod by the laying-on of hands pronounced the forgiveness of sins to the individuals who made confession. They maintained that the Confessor ought to pronounce absolution only on the condition that the party concerned was a true believer. But this would immediately make the active power of Absolution dependent on the faith of the one making confession. Instead of being assured that forgiveness of sin really was given him, the anxious sinner would be worried about whether his faith was of the right kind, his penitence sufficiently serious & deep-felt, etc.

Now, the Norwegian Synod has surely never taught that anyone can enjoy the forgiveness given in Absolution unless he with a penitent & believing heart receives & appropriates to himself this blessed gift. But it is not the business of the pastor to judge the hearts, for that he cannot do. He who pronounces forgiveness in Absolution only applies the Gospel to the individual who makes confession. Just as the Gospel, proclaimed from the pulpit, is the same as it sounds to all & brings the same gift to the unbelievers as to the believers, so does God in Absolution give the grace of forgiveness as well to him who in unbelief rejects it as to him who in faith accepts & appropriates it to himself. The Gospel proclaims the salvation which is prepared for all sinners. When the Saviour on the cross spoke the wonderful words, "It is finished," then atonement was made for the whole world, whether the individual sinners will believe it or not.

This same truth was held forth with special emphasis in the controversy which was later carried on concerning Justification. Here also the teachers of the Synod proclaimed the full Gospel which assures all poor sinners that they are in Christ already reconciled to God; for "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them," 2 Cor. 5,19. By His perfect obedience & His innocent suffering & death, Christ has made perfect atonement for the sins of the whole world. He took upon Him the whole world's debt of sin & paid it. He has thereby procured for all sinners a perfectly valid righteousness, with which they can stand before God. "He was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification," Rom. 4,25. Not in order that we shall be justified, but because we in the sight of God already are justified; for the same word, which is used both times in the original Greek just as in our translation, i.e. "for", has the same meaning in both parts of the sentence. If Christ was delivered <u>for</u> our offences, i.e. because our offences, sins, were laid on Him, counted against Him, then He was also raised again <u>for</u> our justification, i.e., because we by virtue of Christ's atonement, in the sight of God are considered righteous. Just as Christ took our place when He was delivered, so He also took our place when, after His work of atonement was completed, He was declared righteous by being raised again from the dead. This is the full Gospel, the glad tidings which God wants His servants to proclaim when He says: "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins," Is.40,1.2. The Apostle Paul therefore says: "Therefore by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life," Rom. 5,18. (Note: Unfortunately, the older Norwegian translation has: "shall come upon all men" in the second part of the sentence. In a later translation this has been corrected.)

So then, salvation is prepared, the whole world's sin is atoned for, all sinners are now righteous in Christ; for otherwise they could not be reconciled to God. These are the glad tidings which God wants us to proclaim to all sinners. But, sad to say, many of those to whom this glorious message comes will not believe it, & by their unbelief they reject the salvation & do not personally partake of the righteousness which already long ago in Christ has been brought about, but are eternally lost. Yet it is not their many sins, which were once laid upon Christ, that condemns them, but the cause of their condemnation is their unbelief: for Christ says expressly: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned," Mark 16,16. And again: "He that believeth on him (namely, the Son) is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God," John 3,18.

For preaching this f ull unconditioned Gospel the teachers of the Synod were violently attacked. And the opponents always laid such undue stress upon our faith that one could not help but get the impression that faith was something more than a hand which with man receives & accepts God's gift, that it either must possess something with which we merit God's grace, or that it is necessary to complete the salvation, which God has prepared. The result was that the preaching was made to deal more with faith & man's conduct than with that which is to be believed, viz., the glorious message of salvation from God, the message which itself creates faith & nourishes & strengthens it in the heart of man. Every pastor with some experience knows what sad consequences such wrong preaching may have upon the anxious sinner. The poor sinner who has learned to realize his great need may so easily be led to worry about whether his faith is as it ought to be, that he does not show the right conduct over against God's grace, instead of listening alone to the message which God brings to him. It is one of the most dangerous tricks of the devil to prevent the anxious sinner from trusting in the grace of God alone. How important it is, then, that we do not let anything stand in the way of the full revelation of God's grace. Rightly, therefore, does Prof. J.B. Frich say on the occasion of the Synod's 50th anniversary (Festskrift,p.258): "These truths, concerning Christ's Atonement, the Gospel, Absolution and Justification...are the most precious truths for which ~~we can rejoice and thank God~~ the Norwegian Synod has sought to contend. If there is anything for which we now can rejoice and thank God, it is because by His great mercy, in spite of our weakness, He has opened our eyes to see these truths, & has to this day preserved them unto us. If we truly hold fast to these teachings, we are going to have the true doctrine also in other points!"

The Synod was to be called upon to set forth these same Gospel truths even more powerfully in the controversy which was carried on in its own midst concerning Election, the Call and Conversion. First it concerned the doctrine of Election. This is a doctrine which in a number of passages in Holy Scripture is held forth as a comfort for believers. It is a glorious revelation of the Gospel. This doctrine is not revealed for the purpose of giving men something to brood over or worry about, but solely to comfort those who are in need of comfort. This doctrine proclaims that God not only here in time has loved us & come near to us with His grace but already from eternity He has not only determined to sacrifice His Son in order to save poor sinners, but He has resolved to call, justify, sanctify & glorify the individual sinners, i.e., bring them to faith & keep them in the faith whereby they can partake of the salvation in Christ both in this life

& in eternity. Like all His acts toward those who are saved, God has made this decree without being moved by anything else than His grace & mercy in Christ Jesus. God has revealed this to us in His Word in order to strengthen our faith, inasmuch as we are thereby reminded that God's care for us is so great that it reaches into eternity. We shall thereby be moved to confidently put our trust in Him alone for our salvation without being affected by the knowledge of our own natural corruption & total inability to show forth a conduct which in any measure can be pleasing to God.

But that which God reveals in the passages concerning Election applies only to the believers. It has nothing to do with the unbelievers. Let us mark this well. It is so important that we remember this, because here the human mind wants to begin to speculate & raise all sorts of curious questions: If God thus arbitrarily, as it seems to us, has predestined some people to partake of His salvation, He must, as a matter of course, have rejected the others, unless it can be shown that there is something by which He was governed in His choice. And this something they think they have found in Rom. 8,29 which says: "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate" etc. What did He see, then, in those whom He foreknew? Surely, they say, this was naturally their faith, in view of which He elected them & not others. But these are deductions of the human mind & not the teaching of God's Word; for God's Word does not say anywhere that God has predestined men <u>in view of their faith</u>. On the contrary, Scriptures clearly teach that God has elected us <u>unto faith</u> (2 Thess. 2,18; James 2,5). The word <u>foreknew</u> does not contain anything else than that God beforehand knew them as such on whom He would show mercy in accordance with other similar expressions in Scripture, as for example Matt.7,23; 25,12.

The teachers of the Synod were violently attacked because they, like the brethren in the Missouri Synod, held forth the glorious Gospel which the Lord reveals in the passages of Scripture which speak of Election, without adding anything thereto or taking anything away in order to satisfy the curious questions raised by human reason. They were accused of Calvinism, teaching that God wanted to save only some people while He consigned the greater number to eternal damnation. The opponents, headed by Dr. F.A. Schmidt, demanded that all the pastors of the Synod should adopt the definition of the doctrine of Election which is found in Pontoppidon's "Sandhed til Gudfrygtighed," namely, that "God has predestined unto salvation those whom He foreknew would believe and continue in faith unto the end." If they refused to do this, they should be deposed from their office.

The faithful teachers of the Synod did not refuse to recognize as brethren those who like Pontoppidon, Gerhard & other old teachers in the Lutheran Church used this expression, provided that they like those old teachers otherwise taught rightly concerning sin & grace. To be sure, they did not recognize this so-called form of doctrine as Scriptural, since no passage is found in Scripture which speaks in this way about Election; neither is such expression found in our Lutheran Confessions. They showed clearly that if this definition of Election is to be taken in the sense which the words undeniably express, then it weakens & limits the glorious Gospel which God wants to proclaim in the passages which speak of Election. That this was actually the case became clearly evident when, during the controversy on Election, the consideration of the doctrines of the Call & Conversion were considered. Just as the so-called Anti-Missourians taught that God in Election took into account something in man, so they ascribed

to men a certain ability thru the prevenient grace to follow God's call & to resolve to accept His grace. Quite unconcernedly they held forth the good conduct of man as an explanation of why some men are converted while others are lost.

The faithful teachers of the Synod voiced definite disapproval of such a doctrine, because it militates against the Gospel, which teaches that men are saved by grace alone. God's Word teaches clearly that men are by nature dead in trespasses & sins. If that is true, then there can be no question that they have any ability to follow God's call & to resolve to accept His grace, or to show forth a "good conduct." In order to be saved, a person must be born again. This Christ impresses on one who wanted to rely on his own good conduct. Just as no account was taken to my conduct when I was born in the flesh, so no account is taken to my conduct when I am born of the Spirit.

But has not a settlement been reached between the various parties in this controversy? A document has indeed been framed which bears this name. But it does not contain any real settlement, which is made most clearly evident by the fact that leading officials in the new church body time & again have declared that none of the parties have changed their doctrine; they teach the same doctrine as they formerly held. They have only found that those doctrinal differences are not divisive of church fellowship. This was not said indeed when they tried to appease the troubled consciences of members of the Synod. Then one explanation after the other was offered by members of the committee, which explanations were to show that "Opgjör" itself was accepted; & this document must in the future be interpreted in accordance with its own wording. In this document the so-called second form of the doctrine of Election is without reservation accepted as well as the Scriptural doctrine of Election found in the Lutheran Confessions. The teaching of God's Word is thus placed side by side with the doctrine of men which is to satisfy human reason. They have indeed rejected the expression "man's good conduct," but the doctrine which was held forth in this expression is retained & secured by the words "Feeling of responsibility over against the acceptance or rejection of grace." The entire "Opgjör" is framed in such a way that it is not a settlement, but an agreement whereby both sides may retain their former doctrines.

But have not a series of theses on other doctrines concerning which there has been controversy been adopted, & ought not "Opgjör" be interpreted in the light of these theses? These theses were indeed officially adopted by the Synod conventions together with "Opgjör." But within the Synod there had been no public controversy concerning these things which need to be taken into account. It was different when these same theses were to be used as a basis for union with others who were well known to have taught differently than the Synod concerning these things. Then theses were needed to reject false doctrines which had been taught. This is something which we find in all our Confessional writings, which treat thoroughly the doctrines concerning which there had been controversy. In addition to this, these theses were hurriedly adopted in the excitement of the Union Movement without any debate, so that those who had been separated could be joined together as soon as possible. There was little probability that the individuals gave any serious thought to the fact that their doctrine & preaching was to be governed by these theses in the future.

We cannot therefore, with our best intentions, become convinced that the adoption of "Opgjör" & the

other theses under such circumstances gives us any assurance that the stand which our Synod took with reference to the teaching of a full & unadulterated Gospel will be predominant in the new Church body. Therefore we cannot with a good conscience join it, but we must, as God gives us grace, continue the Norwegian Synod. We will make our own the prayer with which Prof. Frich closes his essay in the Synod's "Festskrift": "May the merciful God graciously preserve unto us and our children His pure and unadulterated Gospel! May He ever increasingly teach us to proclaim it in all its blessedness, and set forth the blessed Saviour before the eyes of sinners, as if He were crucified among them! To see how earnestly He in His Gospel calls us all, stretches out His arms toward us, and longs only to enfold us into His gracious bosom! May we ever more among us experience how sweet it is to fall asleep as a suckling child in Jesus' arms. Amen."

In all these controversies, & especially in the controversy on Election, it became evident that the Norwegian Synod in all points wanted to be governed by the revealed Word of God alone as the only rule of doctrine & life. Even when it seemed to human reason that there were contradictions in Scripture, & when the teachings of Scripture were not in harmony with human speculations, the Synod has accepted all of God's Word without adding or subtracting as much as a tittle in order to satisfy the demands of human reason. This became clearly evident in the controversies formerly carried on concerning Sunday & the question of slavery, which it is not necessary to enter into here. The Old Synod had caused the Greek word Gegraptai, "It is written," to be imprinted in its seal, & it endeavored faithfully to act in accordance with this motto. In all the controversies which the Norwegian Synod was forced to carry on, it became obvious again & again that the opponents did not want to be governed wholly by this principle. And since no reliable settlement of this question has been reached in the united church body, we do not dare to enter into church fellowship with its members.

It is surely the duty of a church body to watch over purity & unity of doctrine, to bear an unequivocal witness to the truth in opposition to all false doctrine, & to point out & warn against all departure from the truth in doctrine & life. God's Word says: "Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor, and not suffer sin upon him," Lev. 19,17. "A man that is an heretick, after the first and second admonition, reject," Tit. 3,10. "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us," 2 Thess. 3,6. The Synod always endeavored to be regulated by these & similar passages. Just as the individual pastor and congregations carefully guarded against having joint work with Reformed & others who did not in all points take the right stand in doctrine & practice, so the Synod as a whole exercised the greatest care before it even gave appearance of acknowledging & fraternizing with other church bodies. At the meeting when the Norwegian Synod was organized, an overture was made by the Ohio Synod that the 2 synods enter into closer relations with each other, but the offer was declined because they felt they had not had an opportunity to make thorough inquiry about the stand of this synod in doctrine & practice. At the following meeting which was held in 1855, the Synod elected 2 of its pastors to study this question, so that they later on could recommend a Lutheran body with which the Synod could establish closer relations &, if possible, to make use of their educational institutions for the training of pastors & tea-

chers. This led to the connection with the Missouri Synod, which became of such blessing to the Norwegian Synod for the preservation of the truth.

The Synod continued to follow the same course. The invitation to take part in the founding of the "General Council" was declined, while they partook with life & spirit in the work to establish the "Synodical Conference." It was the same consideration which here asserted itself. The Synod carried on doctrinal discussions at all its meetings, in order that the members might be grounded in the truth & warned against all errors. In this way doctrinal discipline was constantly exercised within the church body, just as the various synods within the Synodical Conference keep an eye on one another in this respect, inasmuch as all synodical reports are scrutinized by committees for that purpose, which are to report the matter to the Synodical Conference, if they find something in these reports which is not in accordance with the truth.

The official organs of the Synod always contained strong testimony to the truth, just as aberrations prevalent here & there were pointed out. It is true that this often led to controversy, but that could not be avoided, if they were to do their duty. For many this testimony proved to be of the greatest benefit. When the preservation of the truth was at stake, the teachers of the Synod were not guilty of negligence, so that they could be characterized as dumb dogs that cannot bark, or as builders that daub with untempered mortar, or heal the hurt of God's people by saying, Peace, peace, when there is no peace. As late as the year 1900 the Synod conventions, together with resolutions declaring that they would work earnestly in an effort to bring about unity among the various Norwegian Lutheran bodies, adopted also a paragraph which reads as follows: "Also for the very purpose of furthering true unity & of preserving the truth of God's Word, which we believe that your Synod by God's grace possesses pure and true, our Synod wants to avoid and abstain from all kinds of unionism and all proceedings which would make it appear that we are in doubt whether we in all points have the truth pure and true or not."

Has this unequivocal & fearless testimony to the truth been continued in the new church body? With due recognition of the efforts that have been made by some members of the body to be heard, we must, however, admit that as a church body little has been accomplished in this respect. Just as the former differences between the various parties to the union have not been considered more serious than that they have been declared not divisive of church fellowship, so there has been little questioning about the stand taken by the other Lutheran bodies with whom they carry on joint work. Quite soon after the Union of 1917 the "Norwegian Lutheran Church" began to co-operate in many fields with all the Lutheran synods except those in the Synodical Conference. Between leading men in these synods some negotiations concerning doctrine were carried on. They agreed among other things in the future to follow this principle: "That a polemic attitude be abandoned, and if manifested, ignored." Thus they agreed to cease assuming a controversial attitude toward one another, & if anyone began to testify against errors he was to be ignored or, in other words, he was to be killed by silence.

This principle has indeed been followed by those who have been leaders in the "Norwegian Lutheran Church." The testimony which the church body has borne against aberrations in the other Lutheran bodies with whom they have co-operated

to a greater or less extent has been extremely weak. Some voices have indeed been raised against aberrations within the church body, but if doctrinal discipline has ever been exercised, the public has never become aware of it. Only the Missouri Synod, with which the Norwegian Synod had the most intimate fraternal relations, has been attacked, sometimes quite vehemently. This shows clearly enough how the church body has kept aloof from our old tried brethren, while they have entered into brotherly relations with our Synod's former opponents. Now they have moreover joined together with them in the so-called "American Lutheran Conference." Three of these synods, the Ohio, Buffalo & Iowa Synods, carried on for over 15 years negotiations with the Missouri & Wisconsin Synods concerning the very same doctrines concerning which there had been controversies also among the Norwegians. The negotiating committees came to agreement on a set of positive theses. But since the document did not contain sufficient antitheses which rejected the false doctrines for which the opponents had formerly contended, it was not adopted by the Missouri Synod as a sufficient guarantee of unity of doctrine. The theses were turned back to the committee with the request that they continue negotiations on them in the light of history, i.e., taking definitely into consideration the stand formerly taken by the various synods. The 3 said synods in the meantime, after one day's negotiations, reached "full agreement" with similar committees of the Norwegian Lutheran Church, the Augustana Synod & the United Danish Church. This shows indeed how serious their negotiations with the synods of the Synodical Conference were. In the meantime the result now is that the majority of the pastors & congregations of the old Synod have officially joined together with the old opponents of the Missouri & Norwegian Synods. And curiously, not a single vote was cast against this federation.

I hope it will not be considered immodest if I quote some words from an address which I delivered at a meeting of the Zion congregation in Minneapolis in 1915: "In this Lutheran Church in this country there have been, and still are, two distinct trends, one conservative & one liberal. We together with the Synodical Conference have hitherto represented the conservative wing. This has enjoyed the greatest growth & has laid the most solid foundation. Despite the many attacks which have been made upon it, this part has through its clear testimony served as an effective support for the whole Lutheran Church in this country, & has drawn the other groups in its direction. This explains why all the Lutheran bodies in this country are more conservative today than the church in Norway. Our testimony has borne goodly fruits. But I am convinced that by entering into a union on the present basis we shall be drawn into the liberal part, greatly to the detriment of the Church as a whole. And we would thereby shirk our Christian duty to be faithful witnesses." Having observed the developments in the 15 years since these words were spoken, it must be admitted that the fear here expressed was only too well founded. The Norwegian Lutheran Church has now actually joined together with the more liberal synods on a basis which does not require the exercise of doctrinal discipline as is the case in the Synodical Conference, while they have turned their backs on our old brethren in faith. We regard it as a sinful neglect of our duty to bear witness to the truth, if we should leave our time-tried brethren in faith & join with their opponents & have fraternal relations with such who, both in doctrine & practice, are guilty of things which are not in accordance with God's Word. Therefore it becomes our sacred duty to arrange it so that we can maintain fraternal fellowship with those who have always been faithful brethren; for this in itself is a weighty testi-

mony, & as far as we are concerned we want to continue our work on the old time-tried foundation. That is the reason why there is still "The Norwegian Synod."

But there are surely many in the new church body, both pastors & laymen, who still are convinced that the stand in doctrine & practice held by the old Norwegian Synod is correct, a stand which it is still their duty to promote & to uphold. But they believe that their testimony will have more weight & be more far-reaching if they remain in the Norwegian Lutheran Church. They often express the wish that we too would join them, so that we by working together may have hope of accomplishing so much more in the interest of the truth than by standing alone.

But we do not dare to follow this invitation, however tempting it sometimes might be for our flesh & blood. We might perhaps thereby now & then get an opportunity to hold forth some things before a larger audience than we now have. But it is our conviction that our testimony would not thereby have greater weight. By entering the new Church body, we would thereby officially recognize as brethren in faith many with whom we know we are thoroughly in disagreement. This very fact would in a large measure take the effectiveness out of our testimony. Even if we were permitted now & then thru the organs of the church to call attention to this or that aberration from true Lutheran doctrine & practice, what could we accomplish, inasmuch as these organs are filled with testimonials by spokesmen from the other side who have just as much right to be heard as we have? The unionists are always obliging toward those of other faiths, so long as they themselves have the same opportunity to be heard. When all parties thus have the same right to be heard, how can the simple Christian, who is in need of guidance, know whom to follow?

Although our testimony therefore is heard only within a comparatively small circle, our stand is nevertheless much more widely known; & the leaders in the Norwegian Lutheran Church have much greater fear of our testimony than of that which is occasionally heard within their own midst. In spite of the fact that they have generally tried to kill our testimony by silence, it has sometimes caused leaders of the church to publish articles in the interest of the truth, because they fear others would follow the example of those who have already withdrawn from their church & have joined our Synod.

Yet, in the last analysis, it is not up to us to indulge in such calculations. If we in all points abide by God's Word, our course will be clear. If we seriously do this, then we may confidently leave the result in God's hands. Here may I be permitted to add a couple of quotations from men whose names formerly were very popular among us:

"The Scandinavians who have joined the 'General Synod' will now no doubt claim that they just thereby seek to draw the erring 'brethren' unto the way of truth, but how can they do this when the constitution of the Synod stipulates that the error is to be tolerated? On the contrary the 'erring brethren' with the law on their side can force the orthodox to be silent because the law gives the error freedom to exist side by side with the truth. But what shall we say about a church body where falsehood and truth are placed on equal terms? When & where can the truth tolerate a lie without denying itself? The truth abides by God's Word, & there we are commanded to testify against the lie & avoid all communion with it. An errorist is to be unto us a curse (Gal. 1,8); we are to avoid those who cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which we have learned (Rom. 16,17);

we are not to receive those who do not bring the true doctrine into our house, neither bid them Godspeed (2 John 10)." (Laur. Larsen in Kirkelig Maanedstidende, 1859, p. 50).

"O ungodly fellowship, o cursed union, which is founded on a love which has only stolen the appearance of true love, but has sacrificed the eternal divine truth and has trodden under foot the eternal commandment of God! What good can come from such love and agreement? So far from being benefitted by it, the orthodox, yes, the whole church will be harmed thereby. As long as the orthodox keep aloof from the errorists, so long will their errors be constantly and impressively rebuked, so that they either acknowledge and desist from them, or that they cannot always spread them ever further. But if the orthodox mingle with the errorists, these will thereby become more and more indifferent to their errors, and the orthodox will become ever more lukewarm toward their truth, and instead of the truths gaining the victory, error will win out, and the truth will lose. One does not show love to a person who goes on a wrong path by accompanying him. He shows him love not only by warning him against his error, but also showing by his actions how serious the warning is by leaving him if he does not want to be corrected." (From a sermon by Dr. Walther translated and printed in Kirkelig Maanedstidende, 1858, p. 89).

I have here sought to point out the essential considerations which have moved us in our efforts to maintain the Norwegian Synod without entering into details. Questions regarding our attitude to lodgery, the Millennium, women's rights to speak publicly and vote in the congregation, as well as the right principles of church government, the office of the ministry, etc., I have not touched upon. Correct answers to these questions will be governed by what has already been said.

May the Lord by His Word lead us to an ever better understanding of our duties as faithful stewards of His mysteries!

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

While Luther was preaching at Erfurt, on his way to Worms, a noise was suddenly heard in one of the galleries, & it was thought it was giving way from the weight of the crowd. This caused much confusion in the auditorium. Some rushed from their places; others were motionless with fear. The preacher stopped for a moment, then stretching forth his hand, he exclaimed aloud: "Fear not, there is no danger - the devil is seeking to throw hindrances in the way of my preaching the Gospel, but he shall not gain his point."

When Melanchthon arose to preach on some occasion, he took the text: "I am the good shepherd." On looking round upon his numerous & respectable audience, his natural timidity entirely overcame him, & he could only repeat the text over & over again. Luther, who was in the desk with him, finally exclaimed impatiently: "You are a very good sheep"; and telling him to sit down, took the same text, and preached an excellent discourse from it.

O P E N L E T T E R

Oberursel (Taunus) den 12.9.1955

To the Clergy Bulletin,
the Rev.T.W.Teigen, Editor,
917 S.Grange Ave., Sioux Falls, S.Dak.

Your issue of June-July 1955, p.107, published my appreciation, especially of your study "Heresy", shared by my colleague. It first reached me a fortnight ago. I was surprised to appear in print, but have no objections.

It is to be understood, of course, that I wrote you a courtesy letter for receiving free copies and that the reference was to scholarly efforts, not to polemical inferences restricted to the American scene

May I use your space to prevent misunderstandings and to urge a point very vital to our view. We deeply deplore the tendency in Synodical Conference circles during the last two years to turn down the one suggestion which could have greatly helped to clarify issues and perhaps to reunite the Synodical Conference and even make it a World Synodical Conference. The suggestion was conveyed to the heads of all Synods of the Synodical Conference more than a year and a half ago. It proposed to follow the procedure adopted by Jakob Andreae and others after Luther's death to reunite the Church, which resulted in the Formula of Concord. Concretely, the plan was to induce all Lutheran bodies of the Synodical Conference and in fellowship with the Synodical Conference to be represented in a Conclave Theologorum to meet in the United States for months in a stretch. Executive and publicity influence was to be eliminated entirely, the platform was to be that of concentrated theological work uninfluenced by outside factors. The aim was to get at the grass roots of the troubles of this whole transition period and also to arrive at results which could interpret Biblical and confessional Lutheranism properly to the outside world. It is impossible to evade the ecumenical issue. The true unity of the Church of Christ must be vindicated over against the tenor of Lutheran World Federation and the World Council of Churches. Mere Conservatism is too cheap an answer. Current movements must be examined. The various "confessions", "Einigungssätze" etc. in our own circles must be compared, reviews, and connected. A world document might have been produced, not a provincial effort. And real systematic thinking might have overcome by joint approach the troubles of the Synodical Conference. While America is weak in systematic theology at present, the contribution of our other continents may not be even equal to the American share, but our different experiences would elicit adequate and world-wide intercession.

To sum up, it is still our conviction: Conclave Theologorum esse convocahdum. Judgment Day is coming. To destroy the orthodox visible church of Christ, to abrogate true confessional continuity - is there a greater crime? With the historic precedent of the work up to 1577/80 can any Lutheran body have a good conscience in rejecting this procedure now?

May God bestow not only courage and honesty, but in addition consecrated vision.

W. M. Oesch, D.D.

* BOOK REVIEWS *

The Thirty Years War, by C. V. Wedgwood, Vol. 10 in Bedford Historical Series, London, 1938.

Over 500 pages of fascinating reading on a phase of history which is little known among us, yet of tremendous importance to us. Miss Wedgwood has given a clear & complete picture of the Thirty Years War, its causes, and results, the personalities, the battles, the suffering, the destruction, the cross currents and under currents. Any student of Lutheran Church history will be immensely profited & intrigued by this scholarly, objective book. Many of the notions we pastors generally hold about this war are upset, & perhaps the weakest phase of the book is the religious; nevertheless here is a book we should all read. The author shows how the war was never on anyone's part a religious war, yet religion played a tremendous part in it. But never were the forces of religion aligned on the denominational basis. The Catholic French Cardinal Richelieu, receiving the moral support of the pope, Urban VIII, allied himself with the Lutheran Gustavus Adolphus & the Reformed Stadtholder of Holland in opposition to the Catholic Emperor Ferdinand, the Catholic Duke of Bavaria, the Lutheran Elector of Saxony, & the Reformed Elector of Brandenburg whose Lutheran subjects refused to fight for him for fear he would make Calvinists of them. Germany was the battleground, yet there was no major German force in the field. Gustavus was adding to the Swedish Empire, Richelieu was protecting France against Spain, the Holy Roman Emperor was trying to regain his German provinces for Catholicism & to protect Austria & Bohemia against the inroads of Calvinism. Maximilian of Bavaria was carving out an Electorate for himself, while the generals of mercenary armies, Wallenstein & nearly all the others, were building little empires for themselves. The accounts of the sack of Magdeburg, the starvation, the pillaging, the mutinies of troops are vividly portrayed. Catholic soldiers, captured in battle were fighting in Protestant ranks the next day, and vice versa, armies & generals were sold to the highest bidder. And in the end no one gained, the religious lines remained about as they had been; but much of the old spirituality & earnestness about religion had gone. And while this war was raging on the political front, the Lutherans of Saxony were engaged in the bitter & tragic Syncretistic Controversy, which added its wounds to the already exhausted body of German Lutheranism. This book will make you mad at your spiritual forebears, it may make you lose a lot of respect for some gilded lilies of church history, but you won't put it down till you have finished it.

J.A.O.P.

* * * *

Archeology and the Old Testament, by Merrill F. Unger. Zondervan Pub. House, Grand Rapids, Mich. $4.95.

Those interested in Biblical Archeology could do worse than procure Dr. Unger's new book. It is a survey of the whole field of Biblical Archeology from the story of Creation to Judah after the Exile and covers the most recent explorations and researches in that field, from a conservative Christian point of view. The book has many illustrations and charts and brings the essential facts out clearly. The book may be ordered from the Lutheran Synod Book Co.

G.O.L.

* * * *

Christian Giving, by M.S. Azariah.

"Christian Giving" is a small

(94 pages) book which was recently supplied free by the ELC to its pastors, and I thought it may therefore be worth the $1.25 asked for it by Augsburg. Its value I think lies in pointing to stewardship passages rather than in making a good exposition of these passages. In general, Julian Anderson's 1954 paper before our Synod, "God-given Talents at Work," is much more to the point. Written by the first native Anglican bishop in India, the book is interesting in showing the growth and growing-pains of stewardship in a native church which had been largely supported by foreigners' money. He concludes, as we do, that a congregation receiving mission aid should take as much of the responsibility as possible by teaching each convert how to be a good steward. His mention of the Harvest Festival during which farm produce is brought to the church as the offering reminds us of our food collections for Bethany and our OPH; perhaps we could organize a bit and have a Synod-wide Harvest Festival for these or other causes - especially in our rural congregations. A point of his is good: call these offerings, not collections.

Some of the main passages on giving Bishop Azariah gives are: Luke 12:16-21, Luke 16:1-13, Luke 16:19-31, Mark 10:17-22, Luke 12:32-34, Matt. 13:22, John 12:4-6, Gen. 4:2-4, 14:20, Hebrews 7:4, Gen. 28:22, Ex. 36:2-7, 1 Chron. 29:1-14, Luke 19:1-8, Mark 12:41-44, Acts 2:44-45, 11:27-30, and 2 Cor. 8 and 9. If you study these through you will not come to two of his conclusions, I hope: "To be faithful in handling money entitles a man to receive the reward of fellowship with God, and permanent enrichment of life in righteousness, holiness, peace, and joy" - or - (of the rich young ruler) "Giving all away would alone have delivered his soul from death."

N.B. Harstad

"TO SEE OURSELVES
AS OTHERS SEE US."

Gladys Taber writes in the October Ladies Home Journal - "On the way to church on a lovely Sunday, I often wish I could persuade somebody to put out a hymnal with a few hymns in a sort of average or middle range. The only hymn I can sing is Day is Dying in the West, and they never use that on Sunday mornings! That hymn keeps to the middle of the road. But most of them begin way down and then leap like gazelles to an upper E or F. It would be wonderful if just a few hymns were transposed into an ordinary easy key. I could really stay through the whole verse instead of having to jump in and out so frequently."

I say amen to the whole paragraph. I would also underline for a slightly different connotation the words, "put out a hymnal with a few hymns." Why do our hymnals have to have hundreds of hymns? The first Lutheran hymnbook contained eight hymns. The Erfurt Enchiridion contained 25 hymns. I don't mean that thereby we should be limited to the use of 8 hymns, but on the contrary that we should have the opportunity to have an additional set of hymnbooks.

For example, there are many hymns in the Hymnary that I would like to sing. But we have the Hymnal, and that has also its own treasure of hymns. I can't afford both varieties, because each one is too big. The Hymnal contains 22 hymns by Luther. Some of these are surely unknown to users of the Hymnary. And the Hymnary contains many treasures by Kingo, Ingemann, Brorson and Landstad unknown to the users of the Hymnal.

N. Oesleby

From the

ARMED SERVICES COMMISSION

"Will all of our pastors who have churches near army, navy, and air bases send to the undersigned the location of these churches and directions as to how they may be reached from the bases near them, also giving the telephone number of the pastors? The time of church services and of other meetings in which our people would be interested should also be given. This information will then be relayed to our people in the armed forces.

D.L. Pfeiffer
30 Richfield Road
Arlington 74, Mass.

EDITORIAL NOTES

The article, "WHY THE NORWEGIAN SYNOD?" by Christian Anderson, was originally prepared in Norwegian, delivered at the Circuit Meeting at Hartland, Minn., on Sept. 24, 1930, and printed in "LUTHERSK TIDENDE," Nov. 19, 1930. It has been re-done in English by Christian Anderson for the Clergy Bulletin. The reader will find it valuable both theologically and historically. He will probably also be moved to reflect that the issues of 1917 are by no means dead.

HENCEFORTH, we aim to have the Clergy Bulletin in the mails by the 15th of each month... Contributors aim, too, please. Official announcements intended for the issue must be in the hands of the Editor by the 1st of the month. . . We have a number of good articles "in the bin" now, with more promised, and more and more and more, we hope.

LITT AV HVERT

Eunice Elizabeth was born to Rev. & Mrs. Luther Vangen in Chicago on Sept. 28. Mother and daughter were reported just fine in the announcement received here. We have not heard that it is any different with the father.

Philip Ross also entered the home of Rev. & Mrs. Hugo Handberg of Mayville, N.D., on Oct. 18. The Handbergs now have 2 boys.

A circuit meeting of the Southwestern Minn. circuit was held at Bethany Church in Luverne on Sunday, Oct. 30. The program centered about the Reformation theme, & was held in 2 parts:

PART I

Opening devotion by J. Preus. Short talks on:

1) Events leading up to the Reformation; T. Teigen.
2) The 95 Theses; Schweikert.
3) The results of the Reformation; A. Schulz.

PART II.

Separate meetings for men, women and young people. The men discussed Synod finances; the women decided to work together in projects for Bethany etc.; the children and young people saw a film strip on Martin Luther.

A profitable afternoon was had by all. An offering was received for the $40,000 Bethany fund. The ladies of the congregation served a delicious supper, and the people returned to their various homes.

A young people's gathering of the S.W. Minn. circuit was held in Sioux Falls on Sunday, Nov. 6. Opening devotion was held by the pastor loci, T. Teigen, followed by Bible study, a talk on Evangelism in England, by J. Petersen, and a talk on choir work by G. Schweikert. The Sioux Falls young people served a lunch following the meeting.

A STUDY OF THE

(Note: The Passion Story, by Johannes Bugenhagen, is used as it is found in CPH tract No. 10-76 entitled, "The Passion and Death of Jesus Christ

Below the Passion Story in parallel columns are the narratives of the four Evangelists. The words of each Gospel account which are used in the Passion Story have been underlined, using a seperate color for each Evangelist. The corresponding words in the Passion Story have also been underlined. The words of Matthew are underlined with black, Mark with green, Luke with red, and John with blue.)

The work has been done by Bob Moldstad in connection with a study of the Gospels. There are 39 pages of copy, plus title page. A duplicated reproduction is planned, but because of the expense of duplicating in four colors, orders will be taken before publication. A limited number of copies will be available. First come, first served. If you would wish a copy of the work, use the form below for reserving copies at the pre-publication price. You will be informed if and when the work will be available.

If this offer meets with favorable reply, a similar duplication may be undertaken which will not have the underlined words. Such a publication would be less in cost, printed in purple spirit duplication, and would be suitable for use in Bible classes for studying and underlining.

--- ---

Please reserve for me _____ copy (copies) of the proposed duplication of the Passion Story.

I understand that I will be informed if and when the work is to be completed.

Check here if interested in a duplication without underlining: ____

Name: _____

Address: _____
street city zone state

Pre-publication price, to be paid upon announcement of availability, postage prepaid, $1.00.

--- ---

Order from: Bob Moldstad
Bethany Luth. Seminary
Mankato, Minnesota
October, 1955

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

a good and just man, (the same had not consented to the counsel and deed of them,) who also himself waited for the kingdom of God, and was a disciple of Jesus, but secretly, for fear of the Jews, [illegible] that he might [illegible] the body of Jesus.

[illegible]

MATTHEW 27	MARK 15	LUKE 23	JOHN 19
57. When the even was come, there came	42. And now when the even was come, because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath,		
a rich man of Arimathaea, named Joseph, who also himself was Jesus' disciple:	43. Joseph of Arimathaea, an honourable counsellor, which also waited for the kingdom of God,	50. And, behold, there was a man named Joseph, a counsellor; and he was a good man, and a just: 51. (The same had not consented to the counsel and deed of them;) he was of Arimathaea, a city of the Jews: who also himself waited for the kingdom of God.	38. And after this Joseph of Arimathaea, being a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews,
58. He went to Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus.	came, and went in boldly unto Pilate, and craved the body of Jesus. 44. And Pilate marvelled if he were already dead: and calling unto him the centurion, he asked him whether he had been any while dead. 45. And when he knew it of the centurion,	52. This man went unto Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus.	besought Pilate that he might take away the body of Jesus:

CLERGY BULLETIN

Published by Authority of the General Pastoral Conference of the Norwegian Synod of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church.

Vol. XV, No. 4. December, 1955

CONFIRMATION INSTRUCTION

(A Conference Essay)
By S. E. Lee

This is by no means intended to be an exhaustive treatise on the subject of Confirmation instruction. Our object is to present a few simple suggestions on the practical side with the hope that they will in turn provoke a wholesome discussion. It is our wish that through an exchange of suggestions and ideas of a practical nature someone may take home an idea which will be of help.

In his book on Pastoral Theology, Dr. John Fritz states that the characteristic feature of confirmtion is not the renewal of the Baptism covenant (this should be done daily), much less is it a necessary complement to Baptism, but the characteristic and essential feature of confirmation is that those to be confirmed are able to confess their knowledge of all the chief Christian doctrines and their Christian faith. The necessary prerequisite of confirmation therefore is thorough instruction in the chief doctrines of the Christian religion (Indoctrination). Indoctrination is not optional but commanded by God Himself. A certain amount of indoctrination is absolutely necessary if one would be a Christian. The minimum amount necessary for one who would partake of the Sacrament of the Altar is that he be able to examine himself. I Cor. 11,28.

St. Paul declares that the Holy Scriptures were written "for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." The natural man is filled with sin, & doomed to everlasting despair. The Bible offers hope in Jesus Christ. It testifies of Him, who He is, whence He came, & what He did for the redemption of the world. It sets Him forth as the Son of the Father, true God & true man. It affirms that He is "the Way, the Truth, and the Life." It teaches that apart from faith in Jesus there is no hope for the forgiveness of sins and the blessing of heaven. It offers full salvation to all who believe in Jesus Christ. It seeks to call all men into His discipleship, so that they may love and serve Him.

These are the simple truths that we are to impart t o the children. Today we see how great & influential agencies, such as the press, the motion picture, the radio and television, tend to build up universal thought patterns that are hopelessly out of harmony with the requirements of Christian doctrine & Christian life. On all sides we are surrounded by sects and by false teachers which tend to confuse the minds of the young & old alike. All of this means, if it means anything at all, that the person of today finds himself engaged

in a more difficult struggle for the preservation of his Christian faith and Christian morals than was true in a simpler form of life. It also means that should the Christian come through his earthly pilgrimage safely & finally reach the goal of life, it will be absolutely essential that he be so thoroughly indoctrinated & instructed & influenced as to make it possible for him with the aid of the Holy Spirit victoriously to resist the dangers & temptations which dog his every step. It means that a pastor should very carefully, very thoroughly, & very conscientiously instruct those who are to be confirmed.

Every pastor prays for well indoctrinated members. To prepare children (or adults for that matter) hurriedly & superficially for confirmation is not good for the individual nor for the church. The chief doctrines of the Bible should be well learned on the basis of clear Scripture texts in order that the Christian may have a sure foundation for his faith, be able to defend it against false teachers, & be able & encouraged to confess it before men.

Our Aim

The Rev. H.J. Boettcher in his instructor's manual for Luther's Small Catechism states: "The trend in education today is to re-emphasize the importance of aims, objectives, and outcomes. The aims of each unit have been stated in terms of the head, the heart, and the hand: knowledge, attitude, and habits."

It must be our aim to impart knowledge to the pupils in our class. In order to accomplish this there must be careful preparation on the part of the instructor. He must have it clear in his mind what specific knowledge he wishes to impart at each meeting. Lack of specific aim accounts for "bookish, stereotyped, mechanical, uninteresting, & relatively ineffectual attempts at religious training." If we do not set out to get somewhere in particular, we will probably get nowhere in particular. Our aim must be to impart knowledge in such a manner that the pupils are able without any trouble to impart to others the knowledge they have gained.

If we have pupils who do not seem to grasp much because of their limited ability to learn, we should not be discouraged. God's promise is still sure: "My Word shall not return void." The story is told of a pastor who became angry with a pupil who failed to answer some simple questions & ordered him out of the room. The boy in tears was about to leave. He made a statement to the effect that while he did not know very much up here (pointing to his head) he still had Jesus in his heart. The pastor, of course, invited him to return and apologized.

Religion has much to do with the heart. Those who are neither warm nor cold God threatens to spue out of His mouth. The Lord complained about church members who did not take seriously some things they knew. The pastor prays that his pupils will not only be knowers but also doers of the Word.

Facts of the Law and sin must be presented in such a way as to lead to shame, humility, & repentance. The Gospel needs to be applied so as to comfort, console, encourage, cheer, bring joy & new strength to the soul. "It should be the teacher's aim to proclaim the Gospel to his hearers till their hearts are melted, till they give up resistance and confess that the Lord has been too strong for them and henceforth they wish to abide with Jesus" (Walther). "The minister wants to rouse his people and warn them against self-deception. That, however, cannot be his ultimate aim. His ultimate aim must be to lead his hearers to the

assurance that they have the forgiveness of sins with God, the hope of the future blessed life, & confidence to meet death cheerfully. Anyone who does not make these things his ultimate aim is not an evangelical minister" (Walther, The Proper Distinction Between Law and Gospel). Law and Gospel must be rightly divided and rightly applied. It is one thing, for instance, to develop clearly the concept of stealing. It is another thing to stir the emotions so that the pupil will feel a deep shame for, a righteous indignation over against, every form of dishonesty, and a desire, out of gratitude to Jesus, to be scrupulously honest about everything. The discovery of facts must be followed by strong emotional appeals, particularly by an appeal to the pupil's gratitude to his Savior.

Our religion is not based upon emotion, but upon indoctrination. However, we must all agree that there are many who have knowledge in their heads which has not reached the heart. In the 2nd Commandment the warning is sounded against wrong use of God's name, a cloak for hypocrisy. "This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth and honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me," Matt. 15,8.

The central doctrine of the Bible is Justification by grace thru faith. This doctrine that we are saved by grace through faith without the deeds of the Law gives all glory to God & enduring comfort for all penitent sinners. In the light of this doctrine none dare boast & none need despair. The doctrine must always be kept in mind. But we observe that while Justification and Sanctification are clearly distinguished at all times in the Scriptures, they are also closely associated. The very purpose of Christ's redemptive work is stated in terms of a sanctified life, for example, "He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him who died for them and rose again," 2 Cor. 5,15. "That we being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life," Luke 1,74-75. Question 157: "What is the purpose of Christ's entire work of redemption? Answer: "A. That I may be His own, that is, I am now righteous and blameless in the sight of God. B. That I may live under Him in His kingdom, and serve Him in everlasting rightcousness, innocence, and blessedness; that is, that I willingly serve Him by an active Christian life and enjoy His blessings, now on earth and hereafter in heaven."

No divorce is more fatal than that which we too often find between the knowledge & the practice of professing Christians. In life it is not possible to separate one from the other. They belong together like roots and fruit. While on guard against pietism, we should not be afraid to foster true piety. The members of our class are born again of the water and the Spirit. in holy Baptism as a rule; they are therefore new creatures in Christ, God's children, members of His family. The new man should therefore be gently encouraged, nurtured, and coached to seek and find expression. We are to guide and lead them to walk in the "newness of life."

S.E. Lee

(The above essay was delivered at the General Pastoral Conference of the Norwegian Synod on July 28, 1955.)

The Editorial Committee of the Clergy Bulletin is made up of the Pastors of the 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.

IS GRAPE JUICE PERMISSIBLE FOR SACRAMENTAL PURPOSES?

(A Conference Essay)
By A.M. Harstad

In answering this question we want to be guided by the Holy Scriptures alone. What the Scriptures teach us to use in the Lord's Supper, that we want to use & nothing else. We will not permit human reason to dictate in this matter; neither will we blindly follow the example of what certain others may use, for the practice of others in this matter must not decide the case for us.

The question must be: What did Christ use when He instituted the Lord's Supper? What is the Apostolic doctrine in this matter? We will abide by that, and know assuredly that then we are on safe ground. The command of Christ concerning the Sacrament: "This do in remembrance of Me," and "This do as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me," includes that we use that which He used when instituting it.

There is a historical note in connection with the institution of the Lord's Supper that indicates what was in that cup which Christ used when He instituted the Sacrament. It is recorded in Matt. 26, 17-19: "Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto Him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover? And he said, Go into the city to such a man and say unto him, The Master saith, My time is at hand; I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples. And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them; and they made ready the passover."

It was the Passover which Jesus was celebrating with His disciples when He instituted the Sacrament. The Passover was celebrated in Jesus' day in a somewhat different manner from that in which it was originally celebrated. Exodus 12. In Christ's day, wine was used at the Passover. And it was wine, not grape juice, which was in the cup used by Christ. This we learn from the Mishna. The Mishna contains the legal decisions of the ancient rabbis, their explanations and applications of the law (mostly the ceremonial and civil law) to special cases, and their regulations regarding the ceremonial observances. The contents of the Mishna are of an earlier date than the final reduction of these oral traditions to the permanency of writing, which took place toward the close of the second century of our era. What does the Mishna say with regard to this matter? Targum Pesachim, Chap. 10, we read: "Also a poor man ate not save in a recumbent position. - And they do not open for him less than four cups of wine, even though he live on alms. At the first cup he gives thanks to God for the day and for the wine.- If any one wishes to drink between the first two cups, he may do so (according to Maimonidis, because the wine does not readily inebriate when drunk while a person is eating); but between the third and the fourth cup (nothing being eaten between them) he may not drink."

Another quotation from the same source reads: "The third cup is the cup of blessing after food. Pure wine is poured in, and a mixture with water is made in the cup. The fourth is that over which they sing the Hallel, and he adds the benediction of the song: 'Let all Thy works praise Thee, O Lord,' and, 'Blessed be He who has created the fruit of the vine.' (Pesach. 117.) Again: "In every one of those cups must be a quarter measure of wine, be it pure or diluted, be it old or new." (Quoted from Theol. Quarterly, Vol. 17, p.166, Article by A.Wismer

on "What Is To Be Used in the Celebration of the Lord's Supper, Grape Juice or Wine?")

These quotations show us that wine was used at the celebration of the Passover. Therefore, the cup which Christ used contained wine.

The Jewish Cyclopedia, under the article on the "Passover," says that in the observance of this rite wine was used. (Theol. Quart., Vol. 17, p.167.)

Schaff-Herzog, in the article "Lord's Supper," says: "At the end of the Supper, before the singing of the Hallel, He takes in like manner the cup of wine, which was passed from hand to hand four times during the paschal meal, and gives it to them." (Op. Cit., p.167)

Let it be understood that at the time of the Passover, which was celebrated in April, such a thing as grape-juice was an impossibility in Palestine in Christ's day. The grapes were harvested in the summer. September marked the end of the grape harvest. The Jews had no method of keeping fermentation from taking place in the grape juice. They had no chemicals to keep grape juice unfermented, nor did they have methods of keeping grape juice frozen, as in modern times. They made wine of the grape juice. The process of fermentation began from six to twelve hours after the juice was extracted from the grapes. It is impossible that there would be grape juice in Palestine in Christ's day in the month of April. Neither are we told that Christ half-way performed the miracle of Cana in reverse by changing wine into grape juice.

But some would argue from the fact that the Scriptures use the term "fruit of the vine" in designating the contents of the cup, that therefore, grape-juice may be used, for that comes under the term "fruit of the vine." But how about this? What is it that Christ calls "fruit of the vine?" It is wine. And let it be noted that the expression "fruit of the vine" was used in the ritual for the Passover to denote "wine." The benediction over the wine was this: "Blessed art Thou, Jehovah our God, who has created the fruit of the vine." (Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, Vol.II,1904, p.496.) And note that Matthew writes not merely "fruit of the vine," the liturgical term for wine used in the Passover ritual, but most definitely "this fruit of the vine," the one regularly used in the Passover.

The Pulpit Commentary, commenting on Matt. 26,29, says: "The offspring of the vine is a poetical way of describing wine (cf. Deut. 22,9; Isa. 32,12, etc.) It is absurd to find in this term an argument for unalcoholic grape-juice."

In every case where the expression "fruit of the vine" is used in the New Testament, it always designates wine. Matt. 26,29; Mark 14, 25; Luke 22,18. This was not a term used by Christ to permit the greatest latitude, but it is the terminus of the Jews for the Passover wine.

In the Apostolic Church wine was used in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. This is evident from I Cor. 11,20-21: "When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper. For in eating every one taketh before other his own supper: and one is hungry, and another is drunken." The Christians at Corinth brought along to the services the earthly elements with which the Lord's Supper was celebrated. That they brought wine and not grape-juice is evident from the fact that some became drunken, having over-indulged. While the apostle takes them severely to task for their drunkenness, he does not at all tell them they must not bring wine. On the contrary, he points out to them

the manner in which Christ had instituted the Sacrament, and this includes the use of wine.

Thus the Scriptures plainly teach us what we are to use in celebrating the Sacrament. And if we look into the writings of the early Christian fathers immediately after the time of the Apostles we have abundant testimony as to the material used in the celebration of the Sacrament at that time. Justin Martyr (Apol. I,65) gives a description of the manner in which the Eucharist was celebrated in his time. There he says in part:"Then bread and a cup of water and wine are brought to him who presides over the brethren. . . . Those among us who are called deacons give to each of those present to partake of the consecrated bread and wine and water." Tertullian says (De Oratione IV, Adv. Marcion IV, 40): "In the bread is accounted the body of Christ. His blood He hath consecrated in wine." Cyprian and Cyril of Jerusalem likewise speak of wine in the Lord's Supper. (Theol. Quarterly, Vol. 17, pp. 171 & 172.)

In the early church, failure to use wine was accounted a mark of heresy. The Ebionites and Encratites used water instead of wine. But these bodies were catalogued as heretics, and one of their heterodox opinions that caused them to be relegated to the company of false believers was their peculiar view as to what was to be used in the celebration of Holy Communion.

The word "bread" does not designate whether leavened or unleavened bread shall be used, nor whether it shall be made of wheat, rye, corn, oats, or barley flour. But with regard to the cup it is different. We are to use only the "fruit of the vine," that is, wine made from grapes. Whether the wine is red or white, and whether it is mixed with water or not, is an adiaphoron. But it is not an adiaphoron whether we use grape-juice or wine. When we use wine we are certain we are using the right thing. If we should use grape-juice we would bring uncertainty into the matter. We quote from the Report of "Mittleren Dist." of Mo. Synod, 1889, pa. 44: "If any among us should copy them (namely, those who use unfermented grape juice) with the understanding that nothing more than that which comes from the vine is necessary, then he could come into severe qualms of conscience, since he, at best (wenn's hoch käme), would have to be acting in doubt."

Pieper, Christian Dogmatics, Vol. III, p.354, says: "In order not to introduce an element of uncertainty into the Sacrament, one should refrain from using grape juice, since it is doubtful whether it is still 'the fruit of the vine' after having undergone the pasteurizing process --- Since no doubt can arise if we use genuine wine, the dignity of the Sacrament demands that we refrain from experimenting with all fluids of which it is not certain whether they are, or still are, 'fruit of the vine.'"

The question might be asked: Why do some advocate the use of grape juice in the Sacrament instead of wine and actually proceed to use it? The answer is that some do it because of a wrong notion concerning the use of alcoholic beverages in general, holding that even the moderate use of such is sinful. But this is not the teaching of Scripture as is seen from such passages as Ps. 104,15; John 2,3-11; 1 Tim. 4,4; 5,23. Another reason why some advocate the use of grape juice instead of wine is the following: They do not believe in the "real presence" in the Sacrament; the bread and wine in the Sacrament are not to them the elements through which Christ imparts to us His true body and blood. Calvin and Beza held that bread and wine were only symbols and signs imparting nothing. They

rejected the true Lord's Supper. It is not surprising then that they both were of the opinion that if bread and wine could not be obtained something else might lawfully be substituted in the Sacrament. Neither is it to be wondered at that their spiritual children now make a rule out of what they considered only a possibility. Where the true doctrine of the "real presence" is rejected, there it easily becomes an indifferent matter what elements are used in the Sacrament.

Neither time, nor place, nor circumstances can be allowed to dictate a change in that which the Son of God Himself has established and which He has commanded to be observed in the church "till He come." 1 Cor. 11,26.

A,M,. Harstad

* * * * * * * * *

MY BEST BOOK

by

Stuart A. Dorr

When it comes to naming one's favorite book on theological subjects, one is faced with a hard choice; by naming one book he may appear to slight others. But a book which has certainly served this writer well is Dau's translation of Walther's Law and Gospel.

Now this is regarded as a standard work among us, as a kind of classic or definitive work. And so it may seem as though a person is simply riding on a great book's glory when one names it as a favorite. But to this writer the book came in a special way. - While the writer was in his vicarage year, teaching the Somber Chr. Day School, near Lake Mills, Iowa, he did a considerable amount of preaching in the neighborhood. One pastor, now deceased, when it came to giving the writer a little something for gas and oil, first asked: "Do you own a copy of Walther's 'Law and Gospel?'" The writer had to answer that, while he had used library copies of it at the seminary, he possessed no personal copy. Somewhat later came the "payoff"; the pastor gave the writer some cash - and a copy of "Law and Gospel," with an appropriate inscription on the fly leaf. Soon after this came the summer vacation; and during that time the writer for the first time read the book from cover to cover. He remembers in particular one afternoon on the farm, when field work was halted because of a rainfall, that he spent reading the book. He remembers too how, as the book opened up before him, he recalled that a certain theologian had advised his class to read the book; "It's dry," he said, "but it's good." Now the question was: How could you call t h a t book dry?

But a book has to do more than call up pleasant memories in order to be "my best book." The reason the writer chose this book is this: It does what the title promises; it shows "the proper distinction between Law and Gospel." This does not mean, of course, that you have to like every word and every illustration which Walther used; you can hardly ever say that about any human author. But this much can surely be said about Walther's great book: It shows clearly how Law can be (and often is) preached as though it were Gospel, i.e., a way to salvation that can serve fallen man; and how the Gospel can be (and often is) preached as tho it were Law, that is, a series of new demands laid upon the Christ-

ian man.

Every single one of Walther's twenty-five theses adds something to the total picture. But one thesis which might be of special service to us in our Synod at this time is the Twentieth, which reads this way:

"In the sixteenth place, the Word of God is not rightly divided when a person's salvation is made to depend on his association with the visible orthodox church and when salvation is denied to every person who errs in any article of faith."

In order that we may rightly defend the truth, we would do well now to avoid the use of any language which would make it appear that we "deny salvation to every person who errs in any article of faith." No doubt such charges will be leveled against us, whether we deserve them or not; let us just make sure that we do n o t deserve them. For if we do deserve them, then we are not rightly distinguishing between Law and Gospel; and rightly to distinguish between Law and Gospel, this is our whole mission as servants of the Word.

Stuart A. Dorr

* * * * * * * *

Servants of Apostasy. By Carl McIntire. Christian Beacon Press, Collingswood, N.J. 415 pages. Price: Clothbound, 4.00; Paperbound, 3.00.

A book very muc h worth reading. The major part of the book is a devastating, well-documented expose of the double talk - theological & otherwise - of the World Council of Churches, particularly as it operated at Evanston in 1954, demonstrating that the World Council, to use a nice reserved English superlative, is more than a little pink, and that it is what it is as a result of theological modernism in the churches. The latter chapters of the book set forth the excellencies of the International Council of Christian Churches, a minority of courageous "fundamentalist" churches, whose testimony has a heart-warming Scriptural ring conspicuously absent in the World Council. The appendices, among other things, include the constitution of the ICCC and a list of the churches belonging to it, as well as a list of the churches lined up with the World Council. In the latter list one notes the great number of Lutheran Churches, a circumstance which makes the hope of "Lutheran Unity" almost hopelessly dim. That hope might have been brighter had those Lutheran Churches lined up with the ICCC, had it been a matter of either/or.

The readers in our circles will probably reflect that the position of the "fundamentalists" does not include everything that is "fundamental", that it, therefore, also is a position of compr omise, which given time would ultimately lead to the theological mess of the World Council, that Lutherans becoming members of the ICCC would be feeding the unionistic spirit, and that our objections to the ICCC are on similar grounds as the objections of the ICCC to the WCC. That viewpoint is not likely to make us any more popular with the ICCC than the ICCC is with the WCC, though the people of the ICCC would be in a position to understand and appreciate our position better than anyone else.

The reader will appreciate the vast amount of information in the book laying bare the "angelic" iniquity of the Ecumenical Movement and will be impressed with the courage and the Christian forthrightness of the writer and of all

those who together with him are carrying on the fight in the larger public circle.

T.N.T.

* * * * * * *

FROM THE MISSION BOARD -

Field Secretary H.A.Theiste writes: "Work is progressing in California to the extent that Dan Johnson is about to begin holding services in temporary quarters in the area of Northridge, about 3½ miles from our Granada Hills Mission. It is an area that evidently is rapidly expanding in population, 3 new school having been erected in this immediate area only within recent months. There are no Lutheran churches within a mile in any direction."

* * *

May the blessings of the Christ Child abide with you and yours in this Christmas season and throughout the new year!

NORTHWEST
PASTORAL CONFERENCE

Date: Wed. & Thurs., Jan. 25 & 26, 1956.
Place: Bethany College.
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Program:

1) The Clarity of Scripture (cont.) - H. Handberg.
2) Exegetical Study of Heb. 12:1-11 - A. Schulz.
3) Review of Vol. I (Eng.) of Pieper's Dogmatics, & a detailed review of the section on Inspiration - C.U. Faye.
4) Communion Announcements - M.E. Tweit.
5) Background of Pietism - J.A.O. Preus.

A. Schulz, Secr.

CLERGY BULLETIN

Published monthly by authority of the General Pastoral Conference of the Norwegian Synod of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church.

Vol. XV, No. 5. January, 1956

THE FUTURE ACCORDING TO TOYNBEE

by

C. U. Faye

Arnold Joseph Toynbee, born in 1889, was educated at the "public school" (corresponding somewhat to a junior college in this country) Winchester College and at Balliol College, Oxford University. After a distinguished career, he became Research Professor of International History at the University of London. In 1925 he was appointed Director of Studies in the Royal Institute of International Affairs. Among his many publications, the one that is best known is his many volumed A Study of History, wherein he traces the history of 29 civilizations, enquiring particularly into the causes of their downfall. This work ranks with Spengler's once well known, but now all but forgotten The Downfall of the West. Toynbee is, at present, a member of the Institute for Advanced Study at the University of Princeton. He exemplifies the principle that a man's reliability as a guide does not always correspond to his reputation and eminence in the learned circles of this world.

The following remarks are occasioned by his address, the second of the Seymour Memorial Lectures, sponsored by the University of Minnesota and financed by the Minneapolis Star And Tribune as a memorial to the late Gideon D. Seymour, executive editor of these newspapers. The address, delivered to an overflow audience at the Northrup Auditorium, University of Minnesota, on Sunday, Nov. 6th, was entitled "The New Opportunity for Historians" and was published in full in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune on Monday, Nov. 7th.

The following is confined chiefly to 2 of the points made in his wide-ranging discourse.

On death. "If nature had not invented death in the act of creating the higher forms of life, these forms would immediately become rigid, and nature would have found herself committed, for all eternity, to her earliest experiments. She would never have been able, afterwards, to discard her unsuccessful productions and to improve upon the rest ... Today, for the first time, the whole world is having, within a single lifetime, to go through a greater revolution than it is perhaps possible, within just one single lifetime, for human nature to digest." His discourse presents no proof that nature "invented" death, nor any proof that, without death, nature would have become static.

On the Future. The "current revolution...is... worldwide... and...is penetrating to the cultural and religious depths. Moreover, it is a revolution which may have two...outcomes which are at opposite extremes.... It may end abruptly in the self-destruction

of the human race. Since 1945, for the first time in history, mankind has the power to destroy itself; and we have had to invent a new word - genocide (killing the race)- to describe this new appalling possibility. But, if this world revolution is not to end in worldwide "genocide" (and I, for one, do not expect that it will end in that way), the only alternative possibility is that it will end in a worldwide social fusion of all the tribes, nations, civilizations and religions of man.... The unification of the whole of mankind is, undoubtedly, a revolutionary prospect; yet it is not something ... quite without precedent.... At different times in different regions, people that had formerly been divided and estranged from one another by differences of language, religion and political allegiance have been united in the so-called world-empires: the Roman empire, the Arab caliphate, the Maurya empire in India, the Chinese empire and the like."

Toynbee's theory that man will be saved from self-destruction by worldwide fusion of all nations, civilizations and religions is just an application of evolution. Evolution implies that we are ever progressing, that we are better today than we were in earlier times. Therefore, according to Toynbee, mankind must ever adapt itself to ever changing conditions and thus ever keep coming to closer and closer agreement on social, political, and religious issues, ever becoming better and, eventually, attaining complete fusion. Is fusion necessary or desirable? In this country the adherents of various religions live together in amicable co-existence. The three languages, French, German and Italian coexist amicably in Switzerland. It is odd that so learned a man as Toynbee should be infatuated by totalitarianism. Totalitarian empires have died one after the other. Recently Hitler's and Mussolini's empires have gone to pieces. Today we have two outstanding examples of totalitarianism: the Soviet and the Roman Catholic. Both aspire to the domination of mankind, both physically and spiritually (or, to use a currently fashionable word, "ideologically"). It is possible, in God's providence, that these totalitarian powers will contribute mutually toward preventing each other from attaining domination of the world. Totalitarian rulers are so drunk with power that they imagine that, because they so decree, they can dethrone God. The leaders of the Soviet state have, more than once, by decree, "abolished" God. The Pope has repeatedly issued official statements contradicting the Word of God, especially by putting himself and the saints in the place of our sole Mediator, Jesus Christ whose Vicegerent he claims to be.

We return to Toynbee's theory that mankind will, as time goes on, progressively become more sensible, eventually becoming fused in one worldwide state. The error in such thinking is the assumption that the newer a thing is, the better it will be. It is true that a 1956 automobile, or refrigerator, or TV set are likely to be better than earlier models. The essential point is not: What progress have we made in producing more efficient machines? The point is: Have the users of these more efficient machines become correspondingly more fitted to use them? Advances in machines may be used by bad men; guns and automobiles by gangsters, atom bombs by wicked rulers, etc. A change in the hearts of men is needed more than technological progress. We have indeed progressed in material things, but that is not true of immaterial, spiritual values. Nothing can improve upon Christian matrimony and family life, nor upon the Christian rule for human relationships: "As ye would that men should do unto you, do ye also to them likewise" (Luke 6:31). As far as religion is concerned, nothing can

improve upon Christianity with its unconditioned Gospel, proclaiming the reconciliation of God with man through the merits of Christ, accepted in God-given faith. This message puts the one accepting it in tune with God and His universe and enables him to strive for the glory of God and the welfare of his fellow men.

There are some who imagine that something better might be found by merging Christianity with other religions. Such attempts are miserable compromises that do away with the essence of Christianity. Such a compromise, possibly indicating the trend toward attempting to establish a universal religion, was in evidence on June 19th, at the San Francisco Cow Palace, in the "Festival of Faith" designated "A Service and Prayer for Peace and Divine Guidance to the United Nations." At this service active part was taken by representatives of the following religions: Bahai, Buddhist, Christian, Hindu, Jewish and Moslem. Our Secretary of State, the Hon. John Foster Dulles, spoke on "The Moral Foundations of the United Nations." The meeting was presided over by the Rev. O. Frederick Nolde, D.D., from the World Council of Churches, and International Missionary Council. Each one taking part in this service acted inconsistently, for he denied his own particular faith by so doing. Such denial may or may not be condoned by non-Christians. Christians, however, can not deny Christ (taking part with non-Christians in their prayers) without denying their Savior. The behavior of the partaking Christians must be stigmatized as evidence either of extraordinary ignorance or of apostasy. In building a new world-religion the first requisite should be honesty. The builders should be ethical in their principles and moral in their behavior, they should be examples of truth & honesty. How can one honestly recite the Apostles' Creed and then partake in worship with non-Christians? Such ignorant or dishonest ambiguities as were in evidence at the so-called "Festival of Faith" in San Francisco contribute less than nothing to true religion.

Besides suggesting the need for fusion in religion, Toynbee looks to recent advances in psychology for help toward the unification of mankind. "The human psyche (soul or mind) is like an iceberg; only a fraction of it emerges above the level of consciousness. Psychology is now beginning to reveal to us the subconscious nine-tenths of the psyche's spiritual depth." Psychological "enquiry might help us to discover how much genuine freedom of initiative and action man has, and what are the spheres and the levels of human activity where this freedom can be exercised." Toynbee has overlooked the deep corruption of the human race. He has been quoted above as stating that nature "invented" death. The Bible, on the other hand, teaches: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." (Rom. 5:12). Death is the judgment of God upon all mankind owing to original sin. History bears out the fact that mankind has always been sinful, and continues to be sinful. Mankind without Christianity becomes worse rather than better. We need but look at the world today. Are Hitler, Stalin, and the leaders of Communist China any better than the monsters of antiquity? If advances in psychology enable us to look deeper into the human mind, they will enable unscrupulous men to exploit those into whose minds they look. Soviet psychologists, using modern techniques to ameliorate psychic disorders, used the same techniques in reverse for brain washing and for driving their victims toward insanity, and their disciples in the satellite countries and in China followed, and perhaps even improved upon, their example. All of modern progress in machines and in knowledge of the human body and

mind can, by wicked and unscrupulous men, be used for evil purposes. No, we do not need more knowledge, but rather some way of turning men, wicked by original sin, into good men. Christianity is that way. St. Paul assures us of salvation from sin and death through our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, through whose vicarious atonement we are justified: "Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life" (Rom. 12:18).

It is wrong to think that we should give up Christian ethics and the Christian religion in order to adapt ourselves to new and man-made developments in society, religion, ethics, etc. Such developments all too often originate in the soil of original sin. Are the disintegration of matrimony and family life to be considered as desirable developments of advancing civilization? Such corruption speeded the downfall of past empires, for instance, the Roman Empire. When the number of the God fearing inhabitants of Sodom was less than ten, the city was destroyed (Gen. 18 and 19). It is the godly remnant (acting as a salt) in any civilization that saves it from being dominated by corruption and so destroyed. If totalitarianism means that men can get together and, just by unanimity, or by majority, or even by force, impose upon people an ideology making them into a unified mass rebellious against God, then God will, in His due time, pay proper attention to the blasphemy, as He did at the Tower of Babel (Gen. 11:6-8). Any civilization rebellious against God destroys itself.

Christians gladly obey the government in all that is not forbidden by the Word of God: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God" (Rom. 13:1). "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29). When our rulers try plans and experiments, for the purpose of bringing about more peace and concord among the nations of the world, we, as Christians, can go along and cooperate in such endeavors, provided they do not demand a denial of our faith. Any government that persecutes its Christian citizens is persecuting the salt that saves it from destruction (Matt. 5:13). May we do what we can to serve and save our country by being a genuine salt, humbly and faithfully performing our duties as true Christians and loyal citizens. May God be with us, for Jesus' sake. Amen.

C. U. Faye

* * * * *

NORTHWEST PASTORAL CONFERENCE

Date: Jan. 25 and 26, 1956.
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Place: Bethany College.

* * * * *

The "Clergy Bulletin" is published by the Southwestern Minn. pastoral conference of the Norwegian Synod.
Editor: Rev. T.N. Teigen
917 So. Grange Ave.
Sioux Falls, S.D.

Subscription price is $1.50 per year, payable to:
Rev. Arthur Schulz
675 Second St.
Tracy, Minn.

Please renew subscriptions promptly.

DR. ROBERT BARNES AND ANGLO-LUTHERAN RELATIONS, 1521 - 1540.

An Abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of History in the Graduate College of the State University of Iowa, August, 1955. (Professor Herbert H. Rowen, Chairman)

by

Neelak Serawlook Tjernagel

During the reign of Henry VIII English foreign policy was characterized by frequent changes in direction and aim. Cardinal Wolsey, whose purpose had been the creation of an Anglo-French alliance, was succeeded in the king's favor by Thomas Cromwell, who saw in the protestant princes of Germany the best hope for achieving the king's purposes in England. The problem inherent in the Anglo-Lutheran relations during Cromwell's tenure of office was the fact that Henry VIII was primarily interested in a political alliance, while the Lutheran princes had organized the Schmalkaldic League for the sole purpose of preserving the theology of the Lutheran Reformation.

The English king's reluctance to accept Lutheran theology even after his repudiation of the Pope, was due in large part to the vigorous and highly-publicized attack he had made in 1521 against the religious tracts of Martin Luther. A number of factors, however, conspired to weaken the king's orthodoxy and t o mitigate his hostility toward Lutheranism. The Cambridge humanists were an additional factor in directing England toward Protestantism. Their first interest in the theology of the Reformation had coincided with the appearance of a new edition of the New Testament prepared by Erasmus and published in 1516. Secret meetings of these Cambridge men included mearly all of those who were to be significant in the early history of the Anglican Church.

The primary interest in this study lies in the career of Robert Barnes, the leader of this Cambridge group, who was tried for heresy by cardinal Wolsey for alleged contentious, seditious, and heretical statements made in a Christmas Eve sermon in 1525, in which he made the first public declaration of the faith of these first English Protestants. The penalty for his offense was a rather loose confinement in prison during which time he engaged himself in the sale of Tyndale's Bible. That activity endangered him further and he fled to Germany. Three years under the tutelage and influence of the Wittenberg reformers made him a thorough-going Lutheran, a fact amply attested by the theological essays he wrote in those years.

It was on the basis of those writings and on a profession of loyalty to the king that Henry VIII brought Dr. Barnes back to England to represent the cause of the crown at the forthcoming conferences with the Schmalkaldic princes. The result of Barnes' activities in that role was that the English doctrinal formulas of the 1530's as well as the Anglo-Lutheran theological agreements of 1536 and 1538 became more and more Lutheran in tone as well as in content.

In 1540 Henry VIII abandoned the efforts to establish an alliance with the subjects of Charles V. The doctrinal formulas of the

previous were disavowed by the Act of Six Articles and the execution of both Cromwell and Barnes.

The efforts of Barnes, and the doctrinal agreements that had been made were not without effect, the king's repudiation of them notwithstanding. They remained to form the basis of the later and the lasting Thirty-nine Articles of the Elizabethan Settlement. Just as Thomas Cranmer was the connecting link between Lutheran and Anglican liturgical practice; so Robert Barnes was the link between the theology of the Wittenberg Lutherans and that of the Church of England. His part in founding the faith of the Anglican Church is far greater than appears in the apparent failure of his personal career. A re-evaluation of his life and work in the reign of Henry VIII is the objective of this study.

IDEA FOR LENTEN PREACHING

For such as might find the idea worth pursuing, we suggest the following for an exposition of the Passion History:

Royalty In Degradation

I. THE KING ON HIS KNEES
Gethsemane

II. THE KING DESERTED BY HIS COURTIERS
The flight of the disciples.

III. THE KING CONDEMNED BY HIS AMBASSADORS
The Council. "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat."

IV. THE KING IN THE MIDST OF PUPPETS
Herod and Pilate.

V. THE KING ON THE THRONE OF THE CROSS

VI. THE KING FORSAKEN BY GOD

EASTER: THE KING IN GLORY
"Wherefore God hath highly exalted Him."

* 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 bite 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 bare spør jeg."

Stuart A. Dorr

CLERGY BULLETIN

Published monthly by Authority of the General Pastoral Conference of the Norwegian Synod of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church.

Vol. XV, No. 6. February, 1956

SOME THOUGHTS ON MARRIAGE COUNSELING

By Ahlert H. Strand

(A Conference Essay)

It is unavoidable for the pastor, regardless of his denomination, to escape marriage counseling. As sure as he performs marriages, he becomes involved in counseling. If he does nothing more than read the marriage ceremony of his church, he has thereby done some counseling. The less effort he expends in dealing with marriage, the less important he shows his people is his regard for the many elements which constitute a Christian marriage.

To give a few thoughts on marriage counseling within a few minutes time, one may present a brief outline on the matter under five headings:

I. Purpose. II. Time. III. Technique. IV. Problems. V. Results.

I. The purpose the Christian pastor has in mind with his marriage counseling is to emphasize God's design for marriage and the home in the thinking of the couple about to be married, or the couple already married.

a) The stress, it seems t o me, from the Biblical point of view should be upon the companionship which God establishes in the marriage relationship. "An help meet for him," is God's classification of woman when placed into the marriage relationship with man.

It became obvious in the creation that man's true companionship could not be established with any creature of God on a satisfactory basis until God made a special companion for man from a curved bone taken from man's side.

In order to counsel a couple on companionship, the pastor must put his thinking to work on the subject in harmony with the Bible. Here he has to get away from the idea that woman is some kind of an inferior creature who is the slave of man. He must think of a wife in terms of a redeemed creature of God who shall share with the man the joys of serving God here upon earth and praising God in heaven.

b) The purpose of marriage is God's design for the procreation of the world may well occupy the second place in the pastor's concept of marriage. Here the ideas and ideals of the Bible must be well presented. While there are hundreds of books written to explain the physical side of marriage, few of them present the idea of procreation in its Biblical form. Of those which I have read, which are not of Roman Catholic origin, the emphasis lies on spacing children. With the curtailing of children seeming to be a major objective of many marriage books, it seems that the pastor should stress the Biblical idea of families.

c) Child care is so closely related to marriage that it seems the pastor ought to at least be sure that he has outlined some of the main Biblical concepts of child care. The atmosphere of the Gospel, nurture and admonition of the Lord, love for one's own flesh and blood, patience, forbearance and similar matters should be emphasized. The home should be a foretaste of heaven, not of the other place. Love as God has loved us should be the home environment.

II. Time for counseling:

a) Premarriage counseling seems to be advantageous in preventing problems after marriage. Premarriage counseling enters into confirmation instruction, young people's gatherings, and, especially, when a young couple comes to arrange for a marriage. It seems that the pastor is failing to utilize one of his most opportune times for counseling if he does not arrange to discuss marriage with the couple about to be married by him. There are many things more important than the rehearsal. The least the pastor should do, it seems to me, is to spend an hour or more discussing those factors of marriage which are outlined in the marriage ritual. In fact, the ritual may serve as a quite satisfactory outline for the discussion.

True, after a couple has decided to get married, it is not likely that the pastor can talk them out of it, even if the match has elements like unscriptural divorce, or mixed religions to the point that the pastor cannot officiate. However, the pastor has an opportunity, even in such cases, to have said a few words in testimony to the teachings of Scripture on marriage.

b) Post-marriage counseling is usually brought into play when complications have arisen in a marriage. The pastor often has to step into the fracas before his counsel is sought because the warfare between the spouses becomes public. Where couples have developed such a high regard for their pastor's counseling tactics that they consult him before they suspend fraternal relations, the pastor has a simpler task than when divorce procedings have already been inaugurated with ultimatums for peace already drawn up and egos insulted beyond the stage where a little patch will do the job and where vulcanizing is nêcessary.

III. Techniques: Here two things seem important:

a) The pastor needs to refrain from preaching at the couple. It is simple to say bluntly: "Thus saith the Lord," and then condemn the couple for their failure to achieve harmony. However, that does not seem to be the most helpful way to procede. Instead, the pastor who can listen intently and discriminatingly to the couple so as to gain some impression as to the source of the friction, may be able to bring his "thus saith the Lord" into a helpful focus upon the situation so the power of the Gospel of Christ may have its healing effect upon the wounds.

b) Instead of preaching at the couple, the pastor does well to so guide the discussion that the couple begins to think through the situation for themselves in the channels of God's Word and thus sees the solution to the problem through their own eyes.

It may seem flattering to the pastor who is asked for advice on a marriage problem. It seems though that the pastor would be wise to say: "If you want advice go to any member

of the Ladies' Aid. But if you want to sit down with me and work out the problem together with me, then my familiarity with God's Word may be of some value to you."

Likewise, if one spouse comes to the pastor with the request that he go to work on the other spouse to change that person over into the desired pattern, the pastor had better say: "It is not in my province to change personalities, but if you want to sit down with me and see if you can find a way of living together with your spouse in a godly way, we may be able, by the grace of God, to grind the valves and adjust the spark to make your marriage operate a bit more smoothly."

IV. Problems Involved:

a) The first problem with which the pastor must come to grips is the built-in self-system with which the human being defends his ego. In the book, The Psychiatric Interview, which is made up of notes from lectures by Harry Stack Sullivan, a great deal of pointed information is given on the self-system, or the security operations of humans in their defense of their ego. This system must be understood well enough by the pastor so that he realizes that even the most prolific confessor is apt to be coloring facts and concealing information. Actually, the self-system is opposed to achieving modification of thought and conduct. In a marriage battle each of the principals in the ring is working for a clean knock-out of the partner. The referee has the job NOT of seeing to it that there is a clean fight BUT of seeing to it that the principals lay aside their hostility and quit fighting.

Here a quote from Sullivan may be in place to keep us alert for flaws in the stories of the marriage partners who are having difficulties:

"When we start to report something that doesn't come up to our standard of behavior, we know that it doesn't come up to this standard. That goes on in covert processes very quickly. What we then produce, however, is no simple statement. It is a stream of words aimed at what we trust is the unskeptical ear that is listening." (page 97)

Hostility is so many sided that couples who speak well about their great love for one another are very likely to be operating their self-system at top speed when they are in the process of seeking ways and means for harmonious adjustment.

b) The pastor has another problem which is common to both himself and the partners in the marriage he is seeking, by the grace of God, to preserve. That is the desire to establish blame. By that I mean there is a strong tendency to operate on the basis of a law court. The idea being to establish which one is the "guilty" and which one the so-called "innocent" one. It is doubtful that a pastor will encounter even one actual case in his entire ministry in which one partner is totally innocent and the other totally guilty. The fact is that some people can put on such a pious front that it would seem that no one could possibly be able to find a genuine fault in them.

The pastor who concerns himself primarily with trying to establish who is the guilty and who the innocent in a marriage difficulty is not likely to be of much help in bringing about harmony in a marriage rift.

Although one or the other spouse may throw things around the house, walk out in a huff, or even become involved in adultery, there are almost always provocations which a

weak spouse is not mature enough to meet without stepping over that very harrow line which separates between socially acceptable and socially rejected forms of behavior.

The natural tendency of the pastor and the spouses he is trying to harmonize is to operate on a reward and punishment system. Find the technically guilty, mete out punishment, sympathize with the technically innocent and file the case away as solved.

God, however, operates on the grace system. That is the system which the ambassador for Christ must follow very diligently, if he is going to become instrumental in bringing feuding spouses into sweet harmony.

Take the case of Ned and Angella. Ned blackened Angella's eyes. He is a villain. Guilty, of course. The evidence is clear. There sits poor, little Angella, weeping. A wounded little lamb.

What's more, Ned confesses that he hit her. But if the pastor does not jump into the fracas at this point, but tries to realize that there's more to this than meets the eye, he may hear that Ned lost his temper because Angella was forever regaling him with stories of how successful other men were in accumulating this world's goods and how he could profit by imitating so-and-so.

The pastor who can learn the art of being a better listener than talker, more skilful at reading between the lines than in accepting the communication at face value, is on his way to becoming a discriminating listener ready to test out possible ideas on what is really the fundamental problem in the marriage he is seeking to bolster.

Here we may list such things as looking for in-law trouble, sexual maladjustment, financial stress, the degree in which the spouses are capable of developing loyalty to anyone, mother and father complexes, and other evidences of emotional immaturity. As he reaches some hypothesis, the pastor must be careful to realize that he may be more wrong than right. Facial expressions are as deceiving as words. In fact, it is highly improbable that the spouses have even a faint idea as to what the real problem between them is. Their communications are merely symptoms that all is not well. Each one trying to hold forth some redeeming features of character to give the pastor the best impression possible.

V. Results.

There will be many failures in the attempt to bring peace and harmony into troubled marriages. The successes are not too frequent. There is more than a slight possibility that some of the failures are due to lack of special training and skill on the part of the pastor in dealing with marriage problems. The training in marriage counseling which is given to pastors in our circles, as far as I have been able to determine, is rather limited. Limited knowledge and training are apt to produce opinionated counselors, which is perhaps the most unqualified type of counselor in existence. The more expert a pastor becomes in the art of counseling in marriage problems, the more he recognizes the limitations of his understanding. Solomon's wisdom, Job's patience, John's love, and Paul's discretion are seldom assembled in one model.

However, even in the vast array of failures which the bulk of pastors must confess are theirs, a sincere effort is required of

everyone who wishes to be faithful to his Lord.

Even if a pastor can only think of one case in his entire ministry in which he has been instrumental in bringing about harmony in a feuding marriage, he will find much to be thankful to the Lord for using him to bring happiness to some human beings.

It would seem logical to sup-suppose that the efforts of the pastors to instruct confirmands and young people in their teens on the complicated business of marriage should bring about some appreciable results over the years. At any rate, it seems wiser to make some attempts at marriage counseling than to simply let nature take its course.

THE CROSS

(Note: This article is a translation of the section "Kreuz" in Vol. IV, p. 851-856 of "Homiletisches Reallexikon," written by E. Eckhardt and published in 1910 by the Success Printing Co., St. Louis, Mo. Those who are familiar with this 8 volume set will know that the author also has cross-references to the various "Synodal Berichten," "Lehre und Wehre," writings of Luther, etc. We do not here include these cross-references. It is hoped that this outline will be of help to our pastors in their preaching and private study. - A. Schulz)

I. What is to be understood by the cross?

A. In its wider sense, it includes all sufferings of Christians, which God lays upon them. Cp. Agenda, Marriage formula.
B. In the true and narrow sense, the word "cross" denotes the suffering which we must endure because of our faith in Christ.
a) The word "cross" can refer to -
1) The cross of Christ, Matt. 27:40.
2) Christ's suffering and merit, Eph. 2:16; Heb. 12:2.
3) The preaching of the Crucified One, 1 Cor. 1:17.
4) The suffering of Christians, Matt. 10:38; 16:24; Mark 8:34; 10:21; Luke 9:23; 14:27.
b) It is necessary to dwell on the doctrine of the cross, in order to prepare Christians for tribulation so that they will be able to bear it. It is especially necessary in our times, when men want to enjoy good days with the Gospel.
c) This doctrine can be rightly set forth only where the pure Gospel is to be found. Enthusiasts and the work-righteous cannot understand it.

II. The word "cross" cannot be used to refer to:
A. Suffering which one deserves. 1 Pet. 4:15; 2:20. The robber on the cross rightly said: "We receive the due reward of our deeds," Luke 23:41.
a) This includes also a person who wantonly plunges himself into debt, or parents who do not bring up their children properly and as a result experience deep sorrow. Cp. The prodigal son; Peter after his denial.
b) A person who suffers in this way
1) suffers against God's will;
2) should make no false comfort for himself, as though he

were suffering with Christ, but he should rather say: I will bear the anger of the Lord.

3) deserves no recognition, even when he bears his suffering patiently.

B. Self-inflicted suffering. The priests of Baal cut themselves with knives. Torture and pain which the heathen, monks and nuns inflict upon themselves, are works of their own choosing, and are an abomination to the Lord. (We should not seek to draw or inflict upon ourselves any suffering.)

C. The suffering of unbelievers. Ps. 32:10. The wicked shall have many sorrows.

III. The word "cross" in its true sense refers to the suffering which we have as a result of following Christ. Christians suffer because they live as Christians and confess the Christian faith. Acts 9:16; 1 Pet. 4:14; John 15:21; 2 Cor. 1:5; Heb. 11:26; Matt. 11:29; 1 Pet. 4:16. Such sufferings are:

A. Self-denial. Because a Christian is concerned about his soul, he must carry out his calling with great care, for it offers dangers for his soul. He cannot participate in sinful pastimes, and may have to give up other things.

B. Hatred of the world. Matt. 10:22; John 15:19; 1 John 3:13.

C. Mockery. Matt. 5:11.

D. Slander. Matt. 5:11; 1 Pet. 2:12. How often Christians are accused of things which they have never done!

E. Persecution. Matt. 5:10; 2 Tim. 3:12; John 15:20-21.

a) Whoever bears the name of Christ and is in earnest about it, must take the suffering of Christ upon himself.

b) It has always been thus in the world. E.g. Abel; Moses. Isaac was persecuted by Ishmael, Gal. 4:29. David was mocked by Shimei, 2 Sam. 16:5-14. The 3 men in the fiery furnace. Daniel. Others endured mockery and scourging, Heb. 11:36-37. Ps. 35:7 (David); Christ; the Apostles. Acts 2:13.

c) The Church will always be oppressed, as were the children of Israel by the Egyptians. The Church is like a ship which goes through all kinds of weather.

d) Christ's Kingdom is a Kingdom of the cross.

e) The glory of the Church and its jewels are inward. From the outside such things are often not to be seen.

f) That is why the Gospel is called the "preaching of the cross," 1 Cor. 1:18, not only because it tells about Him who died on the cross, but also because the cross follows as a fruit of the Gospel.

g) Also in our day we must suffer much for Christ's sake. Merely try to live your Christianity, and you will experience this suffering. How often a pastor must suffer under such a cross.

h) No one need become a Christian in order to enjoy carefree days.

i) Especially in the last days we must expect to endure much suffering. Matt. 24:29.

k) Who is it that bears such suffering?

1) Not the hypocrites. As soon as they begin to suffer for their outward confession, they set aside such confession.

2) Only the true Christians. Ps. 116:10.

l) In particular preachers of the Gospel must suffer.

m) Why does such a cross come?

1) Because the Christians are not of the world, John 15:19.

2) Because the world knows neither the Father nor Christ. John 15:21; 16:3. But such ignorance is no excuse. John 15:24-25.

3) Because the devil and the world cannot endure the Gospel.

n) Christians do not suffer for their faults, but for their well-doing. 1 Pet. 2:20. (Objection: Truth, if it is rightly proclaimed, always finds listeners in the world. One must only strike the right tone.)

IV. We should not let this surprise us, that as Christians we must bear such a cross, as though something strange were happening to us, 1 Pet. 4:12.

A. It belongs to us as followers of Christ. Mark 8:34-35.

a) A Christian cannot be without a cross. Christ and suffering belong together. He who would pluck a rose must also carry the thorns; he who would have a fire must also endure the smoke.

b) No one can journey to heaven without having undergone the hardships of the pilgrimage.

B. We have been called to such suffering. 1 Pet. 2:21. It belongs to our calling as Christians.

C. It is a mark of the children of God. Ps. 34:19. When a Christian sees that his life is such, he should comfort himself with the fact that he is on the way which all other children of God must follow. If you know nothing about bearing a cross because of your faith, then test your Christianity.

D. Christ also suffered thus. The disciple is not above his master, Matt. 10:24, nor is the servant greater than his Lord, John 15:20.

a) We should follow in His footsteps, 1 Pet. 2:21, go with Him along the way of sorrows, and bear our cross after Him. Simon of Cyrene.

b) In that way we will become conformed to the image of His Son, not only in love, patience, obedience, etc., but also in suffering. God had decided upon this, even before the foundation of the world.

c) We suffer with Christ. Rom. 8:17. We carry the death of the Lord Jesus at all times in our body. Partnership.

d) That which is done to believers, God sees as being done to Himself. Acts 9:4. John 15:20. With these words the Lord prepared His disciples for their future suffering.

V. How should we conduct ourselves under such a cross? We should:

A. Not be ashamed of our cross. We have no cause to murmur and complain when persecution strikes us. It is an honor to bear such suffering. (Suffering because of some evil is to our shame; suffering because of well-doing is an honor.)

B. Rejoice in it. 1 Pet. 4:13; Acts 5:41. Suffering for Christ's sake must be something great and glorious.

a) The cross is not a sign of God's wrath, but of our election to grace.

b) Rom. 5:3 - "We glory in tribulations also." 2 Cor. 11:23. To glory in the cross is different than boasting.

C. Thank God, that we are counted worthy to suffer shame for His name.

D. Therefore take up our cross, and willingly and patiently follow Christ's example.

a) No one is forced to bear the cross for Christ's sake. A person can lay it aside. Only a believer takes it upon himself and bears it.

b) We will suffer things wrongfully. 1 Pet. 2:19.

c) Our flesh is offended in the cross. Matt. 16:22.

E. Suppress all threats and thoughts of revenge. When Christ was reviled, He reviled not again. David and Shimei, 2 Sam. 19:23.

a) We should rather overcome evil with good, Rom. 12:21.

b) God endures much from the world! And yet He gives such people their daily bread.

c) Out of love for his enemies, Paul was ready to be accursed himself by Christ if only the souls of the Jews might be saved.

F. Continue in confession and good works. Christ has saved us from death with His blood. We want to confess Him. The Lord will bless such testimony.

VI. What should encourage us to do this?

A. Christ calls such cross-bearers "blessed." Matt. 5:11; 1 Pet. 4:14.

B. Those who bear their cross will also be glorified with Him. Rom. 8:17; 1 Pet. 4:13.

C. Christ promises them a gracious reward. Matt. 5:12. Also Matt. 19:27-29.

Tr. by A. Schulz

LITT AV HVERT

This column is very short of news this month. Surely there are items of interest that others would like to hear about. But we can't pass it on until we hear about it.

According to reports, the Joseph Petersen's of Cottonwood are parents of a little girl, their second, in December.

The "Clergy Bulletin" is published by the Southwestern Minnesota pastoral conference of the Norwegian Synod.

Editor:
Rev. T.N. Teigen
917 So. Grange Ave.
Sioux Falls, S. D.

Subscription price is $1.50 per year, payable to:
Rev. Arthur Schulz
675 Second St.
Tracy, Minn.

Please renew subscriptions promptly.

CLERGY BULLETIN

Vol. XV, No. 7. March, 1956

CHRISTIAN vs. SKEPTIC

(Editor's Note: The reports of the death of Henry L. Mencken brought back before the public mind a name which many of this generation have never heard. Since the first reports, a number of magazines have had reviews of Mencken's life, writings, and character, with emphasis on his skepticism. We know of one man in our midst for whom a personal opportunity was presented to try to reach Mencken's soul. Prof. G.O. Lillegard carried on a correspondence with Mencken, and on the basis of the exchange formulated an article which appeared in series in the LUTHERAN SENTINEL during the summer of 1937. - We believe that many of our readers will appreciate the opportunity of re-reading the article, or reading it for the first time, both because of its human interest and because of the apologetic material it contains.)

The wise Solomon said: "Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him." Prov. 26,4. The Bible makes it clear that only a fool would say: "There is no God." Hence it is rather useless to argue with an atheist; for he is a fool, and if it did any good to argue with a fool, he would not be a fool. At the same time, Solomon also said: "Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit." Prov. 26,5. That is, there are times and circumstances when the Christian should rebuke the folly of an atheist and seek to show him the error of his ways, if only to demonstrate how God "destroys the wisdom of the wise" and "makes foolish the wisdom of this world." 1 Cor. 1. Thus we have of late been corresponding regarding Christian faith vs. skepticism with a man, known for his cynical attacks on religion, but who shall here remain anonymous. The argument may be of interest to others, since the knowledge that it is an actual debate between a Christian and a skeptic may give point to statements which would seem less important if presented merely in a general article. The arguments presented by the skeptic are the same as those which have appeared in his published works, though here stated very briefly. The correspondence was occasioned by an article in which the skeptic praised Dr. J. Gresham Machen highly for his intelligent battle against the Modernists. It is interesting to note that atheists, Unitarians, and skeptics in general have shown high respect for Dr. Machen, and a corresponding contempt for the vacillating, compromising stand of his opponents. They are intelligent enough to see that Modernism is a silly compromise between things which can never be brought together, and although they may ridicule conservative Christianity, they at least respect those who defend it with such intellectual brilliance as Dr. Machen showed, far more than the respect the illogical, neither hot-nor-cold Modernists. In this case, the skeptics article showed a clear grasp of the real issues in the Machen controversy, so that we were impelled to write him and thank him for his statement. In commenting upon his article, we wrote in somewhat the same vein which he affects in his writings, which accounts for the manner in which the argument was carried on from our side. We shall omit the

more personal portions of the letters, and references to the political situation, heading each letter merely with "SKEPTIC" and "CHRISTIAN." A few exerpts from the original article by the skeptic will explain some of the statements in our first letter.

SKEPTIC

"The Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D. ... was actually a man of great learning, and, what is more, of sharp intelligence. .... He saw clearly that the only effects that could follow diluting and polluting Christianity in the Modernist manner would be its complete abandonment and ruin. ... Thus he fell out with the reformers who have been trying, in late years, to conver t the Presbyterian Church into a kind of literary and social club, devoted vaguely to good works. ... The doctrine that he preached seemed to me ... to be excessively dubious. I stand much more chance of being converted to Spiritualism, to Christian Science, or even to the New Deal than to Calvinism, which occupies a place, in my cabinet of private horrors, but little removed from cannibalism. ... But though I could not yield to his reasoning I could at least admire, and did greatly admire, his remarkable clarity and cogency as an apologist, allowing him his primary assumptions."

CHRISTIAN

"I want to express my appreciation of your fairness to Dr. Machen and your clear-headed analysis of the controversy between him and his Modernistic church brethren. At the same time, I should like to comment a little on your article. To write in your own delicate vein:

"From your point of view, Dr. Machen was a fool for believing in Calvinism. From his point of view, you were a fool for not believing in it. But the Modernist who tries to compromise between Machen's belief and your unbelief only succeeds in making himself a fool on both counts and adding a third and peculiarly ridiculous type of folly, that of trying to look wise while compounding folly. Therefore you are right in admiring Machen for his intelligent defense of his folly, even as I - and no doubt he could admire you for the brilliant manner in which you display your folly. And you are perfectly right in despising the fools who lack intelligence to admit that they are fools.

"Dr. Machen, of course, like St. Paul before him, understood perfectly that the "wisdom of God" in which he believed was "foolishness unto natural man." He admitted that to believe in the Bible was, intellectually considered, unadulterated folly. The Bible itself requires of its followers that they shall 'take their reason captive under the Word of God,' - that is, it meets the charge of intellectual folly by admitting the charge frankly and fearlessly.

"The Bible's charge against such skeptics as you, however, is one of moral - not intellectual - folly. If you are to meet that charge, you must likewise admit its validity. To deny the truth of the charge, you must likewise admit its validity. To deny the truth of the charge would be only adding intellectual folly to moral folly.

"But admit that atheism and skepticism are moral folly, - admit it sincerely and honestly - and you are not far from the kingdom of God."

SKEPTIC

"Thanks very much for your most interesting letter. I am sorry to say that I can't agree with you. It seems to me that believing or not believing is not a matter of morals at all. I'd certainly not like to argue that one who dissented sharply from my own ideas was immoral, and I'd think I'd object if the same accusation were made in my direction."

CHRISTIAN

"I do not want to be understood, of course, as holding that anyone who in general 'sharply dissented from my own ideas was therefore immoral'. The point I wished to emphasize was that the Bible, when it condemns atheism as folly, does so from the moral, not the intellectual, point of view. It is true of the Bible throughout (in this respect, as in so many others, it is a unit) that the folly it condemns, as well as the wisdom it commends, concern always the field of morals, rather than that of 'pure intellect,' which we today stress so one-sidedly. Therefore any denial of the one true God is attacked as the fundamental sin against the moral law, at the same time as His existence and His nature are frankly stated to be 'mysteries,' to be apprehended by faith alone, not by human reason. Kant was, in so far, a 'Biblical theologian,' when he in his CRITIQUE OF PURE REASON ~~affirmed~~ destroyed all the pretensions of the human intellect to any real knowledge; and then in his CRITIQUE OF PRACTICAL REASON affirmed the necessity of a belief in God on moral grounds,- 'the categorical imperative.'

"Walter Lippmann, in his PREFACE TO MORALS, makes the mistake of assuming that he has answered Dr. Machen's position when he shows its untenability from the point of view of logic and reason. He has in reality missed the mark entirely, - whether through ignorance, or through a disingenuous evasion one cannot tell. The charge of moral folly which the Bible makes against those who break the moral law at any point cannot be answered by arguments, since all human experience confirms the validity of the charge. Any attempt to deny the charge only lays one open to the charge of intellectual folly also, no matter how speciously men may defend their aberations from the law."

SKEPTIC

"I find it simply impossible to take your point of view. The question whether this or that proposition is true, seems to me to be wholly a question of evidence. Morality has absolutely nothing to do with it. I should add that I am inclined to believe that there is something downright immoral about believing the palpably not true, or attempting to believe it. Some one once wrote an article entitled, as I recall it, 'The Duty of Being Intelligent.' Whether or not it was Lippmann I don't recall."

CHRISTIAN

"It seems that the difference between us may be summarized in the two statements: You contend that it is immoral to be unintelligent, specifically about religious questions, and wish to make acceptance of God and His Word a matter of intellectual evidence. I contend that it is unintelligent to be so immoral as to deny God and His Word, and hence I make it all a matter of faith and morals. Our conclusions are as wide apart as our initial assumptions accordingly. Since 'homo sap' is so constituted that he believes what he wants to believe anyway, we will, perhaps, not get much farther with the argument.

"Whether a proposition is true is, indeed, 'wholly a question of evidence.' But the character of the evidence which is admitted is always of prime importance. By admitting irrelevant evidence or throwing out arbitrarily relevant evidence, one can prove anything he pleases. Thus to say that 'morality has absolutely nothing to do with' such questions as the existence of God, is to throw out of court unheard, the testimony of conscience, or that 'moral nature' of man, which is affirmed to be the most important evidence for the existence of God. Cf. Romans 1-2. It would be difficult to prove that this is an intelligent procedure.

In order for human reason to break the vicious circle in which all its reasoning is caught, it must start with faith in something outside itself. The Christian starts with God, and is content to await the verdict of eternity to justify him. The atheist starts with alleged 'scientific evidence,' which on closer examination, however, proves to be as tenuous as a 'wave in space' and as subjective as the individual's prejudices; in short, he never succeeds in breaking the vicious circle in reality, because that which he assumes to have an existence outside himself has no such permanent existence. I think philosophy is 'the bunk', but at least it provides excellent evidence for the fact that men can prove nothing quite so easily as that they know nothing."

SKEPTIC

"I can follow you so far, but no further. It seems to me highly doubtful that there is anything properly describable as conscience in Man. What appears to be the voice of God is usually, it seems to me, only the accumulated experience of the human race. Vanity is probably quite as much responsible for virtue as religion. I refuse to steal, simply because stealing seems to me to be a cheap and trashy way to get values. I like to believe that whatever values I accumulate are earned. But this takes us into metaphysics, and there I am perfectly willing to shoot both sides in any conceivable controversy."

CHRISTIAN

"When you put 'vanity' where I put 'conscience', you are again closer to the Biblical teaching than you may realize. For Scripture says that it takes the almighty God Himself to make a man's vanity over into a properly functioning conscience.

You see, theology has the edge on metaphysics, just because it is possible in the latter for a man to 'shoot both sides in any controversy' and thus kill himself off completely; or if he does not do it himself, his fellow-men will do it for him; while theology speaks with authority, warning men of the day of reckoning, when the facts which now can be apprehended only by faith will be revealed to all men as something else than theory. Its appeal is, indeed, to the conscience as the organ of the Will. Hence, where conscience is denied, there is neither authority nor appeal. But history and human experience tell us many things about the workings of what is called 'conscience' which have never yet been explained by any psychologist outside of the Bible writers, - least of all by the exponents of that greatest of humbugs, modern psychology, which is metaphysics reduced to the nth degree of silliness. I have done penance, reading such stuff, enough to be sure that the future will justify me in that opinion."

SKEPTIC

"I still stick to my theory that conscience is largely imaginary. If it actually came from God then one would reasonably expect to find a highly developed conscience in God Himself. I must confess that I have never seen any evidence of it. Any human being who ran the world as badly as this one is run would be lynched."

CHRISTIAN

"Perhaps my most serious problem, next to myself, is that of governing the self-willed girls and boys who bear my name. When I consider the task the Lord has, governing a world of men like you and me - not to mention New Dealers and other strange creatures, - it seems to me perfectly marvellous that He keeps things going at all. Granted that the world is an awful mess, the question still remains: Whose fault is it? Since it is the acme of creative power to create beings independent of the Creator's con-

trol, there is nothing strange about the Bible teaching that an almighty God created some beings who were capable of turning into Frankenstein monsters, sinning, rebelling against Him. The Lord's responsibility for their actions ceases when He has made them responsible beings, possessing a free will. Cf. Luther.

"However, the Bible brings us the strange message that God did take upon Himself the responsibility for the sins of the world, in that He in the person of Jesus Christ bore all their guilt and punishment, thus cancelling them and making 'the life more abundant' a free gift to all men. There is supreme irony in the fact that He did this by making use of His Creatures' very hatred against Him, which culminated in 'the lynching' of Christ. Thereby He 'destroys the wisdom of the wise' and proves that 'the weakness of God is stronger than men.' I Cor. 1-2. Thus it cannot even be argued that God ought to have a bad conscience about creating so many Frankensteins as there evidently are. If too many of His creatures refuse His free gift - a gift which He even offers them the will to accept - what blame can attach to God? Obviously we are here dealing with the whole field of Biblical theology, and if I were to expatiate further, this would soon be a book."

SKEPTIC

"I appreciate God's generosity in taking over responsibility for the sins of mankind, but I can't help feeling that He has rather forgotten His own offendings. Certainly the invention of cancer deserves some sort of recompense and restitution. What, again, of war? And what, finally, of Methodism? If I had ever launched such curses on the world, I believe that my conscience would be bothering me today. - But let us discuss these great and horrible matters when we meet. I surely hope it will be soon."

CHRISTIAN

"I cannot find anything in your last letter which has not been answered before. It seems to indicate, however, that we have, perhaps, arrived at the traditional impasse where Rome consigns Christian to the flames, and Christian can only warn of the flames to come. It would be very interesting to see whether we could get any further by friendly discussion in person.

"Since it is Easter time, let me just add that I have often wondered why 'scientists' pay so little attention to the historical, scientific evidences for the resurrection of Christ. They are quite sure of their ape ancestry, although they date it back a few million or billion years. And yet they consider it 'scientific' to doubt an event, which dates back only 1900 years, which has changed the course of history, and which is so unique that all men should marvel at it and make its explanation their first concern. The cynical conclusion one most readily arrives at is that facts become 'scientific facts' in inverse ratio to the reliability of the evidence for them. The less men know, the more cock-sure they are that they know all there is to know. If there ever was a time when a pen like yours was needed to expose the pretensions of science falsely so-called it is now. - This may be only a pious wish; but I shall express the hope anyway that you will at least be a consistent cynic, and ridicule atheistic 'science' and your own cynicism as thoroughly as you have done everything else."

SKEPTIC

"Unfortunately, the evidence for the Resurrection seems to me to be somewhat shaky. The Apostles themselves, unless I am misinformed, had doubts about it, and some of them refused flatly to believe in it. The matter is discussed very briefly in my book, _____. I am, of course, no higher critic, but I have read a good deal in the literature, and it seems to me that a great deal of doubt hangs about the whole matter.

Let us discuss it when we meet.

"I have just cleared off a somewhat tedious job of editing and must now tackle another. I have at least 250 books in mind, and if I could only go back to the age of 30, I'd probably be able to write at least three or four of them. It is a pity that life has to be so short. I look forward, of course, to happy days in Heaven, but nevertheless I'd like to infest this earth for two or three hundred more years. A century is so small a segment of eternity that it seems irrational to make the mortal span so brief."

CHRISTIAN

"It is true, the apostles were thorough-going skeptics with regard to the possibility of such a resurrection from the dead as that of Christ. They had to be convinced by 'scientific evidence,'- so, too, Saul of Tarsus, the brainiest of the Pharisees. But having been convinced, they were ready to give their lives as witnesses to the fact. The enemies of Jesus did not doubt the fact,- they only disputed the implications of the fact and to that end sought to suppress it. It is vain to try to disprove the resurrection today. For if anyone could have done it, the Pharisees would literally have filled the world with their proofs.

"H.G. Wells in his 'Outline of History,' - only as an historian is he a firstrate novelist - comes with some childish 'psychology' to explain the resurrection; likewise most other writers today. Higher critics in general, merely assume a priori that a resurrection is impossible, and then, having begged the question, proceed to prove that there could have been no resurrection. As a student at several universities, I have spent considerable time laughing at the professors who were continually involving themselves in logical fallacies, but whose dignity was such as to make it rather unhealthy for a mere student to point out said fallacies. But this is a large subject, and I shall not try to argue the matter further.

"The more I see of life in this world, the more I appreciate the wisdom which ordained that the span of human life should be threescore years and ten, and seldom more. The average person has, by that time, all the sins on his conscience - including the books that he has written - that he can stand without landing in an insane asylum. And if he should remain physically and mentally sound beyond that age, New Dealers would either legislate him out of existence or surrender him to the tender mercies of Townsendites and $200.00 a month. So what's the use?"

With this - suggestively enough- the debate came to a close: "What's the use?" When St. Paul spoke to the Athenian philosophers on Mars Hill, they listened to him patiently enough, until he spoke of the resurrection of Christ from the dead. Then "some mocked; and others said, We will hear thee again of this matter." They were not interested in such historical facts as the resurrection of a crucified Jew. Theories, speculations, logical and philosophical arguments - all these stirred their interest. But facts? No, that was a different matter! So it is with atheists and skeptics to this day, - the significant fact is that they consistently refuse to face the facts: The fact of sin, the fact of history, the facts of God's dealings with men. Hence, they live, perhaps to their dying day, in a "fool's paradise," where dreams, theories, and "endless genealogies" take the place of God's facts. It is, in truth, but a barren existence which such men lead. And God, of His grace in Christ Jesus, sometimes leads even "the fools of

reason" back out of the wilderness of skepticism to the green pastures of His soul-satisfying Word. Therefore we believe it only right to call also these men by the Gospel, wherever opportunity offers. If the majority only blaspheme, yet the Word even there does not return void. In Athens, there was one Areapagite, Dionysius, who believed, though the rest only mocked the Gospel of the Risen Saviour.

Geo. O. Lillegard

A FEW NOTES ON PROFESSOR CARL PAUL CASPARI

Two names, Caspari and Johnson, are almost household words among us, and we have learned to esteem them highly as true Gospel theologians. It is possible, though, that we have not had much opportunity to know much detail about their work. It is hoped that the following notes, gathered from various notes over a number of years, may give the reader a better acquaintance with one of them, and stimulate interest in both.

CARL PAUL CASPARI was born in Dessau, Germany, on the 8th of February, 1814, and died in Christiania, Norway, on the 11th of April, 1892. - One Encyclopedia of some repute calls him a "German Church Historian," thereby demonstrating that Encyclopedias, like some scientists, theologians, preachers, and even librarians, sometimes speak authoritatively without accurate information. - Since Caspari was born in Germany, wrote many things in German, and did a great deal of work in the field of Church History, we probably ought not quarrel too much about that, - just as we wouldn't quarrel so very much if one called him a Hebrew Exegete, or an Arabic Grammarian, or an Oriental Researcher, or a Greek Scholar, or a specialist in ancient Latin documents, or a Norwegian Bible Translator, or a Christian Jewish Missionary to the Jews, or a Norwegian National Historian, or a writer in Norwegian religious periodicals for popular consumption. All of those things are so. There is also ample evidence that he was quite a wit, an additional reason why his home was a sort of Mecca for university students, and also an additional reason why he was a popular figure in otherwise staid and somber meetings of scholars. Indeed, a many-sided man, and the more one reads him and about him, the more he is impressed that Caspari was thoroughly learned, and you appreciate the story about the time he was traveling incognito with some scholars who were conversing in Latin. When Caspari entered into the conversation in good Latin, they switched to Greek; and still trying to throw him off, they switched to Hebrew, and then to several other less known languages, Caspari speaking the others more fluently than they. Finally one of the travelers said: "Either you are the devil himself, or you are Professor Caspari of Christiania."

Caspari was born of Jewish parents, and had early training in Jewish schools in Dessau. In 1834 he went to the University of Leipzig. He early became interested in classical philology and Hebrew grammar, and made up his mind to make Oriental languages his field. But while he was at Leipzig a friend and fellow-student by the name of Graul introduced him for the first time to the New Testament, the continued study of which led to his conversion and baptism in 1838. Then he decided to study theology, which he did at Berlin with emphasis on Old Testament Exegesis under Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg. In 1842 he took his Doctor of Philosophy Degree at Leipzig, and in 1944 was created Licentiate

in Theology, honoris causa, by the University of Königsberg. The next year he received a call to professorship in Königsberg, but turned it down. Reason: It would mean that he would have to join the Prussian Union Church (Lutheran and Calvinist), something he would not do (even though the respected Hengstenberg, conservative as he was, saw his way clear to be in that kind of fellowship). In the spring of 1847 he was visited by 25 year old Gisle Johnson, already appointed lecturer in theology xxxxxx in Christiania, and was persuaded by him to make himself available for a vacant lectureship in theology at the University of Christiania, to which he was called in due course, and entered upon his work there in that position in 1848. In 1857 he was made full professor.

Caspari's 44 years at the University of Christiania were filled with such an activity as would be hard to parallel. His main field was Old Testament exegesis, and it is for his expositions of the OT that his students, according to testimonies concerning him which we have read, were most deeply impressed and grateful. But circumstances brought it about that he became most widely known for some specialized work, namely, research in the history of the Symbols of the ancient church, especially the Apostle's Creed. The impetus for that was the current Grundvigian notion notion that the Apostle's Creed had followed the Church unchanged from the Apostles, indeed, that the words of the Apostle's Creed, like those of the Lord's Prayer, had come from the mouth of Jesus. (That notion had further implications which we shan't speak of here.) Caspari spent over twenty summers, largely at his own expense, in travels that took him to nearly all the countries of Europe, into libraries and cloisters in search of information on the history of the ancient church and its symbols. The results of his search are briefly summarized in his Introduction to the "Book of Concord", which Caspari together with Gisle Johnson, translated and published in Norwegian.

Caspari was a member of the committee that worked for years on a revision of the Norwegian Bible translation, he and Thistedahl working in the main on the Old Testament. - He received many calls to posts in German Universities, returning them all (Fostock, 1850; Dorpat, 1856; Erlangen, 1867. When he returned the one to Erlangen, the Norwegian theological students sent him an address of thanks).

His writings are scattered about in a number of theological journals published in Germany, and mainly in three periodicals in Norway, "Theologisk Tidsskrift", of which he was co-editor with Gisle Johnson, "Norsk Kirketidende," and "Luthersk Ugeskrift." Following are a few of his works that were published separately (Titles given in English are of works that appeared in Norwegian): "Commentar Ueber Obadiah" (1844); "Arabic Grammar" (in Latin-1848- Later translated into German and widely distributed); "Beitraege Zur Einleitung In Das Buch Jesaia" (1849); "Ueber Den Syrisch-Ephraemitischen Krieg" (1851); "Ueber Micha Den Morasthiten"; "Commentary on Isaiah" (Chapters 1-12, 2 volumes, 1857-58); "The Call of Abraham" (1871); "The Trial of Abraham"(1871). "The Book of Daniel" (1877); "Ungedruckte, unbeachtete, und wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols un Glaubensregel."

Andreas Brandrud has written a little sketch of Caspari. Brandrud was a successor of Gisle Johnson to the chair of Church History at Christiania, and was one of the number of men after Johnson and Caspari in the Theological School who were modernistically inclined. Brandrud had been a student of Cas-

pari and writes gratefully, although he says critically: "Caspari's orthodox view of the Bible did not allow him to investigate with complete freedom." In characterizing Caspari, he compares him with Johnson, saying that "he wasn't w pietist of the Johnsonian type", speaks of his rich fund of wit and humor, something not noted in Johnson, also that more than Johnson, Caspari was a man "med aandelig elasticitet og et friskt og lyst syn paa livet." Then he goes on to say: "But he possessed at the same time a deep and child-like piety, which especially lived and breathed in the Bible, not least in the Old Testament, in the piety of the Patriarchs, Prophets, and Psalms. And he understood how to give it impressive expression. None of his hearers could ever forget Caspari as he often stood on the podium expounding a Hebrew Psalm or a portion of the Prophets, and with closed eyes and in a scarcely audible voice, as in an ecstacy, breathed the holy words out over his hearers."

T.N.T.

The "Clergy Bulletin" is published by the Southwestern Minnesota pastoral conference of the Norwegian Synod.

Editor:
Rev. T.N. Teigen
917 So. Grange Ave.
Sioux Falls, S.D.

Subscription price is $1.50 per year, payable to:
Rev. Arthur Schulz
675 Second St.
Tracy, Minn.

Please renew subscriptions promptly!

ANNOUNCEMENT

The General Pastoral Conference will meet at Bethany College, Mankato, Minn., April 3 - 6, 1956. The opening session will begin at 10:00 a.m. The program is as follows:

1. Psychiatry and the Bible - A.M. Harstad.
2. Introduction to the Book of Jeremiah - Paul Petersen.
3. Translation and exposition of II Thessalonians continued (beginning with chapter 2, verse 13) 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 - George Schweikert.
6. Panel discussion of Christian Day Schools - M.E.Tweit, leader.
7. Church and Ministry, continued - Neil Hilton.
8. Recording of a service and sermon, G. Quill; Critic, S. Dorr.
9. Fundamentalism and the doctrine of Christology - A. H. Strand.

L. Vangen, secr.

This periodical is published monthly by authority of the General Pastoral Conference of the Norwegian Synod of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church.

CLERGY BULLETIN

Published monthly by Authority of the General Pastoral Conference of the Norwegian Synod of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church.

Vol. XV, No. 8. April, 1956

THE CLARITY OF SCRIPTURE

By Hugo Handberg

Conference paper delivered at Northwest District Pastoral Conference, April 13, 1955, Mankato, Minn., and concluded at Northwest District Pastoral Conference, January 26, 1956, at Mankato, Minn.

The matter of the clarity of Scripture is not just an academic subject on which we as pastors should be well informed. It is not something that should come into the pastoral conference spotlight onc e every few years only to make its appearance and then retire offstage for a few more years. Nor should this matter of the clarity of Scripturee be relegated to a paper such as this, to which we might all listen and promptly nod our approval, and then just as promptly dismiss the whole thing from our minds. For to believe that Scripture is a clear Book is no mere academic thing. It is vital to our faith. Our very salvation stands or falls with Scripture's clarity. If the assurance of the forgiveness of all our sins and the promises of eternal life to which a believer clings are ambiguous and unclear, if they can not be trusted and relied upon, then "we are of all men most miserable." 1 Cor. 15,19. Our faith is vain, and we are yet in our sins! (1 Cor. 15,17).

Doctor Walther spoke emphatically regarding the importance of the doctrine of Scripture's clarity. In a sermon on the Lord's Supper, he told his hearers: "Upon this, that God's clear word is reliable, rests the certainty of our faith and salvation. If we could not definitely and safely depend upon God's clear word, without even in the least fearing that thereby we went in error, then our faith would be in vain, and our entire Christianity like unto a house built upon sand."

Unless he holds firmly to the clarity of Scripture, a pastor can no longer stand in his pulpit and speak Moses' "Thus saith the Lord" to his people. His words at the most will be full of uncertainties and "good guesses"... and so will the hearts of his people! That many preachers do not regard Scripture as a clear Book is undoubtedly one of the chief reasons why, when one samples current radio preaching, he finds it so heavily seasoned with "I think" and "It seems to me." Then too, magazine publishers in our day have discovered that it helps circulation to run articles of a religious nature. So we find everybody from Norman Vincent Peale to the wife of cowboy Roy Rogers coming into the homes of our congregations and instructing our people in what makes a good Presbyterian, or what Hinduism is all about. And chief among the dangers in many of these articles is a subtle, and often not-so-subtle, persuasion that Scripture might not be as clear as we Lutherans have always contended.

But we as pastors will not be able to instruct and feed the souls of our flocks to their tem-

poral and eternal welfare if we ourselves begin to question whether Scripture is an intelligible, clear Book. This leaven, that there are certain teachings of Scripture which can be looked at from two or more sides, has long been at work in Lutheran circles, and now has most certainly permeated into our own Synodical Conference. We have seen one after another of the Bible passages we once taught in strong unity with our brethren re-examined and called into question and subjected to ever-new scrutiny by committees and faculties, and we can not deny that a cloud of uncertainty has fallen over vital landmarks of our doctrinal position. Where we are all exhorted by Scripture, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among us, 1 Cor. 1,10, over recent years, and most recently at the Synodical Conference meetings (Detroit, Chicago, 1954), we have seen open divisions. To our shame, we have given birth to a monster in our Synodical Conference, a two-headed practice! No one can deny that there is today in our Conference a double practice which conservatives and liberals alike claim is based on God's Word alone.

It is highly important, then, that we be refreshed and reassured that Scripture is a clear Book, that we be comforted that the cause of the confusion and heartache in our dear Synodical Conference is not to be found in the pages of God's Word, but rather, in the Satan-inspired failings of men. God's Word speaks as clearly and understandably to us today as it has spoken clearly and understandably to all men down through the centuries. Let our prayer be that God will strengthen us to read and study and cling to His clear Word in these most trying days.

When we set out to examine into the clarity of Scripture, we must first map out the ground to be covered. We shall not speak here about the inspiration of Scripture. That the Bible, word for word, is the inspired Word of God is taken for granted. But we shall restrict ourselves to one of the so-called properties of Scripture, of which four are usually named. They are:

1 The authority of Scripture
2 The perspicuity, or clarity, of Scripture
3 The efficacy of Scripture
4 The sufficiency of Scripture

What ground is to be covered, then, in the matter of Scripture's clarity? To illustrate extremes, to draw the "eastern" and "western" boundaries, so to speak, let us hear two quotations. The first is from Luther, who wrote these words to Erasmus:

> "For this ought, above all things, to be received and most firmly settled among Christians, that the Holy Scriptures are a spiritual light by far more clear than the sun itself, especially in those things which pertain unto salvation or necessity." Plass, THIS IS LUTHER, 57.

The second is the well-known quotation from Cardinal Gibbons:

> "We must, therefore, conclude that the Scriptures alone cannot be a sufficient guide and rule of faith because they cannot, at any time, be within the reason of every enquirer; because they are not of themselves clear and intelligible even in matters of the highest importance, and because they do not contain all the truths necessary for salvation." Gibbons, FAITH OF OUR FATHERS, Chapter VIII.

Actually, there is no middle ground between these two boundaries. There can be no degrees of clarity in Scripture. Either Scripture is clear, or it is un-

clear. Either it accomplishes the purpose for which God designed it, or it is a failure.

I will not fully grasp the importance of maintaining the teaching of the clarity of God's Word to men until I see clearly Satan's violent opposition to that single teaching. The very first temptation with which Satan confronted Adam and Eve, and with which he successfully led them away from righteousness into sin and death, was the temptation to doubt the clarity of God's spoken Word. His smooth but deadly suggestion to the woman, "Yea, hath God said?," was nothing but a strong effort to move her away from God's clear and understandable Word and into the wilderness of doubt.

Look also at that awful scene in another wilderness where Satan pitted his craftiness against our Lord Himself. Matt. 4. This tempter, who would be pleased to lead our Savior into any sin, and who could pass before Christ's eyes all the temptations of which his hellish will can conceive... which temptation does he choose? What is it that lies behind his thrice-spoken "if"? Just as in the garden, it is that same effort, that eager desire, to have men doubt the clarity of God's Word, this time aimed at our Substitute, the Man, Christ Jesus. But where is it our Savior finds His strength? How does He resist the devil's suggestion that He might not be the Son of God? He defends Himself with that very Word, that clear Word, that Satan would call into question. Christ's "It is written," "It is written," and "It is written again," are more than a match for Satan's craft; and he must flee confounded.

This should be a strong warning to us that this same Satan, who hurled his full might against our Lord in order that he might cause Him to doubt the clarity of God's Word, will not spare his efforts to lead us into this same sin. But we must follow our Lordds example and take refuge in God's clear Word, which Satan, too, can understand, and before which he must flee.

However, if I deny, or even entertain the least doubt, that Scripture is a clear, understandable Book, in so doing I involve myself in most serious charges against God. For instance: when we read that Adam said of the woman, "This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man," Gen. 2,23, who was it that gave Adam the power to talk? Who gave him the ability to fashion his words so that they had a sensible meaning? Did Adam and his wife have to go to school and receive instructions before they could communicate with one another? No, God is the One who made human speech, and who laid out the laws under which human speech operates. And that God is the Author of Holy Scripture, the Bible has not left us in doubt. Scripture tells us, for instance, in Matthew's Gospel, that "all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet (Isaiah), saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child...", Matt. 1,22-23. And again, "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet (Hosea), saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son." Matt. 2,15. Again, Peter's words, "Men and brethren, this scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas, which was guide to them that took Jesus." Acts 1,16. Again, "... They lifted up their voice with one accord, and said, Lord, thou art God,... Who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said, Why did the heathen rage, and the people imagine vain things?" Acts 4,24-25. When one questions the clarity of Scripture, then, he is doing noth-

ing more nor less than accusing the Author of Scripture, God Himself, who spoke through this same Isaiah and Hosea and David and all the other sacred writers, of deliberately trying to confuse His creature, man, of handing him a book of riddles and expecting him to make sense out of it!

It follows, then, that when I deny that Scripture is clear, at the same time I either deny that God really loves men as He says He does, or else I deny that He is almighty and all-wise. These are most serious charges against God. If I bring the latter charge, I accuse Him of being incapable of choosing those words and those combinations of words which would adequately convey His thoughts and His will to His creature, man, in man's own language, in words that man can understand. But just one among many similar clear passages of Scripture, the words of the angel Gabriel to Mary, tells us that such an accusation against God, that He is not almighty, is groundless and foolish: "For with God nothing shall be impossible." Luke 1,37.

A logical question at this point might be: is there anything that man is in need of hearing from God? And as we look about us in the world, as we feel the accusations of conscience, as our hearts are filled with fears and sorrows, and our bodies with sickness and pain, as we carry one another to our graves, and as we see all the many effects that sin has brought upon us, the answer is an emphatic "yes."

But right here, you see, if we deny Scripture's clarity, even though we are willing to grant that God is almighty and omniscient, we must of necessity, then, deny God's love. Is God's love toward His fallen creature, who must face not only temporal death, but who is under the curse of eternal death, not great enough so that He is willing to tell us of a remedy for sin, if there be such a remedy? And if He does love us enough to tell us, is His love still so inadequate that He is not willing to tell us what we need to know clearly and definitely? Does He leave us confused and uncertain? Does God really mean what He says in 1 Timothy 2,4: "God our Savior... will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth"? Or, with these words, is He building up our hopes and leading us on, only to let us flounder finally in doubt and uncertainty? Can God, in all love and concern, mean what He says here, that He desires all men to be saved and to come unto a knowledge (eis epignosin) of the truth, and yet at the same time put into our hands a book that will mislead and confuse? that will say at one and the same time, in the same words, two or more things that are not in harmony, whose meanings contradict and oppose one another, and thus lead to confusion and misunderstanding? No, any confusion and misunderstanding are always on the part of man, the hearer and the reader, and will be either deliberate, or unintentional and due to ignorance. But never is such confusion on the part of the almighty and loving God who speaks through Holy Scripture, who describes Himself as loving with an everlasting love, Jer. 31,3, and who "so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son." John 3, 16.

But not only is it a fallen world that God loves. We are assured by Scripture that God the Father dearly loves His Son. "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Matt. 17,5. It was a great price, then, that God paid to redeem the world when He sent this dear, beloved Son into humiliation and suffering and death. But to grant that Scripture is un-

clear is nothing else than to say that God really does not love His Son, that now God wants to deprive His Son of the fruits of His labor, that God is not concerned that a single precious soul should be directed to His Son in the plainest, simplest words. If God were unwilling or unable to give us a clear Scripture, then God's Son suffered and died in vain. But to anyone who believes that the Bible is God's Word, this is simply unthinkable... that God would want to strip His Son of all that that Son bought at such a great price by now telling men about their redemption and their justification in unclear and hard-to-understand words. Instead, we read the very opposite in John's 20th chapter: "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." v. 31.

That Scripture is clear the Bible not only says in clear passages, but implies in many more clear passages. Read, for instance, these verses in the 119th Psalm: "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path," v. 105. A lamp, to be effective, must not be unlit, or hooded, or flickering only faintly. It must shine brightly and clearly show the feet where to walk. "A lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path" is hardly a way to speak of a light that leads only into confusion, into ditches and detours. Or consider the 9th verse: "Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? by taking heed thereto according to thy word." This word, then, must make sense and speak clearly if it is to serve as a guide and say what a young man wants to know. "The entrance of thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding unto the simple," says the 130th verse. Again we are told the Word "giveth light." And could that Word be anything but clear if "it giveth understanding unto the simple"? Peter calls the written Word 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." 2 Pet. 1,19. Here there is strong insistence that the Word is clear. It is "a more sure word." "Ye do well that ye take heed" unto it. And again, it is "a light that shineth in a dark place," flooding hearts with the Day Star Himself, Jesus Christ. Paul reminds Timothy that "from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures (so clear that a child can make sense out of, can know, them!), which are able to make thee wise unto salvation (how can this be said of an unclear book?) through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable" for four things, "for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." 2 Tim. 3,15-16. But can anyone profit, can anyone gain, by reading a book that leaves him confused, that can not speak clearly regarding doctrine, reproof, correction, and righteousness? The passage, "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope," Rom. 15,4, testifies firmly that the written Scriptures are clear and understandable, able to instruct ("for our learning"), and able to lead hearts to an intelligible hope. When Paul catalogs the murmurings of the Israelites and then adds, "Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come," 1 Cor. 10, 11, again Scripture is clear, or else these "admonishings" fail of their purpose and are only muddled writings, and God, their Author, fails with them.

The passages in Scripture which urge men to read the Bible are sol-

id proof that these writings are clear and intelligible. Consider Jesus' "Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me." John 5,39. Or His words to the Emmaus disciples, "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken." Luke 24,25-27. Jesus held the Jews responsible for making sense out of what they read in Scripture. The only trouble was that they did not believe what they read. "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" John 5,46-47. Could James be speaking of an unclear Word, impossible to understand, when he tells believers, "Let every man be swift to hear," and when he invites them to "receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls"? James 1,18-21. Is there room for uncertainty, for doubt, for partial and incomplete knowledge (which is all that Scripture could supply if it were unclear!), when Luke says so clearly just the opposite? "It seemed good to me also... to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, That thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed." Luke 1,3-4. Scripture had to speak clearly in order to serve as a norm for the Bereans, who "searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so." Acts 17,11.

And so the list grows.

Scripture must be clear when God commands believers in so many places to use His Word as a weapon against false teachers and false teachings. "Take the sword of the Spirit," He says, "which is the word of God." Eph. 6,17. "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle." 2 Thess. 2,15. This Word must be clear, then, if it is capable of distinguishing truth from error, and deciding the issues in a controverted matter. This is borne out by 2 John 10: "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not... etc." Obviously, God holds us to some clear standard here by which we are to judge doctrine, whether it be that taught by Christ or not. And that Scripture is a clear-speaking Book is the certainty upon which rests the believer's obligation to judge in matters of doctrine and practice, as we are commanded to do in Romans 16,17; Matthew 7,15, etc. If we had no clear guide, or standard, to go by, these passages would have no meaning for us whatever.

That many passages are quoted here attesting directly or indirectly to Scripture's clarity does not mean that every single passage and word of Scripture is clear to us. Stated another way, there are many things in Scripture which are obscure and unclear, not because Scripture is unclear, but because the particular meaning of these passages and words is not clear to all men at all times. When David says that God's Word is a lamp unto his feet and a light unto his path, he is speaking of light on the way to salvation, as the Psalm shows. And when Paul commends Timothy for his knowledge of Holy Scriptures, even from childhood, he assures him that these Holy Scriptures are able to make him wise unto salvation. The Bible itself claims, then, and we teach on the basis of this claim, that this Book is clear in its instructions on the way of salvation, and that it presents these truths so simply that even a child can understand them. The comfort for us is this: if a passage of Scripture teaching a point of doctrine is obscure to you, somewhere else in Scripture, that same doctrine is set forth in passages that need no explanation whatever. Pieper puts it this way:

"To state it more fully, these obscure passages either do not pertain directly to the Christian doctrine, but give chronological, topographical, archaeological, etc., data, or, if they do pertain to doctrine, the same matter is elsewhere in Scripture set forth clearly and explicitly."
Vol. I, p. 324

In a paper treating of "The Properties of the Bible," delivered at the Oklahoma District Convention of the Missouri Synod in 1928, Professor George Schroedel writes regarding this same point:

"It is true that many, nay, most, of those parts of the Bible which are somewhat dark for us also deal with the truths of salvation in a rather direct way. But let us bear in mind that these passages were not written for us primarily and that they were perfectly clear and easily intelligible to those to whom they were originally addressed and who had need of them for their salvation. The Ceremonial Law, for instance, which forms a large portion of the Old Testament, with all its details of Levitical worship and of the Temple vessels used in this worship, was perfectly clear to the Jews, who had need of it as of a schoolmaster to bring them to Christ, while it is not equally clear to us. Thus it is also with many other passages, especially of the Old Testament, which are based on the customs and conditions of the Orient or on ceremonies, figures, and types of Old Testament worship. They were easily understood by those who lived under those conditions, were familiar with these customs, as well as with these ceremonies, figures, and types, and read these writings in their own mother tongue, while we can understand them only after much study, and some passages will remain dark for us, simply because we cannot put ourselves into possession of the facts on which they are based. Even the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is not so clea to us Gentile Christians, was a brilliant light of the first order for the Hebrews, to whom it was originally addressed and who were familiar with the high-priestly office of the Old Testament." Page 21.

Luther, too, shows that passages of Scripture that appear dark to the reader do not militate against Scripture's essential clarity:

"That indeed is true, some passages of Scripture are dark, but they contain nothing that is not found in other places in clear, open passages. And now come the heretics, explain the obscure passages according to their own mind, and contend with them against the clear passages, the foundation of our faith. Then the Fathers fought them with the clear passages, threw light with these on the dark passages, and showed that the dark passages taught the very same thing as the clear passages. Be assured and doubt not that there is nothing brighter than the sun, that is, the Scriptures. Even when a cloud has drifted before it, there is nothing else behind it than the same bright sun. Therefore, if you encounter an obscure passage in Scripture, do not doubt; it certainly contains the same truth which is elsewhere stated in clear language, and if you cannot understand the obscure, then stay with the clear." Pieper, I, 325.

But it is true, there are those for whom Scripture is unclear and hard to understand. And who are they? They fall into 3 groups: a) those to whom the language of Scripture is unknown, or at least unfamiliar; b) those who in their hearts are hostile toward Scripture; and c) those who are prejudiced toward certain Scripture doctrines.

Luther illustrates the first point by saying that a Turk's speech would most certainly be unclear to him (Luther), while a Turkish seven-year-old would easily understand what was said. The reason for Luther's difficulty is that he did not know the Turkish language. A person who does not understand English will certainly find the King James Version an unclear book. But regardless of what languages we have mastered, we must become accustomed to the peculiar language of the Bible itself, and that can be done only by diligently studying Scripture. Doctor Pieper tells us that "if we read the Bible as diligently as we read the newspaper, it would be clearer to us than the newspaper is, since the language of the Bible is the simpler of the two. But to one who reads a thousand words in the newspaper to ten in the Bible, the words of the Bible will appear more or less strange and obscure." Pieper, I, 321. And of particular interest to pastors will be Pieper's comment on the importance of familiarity with the Hebrew and Greek. "Whoever commands but a meager knowledge of these tongues will find the Scriptures more or less unintelligible." I, 321.

The second group of those for whom Scripture is unclear and hard to understand are those who are hostile toward Scripture, who want to sit in judgment over Scripture and criticize it from the high podium of their own ideas. But God has marvelously designed it that Scripture should be a dark Book to those who approach it with this lofty attitude. Such wise and prudent persons are the ones described in Jesus' prayer, "Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes." Matt. 11,25. The same proud minds, who look upon God's Word as unclear and even offensive, are described in 2 Cor. 4,3-4:"But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." And on this very point, that man's mind is eager to exalt itself above Scripture, Luther has a warning in his preface to the Old Testament: "I pray and warn every true Christian most earnestly that he may not be offended at the simple speech and narrative (of the Bible) with which he so often comes in contact. Let him never doubt the fact that the Scriptures set forth nothing but words, works, judgments, and deeds of the sovereign divine Majesty, Omnipotence, and Wisdom, no matter how ordinary they may seem to us. For this is the Word which brands all the wise and prudent as fools and is clear only to the humble and simple, as Christ declares, Matt. 11,25. For this reason put away your arrogance and presumption and regard Holy Scripture as the highest and holiest sanctuary, as the richest mine, which can never be fully exhausted, in order that you may learn that divine wisdom which God there sets forth so simply and plainly as to mortify all pride." St. L., XIV, 3f.

This arrogance and this presumption of which Luther warns are what causes Jesus to speak in parables in the Bible. The parables are not in the New Testament because God is deliberately trying to confuse His people. He is not speaking in riddles and unclear language when He uses parables. No, the unique value of Jesus' parables is that, in simple, understandable language, they make some Scriptural truth more clear to the believer, but have no value whatever for the person who has hardened himself against God's Word. Such hardened, arrogant hearts are the ones described by Jesus in Matt. 13,13ff.: "Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither

do they understand. And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive: For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them."

Two passages that are sometimes advanced against the clarity of Scripture (even, at times, by those who are not necessarily hostile toward all of Scripture) are the words of Paul in 1 Cor. 13,12, where he says, "For now we see through a glass, darkly," and Peter's remark concerning the writings of Paul, 2 Pet. 3,16, "In which are some things hard to be understood." Neither of these passages, however, speaks against Scripture's clearness.

The first, Paul's words, "For now we see through a glass, darkly," is not in any way saying that Scripture "keeps us in the dark," that Scripture in any way is inadequate for the purposes for which God intended it, and that, at the most, it gives only a clouded, dark, and not-so-clear picture of the way to salvation. No, instead, Paul is contrasting the "now" with the "then" that follows. The things we know about God and His works now, in this life, and which are presented in clear words to us in the pages of Scripture, are not to be compared with what we shall know then when we see God face to face in the life beyond. The light of revelation which we have in this world is here contrasted with the light of knowledge which we shall have in heaven. It is much like what you would know about Norway if you had never been there. You might have received very clear and very detailed letters from relatives in Norway describing the beautiful valleys and rock - walled fjords of that land. Yet you have seen Norway only "through a glass, darkly," if you have not with your own eyes gazed down into those valleys or gone by boat up a craggy fjord. Your relatives letters, however, remain clear and understandable. In the same way, our earthly knowledge of spiritual things and our still-to-be-gained heavenly knowledge of spiritual things, are not to be equated. Now we see through a glass, darkly, and many things are hidden from our understanding, many mysteries are unexplained. But then we shall see face to face and know everything, for God will show it to us. Yet, in the meanwhile, Scripture remains a clear Book, calling men to repentance and salvation.

When Peter writes that in the Epistles of Paul there "are some things hard to be understood," 2 Pet. 3,16, neither must this statement be taken as an indictment against Scripture's clarity. Notice that Peter speaks, not of statements, not of words or phrases, that are hard to be understood but of things hard to be understood. We read Christ's words, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Matt. 28, 19. The words are clear. We can see and understand what we are to do. We are to go out to all men, instruct them, and baptize them with water in the name of the Triune God. These words are clear And yet, who can understand the things themselves? Who can understand what the Trinity is? Who can fathom the miracle of baptism? Here, you see, presented in clear words, are things hard to be understood. And that is all Peter is saying of Paul's Epistles, where the context in Peter shows that he is speaking of things that are surely hard to understand, namely, the end and the final destruction of this world. But Peter is not

arguing here against the clarity of Paul's writings, and the passage can not be used in this way.

The third group of those for whom Scripture is dark and unclear are those who are prejudiced toward one or more doctrines of Scripture. To a mind preoccupied by error, the corresponding truth will certainly be dark and hidden, even though that truth is expressed in the simplest and clearest words. Was Christ not speaking clearly when He said to His disciples, "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished. For he shall be delivered unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked, and spitefully entreated, and spitted on: And they shall scourge him, and put him to death: and the third day he shall rise again."? Luke 18,31-33. And yet, what do we find in the very next verse? "And they understood none of these things: and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken." And why was this? It was because of a preconceived idea. It was because of that false notion, common to all Jewry in that day, and in which the disciples shared, that the coming Messiah should be a king of great and visible glory, who should rule over them and their enemies in worldly power and splendor. But the idea of their Master suffering and dying was something else again, and found no room in their hearts and minds.

Under this third point, that of being prejudiced toward certain doctrines of Scripture, we must bring in the Reformed attitude toward the Lord's Supper, the Baptist's insistence on immersion, the ELC's teaching of a double cause of election, and the denial by many Lutherans that God has justified all men, that the world, even the ungodly, stands guiltless before Him because of the merits and the death of Jesus Christ alone. All of these are the result of placing a preconceived idea, an invention of man's mind, over and above the clear, unmistakable words of Holy Scripture.

And I strongly feel that here, in this third grouping, we are getting close to the source of much of our present heartache in the Synodical Conference. Too many of man's ideas are taking precedence over the clear words of Scripture. Certain obsessions are running loose within our gates and are turning our camp upside down.

We have seen in recent years a remarkable increase in membership and in total number of congregations in our sister Missouri Synod. And we must be quick to recognize that this has not been without blessing, for in whatever new and far-flung corner God's Word has been truly taught, there the Holy Spirit has been at work, and souls have come into God's Kingdom. But this missionary expanse of Missouri, reflected not only in greater membership figures, but in greater synodical budgets, increased building on her campuses, greater enrollments at her colleges and seminaries, work in new foreign fields, etc., has helped to give impetus to a steamroller that is now wildly running downhill without a driver in our Synodical Conference. Make no mistake! There are "drivers," but they seem intent only on building up more steam, and carefully avoiding any semblance of trying to bring the machine under control. What is this steamroller? It is the unionistic practice of the Missouri Synod, contrary to clear passages of Scripture, against which we have contended, and quite unsuccessfully, during all these years. Amid the expansion and reaching out of true mission work, there is also a zealous reaching out into areas where God has forbidden us to have dealings.

There is an impatience on the part of many in the Missouri Synod to reach out and embrace those whom God has told us to avoid, those whom we know to be persistent false teachers. And this very impatience is what has resulted in a weak "Common Confession," in cooperation in "externals" that are admittedly not externals, in joint prayers, in approval of Scouting, and similar examples. That this impatience, and thus the offenses flowing out of it, stems from only a part of the synod, from certain officials, pastors, and lay leaders, does not relieve the synod as a whole of its responsibilities to cleanse itself. And here, then, is the preconceived notion, the error with which a great part of Missouri is preoccupied, which has plunged clear passages of Scripture into darkness, namely, this willingness to worship together with, and enter into acts of cooperation and fellowship with, false teachers from whom God has told us to separate. Scripture speaks plainly and tells us to avoid such alliances. Our objections to such acts are met by arguments and reasonings and new terminologies, all of which are designed to excuse and defend those acts. But clearly, the desires and intents of men are being placed above the plain directives of our Lord. I can not help but think of what a Missouri pastor said who was preparing to address, on the basis of a Scriptural text, a banquet of ELC, ULC, Augustana, and Free Church men's clubs. In defense of his actions, he said this, in essence: "What difference does it make? In a few years we'll all be together anyhow." That pastor is today in a responsible position training young men of the Missouri Synod to be pastors.

To what conclusions, then, regarding Scripture's clarity can we come?

The Bible itself persuades us that as we read and study and become familiar with its pages, we are not laboring in a wilderness. That truth that God would have all men know in order that they might be saved is told us in clear, easy-to-understand statements. God has the power and He has the wisdom to express this truth unto us in words that we can grasp and, through the working of God the Holy Spirit, believe. In His clear Law He tells us of our sins and of our lost condition. Through His clear Gospel He tells us of His abounding grace and mercy which led Him to send His own Son to be our Substitute Holy One and Sufferer. Until the return of our Savior Himself, Satan will ever try to becloud this clear Word of sin and grace.

But even as God has told us of our salvation in clear words, so also our God has told us clearly how we are to guard against losing that salvation. A clear Scripture, which tells us all that we must know in order to detect and defend against error, is the weapon we are to use in all matters of controversy and false teachings

And when we find the going difficult, when simply clinging to this clear Word brings us into strife and opposition, we are to flee into this Word as into a fortress, and take shelter there. We are to find strength and new courage in the clear directives of our Savior Himself as to what stand we are to take and what heights we are to defend. We must not fail to refresh our hearts with the many clear promises God has made to those who continue in His Word, who are faithful unto death, who hear the Word of God and keep it.

Let us not succumb, then, to this poisonous cloud that Satan is wafting over our Synodical Conference. It is certainly true, as each one of us feels, there is a great temptation to listen to

those who tell us that this passage no longer applies, and that passage no longer applies. We begin to wring our hands and look askance at a Luther and a Walther and a Pieper and a Koren. Scripture was not as clear in their day as it is in this enlightened day of ours!

No, the Bible God has preserved unto us is clear. It speaks as clearly to a modern-day Timothy, to a child who can read, as it does to a seminary professor or a synod president. It tells us to contend against error in a spirit of tender love and true concern for the souls of men. This we are to do with patience and firmness, paradoxical though that may sound. But when we are persuaded that errorists no longer are willing to listen to the truth, a clear Scripture tells us, in unmistakable terms, what we are to do. A child can understand the clear words. We are to separate, withdraw ourselves, avoid them.

I feel that two paragraphs from Dr. Ylvisaker's paper to the synod on this same subjecttin 1938 are a fitting close:

"Do we need comfort today as a Synod? Is there any one here who questions our right to exist? Do we go wondering whether the price we pay is not too great for what seems to be nothing but a never ending struggle against misunderstanding, defeat, and the many difficulties we seem to have as a Church? Then go back to that same clear Word and ask yourself as in the sight of God: What else can we do? Where shall we go but after Him Who has said: Follow Me? Each day we may and should examine our faith and confession as a whole and in those points which separate us from former brethren; and each examination will show that the clear words of Scripture are there to assure us again that, if we would be found faithful, only one course lies before us."

"Here, in the clear Word of the Spirit of God, we find our sure comfort as a Synod to this day. Our public teaching and our private profession and faith remain that of the clear Word. And pray God for our Synod that this may continue to be the case! Pray God that our pastors may ever more fervently and zealously declare this full Gospel of Christ, and that our members may abide by this faith, ready to give their all that it may be preserved inviolate and delivered to our children as a sacred trust! Against every temptation to deviate from that Word and that Gospel, either as a Synod or as individuals, let us gain the victory over the mighty onslaught of Satan and his "Yea, hath God said" by a faithful appeal to the "It is written" of our blessed Savior, Christ Jesus, the eternal Truth, the Light of the World!"

AMEN

FROM THE CHRISTIAN DAY SCHOOL BOARD . .

"The Christian Day School Board requests that you print in the Clergy Bulletin the announcement that any Christian Day School making a subsidy request this year have that request in the hands of Rev. Paul Petersen by May 1st. - Would you also mention that Paul Petersen is our school superintendent? Thank you,

Carl Annexstad."

Ed: Sure will. 'Tis done. And you're welcome.

FROM NIGERIA

A recent letter from Missionary Gerhart Becker has the information that Gerhart, Cay, and son, Mark (Born Dec. 20, 1955) will leave Nigeria August 3rd on furlough. That is a change from earlier reported plans to leave Nigeria on March 7.

In Memoriam

EMIL HANSEN was born at Twin Valley, Minn., April 26th, 1880, of parents Osten Hansen and wife, Matthea, nee Lerud. He was grafted into Christ in early infancy through Holy Baptism administered by the Rev. A.K. Sagen, and was confirmed at Wild Rice Lutheran Church by the Rev. Hans Johnson. After having attended Park Region Luther College at Fergus Falls, Minn., for a year, he entered Luther College at Decorah, Iowa, and graduated in 1903. He took his three years of Seminary training at Luther Seminary, Hamline, Minn., graduating in 1906. Upon a call from the Home Mission Department of the Norwegian Synod to serve at Warren, Minn., and vicinity, he was ordained on June 24th, 1906, at the Synod Convention at Pelican Rapids, Minn. During the 43 years of his ministry he served parishes at Forest City and Scarville, Iowa, Mayville, N.Dak., Bygland, Minn., Albert Lea, Minn., and Volga, S.Dak. Due to ailing health he retired from the ministry in April, 1949, and moved to Sioux Falls, S.Dak., where he resided till the time of his death. He passed away in faith in his Savious on Friday, March 16, 1956. He is survived by his widow, the former Miss Annette Anderson, whom he married on Sept. 16, 1908, and by one son, Clarence, of Windom, Minn. He is survived also by 4 brothers and 1 sister, his parents and 2 brothers having preceded him in death.

Rev. Hansen was known as a true and able preacher of God's grace in Christ Jesus and a conscientious minister of his Lord and His Word. He saw the error in the doctrinal basis of the union of the Norwegian Lutheran churches in America of 1917, and for that reason refused to enter that union. He was along in reorganizing the Norwegian Synod at Lime Creek, Iowa, in 1918, and continued in membership in that Synod the rest of his life, having served in various positions of trust as Chairman of the Pastoral Conference and as a member of the Home Mission Board. As a member of the Home Mission Board he was instrumental in founding the present Bethel Lutheran Church in Sioux Falls, S.Dak., in 1941.

Funeral Services were held on Tuesday, March 20, at Bethel Lutheran Church in Sioux Falls, Rev. T. N. Teigen delivering the sermon on the basis of 2 Tim. 4, 6-8. Rev. J.A.O. Preus of Luverne, Minn., spoke on behalf of the Synod. Among those who attended the funeral were a host of former parishioners from Albert Lea, Minn., Scarville, Iowa, and Volga, S.Dak., and 9 brother pastors.

"PRECIOUS IN THE SIGHT OF THE LORD IS THE DEATH OF HIS SAINTS." Ps. 116,15.

A fifth child was born into the Juul Madson home in Tacoma, Washington. Further information is lacking at this writing, except that it was born on Christmas Eve.

This issue of the "Clergy Bulletin" is published by the Southwestern Minnesota pastoral conference of the Norwegian Synod. Editor: Rev. T.N. Teigen, 917 So. Grange Ave., Sioux Falls, S. Dak. Subscription price per year is $1.50.

A JOHANN GERHARD SERMON - 1612

Herewith translated as Exhibit No. 1 to show the kind of preaching to the people that was done by the 17th Century theologians, to serve as part of an essay on the subject for the General Pastoral Conference, Easter Week, 1956, Mankato.

Text: John 20:19-29 - First Sunday after Easter.

We read in Genesis 2 that the creation of man proceeded in this way: that God the Lord Himself upon previous decision "formed man out of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life," and so "man became a living soul." In the holy language it properly reads: He breathed into him the spirit of life; thru which it is shown that man was created not only for this temporal but to an eternal life. For thru this breathing upon of God the Creator, man is made in the image of God, received a holy pure and unspotted soul, which controls and preserves the human body, its domicile, not only for the earthly but also for the heavenly, eternal life.

But since thru the Fall the image of God in man is lost, so that the soul is no longer holy, pure and unspotted, but rather unholy and corrupted by sin in all its powers: it was necessary, if we should again be helped, that the Son of God should be sent as Mediator, and thru His suffering, dying and resurrection gain again the lost treasures for mankind and renew again the image of God. This has come to pass by the great, unfathomable goodness of God. Therefore, when Christ had finished His work of redemption and after His suffering and death was risen from the grave, He instituted the honorable ministry of the Word, that thereby the fruit of His death and resurrection may be passed out to mankind.

This institution of the ministry of the Word is of such a nature that the Lord Christ after His resurrection breathed upon His holy apostles and by this inbreathing gave them the Holy Ghost, to signify: He would henceforth use their service that thru their office the lost image of God in man might be restored and renewed.

He would actually say this: As I in the beginning of time in the first creation with the Father and the Holy Spirit breathed upon the first Adam and thereby created him in the image of God and to eternal life, that he became God's dear child and a temple of the Holy Spirit, even so I now breath upon you again, after the redemption, which is like a second creation, now completed. Thru such breathing upon I give to you the Holy Ghost, that not only for your person you should be God's dear children, temples of the Holy Ghost and heirs of eternal life, but that you might also thru the Word in the power of the Holy Spirit convert men to God, that they thru faith are renewed again to become the children of God, the image of God and heirs of eternal life by the Holy Spirit.

St. Paul, 1 Cor. 15:45, points to this comparison: "The first Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit," that is, as we from Adam have the natural life, so we from Christ have the spiritual life.

This history, namely how Christ after His resurrection revealed Himself to His disciples, and by breathing upon them the Holy Ghost gave them the Holy Ghost and put them into the honorable ministry of the Word - this history is reported in the first part of the Gospel, which we will explain in two parts:

And first deal with the appearance of Christ.

Thereafter of the institution of the Ministry of the Word.

The history of Thomas belongs to another time. May God now give us His grace, Amen.

In the description of the appearance of Christ, in what manner the Lord Christ after His resurrection showed Himself alive to His disciples, the Evangelist thinks first of the time, when it happened, namely on Easter Day towards evening.

That day was Sunday and is still named Sabbath in the manner of the holy language, which to the honor of the great Sabbath all days of the week in their

order are called. Early in the morning the Lord Christ was arisen and on the same day showed Himself alive to Mary Magdalene, the other women who went to the grave, the apostle Peter and the two disciples who went to Emmaus. After such separate appearances He would show Himself to all His disciples together, foreordained witnesses of His resurrection, which He delayed until towards evening. He wanted to test their faith beforehand, whether they also would believe other witnesses who had seen Him alive.

As He at the beginning of time in the cool of the day came to the first parents and revealed to them the Promise of the Seed of the Woman, that He would bruise the head of the serpent, so He comes here now towards evening to His disciples, brings them the tidings, that now thru His resurrection He had bruised the head of the hellish serpent and gained the true peace, also made everything good again which by the Fall was corrupted.

Further, the Lord Christ would show thereby that He in every need, when the light of comfort dims but especially in the evening of life in the hour of death, wants to be with us according to His promise, Ps. 91:15: "I will be with him in trouble"; Ps. 23:4: "Yea, tho I walk thru the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me." And then He wants to show His holy wounds, that we in true faith may include ourselves in them and find in them healing for the wounds in our souls.

Thereafter the Evangelist describes the wonderful manner and way in which the Lord Christ came to His disciples and says: "When the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst of them."

This is very wonderful and supernatural. The disciples had locked in and secured themselves with many doors, that they might not suddenly be fallen upon and destroyed by the Jews. But no door, no lock, no bolt could hinder Christ. He came thru locked doors and stood suddenly among the disciples.

Now we see that Christ with His glorified body can do more than we can with our vile, mortal and weak bodies. Therefore it is great folly, if one will not accede more to Christ's body than we to our bodies. He arose thru the sealed grave, thru locked doors He came to His disciples, thru the heavens He ascended and sat down on the right hand of God. Therefore, what He promises to accomplish in and with His body, this we should not doubt that He can do it.

The Lord of nature is not subject to the laws of nature; the glorified body of Christ is not subject to the weaknesses of natural life; the human nature exalted to the right hand of God is not subject to the natural attributes of our bodies.

Also that Christ now stepped into their midst, with that He showed Himself to be the right Mediator, who has stepped in between the angry God and the human generation, and thru the resurrection has reconciled us to God.

Also He would signify thereby that they should receive all His heavenly gifts. No one should have any advantage over another, but He should be the Mediator for Peter, who more than others sinned grossly, as well as for the other disciples.

Thirdly, the Evangelist reports what the Lord Christ in this appearance said to His disciples: "Peace be with you," He says. And, according to the holy language, thru the word "peace" everything good is to be understood for body and soul.

But it is therewith signified that thru His resurrection Christ gained the right peace, as the Prince of Peace, Is. 9:6. He has with His blood quenched the flame of divine wrath, that, when we with true faith hold to Him, "we have peace with God," Rom. 5:1, that He henceforth has "thoughts of peace" toward us, Jer. 29:11.

When the foe is conquered, peace follows, so: because Christ thru His death and resurrection conquered the devil with all his power, therefore He proclaims peace to His disciples. "The God of peace," says the Epistle to the Hebrews,

ch. 13:20, "who brot again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, thru the blood of the everlasting covenant." That is, because the heavenly Father led His Son with great honor and glory out of the grave, this is announcement that He thru His propitiation is fully satisfied and that the human generation is reconciled with Him.

Also because Christ wanted to give His apostles the ministry, therefore He first proclaims peace to them. For the ministry is such an office that "hath given us the ministry of reconciliation," 2 Cor. 5:18. If Christ had not died and risen again, this peace thru Christ would not be founded; then the office, which preaches reconciliation, could not be established. The one follows out of the other.

Fourthly, the Evangelist thinks of this, what Christ has done, namely: He showed them His hands and His side, that is, He showed them the print of the nails in His hands and feet, and also His open side, as we learn from the following history of Thomas. Thru this their faith was to become more sure that Christ with His body in which He was wounded is indeed arisen.

On this the old church teachers have fine thots, with which Dr. Luther is not displeased. And they write almost unanimously that Christ not only showed the scars of His wounds to the disciples then, but kept them also in His Ascension and will keep them in eternity in His holy body. He says to Thomas after His resurrection: "Reach hither thy finger, and behold My hands; and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into My side." Out of this it is sufficiently shown that Christ after His resurrection kept the scars of His wounds in His holy body. For this is not swindle or sham, but was the truth.

Considering the Ascension of Christ, it is said by the Prophet Zechariah, 13:6: "What are these wounds in Thine hands?" Then He will say: "Those with which I was wounded in the house of My friends." This the old teachers explain that it is a conversation of the angels and patriarchs with Christ in His Ascension, in which conversation He testifies that He suffered such wounds for the sake of the believers, who love Him.

Is. 49:16 the Lord God says that He has graven us upon the palms of His hands. From this they conclude again that Christ in His state of exaltation, in heaven, still has the woundmarks.

Matt. 24:30 we read: On the Last Day "shall appear the sign of the Son of man." They will see the Son of God with the signs of the wounds showing.

Since we also will see this in eternal life, which we have believed on earth, 1 Cor. 13:12, several want to conclude from this that we also in eternal life will see the sign of the wounds, wherewith we were redeemed, on the body of Christ.

But herewith this is to be noted, that these things are not to be defended as articles of faith, because for this there is no expressly clear testimony of Scripture, but is rather a likely conclusion. Then also, because it is held that Christ will on the Last Day and in eternal life show the sign of the wounds, it is necessary to add that it must not be so as tho He could not remove them. Also: He does not keep them as weaknesses, not to shame or dishonor, much less as pains, but out of free will, to glory and honor. For this the old teachers have the following reasons:

1. Herewith Christ substantiated His resurrection to His disciples. For their understanding it was altogether impossible that Christ should be risen with the same body in which He suffered. Therefore Christ shows them the nailmarks, that thereby they should be strengthened in their faith.

2. For our comfort, that we might be sure that God will never forget us, because we are graven upon His hands, Is. 49:16. The wells of salvation are yet daily open, Zec. 13:1. He pours forth, so to speak, Christ's blood still daily our of His wounds upon trembling hearts. The door of grace and the portals of life are still open. Christ, as it were,

daily still shows His wounds to His heavenly Father and pleads in the power of them for us poor sinners. Out of Christ's wounds the flame of His love even now still shines forth. His wounds still stand open, that our souls as hunted doves might find refuge therein, Song of Sol. 2:14. His wounds also are a remembrance before the eyes of God, Mal. 3:16.

3. For a sign of His victory, which Christ maintains against the devil and all His power. For as otherwise a courageous hero of war has honor in his wounds and scars, so the sign of the wounds of Christ are like a continued witness that He has valiantly overcome the devil,

Is it not so: When a bridegroom has fought unto death for his betrothed, then such wounds and scars will not deform him in the eyes of his betrothed, but rather make him more beloved - so also the scars of Christ are to be considered a sign of victory and of His love, for out of love He went to battle for us against Satan.

Therefore the dear old teachers explain the passage, Zech. 12:10, which is repeated John 19:37 and Rev. 1:7, "They shall look on Him whom they pierced," so: that Satan and all the godless, impenitent will look with great terror in the Day of Judgment on the signs of the wounds of Christ - he therefore because by those wounds he was overcome, the others therefore because they could by true contrition and faith have included themselves in those wounds but they nevertheless wilfully neglected the time of grace to do so.

4. Finally, for the eternal joy of the elect, who will in eternity behold those scars of Christ with unspeakable joy as things that have more light than the rays of the sun, and will have a constant remembrance of their redemption before their eyes.

If the pious Emporer Constantine kissed the scars of the martyrs who were wounded for the sake of Christ, how much more will not the scars of Christ be looked upon by the elect with great joy. There constantly beholding Christ will

work unspeakable joy in the heart of each of the elect, that he will say: Now I see with my eyes how dearly I was redeemed by the Lord, unto Him be praise and thanksgiving in all eternity.

This is all the fourth part, which in the description of the appearance of Christ the Evangelist sets before us, namely, what Christ did, how He showed His hands and His side to His disciples.

Thereupon follows fifthly, what then followed for the disciples, namely that they were glad. Before this they were worried about their Lord, that He had been so miserably crucified. But now, when they saw Him alive after His resurrection, all sorrow and sadness disappears. From this it can easily be understood what great joy will arise when Christ in eternal joy and glory will show Himself to us. Then shall be fulfilled what He says, John 16:22: "But I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice," etc. There our spirit will again revive when we shall see this heavenly Joseph in the glory of His kingdom, Gen. 45:27.

When now the Lord Christ after His resurrection showed Himself alive to His disciples, He gives to them the ministry of the Word. He does it in this manner that He first and once more repeats His wishes of peace and says, "Peace be unto you," to show that He wants to give them the right peace of heart, also commission them with the ministry of reconciliation. For Christ's wish is an effective means, whereby at once together that is given which He wishes to someone.

Secondly, He says: "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you"; which is not to be understood of the works of the Mediator, since they solely and alone belong to Christ: it is to be understood of the office of teaching. And the Lord wants to say this: As My Father sent Me to teach and to preach, so I will now give to you this office, that you as ambassadors in God's stead shall henceforth carry on this work.

As I was sent by My heavenly Father and did not come by Myself, so I send you; I place you into this high, honor-

able ministry of teaching, to continue it in My name.

As I was sent by My Father, not to claim an earthly lordship, but to preach good tidings "to the meek," Is. 61:1, and indeed not mine but the teaching of the heavenly Father, John 14:19: so I send you, not that you should claim an earthly lordship, but that you should teach and preach not human dreams but the doctrine of My heavenly Father. I will put My words into your mouth that you might speak them to others.

And tho in such office you will meet with many disagreeable things, toil and persecution, as it was with Me in My work, yet you should be certain that the heavenly Father thru His Holy Spirit will dwell with you, and will thru your words be effective in the hearts of men - even as I was not alone, but My Father was ever with Me.

This is the institution of the ministry of the Word. This should freely be held high among us, that we esteem the holy apostles and all their true successors, true teachers and preachers, as God's ambassadors, "as ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God," 1 Cor. 4:1,"as ambassadors for Christ," 2 Cor. 5:20. But in the world we see the contrary.

How hard David reproves it, that his messengers were ridiculed; should then God let it go unpunished when He legates, thru whom He proclaims peace to us, are ridiculed and despised?

But that now after His resurrection the Lord Christ commissions the apostles in the ministry of the Word, thereby it is shown that this also is a fruit of Christ's resurrection, that for us in the Word of God grace and forgiveness of sins is presented, Ps. 68:13: "And at home divided the spoil," after Christ by His resurrection conquered Satan. Therefore thru the ministry of the Word the fruit of that victory is divided, Luke 24:46: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name."

Thirdly, because the ministry of the Word is"the office of the Spirit," 2 Cor. 3:6, and without the power of the Spirit cannot be carried on fruitfully, so Christ thereupon breathes on His disciples and says: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Not as tho the Holy Ghost were a bodily breath, but because the Lord wanted to use this external symbol and means, thereby to give the Holy Ghost to the apostles. Christ also herewith wanted to fulfill the foretype, Num. 4:16-17. /?/ For as there God the Lord came down to Moses and takes His Spirit and lays it upon the seventy elders among the people, that they might with him bear the burden of the people, so the Holy Spirit rests upon Christ, Is. 61:1. He did not receive the Spirit "by measure," John 3:34. Therefore He divides of His fulness also to the apostles, and thru this makes them able to work in the office of the Spirit. From Him as the Head flows the anointing of the Spirit upon the members.

But that Christ just now wanted to use this breathing upon or blowing upon for that purpose, that He gives His disciples the Holy Ghost, that is, the gifts of the Spirit, which they needed for the ministry - this took place for the following reasons.

For one thing, it is thereby signified that the Holy Ghost proceeds not only from the Father but also from the Son, in His eternal going forth. For as He is called "the Breath of the Almighty," Job 33:4, and the "Breath of His mouth," Ps. 33:6, because He from eternity in unfathomable manner proceeds from Him, so He is also called "the Spirit of His," the mouth of Christ, 2 Thess. 2:8, "the Breath of His lips," Is. 11:4, likewise because He from eternity proceeds from Him, as such teaching is taken by Augustine from this text.

According to this we are also referred back to Gen. 2:7, when God the Lord in the first creation thru breathing upon gave to man"a living soul," of which was spoken at the beginning of this sermon.

Further, Christ in John 3:8 makes a comparison between the wind and the Holy Spirit: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof;

but canst not tell when it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is everyone that is born of the Spirit." And thereafter the Holy Spirit came upon the apostles in gentle, motionless sound, Acts 2:2.

It all points to this, that a comparison exists between the effect of the breath or wind and the work of the Holy Spirit, which could be discussed at great length.

Fourthly and lastly, after the Lord Christ gave the Holy Spirit to the apostles, He gives them also the keys of the kingdom and says to them: "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." With which words the Lord Christ makes His apostles stewards of the precious blessings which He thru His suffering and resurrection has won.

The church of Christ is "God's house," 1 Tim. 3:15. In it Christ is the Lord, Hebr. 3:3,6. All the members of the household are Christians. In this house Christ has stored all treasures and blessings which He was won, and placed the apostles over them, as also all faithful teachers and preachers, as stewards. He has given them the keys, that they should open up for the penitent and distribute to them these blessings. On the other hand, they close up against the impenitent; for them they cleanly and altogether cut off these blessings. And so in all matters they deal according to God's order and command when they handle the precious blessings of this spiritual house.

Also, when the apostles and all faithful teachers in this manner, according to God's order, open and close, forgive and retain sins, this should be valid before God in heaven, be it done generally or in particular.

Blessed are those teachers who do not let the keys get rusty but use them according to the divine institution. Blessed are those hearers who accept the word of the preacher as God's Word. God grant this to us all thru Christ His Son. Amen.

❁ ❁

N o t e s

The above translation is in some places quite literal. It was the easiest way for me to get this work done The purpose is to offer an example of 17th century preaching.

Since Gerhard is one of the best of the old orthodox theologians, no more will be offered of his sermonic writings as the above. At the time of the pastoral conference, excerpts should be ready from the sermons of other men, also from sermons by Scriver and Spener. - Geo. Schweikert, Okabena, Minnesota. Feb. 27, 1956.

CLERGY BULLETIN

Published monthly by Authority of the General Pastoral Conference of the Norwegian Synod of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church.

Vol. XV, No. 9. May, 1956

EVALUATION of the HOMILETICAL PRODUCTIONS of the 17th CENTURY THEOLOGIANS

(Conference Essay)

By Rev. George Schweikert

The purpose of this essay is to evaluate the sermons of the 17th century theologians, preachers. In order to do so thoroughly, we might first of all need a standard by which to judge their sermons: in respect to homiletic form, the kind of congregations which heard the sermons, prevailing attacks against sound doctrine and the kind of men who did the preaching.

1. Homiletic Form.

As far as homiletic form is concerned, there is a complaint against some preachers of this age, such as this: "But of course this new-scholastic sermon form with its monstrous architecture and artificiality more often serves the vanity of the homiletic technician than the true edification of the congregation." Herzog-Plitt, Vol. 18, p. 532. (Note: This and following quotations are translations when taken from this encyclopedia.) One example used to prove the foregoing quotation is this: "When, e.g., the arch-virtuoso in the outline method J. B. Carpzov the Older in his 50-year ministry preached fifty times on the same text, and yet always wanted to produce something new, what was then left excepting to compose variations differing from the previous outlines?" ib. p. 532.

No doubt some of this is factual and may to a great extent be fair judgment, but I don't believe this encyclopedist was sympathetic. In any case where one man is not sympathetic with another man, there is usually misjudgment going so far that it may be false judgment. In other words, the Herzog-Plitt encyclopedia is not always fair in evaluating the preaching of the 17th century Lutherans even in the matter of sermonic form.

The outline of a sermon need not always be according to a simple analysis of the text, practically going from the first verse to the next and so to the end. The good preacher studies the text and then considers how best to present its intended sense. I suppose that when the Old Standard Gospels and Epistles were selected, or when any other series was selected, or when a preacher freely picks a text for himself, or when a man used a whole Biblical book to produce a series of sermons: the choices were not or are not made in view of how a number of verses will fit this or that homiletic form. The external form of a sermon is secondary in any case.

2. The 17th Century Hearers.

We may assume that the kind of congregations which heard the sermons preserved for us in books were at least as literate as Americans are now, or the people now in Germany, the Scandinavian countries and England. That is, in matters of reading and writing in religious matters, the people then were fairly well schooled.

I assume that the Roman Catholics with their Latin writings were always the chief opponents of the Lutherans during the Age of Orthodoxy. Latin was the general language of that time for religious writings. When therefore some Lutheran preachers used Latin in their German sermons - words, phrases, quotations - the effect on the people then was not as it would be today.

Greek words were used in the sermons. My guess is that few people then objected to this and said: He's trying to show off.

The use of mixed languages in sermons may under many conditions be properly criticized. However, it may well be that most of the preaching in those days was simple German, without mixing in foreign words and phrases or quotations.

In Herzog-Plitt 18:533 we also read: "At the same time, when evaluating scholastic sermonizing, a distinction must be made between city and country preaching. The printed sermons which have come down to us are city sermons. That some country preachers could not even raise themselves to the synthetic sermon outline is shown by a Holstein Synod decree of 1691. It says that preachers who are not able to use the thematic method, but often mix the hundreds into the thousands, are encouraged simply to use the paraphrastic method of exposition. Already the use of the Low-German in many village pulpits in the low countries of Germany prevented the rise of any great art and rhetoric there. (See Tholuck ...)"

3. Polemics.

Dr. Robert Preus end the preface of his book on "The Inspiration of Scripture ... 17th Century Lutheran Dogmaticians" with these words: "It is not easy to misunderstand the dogmaticians unless one is completely out of sympathy with them. It is worth remembering that the scholastic method was to some extent thrust upon the Lutheran dogmaticians of the seventeenth century. Tholuck has pointed out that a scholastic method was first used by the Wittenburg theologians in an effort to fight the Jesuits with their own weapons."

Before going on, also this might well be quoted from the same book preface by Pastor Preus:

"The seventeenth century has too often been brushed aside by historians as a period of dead orthodoxy in the Lutheran Church, altho a cursory study of the era will reveal a genuine Christian piety expressing itself in a wealth of devotional literature and in hymns which are some of the finest ever brought forth in the Lutheran Church." (See appendix to this present essay.)

"The bitterness and misery of that century in which Europe experienced only seven years of peace, the imminent threat to orthodox Lutheranism from Catholicism and Calvinism without and syncretism within, the fact that bitter invective was the rule in all controversial issues, the fact that abhorence, hatred and intolerance of false doctrine, all of which seems so strange now, was a guiding principle then, all these important facts have been too often by-passed by Church historians, and thus the possibility of appreciating the thinking, motives and desires of these dogmaticians has been all but destroyed. But why such almost universal disapproval of these men by posterity? The answer to this question may be found partly in their stubborn, unrelenting assaults on Romanism, Calvinism, unionism and everything not strictly Lutheran." p. vi.

Because of the usual picture we get of the 17th century dogmaticians, the question is asked: What kind of preaching to the people was done then? Did the preachers then, especially the leading theologians, burden their congregations of laymen with excessive polemics in the sermon? This question is perhaps the main one which caused the request for this present essay. Your may read such blasts as the following, Herzog-Plitt 18: 534:

"The Sermon of the Polemic, Confessional Dogmatism.

"Here the pulpit is noisy increasingly with aggression of theological hypercriticism against the old heretics as against the new Calixtians, Syncretists, Majorists, Synergists, Adiaphorists, Antinomists, Crypto-Calvinists, Osiandrists, Flacians, Weigelians, Arminians, and others, more and more with time as the university development of this sermon almost wholly becomes scholastic-polemical. The 'pure doctrine' is furiously defended with painstaking acrimony against every proper improvement. Instead of evangelical, edifying faith and heart nourishment, the people get theological erudition and offensive scholastic wrangling, sermons interlarded with Latin,

Greek and Hebrew quotations as spiritual food, even also as casual occasions. And this mostly in dry, scholastic form and exposition, in which usually the introduction consisted of grammatical discussion of the text, the title headings in Latin, themes and subdivisions grouped according to heresies, and the practical application in unworkable polemics.

"So the sermons of one Pastor Andeae in Erlangen ed. 1568, each of which had four subdivisions: 1. Difference between the Lutherans and the Papists; 2. The Church of Christ and the Zwinglians; 3. Against the Schwenkfeldians; 4. Against the Anabaptists."

How unfair this characterization may be I do not know because I have not read many sermons in many books. To come to any scholarly conclusions in the matter which would cover all the extant books available from that age, 1550 to 1700, would of course require several years of study for any common pastor.

(Note: Herewith supplied for those attending this conference are one sermon by Gerhard and parts and exerpts and outlines, in translation, by Spener, Dannhauer and Hunnius, including various notes, some quoted, one on Carpzov the Younger.)

In 1685 Spener declared in a very good sermon that the Papacy was increasing its power over people. He preached against the pope as the Antichrist, as you may see from the part of this sermon supplied herewith in mimeographed form. - Rome is always ready to strike. It is always ready to spread its errors - work-righteousness, priest-rule, superstition. But let me first quote from "The Expositor Preacher," CPH 1920, by Theo. Graebner, p. 76:

II. The Polemical Element.

Every preacher has occasion to defend the truth of Scripture against error. Polemical preaching is commanded by Scripture, and has the example of the prophets and apostles and of the Lord Himself. The Following general rules apply:-

1) The congregation must be well grounded in doctrine before it can weigh and appreciate the arguments against error.

2) Those errors should be reproved which constitute a peril to the local congregation; however -

3) The fundamental errors of Rome (work-righteousness, priest-rule, superstition) and of the Reformed sects (work of the Spirit without the means of grace, Sacraments, Church and State, legalism) should be treated as often as the text suggests such antithesis.

4) The preacher should be the master of his subject, and should employ only such arguments as the average mind can grasp.

5) Polemics, except as under No. 3, should be omitted when preaching in another's parish."

My evaluation of 17th century preaching, according to the actual sermons I have read so far, is that it generally had as much polemics in it as was necessary.

4. The Kind of Preachers.

What kind of men were the 17th century preachers? They were scholars. It may be that in their dogmatic writings they sometimes over-defined points. On this you may read the book of Dr. Robert Preus on "The Inspiration of Scripture," and form your own opinion. Reading the exhibits supplied with this essay will show you that their purpose in preaching was surely to preach the Scriptures. As far as their Dogmatics as such are concerned, Heinrich Schmid (translated by Hay and Jacobs, ULC), Hoenecke and Pieper certainly honor them, If their sermons did not produce the kind of faith and life we look for, it is likely that other conditions were to blame. They tried their best, which was very good, as you may see from the exhibits given you herewith, various features of which we shall presently look at by oral reference thereto.

Lutheran Cyclopedia, Jacobs and Haas, Scribners, 1899, under "Homiletic Literature" by Rev. Hugo W. Hoffmann, p. 228:

"HOMILETICS OF THE PERIOD OF ORTHODOXY (1580-1700). The sermons of the latter part of the sixteenth and of the

seventeenth centuries show a degeneration in that many laid too much stress upon a faith as expressed in a concise formula, and produced sermons, however correct they may have been in the learned presentation of dogma, yet were harsh and cold, and proved incapable of awakening a warm spiritual life. Toward the end of the seventeenth century the so-called 'emblematic' form of sermons appears, in which the theme and divisions are presented under frequently too striking emblems, symbols, and illustrations. But besides the dry scholastic or extravagant emblematic productions, there are found most edifying Biblical sermons, though sometimes inclined to be mystical."

Hoffmann then presents a list of preachers in three groups: 1. "Polemical scholastic sermons"; 2. "Emblematic preachers"; 3. "Orthodox, practical, edifying."

Hoffmann places Dannhauer in the first group, and Hunnius and Gerhard in the third group. He does not list Spener. Evidently he counted him as in a class by himself, altho Spener lived and worked in this period and was prominent as a preacher. Hoffmann also does not list Carpzov the Younger.

The Lutheran Cyclopedia of 1899 says concerning Philip Jacob Spener, 1635-1705: "With the spread of Pietism over Germany there came attacks from abroad charging him with being the source of the many fanatical sects springing up everywhere, and a libelous publication emanating from 'the mentally weak senior of the Wittenberg faculty,' Deutschmann, imputed to him two hundred and eighty-three (283) heterodox opinions."

Hymns Coming from the 17th Century

The Lutheran Hymnal published by the Synodical Conference in 1941 contains 660 hymns. 147 of these hymns are dated to show their origin in the 17th century. There are seven more right at the years 1600 and 1700, well known and much used. You may check for yourself and see how many more hymns we use today that come from hymn writers during the last half of the 16th century, 1550 to 1600. This period is included by some as representing the Age of Orthodoxy.

If you check the tunes we use today for the 154 17th century hymns in the Lutheran Hymnal, you will find that 108 of them are dated from 1551 to 1704. (Hymn tunes are often used for more than on hymn, as you know, generally.)

Post-Conference Notes

The essayist did not make use of the hymn texts, which might have been done to demonstrate that the age treated was not one of Dead Orthodoxy. Perhaps the most important question asked from the floor was: How wellldid the 17th century preachers divide Law and Gospel? In answer to this the essayist said that the mimeographed exhibits of preaching may be examined or further study made to get an answer to this question. (The purpose of the essay was to see how much sermons then dealt with polemics.)

The brief conference discussion of the subject in general favored the preachers of the 17th century.

Encyclopedias offer history and characterization of preaching and preachers during the Age of Orthodoxy. Some contributions of articles on this subject as published in encyclopedias may be based mostly on what the writers read in previous encyclopedias. As in the case of any history, only the use of original documents and sources is rightly satisfying, so that, as for example in this case, the mimeographed exhibits of actual sermon manuscripts were and are needed. Preachers want to know things directly for themselves in order to pass judgment of gain personal opinions.

- - - - - - -

The "Clergy Bulletin" is published by the Southwestern Minnesota pastoral conference of the Norwegian Synod.
Editor:
Rev. T. N. Teigen
917 So. Grange Ave.
Sioux Falls, S. D.

Subscription price per year is $1.50, payable in advance to
Rev. Arthur Schulz
675 Second St.
Tracy, Minn.

EDUCATION COSTS & BETHANY COLLEGE

In the news recently was a report to the effect that Earl J. McGrath, former U.S. Commissioner of Education, now president of the University of Kansas, has made a somewhat new proposal for raising the income of both public (tax-supported) and private colleges. He suggests that all student fees be raised by 50% in all colleges. Doing that would result in this, he said: Students at public colleges would then be paying 50% of the cost of their education, and students at private colleges would be paying 85% of the cost of their education. Reading this backwards, he is saying this: At present the students in the average public college are paying only about 33% of the cost of their education; and the students in the average private college are paying about 56% of the cost of theirs.

These figures are interesting - and bone-chilling - to all who are concerned with Bethany College in Mankato. For while the good Commissioner speaks of raising fees in private colleges to make them equal 85% of the total cost, we at Bethany would have to lower our fees in order to reach that level. In the school year 1954-1955 students at Bethany paid 88% of the cost of their education; in 1953-1954 it was 83%; in 1950-1951 it was 93%. From 1946-1947 on to the present time, the percentage has always been 80% or more, with the exception of 1952-1953, when it was 77%.

These figures are interesting for many reasons. Among other things, they will tend to show that Bethany has been operating at a minimum cost, as compared with other private colleges. But these figures are also frightening, for it is no secret that Bethany is having financial difficulties of major proportions. For several years this situation has been developing; and to many it has perhaps seemed, since Bethany's doors continued to open each fall, as though the prophecies concerning it were unfounded. But the difficulty is now upon us.

For this question presents itself: Can one reasonably expect the BLC students to pay more than 85% of the cost of their education, when the average private college student in the U.S.A. has been, and still is, paying a great deal less than that? Is that a realistic expectation?

Not to be overlooked by any means is the situation created by the low costs at public institutions. At the average public college, remember, the student pays only about one-third of the costs. Tax money is flowing into these places, and this makes it much easier, financially speaking, for a student to obtain his education there. This is a factor to be reckoned with when you are dealing with conservative Lutherans, too; for it is by no means true that a conservative Lutheran is always willing to pay anything like 85% of the cost of his education.

So, then, if BLC is going to continue to reopen each fall, it will have to receive more subsidy, either from our Synod or from some other source. In relation to the size of our synod, BLC's present subsidy is, no doubt, good; but in relation to what it needs to keep going and in relation to the usual subsidy in private schools, it is very low indeed. This is not being stated as a criticism of our synod but only as a fact. For the simple, unavoidable fact is that BLC is not getting enough subsidy at present. And unless it gets more, and soon, discussion of the whole matter will be academic, revolving around a non-ens.

It will scarcely do for us who wish to keep BLC a-going longer to face the facts of its life. And the facts are these: BLC needs more money. And it needs more money soon, if not sooner.

--- Stuart A. Dorr

CLERGY BULLETIN

Published monthly by Authority of the General Pastoral Conference of the Norwegian Synod of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church.

Vol. XV, No. 10. June, 1956

THE THEOLOGY of Dr. REINHOLD NIEBUHR

By Prof. Geo. Lillegard

Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr (to be distinguished from his brother Richare, also a theologian) is recognized as the leading theologian in America today. (See "Life", the Christmas issue, 1955, p. 140f.) He is quoted as an authority on everything from Biblical Theology to International Politics, and his effusions appear regularly in such periodicals as The Lutheran of the ULC as well as in The Christian Century. According to newspaper reports, the ULC congregation served by the Rev. John Gerberding, accused of heresy, "rejected his resignation after Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, noted theologian, came to his support.--- One of the ladies in the Holy Cross Church appealed to Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr in behalf of the young ministers. Dr. Niebuhr, Barthian professor at Union Theological Seminary in New York, wrote as follows: '--- I think that Christian leaders should definitely support these young men, whose teachings are not heretical at all but in conformity with the main body of Christian donviction in the Church. It would be a shame to have people excommunicated who hold beliefs very similar to some of the leading figures in Christendom.'"

It is not easy to classify Niebuhr's theology, since he differs in many ways from most Modernists as well as from all orthodox or Fundamentalist theologians. He comes with often striking and apt criticisms of Modernistic heresies as well as of false trends in the world of philosophy, sociology and education. He does not spare Deweyism and socialistic and communistic fallacies. In general, he is called a Barthian or neo-orthodox theologian, although he criticizes Barth's views too at times. His statements may sound very orthodox occasionally, for example when he says: "The good news of the gospel is not the law that we ought to love one another. The good news of the gospel is that there is a resource of divine mercy which is able to overcome a contradiction within our own souls, which we cannot ourselves overcome. This contradiction is that, though we know we ought to love our neighbor as ourself, there is a 'law in our members which wars against the law that is in our mind,' so that, in fact, we love ourselves more than our neighbor." (Christianity and Power Politics,p.2). Stripped of the laborious rhetoric which makes his theology, as well as Barthian theology in general, so often sound like philosophy which the philosopher himself does not understand, this would seem to say that we are saved by grace, not by the works of the law. He takes a more realistic position than most Modernists also in this respect that he recognizes the obvious fact that man is fundamentally selfish and evil. Still he rejects with horror the Biblical doctrine of total depravity in spiritual matters. Thus he says: "Man is in essence a child of God. In Christian thought sinful self-love is never regarded as an essential characteristic of human nature. However, Luther's view of human depravity, his belief that the 'image of God' had been totally corrupted and was 'utterly leprous and unclean,' destroyed, or at least greatly imperiled, the

paradox of the Christian view of human nature, according to which self-love is 'natural' in the sense that it is universal but is not natural in the sense that it represents a contradiction of the true human nature. The Lutheran Reformation is, therefore, that particular locus in the history of Christendom where the problem of justice is most nearly disavowed. It is therefore no accident of history that Nazi pessimism, with its glorification of force and the principle of order, its unqualified affirmation of the state, its disavowal of all universal standards of morality should grow upon this soil." (Chr. & Power Politics, p.18ff.)

Parenthetically we may note that Niebuhr, like other Social Gospel propagandists, bays with the hounds in discussing Nazi-ism, Communism, etc.. The above quotation was written in 1940. Similar statements are made in later writings with regard to Communism, which he favored in his earlier writings, finding many good things in it as compared particularly with Nazi-ism and Fascism. (L.c. p.65f.) Instead of setting up standards of truth and justice to help man stand fast against the storms of false philosophies and entrenched violence, he bends with the breeze and tailors his theology to conform with the prejudices and popular slogans of the day, although he may, indeed, criticise many things that are wrong in State and Church.

One characteristic of Niebuhr's theology is that it deals very little with the field of theology, but rather with that of sociology and politics. This is evident from his published writings, some of the better known of which are: The Irony of American History. Discerning the Signs of the Times. The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness. Christianity and Power Politics. Does Civilization need Religion? Moral Man and Immoral Society. The Nature and Destiny of Man. Beyond Tragedy. An Interpretation of Christian Ethics. Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic. Reflections on the End of an Era. etc.

In his introduction to Moral Man and Immoral Society, he states his aim and purposes in words which could be applied to his writings in general: "The following pages are devoted to the task of analyzing the moral resources and limitations of human nature, of tracing their consequences and cumulative effect in the life of human groups and of weighing political strategies in the light of the ascertained facts. The ultimate purpose of this task is to find political methods which will offer the most promise of achieving an ethical social goal for society. Such methods must always by judged by 2 criteria: 1. Do they do justice to the moral resources and possibilities in human nature and provide for the exploitation of every latent moral capacity in man? 2. Do they take account of the limitations of human nature, particularly those which manifest themselves in man's collective behavior?" (p. xxiv)

The same Introduction gives us a fair sample of the kind of gobbledygook in which Niebuhr himself indulges at times, though he criticises the author of this particular statement for his views: "Apparently," declares Kimball Young, "the only way in which collective conflicts, as well as individual conflicts, can be successfully and hygienically solved is by securing a redirection of behavior toward a more feasible environmental objective. This can be accomplished most successfully by the rational reconditioning of attitudes on a higher neuro-psychic or intellectual symbolic plane to the facts of science, preferably through a free discussion with a minimum of propaganda. This is not an easy road to mental and social sanity, but it appears to be the only one which arrives at the goal." (p. xvi.)

We shall review some of the chief doctrines of Christianity and show what Niebuhr's position is on them, before we discuss further his position on social questions, his main interest.

The Bible teaches clearly that the world was created out of nothing by the almighty word of God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost. To N. the Creation story ~~by~~ is only a myth; the evolution theory has replaced it in the thinking of all but a few obscurantists and naive Fundamentalists. Thus he says in "Faith and History": "It was the genuine achievement of modern historical science to discover that human culture is subject to indeterminate development. Natural science added the discovery that nature, as well as human culture and institutions, undergoes an evolutionary process." (p.2) "In modern culture the idea of progress was substituted for the idea of providence a full century before the concept of evolution was substituted for the idea of creation. The historic development of human institutions and the emergence of novelty in historic time was more obvious and therefore more quickly discerned than the fact that the forms of nature were also subject to temporal mutation. It is significant, however, that the latter discovery placed the final seal upon the idea of a progressive history just as the concept of the divine creation of the world finally established the faith in a divine sovereignty over historical destiny in prophetism." (p.36) (That is, he assumes that the great prophe ts of Israel arrived gradually at the teaching that the one true God ruled all nations and thus finally at the teaching that He also had created the world in the first place.)

Further he says: "The creation myths of Genesis, undoubtedly related in some way to the Babylonian creation epic, do not depart from the general character of the creation myths of early religion." (l.c.p.47) "It is as important to challenge the errors of an atrophied Christian orthodoxy as to refute the mistakes of a too compliant Christian liberalism." (p.32) "The Christian truth was frequently made completely unavailing to modern men by a theological obscurantism which identified the perennially valid depth of Christian symbols with the pre-scientific form in which they were expressed. Thus the idea of the divine creation of the world, which, when taken profoundly, describes the limits of the world's rationality and the inadequacy of any 'natural' cause as a sufficient explanation for the irrational givenness of things, is frequently corrupted into a theory of secondary causation and thereby comes in conflict with a valid scientific account of causation on the natural level. This curruption of religion into a bad science has aroused the justified protest of a scientific age." (p.33)

We note here one characteristic of N.'s theology, viz., that he claims the Bible can be of value only when it is treated as a book of myths and symbols, not as historical fact. He even says, in "Christianity and Power Politics" -- "In one sense all orthodox Christian theology has been guilty of the sin of profanity. It has insisted on the literal and historic truth of its myths, forgetting that it is the function and character of religious myth to speak of the eternal in relation to time, and that it cannot therefore be a statement of temporal sequences." (p.220-1.) That is, he would say - to use and revise Luther's words - "He who teaches otherwise than the word of God teaches, so as to accept as fact what is only myth, profames the name of God among us."

N. also says in "Faith and History": "While the Biblical idea of creation did not anticipate the modern discovery of the emergence of novelty in time, it is actually much more compatible with the view of an evolutionary process than the Greek concept of temporal recurrence. This compatibility was unfortunately obscured both by the theological obscurantism which used the Biblical idea of creation to refute the indubitable discoveries of modern science in the field of natural causation, and by the theological liberalism which simply equated God with the evolutionary process." (p.47)

The Bible teaching concerning the origin of sin and evil is

likewise attacked. N. says in "Faith and History: "The prophets are more conscious of the sins of Israel than of the sins of other nations, precisely because of their confidence in Israel's special mission. Biblical faith finally interprets this evil as so universal a corruption of human freedom that it is symbolized as having infected the first man. Adam fell into evil when he refused to accept the limits which the Creator had set for his power and wisdom and sought to be like God. Ever since, men and nations have been prompted by pride to introduce the evils of contention and domination into the world. They have rent and torn the whole fabric of human togetherness because they made themselves the false centres of the whole of existence. These proud actions result in consequences which echo down the ages. The children suffer for the sins of the fathers because generations are bound to each other in one unbroken chain of life. The universality of this corruption of evil raises the question whether history has any moral meaning." (p.26) - - "A symbolic historical event such as the 'fall' of man loses its real meaning when taken as literal history. It symbolizes an inevitable and yet not a natural corruption of human freedom. It must not, therefore, be regarded either as a specific event with which evil begins in history, nor yet as a symbol of the modern conception of evil as the lag of nature and finiteness." (p.33)

Again N. says: "The myth of the Fall of Adam universalizes, as well as individualizes this theme of man's revolt against God. The influence of this myth upon the Christian imagination is not primarily due to any literalistic illusions of Christian orthodoxy. The myth accurately symbolizes the consistent Bible diagnosis of moral and historical evil. Adam, and together with him, all men seek to overstep the bounds which are set by the Creator for man as creature." (L.c.p.121-2)

Dr. N. seems to hold the belief that man is by nature sinful, yet not in the sense that he is the slave of sin and has lost his free will in spiritual matters. He says: "Biblical faith has always insisted upon the embarassing truth that the corruption of evil is at the heart of the human personality. It is not the inertia of its natural impulses ~~xfxkks~~ ~~xxxx~~ in opposition to the purer impulses of the mind. The fact that it is a corruption which has universal dominion over all men, though it is not by nature but in freedom that men sin, is the 'mystery' of 'original sin', which will always be an offence to rationalists. But it has the merit of being true to the facts of human existence. - - all men, saints and sinners, the righteous and the unrighteous are inclined to use the freedom to transcend time, history and themselves in such a way as to make themselves the false center of existence. Thus the same freedom which gives human life a creative power, not possessed by other creatures, also endows it with destructive possibilities not known in nature. The two-fold possibility of creativity and destruction in human freedom accounts for the growth of both good and evil through the extension of human powers." (L.c. p. 122-3.)

Thus he finds man by nature free to do either good or evil and does not understand the Bible doctrine of man's slavery under sin, -- no doubt because his religion is a moralistic religion in which civic righteousness (such as even the worst heathen can seek and attain) is the essential thing. In "Christian Realism and Political Problems" he says: "The disposition to hide self-interest behind the facade of pretended devotion to values, transcending self-interest, is well-nigh universal. It is, moreover, an interesting human characteristic, proving that the concept of 'total depravity' as it is advanced by some Christian realists, is erroneous. Man is a curious creature with so strong a sense of obligation to his fellows that he cannot pursue his own interests without pretending to serve his fellowmen." (p.120) - "-were they (the Christian systems before

and after Augustine) inferior either because they subordinated the biblical-dramatic conception of human selfhood too much to the rationalistic scheme, as was the case with medieval Christianity culminating in the thought of Thomas Aquinas? Or because they did not understand that the corruption of human freedom could not destroy the original dignity of man, as was the case with the Reformation with its doctrines of sin, bordering on total depravity and resulting in Luther's too pessimistic approach to political problems?" (p.145-6.)

In one of his earlier books, "Does Civilization need Religion," he discusses the problem of evil in this way: "The Genesis account of the fall solves the problem of evil upon an essentially monistic basis by making human sin responsible for even the inadequacies of nature and attributing everything from weeds to mortality to the luckless error of the first man. Neither the goodness nor the omnipotence of God is abridged in this naive but sublime conception in which the human conscience assumes responsibility for more than its share of human ills in order to save the reputation of divine virtue. The monism of this account is, however, qualified by the injection of the tempting serpent, an element which is precursory of the belief in the devil, which the Jews inherited from Babylonia and Persia and which has fortunately qualified all monistic tendencies in Jewish and Christian orthodoxy until this day.--- The idea of attributing personality to evil may be scientifically absur d, but it rests upon a natural error. When the blind and impersonal forces of nature come to life in man, they are given the semblance of personality." (p. 196-7). We might summarize N.'s views on this point by the statement: Man makes devils as well as gods in his own image; and they have no reality outside of the mind of man.

(To be continued.)

BOOK REVIEW

"The Inspiration of Scripture - A Study of the Theology of the 17th Century Lutheran Dogmaticians, by Robert Preus, Ph. D." Order from Lutheran Synod Book Co., Mankato, Minnesota. List price - $4.50.

This book is a solid compendium of what the 17th century Lutheran theologians taught concerning the foundation of Christian faith - the Holy Scriptures. The list of "Contents" in this book, quoted below, shows the wide range of topics found in it. The 12-page Preface describes the plan and purpose of the book, gives direly needed historical information about the "Age of Orthodoxy" and the Lutheran teachers who can not be debunked. Chapter X, the last one in the book, 18 pages, are conclusions by the author which the reader will look forward to while studying the other nine chapters, that is, the last chapter will answer many questions which arise in the reader's mind.

Pastor Robert Preus went over to Edinburgh University, Scotland, to study the productions of the 17th century dogmaticians. In the course of study he also crossed over to Germany and Switzerland to visit universities there and to do research work in their libraries. This book on "The Inspiration of Scripture" is the major result of his extensive work.

The consignment of copies of this new book overseas was sold out already a few months ago. And Edinburgh University men are asking for a second printing over there. The ready sale and acceptance of the book by Edinburgh leaders should indicate its value for Protestants everywhere.

One reviewer has written: "We believe that particularly our younger pastors will find the book a great help." Another has said: "Students in training and professional scholars alike will want to

study this book." A third review is a little fearful that this book by Pastor Preus, which upholds the historic position of the Synodical Conference (as he states), will not receive the recognition and use that it deserves. I do not share his fears; this book is different.

"The Inspiration of Scripture" is a book consisting of direct and indirect quotations of what the old orthodox Lutheran theologians taught on the topics you see listed below in the table of "Contents." Dr. Preus simply served as translator and a kind of managing editor to produce a book in which the old Lutherans now speak in the English language. Lutherans and other Protestants should all be interested in this, and I could even guess that Roman Catholics will take note of it.

Few pastors in America own all the Latin books used in the process of producing this one book. And not many who have them or have ready access to them in libraries will be inclined to make use of them in their original heavy form. But what the 17th century Lutherans wrote belongs to Lutheran history, belongs to all Lutherans. Especially every Lutheran teacher should at least be well acquainted with it.

In presenting the teaching of the old Lutherans in this book, Pastor Preus properly criticizes some of their points and procedures. He says, for instance, "It does no credit to the dogmaticians nor to the congruity of their theological position that they feel constrained at all times to give answer to all the objections of their adversaries, and especially that they do so with the weapons of their adversaries."p.108. But when we consider that controversy can trick the best of men into saying more than is needed and into putting them on the defensive even in side issues, we must be ready to overlook some faults while at the same time learning from their mistakes. Be this as it may, any public teacher in evangelical circles who desires to hold to the principle of Sola Scriptura will appreciate Pastor Preus' criticisms of the old orthodox men and should value his book highly even if he does not fully share the theological position which is readily discernible in this new book.

Since the book is a compend of what a whole century of Lutherans taught concerning the foundation of Christian faith, the Bible, offering a summary of old Lutheran Bible teaching and apologetics: the book of Dr. Robert Preus on "The Inspiration of Scripture" should find a handy place alongside of whatever standard current compend of dogmatics any minister uses.

Uebergrossedeutschegruendlichkeit!? (English: over-great German thoroughness.) Some may try to dismiss the teaching of the 17th century professors in Germany with that long German word: Uebergrossedeutschegruendlichkeit. Well, read the book for yourself and find in it the logical explanation for what is often called Lutheran scholasticism. The old teachers felt bound to stop the mouths of their opponents for the benefit of their Lutheran constituency. If then they sometimes became voluminous, or seem to be pedantic, or sometimes developed a point which more or less remained on the writing tables of the learned - all this was caused by the hot war carried on aggainst them. Even so: we should learn from history; we are foolish if we don't learn from it. It would be a frightening burden for most all of us to dig out what we need to know directly from the original Latin books. But it should be a profitable pleasure to read and use as reference the new book the young doctor has produced for us.

Here, now, is the Table of Contents of "The Inspiration of Scripture" as found on pages xvii and xviii:

9. The Importance of Sola Scriptura, p. 207.
10. Sola Scriptura and Sola Fide, p. 208.
Bibliography, p. 212-216.

We hope that every pastor and teacher will purchase this book, and we recommend the book to all our lay-readers.

G. Schweikert

The "Clergy Bulletin" is put out by the Southwestern Minn. circuit of the Norwegian Synod,
Editor: Rev. T.N. Teigen
917 So. Grange
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
Subscription: $1.50 per year, payable to Rev. Arthur Schulz, 675 Second St., Tracy, Minn.
Please renew promptly.

W E A T H E R R E P O R T
(Air pressure, temperature, wind directions, fronts, and forecasts.)

A. THE MINNESOTA LUTHERAN, April, 1956.

"In times past Bethany College of Mankato, the institution of the Norwegian Synod, was highly favored among the members of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, particularly here in the Minnesota District. Much to our regret this fine relation no longer exists. The norwegian Synod has declared our Synod as heterodox, that is, as teaching false doctrine, which we deny. They have suspended fellowship relations with us, so that pulpit- and altar-fellowship between them and us is now, by their choice, a thing of the past. This surely affects our position toward Bethany College. Our District Pastoral Conference at the time of our District convention in 1955 requested Dr. J.W. Behnken to write to the president of the Norwegian Synod relative to the attitude and policy of Bethany College over against Missouri Synod students who may enroll at Bethany. From the letter of Pres. M.H. Otto to Pres. J.W. Behnken we quote the following statement of policy of Bethany College: '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 will receive our religious instruction, attend chapel exercises and conduct themselves as Christians. This is still our policy.' If it were that simple, well, and good, but is it?

"Some of our parents have not enrolled their sons and daughters at Bethany for the present school year. More may refuse to do so next school year, if this suspended fellowship relation continues to exist. Because of the Norwegian Synod's stand against our Synod, which we believe is not in accord with the truth and by which our young people face the danger of being misled, we feel that we cannot encourage our people to enroll their sons and daughters at Bethany College. We would seriously advise all parents of our District, who consider enrolling a son or daughter at Bethany College, to earnestly consult with their own pastor for counsel in this matter.

Presidium of the Minnesota District, The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod."

B. BOOK OF REPORTS AND MEMORIALS, Mo. Synod, 1956.
1. Re Common Confession.
a. Report of the Committee on Doctrinal Unity.

"Whereas, The Foreward to Part II of The Common Confession states: 'Part II is intended as a supplement to Part I, and the two parts in reality form one doctrinal statement. Neither part is to be regarded as complete in itself or unrelated to the other. Part II was written to bring clarification where misunderstanding of Part I was encountered, as well as adding some doctrines which were omitted in Part I.' (Proceedings, Forty-second Regular Convention, 1953, p.507); and

"Whereas, the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod at its 1953 convention has recognized this organic connection between Parts I and II

of The Common Confession by r e-solving 'that for purposes of study Parts I and II of The Common Confession hereafter be treated as one document, with the understanding that Part II has not yet been adopted' (Proceedings,p.528); and

"Whereas, The Common Confession, Part II, serves to clarify, and safeguard the orthodoxy of, the confession made by the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod in The Common Confession, Part I, and must therefore in the light of history be considered an integral constituent of that confession; therefore

"Your Committee recommends that the Forty-Third Regular Convention of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, assembled at St. Paul, Minn., adopt Part II of The Common Confession in addition to Part I, adopted in 1950, as a statement of doctrine and as a guide for practice in harmony with the Sacred Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions.

"II. Whereas, Because of the probable union pf the American Lutheran Church with the Evangelical Lutheran Church and the United Evangelical Lutheran Church on the basis of the United Testimony on Faith and Life, The Common Confession will not serve as a functioning union document for fellowship with the American Lutheran Church; and

"Whereas, The Common Confession constitutes a landmark in the history of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod's earnest endeavor to realize the genuinely Scriptural purpose embodied in Article IV of the constitution of The Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America, 'to strive for true unity in doctrine and practice among Lutheran church bodies'; therefore

"Your Committee recommends that The Common Confession (Parts I and II) henceforth be regarded as a significant historic statement which may, like other documents of a similar nature, serve our church for purposes of discussion and instruction, both within our own circles and in meetings with others."

b. The above-quoted Book of Reports and Memorials contains also a half dozen memorials asking that the Missouri Synod in its Convention "void", "withdraw", "not use as basis of fellowship", "reject", "set aside" The Common Confession.

2. Re Lutheran World Federation, said book of Reports and Memorials contains the report of a Committee which recommends declining invitation to become a member of Lutheran World Federation. Also several memorials to decline invitation. Also several memorials to accept above-mentioned Committee Report. Several memorials to reject above-mentioned Committee Report and to accept invitation to affiliate with Lutheran World Federation.

C. THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN (May, 1956) forecasting:

"Part II of a 'Common Confession,' drawn up by commissions of the Synod and of the American Lutheran Church, will very likely be adopted, although the significance of the document may be only historical in view of the proposed merger of the American Lutheran Church with the Evangelical Lutheran Church and the United Evangelical Lutheran Church.

"In view of Missouri Synod involvement with the more immediate problems or relationships within the Synodical Conference (which are likely to arouse a great deal of spectator interest at the convention), no one inside or outside the Synod expected this convention to request membership in the Lutheran World Federation. At the same time, there are those who hope that the Synod will eventually deal with this question on the basis of an objective analysis of the organization's stated purposes as interpreted by the organization itself."

Presidential Request

A reminder to all Boards, Committees, and Visitors, too, who have a report to render to the Synod, to have said report in the hands of the undersigned by June 20th.

All pastors are asked to submit the names of their delegates by the same date.

M. H. Otto

CLERGY BULLETIN

Published monthly by Authority of the General Pastoral Conference of the Norwegian Synod of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church.

Vol. XV, No. 11. July, 1956

THE THEOLOGY of Dr. REINHOLD NIEBUHR
(Concl.)

by Prof. Geo. Lillegard

We have noted in N's statements so far quoted that he looks upon the Bible as a book of myths and symbols which have no historical validity whatever. To him it is a grievous error to look upon the Bible as an authority in either religion or morals. He says, for example, in "Does Civilization need Religion?" :-

"The uncompromising spirituality of the ethics of Jesus is totally lacking in Calvinism. Its moral theories were in fact derived from the Old rather than the New Testament; and there is hardly a scintilla of evidence in Calvinistic thought that the Sermon on the Mount is recorded in the scripture which it accepted as revealed finality. Its very bibliolatry was partly responsible for its non-Christian type of ethics, for through it the casual moral theories of the early Hebrews achieved the dignity of absolute truth. Lack of historical perspective in the use of the Old Testament further aggravated this error, for the real worth of the prophets was never appreciated and their high type of moral idealism could not serve to qualify the less heroic morality of the law and the superficial moralizing of the Wisdom literature. Incidentally it may be observed that bibliolatry is one of the handicaps to moral progress in almost all religions. Through its primitive cultures and moral customs which happen to be enshrined in the canon become absolutely authoritative, and the weight of their influence is set against new ventures in moral life." (P. 100-101)

Note how he calls any belief in the Bible as the inspired and authoritative Word of God a mere "bibliolatry" which like any form of idolatry is harmful as well as absurd; that he does not recognize the obvious fact that the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount is in all points the same as the ethics of the Old Testament, both the Law and the Prophets; that he places the prophets over against the Law and the Wisdom literature as representing a different order of morality, -- which errors he could commit only by assuming that the discredited evolutionary Higher Critical theories of the development of Jewish religion are correct in every part.

Dr. N's views on the Person of Christ follow the same "neo-orthodox" pattern, (the only new thing about "neo-orthodoxy" is that it applies the term "orthodox" to its hoary heresies and sometimes uses orthodox-sounding language in a thoroughly perverted manner.) We read in "Faith and History": "--- the affirmation of the Christian faith that the climax of the divine self-revelation is reached in a particular person and a particular drama of his life, in which these particular events become revelatory of the meaning of the whole of life is falsely rationalized so that the Jesus of history who is known as the Christ by faith, is interpreted as an inhuman and incredible personality with alleged powers of omniscience within the conditions of finiteness. In this way the ultimate truth about God and His relation to men, which can be appropriated only in repentance and faith, is made into a 'fact' of history. These errors of a literalistic orthodoxy tend to obscure the real issue between Christianity and modern culture as surely as the premature capitulation of liberal Christianity to modern culture. The Christian truth is presented as a 'dated' bit of religious fantasy which is credible only to the credulous and which may easily be dismissed by modern men." (p.33-34.)

Again he says: "---error arises when the effort is made to guard the uniqueness of the truth of faith and to prevent its absorption into a general system of knowledge by insisting that Christian truth is miraculously validated and has no relation to any truth otherwise known. This is the

error to which Protestant literalism is particularly prone. Its consequence is cultural obscurantism. The truth of faith, thus jealously guarded, degenerates into a miraculous historical fact. Miracles may be believed without the repentance which is the prerequisite of the renewal of life. The tendency to transmute a truth of faith, which can be known only by a person in the totality and wholeness of his life, into a miraculous fact, which the credulous but not the sophisticated may easily believe, accounts for the frequent spiritual aridity of Protestant orthodoxy." (p.166, l.c.) - Note how he denies the historicity of everything miraculous in the story of Christ, while at the same time affirming that the real value and meaning of Christianity is gained for modern man only by a so-called "faith" which has no objective historical facts as its content, but is a purely subjective thing. This "spiritualizing" of Christian history is applied to every part of Christ's life, -- His work, death and resurrection. Thus Niebuhr says in "Faith and History": "It seems fairly certain that the earlier narratives reported an experience of communion by the disciples with the resurrected Lord in Galilee (I Cor. 15,1-8), while later narratives not only fixed this event at Jerusalem, but sought to validate it by factual details of which the empty tomb was the most significant. The story of this triumph over death is thus shrouded in a mystery which places it in a different order of history than the story of the crucifixion." (That is, it is not a historical fact ~~that~~ in the same way as the crucifixion is a fact.) "Yet the church as a fellowship of believers was obviously founded upon the conviction of the fact of the resurrection. This 'fact' contained an alteration in the story through faith's apprehension of the significance of the story." (p.147) That is, the faith of the disciples twisted the story of the resurrection into something else than the actual facts warranted, but which their "faith" wanted to believe.

Dr. N. says again: "The effort to certify this triumph (of Christ over death) through specific historical details may well be regarded as an expression of a skepticism which runs through the whole history of Christianity. The account of Christ's virgin birth serves the same purpose. Christ cannot be known as the revelation of God except by faith and repentance; but a faith not quite sure of itself always hopes to suppress its skepticism by establishing the revelatory depth of a fact through its miraculous character. This type of miracle is in opposition to true faith." (According to this, miracles are an embarassment to true faith rather than a support and justification of it, -- a typical Modernist heresy which is rooted in the denial of God as the omnipotent Creator who still governs the universe by the word of His power.) "On the other hand the belief in the resurrection is itself a miracle of a different order, and a miracle without which the church could not have come into existence or could not continue in existence. It is the miracle of recognizing the triumph of God's sovereignty in what seem to be very ambiguous facts of history.---- The church is thus not grounded upon a slowly dawning consciousness of the true significance of Christ. It is founded in the miracle of the recognition of the true Christ in the resurrection." (p.148.) "---- The final pinnacle of the Christian faith is this confidence in the completion of life's meaning by the power of God. ---- This pinnacle has no support from miraculous facts in history; neither can it be deduced from a careful observation of the general facts of human nature and history." (p.150) So the Christian faith is not built, according to N., on the impregnable fact of Christ's resurrection--without which our faith is vain and we are yet in our sins-- but on the subjective "faith" of the apostles whose imagination was equal to the task of making the unreal, spiritual presence of Christ into a physical reality. Christ was not born of a virgin -- that idea is based on a false, rabbinical interpretation of Isaiah's prophecy. He did not actually perform miracles,-- the accounts of these are the product of a later age. He did not rise from the dead; the disciples only thought he did. The miracle was not that Christ rose from the dead; neither was the mystery that God was manifest in the flesh. No, the miracle was that the disciples should believe what they did, and the mystery is that in a "scientific age" there should still be such naive, obfuscated, obscurantist, credulous and essentially skeptical people as Fundamentalists and orthodox Christians really are!

Christ being in no unique way the Son of God, there is no such thing as redemption by His blood. Dr. N. speaks about redemption, but it is redemption of society rather than of individuals. Thus he says in "Faith and History": "The recognition that innocency and goodness might lead to suffering rather than to security and success prompted the Second Isaiah to reinterpret the excessively severe vicissitudes of his nation. Perhaps, he suggested in a passage (ch. 53) which undoubtedly influenced Christ's own interpretation of his messianic mission, it was the fate of Israel to bring redemption to the nations by its vicarious suffering for their xxxx xx sins." (p. 131) Note here the way in which Dr. N. empties prophecy of its predictive quality and assumes that Christ did not fulfil Is. 53, but only adopted it as a description of his own experiences, - something which any sufferer might do. Obviously "redemption to the nations" has nothing to do with the Bible idea of redemption of sinners from sin and death.

But, as said before, Dr. Niebuhr's main interest is in the "redemption" of society as a whole, in the moral improvement of the community, and in the rehabilitation of the world in general through international endeavors. In his book "Moral Man and Immoral Society," he developes the idea that society as a whole stands and operates on a lower moral plane than the individuals do who make up that society. He shows his communistic bias, although he criticises Marxian Socialism on some points, by his consistent use of Marxian jargon in his discussion of the problems of society. His criticisms of Luther and orthodox theologians show that he does not understand the Bible teachings regarding the duties of subjects to their rulers, servants to their masters, etc. He says: "For the church, both Catholic Protestant, the law of love was interpreted religiously rather than socially. It guarenteed equality before God, and therefore in the religious community; but this did not imply that the church would strive to realise an ideal of social justice in society. Luther in fact turned on the peasants of his day in holy horror when they attempted to transmute the 'spiritual' kingdom into an 'earthly one', by suggesting that the principles of the gospel had social significance. Luther incidentally managed to combine defeatism and sentimentality in his treatment of the social problem. Sometimes he suggested that all social issues would be solved if only every one would follow the golden rule. At other times he gave the world up as lost. 'It is indeed true that Christians, so far as they themselves are concerned, are subject to neither law nor sword, and need neither; but just take heed to fill the world with real Christians before ruling it in a Christian and evangelical manner. This you will never accomplish, for the world and the masses are and always will be unchristian.' Martin Luther Works III, p.237." (Moral Man--, p.77.)

Luther's common-sense attitude to social problems, based on the obvious fact that the great majority of people in the world are anything but Christian in their life and conduct, is totally unacceptable to Niebuhr. For though he criticises the advocates of the Social Gospel for their optimism in presuming to change the world which now is, into a happy Utopia, he himself is interested only in changing society as a whole. Thus he says in "Does Civilization need Religion?" - "-- The validity of the religious idea must finally be judged by its capacity to create not only unified personalities but personalities which know how to restrain their expansive desires for the sake of social peace. --- If the religious ideal is to gain any potency in modern life it must be able to convict men of sin and inspire them to a conversion. But the sins of which they need most to be convicted are those which are covert in the social and economic relations which custom has hallowed; and the conversion of life which is most needed is that which will express itself in terms of the economic and political relationships in which men live. Not to be conformed to this world, if it is to have any real meaning in modern life will mean that the religiously inspired soul knows how to defeat the avarice and to overcome the indifference to the worth of human personality which inheres in the whole economic and industrial structure of modern society." (p.232-233) "--- The task of redeeming Western society rests in a peculiar sense upon Christianity." (p. 235.) That is, a Christian must repent, not merely of his own individual sins, but of all the sins of the community or country or the whole world as well,-- of their faulty social set-up, their unequal administration of justice, their wars and rivalries, the crimes they permit, etc.

It is true that the Christian must bear the weight of the world's sins on his heart and must intercede for Sodom daily before the throne of grace. But this does not mean that he shall expect to change the world which is in the power of the Evil One. For he has no such promise from the Lord of the church. But Dr. N. is free in his criticisms of Luther for his failure to reform the world. He says, for example, in "Faith and History": "This fact (that the individual can achieve more morally than the community) has tempted some versions of the Christian faith, particularly Protestant versions, to betray a defeatist attitude toward the social existence of mankind, to exclude the possibility of redemption and a new life in man's social existence and to confine redemption to individual life. The thought of Martin Luther certainly contains this error. Luther believed that 'the world is far too wicked to be worthy of good and pious lords. It must have princes who go to war, levy taxes and shed blood and it must have spiritual tyrants who impoverish it with bulls and letters and laws. This and other chastisements are rather what it deserves and to resist them is nothing else than to resist God's chastisements.' (A Treatise concerning the Ban. Works II, p. 51).

In so far as Luther believed in the possibility of perfecting the social life of man he placed undue reliance upon the virtues of rulers rather than upon the reform of social structures and institutions. 'I know of no state,' he declared, 'which is well governed by means of law. If the magistrate is wise he will rule more prosperously by natural bent than by laws. - More stress ought therefore by placed upon putting good and wise men in office than on making laws, for such men will themselves be the best laws and will judge every variety of case with lively justice! (Bab. Capt. II, p. 263)

"Luther's defeatism on social life is implicit in his rigorous separation of the realm of grace from that of 'civil policy.' 'The way to discern the difference between the law and the Gospel,' he declared, 'is to place the Gospel in heaven and the law upon earth.--- If the matter be a question concerning faith and conscience let us utterly exclude the law and leave it on earth.--- Contrariwise in civil policy obedience to law must be severely required. There nothing must be known concerning the Gospel, the remission of sins, or heavenly righteousness of Christ Himself, but only Moses with the law and the works thereof.' (From Galatians.) Both Catholicism and Calvinism are safe against this error." (p. 199-200)

The fact is that all experience and history show that Luther is right and all Marxists with their 57 varieties of Socialism are wrong. The Social Gospel which N., in harmony with his evolutionary, chiliastic ideas, advocates and preaches has never succeeded in righting a social wrong without inflicting worse evils upon the world. For it is not possible to do good by going contrary to both the Law of God and His real Gospel, as all Social Gospelists do by their confusing of law and gospel and their contempt for the Word in which there alone is true light and wisdom. It is a mark of the blindness that has settled upon the Church called Christian that such theology as N. teaches should be hailed as the acme of human wisdom and Christian principles.

* * * *

QUOTES

"No pleasure is comparable to the standing upon the vantageground of truth." - Francis Bacon, Of Truth.

"Reading maketh a full man, conference a ready man, and writing an exact man." - Fr. Bacon, Of Studies.

"Wherever God erects a house of prayer,
The devil always builds a chapel there;
And 'twill be found, upon examination,
The latter has the largest congregation!"
(Daniel Defoe, The True-Born Englishman)

"What is a minority? The chosen heroes of this earth have been in a minority. There is not a social, political, or religious privilege that you enjoy today that was not bought for you by the blood and tears and patient suffering of the minority. It is the minority that have ... achieved all that is noble in the history of the world." - John Gough, What is a Minority?

"The most dangerous enemy to truth and freedom amongst us is the compact majority." (H. Ibsen, An Enemy of the People.)

Norwegian Synod Memorial Library
Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary Library
Mankato, Minn.

The Pastor's Library - Note 2

Greek Grammars and Dictionaries

Some time ago my dear friend and colleague, C. U. Faye, the Librarian of our Bethany Lutheran Seminary Library, asked me to write an article on grammars and dictionaries of the Greek language. At long last I now undertake to fulfill that request. In so doing, however, may I state in advance that to treat this subject in its entirety would be a Herculean task, and one beyond my abilities and resources. The literature which has grown up over the years dealing with the Greek language and its grammar is truly voluminous; and with the revival of interest in the Koine dialect which has marked the past 50 years that literature is growing apace. To cover this whole body of literature in a complete manner, therefore, would involve writing a book instead of an article.

What Prof. Faye had in mind, however, was no such complete bibliographical treatise, but rather a selected bibliography of some of the dictionaries and grammars which would prove most useful to the average Lutheran pastor in his work and most necessary for his library. It is with this thought in mind, then, that I offer to the readers of the CLERGY BULLETIN a few random thoughts on what seem to me to be some of the more important dictionaries and grammars of the Greek language.

GENERAL BOOKS ON THE GREEK LANGUAGE

Before listing the grammars and dictionaries of the Greek language it seems to me that we should write just a bit about some of the many books dealing with the Greek language per se. After all, the serious study of any language should begin not with conjugations and declensions and paradigms, but rather with a study of the language itself taken as a whole - its origins, structure, affinities with other languages, its dialects, its literature and its effects upon the civilized world. To understand adequately a language one must have some understanding of the people who spoke that language, for language is but the record of a people's history, their thoughts, their asperations and hopes. And all this is particularly true when one approaches the study of Greek, the language in which our New Testament literature was written.

It seems to me, therefore, that every pastor should have in his library not only a volume dealing with the general history of the Greek people, but also at least one book dealing with the Greek language in general. The standard, definitive work in this field is A. Thumb's Die Griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus, published originally in 1901 and revised again in 1916. For the average pastor, of course, Thumb's book is not practicable, because of its length and also because it is available only in the German. For a brief, up-to-date treatment of the subject in English I would recommend B. F. C. Atkinson's The Greek Language, published in 1933 and re-printed in 1952. This is a part of a series on The Great Languages, and its author, the Under-Librarian of the University Library at Cambridge, is an authority on the subject.

In recent years the Koine dialect has held the center of the stage in the field of Greek studies. The chief factor in this excrescence of interest in the Koine was the amazing discovery of vast quantities of papyri in the rubbish heaps of Egypt in the waning years of the 19th century, most of it non-literary and therefore illustrative of the language actually spoken by the people in the Mediterranean world at the beginning of the Christian era. One of the pioneers in the investigation and study of these papyri fragments, and certainly the most prominent name in this particular field of study, is that of Adolph Deissmann, Professor of New Testament Exegesis at the University of Berlin. Prof. Deissmann has written a number of books in which he has established beyond all reasonable doubt that the Greek of these non-literary

papyri is the very same dialect in which our New Testament was written - the Koine. Needless to say, the significance of this discovery is of tremendous import to all Biblical scholars, inasmuch as it establishes the fact that the Greek dialect which our Lord and His apostles used was that of the common people. The importance of this discovery and its subsequent effect on New Testament studies makes it strongly advisable for every Lutheran pastor to familiarize himself, at least to some extent, with the material presented and the conclusions arrived at in Prof. Deissmann's books. The most available of his works is Light From The Ancient East, a translation by Strachan from the German Licht vom Osten, published originally in 1908, but recently reprinted in the English edition by Harper Brothers. Besides Deissmann, the writings of J. Rendel Harris, George Milligan or J. H. Moulton will be of interest and will be found to present essentially the same material and conclusions.

GREEK GRAMMARS

* Certainly every pastor who hopes to work intelligently with his Greek New Testament will find it necessary to have at least one or two good volumes in his library dealing with the details of Greek grammar. The grammar of any language is really nothing more than the scientific study of that language. It is an attempt to systematize, to set forth the principles which govern the use and understanding of the language in question. Needless to say, when one approaches the study of a new foreign language, especially an ancient language which is no longer currently spoken, he must proceed almost entirely under the guidance of a good book on grammar. That is to say, he must learn the principles of accidence or morphology - how words are formed and inflected. And he must also learn the elements of syntax - how words are arranged into meaningful phrases and sentences. And to learn these things is to learn the grammar of the language.

The pastor, as he works with his Greek New Testament - reading and exegeting - will naturally be confronted by many problems and questions which can only be resolved by an adequate understanding of Greek grammar. In many cases he will find it necessary to go to his library for additional information on some specific point. At such times, therefore, a good dependable volume dealing with Greek grammar is indispensable to the Christian pastor.

Certainly the standard work on general Greek grammar for all practical purposes, and the one most readily available to all students of Greek, is W. W. Goodwin's Greek Grammar in any one of its numerous editions. Published originally in 1892, Goodwin's grammar has since been revised many times, most recently by Prof. Charles Gulick of Harvard University in 1930. In this excellent little book all the basic principles of the Greek language are briefly set forth in the traditional way. It should be understood, of course, that Goodwin's grammar is written with the "Attic" dialect particularly in mind, and that it does not, therefore, cover all the peculiarities of the "Ionic" dialect of Homer or the "Koine" dialect of the New Testament writers.

For particular problems dealing with the Ionic dialect the standard work is A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect by D. B. Monro, formerly Provost of Oriel College at Oxford, second edition published in 1891. Monro's work is detailed and complete.

For a more specialized treatment of the Koine dialect, with which the Christian pastor will have to deal almost exclusively in his work with the New Testament, there are a large number of grammars from which to choose. The largest and most comprehensive of these in English is A.T. Robertson's A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Published originally in 1914, this monumental work has since gone through four editions and is without doubt still the standard work in this field. In spite of its bulk - 1454 pages - Robertson's grammar is easily readable and one might almost say that it makes for interesting reading. Its only deficiency is that it was published just a bit too early to make full use of the great wealth of information which has come to us thru the papyri.

Mention should perhaps be made in passing of some of the older so-called "New

Testament" grammars which have been rendered pretty well "out-of-date" by the latest papyri discoveries. The most famous of these was Winer's Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms, published originally in 1822, which ran through 7 editions before its author's death. For many years this book held its place as the standard reference work in its field, and after Winer's death it was revised again and again by such eminent men as Masson, Moulton, Schmiedel and Thayer.

Winer's work was joined about the turn of the 20th century by Friedrich Blass' Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch, which was also revised after its author's death, first by Thackeray and later by Debrunner. The last-named revision ran through six editions, the last one being published in 1931, shortly after the first results of the papyri discoveries had been made public. With the appearance of Thayer's grammar, however, the works of Blass, Winer, and all the other older grammarians have largely disappeared from active use in America.

Another excellent grammar of the Koine dialect is that by the late Prof. J. H. Moulton, who taught at both Cambridge and Manchester Universities. It is entitled A Grammar of New Testament Greek; and was projected by its author to be a definitive three-volume work embodying the results of the papyri discoveries. Unfortunately, Prof. Moulton died before completing this ambitious work, so that at the present time only the first two volumes are available. Volume I, dealing with Prolegomena, was published in 1906 and later revised in 1908. It is intended to be a general introduction to the whole subject of Koine grammar, and contains an excellent account of the peculiarities of the Koine dialect as illustrated also by the non-literary papyri. Volume II deals with Accidence or morphology, and word-formation, and is a very useful reference work. Volume III, which is still in preparation in England, will deal with Syntax, and is anxiously awaited by Biblical scholars. Even tho Moulton was a contemporary of Thayer, his work is considerably more up-to-date, and when complete it will be the finest in the field.

Considerably briefer than Moulton, but also modern and inclusive of the latest information supplied by the papyri is the Neutestamentliche Grammatik by Prof. Ludwig Radermacher of the University of Vienna, published in 1925 (2nd edition). Published only in German, however, it is much less convenient than Moulton for the average pastor.

For ordinary use there are also a number of shorter, more concise grammars of the type of Greek used in the New Testament, any one of which would be most useful in the pastor's library by way of general reference works. The most complete of these shorter grammars is A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament by A. T. Robertson (who produced the large grammar) and W. H. Davis. This excellent grammar has now gone through ten editions. Another very satisfactory short grammar is A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament by H.E. Dana and J.R. Mantey, both Baptist seminary professors. This work, however, lacks the excellent, but brief, introduction to the Greek language and its dialects found in Robertson and Davis, and is somewhat deficient in the matter of its treatment of word-formation. Another, and a most useful little work on New Testament grammar, is W. D. Chamberlain's An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament, published in 1940. As the title suggests, Dr. Chamberlain, who teaches New Testament language and literature at the Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, has compiled his information specifically as an aid to New Testament exegesis. As such it is a most helpful volume.

All of the above-mentioned grammars have been published to be used a reference works. As such, they are hardly very usable as manuals of instruction for the beginning Greek student. What is needed here is obviously a much simpler presentation of the principles of Greek grammar, and of such beginner's grammars there is also a large number to choose from - too many, in fact, to attempt to list them all completely. For use in preparing the beginning student to read classical, or Attic, Greek, mention might be made of the elementary grammars by Allen, Ball and Kaegi, these three probably being the ones most frequently used in the schools of this country. On the other hand, to prepare beginning students to read New Testament Greek in their second year the most frequently used elementary grammars are probably those by Huddilston, Davis and Machen. This by no means exhausts the

list of such elementary Greek grammars. In addition to the above-mentioned works, the author is familiar, at least, with New Testament grammars by Nunn, Vine, Moulton, Hale and Rife; and to these could certainly be added many others. Out of this large number of elementary Greek grammars the author of this article would register his personal preference for A Beginning Greek Book by J. M. Rife as an extremely well-planned and usable little volume for preparing students to read New Testament Greek.

(To be continued)

Julian G. Anderson

NORWEGIAN SYNOD MEMORIAL LIBRARY (SEMINARY LIBRARY)

BETHANY COLLEGE, MANKATO, Minn.

15 June 1956

To: The Rev. Professor B. W. Teigen, President
Bethany College

Reverend Sir:

I have the honor to lay before you my Annual Report, as follows:

NORWEGIAN SYNOD MEMORIAL LIBRARY (LIBRARY OF BETHANY LUTH. THEOL. SEMINARY)
LIBRARIANS ANNUAL REPORT -- 1955/56

The main functions of a library are the acquiring, the preservation and the making available of its material.

The Acquiring of Material. Apart from paying for our periodicals, your librarian has been rather hesitant of buying new books, chiefly because there had to be enough money available for the purchase of certain equipment. This matter will be dealt with below.

The Preservation of Material. Books are preserved by being bound and shelved properly. Our most pressing needs as to binding and shelving are outlined below.

Making Material Available. As far as the undersigned knows, all information asked for by users of the library has eventually been found, if contained in our books. Statistics have not been kept as to how many books have been lent out, nor as to how many persons have received help from the librarian (e.g. professors, students and pastors writing papers, and the like). Cataloging has been delayed, partly because of the lack of equipment, because of the urgency of other work, and because of the lack of sufficient clerical help.

Our most pressing needs will now be indicated.

Binding. During the past year (1955/56) we have concentrated on our continuations.

Note. A "separate" is a book that is published complete in itself (e.g. Pieper's Christliche Dogmatik); a "continuation" is a publication that continues to be published more or less indefinitely, such as a periodical (e.g. Lutheran Sentinel) or a synodical report.

This work has entailed the handling of several hundreds of individual continuations in Norwegian, German and English.

Our Synod Publication Board has instructed the undersigned to see to it that we have two bound copies of each issue of Tidende & Sentinel. Mr. Oscar Pedersen of Minneapolis has given the library bound volumes of these periodicals for 1917 to 1947 inclusive, Professor Lillegard for 1917 to 1924 inclusive. A short list of our continuation holdings may be given here. We have:

bound, at least one complete file of the "old" Synod's ~~Synodisk~~ Norwegian organ, Evangelisk Luthersk Tidende;

bound, at least one, apparently complete file of the "old" Synod's Synodical reports;

bound, at least one complete file of

Lehre und Wehre;
one, very incomplete file of Concordia Theological Monthly (i.e. from the time it appeared as Theological Quarterly);
several incomplete files of the Synodical Reports of the reorganized Norwegian Synod, with gaps after 1945.

This is not the place for a complete listing of our continuations. It will, probably, be proper eventually to publish a more complete list.

Hundreds of unbound issues of Tidende and Sentinel are being moved from shelves in the Synod Book Co. Store Room to a book case (specially built by Mr. Nerison) in the attic. This moving has been a task both awkward (loose issues of these periodicals have had to be carried up several flights of stairs) and time consuming (upon reaching the attic, they have had to be shelved in order, chronologically).

Shelving. We can get more shelf space, if more book cases are erected, -- for instance, three in the attic and one against the East part of the South wall of the Library. This last mentioned one would be used for non-theological books: literature, history, philosophy and Scandinavian books. An attempt would here be made to include only such books as might be referred to, in the course of their duties, by our theological professors, students and pastors.

Book Trucks. We need two book trucks. The Rev. Julian Anderson has kindly made arrangements to have these trucks donated to us.

Unit Card Catalog Cases. We owe it to President Teigen's cooperation that our needs as to card catalog cases will be taken care of. This matter will be further dealt with below.

Clerical Assistance. The time and money spent on library work would be considerably lessened, if we could get the needed clerical assistance.

Remarks on Finances. We have had to spend about $70 on periodicals, leaving about $180 not spent of our budget. For a card catalog case, we will have to spend about $170 (unless this amount is reduced by gifts -- a top or cornice unit and a leg base unit for the card catalog case -- promised to us by the thoughtful kindness of the Rev. Julian Anderson). We will still need about $30 for binding current (1955) volumes of periodicals and about $100 for arrears in binding. Then we should buy some new books.

Synodical Archives. Authors depositing papers in the Archives are requested and urged to hand in papers that are carefully made. The desideratim may be indicated, in short, by stating that the paper should be in a form suitable for publication. Even if not published, having the paper in a good form will be helpful in taking care of it and make it easier and more convenient to study for such as may be interested in it.

Literary Activity (in the Library Field). For the book selection series, "The Pastor's Basic Library" (of which the first contribution was the one on Norwegian Dictionaries by Prof. Einar Haugen) being published in the Clergy Bulletin, President Teigen will soon have one ready on English Dictionaries. Contributions are being prepared on German Dictionaries and, by the Rev. Julian G. Anderson, on Dictionaries and Grammars of the Ancient Greek Language, particularly the Koine.

Respectfully submitted,
C. U. Faye
Librarian

The "Clergy Bulletin" is published by the Southwestern Minnesota pastoral conference of the Norwegian Synod.
Editor:
Rev. T. N. Teigen
917 So. Grange Ave.
Sioux Falls, S. D.

Subscription price per year is $1.50, payable in advance to:
Rev. Arthur Schulz
675 Second St.
Tracy, Minn.

Bethany Lutheran College
Education Department
Mankato, Minnesota

Editor
Clergy Bulletin

Perhaps some of the brethren will be interested in the following information regarding Housing Exemption for Ministers. The material enclosed is gleaned from LUTHERAN EDUCATION 91:256 (which is in turn a summary of an article from WASHINGTON MEMORANDUM by Robert Van Deusen, National Lutheran Council).

"Church officials will be sent a copy of the new ruling on written request to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The interpretation of the new tax law . . . is astonishingly liberal."

"In the case of a minister buying a home, the entire monthly payment is exempt from taxable income, including principal, interest, taxes, and insurance, even though taxes and interest are deductible in addition on the long income-tax form. The reasoning is this: An exemption and a deduction are two different things. An exempt item is not considered income for tax purposes. A deductible item may be subtracted from taxable income before computing the tax if the long form is used. Some people are entitled to both, even though they involve the same items."

"If taxes and insurance are paid separately from the monthly payment, they are still exempt. So is the cost of running a home, including fuel, utilities, and telephone (exclusive of long-distance calls). Even repairs to the house are included, as being a part of the cost of providing a home."

"There are limits, of course. The main one is this: The total of such exemptions cannot be greater than the housing allowance listed in the budget of the employing congregation or agency. If there is no such allowance, there are no exemptions... Church organizations should be sure to list a housing allowance for clerical staff members and to make it large enough to cover the cost of housing as interpreted by the new ruling."

Perhaps there are no ministers (the term "minister" as here used applies to pastors, teachers, professors) who are interested in such information. It applies, of course, only to those who either own or are buying their own homes.

Fraternally,
6-13-56 Vernon Gerlach

LITT AV HVERT

Following the resignation of Pastor Levine Hagen, the East and West Paint Creek congregations of Waterville, Iowa, sent a call to T. N. Teigen, who has since returned it.

We're told that Ted Aaberg has been called by the Board of Regents to be the Bethany Solicitor. Have heard nothing further concerning that call.