

CLERGY BULLETIN

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

Vol. XVI, No. 1.

September, 1956

DOES ENDORSEMENT OF THE BOOK OF CONCORD INVOLVE ENDORSEMENT OF EVERY STATEMENT IN THE CONFESSIONS ?

by Dr. S. C. Ylvisaker

(Editorial Note: The Essay begun in this issue of the Clergy Bulletin was delivered by Dr. S.C. Ylvisaker at the Student Pastor's Conference at Hotel Sherman in Chicago, April 25 & 26, 1944. It was mimeographed and had a limited circulation at that time. A good reading of it should prove timely, edifying, and fortifying. T.N.T.)

A church without a confession is like an orchestra with no music. A church with an unclear confession like a ship in fog.

A church with an otherwise good confession but including but one error is like a symphony where all is harmonious but one part is out of tune. One false note or one singer out of pitch may mar the most beautiful chorus, just as one single glass in a window may change the effect of a most gorgeous work of art. When the Master Director, our Saviour, asks for a song of praise, thanksgiving, prayer, confession, from His Church, who are we to deny Him the harmony of Christian faith which He has planted in the hearts of His children, the clear notes of which He has recorded for us in Scripture?

We need to review the significance of our Confessions briefly in order that we may study the question before us in the proper perspective. Too many have begun to look upon them as a dead letter and as a more or less useless burden which the church carries around to slow its progress. And yet, each time we say "I believe", in confessing the Apostolic Creed, we might well consider our Christian prerogative. In the face of all the world we hurl that "I believe" as expressing the very victory of faith, and that, of my personal faith. We tremble with the responsibility of it; we are grateful for the privilege of it; we rejoice in the victory of it; we rise up ready to do battle for it -- this God-given conviction that One, namely Christ, has redeemed my soul. This confession has become a very part of me, it is a personal thing, it characterizes me more than any description of my physi-

cal self or any enumeration of my natural attributes or characteristics. Thus also in the case of a church. We do not, can not, must not, remove from the term Confession, the personal element and now of a sudden begin to think in terms of theology, dogmatics, theses and antitheses. No matter how many are along in the act of confessing, the central fact remains that a confession is a personal matter and a personal concern. But the content remains the same in the case of the one or the many, just as the content of the many voices and of the One Voice in Scripture is one, namely Christ. About that sacred name all voices blend of those who are members of the Christian Church from the beginning to the end of time, nay, into all eternity. That name above every name unites the voices of all the saints of God into one grand harmony, and that name thus becomes the distinguishing mark of every confession that is called Christian.

A confession, then, becomes a very simple thing. Its content is Christ. And whether this name is spoken in the babble of an infant or by the trembling mouth of the aged, by the learned or the unlearned, by the outcast or the respected, by the theologian or the layman, it is the earmark of a true Christian who owns the full riches of God's grace and holds in the hand of faith the inheritance of the saints. If it is as simple as that, there is no excuse for any Christian to fail in this self-evident activity of a believer. He will make known the name of Christ by his spoken word, by his Christian life --

and there is that which unfailingly distinguishes a Christian in this --, by his membership in a Christian church, by his aims and purposes and goals. Nay, we may say in deep earnestness that a Christian's whole being breathes a confession of Him Who redeemed him by His blood.

When the question is asked, which Christ shall I confess, or - How much of Christ shall I confess, we may look up in surprise, as if the question is absurd and quite out of order. Yet it is Scripture which warns us that the time will come when men shall say, "Lo, here is Christ, or there", to deceive the hearts of many. So we ask deliberately, Which Christ? And the time has long been here when men are quite willing to Confess the Man, Christ, though not the God-man, as if He can be divided and rent asunder.

When we ask the question, Which Christ?, we find that this very question is anticipated in the Scriptures themselves. That the believers in the Old Testament period might not be confused, the Holy Spirit has, by prophecy, by types, even in the whole sacrificial system described Him so clearly and definitely that He would be known in advance as if He were already there, and that He at His coming would be recognized and accepted for what He was. In the New Testament again He is carefully described, negatively and positively, so that no one in future or in the present would be led astray or eventually have the excuse that they could not know. We would do well to study this more earnestly than we do, and to note that it is to a great extent concern for the enemies of the Church that has made this necessary. For faith is the opposite of doubt, and God does not want His Christians to be in doubt when the question is raised, Which Christ? When Peter says, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," we note at once the added description. Similarly Stephen in his confession, Peter in his sermon on Pentecost, Paul in his address before Festus and Agrippa, the Epistles, the Book of Revelation, the introduction to the Gospel of John. The early Christians in their baptismal formula included a description of this Christ which defined Him and identified Him apart from any other Christ or and false description of Him. And from the Apostolic Creed down to the present

this has, after all, been a chief concern of the individual Christian and of the Christian Church, to define and describe the Christ in Whom they had put their faith, that there would be no question of identification, no mistake, no doubt, as if the Church with one voice declared: Here, in this Christ and none other, is the Rock of my salvation, my hope of salvation, my life and light and crown. "Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." (Acts 4,12)

Similarly, then, also in the case of that other question, How much of Christ shall we confess? The answer is given again in Scripture: the whole Christ, His whole person, His whole work, His whole Word. Here, too, we may say that it is a matter of identification. But the question concerns our missionary activity also, so that when the Church goes out to declare this Christ, it is ready to tell the world, This is what He has done, This is what He has said, that your hope and confidence may be sure. Let us note well, we can not separate Christ from His work or His word. He is identified with both, as He is identified by both. One may say, I believe that Christ died; but if he does not believe in the Christ Who died for us, in our behalf, he simply does not have the true Christ, and his faith is vain. Another says, I believe that Christ said, "For God so loved the world"; but if he can not with the same confidence continue the quotation to the end, he in plain words has a wrong Christ and not the true. In this way the confession of the individual Christian and the confession of the Church can not be satisfied with a half-Christ or a quarter-Christ, as if there were such a thing. Souls are at stake. The glory of Christ is at stake. We must be able to tell the world Which Christ and How much of Christ.

A salesman stepped into my office the other day. He had taught advanced work at two large universities. For some reason or another he let the conversation drift into the religious field, and soon let it become clear that his opinion was that of so many others that religion and religions were all the same. Let each believe what he saw fit, be sincere in this belief, and all would be well. I

urged him as kindly as I could to consider that there was, after all, the matter of identification to consider and that the question of Which Christ? would have to be answered. Was it the Christ Who taught, let us say, infant baptism? The Christ Who is true God or only true man? The Christ Who rose again from the dead? And we may go on from there to more pertinent questions that may trouble us: Is it the Christ who permits Himself to be identified with the Christ of the lodge? Who condones unionistic services with errorists? Who teaches prayer-fellowship with those of another faith or who cling persistently to certain errors against that Bible with which the true Christ has identified Himself? My salesman friend was quick to see the significance of all this, appearing even grateful for the suggestion that he think this over -- and his assurance that he wanted to think this over and talk to me again seemed sincere.

Studying our confessions in this light we will soon learn that the Church down through the centuries has been conscious of its responsibility in this very thing. Confronted by the continual attacks against the person, work and word of Christ, and the repeated questionings Which Christ? How much of Christ? the Church has found it necessary to study the Scriptures ever more thoroughly and intensely to find the answer and to be able to ward off the errors which would point the way to another Christ. In all of this confessional activity, as we may call it, the Church has but one aim, to identify itself with the one, holy, Christian Church of all ages and of all climes apart from which there is no salvation and no hope. It has ever been busy making sure, as it were, that the true Christ dwelt in her midst for the comfort of the believers. It is true, words have been added to words, definitions to definitions, there are these and antitheses, and a whole, to some involved, system of doctrine has arisen about the person and work and word of Christ which seems utterly confusing and even unnecessary -- for are we not urged to let our faith be as simple as that of a mere child, where a single-minded trust is the chief characteristic?

And yet, if we should analyze the simple faith of a child, say in the relation of this child to its mother, it has

by that one act of trust out through a rather intricate process, after all. It has chosen positively this mother and in the face of many an obstacle and danger thrown itself into its mother's arms. Negatively it rejected every other and singled out this one woman unerringly, though many arms may be raised to tempt him. In the case of a sheep the process seems even simpler, but given to analyzing as we are we might make the whole very intricate by describing the temptations of a sheep to choose another voice than that of the true shepherd, particularly if these voices become many and deceitful. The fact that an adult Christian has been endowed by God with a reason and a will and an emotional life which the enemy of our soul can approach from innumerable different angles to cause him to stray, as is proved by the history of the Church also in doctrinal matters, this fact will help us to realize how the Church has been obliged to define its Christ more and more definitely and, if you will, more discriminatingly with a wealth of detail regarding person, work and word that seems to leave many a humble Christian at least wondering if not confused and disturbed. And yet, in the end, in its confessions the true Church has succeeded in doing that one all-important thing of keeping the eyes of the souls committed to her care directed on the one Christ to the exclusion of every other, of defending these souls against the deceits of satan, of giving voice to the deep conviction of the believer in the face of friend and foe, the happy response to the gracious invitation of Jesus Himself; "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven." (Matt. 10,32). In this confession the believer joins in the song of heaven, as it is written: "Bless the Lord, ye his angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word. Bless ye the Lord, all ye his hosts; ye ministers of his, that do his pleasure. Bless the Lord, all his works in all places of his dominion: bless the Lord, O my soul." (Ps. 103,20-22). And finally, by its confessions the Church is at work fulfilling the command of her Lord: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matt. 28,20). That word, "all things", is there to remind us that our confession has the responsibility of stating definitely and

clearly Who Christ is, and bringing to men the whole Christ.

Would it then not be wiser and better for the Church to point to the Bible as God's own revelation and statement to man and as a perfect reply to both questions? That would do away with much strife, bickering about words, even doubt as to whether or not our confession is correct in every way. To this we must answer that such a course would undoubtedly be the best, for that Word is clear and authoritative. And still God wants our confession; He wants my personal reply to the question, Who is Christ? It is only natural that human speech serve in this; the babbling of the infant or the more mature phraseology of the enlightened Christian. But what is more important; consider what men make of the Bible, its meaning and in particular its testimony regarding Christ, His person, work and word. What a confusion we see because of the insistence on putting reason above the Word (as in the case of the Reformed and Modernistic churches) or the tradition and authority of the church as a human institution above that same Word, as in the Catholic Church. And the spirit of man so permeates the reading and interpretation of Scripture to the hurt of the true Church and its members, that it again has become necessary for the Church, because of the enemy, to state in its own words what the Scriptures actually say in reply to the questions above. And after these centuries of battle, of testing and proving, of examination and re-examination, of re-study in the light of the sacred Word, our Lutheran confessions still stand on the field of battle with the challenge of faith and holy assurance: "Only those who have despaired of finding the truth, only skeptics who are ever busy at learning and never reaching the knowledge of the truth can assert: this men have written, therefore it must contain error. If error could be proved in our symbols, then the rod would be broken over our symbols also; then they would not be symbols of the true, pure, orthodox church, but of a false, impure, erroristic church, and no honest man could subscribe to them. But we challenge the whole world and all unbelievers and errorists, to discover one single doctrinal error in our Concordia. All the enemies of our church have spent themselves in vain in this pursuit for 300 years; but they have been

put to shame in their attempt. They have shown that our symbols contain that which opposes their blind reason, and that we gladly grant; but they have failed in proving that they contradict the holy Scriptures in the smallest letter. Any similar attempt will now prove just as vain and shameful on the part of those who nevertheless want to be considered as the most faithful sons of our church. In their attempt to show that the voice of their pretended spiritual mother in her public confessions in part is the voice of error, they will prove nothing else than that they are the bastards, who, because they do not believe the divine Word, deride that church as a liar, which confesses what she has found in the Scriptures as the faith of her heart." (Walther, Syn. Ber.d.westl. Distr., 1858, p.19). Our Lutheran confessions, going back to the ecumenical creeds and down to and including the Formula of Concord, one and all are torn in pain and anguish, even as the confession of a Job; they are singed with the flame of fire and sword, stained with the blood of martyrs, surrounded by the prayers of the believers, bedewed by their tears, and yet wafted on from one generation to the next, borne aloft as the standard of victory, of hope, of triumphant happiness, proclaiming His Name Who rules among His saints, world without end. This is its noble content, this also its aim and goal.

It is to this confession you and I as pastors have added our signature, and by this act we stand before very God and in the company of a host of God's own. Does our signature imply an unconditional acceptance or a conditional one? Do we subscribe to the whole confession or only a part of the same? Are we Lutherans (i.e. Christians, believers) in part, in name, or in deed and altogether? Or is this manner of putting the question before us unfair? DOES ENDORSEMENT OF THE BOOK OF CONCORD INVOLVE ENDORSEMENT OF EVERY STATEMENT IN THE CONFESSIONS? This is the wording of the question that has been submitted to me to answer. Much that pertains to this answer is contained in the foregoing, and on this background any further discussion may become quite brief. We shall try to make the answer as clear and definite as we can, without seeming to avoid such difficulties as the question presents.

If by the expression EVERY STATEMENT IN THE CONFESSIONS is meant every word, every phrase, every historical reference or statement, even every interpretation of Scripture, then we answer with a definite NO. (The following pages lean heavily on Dr. Walther in Syn. Ber.d.westl. Distr., 1858). The confessions are not there to teach grammar, language, history; nor do they pretend to do this. On this point we make a clear distinction between the Scriptures as the verbally inspired Word of God, where every statement is God's Own, whether it be in matters that pertain to human affairs or the spiritual things of God. There that word stands and shall stand: "The scriptures can not be broken." The symbols are the confession of faith, i.e. a statement of what the church believes and holds. It is therefore a declaration pertaining to doctrine, the doctrine of the church. The symbols claim to be nothing else or more than this. Thus an endorsement of the symbols can mean nothing else, and at the same time nothing less, than an endorsement of the doctrinal content of the confessions. An unconditional endorsement means an endorsement of the whole doctrinal content without exception and with the whole heart. A conditional endorsement means an endorsement that either does not include the whole doctrinal content or is not sincere.

We may put it thus: where the writers of the confessions have been obliged to depend on their human knowledge of science, history, or things that do not pertain to doctrine, they may have erred. For this reason we may make an object of further investigation, and eventually reach another conclusion regarding, the quotations ascribed to Ambrose and Augustine in articles 6, 18 and 20 of the Augsburg Confession. We may doubt an historical reference here or there which is not founded on Scripture. We may even question the interpretation of this or that passage of Scripture, remembering that the rule Scripture itself lays down for such interpretation as a requirement for orthodoxy is this that it must be according to the analogy of faith -- Rom. 12,6. John Gerhard is quoted as follows: "Even though we may not always discover the real and special meaning of every passage, it is sufficient in the interpretation of these passages that we present nothing that is contrary to the analogy of faith (Aehnlichkeit des

Glaubens)". Furthermore we may disagree with or try to improve upon the manner of presentation or the building-up of an argument, so long as we do not disagree with the doctrine itself which is being presented, either as the main concern in the presentation or as a minor, necessary or apparently unnecessary part of the presentation. In the matter of adiaphora, we may disagree in judgment with regard to their use or non-use, but not in the doctrine or the principles regarding adiaphora taken from the Scriptures. Not one or all of these considerations effect the question of unconditional or conditional acceptance of the symbols of the church.

It will be helpful to review the various forms in which this conditional acceptance of the confessions has appeared: In one case it would mean that I subscribe to the confessions in so far as they do not oppose the Scriptures or in so far as they agree with the same. Thus the Pietists made use of the formula: In so far as they do not militate against the Holy Scriptures, or: In so far as they agree with the Holy Scriptures. The Rationalists later adopted these formulas, though in a far wider sense. -- Another conditional subscription is found in the formula: In so far as I acknowledge the fundamental doctrines of the Bible are taught correctly or essentially correctly in the confessions. Thus the General Synod in its time. -- A third: I subscribe to the symbols as they are rightly interpreted or understood according to the Scriptures. Thus even the Reformed could subscribe. -- In this connection we remember the conditional acceptance of the symbols in their "historical meaning" by the Iowa Synod, which urged that the symbols should be understood as they referred to specific conditions existing at the time. -- A fourth would say that he accepts that, and only that, which is of a strictly confessional nature in the symbols. Thus Lbhe said: "I distinguish between that which is stated confessionally and that which is not so stated, -- and I distinguish still more. I should never dream of clinging to the letter and becoming guilty of symbololatry... I accept what is said confessionally in the confessions." Thus a great part of the doctrinal content of the symbols would be lost. -- (Ad 4: Walther adds a footnote regarding the Iowa Synod: "The Iowa Synod says the same as

Löhe, of. above, in these words: "As a real confession, a norm of teaching that binds the consciences, only the thetical and anti-thetical decisions can be considered which each article states and establishes against the lie and the error. Not every system of proof, every explanation, etc., which really is a side-issue (accidens) in a confessional writing, can be made a doctrinal statement which binds the conscience. What the symbols want to establish as symbolic, that has symbolic authority." -- A fifth would say: I subscribe to certain symbols both of the Lutheran and of the Reformed church, in so far as these agree with one another. Thus the church of the Prussian Union. - - A sixth: I subscribe to the symbols, but with the understanding that even such doctrines as are clearly stated and established in the symbols are to be considered open questions and treated as such as soon as a difference of opinion arises concern-

ing them among the confessors. Thus the Buffalo Synod in the doctrines of the Church and the office of the keys. - - Finally, a seventh conditional acceptance is that proposed by the rationalists of accepting the spirit, but not the letter, of the confessions.

All of this shows how dangerous a conditional subscription to the confessions is and can become. As for an unconditional acceptance let us consider again that this implies an endorsement of all doctrinal statements in the symbolical books of our church, whether these statements appear in the form of theses and antitheses, as side-remarks or as a part of the line of proof regarding other doctrines. Everything of doctrinal import is included and without any exception. Does the church have a right to demand this of its pastors?

(To be Continued)

GREEK GRAMMARS AND DICTIONARIES

(Concl.)

by J. G. Anderson

GREEK LEXICONS

Once a student has mastered the elements of Greek grammar his ability to read and understand written Greek texts is limited only by his ability to learn the meanings and usages of Greek words. And it is here that the average Greek student finds his greatest difficulty, even after several years of study. For this reason the Christian pastor will find it necessary to include a good Greek lexicon on his library shelves - a book to which he will often find occasion to refer as he studies his Greek New Testament.

The standard reference work of this kind in English, so far as the Greek language in general is concerned, is certainly the excellent A Greek-English Lexicon by Liddell and Scott. Published originally in 1843, this remarkable work has gone through nine editions and many re-printings and has held the field virtually alone in its class for over 100 years. The last edition, published in 1940, is a magnificent two-volume work, completely revised and considerably enlarged by Profs. H.S. Jones and Roderick McKenzie. For general

overall use, covering all dialects, there is nothing finer.

There are also a number of excellent lexicons published specifically for New Testament students and scholars interested in the more specialized field of Koine studies. On the continent a standard reference work of this kind for many years has been H. Cremer's Biblich-Theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräzität, the ninth ~~edition~~ revision of which was published in 1902. In 1912 Cremer's work was revised and enlarged by Kögel. It's popularity was such that it was translated into English by Urwick in 1892. Another famous German lexicon of New Testament Greek is E. Preuschen's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments, revised only quite recently by W. Bauer in 1928.

By far the most famous of all the efforts of the German lexicographers in the 19th century, however, was the Clavis Novi Testamenti Philologica published in 1868 by C. L. W. Grimm as a revision of Wilcke's work of the same name. Grimm's work was enthusiastically received by all

shades of theological thought as the greatest lexicon of New Testament Greek ever produced, and arrangements were made at once to have it translated into English, a task which consumed eleven years. The English translation of Grimm's lexicon soon fell into the capable hands of Prof. J.H. Thayer of Harvard University, and in 1886 his revised and expanded Greek - English Lexicon of the New Testament appeared - certainly the finest one-volume lexicon of New Testament Greek ever to appear in the English language - and the most useful. It has the advantages of being thorough, accurate and concise, and is unquestionably one of the most convenient and useful tools a pastor can put on his shelf. Its one deficiency, which will become more acute as time passes, is its lack of references to the new papyri discoveries.

This deficiency can be supplied, however, to a very satisfactory degree by the addition of Moulton and Milligan's fine volume on The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, published in 1930 and re-printed in 1949. The specific purpose of this work is to illustrate the Koine usage of New Testament words from the papyri and other non-literary sources. As such it is an excellent and useful complement to Thayer's lexicon.

Another remarkable little volume, extremely brief in its treatment of Greek words, but for that reason extremely useful for quick reference, is Alexander Souter's Pocket-Lexicon to the Greek New Testament, published in 1917. It has been aptly described by Moulton and Milligan as containing multum in parvo. By far the most inexpensive of all lexicons, it is a handy little volume to have.

Of recent years the work of revising, enlarging and bringing up to date this vast mass of lexicographical material for New Testament studies has been going on apace, both on the continent and in our own country. By far the most ambitious and thorough-going of all such labors is the new Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament edited by Gerhard Kittel in collaboration with a whole host of contributing editors. The first volume of this truly monumental work appeared in 1949, although the material had been prepared for some years before that date. When

finished, Kittel's Wörterbuch will comprise seven large volumes. At the present time five of these volumes are available, with the other two due to appear in the very near future. For a complete treatment of the vocabulary of the Greek New Testament, Kittel's work will undoubtedly hold the field for many years to come.

At the same time in our own country another revision and extension of another famous standard lexicon is proceeding, and, according to reports, is nearing its completion. This is the translation, revision and enlargement of Preuschen's afore-mentioned Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments as revised by Bauer. It is being undertaken by W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich, and will be entitled A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. A notice of this new lexicon has already appeared in the lists of books new and forthcoming for 1956, but the writer of this article is unable to state whether it will be a one-volume edition or a multi-volume work. If it is carefully done, it may well become the successor to Thayer's lexicon for the English speaking world.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, then, it is the opinion of this writer that the library of the average Lutheran pastor, if it is to be reasonably well-equipped and serviceable for his daily work and an occasional outside "paper" or two, should include the following books as a minimum requirements:

1. A standard reference work on Greek history in general -- Bury, J.B., A History of Greece.
2. A standard reference work on the Greek language in general -- Atkinson, B.F. C., The Greek Language.
3. A standard work on the significance of the new papyri discoveries -- Deissmann, Adolph, Light From The Ancient East.
4. A standard work on Greek grammar in general -- Goodwin, W.W. & Gulick, C.B., Greek Grammar.
5. A standard work on the grammar of the Greek New Testament or Koine -- of the larger grammars, EITHER
 - a) Robertson, A.T., A Grammar of the Greek New Testament...

OR

b) Moulton, J.H., Grammar of New Testament Greek.

-- of the shorter grammars, EITHER

a) Robertson, A.T. & Davis, W.H., A New Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament.

- OR -

b) Dana, H.E. & Mantey, J.R., A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament.

- OR -

c) Chamberlain, W.D., An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament.

6. A standard lexicon of the Greek language in general -- Liddell, H.G. & Scott, R. & Jones, H.S., A Greek-English Lexicon.

7. A standard lexicon of New Testament Greek -- Thayer, J.H., Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament.

All of the above-mentioned works are currently in print and available. The total cost of all seven works, if purchased new and if the larger grammar by Robertson or Moulton be included, would be about \$50 to \$55. The most expensive item would, of course, be Liddell and Scott's two-volume lexicon, which would cost about \$15 if purchased in England. It should be pointed out that all books should be purchased through English booksellers, if at all possible, as the savings gained are considerable by so doing.

J.G. Anderson

* * * * *

CORRECTION: Our readers are kindly asked to make the following correction in the first part of the above article, in the "Clergy Bulletin," July issue, p. 95, line 23 of the first column. Should read: "Robertson's grammar" instead of "Thayer's grammar."

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 E. Schulz, 675 Second St., Tracy, Minn.

CONVENTION BUSINESS

(Ed. Note: The following resolutions were adopted by the Norwegian Synod in its convention held Aug. 14 - 19, 1956.)

WHEREAS, it is apparent that the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod at its Convention in St. Paul, Minnesota, June 1956, did give consideration to the causes of our suspension resolution of 1955, therefore be it

1. RESOLVED, that our Synod express its gratitude for that consideration; and

WHEREAS, the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod at the same convention, in Resolution 15,c of Committee #3, pleaded with us that we accept their "fraternal expressions of concern" in regard to us; therefore be it

2. RESOLVED, that the Norwegian Synod meet with the other synods of the Synodical Conference to determine whether or not the constituent synods of the Synodical Conference are now in doctrinal agreement; and be it further

3. RESOLVED, that the Synod's Union Committee be designated to represent the Synod in this matter; and be it further

4. RESOLVED, that our Synod express its desire to take part in the proposed international conference of conservative Lutheran theologians, affiliated with the Synodical Conference.

WHEREAS, however, more time and study are needed to determine whether the causes for our suspension resolution of 1955 have been removed; therefore be it

5. RESOLVED, that for the present the exercise of our fellowship relations with the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod remain in suspension.

CLERGY BULLETIN

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

Vol. XVI, No. 2.

October, 1956

DOES ENDORSEMENT OF THE BOOK OF CONCORD INVOLVE ENDORSEMENT OF EVERY STATEMENT IN THE CONFESSIONS ? (Concluded)

by Dr. S. C. Ylvisaker

Here it is well to bear in mind what the purpose of symbol is. In general this purpose is a) that the church by means of its symbols clearly and definitely confess its faith and teaching before the whole world; b) that she thereby separate herself from all erring communions and sects; and c) that she possess one common, sure and unanimously accepted form and norm of doctrine for her teachers, out of and in accordance with which all other writings and doctrines may and must be judged and regulated, when they are to be examined for acceptance. If the church demands only a conditional endorsement from her servants, then she has a) retracted before the whole world the claim that she really has the faith and the doctrine which she has laid down in the symbols; her confession is therefore not really a confession, and she may consequently be justly accused of being double-tongued and of deceiving the world with her symbols. b) the church, by demanding only a conditional endorsement, does not by means of her symbols distinguish herself from the erring sects, but puts herself on a common level with them since by her own admission her symbols contain errors. As a result the church is c) without a unanimously accepted form and norm of doctrine according to which each individual may judge his own doctrine and at the same time judge all other writings and teachings.

The specific purpose of the Symbols is this that the church may a) assure herself that those who desire to undertake the office of teaching in the church really have the orthodox understanding of the Holy Scriptures and the pure and unadulterated faith which she herself owns; b) that the church may bind these by a holy promise to preach this faith pure & unmixed (lauter). If they can not make this promise, it fol-

lows that the church must ask them to withdraw from the office of teaching in the church either by not accepting the office or by leaving the office if they are already there, and not disturb the church by false doctrine and deceive her members into these false teachings. This special purpose of a subscription to the symbols will be forfeited altogether, so far as the servants of the church are concerned, if they accept the symbols only conditionally. For as soon as the church herself has permitted her servants to adopt the opinion that doctrines may be contained in the symbols which are contrary to the Holy Scriptures, she has a) lost the assurance with regard to the faith of the subscriber which an unconditional subscription would give her; and b) she has thereby cancelled her own demand that her teachers teach the Word of God pure and unadulterated in accordance with the symbols as the doctrinal norm. And again, in the same moment as a congregation, through its pastor's subscription to the symbols, is seeking a guaranty of this that neither a teacher who is uncertain in his conscience nor a deliberate errorist may preach to her all sorts of errors as though she has a right to do this, this guaranty is lost to the congregation by his demand for a merely conditional subscription; nay, the congregation thereby puts into the hands of the false teacher a weapon against itself and robs itself of the right to depose from office the one who teaches contrary to her symbols. By her public confessions, adopted in so many cases after serious discord, the church has finally brought to a close and settled, doctrinal controversies and established peace in the church. A conditional endorsement will in such cases only serve to lay a foundation for a re-

newal of strife and for continual unrest.

Let it be said in all earnestness that every conditional endorsement of the symbols is a backdoor by which dishonesty enters to deride the Church and bring to naught the whole purpose of the symbols and of subscription to the same. In the case of honest men who simply can not test the whole book of Concord according to the Word of God and finally cannot say with certainty that the whole doctrinal content of the confessions agrees fully with the Scriptures, or who are in anxious doubt concerning certain points -- such men most certainly, at least in the state in which they find themselves, are not capable of assuming the office of teaching in the church; for "a bishop must be ... apt to teach" (1 Tim. 3,2). He must be one who holds "fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers." (Tit. 1,9)

On this whole matter of subscription to the confessions Müller, in his classic introduction to the Concordia (Gütersloh, 1876) p. 30-32, says (translated by Y.): "We hold that the church is altogether within its rights when she demands of her servants that they recognize the authority of the church symbols and declare themselves unequivocally in their favor. In itself it is of no importance whether this is done through a formal oath or through a promise accompanied by the giving of the hand, through a written statement or by the simple promise by word of mouth; for the Church may surely presuppose on the part of those who desire to become her servants, i.e. heralds of the Truth, that she has to do with honest men. The form of this declaration may thus be irrelevant, but the content is not; for this must declare definitely and clearly that with which the Church is really concerned, namely the acknowledgment of the scripturalness of her symbols in all that concerns doctrine, and the promise -- because of the scripturalness of the same, and therefore not quatenus but quia -- to conform faithfully in doctrine to these symbols. It is self-evident that only he can make this declaration who in his heart is convinced that the symbols of the Church are the adequate expression of Scripture teaching, that this teaching has sprung up from the soil of the divine Word & agrees

with this Word. If this conviction is there, then subscription to the symbols is not a bond for the spirit, nor a burden on a person's conscience; if this conviction is not there, then there can be no talk of a subscription, and therefore not either of the acceptance of an office in the Church. For the Church not only has the right but also the obligation to inquire into the religious conviction of those who desire to be her servants; she must, in so far as this is possible, obtain the assurance that her servants are for her, not against her, that they gather with her and do not scatter. It is, in fact, more than naive to seek an office in the Church and at the same time expect the liberty and convenience of not only preaching another doctrine than that of the Church, and that with the same power and authorization, but also -- and that is the necessary consequence -- to attack the doctrine of the Church, declare it to be false, and reject it. Whoever seeks an office, either in the State or in the Church, undertakes duties, the performance of which necessarily is associated with the forfeiting of a part of his personal liberty; he enters upon a relation of self-restriction, nay, an unrestricted personal (subjective) liberty is impossible even in living together with other people, even apart from the restraints imposed by the office itself."

From the introduction to the Book of Concord as edited by special resolution of the Missouri Synod in the year 1917, I quote the following, p. 7ff.: "The position accorded the symbols in the Lutheran Church is clearly defined by the Book of Concord itself. According to it Holy Scripture alone is to be regarded as the sole rule and norm by which absolutely all doctrines and teachers are to be judged. The object of the Augustana, as stated in its Preface, was to show 'what manner of doctrine has been set forth, in our lands and churches, from the Holy Scriptures and the pure Word of God.' And in its Conclusion the Lutheran confessions declare: 'Nothing has been received on our part against Scripture or the Church Catholic,' and 'we are ready, God willing, to present ampler information according to the Scriptures.' 'Iuxta Scripturam' -- such are the closing words of the Augsburg Confession. The Lutheran Church knows no other principle. The Lu-

theran symbols, therefore, are not intended to supplant the Scriptures, nor do they do so. They do, however, set forth what has been at all times the unanimous understanding of the pure Christian doctrine adhered to by sincere and loyal Lutherans everywhere; and, at the same time, they show convincingly from the Scriptures that our forefathers did indeed manfully confess nothing but God's eternal truth, which every Christian is in duty bound to, and consistently always will, believe, teach, and confess.... After its adoption by the Lutheran electors, princes, and estates, the Formula of Concord, and with it the entire Book of Concord, was, as stated, solemnly subscribed by about 8,000 theologians, pastors, and teachers, the pledge reading as follows: 'Since now, in the sight of God and of all Christendom, we wish to testify to those now living and those who shall come after us that this declaration herewith presented concerning all the controverted articles aforementioned and explained, and no other, is our faith, doctrine, and confession, in which we are also willing, by God's grace, to appear with intrepid hearts before the judgment seat of Jesus Christ, and give an account of it; and that we will neither privately nor publicly speak or write anything contrary to it, but, by the help of God's grace, intend to abide thereby: therefore, after mature deliberation, we have, in God's fear and with the invocation of His name, attached our signatures with our own hands.' . . . They declare: 'This Confession also, by the help of God, we will retain to our last breath, when we shall go forth from this life to the heavenly fatherland, to appear with joyful and undaunted mind and with a pure conscience before the tribunal of our Lord Jesus Christ.' Therefore we also have determined not to depart even a finger's breadth either from the subjects themselves or from the phrases which are found in them, but, the Spirit of the Lord aiding us, to persevere constantly, with the greatest harmony, in this godly agreement, and we intend to examine all controversies according to this true norm and declaration of the pure doctrine.'" The following section on "Pledging of Ministers to the Confessions" shows that the pastors and teachers were asked to pledge then as now.

Our Confessions belong to us personally in so far as we make them our own by a

faith which conforms in all things to these Confessions. They are not our own, as if we can do with them as we please. They belong to the Church as the standard of this Church in war and in peace. These Confessions are based on the Word; they proclaim that Word; and they shall abide because the doctrines they proclaim are God's own. He who subscribes to them, let him do it without any reservation, fear or doubting, for they are the voice of the bride, the Church, as she hails her Lord, acknowledges His grace and love, glories in His truth and wonders at the divine mystery of His presence. These Confessions list many teachings, they breathe the same spirit and point to but one object, the Christ of Calvary. Because they describe Him, it is not for us to change them on any point, for fear such change will point us to another Christ, even as two individuals may be exactly alike except in a single feature, the color of the eyes. Our Confessions are supported by two main pillars, the principles upon which our Lutheran Church is built, the doctrine of the inspiration of the Scriptures and the doctrine of justification by faith alone. By means of these two principles all teachings of the Confessions are knit together into one whole, they permeate every teaching, give meaning to them all. Those who deny wholehearted endorsement to one teaching, no matter how minor it may seem to be, in reality deny the very heart of our Lutheran faith, for no doctrine of Scripture can be separated from these two main principles. To deny endorsement to a single doctrine of the Confessions is to deny both the clearness and the authority of Scripture Itself, which teaches these doctrines.

Let us look to ourselves in these perilous times when so many are wavering and even rebuke ourselves into a more earnest attitude over toward our Confessions, remembering

that it is an ignorant Christianity which does not see,

an indifferent Christianity which does not care,

a lazy Christianity which does not study and search the Scriptures and the Confessions,

a proud Christianity which demands to know rather than to believe,

a naive Christianity which refuses to

recognize its enemies,

an unthankful Christianity which does not recognize its treasures,

a disloyal Christianity which will not confess that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works."

And though we, as the fathers of old, by confessing, may have to become confessors in the sense of martyrs, being misunderstood, derided, persecuted, pray God that He may grant us grace to remain faithful to that eternal Truth which He revealed to us in Christ and which is confessed so nobly in our glorious Confessions.

S. C. Ylvisaker

Norwegian Synod Memorial Library
Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary Library
Mankato, Minn.
The Pastor's Library - Note 3

ENGLISH DICTIONARIES

by

President B.W. Teigen, Professor of English and Symbolics

Dictionary making has occupied the English people for quite a few centuries. Originally dictionaries existed primarily to help one acquire a vocabulary in a foreign language. For example, in the 15th and 16th centuries there came into existence several English-Latin word lists. Often they had only one word equivalent. It seems that the first book to bear the name "Dictionary" was Whittle's "Short Dictionary for Young Beginners" (1538).

A second period in dictionary making began when Robert Cawdry early in the 17th century got out an alphabetical table of "hard words". There was apparently great demand for this sort of thing, for in 1616 a Bullocker published a similar book which he called "The Expositor".

Dictionary making entered a third phase at the beginning of the 18th century when a professional lexicographer, Nathaniel Bailey, made an effort to explain words in a scientific way in his An Universal Etymological Dictionary of the English Language (1721). His greatest work published in 1730 went through several editions and was quite widely distributed. Bailey had about 15,000 words in his dictionary, although it is estimated that 250,000 to 275,000 words were in use in the English language at that time. Bailey tried to list words that were in common use without making any judgments as to their standing. Since they were a part of the English language he included the four-letter

words, defining one term in Latin.

It has been said that without Bailey there would have been no Johnson, for he used Bailey's work as a starting point for getting out his famous dictionary. Johnson's Dictionary of the English Language (1755), became the one with the prestige and the one which has tended to put a halo of absolute authority around almost any dictionary. It is interesting to note that for the first time an editor explicitly obtrudes himself in a dictionary. Johnson introduced his own opinion by labeling terms according to what he thought about them. It has been pointed out that Johnson used 214 epithets, the most common being "low", "a low term", "corruption", "vicious", etc. He castigates about 1200 words in one way or another. Because of Johnson's prestige, many dictionary makers followed his practice, and thus dictionary makers began to prescribe for their readers.

Before leaving Johnson's dictionary, it might be of interest to call to mind some of his more famous definitions which he put into his dictionary. He defines a lexicographer as a "harmless drudge." His dislike of the Scotch crept into his definition of oats, "a grain, which in England is generally given to horses, but in Scotland supports the people". Johnson was a learned man and used a learned language as can be seen from his definition of network, "anything reticulated or de-cussated, at equal distances, with inter-

stances between the intersections". Johnson made several obvious mistakes in his dictionary and was quite candid in admitting them. We all might more often follow Johnson's example in answering a lady as to why he defined a "pastern" as the "knee of a horse"; "ignorance, Madam, pure ignorance."

The great American lexicographer is Noah Webster. He published his first dictionary in 1808, but his masterpiece was a later work, Dictionary of the American Language (1828). He inherited from Johnson the idea of prescribing what he thought was correct, a practice which he also followed in his famous Blue-backed Speller. He was quite naturally anti-British, and he succeeded in changing, and making stick, several spellings, e.g., our to or (color) and re to er (theater). He was also able to do the same with certain pronunciations. In some sequences the standard British way to pronounce er was ar, but Noah was able to change that so that we do not say "perfect" or "marcy"; but despite Noah, we do say "sergeant" and people call themselves "Clark" (clerk).

When Noah Webster died, his widow sold the dictionary rights to the Merriam brothers. These printers were interested not only in making money, but they had an ideal that this country needed a great dictionary based on the best scholarship available. So they went to the universities (Yale, Harvard, and later Princeton) for the best philologists. When the first series of Merriam-Webster was published in 1864, the brothers decided not to take any profit out of the venture until they could get out a new edition about every 25 years, and they have. There were editions in 1890, 1909, and in 1934 the latest edition, Webster's Second International. I have been reliably informed that they plan to come out with a new edition sometime around 1960. Apparently their plan of setting aside a reserve before reaping the profits has driven out of business their competitors, such as the Funk and Wagnall's New Standard.

Note that the 1934 edition of Merriam-Webster uses the word "International". It is widely used, and some of the 300 consultants lived outside of the United States, although most of them lived in this

country, predominantly in the East. The consultants were well educated and noted people, generally educated in the East (Harvard), but they were not necessarily trained linguists. Such people without linguistic training and background may have different ideas about what they actually say and hear. In this connection it might not be out of the way to say a word or two about "preferred pronunciation". The idea generally seems to be that the first pronunciation printed in the dictionary is better than the second and that one ought to change over to it, even though it is absolutely foreign to one's mode of speaking. It is well to remember, however, that to keep down the expense Merriam published only two pronunciations (occasionally three), but that was not to say that the other pronunciations were wrong. If one says "preferred pronunciation" one will also have to ask, "by whom?" One of the pronunciations had to be printed first, and since there were more Eastern observers who had the New England pronunciation (a dialect much less widely distributed than general American or Mid-Western), these pronunciations were listed first, although several times the vote was a 151-149 affair. In view of this it would seem to be rather unnecessary for a Mid-Westerner to try to take over a New England pronunciation when his own is perfectly respectable. If one is looking for a reliable guide to pronunciation, consult Kenyon and Knott, A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English, published by Merriam.

There is no such thing as "the dictionary" which can be quoted to settle any and all questions about words. Most dictionaries are commercial ventures, and the editors compile the best book they are capable of and with the money allowed by the publisher. There is one monumental work, however, which would not be classed as a purely commercial venture. About the middle of the last century, when the results of the great historical linguists began to be known (Rasmus Rask, Grimm Brothers, Bopp, etc.), a group of English scholars proposed a dictionary of the English language based on historical principles and the best linguistic scholarship. It is interesting to theologians to know that one of the British scholars was Archbishop

Richard C. Trench, author of these famous works on the miracles and the parables, and synonyms of the New Testament. The idea behind this proposed dictionary was to give the complete history of every word entered. Not only the scholars, but volunteer readers in England and all over the world (an extremely large number of them were clergymen who had time to study) read and wrote out on slips of paper all English words in the sentences where they were used. It is said that over six million of these slips were worked over by the editors. The first fascicle came out in 1884 and the last in 1928. A one-volume supplement was issued in 1933. These fascicles have been bound into ten volumes and the completed work is known today as the Oxford English Dictionary (OED). A linguist writing in 1956 states that it "is the greatest dictionary in any language". One wonders whether a similar judgment will be rendered over the completed Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch. Incidentally, neither Bethany College or Seminary library has the OED. It would make a wonderful memorial gift; I think that the current price is about \$175.00.

Growing out of the OED and supplementing it by studies of specific periods and areas are several other great dictionaries: A Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles, edited by Sir William Craigie, was published by the University of Chicago in 1944 in four volumes; and a two-volume Dictionary of Americanisms, edited by Mitford M. Matthews, came out in 1951. The University of Michigan, under the editorship of the great American linguist, Hans Kurath, is publishing a definitive work on Middle English - Middle English Dictionary. This University has all the earlier files of the OED.

But as I previously remarked, most dictionaries are commercial ventures and they will vary in date, size, and responsibility of editing. Competition has been good for commercial dictionary-making, with the result that today there are several good modern desk dictionaries. They sell for the same price (\$5.00, and \$6.00 for thumb index), and they have about 140,000 entries. I shall list them in the order which I think I would purchase them today.

Webster's New World Dictionary (NWD), Cleveland: World Publishing Co. This desk edition, which has nothing to do with Merriam-Webster, was first published in 1953. The general editor is Joseph H. Friend, an excellent lexicographer who secured the services of some able assistant editors, consultant and contributors. The definitions are concise, concrete and exact. This book gives more etymological information than any other desk dictionary, a factor which would appeal to pastors trained to use several languages. Dr. Harold Whitshall's nineteen page introductory essay "The English Language" is a good summary of the phonology, morphology, and syntax of the English language.

The American College Dictionary (ACD), New York: Random House and Harper Brothers. This dictionary, first published in 1947, gave the first real competition to Merriam-Webster in recent years, a fact which was good for the dictionary business since Merriam-Webster had tended to rest on its laurels. When it was first published, Bennett Cerf, head of Random House, said that if Merriam-Webster had been the General Electric in the dictionary world he would be satisfied if the ACD became the Westinghouse. I think that in all probability it has become at least that. It was prepared under the general editorship of the famous lexicographer, Clarence L. Barnhart, and its editorial advisory board is composed of such outstanding linguists as Leonard Bloomfield, Charles C. Fries, W. Cabell Greet, Irving Lorge, and Kemp Malone. Its definitions are concise and exact and it has good illustrations, but its etymological notes are not as copious as those of the NWD. A thorough reading of its introductory essays will bring you a new and fresh understanding of the English language. The essays are: "Selections of Entries and Definitions" by Irving Lorge; "Pronunciation" by W. Cabell Greet; "Treatment of Etymologies" by Kemp Malone; "Synonyms and Antonyms" by Miles L. Hanley; "Usage Levels and Dialect Distribution" by Charles C. Fries; and "British and American Usage" by Allen Walker Read.

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, Springfield, Mass.: G. and C. Merriam Co., 1949. This dictionary is an abridgment

and reworking of the new International, second edition, 1934. It replaces Webster's Collegiate Dictionary and was Merriam's answer to the ACD. It is a good solid dictionary, but it has several drawbacks: All entries are not in the same list of words, biographical names and the pronouncing gazetteer being in separate lists; the illustrations are not too good, and instead of describing the actual size of something in feet and inches the book will caption a picture with words such as these, "Dodo (about 1/20)". Some of the definitions tend to be more difficult to understand and the work has not always made use of the linguistic research of the last 35 years. No doubt when the new edition of Webster's Unabridged comes out about 1960, the desk dictionary based on that will be an excellent up-to-date work.

If you do not have \$5.00 but you do have \$3.50, I would like to suggest for your consideration a dictionary with about 80,000 entries: The Thorndike-Barnhart Comprehensive Desk Dictionary, Chicago: Scott-Foresman, 1951. It is surprising how adequately this dictionary will serve one's needs. The definitions are concise and exact, and one will usually find the definition he is looking for because the

dictionary has used the famous semantic count of Thorndike and Lorge to select the different senses of a word for definition. Porter G. Perrin, author of the excellent freshman English textbook, Writer's Guide and Index to English, has written special usage notes for this dictionary. They are helpful in assisting one to write effective and acceptable English. The essay by G. C. Fries and Aileen Traver Kitchen, "American English Grammar", is the best summary of the grammar of our English language to be found in these desk dictionaries, and Prof. Albert Marckwardt's essay, "Punctuation", is unsurpassed.

Besides word information a good modern dictionary will give you many geographical, historical, and biographical facts, but there still may be some up-to-date facts one may want to have. I suggest that for \$1.10 you purchase The World Almanac and Book of Facts for the current year. That will give you information from the batting champion of 1931 to the number of members of Jehovah's Witnesses.

B. W. Teigen

WISCONSIN SYNOD RESOLUTIONS

(Editor's Note: The following Resolutions of the Thirty-third Convention of the Wisconsin Synod, at Watertown, Wisc., August, 1956, are reprinted from the Northwestern Lutheran, Sept. 16, 1956, pp. 294 and 295.)

Resolution on Continuing Fellowship

Even though we deplore the fact that the question of unionism and the controversial issues listed in our Synod's 1953 resolutions in themselves still remain unresolved, yet,

WHEREAS, the resolution of The Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod, declining membership in the Lutheran World Federation, is an excellent statement of scriptural principle and policy, and lays a better basis for a discussion of the principles of church fellowship and their application; and

WHEREAS, The Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod resolved "that hereafter the Common Confession (Parts I and II) be not regarded or employed as a functioning basic document toward the establishment of altar and pulpit fellowships with other church bodies" and whereas, we understand this to mean that thereby The Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod's 1950 resolutions concerning the Common Confession (First and Third Resolves of Resolution 14) have been set aside and whereas, The Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod recommended that committees preparing future doctrinal

statements take note of the suggestion to make fuller use of antithetic statements; and

WHEREAS, The Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod gratefully acknowledges "every fraternal expression of concern and guidance in matters of doctrine and practice" from brethren in the Synodical Conference; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that we concur in the suggestion of our Standing Committee on Matters of Church Union to "hold the judgment of our Saginaw resolutions in abeyance" until our next convention . . .

Resolution of Protest

WHEREAS, we are not ready to stand committed to the contention "that the Common Confession, one document composed of Parts I and II, be recognized as a statement in harmony with the Sacred Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions," inasmuch as the document failed to settle the doctrinal controversies which the Church was assured had been settled by it; and

WHEREAS; we deplore the specific resolutions which our sister synod passed on the issues of Scouting and military chaplaincy; its stand on prayer fellowship; and the fact that several other issues were not acted upon at all, e.g., the communion agreement with the National Lutheran Council; be it

RESOLVED, that our fellowship with The Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod be one of vigorously protesting fellowship to be practiced, where necessary, in the light of II Thess. 3:14, 15.

Resolution on Future Discussions

BE IT RESOLVED, that our Synod take part in the suggested conclave of theologians and take immediate steps to help arrange such a gathering of theologians to allow for a full discussion of all unresolved issues; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Praesidium and/or the Standing Committee on Church Union be authorized to make arrangements that the issues which disturb the unity of the Synodical Conference be thoroughly discussed and considered on the basis of God's Word; and be it finally

RESOLVED, that our representatives work in close cooperation with our brethren of the Norwegian Synod of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church, which fully shares our doctrinal position.

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 E. Schulz, 675 Second St., Tracy, Minn.

ANNOUNCEMENT

In August, a copy of the Pieper essay on Church Government was sent out to the readers of the C.B. Those who expressed the wish to have printed copies were enough to warrant having it printed. Very likely the cost will be about \$.15 per copy in quantities. The second Pieper essay on "The Difference between Orthodox and Heterodox Churches" will be mailed to our readers in the near future.

CLERGY BULLETIN

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

Vol. XVI, No. 3.

November, 1956

BURIAL

(Note: This article is a translation of the section "Begräbnis" in E. Eckhardt's Reallexikon, vol. I, pp. 284 - 289. Translation is by Rev. A. Schulz.)

- I. Christians are accustomed to bury their dead in a Biblical manner. For this they have the example of:
 - A. God, who buried Moses, Deut. 34:6;
 - B. Christ, who allowed Himself to be buried and thereby hallowed our graves;
 - C. The old Christians. Gen. 23:4 (Sarah); 35:19 (Rachel); 50:7 (Jacob); Acts 8:2 (Stephen); Matt. 14:12 (John the Baptist).
 1. Thereby we Christians express our faith and hope of the resurrection. We plant the dead in God's acre as we would a grain of wheat, 1 Cor. 15:37.
 2. Among the heathen it happens that they throw their dead to the dogs or birds, or burn them.
- II. In itself burial is a purely civil matter. Anyone can take part in a burial without churchly ceremonies, in private. (Only through the manner of burial among Christians does it become a part of the public service.)
- III. The burial of an ass (Jer. 22:19; 26:23) takes place:
 - A. In private (ohne Sang und Klang), without churchly ceremonies;
 - B. Outside of God's acres, or at a special place in the same.
- IV. A churchly or Christian burial takes place when the dead is buried with Christian honor, with singing, prayer and a message from God's Word.
 - A. To perform the Christian burial of the dead belongs to the official duties of the pastor, and the congregation has called him for this purpose. What the pastor does, he does in the name of the congregation.
- B. It is therefore a churchly burial when the pastor takes part in it according to his office, and publicly prays even the Lord's Prayer.
- C. We should thankfully recognize the blessings of a Christian burial, and not think: "It is immaterial how I am buried."
- D. If through unusual circumstances a Christian receives no Christian burial, that in no way affects his salvation.
- E. The superstition is to be rejected, as though the Christian burial in any way is a help to salvation.
- V. The Christian burial:
 - A. Is done to the glory of God;
 - B. Is a service of love. 2 Sam. 2:5.
 - C. Is done for the comfort of the relatives;
 - D. Is a confession of membership; the departed was a Christian and our brother in the faith.
 1. This confession is also expressed in the church and at the grave by singing, prayer, and confession of our common faith.
 2. The burial is commonly looked on as a confession. If the lodge or military or a Catholic priest follows the dead person, then we can conclude certain things concerning him.
- VI. To whom shall it be granted? A Christian burial only for Christians. We therefore grant a churchly burial only to those whom we according to love consider as Christian and brethren in the faith;

- A. Members of the congregation, who fall asleep in faith;
- B. Outsiders, who may not have belonged to the congregation, but whose souls were ministered to on their deathbed, and who gave clear signs of repentance and faith;
- C. Baptized children of unchristian parents, if they still stand in the baptismal grace;
- D. Still-born unbaptized children of Christian parents, concerning whom we have the hope that God received them in grace;
- E. Those who are possessed, insane, who were known as Christians before their sickness;
- F. Impenitent, excommunicated, if they repent in the last hour.
 1. One should certainly also mention this publicly, in order to avoid causing offence.
 2. If the pastor himself was not a witness of the repentance, then the testimony of upright Christians should be at hand.
 3. A pastor cannot deny a Christian burial also in the following cases:
 - a) When a person is under church discipline, but the process of excommunication has not yet been concluded;
 - b) When a member of a congregation dies in an unchristian manner, when however this is known only to the pastor and no witnesses were present;
 - c) When it is doubtful, whether someone has laid hand on himself or not, whether a suicide was done intentionally or while insane, if there can still be doubts whether someone died as an unbeliever. Doubt is to the good of the one who died.

VII. To whom shall it be denied? The churchly burial is to be denied to all non-Christians and false-believers; or in other words, to all those who in their death did not stand in altar-fellowship with us. This includes:

- A. All non-Christians, who depart in impenitence, all despisers of God's Word and the Sacrament. He who did not hold to a church during his

time does not belong there in death;

- B. Those who suddenly depart this life in mortal sin;
- C. Those who have been excommunicated (Pastorale, p. 308);
- D. Drunkards;
- E. Suicides. (Exceptions are those who commit the act while they were irresponsible);
- F. False-believers. We know nothing about them, whether they died in their error, or in the Gospel, which may still be among them. They belong under the pastoral care of their church. Besides, it would be a denial of the truth when we bury as Lutherans those who did not wish to be Lutherans. (If the false-believing party in a mixed marriage dies, then the orthodox party should seek no heterodox burial for the heterodox party. He should much rather let the matter take its course, and not look to the heterodox pastor as his comforter);
- G. Lodge members. We deny membership to the lodge. Also no pastor should agree to preach the funeral sermon and leave the rest to the lodge. He can then just as well give up his whole testimony against the lodge.
 1. Members of congregations often expect that pastors should bury all people, as does the gravedigger, and think it wrong for him to refuse a burial.
 2. Unfortunately there are pastors who are belly-servers, who will give anyone a Christian burial. Their testimony will bear little fruit!
 3. Ibsen, an enemy of Christianity, was given a churchly burial.
 4. The reason why the relatives of such people so earnestly request a Christian burial is honor before men, and the mistaken belief that when a pastor buries someone, then all is well.

VIII. The reasons why we must deny non-Christians a Christian burial are these:

- A. To bury non-Christians like Christians is an unscriptural practice.

1. God Himself has gone before us with good examples. Jer. 22:19 - "He shall be buried with the burial of an ass." 1 Kings 21:24; 14:13.
 2. It was also done this way in the Christian Church.
- B. It would be a lie to sing: "his soul lives eternally in God," while at the same time it is certain that he has entered into damnation. It would be hypocrisy to confess someone as our brother in the faith who never wished to belong to us.
1. Luther: "We can not sing our hymns."
 2. To bury non-Christians as Christians is profaning the name of God.
- C. It would give great offence
1. To Christians themselves, who must take offence in it;
 2. To the world. The world would think: "Faith or unbelief makes no difference, a person can live ungodly and will still be lauded as being saved." Or: "The preacher does everything for money."
- D. To deny non-Christians a Christian burial is a powerful testimony against sin and unbelief, and is the best sermon. (If we would deal otherwise, our testimony would bear no fruit.)

IX. Objections.

- A. Burial should be for the sake of the living, not for the sake of the dead. - And yet everything is done for the sake of the dead. When unbelievers seek a pastor for their dead, they do not want to hear God's Word, but to show churchly honor toward their dead.
- B. The relatives of the dead person belong to the congregation; it is the pastor's office to comfort them. - The pastor can carry out his office before or after the burial, without showing honor to the dead person which he does not deserve.
- C. The pastor can at least preach a funeral sermon. He need make no reference to the dead person. - If he need not refer to the dead person, why bother to have a funeral service?
- D. It is a wonderful opportunity to tell the truth to people who other-

wise do not come to church: "Don't live as did this person." - Then the relatives would be offended, and the others instead of being won would rather be embittered.

- E. The pastor should merely read from the Agenda at the grave, or merely say the Lord's Prayer, or merely go along. - In the Agenda there is no formula for unbelievers. No one needs a pastor to say the Lord's Prayer. If a pastor can pray the Lord's Prayer at the grave of an unbeliever, then he can conduct the entire funeral service.
- F. The pastor cannot see into the heart, whether a person is a Christian or not. - But every Christian knows that a person who wilfully despises the means of grace to the very end is no Christian.
- G. The dead person might have come to repentance in the last moments. - We cannot judge in the manner of the secret, hidden judgment of God, but only according to that which is before our eyes.
- H. Then the relatives will leave the congregation. - The favour of God and the salvation of souls should be more important to us than the favour of men.

X. Burial customs.

- A. Among the heathens: For the sake of the dead they would cut letters or marks in their flesh, Lev. 19:28. They would cut themselves above the eyes, Deut. 14:1; Jer. 16:6.
- B. Among the Jews:
 1. They gather in a house of mourning. Matt. 9:23; Acts 9:39; op. Eccl. 7:2.
 2. They pretend to lament. Gen. 50:10; Acts 8:2. - Gen. 37:35; 1 Chron. 19:2; Jer. 6:26; Sirach 38:16. In every case this lamenting was done with consideration of God's Word.
 3. They abstained from feasts of mourning. Jer. 16:7; Tobias 4:18. "Give alms of thy bread and wine at the burial of the pious."
 4. Put on clothes of mourning. Time of mourning.
 5. Pipers, weeping women. Matt. 9:23
 6. Embalming.

- C. Among the first Christians. The old-Christian burial.
1. Also Baptism or the Lord's Supper was celebrated at the time of a burial. Origen. 1 Cor. 15:29 - "baptized for the dead."
 2. Under the papacy many ceremonies have degenerated in unbelief and idolatry.
 3. Funeral sermons were held in the old-Lutheran Church only on special occasions.
 4. The way and manner of Christian burial is not commanded by God.

CONVENTION DEVOTIONS

(Editor's Note: In answer to several requests we are submitting the list of texts for Scripture readings, sermonettes, and benedictions at our Convention last August. T.)

Theme: "TESTIFYING THE GOSPEL OF THE GRACE OF GOD AFTER THE MANNER OF ST. PAUL."

Tuesday, p.m., Aug. 14: Acts 20,17-38.
Session closing: Rev. 1, 5b.6

Wednesday, a.m., Aug. 15. Acts 26,19-23;
"Testifying...in faithfulness to God and the Truth of the Gospel."
Session closing: 1 Tim. 6,13-16.
Wednesday p.m., 1 Cor. 2.
Session closing: Heb. 13, 20.21.

Thursday, a.m., Aug. 16. 1 Cor. 15,9.10.
Session closing: 2 Cor. 13,14.
Thursday p.m. 1 Cor. 3.
Session closing: 1 Pet. 5, 10.11.

Friday, a.m., Aug. 17: 1 Cor. 9,19-23;
"Testifying...with Sacrificing Zeal for Blood-Bought Souls."
Session closing: 2 Pet. 3,17.18.
Friday p.m. 2 Cor. 11,23 to 12,11.
Session closing: 1 Cor. 15,58.

Saturday a.m., Aug. 18: Phil. 1,19-23;
"Testifying...in Hope" (Memorial).
Session closing: Eph. 6,23.24.
Saturday p.m. 2 Tim. 4,1-8.
Session closing: Jude 24.25.

* * * * *

QUOTES

Last evening I paused beside a blacksmith's door
And heard the anvil ring the vesper chime.

"How many anvils have you had," said I,
"To wear and batter all these hammers so?"

"Just one," said he; then said with twinkling eye,
"The anvil wears the hammers out, you know."

And so, I thought, the anvil of God's Word
For ages skeptic blows have beat upon;
Yet, though the noise of falling blows was heard,
The anvil is unharmed -- the hammers gone. (Hammer & Anvil, by J.Clifford)

- XI. The place of burial was
- A. Outside of the city. Gen. 23:19-20; 35:19; Matt. 8:28; Luke 7:12.
 - B. Within the city. 2 Chron. 24:16, the graves of the kings. 1 Sam. 25:1.
1. Many had special burial places for the family. Joseph of Arimathea. Abraham.
 2. Later on houses of prayer and chapels were often built at the place of burial.
 3. Often God's acre was located next to the church.
 4. The Catholics bury in ground which is consecrated to a depth of three feet.
- XIII. Every congregation should, where it is possible, have its own cemetery, and
- A. consider it precious and valuable,
 - B. consecrate it,
 - C. keep it clean,
 - D. not permit it to be marred by unchristian epitaphs or rationalistic, heathen symbols. (Pastors of other faiths have no right to perform their office on a Lutheran cemetery, nevertheless if the lots have been sold it may not be possible to keep such pastors out in every case.)

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 E. Schulz, 675 Second St., Tracy, Minn.

DOCUMENTS OF HISTORIC INTEREST

(Editor's Note: Among the papers of the late Rev. C.N. Peterson which were sent to the theological library at Bethany, a number of items were found which are of historic interest. We intend to publish some of these documents as a supplement to the CLERGY BULLETIN, and to distribute them among our pastors. We suggest that you keep these in a separate folder. There will be more from time to time. - - We present in this issue the minutes of the "ABERDEEN HOTEL MEETINGS." They are fragmentary. We have not been able to date to find minutes on all the sessions. We would welcome any leads from the older brethren as to how we might find records of meeting on June 8 and of any that followed. TNT.)

ABERDEEN HOTEL - Tuesday evening - June 5, 1917

The meeting was called to order by Rev. C.N. Peterson. Rev. O.T. Lee led the devotion.

Rev. C.N. Peterson explained the purpose of the meeting and how it came to be called. Rev. C.N. Peterson extended a welcome to a committee from the Synodical Conference, consisting of Dr. W.H.T. Dau, Dr. F. Pieper and Prof. Theo. Schlueter.

Rev. J.A. Moldstad was elected president of the evening, and the undersigned secretary.

Being called upon by the president, Dr. Pieper said that he would be glad to answer any questions, but had nothing further to say just then.

Prof. Dau explained why their committee was elected by the Synodical Conference. The purpose was to bring about a discussion of the doctrine with the Norwegian Synod. Up to this time they had not been able to arrange a meeting with the Synod. They had twice reported failure to the Synodical Conference, and twice their power was enlarged, and they feel now that they have the right to meet with this body, tho it may be misconstrued by some.

Dr. Pieper: It is the duty of the minority to do away with "Opgjør" and the Austin Agreement and to win over the majority to your side. We advised Prof. Preus and Rev. Torrison to do so when they were in St. Louis, and I am surprised to see that they have not made use of their opportunity. The Austin Agreement concedes that there is nothing contrary to Scripture in the minority view, and this is your weapon. The second concession by which you may defend your position is that the Austin Agreement means to say in thesis four that God alone is author of faith, while man alone bears the responsibility of unbelief, thereby admitting that a change is necessary in the corresponding thesis of "Opgjør". Another point, your duty is to stand by the Synod. The Norwegian Synod took the right stand in the controversy concerning election, viz. that the first form of doctrine is scriptural, and that the second form of doctrine has no proof in Scripture. Dr. Stub proves the same in an article in Lehre & Wehre in 1881. It was the position of the Synod also that these forms of doctrine would not necessarily lead to schism when dealing with people who do not combine the synergistic view with the second form of doctrine. You are dealing with such who profess synergism.

Rev. J.J. Strand: It doesn't make any difference if they now have changed the word "responsibility" to "duty" in the fourth thesis.

Dr. Pieper: We may say that man has obligation to believe in Christ, but by the synergist, the obligation would be construed to imply ability to accept Christ. Here you must be on your guard.

Prof. Dau: Explained that Prof. Schlueter, the 3rd member of the committee, was not present at the meeting in St. Louis, where Prof. Preus and Rev. Torrison presented the Austin Agreement. That meeting was arranged by telegram, and there was not time to notify Prof. Schlueter. The question put to us by Prof. Preus and Rev. Torrison was: Is it, in view of the changed conditions in the Synod, our duty to leave the Synod? We answered, "No" because you now have the opportunity to work and witness for the truth as previously explained Dr. Pieper. We held, after reading the document, that there was material gain made through the Austin Agreement. We were startled by the added note. However, that was explained to us as follows: The union movement has progressed so far that even many legal moves have been made on the basis of "Opgjør". The change in "Opgjør" might tend to annul the things that have already been done, and it is furthermore the understanding that the note does not change the concessions made to the minority in the Austin Agreement. The change to "feeling of duty" materially changes "Opgjør" in favor of minority. The minority is invited to enter the new body to witness concerning those things which the minority has stood for, so we thought that a great opportunity was offered the minority, and I still maintain that it is the duty of every one in the minority to bear testimony in the Norwegian Synod and not to leave it at this time.

Rev. J.A. Moldstad: Did you and do you now advise to stay in the Norwegian Synod and enter the new body with the Synod?

Prof. Dau: We did not so advise. It was our understanding that the Austin Document would be presented to the three bodies for discussion. Our answer does not look beyond the point when this document is presented to the Synod and acted upon. We did not say what to do, if it so happens that the Synod rejects the Austin Agreement; or if they invite you to enter the new body with the privilege of your views.

Rev. J.J. Strand: Would it be right to enter the new body if the Austin Agreement is adopted? Dr. Dau: "Yes."

Rev. J.A. Moldstad: I think that Prof. Dau has misunderstood the question or else he would not unreservedly answer "yes."

Dr. Pieper: If demands by minority agree with Scripture, then "Opgjør" must be changed. Secondly, since it is conceded that God alone is the author of faith and man alone is responsible for his unbelief, then thesis four must be changed. There is a possibility to enter the new body under a two-fold proviso: if the new body invite me to enter, with the understanding that I am not bound by "Opgjør," and secondly, grants me the privilege to witness concerning the truth, I would enter the new body; but I would want to be free from "Opgjør", from the Austin Agreement, and entirely at liberty to testify according to my convictions.

Rev. C.A. Moldstad: Up to this time all the leaders in the minority have been silent, and that does not seem to agree with the statement that they have the privilege to witness.

Rev. E. Hansen: Is it correct to say that unconverted man has a "feeling of duty" to accept grace?

Dr. Pieper: I think that is a slip of the tongue. They mean to say that man arrives at a state of neutrality in which he may either reject or accept, and here we have the root of synergism. You should attempt to persuade the majority to do away with "Opgjør" and the Austin Agreement; give the Word of God a chance, and be hopeful, you can never tell what will happen. I am optimistic.

Rev. J.J. Strand: Was the minority note added when the Austin Agreement was presented in St. Louis?

Prof. Dau: If the Austin Agreement be adopted "Opgjør" is changed because they cannot say "yes" and "no" to the same question.

Rev. J.A. Moldstad: You can be certain that the Austin Agreement will be railroaded through without discussion or explanation, and we cannot then enter the new body.

Prof. Dau: As previously stated, when the brethren asked me in St. Louis we did not go so far as to discuss what to do in view of what might happen. I cannot understand how one, much less thousands of men, could get up and say "yes" and "no" to the same question. I asked in St. Louis if the parties to the Austin Agreement were sincere, and they answered "yes"; if they were not sincere, I have nothing further to say.

Rev. J.J. Strand: Suppose they say that the Austin Agreement shall supersede the "Opgjør"?

Prof. Dau: They said so at St. Louis.

Rev. Peterson rose to point of order, suggesting that there will be an opportunity tomorrow afternoon to present the gentlemen of the Synodical Conference to the Synod, and we ought to know how they wish to be presented, individually or as a committee. Secondly, we must arrange for another session.

Rev. O.T. Lee: A year ago our conscience told us that we could not enter the Union unless three things were changed in "Opgjør"; now we are told that the Austin Agreement meets this demand, and we were told at our meeting in January, that the gentlemen from St. Louis advised us to join on the basis of the Austin Agreement. He read a letter from Rev. Tangjerd, tending to show that such changes are not intended to be brought about by the Austin Agreement. We are advised to go along as a fighting body, but the opportunity to witness is denied us by the expression "gjen-sidig broderlig anerkjendelse." The expression "feeling of duty" is not a slip of the tongue. Dr. Stub defends it and quotes Agrippa and Felix to prove it.

Rev. H. Ingebritson: We are accustomed to hear them say "yes" and "no" to the same thing. In correspondence with Rev. Torrison, the expression referred to by Rev. Lee is defended. They are in dead earnest when they answer "yes" and "no" to the same question, and when they use the expression "feeling of duty."

Rev. Peterson: We need advice as to how to proceed at the meeting. In his triennial report, Dr. Stub undoubtedly will make quite a point of this, that an agreement has been reached between the majority and minority in the Synod. Should we then object immediately after the reading of the report, or wait until the next day when it is taken up for discussion? Rev. Harstad is of the opinion that we ought to be prepared to present a declaration in form of an injunction before the election takes place. And again I would ask how the committee from St. Louis would like to be presented to the Synod.

Dr. Pieper: I think it impossible or inadvisable to present us to the Synod because we have endeavored unsuccessfully up to this time to meet the Synod or its representatives since the time we were elected in 1912, and we feel that before being presented to the Synod the Synod ought to invite us to meet with them.

Prof. Dau: Our first commission in 1912 was to appear before the Synod in convention assembled. This was communicated to the Synod. Dr. Stub answered that the Synod did not find it advisable for the committee to appear in the meeting of the Synod, but that a committee had been elected to confer with the committee from the Synodical Conference. As we were elected to meet the Synod in convention assembled, we had no authority to treat with the committee. In 1914 we reported our failure to the meeting of the Synodical Conference in Milwaukee and were given the added authority, but up to this time we have been unable to arrange a meeting with the committee.

Rev. J.A. Moldstad: Could you not attend the meeting of the Synod as individuals, and then perhaps you might be invited to speak in the meeting.

Prof. Dau: That might give them provocation; it might hurt your cause.

Dr. Schlueter: I agree with Prof. Dau; I do not think it advisable to be present.

Rev. Peterson: I cannot remember that the Synod has refused to receive a committee from the Synodical Conference, but as far as I can remember it was reported to us that a committee had been elected by the Synodical Conference and that the proper way would be for us to elect a committee to act with that committee. The majority members of the Synod said expressly that they stand in the same relation to the Synodical Conference now as before. If they do not do so, they will not invite your committee to a seat in the convention. And if they do not invite you to a seat, it will be the means of opening the eyes of ministers and lay delegates to the true condition of affairs. Let them construe it as a provocation - they construe all things that way anyhow. If we speak, it is wrong; and if we are silent, it is wrong.

Rev. C.A. Moldstad: How long can the committee be with us?

Rev. H. Ingebritson: I think we can leave the discussion of this matter now. We have nothing to gain by seating the committee in the convention, but we can gain a great deal by discussing the issue with them here.

Dr. Pieper: Prepare for discussion on the Austin Agreement. When a man says "yes" and "no" to the same thing, it is because there is a cloud over his vision. It is your duty to dispel this cloud.

Rev. J.J. Strand: What if we are not allowed to speak in the convention?

Dr. Pieper: Then your ways part (Prof. Dau "yes"). Select your strongest man to present these points to the convention.

Rev. J.A. Moldstad: I feel that I cannot vote for the Austin Agreement unless it is explained on the floor of the convention to mean what we have stated here this evening.

Dr. Pieper: No, the Austin Agreement must be debated, or else you are out of it.

Rev. Ingebritson: Does Dr. Pieper mean to say that "Opgjør" must be changed?

Dr. Pieper: Of course, and to that end you must use the Austin Agreement. This is your opportunity, your last chance.

Rev. C.A. Moldstad: The minority leaders have already accepted the invitation to enter the new body on the basis of the Austin Agreement, and therefore cannot

discuss the Austin Agreement.

Rev. Ingebritson: Dr. Pieper has said that "Opgjør" must be changed. If there is anything that is clear to us, and if there is anything that has been emphasized by the majority, it is that "Opgjør" cannot be changed; that has been their stand before and they will take the same stand now. I feel that our brethren from St. Louis have not been in a fray like this. Remember that the big men have left us, those who were our leaders, the learned men. We are only small men left as we have not been recognized before, we surely will not be recognized now.

Dr. Dau: On behalf of the committee I wish to state that we will remain in St. Paul all day tomorrow, and are ready to confer with you. There has never been any question in our mind but that "Opgjør" must be changed, but we feel that the Austin Agreement does this. We are outsiders and so possibly keep a little cooler; hence the impression left on Rev. Ingebritson. We should like to hear you discuss the Austin Agreement so that it may be made clear, whether or not you feel that you have gained your demands of a year ago. As to what may happen, I never cross a bridge until I get to it. Do your present duty. As to your smallness of number, remember Gideon's band, bear testimony to the truth and leave the consequences to God.

Rev. J.J. Strand: Would it be advisable to invite Prof. Preus and Rev. Torrison to meet with us?

Rev. J.A. Moldstad: If it were possible to convert the three theological professors, Rev. Torrison and Prof. Preus, much would be gained.

Rev. Peterson: We ought to meet tomorrow noon. I do not think it well to invite Prof. Preus and Rev. Torrison, but rather as suggested by Prof. Dau this afternoon, let the gentlemen from St. Louis call on Preus and Torrison individually.

It was decided to meet tomorrow, Wednesday, at one o'clock, and in the evening at 7 o'clock at the Aberdeen Hotel.

Meeting adjourned, all rising and praying the Lord's Prayer in unison.
(Read and adopted June 7th P.M.) John O Dreng secy.

Wednesday, June 6th, 1917 at one o'clock P.M.

President called the meeting to order and called attention to a few facts in connection with the pamphlet containing the program for the Synod meeting, and resolution to be presented to that meeting.

Rev. H. Ingebritson: I think it best to take the Austin Agreement and discuss it to get a clear understanding of what is the meaning of the text, and then we can talk about what Prof. Preus or Rev. Torrison or other people may put in to it.

Rev. B. Harstad: What are the differences of opinion as to the meaning of the text? I understand it clearly, and according to my understanding of it, the Austin Agreement says that there can be no change in "Opgjør", but we are invited to come along provided we agree to recognize the members of the other bodies as brethren in faith.

Rev. H. Ingebritson: That is exactly what we did not agree on last night. Upon motion by Rev. Ingebritson it was decided to discuss the text of the Austin Agreement. He added: It is my understanding of the expression "reservations" that we may hold our views but accept the others, who hold a different view, as good Lutherans.

Prof. Dau: Are not the reservations those things which the minority have son-
tended for? (several: "yes.")

Dr. Pieper: Remember what the Austin Agreement grants you as called attention
to at last night's meeting.

Rev. Holden M. Olson: If they concede a change in "Opgjør" as a basis for con-
fession but no change in "Opgjør" as a legal basis for the Union, would that be
sufficient?

Dr. Pieper: No, you must insist on change in "Opgjør."

Dr. Dau: I have held these men to be sincere; they have taken the first step
and practically changed "Opgjør." They are now practically forced to take the next
step, and do away with "Opgjør."

Dr. Pieper: Your task and your duty now is to speak; if you are not allowed
the floor, you are excused and cannot go with them. We intended, when we gave ad-
vice to your committee in January, to have you fight from January to June, and then
at this meeting take a last stand. In thesis four, the use of the means of grace
are not in question. Please observe that there is a misquoting of the Formula of
Concord.

Rev. H. Ingebritson: Read a portion of the Austin Agreement and called atten-
tion to some contradictory remarks, saying that in the first place the document says
they cannot grant what we ask, and then in a later paragraph they say that in real-
ity they will do so.

Rev. Harstad: We have endeavored for years to convince the majority, but we
have failed; - they declare themselves so liberal as to admit us, the same way as
they would embrace others, even of the Reformed Church. Suppose they strike para-
graph 8, does that really help? It does not help me, because the same doctrine is
endorsed later on. Are we advised to endorse the statement concerning "feeling of
responsibility"? Unregenerate man does not feel it, for what feeling of responsi-
bility did the Jews have when they said "Crucify him"?

Prof. Dau: You would not want a special "Opgjør". It would make you a church
within a church. The confession you come in on must be the confession of all. As
to the second form of doctrine, you in the year 1882 accepted the second form with
the proviso that it is so explained as to shut out all synergism.

Rev. Harstad: We do not reject the second form of doctrine now, only in so far
as we are dealing with people plus synergismus. You must also distinguish between
having responsibility and the feeling of responsibility.

Upon Motion it was decided to adjourn until 7 o'clock, and that Dr. Pieper be
given the floor at the beginning of the meeting.

(Read and adopted June 7th P.M.)

John O. Dreng, sec'y

(Editor's Note: THE SESSION of June 7, 1917, 7:00 p.m. was conducted in Norwegian.
Rev. Christian Anderson has translated the report of that session. Because the
reader will see allusions to a document submitted by Rev. B. Harstad, we submit here
that document in translation also by Christian Anderson. TNT)

To the Majority in the Norwegian Synod.
The undersigned do hereby beg to declare:

1. We do not for conscience sake want to join the new church body on the present
basis.

2. We remain standing on the old confession and organization, which we in Christian liberty have a right to defend, and under which we have a right to work in the future as in the past.
3. We therefore lay claim to be the Norwegian Synod which will maintain the constitution and incorporation of this church body, its seal, and motto: "It Is Written."
4. Since we desire to avoid every litigation, as far as it is possible, we hereby pledge our word to transfer by a "Quit claim deed" the material property which is now held by the Synod when a majority of the present Board of Trustees request it.
5. This is our definite declaration and offer, by which difficulties on both sides may be solved in a peaceful way, without preventing the majority from carrying out its intentions or depriving it of anything it may have use for in its new organization.

B. Harstad, Parkland, Wash.
T.C. Sætra, East Stanwood, Wash.

Meeting in Aberdeen Hotel, St. Paul, June 7, 1917. 7 p.m.

Meeting opened by the chairman, Pastor J.A. Moldstad.

Minutes from Tuesday evening and Wednesday noon read and approved.

Past. J.A. Moldstad: The first thing which is necessary now is to find a common platform on which we stand.

Past. H. Ingebritson: I left the meeting this afternoon worried, because it appeared as if we were hung up on small matters and would part that way. The main point for us is to hold high the banner for which we have contended. We ought to have an organ and so much of an organization that we can have it published. We shall not have access to any other publication than "Amerika."

Past. C.N. Peterson: He quoted parts of a speech which he delivered in North Minneapolis, when the new congregation was to be organized there. His speech was directed to showing the necessity of submitting to the majority in all things which do not violate the conscience, even if one is not in all things fully in agreement with what the majority decides. With reference to the declaration which it is proposed to send to the Synod: There are several who cannot go along on the declaration edited by Past. Harstad - viz., on account of the last two paragraphs. There are now 43 subscriptions, and I expect more in the mail today. One way to proceed is not to consider the declaration here now, but that Past. Harstad reads it with the signatures we now have. Or, if we could agree on making a declaration which all would accept - f. ex. only the first two paragraphs of the proposed declaration. If we make this declaration, we stand in the old organization until it is finally dissolved. Thereby we say that this is the best way in which we can take care of the interests of the Synod.

Past. B. Harstad: Let us not be afraid that we are not going to submit to the majority. Even if some may think that I am so stubborn that I will not bow to it, it is not so. Let us speak honestly and plainly. Personally I do not care whether the document is accepted or not, if only our testimony against false doctrine is maintained. I am convinced that they intend to keep the Synod alive for a while. When the new church body meets, a meeting of the Synod will be held at the same time, and they will continue in this way, until all the property of the Synod will have been transferred to the new church body. If we were to try to make a declaration which would cover all the points in controversy, it would be too elaborate. It is therefore sufficient that we make a declaration as we do in Par. 1 - they

know very well what we mean. Furthermore, we must tell them how we intend to continue. I think we ought to consider the break as having already taken place, since they have entered a meeting under a new organization. Therefore we ought to have an organization. If we do not do this, we shall have to meet with them, and to this danger I do not want to expose myself. "Depart from them," this is the Lord's admonition to us. With reference to Par. 4: Why not expose them by showing that we are willing to give up all else if we only can keep our old foundation.

Past. C.N. Peterson: We lose the opportunity to testify against what is wrong if we abandon all.

Past. Harstad: What you want outside of the confession and organization you shall have.

Past. Peterson: We bar ourselves from getting anything in the future.

Past. Harstad: One who subscribes to the declaration can serve an injunction. There are no doubt those who will serve us with their means and gifts. Let us therefore bring about something which shows that we want something, and that we are ready to testify to the truth.

Past. I. Blækkan: Past. Peterson's principle to submit to the majority in cases where the conscience is not violated is correct. But let us not be too sensitive. If we should hinder anyone by keeping the whole document, then we would err. Therefore we must not place these hindrances in the way. If we lay claim to that which is mentioned in Par. 3, they will perhaps serve an "injunction." We stand as trustees of the property of the Synod, and we ought not to give it away to such who will use it otherwise than the donors intended it. "Organization" in Par. 2 comprises that which is in Par. 4. I will go along voting for the first two paragraphs.

Resolved that the time for the speakers be limited to 5 minutes.

Past. Levorson: I have been in the dark since January, and believed that all was good and fine; yet I came here with the intention of not entering the new church body, as the German professors said; but we lay more stress on the error than they do. I am opposed to the first and fourth paragraphs (of "Opgjør"). If we can prepare a brief and clear document, I shall perhaps subscribe to it.

Past. O.T. Lee: I will go directly to the point. The fourth paragraph is unclear. The fact is that the Synod elects officers, and they have the power. (Past. Harstad: Therefore I wanted to submit this before the election, so that it should not take place.) Lee: When we now declare that we cannot enter the new church body, is there not a possibility that they will say that we have withdrawn from the Synod?

Past. Holden M. Olsen: What is on our mind is to be loyal to the Synod. Let us remember that there are others who are loyal, in spite of the fact that they for conscience sake feel warranted to join the new church body. We have friends there, and I cannot break the bond of fellowship with them. We hope that the Synod will not finally be dissolved. The Synod needs the means which our fathers have left. If we serve as a good leaven, God will bless our efforts, and what we now hope can become a reality.

Nils Caspersen: How much more would it be for you preachers to leave the Synod without getting any of the property than for a congregation to be divided without one part getting anything? I am satisfied with this, that you want to keep the old name and preserve the old principles. It seems to me that what is said in Par. 3 is taken care of in paragraphs 1 and 2. They take the old Synod with them and eat it

up, and how it may return we do not know - therefore a new Synod must be formed. The new church body will last at the most three years. Let us organize now, so that we can get as many with us as possible.

Ole Tveden: When the question was of the property, I was reminded by Harstad's words of the words of Luther, "And should they in the strife, Take kindred, goods, and life, etc."

C.A. Digness: I thank my good friend Harstad, what he means is that if anyone smites us on one cheek, turn the other to him also. Let us be brief. Let us only tell them that we want to preserve the old organization. I want to ask Harstad to let them keep the rest. We have nothing on which to give a "Quit claim deed." We can go ahead and "Serve and injunction," then we have the good gentlemen (at our mercy). And then we must remember that the new organization will not last long. People do not know the new constitution. I have not found one man in Grand Forks who knows anything about it. It is retrogression instead of progress - they enter into catholicism. Only wait until the preachers have tyrannized a little, then you will see what becomes of the people.

Past. P. Blicher: I have lived in ignorance down in Iowa. I wrote to the president that he should announce me as a member of the new church body, because I did not think I could come to the meeting, and was under the impression that the minority no longer existed. I have never voted for "Opgjør", and would like to stay in the Synod.

Past. H. Ingebritson: It might seem that the committee from the Synodical Conference viewed the matter in a rather bright light. It was to encourage us and get us to look at the situation a little more optimistically. In a private conversation with me, Dr. Pieper said that Par. 4 contained not only synergism, but also Pelagianism. With reference to goods and property, we want to take the position suggested by the verse of Luther which has been quoted, likewise in regard to name and seal - just so we can keep the confession and principles.

Past. J.J. Strand: I received the impression that Harstad is in beautiful accordance with himself. There are many who lay stress on property. Peterson has pointed to the recourse, that those who do not subscribe may declare their position in the meeting. My congregation has decided to enter the new church body, but my representatives did not vote. There is hope that we can win a few, if I do not partake in stirring up a commotion, and therefore I cannot subscribe.

Past. C.A. Moldstad: I move that we submit to the Synod the first two paragraphs of our declaration.

Nils Casperson: Since there began to be a minority and a majority in the Synod, the minority has given the majority too long rope. Now we must watch out and tie a knot on the rope.

Past. O.T. Lee: When I heard Past. Blicher speak, I came to remember that L.P. Jensen wrote that he is with us with his whole heart - likewise Johanssen. I also want to give the information that I have in my possession \$2000.00 donated by an anonymous giver to the Synod. This sum has been turned over to three men to be held in trust by them.

Past. C.A. Moldstad's motion was put to a vote and passed. It was resolved that the chairman, Past. J.A. Moldstad, read the declaration with the names of the signers to the Synod. - Resolved to meet tomorrow evening at 7 o'clock. - Meeting adjourned with the Lord's Prayer and Benediction.

J. O. Dreng, Secretary

1. The first part of the document discusses the general situation of the country and the role of the government in the development of the economy.

2. The second part of the document discusses the role of the government in the development of the economy and the role of the government in the development of the economy.

3. The third part of the document discusses the role of the government in the development of the economy and the role of the government in the development of the economy.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the role of the government in the development of the economy and the role of the government in the development of the economy.

5. The fifth part of the document discusses the role of the government in the development of the economy and the role of the government in the development of the economy.

6. The sixth part of the document discusses the role of the government in the development of the economy and the role of the government in the development of the economy.

7. The seventh part of the document discusses the role of the government in the development of the economy and the role of the government in the development of the economy.

8. The eighth part of the document discusses the role of the government in the development of the economy and the role of the government in the development of the economy.

9. The ninth part of the document discusses the role of the government in the development of the economy and the role of the government in the development of the economy.

10. The tenth part of the document discusses the role of the government in the development of the economy and the role of the government in the development of the economy.

11. The eleventh part of the document discusses the role of the government in the development of the economy and the role of the government in the development of the economy.

12. The twelfth part of the document discusses the role of the government in the development of the economy and the role of the government in the development of the economy.

CLERGY BULLETIN

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

Vol. XVI, No. 4.

December, 1956

AGAIN A LITTLE ABOUT DR. ULRIK VILHELM KOREN

by. T. N. Teigen

Dr. Ulrik Vilhelm Koren was undoubtedly the most outstanding of the three major personages in the history of the Norwegian Synod. The main facts of his life are quite well known; Born in Bergen, Norway, Dec. 22, 1826. Educated in Bergen Cathedral School and Christiania University. Ordained in Norway on a call from congregations in northeastern Iowa and came to those congregations in time to preach Christmas sermons in 1853. Became a member of the Norwegian Synod, arriving several months after its organization. President of the Iowa District of the Norwegian Synod, 1876 to 1894. Succeeded Herman Amberg Preus as President of the Synod in 1894, and served in that position until his death on Dec. 19, 1910. He enjoyed the unique distinction of having been the first Norwegian Lutheran Pastor west of the Mississippi, and of having served the same congregation, Washington Prairie, near Decorah, Ia., continuously for 57 years, from the time of his arrival unto his death in 1910. There are many ways in which he is known among us: As a deep theologian, an extensive writer, as a well versed hymnologist, and as a practical pastor.

It was his lot to be an active participant in many doctrinal controversies. He often said concerning the doctrinal controversies that touched the Norwegian Synod that in every one of them it came down in one way or another to the question whether or not Christ alone is our Saviour. He was a theologian of grace. "Grace alone" was the ruling principle in his life and work, not merely as an intellectual matter, but as a most practical doctrine. To those who have read his writings the following characterization will be recognized as sound: His greatest glory; The pure Word of God. He recog-

nized the Truth as a gift of God's grace. His greatest fear; That the truth might be taken away from us because of our misuse of it and of our indifference and neglect. When trouble came upon the Synod, Koren always pointed out that it was a well-deserved chastisement which we have brought upon ourselves because we have not used the gifts of grace aright. On occasions of Jubilee - and each passing year - he marvelled that God in grace and mercy had still left His truth with us.

In his day and in later days the epithet, "dead orthodoxist", was tossed his way, as it was also toward others of blessed memory. He admitted that there is such a thing as "dead orthodoxy" and "dead orthodoxists", but we have not read that he spent much time and space in denying the charge against himself. What he said and did supply the evidence for right conclusions. We take the liberty to set down a few of his statements which have not been published in translation:

From a Synodical Address in 1886:

"A controversy such as this one we must first of all acknowledge as a chastisement from God. The Norwegian Synod has not used its gifts of grace aright." (Samlede Skrifter, II, p.213.)

"I consider that it is doubtless that among many of us pastors there has been a lack of a right view as to the purpose of the grace which we have especially boasted of having received, namely, a clear insight into the main doctrines of the Lutheran Church. Not for self-vaunting and pride were these gifts given us, but that by them we should in

a more thorough conversion and with so much greater zeal for the Lord's service in a holy life be His witnesses and show the power of His Word unto salvation. But instead of this a neglect and despising of God's Word has more or less ruled in the congregations, and in many places, manifest service of sin, so that just thereby the 'pure doctrine' and the zeal for it has become despised, and many consciences have become confused, since they found a freer life of sin among them who boasted themselves of the pure doctrine than among them who concerned themselves less about being strict on this point." Ibid., pp. 214.215.

"It had often been acknowledged and often been expressed among us that under such circumstances the Lord's chastisement ought to be expected. Still hardly had any of us expected that this chastisement would come in the form and with the force as was the case. For that with which God now confronts us is the danger of losing the very thing which before has been our honor and joy, the very thing which the Norwegian Synod more than all others had received - but received not for self-righteousness and pride, but for pious and diligent use - namely, the old unadulterated Gospel." Ibid. p. 215.

"There are only too many who adhere to the old Lutheranism who calmly content themselves with having it without using it for the purpose for which God has given it to us, namely, conversion and salvation. Here the danger is the greatest: for if this continues, then God will most certainly not allow us to retain the truth.

"What does it profit if we correctly confess that 'it is God who must do all,' when nothing is done? The reason is not that God does not want to work among us the thing that is needful. No, it is the security and slovenliness among us that hinders Him. This security and slovenliness, this lack of earnestness and truth in Christendom, - that is what brings it about that no true and sound conversion takes place. That is what brings us under the threats and the condemnation which the Spirit spoke to the congregations in Asia Minor.

"If we are to escape these, if things are to be good and well in our church again, then we must acknowledge our trouble as a well deserved punishment from God and humble ourselves under His mighty hand. We must not be as the Jews of whom the Prophet Jeremiah complained to God: 'Thou hast stricken them, but they have not grieved.' (Jer. 5,3). But neither must we give ourselves over to idle and useless complaining.

"We must pray that God will turn away the well-deserved punishment, and above all, that He will not remove His candlestick from among us. But we must obey God and be diligent in what we know to be His will. We must nourish ourselves by faith in God's grace so that we receive both desire and strength to walk in a new life with our Saviour. We shall 'lift up the hands that hang down, and the feeble knees; and make straight paths for our feet, lest that which is lame be turned out of the way; but let it rather be healed.' We must both hold fast to God's Word, whether there are many or few who want to be with us, and likewise walk in this world according to this Word, so that we let it become expressly manifest in our lives." Ibid. p.217. 218.

From a Synodical Address in 1887;

"But if we shall be able to preserve the truth which God has committed to us, then let us not forget the great responsibility which rests upon us; for the preservation is not our work, but God's, and God will not preserve it for us if we do not use it better than we have done." (Vol. II, p.43.)

"Can we reckon them blessed who are content with an outward adherence to pure doctrine? Will not they, who thus let themselves rest, sometime be put to shame by thousands of other Christians who had smaller gifts? And will such Christians, who have the name of orthodox, for long be allowed to keep the pure doctrine? No; just as little as that evil and slothful servant, who did not use his talent, was allowed to keep it.

"For what purpose do we have the truth? It has been entrusted to us in

order that by it we may bring our hearers to Christ." p. 44.

From a Synodical Address in 1891:

"If we rightly understand what has been given us by God, then a holy fear will follow to preserve it, a wakeful zeal to defend it, and an earnest effort to use it rightly; in other words, an enthusiasm will follow, whose type so gloriously shines forth to us from the letters of the Apostles and from the history of the first Christians and again from the early times of the Reformation." II, p. 248.

"We have learned what special dangers are connected with the special gifts of grace which God has given us, and how easily they are misused to spiritual slovenliness and sleep. We have also felt the heavy chastisements which God has allowed to come upon us. It is necessary, then, that we encourage one another to use God's gifts better and with greater faithfulness; and how should we be better encouraged to that end than by absorbing ourselves in a consideration of the glory of these gifts. The clearer these shine for us, the more we will learn to guard ourselves from deserving God's chastisement by indifference and misuse and bringing upon ourselves the condemnation of having the gifts taken away from us." II, p. 249.

From a Synodical Address in 1893:

"Frequently a distinction is made between doctrine and life, and it is a well known charge against us that we only concern ourselves with doctrine, pure doctrine, with two or three u's in the pure (ren Laere med to eller tre e'er i ren) and forget life. We have no call to shove aside any charge untested, and simply to blow it away, and we must therefore also examine ourselves in this matter." Then he refers to the possibility suggested by the passage, "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat," and quotes John 13: "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them," remarking: "Doing does not necessarily follow from knowing."

From a Synodical Address in 1893:

"But while there is therefore in a sense a rightful distinction that can be made between doctrine and life, it would not be right to make such a distinction between faith and life. These two can not be separated; for faith is life. Only then can one separate these when he, as the Roman Catholic Church does, has taken the life out of faith and only has the shell left - an outward holding as true (Forsandtholden) without application to one's self, i.e., without confidence and appropriation to one's self."

"But since faith which is the heart's personal trust in God's Word and promise is a completely practical matter, it follows of itself that in the consideration of the matter before us we can do it rightly when we remember at all times that it is a practical matter, so that we speak not only about faith, but also in faith. If we do not do that, we condemn ourselves." Synod Report, 1893, 35.

* - * - * - *

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 E. Schulz, 675 Second St., Tracy, Minn.

* - * - * - *

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Rev. S. E. Lee pleads that all pastors return the questionnaire re the A.A.L. Insurance Plan by Jan. 1, 1957. The plan requires 75% active clergy participation. Lee says if we don't get it, the matter will be dropped.

New Address:

Rev. Robert A. Moldstad
420 Crescent Blvd.
Lombard, Illinois

Rev. Walther C. Gullixson
Waterville, Iowa

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

(Note: The following is a translation of the first part of the book "Kirchengeschichte für Kinder und Eltern," by Dr. C. M. Zorn. Present plans call for possibly putting the entire translation out in multilith form. This is still a rather rough draft, intended to give an idea of what the History will be like. The translation is by Rev. A. Schulz.)

I. Up to the year 324.

1. The Destruction of Jerusalem.

"Church History" is the history of how things have gone with the congregation of Church of Jesus Christ here in time, as it is no longer recorded in the Book of Acts and in the New Testament in general. Concerning this Church History we know only that which is told us in human books. But there is something which God Himself has spoken that we do have. We have, namely, the divine prophecies, which speak concerning the Church of Jesus Christ from the time of the Apostles until that longed-for Judgment Day. We have these prophecies in the four Gospels and in the apostolic letters and especially in the Revelation of St. John. And from these prophecies we know that the devil will always seek to destroy the Church of Jesus Christ, but that Jesus Christ will always help and preserve His little flock in the true faith unto eternal life; and that He will do so until the very end of this world.

Now hear what Church History says concerning the time immediately after the imprisonment of the Apostle Paul in Rome.

Soon after this, the Jews rebelled against the Romans. The Roman general Vespasian then came with a large army against Jerusalem. The Christians who were in Jerusalem fled to the east side of the Jordan in the city Pella. When this general Vespasian was made emperor, his son Titus lay siege on Jerusalem. This was right at the time of Easter. One and a half million people were in the city. A terrible famine was the result. Women butchered their own children and ate them. The Romans captured the city. A million people perished. The temple was destroyed, so that "there was not left one stone upon another," Matt. 24:2. Jerusalem was completely destroyed. One hundred thousand men were sold as slaves. The Jewish people were scattered throughout the world. That happened in the year 70. This had been foretold by the Lord Jesus Christ. And the Jews are to remain scattered throughout the world until the Last Day.

The Christians also now went out into all the world and preached the Gospel to every creature; in Africa, in Asia, in Europe. Christian congregations came into being especially on the north coast of Africa, and in Persia, India and Armenia, along the Rhine, in France and in England.

What happened to the Apostles who were still living when Jerusalem was destroyed? They also went out into all the world. And all of them, with the exception of John, died as martyrs. John died in old age as bishop of the congregation in Ephesus.

The destruction of the Jews was a terrifying event. The Christians who fled and wandered throughout the world endured much affliction. But the wonderful thing is that now the Gospel was preached wherever they went.

2. The shepherds and teachers of the Christian congregations.

It is God's good and gracious will that individual congregations of Christians have shepherds and teachers, who are to feed the Christians, young and old, with God's Word, instruct them therein and watch over them. In the Acts of the Apostles you have seen that for this purpose such people are to be ordained in all congregations. These shepherds and teachers are also called elders and bishops (overseers). And these were not lords, but servants of the congregation, servants in the Word (1 Cor. 3:5). And they were all equal in their office, none was higher than the other. God wants it that way.

But this is a matter which you must understand well and rightly. Therefore hear what I shall now tell you.

What is actually and in truth a Christian congregation? A Christian congregation is a part of the holy Christian Church, the communion of saints. God includes only the true believers as members of a Christian congregation, only His dear children (Rom. 1:7; 1 Cor. 1:2). The hypocrites and ungodly, who are there and who we include, because we cannot see into the heart, are not included by God. (Matt. 13:47-50; 2 Tim. 2:19). Now, God has given the Gospel to such a Christian congregation, and everything which belongs to the Gospel, including the command and the office to preach and to teach the Gospel, to feed the Christians and to watch over them. (1 Tim. 3:15; 1 Pet. 2:9-10). Thus a Christian congregation itself is to elect and call its pastors and teachers. No one in the congregation may stand up and say: I will be your pastor and teacher. No one may come from somewhere else and say: I will be your pastor and teacher. No one in the whole world may come to a congregation and say: I will direct and send to you a pastor and teacher. Every Christian congregation itself is to elect and call pastor and teacher, in order that in the name of all the members of the congregation and by their commission they may do what God wills, namely, to feed and teach all with the Word of God and to watch over them. And the congregation is to see to it that the pastor and teacher carries this out. - That is the public office of pastor and teacher in the Christian congregation, as God would have it. Privately and apart from that all Christians should teach and admonish and comfort each other with God's Word. (1 Thess. 5:11-14). Have you understood all this?

And now listen! Even while the Apostles were still living, something arose and tried to come forth and would not be held back; and when the Apostles were dead it did come forth - something which God did not wish to have. And when something comes which God does not wish to have, from whence does it come? You know! Then it comes from the devil and from the perversity of men.

What came? First of all, it came about that when there were several pastors and teachers in a congregation, one of them was called a "bishop" and the others stood under him. - Then, later on, it came about that the "bishops" of the larger

cities placed themselves above the other "bishops" of the surrounding area, and so ruled over a large number of congregations. - Then, still later, it came about that all servants of the Word, bishops and others, said that they alone could explain God's Word and rule the Christians. They called themselves the clergy, the special class. And the other Christians were called laity, which means, the ignorant people. - Finally, it came about that those who belonged to the "clergy," as priests, were looked upon as mediators between God and men, as such people through whom men must come to God. And there were all kinds of lower and higher priestly orders. Phooey on you, devil! Jesus Christ is the one Mediator between God and men, and through Him alone we are to come to God. (1 Tim. 2:5-6; Hebr. 7:24-25).

Yes, all of that, especially the last two circumstances, were from the devil. And evil came of it, as you will soon see. However, this had been prophesied by the Apostles.

3. The church life of the Christians.

When the Apostles were dead, there were still church teachers there who were students of the Apostles. And they gathered the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists and made one book out of them; that is our New Testament.

When the students of the Apostles were also dead, then there were some well-known church teachers whom we call Church Fathers. We still have some of their writings. But in none of these writings do we find the completely pure doctrine of the Apostles, but also "wood, hay, stubble," human opinions. 1 Cor. 3:11-15.

The Christians came together for public worship chiefly on Sunday, the "day of the Lord," that means, on the day of Christ's resurrection. There something from the New Testament was read and explained. Festivals were held each year on Easter and Pentecost, and later on also at Christmas. The Christians held their public worship here and there in the houses; when they were persecuted they came together in caves and forests. Naturally churches were built only after the persecutions stopped.

Those who were Christians and wanted to be baptized were first of all well instructed, and were called Catechumens. These attended the public service; but before the Lord's Supper was celebrated they had to leave. When Christian parents had children, these were baptized and later on instructed.

The Christians left no sin go its way unpunished. They practised strict church discipline. When a Christian committed some sin, he was not permitted to go to the Lord's Supper until he had publicly asked forgiveness. When a Christian committed a gross sin, he was not even permitted to attend divine worship. If he did not repent of his sin and seek to amend his life, then he was excluded from the Christian congregation. When he had then clearly shown that he repented of his sin and amended his life, only then was he placed on probation, sometimes for several years, before he was fully and completely received back into the congregation and permitted to go to the Lord's Supper. Then, when he had passed the period of probation, he had to kneel down before the congregation and received from the "bishop," who was then present, the forgiveness of sins and the brotherly kiss. And then he received the Lord's Supper.

Many heathen people cremated (burned) their dead, but the Christians buried their dead, just as the Savior also was laid in a grave. Signs and emblems of their faith and the hope of the resurrection were placed in the graves with the bodies, for example, an anchor. Hebr. 6:19-20. In Rome and in other Italian cities there were long underground passageways, called catacombs. Unnumbered Christians are buried in them.

When there was a controversy among the congregations concerning Christian doctrine, then general church conventions, called Councils, were held which considered the controversy and made decisions. However, only the "bishops" of the land attended these church conventions and were permitted to speak and make decisions. You have learned in the previous chapter that that was contrary to God's Word and will.

4. The Persecutions of the Christians.

Today we shall hear of some wonderful happenings among the Christians.

The heathen began to rage against the Christians. They slandered the Christians terribly. The Christians were held to be at fault for every misfortune that happened, because they did not pray to idols. For example, when it did not rain or when it rained too much, then the Christians were to blame for it. And the heathen said that the Christians were rebels against the government because they did not have the heathen state religion. For that reason the heathen demanded that the Christians curse the name of Jesus Christ and bring sacrifices to the idols or even to the picture of the Roman emperor. When they did not do this, they were killed. Thousands upon thousands of Christians were killed, men, women, young men, young women, children. They were burned alive, drowned, beaten with clubs; they were left to starve or die of thirst, their flesh was torn from their body with glowing tongs, they were thrown before wild animals for food. In every possible devilish way they were put to death as martyrs. And what did the Christians do all this time? They loudly praised the Lord Jesus Christ and commended their spirit into His hands. And what did the devil accomplish with these persecutions of the Christians? More and more heathen became Christians.

The great persecutions of the Christians lasted for about 250 years. They began under the emperor Nero in the year 64 and ended under the emperor Constantine in the year 320. Nero was like one possessed by the devil. Just listen! He left the beautiful city of Rome burn for seven days, and then said that the Christians were to blame for the fire. And now the people were enraged against the Christians and killed them in many fearfully gruesome ways. For example, they were covered with tar and burned, and their burning bodies served as torches to light the magnificent gardens of the emperor. They were also sewed up in animal skins and in a public theater were thrown to mad dogs and were eaten by them. Thereupon the thousands of spectators would clap their hands.

Ignatius, the bishop of the congregation in Antioch, was thrown to the lions in Rome. There he said: "I am Christ's grain of wheat, the teeth of the animals

must grind it to bits in order that it may be found as pure bread." That was in the year 116. - Polycarp, bishop in Smyrna (Rev. 2:8), a student of the Apostle John, was burned alive. When he was told that he should curse Jesus Christ, he answered: "I have served my Lord Christ for 86 years, and He has never done me harm; how can I now curse my King who has redeemed me?" That was in the year 167. - Perpetua and Felicitas, two women in Carthage (North Africa) urged all the martyrs to remain steadfast, and died a very blessed death.

The emperor Decius, in the year 250, waged a bloody persecution against the Christians in all lands of the Roman empire. In Rome there was a Deacon. A "deacon" had a special office in the church, one concerning which nothing is said in the New Testament and which was brought into being later on. This deacon was named Laurentius. The prefect, a high government official, required of him that he should hand out the church's money. Laurentius asked for time to get the money. He then quickly gathered the poor people of the congregation and then said to the prefect: "The treasures of our God are in the courtyard, pure golden vessels." When the prefect saw the poor people, he thought that Laurentius was mocking him, and caused him to be slowly roasted on a glowing iron grate. Laurentius was praying when he died.

Conditions were most terrible under the emperor Diocletian in the year 303. He wanted to wipe out all the Christians. They were gathered up by the hundreds of thousands. Often the executioners could do no more of their bloody work. And the Savior strengthened His own through His Holy Spirit. They died with joy, they spoke words of encouragement to each other, they shouted with joy to heaven. The heathen wondered when they saw this and said: What kind of people are they! Finally the emperor Diocletian saw that he could not wipe out the Christians, and he poisoned himself and died in despair. And with that the great persecutions of the Christians came to an end.

* * * * *

BY THEIR REVIEWS YE SHALL KNOW THEM

The following review of Dr. Robert Preus's book, "The Inspiration of Scripture, A Study of the Theology of the 17th Century Dogmatists" appeared in the Sept. 12, 1956 issue of "The Lutheran" (ULC):

ORTHODOXISTS

The Lutheran theologians of the seventeenth century have had a tremendous influence on both the thought and the life of Lutheran churches and people in subsequent times, even down to our own day. The name of John Gerhard, the greatest of these theologians, is familiar to many. But rare is the Lutheran in America who can claim first-hand acquaintance with the published writings of even this one man.

The reason for such neglect is that the so-called Orthodoxists of the seventeenth century wrote for the most part in Latin, and few of us today have sufficient knowledge of this language to be able to

investigate this part of our heritage.

Consequently this study by a pastor of the Norwegian Synod, which is associated with the Missouri Synod in the Synodical Conference, is a welcome addition to a scanty literature in English. The author has diligently examined the position of the Orthodoxists on a topic which was central to them, for they believed the authority of the Scriptures could be buttressed by their particular theory of inspiration.

While this theory satisfied most people of that time, it can hardly be made to fit what we now know about the origin of biblical literature & especially about the formation of the canons of the Old and New Testaments. The weakness of Dr. Preus's book is his apparent unwillingness to subject his findings to criticism. The strength of his book is its painstaking exposition of a theory which has projected its shadow into our own time. (Th. G. Tappert)

CLERGY BULLETIN

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

Vol. XVI, No. 5.

January, 1957

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE SYNODICAL CONFERENCE CONVENTION, CHICAGO, DEC. 5, 1956, RELATIVE TO DOCTRINAL MATTERS

In the Name of the Father and of the Son and of
the Holy Ghost.

Resolution I

Since the controversy which has long disturbed the Synodical Conference has caused serious concern in the minds of all its members, it is imperative that the problem of healing the wounds be approached in the spirit of repentance for all that has arisen from the flesh in this controversy, and that in the spirit of humility and charity we voice and faithfully apply the truth of Holy Scripture which is to guide us in these matters.

Therefore we recommend:

- I. That the President of the Synodical Conference be authorized to call a joint meeting of the union committees of member Synods in order to:
 1. Establish the significance of the action taken by the Synods at their last conventions; and to
 2. Develop a program of future discussion on the basis of these findings. We suggest as a course of action that the union committees:
 - a. Meet jointly and draw up a list of the problems troubling the Synodical Conference, stating clearly the status controversiae in each case;
 - b. Set forth the views of each synod regarding the matters under discussion in such a way that each synod's view is properly expressed in thetical and antithetical form, using pertinent proofs from the Scripture and the Confessions;
 - c. Publish in the official organs of the constituent synods the findings of the union committees as their reports are prepared, so that these matters may be discussed throughout the various synods during the year 1957; and
 - d. Request the various conferences and districts to study the findings of the union committees and report their evaluations to the 1958 convention of the Synodical Conference through their synodical officers.
- II. That as the union committees of member synods reach agreement in the controversial issues they draw up a common doctrinal statement to serve the Synodical Conference.
- III. That the Synodical Conference request the joint union committees and officers of the constituent synods, prior to the next convention of the Synodical Conference to study the advisability of calling a conclave of conservative theologians of Lutheran Churches in fellowship with the Synodical Conference throughout the world to assist in the solution of any unsolved doctrinal problems existing in the Synodical Conference.

IV. That all member synods sincerely endeavor to create an atmosphere amenable to the spirit of harmony and refrain from hindering the work of the above-mentioned committees by unwarranted public attacks or by lack of patience in waiting for the Spirit of God to create true harmony through the testimony of His Word.

"In Thee, O Lord, do I put my trust; let me never be ashamed; deliver me in Thy righteousness. Bow down Thine ear to me; deliver me speedily; be Thou my strong Rock for an house of defense to save me. For Thou art my Rock and my Fortress; therefore for Thy name's sake lead me, and guide me." Amen.

Respectfully submitted by
The Floor Committee on Doctrinal Matters

Dr. John S. Bradac, Chairman
Dr. J.A.O. Preus, Vice Chairman
Mr. Herman Barsum
Pastor Edwin Jaster
Teacher Paul Kolander

Dr. O. E. Overn
Pastor Walter Pankow
Pastor E. H. Stahlke
Pastor W. Harry Krieger, Secretary

* * * * *

(Note: For the additional information of our readers, we are here including a report on the Synodical Conference convention, which met in Chicago, Dec. 4-6, 1956, and which was written by Prof. Erich Sievert of Dr. Martin Luther College in New Ulm, Minn. The report was afterwards sent to Wisconsin Synod delegates to the Synodical Conference.)

Opening Services: December 4, 10:00 A.M. Devotions - Missionary Service.

The Rev. Dr. Andrew Daniel of Detroit preached the sermon for the opening services in which the Sacrament of Lord's Supper was celebrated. The theme of his sermon was Christian zeal in religion which he defined "as a burning desire to please God, to do His will, to advance His glory in the world by every Scriptural means." He referred to zeal as "a thing referring to one's own group. It is possible for us to be unwearied in promoting the interests of our own church body, and yet have no grace in our hearts. Such zeal is certainly not of God. If zeal is to be really good, pure, of God, it needs to be tempered with love and charity. It will always endeavor to speak the truth in love."

Most delegates partook of the Sacrament. A goodly portion of Wisconsin Synod delegates were included among the guests. Members of all four synods of the Synodical Conference attended the opening services as well as the devotional services. Pastor Edgar Hoenecke conducted one of the devotional services. Professor Norbert Reim preached the mission sermon on Wednesday evening. He told the audience that it must guard its "orthodoxy and purity of practice." "If we as salt should ever lose our savor, the very foundation of all of our mission work shall have been ravaged and destroyed."

Presidential Report - Dr. Baepler; December 4, P.M.

Dr. Baepler reported first of all on the relationships that existed between the various Synods of the Synodical Conference. He particularly called attention to the Norwegian resolutions and the Wisconsin Synod action at Saginaw and Watertown. He then stated that we must ask ourselves as a Conference, "Can we continue as a Synodical Conference under these conditions? It would be an outward lie to continue under the pretense of peace when there is no peace. Thanks be to God, however, there are rays of hope though dim they may be."

"It becomes imperative that the Synodical Conference further the unity in doctrine and practice." He then went on to show how there "was no complete unity at the very outset of the organization of the Conference but there was always a striving for unity."

He warned against an insisting on the finality of our own exegesis which alone is possible in heaven. He also stated that "unity must not be based on sentimental arguments, on expediency, on false principles." He expressed the hope for unity in an atmosphere of "love, peace, an atmosphere of no dissension, no striving."

Dr. Baepler recommended changes for the structure of the Conference.

1. "Missouri?" he said, "has 85% of the suffrage. This is correct in secular matters, but a more equitable system should be devised to do away with Missouri's power of the veto." He felt that if there were more equality of representation, the atmosphere for brotherly discussion would be more conducive to peace.
2. While he realizes that the sovereignty of the local congregations and the various Synods must be protected, nevertheless, something must be done to correct the frustrating situations which prevail when Synod's such as the Norwegian and the Wisconsin Synods refuse to carry on doctrinal discussions.
3. Membership in the Conference should be increased to include bodies such as the Lutheran Church of Australia, The Church of Nigeria, the Lutheran Free Church of Europe and other confessional groups such as ours.

Dr. John W. Behnken Speaks - December 4, P.M.

After the report of Dr. Baepler, Dr. John W. Behnken of the Missouri Synod delivered a prepared statement. This was not a regularly scheduled part of the Convention Agenda. No other president was granted this privilege. The Wisconsin Synod brethren in caucus discussed the wisdom of having President Naumann address the body but felt that this would be unwise. At the close of the session he did make a statement about Dr. Behnken's address as well as his refusal to clarify his position with regard to the 1950 Missouri resolutions and the Common Confession in relationship to the St. Paul resolutions.

In his address Dr. Behnken referred to the fact that the world is looking upon the conservative Synodical Conference with the expectancy that its dissolution is at hand. "We don't want this to happen."

"Intersynodical cases have not always been settled. Some have just been closed."

"Intersynodical conferences have manifested a sore lack of the spirit of love. None of us is blameless."

He explained that Missouri was not desirous of a conclave of theologians at this time. He said that he and President Naumann had agreed on calling such a conclave but that his position was that it be held prior to Missouri's St. Paul convention. He felt that outsiders did not have the proper understanding of our problems and could not very well sit in judgment on our problems.

He listed Missouri's conciliatory resolutions of St. Paul as evidence of the fact that Missouri was gravely concerned. He pleaded with the sister synods to evaluate their actions on the basis of God's Word.

For mutual edification, he suggested that the synods develop one clear, comprehensive document outlining their beliefs and teachings on the basis of God's Word and the Confessions. To do this he referred to joint theological faculty meetings, to pastoral conferences, and meetings of other groups.

Dr. Behnken expressed grave concern about the Norwegian action and Wisconsin's "protesting fellowship." He said Missouri is troubled and wants an answer for the severity of the resolutions from the Synod's concerned.

With regard to the Common Confession Dr. Behnken reported that "it appears from recent historical developments that the Common Confession can no longer serve as a doctrinal document. Hereafter the Common Confession is not to be used as a functioning document for union but that it is to be only recognized as a statement in harmony with the Scriptures. If it is not in harmony with the sacred Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions, we plead for definite, convincing, scriptural proof. Missouri asks for guidance."

Dr. Behnken feels that we should recognize that a degree of unity does exist. "We should endeavor to keep this unity." "In the area of church practice, or the application of Biblical principles, not one of us is perfect. There it becomes necessary, and this should not be impossible among brethren, to meet again and again to practice brotherly admonition."

Of Protestantism Behnken said, "Protestantism is obsessed with the mania that all Protestants must unite even if it takes compromise. Lutherans, too, have been bitten by the ecumenical bug. The Lutheran bodies in Europe are linked with the Reformed Church. The Church of Sweden practices intercommunion with the Anglicans, Denmark with the Church of Scotland, and Holland with the Reformed. All these so-called Lutheran Churches belong to the Lutheran World Federation, yet nothing is done about their un-Lutheran practices. The Synodical Conference owes the faltering Lutheran bodies a warning of where their course will lead them."

Dr. Behnken closed his remarks with the admonition that the Synodical Conference remember the purposes of its existence which he listed as "to give outward expression to the unity of spirit existing among the constituent synods; to encourage and strengthen one another in faith and confession, to further unity in doctrine and practice and to remove whatever might threaten to disturb this unity, to cooperate in matters of mutual interest, to strive for true unity in doctrine and practice among Lutheran Church bodies."

There was no discussion time for Dr. Behnken's remarks.

Election Results

President - Dr. Bradae of Whiting, Indiana. Papers hailed him as the "peace-maker."
Dr. Bradae plans to call all union committees together in January.

1st Vice President - Rev. Carl Zorn of Closter, N.J. (Mo.)

2nd Vice President - Rev. Karl Krauss of Lansing, Michigan (Wis.)

3rd Vice President - Rev. Julian Anderson of Minneapolis, Minnesota (Nor.)

Secretary - Professor Herbert Bouman of St. Louis, Mo.

Mission Matters

A budget of \$509,000 for the current fiscal year was approved.

A loan of \$1000 to Mr. Asibong Okon of Nigeria for the purposes of study to obtain his doctorate was approved. This is not to become general practice, however.

A Bible Institute for training of assistants to the pastors in the mission field was approved at the cost of \$25,000. Missouri delegates stated that their National Lutheran Woman's Missionary League would underwrite this expense. Some Wisconsin men objected to this since it was a project of all synods. Their objections did not prevail.

The Conference approved the opening of the new Florida mission field.

The Conference approved the calling of an American teacher for the children of our American missionaries in Africa lest we lose some of these workers.

The Conference instructed the Missionary Board to weigh carefully the withdrawal of government financial support for our Nigerian schools and to take the necessary steps to carry on without such help. Total new cost might reach the \$100,000 figure. Pastor Wm. Schweppe called the new governmental policy a "blessing in disguise."

The Conference voted to continue the improvement of the schools at Greensboro and Selma. While the Missouri and Slovak Synods have set aside their share of the \$125,000 previously authorized, the Wisconsin and Norwegian Synods had not done so. They are to indicate when these monies will be forthcoming.

The theological department of Immanuel Lutheran College at Greensboro, N.C. is not to be closed. Significantly the Negroes present generally voted for closing the department. They would prefer St. Louis, Springfield, or Thiensville because of the segregation factor involved.

--- (Note: At this point Prof. Sievert has the Doctrinal Resolutions which are found at the beginning of this issue of the "Clergy Bulletin." He then adds the following.) ---

In connection with part 1 of Roman I, Pastor Paul Albrecht asked about the meaning of new resolutions of Missouri in 1956 in relation to the 1950 resolutions and their effect upon them. He expressed the view that Dr. Behnken could enlighten the body on that point. The chair ruled that it would hardly be possible to give such explanation since time for the noon-hour adjournment had arrived.

President Naumann in his remarks to the Convention just before final adjournment called attention to President Behnken's address and the fact that even though the Conference had voted a resolution asking all sister synods to refrain from making statements that would hinder orderly resolution of all difficulties, that his Synod may want to make editorial comment on some of the things in the address. He also expressed grave concern over the fact that Wisconsin inquirers were "summarily dismissed" with no answer to their questions about the new Missouri resolutions. Both Dr. Behnken and I believe Dr. Grumm referred them to the Union Committees for an answer. He expressed the thought that he (Pres. Naumann) would have found it much easier to rally the support of all of his brethren in the Wisconsin Synod for the plan advanced by the Conference, if an answer had been forthcoming.

There was very little discussion of doctrinal matters on the convention floor. The main discussion centered upon a mode of procedure. The press releases of Dr. O. Hoffmann of the Missouri Synod in which he particularly stressed the chief differences of Scouting and Military Chaplaincy as being a major point of discussion at the Convention were not factual if he wished to convey the impression that these matters were discussed. They were not part of the doctrinal discussion of the convention.

In general there was a spirit of congeniality at the convention. The big theme seemed to be that the constituent synods show a greater spirit of Christian love for each other.

Conference Paper.

Dr. Carl Meyer presented a scholarly paper on "The Synodical Conference - The Voice of Confessional Lutheranism." It was adopted with one correction because of an objection raised by Pastor Edgar Hoenecke.

(Ed. Note: The following is a reprint from "JANUARY SURVEY OF BOOKS" in the January 2, 1957, issue of the CHRISTIAN CENTURY, and is given here simply as a matter of information.)

DOGMATIC DOGMATICIANS

The Inspiration of Scripture: A Study of the Theology of the 17th Century Lutheran Dogmaticians. By Robert Preus. Lutheran Synod Book Co., \$4.50.

This book is not only an exposition of the understanding of Scripture and related problems on the part of the 17th century Lutheran dogmaticians; except for minor points it is also a defense of their position. The author's own position guarantees a sympathetic exposition and concern for the nuances in their theological conception which are frequently missed by those who do not find themselves attracted by these writers. Insofar as he corrects over-simplified generalizations concerning their outlook, this is a contribution to historical understanding. But it must be added that the writer's corrections are shared much more by others than he assumes. More important, however, is the fact that the author has surveyed this fairly extensive literature on an important issue, practically all of which is in Latin, and made it available to English readers. It is, therefore, regrettable that the distinctions which are ceaselessly adumbrated lead to a fair amount of repetition and a resultant dullness.

The sophistication behind the distinctions made by these 17th century theologians in the context in which they worked is clear testimony that orthodoxy and fundamentalism should never be confused, even though some of us may find it difficult to have patience with either. Dr. Preus has succeeded in showing some of the nuances of understanding of these learned men, and in this sense he has inadvertently set them apart from the fundamentalists. There is no question that these Lutherans believed every word of the Bible to be inspired of God and therefore true. But it is important, as Dr. Preus shows, to note why and how this is the case. It is God's self-chosen way of manifesting himself. Exactly because of this, the word of God is broader than Scripture, though since the time of the Scripture (and this is not to be identified with the canon), one must say that it is the word of God. But it would not do to say that the word of God is Scrip-

ture, in spite of the fact that God has ceased to reveal himself apart from it.

This means that the Bible is a book of revealed truth or doctrine. Theology is not identical with the Bible but is based exclusively on it. At the same time, Preus reminds us, it is a mistake to over-emphasize this, since the dogmaticians were not so naive as to exclude the revelation of God himself. They did not confuse God and doctrine, as is alleged in many textbooks.

It is the content of the Bible which is the word of God, not its words or syllables. But it is the word of God, including every word. It does not become the word of God. In respect to the "dictation" of the Scriptures, there has nevertheless been adaptation and accommodation to those who write. The words are the words of God, but they are also the historical and experienced words of the writers. Preus states that the dogmaticians never dealt with the question of how these two are related, but they simply affirmed both. Here, Preus reminds us, one sees one of the lacunae in their theological method.

It may be said that the preceding distinctions do not make much difference, since the net result is still an inerrant Scripture. True. But historical honesty demands that before rendering judgment we see the men as they saw themselves. Moreover, it demands that we see them in their time. That will not excuse their mistakes, just as it will not excuse ours. But it will here, as frequently elsewhere, make intelligible to subsequent generations why positions no longer tenable were once held. Dr. Preus is right in pointing to the tremendous struggle with the Roman Catholics in this period, and in showing how this drove the dogmaticians to their position on Scripture over against a church which claimed the right to interpret Scripture and accepted other sources as well. What Dr. Preus does not do -

only hints at - is to set the whole problem of the issues these people faced into the much broader cultural and historical setting. But something that venturesome could easily call into question the position of Dr. Preus himself.

John Dillenberger

* * * * *

ANNOUNCEMENT

Prof. J.A.O. Preus, Bethany solicitor, tells us that as of Jan. 3, the figure for the Bethany \$40,000 Appeal has reached \$22,974.03.

NORTHWEST PASTORAL CONFERENCE

Time: Jan. 22 - 23, 1957 - 10:00 a.m.

Place: Bethany Lutheran College.

Program:

- 1) Report on Synodical Conference conv.
- 2) An Evaluation of Pieper's Dogmatics (Eng.), Vol. I, and a detailed review of Pieper's treatment of "Inspiration" - C. U. Faye.
- 3) Communion Announcements - M. Tweit.
- 4) Catholic Criticism against the person of Martin Luther - T. N. Teigen.
- 5) When is Unionism involved in such connections as baptismal sponsors, weddings, funerals etc. - R. Preus.
- 6) How can we improve our "Beichtspredigen"? - N. A. Madson.
- 7) Preach the Gospel - Chr. Anderson.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

(Note: The following is a continuation of the article in the December C.B., which is a translation of "Kirchengeschichte" by C. M. Zorn. Translated by A. Schulz.)

II. From the Years 325 to 814.

5. Christianity has Peace and becomes Lukewarm.

Constantine the Great was now the Roman emperor. But there were several others who also claimed to be emperor. Constantine waged war against them in order that he alone might be emperor. One time he was in great need and prayed. He then saw a cross in the sky and heard a voice which said: "In this sign you will conquer." Thereupon he took away the eagle which had always been on the Roman flag, and put a cross in its place. And then he conquered his enemies.

From that time on the Christians had peace. The emperor loved them. He did away with heathen customs. He read in the Bible. However, he did not permit himself to be baptized until shortly before his death in the year 337. He lived in the city of Constantinople, which was the capital city. In Jerusalem he permitted the building of "the Church of the Holy Sepulchre," where it was thought that Christ's grave had been.

It was now an honor to be a Christian. Therefore many heathen became Christians. However, they did not become Christians because they as poor sinners truly believed in the Savior and loved Him. As a result, many hypocrites (make-believe Christians) came into the Christian congregations. Worldly customs came into the congregations. True Christians were still there, but they wept over the evil times which appeared so good outwardly. Beautiful churches were built everywhere, and the congregations were rich. But what good was that when the Christians themselves were not God's temple, when faith was poor and weak? Does that please God?

Julian, a nephew of Constantine, was emperor later on. He had been brought up to be a strict Christian, but he hated the Lord Christ and the Christians, and did everything he could to bring heathenism back into power. Men have given him the

name Julian the Apostate, which means, the one who has fallen away. You know for yourself that today also many Christians fall away and become heathen. - And Julian did something else. Jesus Christ had foretold the end of the temple and of the Jewish divine worship. The temple had already been destroyed. Now Julian tried to build it again in order to put to shame the prophecy of Jesus. But every time that they tried to lay the foundation, fire came out of the ground. At last Julian had to give up. What was his end? He was mortally wounded in battle. He took up a handful of his blood and threw it toward heaven, and said in despair: "In spite of everything you have won, Thou Nazarene!" His successors again defended the Christians.

Children, earthly fortune is more dangerous for us Christians than earthly misfortune.

NEWS

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 E. Schulz, 675 Second St., Tracy, Minn.

Rev. G. F. Guldberg of Thompson, Iowa, has accepted the call to Lengby, Minn.

CLERGY BULLETIN

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

Vol. XVI, No. 6.

February, 1957

* PREACH THE GOSPEL *

by

Pastor Emeritus Christian Anderson

(Note: The following essay was delivered at the Northwest District Pastoral Conference on Jan. 23, 1957.)

"Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." This was our Savior's commission to His Church, and specifically to those who are called to administer the Word and the Sacraments publicly. The privilege and duty of Christian pastors, then, is summed up in these few words: Preach The Gospel. All so-called other activities are only auxiliary, and are to be made to serve this main purpose of his calling, to preach God's Word for the salvation of sinners. It is of the greatest importance, therefore, for the Christian minister to know how to preach the Gospel most effectively.

It is very difficult to give definite rules for preaching. Melancthon is reported to have said: "Preaching is not an art, otherwise I should have learned it." He calls attention to the fact that Luther is such an exemplary preacher of the Gospel because his whole life is filled with it, and, because of his own serious spiritual experiences, it becomes natural for him to apply it to his hearers without following any man-made rules. This does not mean, however, that the preacher should ignore certain essential requirements of intelligible speech, such as a logical presentation of the subject, and the use of such language that can be grasped by the hearers, and the like.

I shall not try to enter into the whole field of good preaching, but only mention a few essential things and call attention to a few things to be avoided which may tend to hinder the work of the Holy Ghost through our preaching of the Gospel. This may serve to instigate a profitable discussion of this all-important subject.

To preach the Gospel does not mean only to preach about the Gospel. It is so easy to launch into an enthusiastic objective lecture on the wonderful and glorious tidings of the Gospel without bringing the contents of the message close to the hearts of the hearers. Although a praise of this glorious message should by no means be avoided, since it has its place, it should not be the all-absorbing topic of the sermon. Lecturing, as we understand it, is not preaching. Giving instruction in Scriptural truths is indeed an important part of preaching, but such instruction should always be connected closely with the actual needs of the hearers, and it should be clearly brought out in such way that the hearers get a full understanding of its importance to them. When I, as a preacher stand before my congregation, I should realize that I am an ambassador for Christ bringing spiritual food to immortal souls. It is important to have as much knowledge as possible of the special needs of my hearers, so that I can give them the necessary instruction, admonition and comfort. To get this knowledge, it is important to make a serious study of the hearers and their environments, and to sound out their degree of knowledge through conversation and association. The minister who has had the privilege of making a large number of sick calls enjoys a great advantage in this respect, because in sickness and distress, and especially when they expect that death is approaching, people are more apt to open their hearts and reveal their spiritual needs than under normal conditions. It is true that Holy Scriptures teach what the needs of our immortal souls are; and yet it is to some extent left to my judg-

ment what are the special needs of those with whom I am dealing. Much help can be had from the experience of others, either through conversation with them or by reading what they have written. And the pastor can from his own experience learn much about the needs of others and how to deal with them. It is up to the faithful pastor to make diligent use of these means to fit him for his important work.

To preach the Gospel effectively, the preacher should always have in mind the spiritual conditions of his hearers and apply the Gospel directly to these conditions. Though these conditions may vary in the different individuals, the preacher knows that there are some whose faith is weak and wavering, some who hardly dare to think that they have a living faith, some who are waging a fierce battle against besetting sins, some who fear that they have so long been negligent in their service of God that there can be little hope of their salvation, and so on. All such need the comfort of the Gospel, and it should be applied directly to them, so that it may grip their hearts as a message intended especially for them. And what is said about comfort applies to instruction, correction and admonition as well. The preacher should not speak only in a general way about these things, but he should try to apply them directly to his hearers. That is what is meant by preaching the Gospel and not only about it.

Hand in hand with the application of the pure Gospel to languishing souls, goes warning against all doctrines and practices which more or less dim the light of the Gospel or altogether corrupt it. It is important that this is done in an effective way, and yet not so as to interfere with the proclamation of the One thing needful. In our day when legalistic morality preaching is so general, and the so-called social gospel is made so prominent, there is the danger that earnest true Gospel preachers may place such emphasis on the polemical element that the application of the full unconditioned Gospel is more or less hindered. A predominantly polemical sermon does not as a rule furnish much real food for a hungry soul. The preacher should therefore first bring out the positive truths which cure the spiritual ailments, and then point out the dan-

gers to which the hearers are exposed, dangers which threaten to rob them of the full comfort which they may have from the pure Gospel. By doing this, we emphasize these truths as well as to warn them against the errors. It may be necessary sometimes to call the errorists by name, in order to make the matter clear, but this should always be done with the greatest caution, so as not to give the impression that you are engaged in a personal conflict. At all events it is the positive application of the Gospel to the needs of the hearers which is the all important consideration.

If the Gospel is to be preached effectively, the Law also must be preached. Walther: "Without the Law the Gospel is not understood, and without the Gospel the Law benefits us nothing." The Law must be used to show men that they are sinners and the dreadful consequences of their sins before they can be expected to have any desire for the comfort of the Gospel. But the Law, too, must be preached directly to the hearers as something which applies primarily to them, and not give them a chance to apply it only to others. Especially when we preach from texts which reveal the sinfulness of certain persons or groups of persons it is so easy to give long lectures on the Scribes and Pharisees and the enemies of the Savior generally and other Biblical characters who are to serve as a warning for us, forgetting that we, too, have the sinful hearts from which such evil deeds spring and the mortal errors flow. It is always easier for our perverted minds to paint these evils in glowing colors than to show clearly that the propensities which are so evident in grossly evil men exist also in our own and in the hearts of our hearers. It is so natural for us to enlarge on the sins of others rather than to apply the Law to ourselves. A member of my first parish made a trip to Alaska in the beginning of the century, to see if he could find some land suitable for farming. While there, he had occasion to visit a Methodist mission which had just been started. The missionary had as yet learned very little of the language of the native Indians. They had a large picture of Christ hanging on the cross with many of His enemies standing around watching Him. The missionary went up to the pict-

ure and struck at one after the other of the enemies, and then one by one in the audience would follow his example. How easy it is for our sermons on Christ's Passion to deteriorate into something like that, instead of really applying the Law and the Gospel!

But in order to apply the Law effectively to the hearers, it is necessary to have as genuine a knowledge as possible of the special temptations to which the hearers are exposed in the community as well as the sins that are prevalent among them. These things the pastor should study earnestly, in order that his preaching of the Law may be timely and to the point. While he should carefully try to avoid giving the impression that he has certain individuals in his audience in mind, his preaching should nevertheless be so directly applied that all may be made to feel the sting of his message in their hearts. This requires true Christian psychological understanding, something which we should continually pray the Lord to give us. And this second use of the Law is needed not only for those who are still unbelievers, but the believers are in need of it as well, in order to be urged daily to seek new grace. In the third use of the Law for admonishing the believers unto good works, care should be taken not to give the impression that salvation wholly or in part can be merited through the keeping of the Law.

There is a danger to which we are often exposed, to devote a greater portion of the sermon to the preaching of the Law, and then in a few sentences try to bring comfort to those who have learned to see their misery of sin. The Gospel should always predominate in our sermons, even when we are tempted to think that there is not much longing for its comfort among our hearers. Many are afraid that there is such a low degree of penitence among the hearers that the preaching of the Gospel will only strengthen them in a false sense of security. This, however, is something of which we cannot presume to be fair judges. After all, it is only the Gospel which draws men unto the Savior, so that they may partake of His salvation. Therefore it is so important to preach the full, unconditioned Gospel at all times, whether we think the hearers have any desire for it or not. In his book "Law and

Gospel," Dr. Walther says: "True, we have to preach the Law, only, however, as a preparation for the Gospel. The ultimate aim of our preaching the Law must be to preach the Gospel. Whoever does not adopt this aim is not a true minister of the Gospel." P. 404. His whole dissertation on the last thesis of the book is devoted to showing why the Gospel should be allowed to have a general predominance in our teaching. It is well worth while to read this last chapter of the book again.

Then there is a danger of bringing many extraneous thoughts into the sermon, which are apt to lead the hearers more or less away from the Gospel truths which we want to impress on them. One such danger lies in long introductions, which are intended to lead the thought into the main part of the sermon; but often these introductions launch at length into some earthly matters, giving all sorts of details, so that the minds of the hearers become so taken up with these things - which in themselves may be worthwhile - but they rather deter from the full force of the message which the preacher intends to bring across. As a rule a short introduction is all that is needed to prepare the minds for the main thoughts that come in the body of the sermon. Often the best introduction is found in the text itself, on which we are to preach.

Illustrations from every-day life are often very useful to explain divine truth; but when they are drawn out with a large number of irrelevant details, they often detract from the truths which they are supposed to illustrate. Reference to these commonplace things should be limited to pointing to the Punctum comparationis. Usually we can take for granted that the hearers know the details, so that they do not need to be reminded of them.

May the Lord grant us grace to become true evangelists, real Gospel preachers! May we not only say with the Apostle, but actually live up to his saying: "I am determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified!"

* : * ; * : *

"Leave the matter of religion to the family altar, the church, and the private school, supported entirely by private contributions. Keep the church and the State forever separate." - U.S. Grant, (1875)

GENERAL PASTORAL CONFERENCE

Time: April 23 - 26, 1957 - 10:00 a.m.
Place: Bethany Lutheran College.

Program:

- 1) Exegesis: Psalm 109 (Imprecatory Psalm) - R. E. Honsey.
- 2) Doctrinal: The Office of The Ministry- Neil Hilton, Geo. Lillegard, and M. H. Otto.
- 3) Practical: Catechetics - V. Gerlach.
- 4) Historical: Dead Sea Scrolls - N. C. Oesleby.
- 5) Synodical Affairs and Bethany College- M. H. Otto.
- 6) Sermon: Iver Johnson - Critic: Morris Dale.
- 7) Doctrinal: Fundamentalism and the Doctrine of Christology - A.H. Strand.
- 8) Panel Discussion on Christian Day Schools - M. E. Tweit.
- 9) Practical: Seminar on Mission Techniques - Mission Board.

R. H. Ude, secretary

* * * * *

NEWS WITHOUT COMMENT

(Note: The following article appeared in the "Minneapolis Star" on Jan. 28, '57).

Seminary to Install President

Northwestern Lutheran Theological seminary will install its fourth president and dedicate a new library during its annual convocation Tuesday through Thursday.

Dr. Clemens H. Zeidler, 45, will be inducted as president in a service 8 p.m. Wednesday at Salem English Lutheran church.

The former George Pillsbury home at 116 E. Twenty-second street will be dedicated as J.K. Jensen Memorial library at 4:15 p.m. Tuesday.

Dr. Zeidler will be presented for installation by Dr. Harold T. Rasmussen, pastor of Richfield Lutheran church and president of the seminary board of directors.

Dr. Paul E. Bishop, president of Northwest synod, United Lutheran Church in America (ULCA), will conduct the service and Dr. Zeidler will preach the sermon. Also taking part will be Dr. Jonas H. Dressler, retiring seminary president, and Dr. Gould

Wickey, Washington, executive secretary of the ULCA's board of higher education.

Before assuming the seminary presidency Dec. 1, Dr. Zeidler was president of Central States synod of the ULCA with headquarters in Omaha, Neb. He was once a pastor at Appleton, Wis., and is a former lawyer.

Sessions of the convocation will be held at Lake of the Isles Lutheran church. Speakers will be Dr. Adalbert R. Kretzmann, pastor of St. Luke's (Missouri Synod) Lutheran church in Chicago; the Rev. Arnold Flaten, chairman of the department of art at St. Olaf college, Northfield, and Dr. T. A. Kantonen, professor at Hamma Divinity school, Springfield, Ohio.

* * * * *

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 E. Schulz, 675 Second St., Tracy, Minn.

/ / / / / / / /

"The Lord's Supper is given for a daily pasture and sustenance, that faith may refresh and strengthen itself so as not to fall back in such a battle, but become ever stronger and stronger. For the new life must be so regulated that it continually increase and progress; but it must suffer much opposition. For the devil is such a furious enemy that when he sees that we oppose him and attack the old man, & that he cannot topple us over by force, he prowls & moves about on all sides, tries all devices, & does not desist until he finally wearies us, so that we either renounce our faith or yield hands & feet & become listless or impatient. Now to this end the consolation is here given when the heart feels that the burden is becoming too heavy, that it may here obtain new power and refreshment."

Large Catechism, Trigl: p. 759.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

by C. M. Zorn

(cont.)

6. The Migration of the People.

The Roman Empire now began to break up. It had come to be like a monstrous and frightful beast, which had arisen out of the sea of men and to which the devil had given his power and his glory and great might. How it now ranted and raged against Christ and the Christian Church! This beast now received the mortal wounds which had been prophesied of it. Rev. 13: 1-3a.

How did that happen? In the year 375 the Roman Empire broke up into two parts. There was now an eastern kingdom and a western kingdom. In the eastern kingdom the capital city was Constantinople, in the western kingdom the capital city was Rome. Each kingdom had an emperor.

It was at this time that the migration of the people began. This lasted for about 200 years, from 375 to 568.

What was this? A people called the Huns came from Middle Asia and wanted to live somewhere else. They came like a tidal wave off of the ocean, and came first of all against the Goths. The Goths were a German people, who lived in the eastern part of Europe. The Goths in turn were divided into the East Goths and the West Goths. The Goths were driven by the Huns toward the west. And so the movement went further and further. Everyone was moving and wandering. The West Goths, who had become Christians (although false-believing Christians) through the bishop Ulphilas, conquered Rome and Italy. The migration went further and further. The East Goths came to Rome and Italy, and put an end to the western Roman empire. That was in the year 476. And so now only the eastern Roman empire was left. That remained for another thousand years, but was weak and miserable.

Thus the dreadful, cruel beast of the Roman empire received a mortal wound.

The migration continued for nearly a hundred years through all of Europe. However, the Gospel and Christianity also went with these people.

The prophet Daniel has said that "the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will." Dan. 4:17. Children, you are living in a time when you can see that for yourselves. But the kingdom of Christ abides forever.

7. A Great Controversy in the Church.

Even before the year 325, which is the period of which we are now speaking, a controversy had arisen among the clergy (do you remember who are meant by that?) as to whether Jesus Christ was really true God and begotten of the Father from eternity, as the Word of God teaches. Many had said: Yes, Jesus Christ is true God, begotten of the Father from eternity, and also true man, born of the virgin Mary. That was right. But many had said something entirely wrong. And these had become divided into two parts. One part said: Jesus Christ is the Father Himself, and He became man. The other part said: That is not true; Jesus Christ is a wonderful creature of God, who did not exist from eternity, but still was there before God

created the world and the angels and men; and this wonderful creation of God became a man. Thus both of these parts were completely wrong in their teachings. Neither of the parts even believed that God was Triune: Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

In Alexandria, a famous city in North Africa, there was within a Christian congregation a "deacon" by the name of Arius. He had publicly taught that Jesus Christ was not true God, begotten of the Father from eternity, but was rather a wonderful creature of God, who was present before the time of the world and through whom God had created heaven and earth; and this creature of God later on became man. In this same congregation was another "deacon" by the name of Athanasius. He taught the right teaching. And he accused Arius of false doctrine before the bishop Alexander, who lived in Alexandria. Alexander then tried to bring Arius back to the right teaching. However, when he did not succeed, he called together a gathering of the clergy in that area in the year 321, and in this gathering Arius was excluded from the Christian Church. But that did not help very much. In fact, it didn't help at all. Things became still worse. Arius gained many servants of the Word on his side. He composed songs and sang his false doctrine into the hearts of the Christian people. And just as a fire which is kindled on a dusty prairie soon spreads out into an uncontrollable conflagration, so also the false doctrine of Arius spread out farther and farther throughout all Christendom. Emperor Constantine the Great heard about this. At first he thought that the difference in doctrine was not so great, and that the people should not fight. But the people continued to fight.

Now we come to the year 325. In this year the emperor called all the bishops in the Roman empire to a general Church Council at Nicea in Asia Minor. A total of 318 bishops were there, and the emperor was also there. Athanasius, who was still a deacon, spoke mightily against the false teaching of Arius and for the true teaching. He won. The doctrine of Arius was rejected. Arius was excluded from the Christian Church. The Nicene Creed (confession of faith) was adopted. Are you familiar with it? It is the second of the three general confessions of faith of the Christian Church. These are the Apostolic, the Nicene, and the Athanasian creeds. This third one came later on.

But even this did not help. The false doctrine of Arius still remained. Even the emperor accepted it. In the year 336 Arius was to be ceremoniously received back into the Church. However, on the evening before, he died suddenly in the midst of great pain. But the false doctrine of Arius did not die. By means of the migration of the people it was carried everywhere. And it is still there today.

8. Another Great Controversy in the Church.

Around the year 400 a monk by the name of Pelagius taught as follows: Men are not conceived and born in sin, are not corrupt by nature, but can keep themselves free from sin if they only wish to, and can become righteous before God and be saved by their good works. - Thus Pelagius taught in Rome, and later on also in Carthage, North Africa. And many accepted this false teaching. It is called Pelagianism.

Yes, this teaching is basically false. It is directly contrary to the Word of God. If what Pelagius taught was true, then there was no need for Jesus Christ to come. This doctrine is heathenish.

A short while later a monk in Gaul (France) by the name of John Cassianus taught thus: Men are conceived and born in sin and are corrupt by nature, and yet they can

by their own reason and strength believe in Jesus Christ and come to Him, if God's grace helps only a little. Many accepted this teaching, since it did not appear to be as radical as that of Pelagius. For that reason this teaching was called Semi-pelagianism (half-Pelagianism).

Also this teaching is basically false and directly contrary to God's Word. If this teaching were true, what need would there be for us to be born again in order to enter into the kingdom of God? John 3: 3,5.

Children, when you have learned the Small Catechism of Dr. Martin Luther, you know that both teachings are false, Pelagianism and also Semi-pelagianism.

There was one person especially who rejected both of these false teachings, and that was the well-known Augustine, bishop at Hippo in North Africa. Everywhere the bishops held many conferences because of this teaching, and they fought against it and rejected it often. But both false teachings remained. They are still present today, especially in the Roman Catholic Church. But also in the Protestant churches Pelagianism and Semi-pelagianism were freely and boldly taught, and no one was concerned in the least bit that both teachings were clearly contrary to God's Word and also contrary to the original confessions of the churches. And in the evangelical Lutheran churches, that is, in the churches who called themselves evangelical Lutheran but had fallen away from God's Word and their original Confessions, it is the same thing.

Children, when you are older, see well to it that you belong to a church in which this is rightly taught and preached! It is not enough that the church has the Lutheran name. The doctrine must be right.

9. The Monastic Life.

Yesterday you heard about a "monk." Today you shall hear what that is.

When the persecutions of the Christians stopped and the Christians had rest, but unfortunately became lukewarm, some people separated themselves from the others and lived as hermits, that is, by themselves, and wanted to become truly holy. - Does God want such a thing? No. God's Word says: "Through desire a man, having separated himself, seeketh and intermeddled with all wisdom," Prov. 18:1. Christ said to the Christians: "Ye are the salt of the earth" and "Ye are the light of the world," Matt. 5: 13-14. Salt and light are not to be separated and be by themselves! Christ said: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature," Mark 16:15. And no one can be truly holy anyway, even when he separates himself from other people, for his sinful Old Adam still goes with him. - Now, such hermits were called monks, if they were men, and nuns, if they were women. And the closed building in which the monks or nuns lived was called a cloister.

Now I will tell you about two of the first cloisters. In the year 340 a Christian by the name of Pachomius established a society of monks, and his sister established a society of nuns. That was in Egypt. Both societies went off to an island in the Nile river. There each society had its own cloister. Pachomius was the abbot, that is, the father and overseer of the monks, and his sister was the abbess, that is, the mother and overseer of the nuns. The monks and nuns lived strict and simple lives. They clothed themselves alike in very simple garments. They ate and

drank no more than was necessary for the preservation of life. They remained unmarried. They held divine worship, they prayed, they read in the Bible. - Before long many Christians followed their example, and many cloisters rose up in the East.

Cloisters also arose in the West. In the year 529 Benedict of Nursia established a cloister for monks on the mountain Cassino in Campania (Italy), and later on several others. In all his cloisters the same rules or orders prevailed; the monks had to vow especially four things: 1) they were to have no possessions of their own whatsoever; 2) be absolutely obedient to the abbot; 3) remain unmarried; 4) be monks for the rest of their lives. All of these monks were called Benedictines. Still other cloisters then arose. All cloisters which had the same orders were called monastic orders. There were many more orders for monks than there were for nuns. All of the cloisters were under the supervision of the bishops.

Concerning the monasticism of this time, the truth must be set forth in the light of two facts.

First: Many of the monks went completely insane, because they wanted to make themselves holy. They tortured themselves in frightful ways, just as many of the heathen also did. Thereby they wanted to earn salvation for themselves. Many, however, were lazy and hypocritical and deceitful. - That was certainly not good.

Second: But something good must also be said. Many cloisters were a refuge for the poor, unfortunate and forsaken. Many were built in forests and deserts; and there the monks established churches and schools and preached the Gospel, although they themselves did not understand it rightly and clearly, and they taught the people how to grow fruit and take care of fields, and built streets and bridges. The cloisters also sent missionaries into other lands. From the years 600 to 688 the monks Columban, Kilian and Gallus came from Ireland to Germany and extended the church out from Neckar to the Rhine as far inland as Switzerland. There Gallus established the cloister of St. Gall. Kilian preached at Würzburg in Bavaria.

Translation by A. Schulz

* * * * *

A WORD FROM DR. WALTHER

"When a theologian is asked to yield and make concessions in order that peace may at last be established in the Church, but refuses to do so even in a single point of doctrine, such an action looks to human reason like intolerable stubbornness, yea, like downright malice. That is the reason why such theologians are loved and praised by few men during their lifetime. Most men rather revile them as disturbers of the peace, yea, as destroyers of the kingdom of God. They are regarded as men worthy of contempt. But in the end it becomes manifest that this very determined, inexorable tenacity in cling-

ing to the pure teaching of the divine Word by no means tears down the Church; on the contrary, it is just this which, in the midst of greatest dissension, builds up the Church and ultimately brings about genuine peace. Therefore, woe to the Church which has no men of this stripe, men who stand as watchmen on the walls of Zion, sound the alarm whenever a foe threatens to rush the walls, and rally to the banner of Jesus Christ for a holy war!"

Law and Gospel, p. 28.

CLERGY BULLETIN

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

Vol. XVI, No. 7.

March, 1957

THE BIBLE AND HANDICAPPED PEOPLE

by

Rev. A. M. Harstad

I. "I believe that God has made me and all creatures, that He has given me my body and soul, eyes, ears, and all my members, my reason and all my senses." This confession which we make in Luther's explanation of the First Article of the Apostles' Creed is in perfect keeping with the teachings of Scripture. "Know ye that the Lord, He is God; it is He that hath made us, and not we ourselves; we are His people and the sheep of His pasture." Ps. 100, 3.

One of the greatest gifts God has given us is our reason. Soundness of body is of little benefit if one has not the use of his reason. Reason is one of the things that sharply differentiate man from the animals. The animals have senses, but they have not reason.

What do we mean by reason? We mean that power of soul which man has to think and to know, making it possible for him to have concepts, to compare things with one another, to put together and to differentiate, as also to pass judgment and to draw conclusions.

II. In the beginning God created man a perfect being, possessing the image of God which consisted in perfect righteousness and holiness, and in perfect knowledge. Man had great strength of body and of mind. The fact that man was able to name all the animals with names appropriate to their natures shows the great knowledge that he possessed.

If sin had not come, there would have been no sickness, no impairment of powers of body, mind, or senses. There would have been nothing to cause grief or pain in man. Intellectual perfection would have been man's inheritance. And there would have been no death.

III. However, the devil brought sin into the human race, and all the misery and woe that we see followed after sin. Alas, what havoc sin has worked in man and even in the physical world round about us. The world, which in the beginning was "very good," has been overatken by the terrible flood in the days of Noah; and this flood no doubt, had an incalculable effect upon the physical condition of the world. Paul writes: "We know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." Rom. 8, 22.

And man, who was to have dominion over all of God's creatures, has suffered impairment of powers of body, reason, and senses, and has become subject to death. Through the fall man lost the image of God, and is now, by nature, on the way to everlasting perdition. "And were by nature the children of wrath, even as others!" Eph. 2, 3.

IV. But into this sinful world Jesus Christ has brought salvation for man. "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil." I John 3, 8. The devil robbed man of the image of God. Christ came to restore it to man. Therefore He redeemed man at the price of His blood. Therefore He sends His Holy Spirit to work in man faith that accepts salvation and holiness of life - so that a beginning is made already now of restoring the image of God in the believer; and in heaven the image of God shall once more be perfect in man. Therefore Scripture speaks of Christ that He is our Hope. 1 Tim. 1, 1.

V. But while man dwells here on earth the sinful corruption abides in man, also in the believers. The believers in Christ, too, are subject to all the ills that be-

fall mankind; the believer, too, may experience being deprived of the use of one or the other of his senses, or the impairment of the senses, or mental retardation, and sickness of the body.

God is indeed the Giver of the powers of body and mind. But Scripture shows us that He does not give to all alike. Cf. The Parable of the Talents.

VI. And now we come to the question which we are so prone to ask: Why are some given so little in comparison with others? Why the mentally retarded? Why the blind, the deaf, the speechless, the brain-injured? Why does God let that injury happen to the mind of that child? Why does He let some lose one or the other of their senses? etc. "The hearing ear and the seeing eye, the Lord hath made even both of them." Prov. 20, 12. Then, we ask: Why does He not give to everyone a seeing eye and a hearing ear? Why does He let some be born without these senses, or why does He allow some to suffer loss or impairment of these senses?

Here we will have to confess we are up against one of the inscrutable things in God's government of the world. God's ways are not our ways, and God's thoughts are not our thoughts. His ways and thoughts are far higher than ours. But we do know that He loves us in Christ. And when we are believers in Christ nothing can happen to us but what it is sent by a loving God. "All things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose." Rom. 8.

We may offer these points in answer to the question "Why?" even though a fully satisfying answer may not be possible in this world:

A. Not as a punishment for some specific sin in every case. The disciples asked Jesus once: "Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents that he was born blind?" And Jesus answered: "Neither hath this man sinned nor his parents; but that the works of God should be made manifest in him." John 9, 2.3.

That there are cases where people have been punished for specific sins is apparent from Scripture; Gehazi overtaken by leprosy; Herod being eaten by worms.

But we are warned in Scripture against pointing an accusing finger and saying: "See, that is because he is a worse sinner than others." Luke 13, 1-5.

B. God has a loving purpose with His children also when He sends affliction upon them. "Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth." Heb. 12, 6.

1. Love to the parents of the handicapped child. "It is good for me that I have been afflicted, that I might learn Thy statutes." Ps. 119, 71. Through affliction they must learn to pray from the heart: "Thy will be done."
2. Love to the handicapped child. We may ask: If the child had an unimpaired reason, would it have remained steadfast in faith unto eternal life, or would it have fallen away? This may be God's way of leading that particular child on the way to eternal life.

Health of soul is the all-important thing. And this all can attain. The fact that the powers of mind are impaired is no hindrance to the attaining of faith. Rather it could be said that possessing great powers of mind might be a hindrance. 1 Cor. 1, 26-29. Matt. 11, 25.26.

C. To teach us who have been blessed with powers of reason to appreciate what He has given us.

Experience shows that we often do not appreciate blessings until we begin to lose them, or until we see others who do not have them. Witness the words spoken so often by visitors to Bethesda: If I never appreciated it before that I have faculties of mind and of body unimpaired, I hope I do now.

D. To give an opportunity for service on the part of the strong to the weak. The strong are here for the weak, and the weak for the strong. In this way we are given an opportunity to serve Jesus in serving the handicapped.

VII. Every soul is precious in God's sight. There is a dignity that every soul possesses: the dignity of being a creature of God and of having been redeemed by

the blood of Christ. And God wants every soul in heaven. Right here at Bethesda we have those children who are not able to appreciate the beauties of nature and art, or to enjoy associating with others. Yet those children, by reason of their baptism and faith in Christ, as children of God. And we who work with them ought always to bear that in mind.

And let it be said that God often uses weak instrumentalities to accomplish His purpose: The rod of Moses, Ex. 4, 2; the five smooth stones of David, 1 Sam. 17, 40; a poor widow and her little flour and oil, 1 Kings 17, 12; the five barley loaves, John 6, 9.

When it comes to the matter of who is rendering the most service to God and man I wonder if some of our Bethesda patients do not rank very high.

VIII. There are many references in Scripture to people suffering from handicaps; Mephisbosheth was lame on both feet; there were the lepers in Jesus' day; the blind, the deaf and mute, Mark 7, 32ff; the epileptic, Matt. 17 and Matt. 4, 24. (The word "lunatick" in these passages ought rather to be "epileptic.")

And Scripture points out that there are differences of abilities. Rom. 12, 6ff,

and that whatever abilities the Christians have they shall use for the benefit of all.

Scripture also speaks about the "simple" though not necessarily in the sense of being feeble-minded, but rather in the sense of being inexperienced, uneducated, easily enticed and seduced, credulous. Ps. 19, 7. Ps. 116, 6; 119, 130; Prov. 1, 4-22, 32; 7, 7; 8, 5; 14, 15.

The expression "feeble-minded" is used 1 Thess. 5, 14, but in the sense of "faint-hearted."

IX. And now in conclusion: God's Word bids all believers to be happy in Christ our Savior, no matter what their situation in life may be. Dan. 12, 13: "But go thy way till the end be; for thou shalt rest and stand in thy lot at the end of the days." There shall be perfection in the joys of heaven. Let us accept the comfort God's Word gives us in the midst of our affliction and cling to the guidance of God's Word. In the end we shall have to confess with the people in the Gospel: "He hath done all things well; He maketh both the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak." Mark 7, 37.

(Note: The above was prepared for discussion at a Faculty meeting at Bethesda Lutheran Home, Watertown, Wisc.)

* * * * *

"ALL-LUTHERAN CRUSADE FOR CHRIST"

"Committee meetings, ministers conferences, canvassers visits, reports of visiting laymen teams.

"A mass of preparations has been under way the past month as the Lutheran Crusade for Christ moves into high gear this Sunday, to continue through Thursday, February 7.

"Before taking part in the concentrated evangelism program, each Lutheran congregation completed a community survey to determine the need for such a mission.

"Result is a two-pronged, unified effort - that of winning souls into the Kingdom of God and of reactivating inactive members within each congregation.

"Rallies this Sunday will touch off the Preaching-Teaching-Reaching Mission

for some 50 National Lutheran Council and some 30 Missouri Synod Lutheran churches in the nine-county area of Southwest Minnesota.

"Following the rallies, each congregation will hold special evening services through Thursday, with guest missionaries as the speakers." (Worthington Globe, Jan. 31, 1957.)

This is not just like the evangelistic services of Billy Sunday, Gypsy Smith, or Billy Graham. That kind of effort is mainly a series of mass meetings. This effort started out with sectional meetings, but doubtless the main aim was to get the people into the local churches 5 nights in a row for intensive revival work. That sounds good.

There is no question about it, each individual church needs revival. And if the aim is to raise the spiritual standard of knowledge of the members of each congregation, that is a most commendable aim. And if the means of doing this is Scripture alone, the unchurched who might be gained will be helped.

No doubt a tremendous amount of work was done in planning. The plans were impressive, and the work required by those plans was likely quite exhausting for many willing church members. We can believe also that the people in these churches were told something about the absolute need of continued work after all these spiritual pep meetings are over.

There are many Lutheran lay-people in southwestern Minnesota who can remember the time when their local churches seemed to be for people of German or Scandinavian extraction. Before World War I, the main languages used in these churches were Scandinavian or German. Each church or group of churches was more or less a kind of closed corporation. They never dreamed of such publicity for churches as we see it now. They frowned on revival services. The evangelistic methods used now would never have been accepted forty years ago, or less.

The generation of Lutherans of forty and more years ago believed in thorough Catechism instruction and they practised church discipline. For young and old, the regular service was the center of church life. The ordinary church member then acted with more personal, spiritual responsibility. Parents exercised more Bible authority over their young. Each local church was more active in taking care of its own affairs.

Evangelistic services have their limitations. And they may have results that are not good. Crusades are built up on spiritual excitement, and this wears down and is gone in about the same length of time that it took to reach its climax. When such crusades are planned by the higher-ups, people are trained to look for further orders from the same source. Such crusades are bound up with so much human arrangement, and the results are counted so much in the numbers gained and the extent of activity, that people are inclined to think more of the human element and hu-

man decisions and external accomplishments than real spiritual advancement.

A preacher once said: I would like to be pope long enough to abolish the office of pope, cardinal, bishop, superintendent, executive director, and every vestige of hierarchical control. Then the members of each local church could be kings and priests as they should be, having headquarters in heaven, and nothing but Scripture to use on earth. In line with this, one might wish for some great, united effort to be made to teach the people what the Bible teaches, making each disciple of Christ directly responsible to the Lord of the Church, and causing each local church to operate as a full-fledged church with all rights, privileges, duties, and responsibilities.

And then there is the matter of external cooperation, which, frankly, is the purpose of writing about this "Crusade." The newspaper publicity makes distinctions. The churches of the National Lutheran Council work separately, that is, in the localities they do not work jointly with the churches of the Mo. Synod. The whole Crusade, however, will certainly leave the impression on the common people of joint mission work by all the churches named and participating. The results will naturally be such as the results of the Lutheran chaplaincy system and service centers of men in the Armed forces. No matter how much Mo. Synod leaders may deny it, such a Crusade as this is bound to have the effect of further unionizing their own followers with NLC bodies.

The general public must be led by such a Crusade to regard all the Lutherans named as people engaged in joint church work. The common man in the NLC bodies and churches talks about the joint effort of "80 Lutheran churches." NLC leaders can rightly claim the Crusade as being another step toward Lutheran Union. And with such activities as this Crusade, the average member in Mo. Synod churches is being schooled to want union, using good logic also to say that if there can be this much cooperation there can be more like it and also joint church services among the lay-people.

After the adoption of the Common Confession by the Mo. Synod Convention in

(Cont. on page 50)

BOOK REVIEW

FROM EDEN TO EGYPT, by George O. Lillegard, Northwestern Pub. House, Milwaukee, Wis. Cloth, 408 pages, 3.00.

There are 51 chapters, each a sermon on a portion of Genesis. The sermons may be classified as exegetical. The author selected the Book of Genesis because of its importance to the rest of the Bible and because of the fact that it has become a neglected book.

The sermons are Scriptural; but they make no allowance for the insights that God gives us through the realm of science. It has been said that Genesis is made up of 99% telling us Who created the universe and 1% about How He did it. The author deals with the How to some extent. On that score interpretations have differed even among orthodox students of the Bible. No one who believes in God, as revealed in the Bible, will question God's power even to the extent that He might have created the world in a flash; but as to whether He did it in 6 days by our reckoning is quite another matter. God did create.

Man fell into sin. That is real. The Bible teaches that only God can redeem fallen man by His grace in Christ. On that there can be no divided opinions among those who believe in the Word of God. But where the whole creation period is spoken of as the day in which God created the heavens and the earth, it is not much use to be dogmatic where the Bible is not dogmatic. The world was created by God's almighty Word. That remains true forever.

What interests this reviewer in particular is the fact that 51 sermons were preached on Genesis, and that certainly points the way for great possibilities of more preaching of the same kind by other pastors and on other Biblical books as well.

Theodore Huggenvik

(Book News Letter, Feb., 1957, APH)

* - * - * - *

REVIEW

Dr. S. C. Ylvisaker's "Creation Day Points":

1. To the unlearned reader the simple meaning of the text is DAY.
2. The word DAY is defined in the context, v. 16: "And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule by day, and the lesser light to rule the night."
3. Day is limited by evening and morning.
4. Day is distinguished from SEASONS and YEARS, v. 14.
5. Man was created on the sixth day. If this day were a period or era, how could Adam's age be so carefully determined as it is?
6. In Exodus 20 we should have to do violence to the text if the word DAY were made an era.
7. The Holy Ghost does not speak in such cryptic language that we should be obliged to seek for a hidden meaning for the word DAY, particularly when it is defined as carefully as it is in this particular context.

* * * * *

LUTHER; "When Moses writes that God made heaven and earth and all that is in them in six days, let the six days stand... If you cannot understand how it could have been six days, then accord to the Holy Spirit the honor that He is more learned than you." (St. Louis Walsh III, 21.)

LAURITS PEDER LUND

Pastor Emeritus, Laurits Peder Lund passed away in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., on Friday evening, Feb. 8. Funeral services were held at Bethel Lutheran Church, Sioux Falls, on Monday, Feb. 11. Prof. A.A.O. Preus of Bethany College, the immediate successor of Rev. Lund in the congregations at Luverne and Jasper, Minn., preached on 1 Pet. 1,3; Rev. T.N. Teigen preached on John 14,23-27 and Hebrews 13,7. Rev. Paul Petersen, present pastor of Luverne, spoke on behalf of Pastor Lund's former congregations and on behalf of the Norwegian Synod. Burial was made in the Bethany Cemetery near Colton, S. Dak.

Obituary

LAURITS PEDER LUND was born at Ribe, Denmark, on Oct. 14, 1877. Grafted into Christ in early infancy, he was confirmed in 1894. He immigrated with his parents in 1880 when the family settled in Butler County, Iowa. After attending St. Ansgar Seminary for a year, Laurits Lund enrolled at Luther College, Decorah, in the fall of 1899, graduating in 1904. He entered Luther Theological Seminary in St. Paul in 1906 and finished his ministerial training there in May, 1909. On June 13, 1909, he was ordained to the office of the Holy Ministry on a call from congregations at Luverne, Jasper, and Kenneth, Minnesota. He was married to Ella Maria Dalen of Colton, S. Dak., on June 16, 1909. His entire ministry of 41 years was in the congregations of his ordination, until his retirement in 1950 when he moved to Sioux Falls. He has been a member of Bethel Lutheran Church since that time. He was drafted by the voters of his district in 1927 to serve a term in the Minnesota State Senate. He was also a member of the Minnesota State Historical Society.

Survivors are his widow; four daughters: Mrs. Loy Pfeiffer of Pequot Lakes, Minn.; Mrs. Robert Hopewell of Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Mrs. Wilder Ohs of Webster City, Iowa; and Mrs. F. H. Vanstrom of Rockford, Ill.; three sisters: Mrs. Sena Lomen and Miss Rena Lund, Nashua, Iowa; and Mrs. Harvey Larson, Dorset, Minn.; One brother, Carl, Nashua, Iowa. He has had 12

grandchildren and two great grandchildren. He was preceded in death by a son, Conrad, who died in infancy.

"And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever." Dan. 12, 2,3.

* * * * *

(Cont. from page 48)

1950 and much talk then about union between the Mo. Synod and the American Lutheran Church, a farmer's wife asked an important question. She asked: Why did the Mo. Synod have to stir up so much trouble negotiating with other Lutherans when the Synodical Conference could do so much better work by remaining separate? The question still stands, with more and more reason for asking it.

Or make the whole matter more striking and ask this one: What would the reaction have been in 1938 if then the present activities of the Mo. Synod leadership could have been fully pictured? Without doubt most everybody would have said: Such a picture cannot be true. But the leaven works - gradually. And the fine human feeling of good will among most Lutherans today is a mighty force against all such as believe they must hold to the teaching and practice of Synodical Conference Lutherans of forty years ago. Long after the sound of action has died away, the radiation "fall-out" of joint work like this Crusade affects and infects all of us.

- Geo. Schweikert

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, payable in advance to: Rev. Arthur E. Schulz, 675 Second St., Tracy, Minn.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

by C. M. Zorn

(cont.)

10. The Church Fathers.

Today you will learn to know a little about four of the greatest and best known of the teachers in the Church. We call them Church Fathers.

1. Athanasius, bishop in Alexandria, North Africa. You are already acquainted with him. He had to endure much suffering because he fought fearlessly for the divine truth. He died in the year 373.

2. Ambrosius, bishop in Milan, Italy. He also fought against the Arians, as did Athanasius. His sermons were very beautiful. He also composed a hymn of praise, which is included in all our hymnbooks and which is called the Ambrosian chant (Te Deum). He was afraid of nothing, not even of the emperor. The emperor Theodosius the Great became angry with the inhabitants of the city of Thessalonica in Macedonia because they started a revolt, and he wanted to punish them severely. Ambrosius asked the emperor not to do that, and the emperor promised that he would not. And yet he permitted his soldiers to kill 7000 people. Ambrosius then wrote to him and told him that he could not receive the Lord's Supper until he had publicly repented. However, when the Lord's Supper was distributed, the emperor came to the altar and wished to receive it. Ambrosius walked toward him and sent him back. For eight months the emperor was angry and obstinate. Finally he came into the church, laid aside his emperor's cloak, fell on his face and prayed aloud: "My soul cleaveth unto the dust; quicken thou me according to thy word!" Psalm 119:25. The people in the church wept and prayed with the emperor. Then he was again accepted. Ambrosius died in the year 395.

3. Hieronymus (also called Jerome). For a while he held an office in the congregation at Antioch in Syria, but then he travelled here and there a great deal and wrote theological books. He understood the Hebrew language and translated the Bible into Latin. This translation is called the "Vulgate", which means, the universal, because it was considered the only correct translation in the Roman Catholic Church. However, it contained many great mistakes. Hieronymus was a great friend of the cloisters and did much for them. He died in a cloister in Bethlehem in the year 420.

4. Augustine, bishop in Hippo, North Africa. You also know something about him. He was born in Tagaste, Numidia, North Africa, in the year 354. He was raised a Christian by his pious mother Monica. But when he studied Rhetoric (the art of speaking) in Carthage, he entered upon a frivolous and immoral life. He then became a teacher of rhetoric in Carthage and in Rome and in Milan. There in Milan he heard Ambrosius preach, and the Holy Ghost knocked upon his heart. One time he was walking back and forth in his garden. The wind blew a piece of paper into the garden. He picked it up. It was a page from the Bible. He looked at it. The first thing which he saw was a passage in which sin was punished and he was directed to Christ.

Now the good Shepherd had found His lost sheep. For years his dear mother had tearfully prayed for him. Now some words which a pious bishop had once spoken came true, namely, that the son of so many tears and prayers could not go lost. In 387 he was baptized by Ambrosius. He now gave up his office, went back to Africa, and was first a deacon and later on in the year 396 became bishop in Hippo. - - Augustine wrote many wonderful books, which we still have today. In these books he fought against the false teachings which were so widely spread, and splendidly taught the free grace of God in Christ Jesus. He died in the year 430.

Trans. by A. Schulz

* * * * *

GENERAL PASTORAL CONFERENCE

Time: April 23 - 26, 1957 - 10:00 a.m.

Place: Bethany Lutheran College

Program:

- 1) Exegesis: Psalm 109 (Imprecatory Psalm) - R. E. Honsey.
- 2) Doctrinal: The Office of the Ministry - Neil Hilton, Geo. Lillegard, and M. H. Otto.
- 3) Practical: Catechetics - V. Gerlach.
- 4) Historical: Dead Sea Scrolls - N. C. Oesleby.
- 5) Synodical Affairs and Bethany College - M. H. Otto.
- 6) Sermon: Iver Johnson - Critic: Morris Dale.
- 7) Doctrinal: Fundamentalism and the Doctrine of Christology - A.H. Strand.
- 8) Panel Discussion of Christian Day Schools - M. E. Tweit.
- 9) Practical: Seminar on Mission Techniques - Mission Board.

R. H. Ude, secretary

Gleanings From A Biography Of
A. T. Robinson

by Everett Gill.

A. T. Robinson "would remain standing while attending to the business in hand, knowing the average man's incapacity properly to evaluate time. He knew what was in man and was certain that an invitation to sit down meant the loss of a precious half hour. As a result of this devotion to work a friend could speak of him as 'the despair of many because of the quantity and excellence of the work' he turned out. The writer added that he was sure that A.T.R. was 'sincerely happy in the anticipation that heaven is to be a place where there is no night, so that he may work all the time.'" (p. 171). He wrote 45 books, beginning to write at 38 and ending at 70. (pp. 139-40). It is claimed that he wore out a dozen Greek Testaments in his lifetime. He taught the New Testament from the Greek text in hand. He did this even in the popular assembly, the majority of whom were laymen and women who knew no Greek. Moody had adopted this method and requested Robertson to try it out. Robertson was working on a translation of the New Testament when he died. His reason: "I can thus preserve for popular use the result of much of my life's work."

CLERGY BULLETIN

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

Vol. XVI, No. 8.

April, 1957

INTRODUCTION TO THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH

(A Conference Essay)

by Rev. Paul Petersen.

In studying the Book of Jeremiah one should consider the times and conditions under which he lived. Jeremiah lived in a most critical time in the history of Israel. II Kings 22 to 25 and II Chronicles 34 to 36 give us a background of the history of Judah during this period.

After the Kingdom had been divided in about the year 975, Israel had to feel the wrath of God because she stubbornly refused to listen to God's messengers who called them to repentance. The kingdom of Israel was overthrown, taken captive by the Assyrians, never to be restored again as a nation.

The Kingdom of Judah existed for a time under pious King Hezekiah. But the kings who succeeded him, with the exception of King Josiah, were very wicked men, and the people followed their example. As a result, Judah too was severely punished like Israel, with this exception, however, that after 70 years of captivity, the people of Judah were allowed to re-settle in their homeland. This was done according to God's providence, for out of Judah was to come the Messiah, the Savior of the world.

So far as world conditions at the time were concerned, Judah was caught in the middle of a three-way struggle for power between Assyria, Babylon, and Egypt. For 300 years Assyria had ruled the roost, but at this time was growing weak; Babylon was becoming the leading power. Egypt, which had been such a strong power in the past, had declined but was now struggling to come back. Babylon won the battle for supremacy during Jeremiah's time.

Three important world events occurred during Jeremiah's ministry. First, the battle of Migiddo. Because of Assyria's

weakened condition, Pharaoh Necho of Egypt waged war against her, and Josiah, the king of Judah, decided to cast his lot with the Assyrians, and he joined the Assyrians in battle against Egypt. A decisive battle was fought at Migiddo, where good Josiah lost his life. This loss meant the end of Jewish independence and it also ended the hopes of a possible reunion of Israel and Judah. From this time Judah was a vassal of either Egypt or Babylon.

The second important event took place in the 4th year of the reign of wicked King Jehoiakim. This event which paved the way for the supremacy of Babylon and the captivity of Judah was the battle of Carchemish, in which the Babylonians decisively defeated the Egyptians and won dominion over western Asia. Jehoiakim, the first son of Josiah, who became king after the short reign of Jehoahaz, was on the throne. Jehoiakim rebelled against the Babylonian king, and as a result Nebuchadnezzar entered Jerusalem and captured the rebel king.

The third important event was the destruction of Jerusalem and the Babylonian captivity of Judah. This began in the reign of Jehoiakim and lasted through king Zedekiah. Nebuchadnezzar came up against Jerusalem and carried off the vessels of the house of the Lord and put them in his temple in Babylon. II Chron. 36:7ff. And at this time 3,023 Jews were deported to Babylon as a warning against further rebellions. Jer. 52:29.

The Babylonians under Nebuchadnezzar appeared a second time on the soil of Palestine during the reign of Jehoiachin. This time the king himself, his mother, his wives, and all the officials were carried to Babylonia. And in order to make

certain there would be no uprising, he took all the princes and all the men of valor, even 10,000 captives, and all the craftsmen and smiths none remained, save the poorest sort of the people of the land. II Kings 24:14.

Then Nebuchadnezzar appointed Zedekiah king. Zedekiah broke the oath of fidelity which he had made with Nebuchadnezzar when he rebelled against him. He secretly sought aid from the surrounding countries of Edom, Moab, Ammon, Tyre and Sidon, since his own kingdom was weakened by the deportations to Babylon. When he had assured the king of Babylon of his fidelity and with the aid of these other countries, he began his revolt. The revolt was a failure, and his punishment came quickly. Nebuchadnezzar advanced against him and came to Riblah, a very strategic point from which to operate against both Judah and her allies. Judah was defenseless, and all of Judea was overrun with the exception of two fortified cities. Jerusalem was surrounded by the enemy. On the 9th day of the 4th month of the 11th year of Zedekiah 586, the walls of Jerusalem crumbled and the enemy entered. The city was set afire and, when the king tried to escape, he was caught and tortured. His sons were slain before his eyes, after which his own eyes were put out and he was deported to Babylon.

Only a small portion of the inhabitants were left behind in Jerusalem. Gedaliah was made their civil administrator and Jeremiah their religious leader. Gedaliah was murdered by his fellow-man Ishmael. In fear of reprisal for this act, the Jews fled to Egypt, against Jeremiah's advice.

As for the religious conditions of the time, they too were tragic. They may be summarized in these words of Jeremiah: "My people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water." Jer. 2:13.

Although Hezekiah, the son of wicked King Ahaz, was a good and pious King, who sincerely sought to stem the tide of wickedness and idolatry, his work of reform was undone by his wicked son Manasseh. Manasseh restored all the idolatrous acts of Ahaz and added a few more of his own, including the worship of the sun, the moon

and the stars. He caused his children to pass through the fire in the valley of the son of Hinnom. And as a punishment, Manasseh was deported to Babylon. While there he repented and was restored to his kingdom. When he returned, he began a reform and commanded Judah to serve the Lord God of Israel. II Chron. 33.

His son, Amon, reverted back to idolatry and "he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord," II Chron. 33:22. He served only a short time, for he was assassinated by his own people. II Chron. 33.

Of the five kings of Judah, Josiah, Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah, under whom Jeremiah prophesied, only the first, Josiah, was a pious king. "He did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, and walked in the ways of David his father, and declined neither to the right hand, nor to the left." II Chron. 34:2. Josiah sought to eradicate every form of idolatry in Judah. His reform extended even outside of the boundary of Israel itself. II Chron. 34:6.

In the 18th year of his reign he ordered the repair of the Temple in Jerusalem. While this repair was going on, a temple copy of the law of Moses, the Pentateuch, was found under a pile of rubbish, by Hilkiah, the High Priest. (Not the father of Jeremiah). The king was given the book to read, and when he had done so he "rent his clothes" in token of mourning for the guilt which Israel had incurred by their breach of its commandments. The king caused the book to be read to all the people and immediately made a covenant before the Lord "to walk after the Lord, and to keep his commandments, and his testimonies, and his statutes with all his heart, and with all his soul, and to perform the words of the covenant which are written in this book." II Chron. 34. Then they celebrated the Passover, which had not been observed for a long time. II Chron. 35:1-19.

But Josiah's reformation was short lived. It became to many of the people only an emotional thing, with more stress on outer reform than true repentance. Judah's loss was great, however, when Josiah was killed in battle. His successor was his younger son, Jehoahaz. He did not walk in the ways of his father, but "did evil in the sight of the Lord" and reinstated

idol-worship in Judah. His short reign lasted only three months.

Next came Jehoiakim, an older brother of Jehoahaz. He, too, was very wicked, having departed from the true God whom his father Josiah had so faithfully served. Jeremiah describes him as a vain, bloodthirsty, violent oppressor. Jer. 22:17. His contempt for Jehovah and the true religion was shown by the fact that he took the roll that Jeremiah had written, by the command of God, which threatened divine judgment upon the nation unless true repentance took place, and threw it in the fire. Jer. 26:23. This roll of a book contained all the prophecies which Jeremiah had dictated to his friend and secretary, Baruch, during the preceding 20 years. Jehoiakim hated the true prophets and killed faithful Urijah with his sword. Jer. 26:23. When wicked Jehoiakim died, he was buried with the burial of an ass, drawn out and cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem. Jer. 22:19.

Zedekiah, the last of the kings of Judah, was not as hostile toward Jeremiah as the other kings, but he hardened his heart against the Lord. The people continued to mock the messengers of God, despised His Word, polluted the house of the Lord, misused the prophets, until the wrath of God arose against His people. Under the rule of all the kings, except Josiah, the people relapsed into gross paganism and immoral practices. Idolatry was practiced by young and old. Jer. 1:16; 7:18. Human sacrifices were offered. 19:5; 32:35. Covetousness, dishonesty, murder, adultery, theft, false swearing were rampant. 2:34; 5:27-29; 6:7; 7:9. Chapter five of Jeremiah gives a description of the universal depravity of Judah. This moral corruption was evident also in the prophets and priests. 6:3; 8:10; 23:11-15 and in the pastors 23:1-3. Judah had become a "degenerate plant."

To a nation so ungrateful for all the goodness and mercy which God had showered on them, so forgetful of all her blessings and falling so low in unfaithfulness and wickedness, a serious warning was timely. It fell to Jeremiah's lot to warn them, to plead with them and to call them to repentance, to urge them "to ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and to walk therein." But coupled with the threats

of divine judgment were the glorious promises that God would not carry out His threat if they would repent. Jer. 3:12-21; 23:3-8; 29:11; 31:3,34; 33:8. But the people would not listen to Jeremiah and obey God's Word, Jer. 35:15; 25:3, but listened instead to the false prophets who were predicting peace and prosperity.

Author

The name Jeremiah means "Jehovah throws down." The book itself tells us a great deal about the author. He was born at Anathoth, a small village northeast of Jerusalem, a son of Hilkiah, a priest in the land of Benjamin. Jer. 1:1. He was ordained a prophet at the early age of about 20 years. 1:4-10. He believed that God had selected him even before he came forth from his mother's womb. 1:5. Like Moses, he was reluctant to accept the call. "Ah Lord God! Behold, I cannot speak; for I am a child." Jer. 1:6. But the Lord said: "Say not, I am a child; for thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee, and whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak. Be not afraid of their faces; for I am with thee to deliver thee, saith the Lord," vv. 7-8.

Jeremiah was active in the capacity of prophet from the 13th year of King Josiah to the destruction of Jerusalem in 586. Even after the fall of Jerusalem, he prophesied in Egypt for a time, so his work extended over a period of between 40 and 50 years. He preached to the people of his home town and throughout all the land and exhorted them to obey the divine command, but in so doing he became the object of much hostility. He was labeled as a dangerous fanatic. 12:6. During Jehoiakim's reign, after the roll burning incident, he was put in the stocks, but was released a short time later. 20:1-3.

He was blamed for the siege of Jerusalem because they claimed that his unfavorable predictions discouraged the defenders of Jerusalem. When he tried to leave the city to go to his home town Anathoth to transact some business, he was charged with deserting to the Babylonians and was thrown in prison. King Zedekiah released him, 37:16, but the princes had him thrown into a dungeon to die, 38:16. An Ethiopian eunuch obtained the king's permission to release him from this miry pit.

Jeremiah was in Jerusalem when the Babylonians arrived. He was treated kindly by them and given a choice of going to Babylon or remaining at home. He chose to stay and was protected by Gedaliah, whom Nebuchadnezzar had made governor of Judah. When Gedaliah was murdered, Jeremiah urged the Jews not to flee to Egypt. But his advice was not taken. They not only went to Egypt themselves, but also took Jeremiah with them. The time and manner of his death are unknown. One tradition asserts he was stoned by the Jews in Egypt. Another, that he was taken by Nebuchadnezzar to Babylon, where he died.

Jeremiah was a gentle, tenderhearted and sympathetic man with a mild and sensitive nature - quite a contrast to the hard message he had to proclaim. He was torn between his longing for peace, his hard, inescapable task, and his tender love for his own people. He was even denied the love and companionship of a wife and children. 16:2. The message that he was forced to deliver was one of doom to his native land and therefore he incurred the wrath of his fellow men. He lamented his lot and even cursed the day he was born. 20:14. But God took him to task for his complaint and demanded of him repentance, trust and obedience. This discipline further strengthened him.

Jeremiah lived about a hundred years after Isaiah. Ezekiel and Daniel were contemporaries of Jeremiah.

Jeremiah's mission can be summed up in verse two of Chapter 1. "See I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build and to plant." He not only pronounced his woe against the wicked, but he also uttered promise of divine grace and deliverance for the few who remained faithful and true to God. While his prophecies were directed particularly to Judah, he prophesied against the other nations as well.

From the very beginning of his ministry, he declared that Judah's conqueror would be a country from the north. 1:14. This power from the north is named in Chapter 25 as King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon. In contrast to the false prophets, who cried peace and prosperity when there wasn't

any, Jeremiah from the outset prophesied that Jerusalem and the Temple would be destroyed and that the people would be exiled to Babylon. Chapter 25:11 and 29:11 place this as a definite 70 years, after which deliverance would come. These promises of deliverance are found already in the early years of the prophet: 3:14f.; 12:14ff.; 16:14ff. But during the siege and afterwards, these promises become more frequent. 23:1ff.; 24:6ff.; 47:2-4. Also Ch's 30 - 33.

He further prophesied that if Judah would turn from her wickedness God would save her from destruction at the hands of Babylon.

But the most beautiful of Jeremiah's prophecies are the Messianic prophecies concerning our Savior. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is the name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." Jer. 23:5,6. "But they shall serve the Lord their God, and David their King, whom I will raise up unto them." Jer. 30:9. "In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely; and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, The Lord our righteousness. For thus saith the Lord: David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel!" Jer. 33:15-17.

The prophecy of the new covenant in Ch. 31:31-34 refers to the New Testament which began with the coming of Christ. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them, saith the Lord: But this shall be a covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and shall write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people."

The book is rather difficult to outline. It is not chronological, but topical. The prophecies do not run according to the time in which the different kings reigned. For example, the prophecies during the reign of Zedekiah, the last king, follow immediately after the prophecies of the first king Josiah, and Zedekiah comes in the midst of the reign of Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin.

The general outline of the book would be thus:

I. Predictions of the approaching judgment of Judah and the promise of restoration from exile. Ch. 2 to 33. It includes a general denunciation of Judah, Ch. 2 to 20; denunciation of the civil and religious rulers, Ch. 21 to 23; an unfolding of the duration of the judgment, Ch. 24 to 29; and a prophecy of the blessings which would follow the exile, Ch. 30 to 33.

II. History of the infliction of the judgment, Ch. 34 to 44, including denunciations of the corruption which prevailed immediately before the destruction of the city, Ch. 34 to 38; and an account of the destruction of Jerusalem, Ch. 39, and of the wretched conditions of the remnant, and prophecies spoken to them, Ch. 40-44.

III. Predictions in regard to foreign nations. Ch. 46 to 51.

1. Against Egypt. Ch. 46.
2. Against Philistines. Ch. 47.
3. Against Moab. Ch. 48.
4. Against Ammonites. Ch. 49:1-6.
5. Against Edom. Ch. 49:7-22.
6. Against Damascus. Ch. 49:23-27.
7. Against Kedar. Ch. 49:28-33.
8. Against Elam. Ch. 49:34-39.
9. Against Babylon. Ch. 50 and 51.

IV. Historical conclusion. Detailed account of the capture of Jerusalem by the Babylonians and the exile of its inhabitants.

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, So. Dak.

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

CONSIDERATIONS IN REJECTING

FALSE DOCTRINE

"As to the condemnations, censures, and rejections of godless doctrines, and especially of that which has arisen concerning the Lord's Supper, these indeed had to be expressly set forth in this our declaration and thorough explanation and decision of controverted articles, not only that all should guard against these condemned doctrines, but also for certain other reasons could in no way have been passed by. Thus, as it is in no way our design and purpose to condemn those men who err from a certain simplicity of mind, but are not blasphemers against the truth of the heavenly doctrine, much less, indeed, entire churches, which are either under the Roman Empire of the German nation or elsewhere; nay, rather has it been our intention and disposition in this manner openly to censure and condemn only the fanatical opinions and their obstinate and blasphemous teachers, (which, we judge, should in no way be tolerated in our dominions, churches, and schools,) because these errors conflict with the express Word of God, and that, too, in such a way that they cannot be reconciled with it. We have undertaken this also for this reason, viz., that all godly persons might be warned diligently to avoid them. For we have no doubt whatever that even in those churches which have hitherto not agreed with us in all things many godly and by no means wicked men are found who follow their own simplicity, and do not understand aright the matter itself, but in no way approve the blasphemies which are cast forth against the Holy Supper as it is administered in our churches, according to Christ's institution, and, with the unanimous approval of all good men, is taught in accordance with the words of the testament itself. We are also in great hope that, if they would be taught aright concerning all these things, the Spirit of the Lord aiding them, they would agree with us, and with our churches and schools, to the infallible truth of God's Word. And assuredly, the duty is especially incumbent upon all the theologians and ministers of the Church, that with such moderation as is becoming they teach from the Word of God also those who either from a certain simplicity or ignorance have erred from the truth, concerning the peril of their salvation, and that they

fortify them against corruptions, lest perhaps, while the blind are leaders of the blind, all may perish. Wherefore, by this writing of ours, we testify in the sight of Almighty God and before the entire Church that it has never been our purpose, by means of this godly formula for union to create trouble or danger to the godly who to-day are suffering persecution. For, as we have already entered into the fellowship of grief with them, moved by Christian love, so we are shocked at the persecution and most grievous tyranny which with such severity is exercised against these poor men, and sincerely detest it. For in no way do we consent to the shedding of that innocent blood, which undoubtedly will be required with great severity from the persecutors at the awful judgment of the Lord and before the tribunal of Christ, and they will then certainly render a most strict account, and suffer fearful punishment." (Preface to the Christian Book of Concord, Triglott, p. 19).

NOTE: In 1900 the Eastern District Synod Convention discussed an essay by District President Halvor Halvorson entitled: "The Christian Congregation's Task, With Special Reference to the Proper Manner in Which the Individual Christian and the Congregation Should Meet the Sectarians." The fourth thesis read: "Our weapons of warfare against error and sectarianism must not be earthly and carnal, but spiritual, namely, God's Word, faith, and prayer." In connection with the discussion of that thesis, President Vilhelm Koren read the section of the Preface to the Book of Concord, quoted above, and added the following comment:

"It is good for us to be reminded that when we reject false doctrine we do not condemn the whole church body; but only those who promote the false doctrine; and that we censure the sin that a church body tolerates error." (Eastern District Report, 1900, p. 48.)

T.N.T.

(Note: For Walther's comments on the above passage from the Triglott, see "Law and Gospel," p. 339ff.)

RE BIRTH CONTROL

We believe wholeheartedly that it is wrong for husband and wife to practice birth control, either through natural or artificial means, when it is done from selfish motives, for example, when parents do not wish to be bothered with the great amount of work that is involved in raising children, or when they wish to avoid having children, or at least having very many of them, in order that they may spend their money on a high scale of living and entertainment, or when in good health they prevent the birth of children for fear of losing their health, thus showing a decided lack of trust in God to provide the health, the money and the strength to raise a family.

But we do not believe that Scripture forbids birth control, either through natural or artificial means, under all circumstances. Here we present the matter of ill health, especially on the part of the wife. It is true that we should trust the Lord for health and strength also in the bearing of children, but what about when the good health of the wife is gone? Hasn't God by not giving the wife continued good health shown thereby that until He restores her health, it is not His will that she should bear children? To use an illustration: When a Christian individual engaged in hard physical labor goes to the doctor and is told that he has a very bad heart and must by all means refrain from over-exerting himself in the future, does that Christian say: "Oh, no, I'm going to keep right on working hard as usual. I've got to trust the Lord." Hasn't the Lord by permitting that bad heart condition to develop already revealed His will for that Christian so far as his earthly work is concerned? Would not continuing as before be a deliberate harming and shortening of the life?

When we say we believe there are exceptional cases where because of ill health it may be permissible for husband and wife to practice birth control, either through natural or artificial means, we do not mean imagined ill health, or fear of losing one's good health, but an actual condition of ill health based on sound, competent medical advice. We are not here advocating "Planned Parenthood" where the

parents decide beforehand how many children they will have and just when they shall be born. We believe that is to be left to God's will and direction. And we believe that the Christian couple in practicing birth control when God has not granted continued good health to the wife is in so doing still leaving the whole matter of bearing children to God's will and direction. At the same time we should also remember that doctors may be wrong at times, and that God can miraculously preserve the life of a mother in childbirth, also when she is in ill health.

There are those who say that it is permissible for the Christian couple to regulate the bearing of children when a condition of ill health exists, but that it must be done through self control or continence. Aside from the question of whether or not there is any essential difference between continence or the art-

ificial methods of birth control, we raise this point: Is it not true that marriage is not only for the purpose of bearing children, but also to help the Christian to avoid the sin of fornication? Paul says: "Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband." (I Cor. 7:2). Can not this purpose of marriage often be frustrated when continence is made the only God-pleasing way to live as man and wife when ill health forbids the bearing of children? Some may have the gift, but where does Scripture lay this upon every individual's conscience?

Let us on the one hand be ever so firm in our opposition to birth control of any kind when practiced from selfish, sinful motives. On the other hand, let us not lay more on the conscience of the Christian than God's Word does.

T. Aaberg

* * * * *

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

by C. M. Zorn

(cont.)

11. The Ruin of the Church.

Just think of all the many different things that happened during this period of years between 325 and 812.

We have already learned that Christianity soon became lukewarm and earthly-minded when it had peace and honor and respect under the emperor Constantine the Great. That was already a corruption in the Church. And it became even worse because of the migration of the people, even though the Church was also extended thereby. We shall now hear how very corrupt Christianity became in this period of which we are now speaking.

You know that even before this time, shortly after the death of the Apostles, the clergy alone had the right to speak in the Church, and the other Christians were called laity, or the ignorant ones. And even these clergy taught and guided the poor Christians in the wrong way. It helped very little that there were such excellent men as Athanasius, Ambrosius and Augustine. The clergy were full of false doctrine and were just as earthly-minded as the laity. It then came about that the emperors, as long as there still were emperors, began to join in conducting the innermost affairs of the Church, and even made bishops out of certain men that they liked.

O how miserable conditions now were in Christianity! The true faith and the true Christian life died away like burned-out coals of fire, and only the cinders remained. And what were these cinders? They were: outward splendor. The people

had magnificent churches. They held grand worship services with many pretentious ceremonies, that means, with many forms and rites which looked very beautiful outwardly. The "priests" clothed themselves like the priests in the Old Testament among the children of Israel. They drew up all sorts of church laws, and said: You must do this and that, and then you are a true Christian and will be saved. This resulted in hypocrisy. But still more. The virgin Mary was divinely honored. The "saints", the Apostles and martyrs, were divinely honored. The picture of the cross was divinely honored. A splinter of wood from the cross of Christ was divinely honored. Actually there was no such splinter, but they showed a piece of wood to the people and said that it was a splinter from Christ's cross. Relics, that is, bones and other belongings of the saints, were divinely honored. Traditions, all sorts of stories passed on from mouth to mouth about Christ and the Apostles which are not found in the Bible and which were often very foolish, were believed. Jerome, of whom we heard yesterday, was full of such stories. Candles were blessed, processions were made, feast days of the saints were introduced. If a person fasted on such and such days, if a person gave gifts to churches and cloisters, if a person went on all sorts of pilgrimages, then that was considered a good work through which he could earn salvation for himself. Yes, after a long and bitter controversy the clergy finally declared that the true faith consisted in giving divine honor to pictures of the saints and kissing them. In short, in place of the true faith, superstition, outward work-righteousness and hypocrisy came in. Thus the Church was corrupted.

And still the Lord Jesus Christ had His own in the midst of this corrupted Church, people who truly believed in Him and were saved. For "the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his. And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity," 2 Tim. 2:19.

Trans. by A. Schulz

* * * * *

ANNOUNCEMENT

All requests for Christian Day School Subsidy should be in the Board's hands by May 1st. Requests may be sent to:

Pastor Paul Petersen
735 N. Freeman
Luverne, Minn.

CONCERNING BAZAARS

1. What do we mean by bazaars?

We mean public sales which are held by Christian churches, or by societies within the churches, and in which all sorts of articles are sold for the benefit of the church.

2. When are such bazaars displeasing to God?

When they are characterized by one, or all, of the following features: Solicitation of donations for the sale among unorthodox people or unbelievers; overcharging for articles offered for sale; prevailing on people to buy by all manner of means, some

of which are unseemly; sale by raffle or other games of chance; the raising of money by various tricks and devices; clamor and turmoil of an auction sale.

When such and similar methods are employed to beguile both friend & foe into giving for the Church of God, that surely is an abomination in God's sight..... God wills that His beloved Christians give willingly and gladly and straight from the heart & pocket whatever is needed for His Kingdom. Those are sacrifices with which He is well pleased. Whatsoever lies above & beyond this, or rather lies beneath & falls short of this, He to whom all things belong would neither have nor bless. However, when Christian women make all sorts of useful things, or where Christian men donate all sorts of usables, & these are sold in a decent way & the proceeds used for the benefit of the church, that is a different thing and is not wrong.

(From "Questions on Christian Topics," by C. M. Zorn, p. 207f.)

CLERGY BULLETIN

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

Vol. XVI, No. 9.

May, 1957

"THE SUCCESSFUL PASTOR"

A Pastoral Sermon

by

G. O. Lillegard

Text: II Tim. 4, 6-18.

It is natural for any normal, healthy person to want to succeed in his chosen field of labor. So, too, those who have been called to work in the Lord's harvest fields should try to make a success of their work. The Lord expects them to do their best, to devote all their talents and energies to the supremely important tasks laid upon them; and there is a curse pronounced on him who does the work of the Lord negligently. But then it is necessary also that we know by what standards God will measure our success. We must not measure it by worldly standards; for it is God, not the world, that is to judge whether we have succeeded or not. But it is always tempting for us to accept the standards of the world, since we live in the world and are pressed on every side to follow the ways and adopt the views of the world. So there are many, even in orthodox Christian circles, who are continually measuring the success of the work of a congregation or church body by its growth in numbers, in wealth, in importance and prestige in the eyes of the world, and who want the church to "present a united front" so that it can impress the world and force its views of right and social justice upon others by the sheer weight of numbers. Thus a fellow-Lutheran wrote recently; "It may be that the United Lutheran Church of tomorrow will not embrace all Lutheran elements, for it is possible that some few may drop off to the left and be lost to un-Biblical liberalism, and that others may drop off to the right and be lost to a sterile, un-Biblical traditionalism. It is our confident conviction, however, that between these two extremes will stand a great army of Christians united on the principles of divine truth who will glori-

fy God by bringing unto men the saving, life-transforming message of divine love." He believes it necessary, if our Church is to bring out the truth to others successfully, for the great majority of Lutherans to form one united church and "stand shoulder to shoulder in fighting the battles of Christ against the forces of evil." Others think that if the Church is to do its duty in this world, it must win the State, the powers-that-be, over to the Christian point of view. If it cannot do that, they call it a complete failure. Others strive mightily to win at least the favor and good will of the leaders in social, literary and scientific circles and count it a great victory if they can elicit some complimentary references to the work of the Church from them.

Our text this evening is from the last written words of the apostle Paul, one who has been generally looked upon as the greatest and most successful of all preachers of the Word. It will, then, be well for us to note what he considered success, and just what the external circumstances defining his success were. He wrote from a prison in Rome, shortly before he was to be led out to the execution block, to his faithful friend and disciple Timothy; "Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me; for Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world, and is departed unto Thessalonica; Crescens to Galatia, Titus unto Dalmatia. Only Luke is with me. Take Mark and bring him with thee; for he is profitable to me for the ministry. And Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus. -- Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil; the Lord reward him according to his works; of whom be thou ware also; for he hath greatly withstood our words." That is, Paul was left in prison almost alone, partly because his fellow-workers were needed in

other places, partly because they had left him for love of the world or even stood up against him to oppose his witness to the truths of the Gospel. Regarding his trial before the Roman court, Paul says: "At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me; I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge." That does not sound much like success, does it?

This faithful witness to the saving truth in Christ Jesus was forsaken in his hour of greatest need even by his fellow-Christians, who no doubt thought his imprisonment was the result of his own "extreme views" or fanatical zeal, such as a well-balanced Christian should not express and manifest. In short, there is not a single external-circumstance that we can point to which shows that anybody whatever at that time looked upon St. Paul as a great and successful man in the history of the church. That recognition came from the Christians only in later years. Still Paul had no doubt about his own success. Regarding his trial he says: "Notwithstanding, the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me; that by me the preaching might be fully known, and that all the Gentiles might hear; and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion. And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom, to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen."

We see that he faced death without fear and looked back upon his life without regret: "For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith." He does not say anything about the thousands who by his preaching had been won for the Gospel. He does not boast of having united the Christian churches into one strong organization able to make its combined influence count for something in the Roman world. No, the one thing that to him was supremely important was that he had "kept the faith." We remember how he wrote to the Corinthians: "I therefore so run, not as uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air; But I keep under my body and bring it into subjection; lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." Now he could say that he had run the race well; he had fought a good fight; he had succeeded by the grace of God in keeping the faith. He had stuck to the whole

truth of God in Christ Jesus; he had clung to Jesus Christ by a saving faith. He had kept the faith in his own heart and mind and had not departed in one particular from the faith once delivered unto the saints. He had kept the faith! That to him was success. What of it, if all men had forsaken him, if no man stood with him, if he were left alone in a cold, damp prison, so that he had to ask Timothy to bring him the cloke he had left at Troas to keep him warm, and the books and parchments, those faithful friends of men, to keep him company. What of it, if all his labors on earth had netted him no praise or glory, even from his fellow-Christians. He knew with a divine certainty that the Lord Jesus Christ; He who "shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom," would give him his reward. "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing."

There is, then, only one standard by which to judge the success of our work as a church, or to determine whether we are engaging in that work successfully. That is, do we in and through it keep the faith, so that we not only preach the whole counsel of God to others without changing an iota of it, but also cling to Jesus by a living faith ourselves till the time of our departure is at hand. It is not for us to count the souls we have saved --- the Lord alone knoweth them that are His, and only in eternity will we know whether our preaching has been but a voice crying in the wilderness with few to hear it and be saved, or whether it has borne rich fruit in the hearts of our fellow-men. It is not for us to measure the success of our church work by statistics and external improvements in the earthly resources and power of the church body we serve. Only the Lord can judge whether we are building upon THE foundation, Jesus Christ, "gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; for the day of the Lord shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is." It is our one duty to make sure at all times that we preach the full Gospel of the forgiveness of sins freely for Christ's sake; to preach that Word in season and out of season, whether men will heed it or not; to "reprove, re-

buke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine." Our faithfulness in preaching the Gospel will have its reward, indeed, both in this life and in the life to come; for godliness is profitable unto all things. But the joy and peace which Christ gives His faithful servants is one that is not dependent on any earthly success or prosperity; it will be ours as surely in a lonely prison or concentration camp as in a comfortable home; it will be ours as much under trials and persecutions as when men honor us and speak well of us. For through it all, the promise of the crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous judgem shall give us at the last day, as surely as we love His appearing - this promise will make us rejoice in the hope of the glory of God.

We are living in an age which has been characterized by a great falling away from the faith once delivered unto the saints. At the same time as the organized Christian Church has grown in earthly power and wealth, it has lost its true spiritual character and become too often but another kingdom of this world, interfering so much with secular affairs, that it has become in turn the victim of hostile forces in many countries that had for centuries been known as Christian. Then it is only the more necessary that we look humbly each day to God to keep us by His Holy Spirit in the faith; that we confess our sins and the sins of our people and trust only in the redeeming blood of Christ Jesus to save us from them; that we watch and pray lest we enter into temptation, becoming faithless to the teachings of the Word or lacking in Christian love and true holiness. It is not possible for any one

of us by his own strength of character to show forth the fruits of faith; that, too, is the gift of the Holy Spirit. "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." But just because it is all the gift of God, we can be sure of keeping the faith and of being able to fight the good fight of faith against all the powers of darkness. Since it is God who worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure, we need only to leave it all to Him, so that we use His Word, which is the power of God, as our sword in battle, and live in and by that Word as the light on our way and the food for our souls. So shall we also be able to say, when the time of our departure is at hand, without the least spirit of boasting, but giving all glory to God: "I have fought a good fight; I have finished my course; I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing. - The Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto His heavenly kingdom; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen."

(NOTE: The above sermon was delivered at the Pastoral Service at the Convention of the Norwegian Synod, June 16, 1941).

* * * * *

GOD AND SUCCESS

by Curtis Cate

(Note: With the kind permission of the Publishers we reprint the following article from the April, 1957, issue of THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY).

Whether or not the historians of the future will agree with Norman Vincent Peale's verdict that "America is the first great nation in history to be established on a definitely religious premise," it is perhaps a little premature to say. But when they come to bend their magnifying

glasses over the confusing paradoxes of the present, there is one symptom at least which they are likely to single out for special study as constituting, for better or for worse, an unquestionably American innovation in the field of contemporary religion. This is the new style, or perhaps one should say the new pace, which has been set by those rugged captains of faith, by those trail-blazing religionists, who have sought in the last ten

years to give a new and unprecedented impetus to religious predication in this country.

The American religionist - the title is a relatively recent one - has no exact counterpart in any other country. He is not a saint or a holy man, with his staff and his bowl, as we have been brought up to imagine them. There is none of the monk or the mystic about him, though there is quite a touch of the missionary. He is not a man of meditation but an activist; not a man of faith and prayer himself so much as a man who assiduously instructs others in how to acquire faith and how to pray. A religionist does not even need to be a clergyman. His mission is simply to popularize and sell religious health. He is a zealous promoter of psychic comfort, a supersalesman of salvation who has revolutionized the traditional methods of propagating piety by learning to peddle faith with all the elan of a Madison Avenue advertiser plugging a new barbiturate.

The new faith has little to do with the old-fashioned faith as Saint Paul conceived it - the faith of the contrite Christian humbly imploring the mercy and guidance of the Almighty to fight off sin and temptation. That is a negative approach to faith which our pioneer religionists have repudiated as unworthy of the Century of the Common Man. The new faith is a positive faith in man's power to have faith and to use it to conjure up the cooperation of God; it is a confident faith in the latest "prayer techniques" that are guaranteed to get results; it is a streamlined faith in the tried and tested spiritual formulas that will win us those earthly rewards which the Baptist faith-healer, Oral Roberts, assures us are our due, because "Christ has no objection to prosperity."

One of the easiest ways of acquiring this twentieth-century approach to religion is to dip into a few of the inspirational books which have added luster to our literary output. Lay hold of the master key to the life within you, Marcus Bach recommends in a recently published book, and you can acquire The Will to Believe. Just learn to think well of yourself, Dr. Hyman Schachtel urges, and you will get The Life You Want to Live. You can achieve spiritual sovereignty, Dr. Roy Burkhart assures us, by acquiring The

Freedom to Become Yourself. Harness The Magic Power of Your Mind, Walter Germain encourages us, and you can live twenty-four hours a day. Learn to pray while at work, George Murrain insists, and you will find that There Is a Place for God in Business. Forget the "ifs" in your life and you will discover, according to Alexander Lake, that Your Prayers Are Always Answered. The last three authors, incidentally, are not gentlemen of the cloth. Mr. Germain is a former Michigan police inspector who has made a specialty of juvenile delinquency; Mr. Murrain is a New York business consultant and the founder of the Spiritual Guide for Business Institute; and Mr. Lake has been an African big-game hunter and guide as well as a writer.

But the most important source books of the new faith are, of course, the great classics of Dr. Norman Vincent Peale. Get rid of your inferiority complex, Dr. Peale urges us, and you will possess A Guide to Confident Living. Learn to believe in yourself and you will find that You Can Win and that you can enjoy The Art of Living. With Dr. Smiley Blanton (Dr. Peale's coauthor and psychiatrist colleague at the Marble Collegiate Church in New York) you will discover that Faith Is the Answer to all your problems, and you will develop The Art of Real Happiness. Learn to break that worry habit and you will be able to tap the miraculous reserves of hidden energy stored up in The Power of Positive Thinking.

The latest masterpiece in this impressive series has just been published by Prentice-Hall under the confident title Stay Alive All Your Life. Like its predecessors, it is an anthology of success stories. Its author assures us that it goes even further than The Power of Positive Thinking in "emphasizing how to achieve well-being, vitality, enthusiasm, and effectiveness in life."

2.

Reduced to its essence, Dr. Peale's philosophy is this: the mind of man is like an eight-cylinder motor. If it feeds on "defeat thoughts," it splutters and chokes, like a Cadillac that has been filled with bad gasoline. Weighed down by negative thoughts, man loses his self-confidence and his power to act. Everything in him turns gloomy, somber, sour.

The sorer he gets, the more he alienates his friends and associates, thus exacerbating his initial feeling of rejection and insecurity. To escape this vicious cycle, he must cleanse his mind of negative thoughts and inject new positive ones. This will act on his spiritual metabolism like high-octane gasoline on a coughing engine, turning his mind into a "power-producing plant." And how do you go about getting these "positive thoughts"? The answer is simple: by praying (prayer is an essential ritual in the "power-producing process"), by going to church (going to church also ensures a longer life), and above all by dipping into the Bible.

"The words of the Bible," says Dr. Peale, "have a particularly strong therapeutic effect. Drop them into your mind, allowing them to 'dissolve' in consciousness, and they will spread a healing balm over your entire mental structure." For example, as you get up in the morning, repeat the following Biblical phrase three times: "This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." (Psalms 118:24.) And the Doctor adds: "Only personalize it and say: 'I will rejoice and be glad in it.' " If you repeat that one sentence three times before breakfast and meditate on the meaning of the words, you will change the character of the day by starting off with a happiness psychology."

There is, of course, nothing radically new about this kind of morale-boosting technique, variants of which can be found in a number of our religious cults. It is reminiscent of the technique of "conscious auto-suggestion" which was popularized just after the First World War by Dr. Emile Coue. But the method prescribed by the genial French doctor from Nancy had almost no religious overtones, and it contained suspicious symptoms of negative thinking. You could, if you wished, add the phrase "By the Grace of God" after you had made the ritual incantation (twenty times repeated) of "Every day in every way I am getting better and better," and thus turn it into a prayer. But this addition was not essential to the success of the formula. Furthermore, Dr. Coue's pocket reader, Self Mastery Through Conscious Auto-Suggestion, is studded with negative warnings, like the fine print in an insurance policy. "Of course, the thing (de-

sired) must be within your power," or "Don't discuss things you know nothing about, or you will look ridiculous."

When we move from Dr. Coue's modest book to those of Dr. Peale we move from a timorous to a confident universe. Dr. Peale's many formulas are altogether positive and guaranteed to work for all sorts of situations, and above all, for hard-pressed business executives down on their luck. Get rid of your negative-thinking friends and learn to have faith, and you will soon be moving mountains of dollars. Invoke God's divine assistance through "deep prayers that have a lot of suction" and you will get what you want in life, or at any rate you will potentially be in a position to get what you want. (This is, fortunately, the only shadow of negative thinking haunting Dr. Peale's books.)

A typical case cited by the Doctor as an example of the success of this method is that of a saleswoman who has been unable to sell vacuum cleaners. One day she breaks down and pours out her tale of woe to a sympathetic customer, who, taking pity on her, gives her this encouragement: "Repeat this formula before every call. Believe it and then marvel what it will do for you. This is it: 'If God be for us, who can be against us?' (Romans 8:31.) But change it by personalizing it so that you say, 'If God be for me, who can be against me? If God be for me, then I know that with God's help, I can sell vacuum cleaners.'" The upshot of this story is that the saleswoman goes out and sells vacuum cleaners. And Dr. Peale concludes: "Now she declares, 'God helps me to sell vacuum cleaners,' and who can dispute it?"

The beauty of this moving story lies, of course, in the ingenious way in which Saint Paul's exhortation to his fellow Christians in their desperate struggle against the pagan authorities of Rome has been "personalized" and adapted to the everyday usage of the harassed saleswoman. The new formula is thus ready-made for secular use and has nonreligious implications whatsoever. This is, indeed, the signal originality of Dr. Peale's works. They are great religious books with a minimum of religion in them. You can search their pages in vain for moral injunctions or guidance as to the kind of good or bad actions you should or should not undertake in life. These books are not much concern-

ed with morality; their essential concern is success. What matters is that you should get what you want.

The new, confident approach to religion has been objected to by some theological traditionalists on the ground that it inevitably implicates God in the seething ebb and flow of human fortunes. It is all very well to say that if you have faith in God, He will never let you down. But what happens if your good luck fails to materialize or suddenly ends? Are you to conclude that God has broken His part of the bargain? To this objection our forward-looking religionists, like Dr. Peale, have a ready answer: you simply didn't try hard enough. Go out and try again. They are equally unperturbed by such judgments as this one by Henry L. Mencken: "All great religions, in order to escape absurdity, have to admit a dilution of agnosticism. It is only the savage, whether of the African bush or the American Gospel tent, who pretends to know the will and intent of God exactly and completely." Mencken was notoriously one of the most negative thinkers this century has produced, and his past pontifications have simply been ignored by our pioneer religionists, even supposing they have ever bothered to read them.

The new fashion, on the contrary, is to see God everywhere and at least potentially succoring everyone in his secular pursuits - except, of course, Communists and fellow travelers. Today the idea of partnership with the Divine is no longer seriously contested, except perhaps in a few last strongholds of resolutely negative thought. Everywhere else it is expanding and triumphing prodigiously. In Dr. Peale's books we find God everywhere, lending a hand in the most mundane occupations. We find Him helping to sell vacuum cleaners and running a beauty parlor; we find Him on the football field, the athletic field, and out on the golf links; above all we find Him in the business office, helping the enterprising to get ahead in the world. For nothing succeeds better in business, Dr. Peale assures us, than "effecting a merger with God." God is everywhere in the universe, the source of all energy, like a cosmic battery that any believer can plug into with the live wire of faith.

This, of course, is pantheism - a new breezy kind of pantheism in suede shoes and a gray flannel suit. The new cult has gone to the extreme of sporting a rakish-looking zoot suit, as happened last July when the International New Thought Alliance held its annual convention in Washington, D.C. I doubt if there has been a religious convention in modern times that has been as positively inspired as this one. For before it was over, the delegates had swept away all the old distinctions between God and Mammon, celebrated the mystic marriage of the Cross and the Dollar, and plunged into ecstatic dithyrambs over the distribution of a pamphlet, written by one cleric present, which bore the electrifying title: Money Is God in Action! -

Getting God into the business office, and even out on the golf links, is the surest way of making Him popular in a period of prosperity. It is the easiest way of divesting Him of his former aloof, paternal attributes, of "bringing Him down to earth" and "democratizing" Him, in order to make Him more palatable to the success-seeking, Freud-riden, leisure-loving generations of the present.

Thanks to our pioneering religionists, we can now take comfort in a new God shaped "in the image of man"; a really friendly, companionable, democratic God, who doesn't mind having His back slapped in a spirit of pious partnership; a God who, as Jules Masserman has put it, has become "man's omnipotent slave."

In the "dynamic" religion that we are being promised for tomorrow no ascetic discipline or special humbleness will any longer be required. It will be a hot-water bottle kind of piety with none of that gritty old morality in it. It will be a brand of faith that has been synthesized, vitaminized, homogenized, and capsulized, and it will be as ready-made for effortless consumption as that magically bleached, cottony, crustless, already sliced white bread which is the symbol of the modern American's massive superiority over the pagan bushwhacker.

Did I say tomorrow? I was being over-cautious and almost guilty of negative prognostications. For our boldest pioneers have already left even as enterprising a religionist as Dr. Peale far behind. A

harbinger of the great things to come was the recent Gospel Boogie craze, in which jazzed-up fragments of the New Testament were offered to jam-packed audiences munching popcorn and sipping soda pop. Another is the wave of religious songs that has recently swamped the juke boxes with such immortals of sentimentalized piety as "It Is No Secret What God Can Do," "Are You Friends with the King of All Friends?", "If Jesus Came to Your House," and "The Man Upstairs."

Some of the verses in these songs are, it is true, a trifle sticky; and refer-

* * * * *

KEEPING TABS ON THE MODERNISTS

One of the very modern modernists is Nils F.S. Ferre, Professor of Philosophical Theology at Vanderbilt School of Religion, Nashville, Tenn. A comparatively young man, he has authored over a half a dozen books in the last eight years. We recently paged through and read a little in one, "THE CHRISTIAN UNDERSTANDING OF GOD" (Harper & Bros., N.Y., 1951). We herewith submit a few quotations with the thought that the reader might appreciate some handy examples of the modern modernistic jargon and crass unbelief, and also to demonstrate (if indeed the demonstration is needed) that the old modernism is not dead:

p. 174: "Jesus is not the whole Christ. He is the historic head of the Church as its founder. The fellowship came through him. Through him came irreversibly the true Christ who is God's Agape, but the full Christ came only with the revelation of the Church."

p. 178: "When Protestants set up the Bible as an external authority, they showed their need of a 'paper pope.'"

p. 185: "Is it valid, however, to identify the incarnation with Jesus? Is not such a procedure mostly a matter of Christian mythology?"

p. 186: "In Jesus this truth of Agape was incarnated in life and thought at the very time in history when this living truth could maintain itself and slowly fight or woo its way into the world. Here the work of God touched history and operated in it in a new, radical sense. Here God first worked through the understanding of what

ring to God as "The Man Upstairs" may be hard to swallow for the old-fashioned among us. But this is the price we must pay for the privilege of bringing God into the drugstore as well as the business office. We can all rejoice, with Dr. Peale and his fellow pioneers, that the Good Lord has heard the call and condescended with such debonair grace to be One of the Boys, a Hundred Percent American, and a valuable Member of the Team.

He is and wills. His working in this way did not depend upon the absence of what is not God. We have no way of knowing, even, that Jesus was sinless, but such a claim is irrelevant to the reality of the incarnation. Such a proposition would, for that matter, depend mostly on some literal claims found in the Bible. Such claims there are, but the Bible used in this external manner becomes a distinct danger to living faith. Such letters kill while the Spirit gives life. Even though Jesus' life was peculiarly subject to myth, behind the myth is the reality which gave rise to it."

p. 191: "Mary, we remember, was found pregnant before her engagement to mild Joseph. Nazareth was hard by a Roman garrison where the soldiers were German mercenaries.... Hence Jesus must have been the child of a German soldier! After all ... such is the experience of many girls near military camps."

p. 191: "The doctrine of the Virgin Birth has all too often been made into a concept which robs Jesus of his full humanity. It has often led to the making of Jesus into some theophany rather than into a real saviour."

p. 201: "Sinlessness is a bloodless category, making an anemic saviour. What matters is the reality of his struggles, that he was in all things like us, and that victory is possible with God and is indeed a reality in Jesus' life as a 'fragment of the future,' to use Cairn's phrase."

p. 214: "What, however, of the historic credibility of the records? The records

are obviously confused and accounts do not always seem to agree..."

p. 224: "But if Jesus takes the place of God, we still have idolatry. He is the mediator, not the eternal God."

p. 232: "When a person dies, though completely forgiven, he may still have untold consequences for which he must help to pay. The righteousness of God is vindicated, the sinner being enabled and thankful to participate in the work of

reconstruction. Purgatory stands for this truth of reconstruction of consequences after death in whatever proper medium God may have prepared. Hell is for the bad; purgatory for the repentant; hell leads away from heaven; purgatory is a necessary corridor to heaven. Purgatory may last through many lives and existences after this one, for God has much time to make a right product, to foster wonderful children."

T.N.T.

* * * * *

FROM A. J. TORGERSON

Dr. Hugenvik's review of Lillegard's "From Eden to Egypt" moved Pastor Emeritus A. J. Torgerson of Yakima, Wash. (87 next Nov. 27) to submit the following from "The Philosophy of Wit and Humor" by Eli Perkins. (Eli Perkins put out a book which provided chuckles for our fathers, "KINGS OF THE PLATFORM AND PULPIT"):

"Satire intensifies an absurdity. Now if I were going to expose the error of evolution, which is a direct assault upon the Bible, I would not deny evolution, I would satirize it.

I would say with Darwin and Huxley, that before we can adopt evolution and modern reason we must do away with the Bible. Yes, destroy the old Bible!

The old theory of creation is all wrong. Nothing was created. Every thing grew. In the old Bible we read: "In the beginning God created heaven and earth."

"Now this is all wrong," says Darwin and I. Our new Bible is to commence like this:

Genesis, Chap. 1.

(1) There never was a beginning. The Eternal, without us that maketh for righteousness, took no notice whatever of anything.

(2) And Cosmos was homogeneous and undifferentiated and somehow or an other evolution began, and molecules appeared.

(3) And molecules evolved protoplasm, and rhythmic thrills arose and then there was light.

(4) And a spirit of energy was developed and formed the plastic cell, whence arose the primordial germ.

(5) And the primordial germ became protogene, and protogene somehow escaped eocene -- then was the dawn of life.

(6) And the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after its own kind, whose seed is in itself, developed

according to its own fancy. And the Eternal, without us that maketh for righteousness, neither knew nor cared any thing about it.

(7) The cattle after his kind, the beast of the earth after his kind, and every creeping thing became evolved by heterodeneous segregation and concomitant dissipation of motion.

(8) So that by survival of the fittest there evolved the simiads from the jelly fish, and the simiads differentiated themselves into the anthropomorphic primordial types.

(9) And in due time one lost his tail. This was Adam and he became a man. And behold he was the most cunning of all animals; and lo! the fast men killed the slow men, and it was ordained to be in every age that the fittest should survive.

(10) And in process of time, Moses and Christ died, and by natural selection and survival of the fittest, Matthew Arnold, Herbert Spencer, and Charles Darwin appeared, and behold it was very good."

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, So. Dak.

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

EDITORIAL NOTE

We are indebted to D. L. Pfeiffer for calling our attention to the ATLANTIC MONTHLY article by Curtis Gate reprinted elsewhere in this issue. It is not altogether clear what kind of religion Mr. Gate has, but he does a pretty good job of pricking the balloon of Norman Vincent Peale and his apes. Just as Pealism has been vogue, so now debunking Peale is be-

coming the vogue. In the last half year or so we have read a number of articles along the debunking line, some of them in a religious magazine which earlier seemed to have been following the Peale vogue. - This seems to be as good a place as any to pass on a little witticism of somebody or other we read someplace or other: "Paul is appealing, but Peale is appalling."

T.N.T.

* * * * *

CHRISTIAN STEWARDSHIP

Paul plainly teaches that the only motive of Christian giving is love to Christ and that such love can be wrought and nourished in the heart only by the Gospel, 2 Cor. 8: 8,9. This a pastor must keep in mind if he would persuade Christians to become cheerful and liberal givers. . . .

Money-making schemes to raise money for the church should therefore not be used. The money which the church needs should not be schemed out of the pockets of the people, but it should be given by them with a willing heart. The Christian gives not in exchange for value received, but in appreciation of value received, to wit, the blessings of God, particularly those of the Gospel, for which no man can pay, but which have been purchased with the price of the blood of the Son of God and are without cost dispensed to sinful mankind. If a church resorts to all kinds of money-making schemes to raise its budget, it thereby gives offense to the people of this world, who are made to think that the Christian religion cannot be worth much if such schemes must be used for its support. Such money-making schemes are intended to be money getters; actually they are money losers. In that way Christian people are not trained to become cheerful and liberal givers. Horace Greeley received a letter from a woman stating that her church was in distressing financial straits. The members had tried every device they could think of -- fairs, strawberry festivals, oyster suppers, a donkey party, turkey banquets, Japanese weddings, poverty sociables, mock marriages, grab bags, box sociables, and necktie sociables. "Would Mr. Greeley be so kind as to suggest some device to keep the struggling

church from disbanding?" The editor replies: "Try religion." (There can be no objection to the giving of dinners, suppers, picnics, entertainments as social affairs, when the buyer or purchaser is not made to believe that he is thereby contributing offerings to the church.)

Christian people should not ask unbelievers to support their church or any part of their work. The admonitions to give to the Lord and for the extension of His Church are in the Word of God always directed to God's children, never to unbelievers. Nor should a Lutheran congregation beg money from Christians of other denominations. To say the least, it would be a disgrace if the Lutheran Church, which claims to be the true orthodox Church, would go to those whom it accuses of preaching false doctrine and ask for financial assistance. Nor should a Lutheran support the work of other church denominations; for in so doing, he would become guilty of assisting and promoting a false religion.

The Bible plainly teaches that it is every Christian's duty to give his money for the support of the church, 2 Cor. 8:14; Gal. 6:6-8; 1 Cor. 16:2. We have a right to expect that every communicant member contributes to the church, even as the poor Macedonians did not ask to be excused, but gave even beyond their power, 2 Cor. 8: 1-5; Mark 12: 41-44.

(The above article is quoted from the "Pastoral Theology," 1945 ed., p. 262f., by J. H. C. Fritz).

CHRIST'S RESURRECTION AND APPEARANCES ON EASTER DAY
According to the Four Gospels. (Local church bulletin, 1957.)

In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, very early in the morning, came Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, to see the sepulchre. They brought sweet spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them, that they might come and anoint Him.

And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow: and for fear of him the keepers did shake and became as dead men.

The women came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun. And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre? And when they looked, they saw that stone was rolled away: for it was very great.

Then Mary Magdalene runneth and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple, whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them, They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not, where they have laid Him.

The other women entered into the sepulchre, and they found not the body of Jesus. And it came to pass, as they were much perplexed thereabout, behold, two men stood by them in shining garments, and they saw a young man sitting at the right side, clothed in a long white garment; and they were affrighted. And as they were afraid, and bowed down their faces to the earth, the angel answered and said unto the women: Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen; come, see the place where He lay. Remember how He spake unto you when He was yet in Galilee, saying, The Son of Man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again. But go your way quickly, and tell His disciples and Peter that He is risen from the dead; and, behold, He goeth before you into Galilee. There shall ye see Him, as He said unto you. Lo, I

have told you. And they remembered the words of Jesus.

And they went out quickly and fled from the sepulchre; for they trembled and were amazed, departing with fear and great joy; neither said they anything to and man; for they were afraid.

Peter (after hearing what Mary Magdalene said) went forth, and that other disciple, and came to the sepulchre. So they ran both of them together: and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre. And he stooping down and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in. Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre, and seeth the linen clothes laid by themselves, and the napkin, that was about His head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself. And Peter departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass. Then went in also that other disciple, which came first to the sepulchre, and he saw and believed. For as yet they knew not the Scripture, that He must rise again from the dead. Then the disciples went away again unto their own home.

(Here read John 20:11-18, about Jesus appearing to Mary Magdalene at the grave.)

When Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, He appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom He had cast seven devils. And she went and told them that had been with Him, as they mourned and wept, that she had seen the Lord, and told them what things He had spoken to her. And they, when they heard that He was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not.

As the other women went to tell His disciples, behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held Him by the feet, and worshipped Him. Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid: go tell My brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see Me. And they went and told all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest.

(Here read Matt. 28:11-15, about the keepers who reported to the chief priests and were then bribed.)

(Continued on other side.)

And the words of the women seemed to the disciples as idle tales.

After that He appeared in another form to two disciples as they went that same day to a village called Emmaus.

(Here read Luke 24:13-35 about the Emmaus disciples and Jesus revealing Himself to them.)

And they (the Emmaus disciples) went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them. And as they spake, that same day in the evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, as they sat at meat, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And He up-raided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen Him after He was risen.

And He said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold My hands and My feet: handle Me and see; for a spirit

hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me have. And when He had thus spoken, He showed them His hands and His feet. And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, He said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave Him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb. And He took it and did eat before them. Then were the disciples glad when they saw the Lord.

Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as My Father hath sent Me, even so I send you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retain.

Compiling the record of the other appearances of Christ in like manner would complete the "many infallible proofs" we have of the Lord's Resurrection.

Note always the purpose of the Lord's death and resurrection: forgiveness of sins, life, salvation, and on that basis having grace and strength to serve Him as His own. Go, and tell!

DOCUMENTS OF HISTORIC INTEREST

1. St. Louis Faculty Opinion on "Opgjør" and "Austin Agreement":

St. Louis, Mo., Jan. 9, 1917

Rev. Prof. C.L. Preus

Rev. I.B. Torrison

Esteemed Brethren:

In accordance with your request we, the undersigned, herewith present in writing the opinion which we rendered upon the occasion of a conference with you, which we attended upon your request, Dec. 28th.

In the matter which was the subject of our discussion, the point at issue was not whether the minority ought to make first entrance into a situation as now pending in the Norwegian Synod. - this we should advise no one to do - but the point at issue was whether the minority should be under constraint to leave the Norwegian Synod now for reasons of conscience, or whether matters were still in such a state that it is your duty to continue to bear witness to the truth.

Our Opinion is this:

First - Whereas, the Union Committee concedes that the demand of the minority, - that Thesis I be stricken from "Opgjør" - is in harmony with Scripture and the Confessions; and

Secondly - Whereas, the Committee on Union publicly declares that the expression in Theses IV of "Opgjør" - (feeling of responsibility with reference to acceptance or rejection of grace) - is to be understood as meaning that God alone is the cause of acceptance and man alone the cause of rejection; and

Thirdly - Whereas, the minority is not under constraint to remain silent, but has been specifically conceded freedom of speech with reference to the "Opgjør";

Therefore, we hold that the time has not yet arrived for an immediate severance of connections with the Norwegian Synod, but that your duty lies in the direction of securing, with God's help, free recognition for the truth in the Norwegian Synod, by bearing witness to the same.

Respectfully,

F. PIEPER

W.H.T. DAU

TH. GRAEBNER

(Editor's Note: The above letter was written in German. It came into the discussion at the Minority West Hotel meetings in January, 1917, and was evidently misunderstood. In the Sept. 1st, 1917 issue of LUTHERSK TIDENDE, Dr. Th. Graebner submitted the above translation and added the following note: "This letter concerns itself only with the period of time from January to June. Absolutely." - The following letter was written right after a meeting in St. Louis of the professors with Rev. Nachtsheim and Rev. C.N. Peterson of Minneapolis).

2. LETTER OF TH. GRAEBNER TO REV. O.T. LEE regarding "Opinion" of Jan. 9, 1917:

St. Louis, Mo., Feb. 11, 1917

Rev. O.T. Lee

Northwood, Ia.

Dear Friend and Brother:-

Your lines of Feb. 5 received. I am using this opportunity to convey my answer by bearer, Rev. Peterson. You are certainly right, when you say, that the advice to go into the new church-body is not found in the letter addressed by Dr. Pieper,

2.

Prof. Dau and myself to Prof. Preus and Rev. Torrison. The question we answered was, no, not now, because by the terms of the Austin Agreement you are given an opportunity to make a strong effort within the Synod to have Opgjør corrected. There is no word in the letter about joining the new body. It only says that as long as the right of open testimony is conceded to the minority they should remain and speak, and not now leave the Synod. Anything that goes beyond this meaning and purpose of the letter is an unwarranted interpretation.

I am
With fraternal greetings
very sincerely yours
Th. Graebner

3. LETTER OF PROF. J.N. KILDAHL TO DR. F.A. SCHMIDT;

St. Olaf College, J.N. Kildahl, President
Northfield, Minn.
Jan. 9, 1912

Dear Dr. Schmidt!

"While th' world pursues its circling range
Things happen that are passing strange."

Dr. Stub is now fighting a battle against the same arguments and objections on the part of Missouri against your doctrine, which you and others through all these years have defended, and Dr. Stub now uses against the Missourians the same arguments which we in the conflict have used against him and others. Methinks it is mighty interesting. When a person strikes in on a false tack in doctrinal matters, he will either consistently go farther on that course, or he will reef his sails and turn back. Missouri seems consistently to go farther and farther away; but the Norwegian Synod, God be praised, seems to be beginning to realize that this is carrying them in the wrong direction. That Dr. Stub makes the assertion that the Norwegian Synod now stands where it always has stood, and where Walther stood, means but little compared to the joyous fact that he has now begun so serious a battle against the false Missourian doctrine. He is now himself offering the strongest testimony for that which I, some time ago, wrote in "Lutheraneren," namely, that anyone who knew anything about the Missourians' doctrine would a priori know that when the Norwegian Synod had adopted "Opgjør," there would have to come a break with the Missourians. The break is come, and the Norwegian Synod will, we trust, separate itself farther and farther from the Missourians. And the Missourians will very likely offer testimony to prove that the Norwegian Synod does not stand where Dr. Walther stood. In spite of the false attitude which Dr. Stub takes regarding the Norwegian Synod's past and regarding Dr. Walther, we do have to greet his powerful opposition to the Missourians with joy.

As I have said before, your battle against the false doctrine of the Missourians has not been in vain. It has led to victory among the Norwegians in this country. The Norwegian Synod and certain individuals in the United Church will not want to accord you the honor for this. Stub will above all want it to appear that the Norwegian Synod now stands where Walther stood, and that therefore your struggle was unjustified. But he will not succeed in making people believe this. And finally you can have the satisfaction that your struggle has borne fruit, and that you have saved the Norwegian people in America from Calvinism. And God and history will render another verdict than does Dr. Stub. It is oft thus, that he who has taken the lead in a great cause, and has of necessity had to make many enemies, has not from his contemporaries always gotten the thanks due him; but history has rendered a more righteous judgment.

Well, it was only this that I wanted to say.

Wishing you as well as Mrs. Schmidt a blessed New Year, I am
Fraternally yours in the Lord,

(Ed. Note; Above trans. from Norwegian by Dr. N.A. Madson. - The date on letter evidently should be Jan. 9, 1913. The writings of Stub referred to are a series of articles in LUTHERSK KIRKETIDENDE, Dec. 1912 & Jan. & Feb. 1913. They are interesting reading. Look them up).

J. N. Kildahl

CLERGY BULLETIN

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

Vol. XVI, No. 10.

June, 1957

OPENING SERMON

at the

Synodical Conference Convention

Aug. 9, 1954

by G. O. Lillegard

Ezekiel 3, 4-12: Our Prophetic Mission.

It is one of the striking features of the O.T. writings that they so often address God's Chosen People as if they were, -- not the best and greatest of all the peoples of the world, not the most pious and obedient to God of all men, - but the most wicked and rebellious. Moses said to the Israelites of his day: "Understand therefore, that the Lord thy God giveth thee not this good land to possess it for thy righteousness; for thou art a stiff-necked people. Remember and forget not, how thou provokedst the Lord thy God to wrath in the wilderness: from the day that thou didst depart out of the land of Egypt until ye came to this place, ye have been rebellious against the Lord." Isaiah began his remarkable prophecies with the damning words: "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth; for the Lord hath spoken, I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me.-- Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil-doers, children that are corrupters: they have forsaken the Lord, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger, they are gone away backward." And Jeremiah told the proud people who were walking blindly on the verge of disaster: "Thus saith the Lord, What iniquity have your fathers found in me, that they are gone far from me, and have walked after vanity, and are become vain? - The priests have said not, Where is the Lord? and they that handle the law knew me not: the pastors also transgressed against me, and the prophets prophesied by Baal, and walked after things that do not profit. -- Hath a nation changed their gods, which are yet no gods? But my people have changed their glory for that which

doth not profit. Be astonished, O ye heavens, at this, and be horribly afraid, be ye very desolate, saith the Lord." It is no new or unique thing then, when we find the Lord God saying to the prophet Ezekiel also: "Son of man, go, get thee unto the house of Israel, and speak with my words unto them. For thou art not sent to a people of a strange speech and of an hard language, but to the house of Israel. Surely had I sent thee to them, they would have hearkened unto thee. But the house of Israel will not hearken unto thee: for they will not hearken unto me: for all the house of Israel are impudent (or stiff of forehead) and hardhearted." And the first Christian martyr, Stephen, could summarize the whole O.T. history of the Jews in the words: "Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye!"

Thus the O.T. makes it very clear that there was nothing whatever in the people of Israel, - no merit or virtue - which caused God to choose them as His peculiar people. He chose them simply to demonstrate that salvation was by grace alone, as St. Paul says: "For he (God) saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy."

Since God's people were such as they were, the prophets had to take a firm stand against their sins, their self-righteousness and their unbelief. They had to warn them continually that judgment must begin at the house of God, and that there was no way by which they could stand before God except by daily repentance for sin and

daily renewal in the faith in the promised Redeemer of the world. In order to carry out this prophetic mission, they had to have courage, determination and boldness such as only the Spirit of the almighty God could give. Therefore the Lord said to Ezekiel: "Behold, I have made thy face strong against their faces, and thy forehead strong against their foreheads. As an adamant harder than flint have I made thy forehead: fear them not, neither be dismayed at their looks, though they be a rebellious house." Similarly, the Lord had said to Jeremiah: "Behold, I have made thee this day a defenced city, and an iron pillar, and brasen walls against the whole land, against the kings of Judah, against the princes thereof, against the priests thereof, and against the people of the land. And they shall fight against thee; but they shall not prevail against thee; for I am with thee, saith the Lord, to deliver thee."

Thus the prophets were told to set themselves, not only against the wicked heathen who threatened the existence of God's people, but primarily against the Chosen People themselves, exposing their hypocrisy and idolatry and calling them to repentance. It was not by winning the ears of the crowd, or by currying favor with the mighty in the land, or by establishing good public relations with everyone in general, that they succeeded in building the church of God. It was by standing like adamant against all the popular trends and delusions of their day and resting satisfied with having only "a very small remnant" travel the narrow path with them. They had to be hard and uncompromising in their words, these prophets of the Lord, if they were to fulfil their mission.

Yet it was not their task merely to oppose, to condemn, to consign men and nations to destruction. The Lord said to Ezekiel: "Son of man, all my words that I shall speak unto thee receive in thine heart, and hear with thine ears. And go, get thee to them of the captivity, unto the children of thy people, and speak unto them, and tell them, Thus saith the Lord God; whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear." And "all the words of the Lord" meant the marvelous gospel of God's grace and His promises of mercy and blessing in the coming Redeemer, the Son

of David, as well as the Law and threats of judgment. There are no more striking presentations of the Gospel anywhere in Scripture, perhaps, than those we find in Ezekiel's parables and visions. He makes it very clear that God's people can never earn life and salvation by doing good and practicing righteousness, but that it is God alone who by His grace and almighty power redeems and regenerates them. This is the meaning of the words: "Then the spirit took me up, and I heard behind me a voice of a great rushing, saying, Blessed be the glory of the Lord from His place." It was by the power of the Spirit alone that Ezekiel could prophesy, and by that Spirit alone did the blessing of the Lord come to men. This is the meaning also of the drastic picture which Ezekiel paints of Israel as a child, lying uncared for in the blood of its birth, whom the Lord took to Himself, and made beautiful and gave many precious gifts, and then took to Himself in due time as His bride, but who yet played the harlot with her heathen neighbors. And in the beautifully developed parable of the Lord as our Shepherd, Ezekiel says: "Thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I, even I, will both search my sheep and seek them out. As a shepherd seeketh out his flock in the day that he is among his sheep that are scattered; so will I seek out my sheep, and will deliver them out of all places where they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day. -- I will seek that which was lost, and bring again that which was driven away, and will bind up that which was broken, and will strengthen that which was sick; but I will destroy the fat and the strong; I will feed them with judgment. -- And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them; I the Lord have spoken it."

If there should still be any doubt as to what Ezekiel means to teach, what could be more brilliantly clear than his description of the valley of dry bones which the Lord caused him to see! To these dead bones, the Lord God said: "Behold, I will cause breath to enter into you, and ye shall live; and I will lay sinews upon you, and will bring flesh upon you, and cover you with skin, and put breath in you, and ye shall live; and ye shall know that I am

the Lord." The result was that "the breath for Jesus came into them and they lived, and stood up upon their feet, an exceeding great army."

But this message of God's grace, of His saving, regenerating work upon the hearts of men, was no more acceptable to the people than was the message of judgment and punishment for their sins and unbelief. For by nature all men are proud, self-righteous, ready to condone in themselves the sins which they condemn in others, unwilling to admit that there is no good in them, and that they cannot by their own works merit heaven. The Gospel of the forgiveness of sins for the crucified Redeemer's sake comes to such people as a reflection on their integrity and good character, as an insult to that which is best in their lives. The worldly mind and heart wants to build character, to make men self-reliant and noble and strong. It appreciates the Law and pays respect to it, though it be only the tribute of hypocrisy. Then to be told that no man can keep the Law or make himself good enough to stand before God, - this is an offence and stumblingblock. It is an offence also that the Gospel of Jesus Christ does not aim merely to build civic righteousness, but first and last to save sinners for eternity. To the self-righteous priests and elders Jesus said: "Verily I say unto you, That the publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you." We are told in plain words that God "justifieth the ungodly;" that "when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly," - yes, that "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." The Gospel proclaims that 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." But if a man will not admit that he is a lost sinner, he inevitably rejects the justification God has pronounced upon him, and will proceed with his own program for building the kingdom of God by developing good moral character and introducing social welfare measures to create a heaven on earth. Thus men, in the very name of Christ, by-pass the cross of Christ and presume to make the lot of the Christian easy and pleasant, with no persecutions, no trials, no disgrace or shame to bear

for Jesus. Dr. W.A. Visser 't'Hooft, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, expressed the aim of the great majority of those called Christians today in these words: "The Church is expected to stand for man, for his dignity, for human solidarity, for a decent human life on this planet." Not a word was said about Christ's kingdom of glory and the life eternal which He has earned for us.

Thus it is the cross of Christ which forever is the offence to natural man. Preachers may denounce the sins of their age and receive acclaim and praise for it. But let them insist that there is no other way to be saved than by faith in Him who justifies the ungodly, - that unbelief is the only damning sin, and it will be quite another story. Not only will open unbelievers and atheists visit their scorn and ridicule upon them, but also many so-called Christians -- Papists and Pietists, Rationalists and Social Gospelists, Masons and Modernists, -- and even many who confess the true faith with their lips, tho their hearts are filled with contempt for the truths they have learned.

So when the prophets thundered their warnings to the people of God, unbelief was the one great sin which they had in mind, -- unbelief which led to rejection of the true God and the substitution for Him of the golden calf or the sensuous worship of Nature and the Baalim of sex and earthly prosperity. The Lord told Ezekiel: "Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore hear the word at my mouth, and give them warning from me." He was to warn the wicked who refused to repent of his sins, as well as the righteous man who turned from his righteousness and committed iniquity. If he did not do this, the Lord would require their blood at his hand. Only if he warned them faithfully would the prophet deliver his own soul. God did not require of the prophet that he should actually save the wicked man, in order to deliver his own soul; but that he should bear witness to all men, speaking the Word of God, whether they would hear or whether they would forbear. So it is not the Christian's responsibility to convert all nations, but it is his duty to preach the Gospel to them as a witness, warning them of the wrath to come upon all who do not take refuge in the blood of

the Lamb, slain for the sins of the world.

The "fathers" who organized the Synodical Conference 82 years ago were wide-awake watchmen on the walls of Zion, who did not hesitate to cry out against every form of wickedness and particularly any deviation from the pure Gospel of the only Savior. Faced as they were in our land with chaotic church conditions, with sects of every kind perverting the Gospel and darkening counsel by words without knowledge, they did not take refuge in weak compromise with others called Christian, but stood boldly against them and set their faces like flint against the slightest departure from the Word of God. Surely, if the Lord, since the days of the prophets, ever made any man's face strong against the faces of the enemies of the pure Gospel and his forehead as an adamant harder than flint, He did so in the case of Martin Luther. And the founders of our Synodical Conference were true disciples of Luther, who knew what it meant to be called by his name, and who held fast the saving truth of the unconditioned Gospel with a clarity, fervor and tenacity which few men in church history have equalled. Therefore, too, they took such a strong stand against unionism in every form, not only with erring sects, but also with those who confessed the Lutheran faith on paper while denying it or setting it aside in actual practice. They were not afraid to stand alone against the great majority; to use strong terms in condemnation of the hypocrisy and rebelliousness of those who were called the people of God, but who were not faithful to the inspired Word of God in every particular. They set their mark upon their church accordingly, making it known in every part of the world as a church which stood fearlessly for the truth against every error and every tendency to compromise with error.

We, too, their spiritual descendants, are called to be watchmen unto the house of Israel, the church of the living God. We live in an age when the true Gospel of Jesus Christ has been obscured by a welter of conflicting opinions and teachings, covered over by a one-sided emphasis on external Christian activities and social service; an age when an imposing Tower of Babel, called the World Council of Church-

es, can claim to be the visible demonstration of the spiritual unity of the true Christian Church, the Communion of Saints, although it recognizes every error promulgated within the visible church as possessing equal rights with the truth and blasphemously uses Christ's name to adorn Christ-less and anti-Christian principles. We live in an age when most of those called Lutheran take a leading part in this modern denial of the pure Gospel of grace alone; when even would-be conservative Christians are so bemused by the popular evolutionary, Socialistic and Modernistic theories that they set aside the inspired Word of God on one point of doctrine after the other, in order to make room for man-made teachings.

So we, too, need to ask the Lord to make our faces as an adamant harder than flint against every one who corrupts the Gospel, whether he be professing friend of the truth or open foe. It is not something we may do or may not do, as we wish. It is something we must do, if we would save our souls. For the Lord says also to us as He did to Ezekiel: "When a righteous man doth turn from his righteousness, and commit iniquity, and I lay a stumbling-block before him, he shall die; because thou hast not given him warning, he shall die in his sin, and his righteousness which he hath done shall not be remembered; but his blood will I require at thine hand. Nevertheless if thou warn the righteous man, that the righteous sin not, and he doth not sin, he shall surely live, because he is warned; also thou hast delivered thy soul."

May God grant us the grace thus to fulfill our prophetic mission as watchmen unto the house of God, for the sake of Jesus Christ, our Lord and only Savior. Amen.

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, So. Dak.

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

DOELLINGER AND PAPAL INFALLIBILITY

by Angelo LoVallo

(Note: The following article is reprinted from "The Converted Catholic" (March 1957) for the interesting and valuable historical information it contains).

One year prior to the convocation of the Vatican Council in 1870, the German-born Rev. Johann Joseph Ignatz Von Doellinger, foremost Roman Catholic historian, theologian and canonist of his day and instructor of Canon Law and Church History at the University of Munich, together with the Revs. Huber and Friedrich, also famous priest-historians and theologians, wrote the celebrated "Letters of Janus." This work contained a mass of historical proofs demonstrating that the personal infallibility of the Pope, which was about to be defined as an article of faith, was a novelty pure and simple. Later, during the Vatican Council, these arguments were used by bishops and theologians of the minority group who strenuously fought the definition of this dogma.

The sessions of the Vatican Council were very stormy. The minority bishops of the opposition were frequently interrupted, called heretics, threatened with physical harm and loss of office and prestige, and even shouted down to silence. In the end, however, Pope Pius IX won the day, and thus the dogma of the personal Infallibility of the Pope was defined de fide at the Vatican Council in 1870, to be believed by all Roman Catholics under pain or mortal sin.

Subsequently, the bishops of the minority group (which numbered 150), and many of the priest-theologians, one by one, retracted their own words. This is especially true of the bishops, who did so either because they were bribed with the "pallium," symbol of the archbishopric, as in the case of Bishop Strossmayer of Yugoslavia, or because they feared the loss of money and prestige connected with the Roman Catholic bishopric.

Now Doellinger, who was prevented by the Jesuits and Cardinal Reisach from attending and addressing the Vatican Council, was not to be silenced. In fact, he led a protest group of forty-four profes-

sors of the University of Munich and called together a Congress at Nuremberg, which assembled in August of 1870, and published a declaration adverse to the Vatican decrees on Papal Infallibility. As a result, an immense ferment was set in motion. In Bavaria, where Doellinger's influence was the most strongly felt, there was a great resistance to the resolutions of the Vatican Council.

But Cardinal Von Scherr, Archbishop of Munich, held that the authority of the Vatican Council was paramount and binding, and ordered Doellinger to submit. Instead of submitting, however, on the 28th of March, 1871, he penned a memorable letter to Cardinal Von Scherr, refusing to subscribe to the Vatican decrees. The important points of the letter are in the following:

PLEA FOR JUSTICE

"Your excellency has asked me in two letters to explain my position with respect to the Roman Decrees of July 18, 1870, which have been published by you

"It has transpired in the circle of your cathedral chapter that it is your intention to proceed against me with such penal measures as are used only against priests who have been guilty of gross moral crimes, and even but seldom against these, if I do not, within a certain period, submit myself to the two new articles of faith, as to the omnipotence and Infallibility of the Pope.

"I learn at the same time that a council meeting of German bishops is to take place shortly at Fulda.

"In the year 1848, when a meeting of all the German bishops was held at Wurzburg, the honor of an invitation was extended to me, and I took part in the proceedings. Your excellency might perhaps arrange that I should be allowed in the meeting which is about to take place, not this time to take part in the proceedings, but to have an audience for a few hours.

"For I am prepared to prove before this meeting the following theses, which are of decisive importance for the present situation of the German Church, as well as for

my personal position.

"First, the new Articles of Faith are based upon the texts in the Holy Scriptures, St. Matt. xvi. 18, and St. John xxi. 17, and, as far as infallibility is concerned, upon the text, St. Luke xxii. 32, with the same, Biblically considered, must stand or fall. But we are bound by a solemn oath, which I myself have twice sworn, to 'accept and to explain the Holy Scriptures, not otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.' The Fathers of the Church have all, without exception, explained the texts in question as bearing a totally different meaning from the new decrees, and in the text St. Luke xxii. 32, especially, have anything but infallibility given to the Pope. Therefore, were I to accept this explanation with the decrees, without which every Biblical basis is wanting to them, I should commit perjury. And, as I have said, I am prepared to prove this to the bishops in councils.

"Secondly, in several episcopal pastorals and notices which have lately appeared, the assertion has been made, or the historical proof sought, that the new doctrine now proceeding from Rome as to the universal power of the Pope over every single Christian, and as to the Papal Infallibility in decisions in the Church on matters of faith from the beginning, through all time and for ever, has been generally, or, at least, nearly generally, believed and taught. I am prepared to show that this assertion is based upon an entire misconception of the traditions of the Church for the first thousand years, and upon the entire distortion of her history. It is in direct contradiction to the plainest facts and testimonies.

"Thirdly, I am ready to prove that the bishops of the Latin countries, Spain, Italy, South America, and France, who formed the immense majority at Rome, were, with their clergy, already led astray by the classbooks from which they took their ideas during their seminary education, the proofs given in these books being for the most part false, invented, or distorted. I shall prove this, first, with the two principal and favorite works of modern theological schools and seminaries, 'The Moral Philosophy of S. Alphonsus Liguori;' (especially as regards the treatise contained therein concerning the Pope), and

'The Theology of the Jesuit Peroni'; further, with the writings of the Archbishop Cardoni, and of Bishop Ghilardi, which were distributed in Rome during the Council; and finally, with 'The Theology of the Viennese Theologian Schwetz.'

"Fourthly, I appeal to the fact, which I am prepared to prove in public, that two General Councils and several Popes have already decided in the fifteenth century, by solemn decrees, issued by the Councils, and repeatedly confirmed by the Popes, the question as to the extent of the Pope's power, and as to his infallibility, and that the decrees of the 18th of July, 1870, are in the most glaring contradiction to these resolutions, and, therefore, cannot be considered as binding.

"Fifthly, I believe that I shall be able to demonstrate that the new decrees are simply incompatible with the constitutions of the States of Europe, and especially with that of Bavaria; and that I, who am bound by oath to this constitution, which I have lately sworn on my admission to the Chamber of the Councillors of State, find it impossible to accept the new decrees, and as their necessary consequence, the Bulls 'Unam Sanctam' and 'Cum ex Apostolatus officio,' the Syllabus of Pius IX., with so many other Papal declarations and laws, which are now to be accepted as infallible decisions although they are in irreconcilable antagonism to the laws of the country. I appeal on this subject to the opinion given by the Legal Faculty in Munich, and I am ready to abide by the arbitration of any German Legal Faculty which your excellency may be pleased to name.

Concern For Truth

"I only ask two conditions for the conference which I have proposed, or rather prayed for; first, that my assertions, together with any counter-assertions, shall be recorded, with a view to their subsequent publication; secondly, that a man of scientific culture, to be chosen by me, shall be allowed to be present at the conference.

"Should this be unattainable before the German bishops in Fulda, I venture most respectfully to make another request: that it may please your excellency to form, out of the members of your cathedral chapter, a committee, before which I may plead my

cause in the way above mentioned. Several of these venerable gentlemen are Doctors, and were formerly Professors of Theology, and were once my scholars. I may assume that it would be more agreeable to them to treat with me in quiet argument, to confute me, if possible, with reasons and facts, than to draw up, upon the seat of judgment, criminal sentences against me, and to submit the same to your excellency, to be fulminated, as the saying is. If your excellency will consent to preside at this conference, and will condescend to correct any errors into which I may have fallen in the citation and explanation of testimonies and facts, I shall count it as a great honor, and the cause of truth must be profited thereby. And when you place before me the prospect of the exercise of your pastoral power, I may still hope that you will prefer to employ, in the first place, towards me, the finest, most noble, most benevolent, and most Christlike attribute of this power - namely, the teacher's office. Should I be convinced by testimonies and facts, I engage myself to revoke publicly all that I have written in this matter, and so confute myself. In any case the results must be advantageous to the Church and the peace of souls. For it is not I alone who am concerned; but thousands of the clergy, hundreds of thousands of the laity, who think as I do, and find it impossible to accept the new articles of faith.

Distorted Testimonies

"Up to this day not a single one, even of those who have signed a declaration of submission, has said to me that he is really convinced of the truth of these theses. All my friends and acquaintances confirm me in this experience; 'not a single person believes in it,' is what I hear day by day from all lips. A conference such as I have proposed, and the publication of the proceedings, will in any case afford that deeper insight which so many long for.

"Your excellency may refer me to the pastoral letter which has recently appeared under the sanction of your name, as a source whence I might derive sufficient instruction and correction in respect to the opinions I hold; but I must avow that it has produced a totally contrary effect upon me, and I engage to show that this pastoral letter contains a long series of

misunderstood, distorted, mutilated, or invented testimonies, which, together with the suppression of important facts and opposite testimonies, present a picture totally dissimilar to the real tradition. Assuredly the person to whom your excellency confided this composition has not invented the falsifications, but has borrowed them in good faith from others (from Cardoni and others); but if he be willing to defend his elaboration at the proposed conference, he would find me ready, within a very few hours, either to prove my allegations or, if I should not succeed therein, publicly to apologize and to make an honorable amend. In consideration, however, of the importance of this matter, I conceive it to be my duty to make this offer, subject to one condition only, that his Majesty's government be requested to appoint an official, well versed in the knowledge of historical and ecclesiastical law, to be present at the conference as a witness. As this matter is also one of the highest interest for all governments I presume it may be taken for granted that such a request will not be refused on the part of the government.

Precedents For Discussion

"In the past history of the Church, facts are not wanting to prove that my proposal is in perfect harmony with the principles and practice of the Church. Thus, in the year 411, a conference, consisting of 286 Catholic and 279 Donatist bishops, was held under the presidency of the Imperial official Marcellinus; at this conference the disputed doctrines of the Church was discussed, and the President decided in favor of the Catholic bishops. In the year 1433 Bohemian Calixtines appeared at the council at Basle. A decree of the Synod of Constance issued 18 years before, concerning the communion in one form, was then submitted to a new discussion and examination, from which those compacta resulted, which were recognized by the Holy See, in virtue whereof an important and far-penetrating concession, and derogating from the older resolution, was made to the Bohemians.

"A still greater parallel to the discussion I propose is to be found in the conference, so celebrated in French history, between Du Perron, the Bishop of Evreux, and the Protestant statesman and scholar, M. Du Plessis-Mornay, which took

place at Fontainebleau in the year 1600, at the instigation of King Henry IV. The question under consideration was the charge preferred against Mornay, that in his book on the Eucharistics he had falsified a great many passages or quoted them incorrectly. The King himself presided; and the most notable men of both churches were present as witnesses. This conference was interrupted by Mornay's illness after the lapse of a few days, and after a number of passages quoted by him had been examined; nevertheless it produced an effect on the then greatly agitated state of the public mind extremely favorable to the Catholic cause.

"Most venerable Archbishop, I leave entirely to your judgment which form you will give to a conference so much desired by me, and certainly so welcome to multitudes of German Catholics, and what persons you will invite to attend or oppose me. In your diocese there is certainly no want of professional theologians who will be glad to accept your invitation. The practice of the Church proves that a question of faith is just as much an affair of the laity as of the clergy, and that the former may take part in the scientific examination and establishment of the tradition - as both Popes and theologians have acknowledged. And in this case, which is a matter for historical proof, I am gladly ready to submit to the verdict of the most eminent historians of the German nation and of the Catholic faith. Such men as Ficker, Reumont, Hofler, Arneht, Kampschulte, Cornelius, Lerenz, Wegele, Aschbach, may judge whether my proofs be critically and historically right or not.

"Your excellency was pleased formerly to honor my book on the First Ages of the Church Apostolical with your approval, and it was generally considered among German Catholics to be a true picture of the time of foundation: even the Jesuitic-Ultramontane party let it pass without censure. But if the new decrees contain the truth, then I have laid myself open to the reproach of having entirely misrepresented the history of the Apostles. That entire section of my book which concerns the constitution of the earlier Church, my description of the relation in which Paul and the other Apostles stood to Peter - all is fundamentally wrong, and I ought to condemn my own book, and confess that I have

neither understood Luke's Acts of the Apostles nor their Epistles.

"Blasphemous Usurpation"

"The new Vatican doctrine confers upon the Pope the whole plenitude of power over the entire Church, as well as over every individual layman, priest and bishop; and this power pretends to be at once the genuine episcopalian, and also the specific Papal authority, which is to comprise all things whatsoever, in relation to faith, morals, duties of life and discipline, and is to be entitled to lay hold upon the monarch as well as upon the day laborer, in order to inflict upon him punishment, commandment, or prohibition. The wording is so carefully put that no other position and authority is left to the bishops than such as pertain to Papal commissioners and pleni-potentiaries. Every person acquainted with history, and with the Fathers, must know that, by this means, the orthodox episcopacy is destroyed in its very essence, and that an apostolic institution which, in the opinion of the Fathers of the Church, is entitled to the highest consideration and authority, is thus reduced to an unsubstantial shadow. For no one will admit it to be possible that there shall be two bishops in the same diocese - the one being at the same time the Pope, and the other merely a bishop - because a Papal vicar or a diocesan commissioner is not exactly a bishop nor a successor of the Apostles. In virtue of the powers conferred upon him by Rome, he may be a very mighty man as long as his employer chooses to maintain him in office, precisely as a Jesuit or a Mendicant whom the Pope has endowed with an abundance of privileges might be.

"I am well aware that this prospect of an extension of their power has been held out to the bishops at Rome, and that it has often been said of them - 'The more irresistible the Pope the stronger you will be, for the plenitude of my power will cause rich rays to alight upon you.' The bishops of the minority have full well seen through the deceptive part of these promises; by the official 'analytical-synopsis' it is shown that they have fully recognized that, when the universal episcopacy of the Pope is established, they may still continue to be dignitaries of the Church, but they will cease to be true bishops. Right reverend sir, you yourself

took part in the deputation, which on the 15th July, made the most urgent counter-representations to the Pope - representations which M. de Kettler essayed to render still more emphatic by his prostration at the feet of the Pontiff. These representations, it is well known, were made in vain. The only consolation offered to the prelates, mourning over the loss of their orthodox dignity, was limited to the wording of the decree, which provided that the power of the bishop is an 'ordinary' one (that is to say, in the language of the Roman canonists, a 'potestas ordinaria subdelegata'), and that the Pope considered it his duty to support the same was proved by a mutilated quotation from Gregory the Great: but if this passage had been quoted completely, together with others, it would have proved to the world that this Pope of the seventh century repelled from him with the profoundest aversion as a blasphemous usurpation the idea of such a universal episcopacy as is now intended to be established.

The Yawning Chasm

"And here I beg your excellency to consider that the doctrine which we are now to adopt forms by its own nature, and by the declaration of Pope himself, by the confession of all infallibilists, a fundamental article of faith - that it is a question of the regula fidei, of the rule which must decide what is to be believed and what is not. In future every Catholic Christian can only answer the query why he believes this or that as follows: - 'I believe, or deny it, because the infallible Pope has commanded me to believe or to deny it.' This first principle of faith, as the Holy Scriptures necessarily should most clearly show, can never have been doubtful in the Church - it must at every date and among every people have governed the whole Church like a brightly shining star - must have been placed at the front of all instruction; and we all wait for an explanation of why it is that only after 1830 years the Church has started the idea of making an article of faith of a doctrine which the Pope calls, in a letter addressed to your excellency on the 28th of October, 'ipsum fundamentale principium catholice fidei ac doctrinae.' How can it have been possible that the Popes should, during centuries past, have exempted whole countries, whole schools of theology, from

belief in this 'fundamental article of faith'? And - may I add - how is it that your excellency yourself strove so long and so persistently against the enunciation of this dogma? Because it was not opportune, you say. But can it ever have been 'inopportune' to give to believers the key of the whole temple of faith, to announce to them the fundamental article on which all the rest depend? We stand all of us giddy before a chasm which opened before us on the 18th of July last.

"He who wishes to measure the immense range of these resolutions may be urgently recommended to compare thoroughly the 3rd chapter of the decrees in Council with the 4th, and to realize for himself what a system of universal government and spiritual dictation stands here before us. It is the plenary power over the whole Church as over each separate member, such as the Popes have claimed for themselves since Gregory VII., such as is pronounced in the numerous bulls since the bull 'Unam sanctam,' which is henceforth to be believed and acknowledged in his life by every Catholic. This power is boundless, incalculable; it can, as Innocent III said, strike at sin everywhere; can punish every man, allows of no appeal, is sovereign and arbitrary, for, according to Bonifacius VIII., the Pope 'carries all rights in the shrine of his bosom.' As he has now become infallible, he can in one moment, with one little word 'orbi' (that is, that he addresses himself to the whole Church), make every thesis, every doctrine, every demand, an unerring and irrefragable article of faith. Against him there can be maintained no right, no personal or corporate freedom - or, as the canonists say, the tribunal of God and that of the Pope are one and the same.

"This system bears its Romish origin on its forehead, and will never be able to penetrate in Germanic countries. As a Christian, as a theologian, as a historian, as a citizen, I cannot accept this doctrine. Not as a Christian, for it is irreconcilable with the spirit of the Gospel, and with the plain words of Christ and of the Apostles; it purposes just that establishment of the kingdom of this world which Christ rejected; it claims that rule over all communions which Peter forbids to all and to himself. Not as a theologian - for the whole true tradition of the Church

is in irreconcilable opposition to it. Not as a historian can I accept it, for as such I know that the persistent endeavor to realize this theory of a kingdom of the world has cost Europe rivers of blood, has confounded and degraded whole countries, has shaken the beautiful organic architecture of the elder Church, and has begotten, fed, and sustained the worst abuses in the Church.

"Finally as a citizen, I must put this dogma away from me, because by its claims on the submission of states and monarchs, and of the whole political order under the Papal power and by the exceptional position which it claims for the clergy, it lays the foundation of endless ruinous dispute between State and Church, between clergy and laity. For I cannot conceal from myself that this doctrine, the results of which were the ruin of the old German Kingdom, would, if governing the Catholic part of the German nation, at once lay the seed of incurable decay in the new kingdom which has just been built up.

Accepted, & c.,
I. VON DOELLINGER."
Munich, March 28, 1871."

The Outcome

The Rev. Dr. Doellinger's letter was unanswerable. Not long after he had published it, on April 18, 1871, he was publicly excommunicated a divinis by his Archbishop Cardinal Von Scherr. This action on the part of the Archbishop caused the numerous friends of Doellinger, in both the Roman Catholic and Protestant churches, to rejoice exceedingly, for the world-celebrated scholar did not bow to the yoke of Rome. He had quite a circle of friends who sided with him, among whom were a number of erudite priests,

Even after being excommunicated, Doellinger was held in high esteem by his Roman Catholic King, Louis II of Bavaria. As a matter of record, the King wrote to the excommunicated Doellinger a letter in which he expressed not only his condolence but also his royal admiration for the latter's character and conduct in the whole unsavory proceedings. King Louis II, to prove his faith and trust in Doellinger, named him in 1873 president of the Royal Academy of Sciences, general conservator of the scientific collections of the State, and rector-magnificus of the University of Munich.

The reaction of Doellinger and of the other famous priest-theologians, historians, and canonists led to the formation of the "Old Catholic Church" in Germany. Although he was not actively and formally united with the Old Catholic Church, Doellinger belonged to it by conviction. "As for myself," he declared later, "I consider that I belong by conviction to the Old Catholic Community."

While on his death-bed, Doellinger adamantly refused to receive the last Roman Catholic Sacraments from the hands of the local parish priest, at the cost of submission to the Papacy. The last rites were performed instead by his friend and ex-priest, Professor Friedrich.

In sum, Doellinger's case provides proof not only of the uncertainty and disunity within the Roman Catholic fold itself, but also of the fact that there are within the Church honest men who prefer to serve God and subserve their conscience rather than submit to merely human authority and who when the time is ripe will break away. It behooves every true Christian to be aware of this dichotomy of allegiance that exists within the hearts of the sincere Roman Catholic and never to offend or stymie the intellectual or spiritual quest of the Catholic who is laboring to find himself and his God.

* * * * *

NEWS ITEMS OF NOTE

Lombard, Ill. - On May 5th our new mission at Lombard organized under the name: St. Timothy Ev. Lutheran Church. We have 70 souls, 43 communicants, 18 voters, and 23 households.

The congregation voted to extend a permanent call to its missionary, Robert A. Moldstad. The pastor elect will be ordained and installed at an afternoon service, June 9, Pentecost.

On May 17 Timothy Anders became a new member of the Moldstad household. We offer to them our congratulations!

CLERGY BULLETIN

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

Vol. XVI, No. 11 & 12.

July-August, 1957

BOOK REVIEW

by

Julian Anderson

A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, Cambridge Press & University of Chicago Press, 1957 (xxxvii, 909 pp.)

As the Foreword explains, this latest addition to the field of Greek lexicography is "a translation and adaptation of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur, fourth revised and augmented edition, 1952". Thus, for the first time the results of Dr. Bauer's 35 years of labor in this field are now accessible to the English reader. The present work is an "adaptation" of Bauer's work in the sense that "more or less significant adaptations or additions" have been made in the case of a few entries; a handful of new words have been included not found in Bauer's, and the bibliographical references have been expanded and brought up to date. It will no doubt be of interest to our readers to know that this translation was made possible by funds collected by the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod in their Centennial thank-offering in 1947 and set aside especially for this work.

As pointed out above, the printing of this new lexicon has been done by the Cambridge University Press in England and the University of Chicago Press in America. Of the two, the Cambridge edition is much superior in quality, having a good cloth binding which will last for many years, while the American edition has the much inferior paper binding. The difference in quality between the two is far greater than the difference in price, which is about a dollar. The price in either case, incidentally, is about \$15.00.

The page size is $7\frac{1}{2}$ by $9\frac{3}{4}$ - a very handy and convenient size (about the same size as Thayer's Lexicon) - not too large to be bulky, but large enough to include the vast amount of material necessary in such a work. The format, or page arrangement, is one of the most commendable features. Each page is divided into two columns, and the type, although it is not large, is particularly readable and pleasing to the eye. By using a hanging indent each separate entry on the page stands out very prominently and can be quickly & easily located. Furthermore, the arrangement of the material under each entry is particularly well laid-out, with each section and subsection plainly marked out by a suitable number or letter and also indented.

So far as the actual contents are concerned, three general observations might be made. First, there are a larger number of entries, or words treated, in this new lexicon when compared with the older lexicons in English - due to the fact that this new work covers the entire field of Hellenistic Greek (see below), and thus includes many forms not found in the N.T.

Secondly, so far as the amount of material given for each word is concerned, the length of the articles given under each entry is just about the same as that given in Thayer for the corresponding word. And, as one might expect, the actual contents of the material is substantially the same as in the older lexicons.

And thirdly, the arrangement of the material under the various entries with regard to the different connotations, usages and shades of meanings is the same as in the older lexicons. This, of course, is

exactly what we should expect, since the handling of such matters will necessarily admit of little difference of treatment.

One of the most commendable features of this new lexicon is its wide scope, covering the entire field of Hellenistic (or Koine) literature. It is more than a simple lexicon for the New Testament, since it covers also the vocabulary to be found in the Septuagint, the Apostolic Fathers, the Old and New Testament Apocrypha, and, to a more limited extent, the secular authors of the Hellenistic period - Josephus, Philo, Strabo, Pausanias, Arrian, and a host of others. In this respect this new lexicon will fill a very definite need in the field of Hellenistic studies which have come so much to the fore in recent years.

Another welcome feature is the "modernity" of this new lexicon in two important respects. First, an attempt has been made to include the results of the voluminous papyri discoveries of the past 60 years. As our readers know, these papyri finds, containing both literary and non-literary documents, are one of the most significant developments in the field of classical studies since the renaissance; and certainly the most important development ever to take place in the field of Hellenistic Greek. Wherever possible the editors of this new lexicon, following Bauer's example, have included pertinent references to the papyri under each entry. More will be said about this later.

Perhaps the finest and most useful feature of all, however, is the copious list of bibliographical references under each entry, covering the entire field of theological literature, especially periodicals. A great deal of research must have gone into this feature, as the number of references to articles, monographs, and books dealing with the various words seems to be quite exhaustive. It goes without saying, of course, that this is a most useful and helpful addition to the biblical scholar and exegete who may wish to dig more deeply into a particular word and its usage. As the editors point out, these bibliographical references have been brought up to date as far as 1954.

It should also be pointed out that this new lexicon contains Bauer's well-known

Introduction on the subject of New Testament Greek and its lexicography. This introduction, while it is not exhaustive nor perhaps even the best treatment of the Koine, is nevertheless an excellent piece of work and can be read with profit by every student of New Testament Greek.

Still another helpful and pleasing feature is its treatment of irregular and difficult verb-forms. Instead of relegating these to an appendix, as in Thayer, most of them are listed in the proper alphabetical order with an accompanying reference to the proper listing. For the beginning student or the pastor who is a bit "rusty" in his Greek, this is a most welcome arrangement.

With all of these commendable features, however, this new lexicon also has its shortcomings. In particular, attention must be called to three important deficiencies which seriously impair the usefulness and practicability of this new work so far as the average pastor is concerned. In the first place, this lexicon is totally lacking in any sort of etymological information, a fact which was deplored by Bauer himself in the Foreword to his 3rd edition. So far as this reviewer has been able to ascertain, there is not a single note on the etymology of any word - i.e. on the roots from which the various words have been formed and the historical developments of words so far as their formation, usage and meaning are concerned. This is, indeed, a most distressing desideratum, as this sort of etymological information is really quite essential and of immense help to the Bible student, exegete, and translator - and in particular to the average pastor as he labors to prepare an exegetical "paper" or to come to a fuller understanding of the biblical text. This deficiency is all the more surprising since a great deal of excellent material of this sort is readily available in the many "word" studies recently published and in the lexicons of Thayer and Cremer. Surely the inclusion of a modest amount of such etymological material would not have increased the size of the volume so very greatly, nor would it have materially increased the cost of production. Its lack, however, will greatly decrease its practical usefulness.

In the second place, this new lexicon

is completely lacking in any comparative treatment of synonyms - the sort of thing which every student of N.T. Greek has found so invaluable and useful in Thayer's much-used lexicon. In this respect, too, the scholar, the exegete, the translator, the average pastor, and the average Bible student knows full well how the careful study of the sometimes minute differences between "synonyms" can be of great aid in bringing out the fullness and richness of the biblical text. And here, too, this deficiency is so surprising because such material is so easily available in Archbishop Trench's famous work on New Testament synonyms. All the more remarkable is the fact that Trench's monumental work is never once cited in the otherwise exhaustive list of bibliographical material! Here also the inclusion of such material would have made little difference in the size or cost of the lexicon.

The third deficiency has to do with the above-mentioned references to the papyri. While these references are numerous, as pointed out above, they are in every case limited to mere citations (e.g. P^{Oxy}. 11, P^{Tebt}. 163) with no accompanying illustration or text, which renders all this much-advertized use of the papyri of little or no use whatsoever to the average pastor or scholar. While it is enlightening and interesting to know that a certain N.T. word was used also in some of the papyri documents, such information is of no real practical value unless one knows also how the word in question was used in the papyri - what its exact meaning was, or if it was used in some peculiar technical way, or in some common or uncommon phrase, all of which may throw light on its usage in the New Testament. Thus Moulton and Milligan, in their famous Vocabulary from the Papyri, always quote the word in question in context, giving either a whole phrase or sentence to illustrate the exact usage. Indeed, the inaccessibility of these papyri finds for the average pastor, and even most scholars, make such a practice necessary, since there are very few libraries which have more than a very small portion of these new texts even on micro-film. Thus, the total lack of such illustrative material in connection with these papyri citations will seriously limit the use and usefulness of all these references in this great new field. In the opinion of this

reviewer such a lack reduces the value of all these papyri references in this new lexicon practically to zero, both for the scholar as he studies the word more carefully, and for the average student and pastor as he attempts to discover what light the new papyri documents can throw on the meaning and use of any particular word. By way of defense it should be stated that the editors of this new lexicon make it a practice to cite Moulton and Milligan in all cases where the word is found there. This being the case, however, the reference in the Lexicon is of little value, since Moulton and Milligan would have to be consulted in any case.

To these three major deficiencies one might add another of quite minor character - the lack of any appendices of the kind that are found in Thayer, listing borrowed words, words peculiar to the particular New Testament writers, etc. The fact is that there are no appendices of any sort in this new lexicon, although it could be admitted that such are not of any great importance.

In conclusion, then, it would seem to this reviewer that this new lexicon is particularly useful, first, for its excellent and up-to-date bibliographies; and second, because of the fact that it can serve as a lexicon also for the study of the Septuagint, Apocrypha, Apostolic Fathers, Josephus, Philo, and other Hellenistic writers. On the other hand, it is clearly deficient and inferior in the matter of etymologies, synonyms, illustrative material from the papyri, and appendices. In these latter respects this new work must still yield the palm to Thayer, which, in spite of its age, is still the most practically useful lexicon for use by the average pastor or student.

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, So. Dak.

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

SOME RECENT STATISTICS ON "BIBLICAL ILLITERACY."

Joseph M. Hopkins, assistant professor in the Department of Bible at Westminster College, conducted a study among his students. As reported in CHRISTIAN HERALD, he said:

"My experience as a teacher in the Bible department of a denominational college is leading me to believe that we have on our hands a generation of Biblical illiterates. This is shocking in itself.

"But more shocking is the fact that most of these illiterates have been regular attendants at Sunday School for the major part of their lives. At the college a Bible placement test was given to 281 incoming students. Generally speaking, they may be considered typical products of our American Sunday Schools, from various church groups... above average, for students entering the college must meet high academic requirements.

"Of the 281 students who took the test, 79 percent failed to identify Matthew as the tax-collector who became a disciple; 74 percent could not name the father of Joseph and his brethren; 70 percent did not know in which Bible book the Ten Commandments are found; 70 percent could not name the book which records the history of the early Christian church following the ascension of our Lord; 65 percent failed to identify Solomon as the famous wise man of the Old Testament; 60 percent could not name a single parable of Jesus. 31 percent were unable to name the first book of the New Testament; and 23 percent could not identify the man who betrayed Jesus Christ.

"The most startling thing about these figures is that 175, or nearly two-thirds of the 281 students reported they had attended Sunday School regularly since childhood. Many, in addition, had received training in religious education classes, vacation Bible schools, and Christian day schools. Only 12 of the 281 stated that they had never attended Sunday School.

"Of the 61 students taking the placement test who acknowledged having taught Sunday School before coming to college, 39 were unable to name the book which contains the history of the early church, 36 didn't know the tax-collector disciple,

34 didn't know where to locate the Ten Commandments, 33 couldn't name a single parable of Jesus, seven didn't know who betrayed Jesus."

* * * * *

KARL BARTH ACCORDING TO R. NIEBUHR, AND NIEBUHR ACCORDING TO HIMSELF.

"Karl Barth insisted that it was necessary to accept Scripture en bloc, even though he allowed himself the freedom of suggesting that the story of the empty tomb was in the category of 'saga' and that the Genesis stories were Ungeschichte. His disciples were usually not so sophisticated or so disingenuous."

"...Christian was a historical religion. It rested upon facts of history as interpreted by faith. But faith would have to be profound enough to remain secure, even though peripheral myths with which former ages surrounded the truth of faith in the hope of validating it were disproved. In short, this honesty toward scriptural foundations of faith was not only an act of loyalty to the whole enterprise of modern culture; it was also a method of purifying the Christian faith. For this honesty made it imperative for the believer to accept Jesus as Christ because the revelation of God in Christ validated itself to him existentially and did not require the confirmation of 'signs and wonders.'"

(From an article by Reinhold Niebuhr, "Literalism, Individualism, and Billy Graham," Christian Century, May 23, 1956).

QUOTES

"Who is so deaf or so blind as is he
That willfully will neither hear nor
see?" - Proverbs of John Heywood.

"Call no man happy till you know the
nature of his death; he is at best but
fortunate." - Herodotus.

"Blessed is the man who, having nothing
to say, abstains from giving in words
evidence of the fact." - George Eliot.

OBSERVATIONS AND AFFIRMATIONS OF A JESUIT

or
Sams Raven in Spiced Gravy

"What distinguished the Catholic community from the Protestant community was the fact that for the protestant, in principle, there was no final authority in the community. Over, above, and outside the community floated the Bible. Its authority was originally considered final, but the community, on principle, had no authority to define its meaning. The fellowship necessarily had the power to exclude members who did not conform to the total community's interpretation, but it had no structural norm whereby another's understanding could definitively be declared invalid. In practice it tried to do so, but the nuclear principle of Protestantism contradicted the practice. As a result, the fragmentation of Protestantism was inevitable. With the same right that the first reformers claimed to reform the actual Church in the light of their sincere understanding of the Bible, new reformers within the Protestant community again reformed the church in the light of their sincere understanding of revelation. This process by inner logic has continued until our own time. But no matter how often the fragmentation took place, it never gave final authority to the community; and with this lack, future fragmentation could not be avoided. The World Council of Churches is a most interesting phenomenon because it is modern Protestant's impressive attempt to overcome the inner drive to fragmentation."

"... In the light of this basic fact in Protestantism, Protestant theology cannot follow the Catholic norm of theology which is the definitive teaching of the living Church. In the beginning, the only Protestant norm was the Scripture understood in the light of the infant philology of the sixteenth century. This could produce a Biblical theology, but logically it could give no system. Yet one of the most important products of the early reformation was Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion, a perfect model of system."

(The above quotations are from an article by Gustave Weigel, S.J., "Catholic and Protestant Theologies in Outline", in AMERICAN SCHOLAR, Summer, 1956. The article compares Catholic theological tradition to a castle which has been remodeled unessentially, and Protestant theology to a "rambling complex of buildings" in which one can see that there were once other structures where the present ones stand, the original lines of the house having been changed, some parts of the building burned down, etc. Gustave Weigel was former dean of the faculty of theology at the University of Chile, now professor of ecclesiology at the Jesuit theologate at Woodstock, Maryland. Editor.)

"PRIVATE INTERPRETATION," 2 Pet. 1:20

Under that title the late Dr. William Arndt in Concordia Theological Monthly (Sept. 1936, pp.685-691) offered an examination of the text and context of 2 Peter 1:21, which article the reader could do worse than look up and restudy if he feels the need. We present here several of the later paragraphs of the study:

"There is still the word 'private' to consider, for which we above accepted the rendering of Thayer, 'subjective.' A glance at the Greek original (ἰδιωτικῶς) suffices to show that private here must not be taken in the sense of 'secret,' 'hidden

from view,' but 'one's own,' 'individual.' To arrive at a clear view of what is meant, we inquire, What is the antithesis? Does Peter mean to say, Not our own interpretation must be proposed, but that of somebody else, that of the Church or of a priest? The context says, no. What the apostle wishes to inculcate is the truth that the Word is firm, reliable, majestic, inviolable. There it stands in divine dignity; let no one touch it with presumptuous hands. That Word has spoken of the great matters pertaining to Jesus, His second coming and our entering into His glorious kingdom, and what it has

said must not be altered or weakened by bringing in an exegesis which is foreign to the words. The Word is not a football of the interpreter, which he may kick about at will. He is the servant, not the master. Let him become humble and say, 'Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth.' The antithesis, then, to one's own interpretation is the sense which the Word itself conveys to us.

"Now the meaning of the passage becomes quite evident. The apostle tells us that the prophecies given in the Scriptures must not be tampered with as we approach them in the role of interpreters. The Word of these prophecies is a sacred, inspired Word, and we must treat it with reverence and not think that we may give it any meaning we desire. On the contrary, the Word is an objective entity, and in reading, interpreting, and applying it, we must not let our subjective feelings or preconceived notions be the judge of its meaning. Peter is here issuing a warning, for instance, against our turning allegorizing interpreters, who, not satisfied with the plain significance of the words, try to find some hidden meaning in them, although Scripture itself does not give a hint that an allegorical interpretation is intended. There is implied here a warning for us not to be like those people who shake and twist and maltreat a passage till finally, much against its will, it yields the meaning the self-willed interpreters are bent on extracting from it. The apostle, to state one more implication, urges us not to be like the rationalists who, offended by the miraculous content of the Scripture, endeavor to explain all its statements and narratives in such a way that the mysterious, supernatural elements disappear.

"What Peter, then, frowns on is not private interpretation as opposed to ecclesiastical or official interpretation. On the contrary, every individual Christian is to read the Scriptures and to meditate on them (Ps. 1,2), which is equivalent to saying that he is to interpret them for himself. Is it not true that whoever ponders a saying of the Scriptures and applies it to himself is thereby doing some exegetical work? No thoughtful reading of a Scripture-passage is possible without some process of interpretation, that is, some mental effort to apprehend the meaning of the words; and that, after all, is the essence of interpretation - getting at the meaning of a statement. The nine-year-old girl - blessings on her! - who proclaims with glistening eyes, 'Jesus loves me, for He says, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not,"' is a little exegete. She has gone into the divine garden and there picked a beautiful flower. What more can an old exegete, having a whole workshop filled with implements, accomplish? May interpretation of this kind ever flourish among us! But when we, instead of gathering and presenting the flowers of God's garden in their natural grace and loveliness, take a petal from a pansy and a rose and a violet and try to construct a flower of our own, then we are engaged in the mischievous business which Peter warns against. In that case we are offering our own interpretation instead of what the Scripture has entrusted to us. The people who are here given a verdict of condemnation are all those who, instead of accepting what the Bible teaches, endeavor by all manner of tricks and devices to put a meaning into the words different from the one which the Holy Spirit has placed there."

* * * * *

LIGHT FROM THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Our attention is directed to Isaiah 51:19 by the variant reading of the St. Mark's Manuscript of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The King James Version reads, "... by whom shall I comfort thee?" Luther: "... wer sollte dich trösten?" R.V. 1881: "... how shall I comfort thee?" Moffatt: "... whoever can console you?" R.S.V.: "... who will comfort you?"

The Masoretic Text reads:

יְהוָה יִנְחֵם אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל

The St. Mark's Ms. reads:

יְהוָה יִנְחֵם אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל

However, Adam Clarke, in 1853 wrote, "By whom shall I comfort thee - (Who shall comfort thee). A Ms., the Septuagint, Syriac, Chaldee, and Vulgate, have it in the third person, יְהוָה יִנְחֵם אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל, yeshchmak, which is evidently right.

Isaiah 21:8 is probably the most famous variant of the St. Mark's Manuscript of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The King James Version reads: "And he cried, A lion..." Luther translated: "Und sine Löwe rief..." Moffatt: "Then my spirit called to me..." R.V.: "And he cried as a lion..." R.S.V.: "Then he who saw cried..."

The Masoretic text reads:

The St. Mark's Scroll reads:

It is interesting to note that Albert Barnes wrote in 1847: "And he cried, A lion." Margin, as a lion. This is the correct rendering. The particle 'as' is

is not unfrequently omitted."

But Adam Clarke wrote in 1853: "The present reading לִי אַרְיֵה, a lion, is so unintelligible, and the mistake so obvious, that I make no doubt; that the true reading is לִי נֹדֵד haraeh, the seer; as the Syriac translator manifestly found it in his copy, who renders it by ܟܦܝܬ duka, a watchman."

N. C. Oesleby

(Note: The quotations from St. Mark's Mss. are from "The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery," Vol. I, published by The American School of Oriental Research, New Haven, 1950. - Oesleby).

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

(cont.)

12. The Pope.

And now, child, listen well! You shall now hear how the pope came to be.

You have already heard more than once that the clergy had all the say in the Church, and that the congregations in a district with their "priests" were under a bishop, who lived in the largest city in the district. But now it came about that also the districts with their bishops and priests and congregations became subject to a Metropolitan or Archbishop, who lived in the capital city of the country or provinces. Then it came about that these Archbishops became subject to a Patriarch. The word patriarch means supreme father, who has the right to command anything. At first there were three such patriarchs: the bishops in Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. Then there were five patriarchs: the bishops in Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. The bishop in the imperial city of Rome was the foremost patriarch, after him came the bishop in the capital city of Constantinople, and then the other three. That is the way it was decided by various church conventions, that is, meetings of the bishops. It was also decided at these church conventions that the bishop of Rome was the patriarch of the entire West Roman empire. The emperor Valentinian III made that a law in the year 445.

But the bishop of Rome was by no means satisfied with that. He wanted to have the Primate over the entire Church on earth. Primate means the first place with all the power. Leo, who was bishop of Rome from 440 to 461, said that that was the way it must be, because the Apostles Peter and Paul had died the death of martyrs in Rome, and especially because the Apostle Peter had been the first bishop of Rome (which is not true), and because Christ had said to Peter that upon him, Peter, He would build His Church (which is also not true), and He wished to give to Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and also because He had said to Peter: "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep, feed my sheep."

And now the bishop of Rome called his office the apostolic seat, and he called himself Pope, which means Papa or Father, and he said that Christ had made him His vicar (or representative) and had given him the rule over His entire Church on earth.

The other bishops were not at all willing to accept this at that time. But later on they did accept it. In the East Roman empire it was not accepted.

Children, that which Leo and the other bishops of Rome after him said were altogether lies from the devil. And in order that you may understand that well, I will show you very briefly what Christ actually said to Peter. It is written in Matt. 16: 18-19 and John 21: 15-17. Peter had said to the Savior: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," Matt. 16:16. Because Peter had thereby shown to Him his true and rock-like faith (verse 17), Christ said to him: "Thou art Peter (a rock, a rock-man), and upon this rock (namely, on Christ and faith in Him) I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Christ said the same thing to all believing Christians in Matt. 18:18 and John 20: 22-23. So He did not say that only to Peter. And as for the words which Christ spoke to Peter in John 21: 15-17, He graciously accepted back Peter, who had denied Him three times, into His service as an Apostle.

- Do you now see what lies the devil spoke through the Roman bishop?

Translation by A. Schulz