



Lutheran Synod Quarterly

SERMON ON I THESS. 4:13-18
Rev. B.W. Teigen

KING SVERRE AND THE POPE
(continued)
Prof. R.E. Honsey

PIEPER ON DOCTRINAL DISCIPLINE
Prof. M.H. Otto

STATE OF THE CHURCH RESOLUTIONS

WISCONSIN SYNODS RESOLUTIONS ON CHURCH FELLOWSHIP

ELS RESOLUTIONS ON CHURCH FELLOWSHIP

PIEPER'S DOGMATICS IN FINNISH
Reported by Rev. A. Aijai Uppala

CLC CONVENTION
Prof. Glenn Reichwald

ADVICE IN THE ART OF INTELLECTUAL DISHONESTY?

BOOK REVIEW

FROM THE EDITORS

LUTHERAN SYNOD QUARTERLY

Published by the authority of the General Pastoral Conference of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod

Edited by the Theological Faculty of the E L S Theological Seminary.

George O. Lillegard, Editor-in-Chief, c/o Bethany Lutheran College, Mankato, Minnesota

Volume II Number I (Published Quarterly) September, 1961

Subscription price: \$1.50 per year. Single copy, .50¢

I. N. I.

SERMON DELIVERED AT THE FUNERAL OF MRS. MILTON E. TWEIT

Text: I Thessalonians 4, 13-18: "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words."

Prayer

Lord Jesus Christ, Thou who hast said: "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted," we pray Thee, send Thy Holy Spirit, whom Thou hast called "The Comforter," that today we may learn to apply to our hearts the consolations of Thy Gospel. Bind up the broken-hearted, heal the wounds of sadness, and fill our fainting souls with trust and confidence, so that at death we may know Thy power. Hear us for Thy mercies' sake. Amen.

Sorrowing children, parents, relatives and friends of Delphine Tweit: Grace be unto you and peace from God, our Father, and from our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. Amen.

It is a sad and sorrowful thing for children to follow the casket of a parent to its lasting place. It is doubly sorrowful when the parent, who was still in the prime of life, was snatched so suddenly out of the world, and her husband and your father now lies so critically injured in the hospital.

But, my dear friends, our Savior is not unaware of what has happened; the grievous

sorrows of bereavement are not unknown to Him. He stood by the bedside of Jairus' daughter; He paused at the casket of the young man of Nain; He even shed tears before the grave of His dear friend Lazarus. Our Lord and Savior is not an insensible Lord but a gracious Savior, a loving and merciful God, of Whom the Psalmist said: "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him. For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust." (Psalm 103, 13,14)

Isn't it a striking proof of the grace of our Savior that we have on the authority of His own Word a special revelation, the aim of which is to comfort on such an occasion as this? The Apostle Paul, inspired by the Holy Spirit, declares; "For this we say unto you by the Word of the Lord." (v. 15) And again the Apostle concludes this portion of his letter by saying: "Wherefore comfort one another with these words."

What better can we do, then, but ponder and learn what God has revealed about'

THE DEAD IN CHRIST

Our Lord does not want us to be ignorant and thus be deprived of this comfort; "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope." There is a limitation set forth at the very beginning of the Apostle's argument: "That ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope." These last words refer to those who are not in Christ, who are not united to Him by a living and saving faith. It is a frightful thing to say of any man, and still more of the mass of men, that they have no hope. And yet that is what the Apostle says: "even as others which have no hope." May none of us here today be in that class of people -- those who have no hope -- who have no peace because they are not yet justified by faith in Jesus Christ.

That was not the situation, however, with the Thessalonian Christians, although they lacked full knowledge and were therefore somewhat disturbed in their faith. Since the time Paul had visited Thessalonica (See Acts 17, 1-10) some of the Christians had died. The brethren were in grief, almost sorrowing as those who have no hope. They were so eagerly awaiting the second return of Christ that they thought it would come while they were still alive, and they feared that those who had died would be shut out of the Messiah's kingdom. It was not because they did not believe in the resurrection of the saints, but because they feared that their dead would not have the same advantages as the survivors would when the Lord came. And since they had no special instruction on this point, they apparently wrote to Paul for advice; at least he knew of their perplexity. They, indeed, could not have turned to a better place for instruction, because the Apostle had the the Word of the Lord.

And this is the Word: "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." (v. 14) Paul's argument here is tightly compressed and we need to look at it quite closely. Let me read it to you again: "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him."

Now Jesus did die and rise again. There is no dispute about that here. But how is the Apostle justified in asserting from this that God will bring the Christian dead again to meet the living on the last day? What is the truth not stated here but implied? What

is the connection between the statement that Christ died and rose again and that this Jesus will bring with Him on the last day those who died trusting in Him?

Why, it is a part of the great central truth of the Scripture, of justification by grace through faith. It is this: that when we truly believe in Jesus as our Savior from sin and death we are united to Him by that living faith; He is the head and we are the members of the body of Christ. The death and resurrection of Jesus are inseparable in Paul's thought about salvation, and he regards our Savior as our substitute. As Christ actually died and rose, so the believers die and rise with Him. All that Christ has experienced will be experienced by the believers. Christ's victory is their victory; Christ's resurrection. Believers are united to Christ as indissolubly as the members of the body to the head. They have been planted together in likeness of His death, so shall they also be in the likeness of His resurrection.

Paul put it this way on another occasion: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." (Galatians 2, 20)

Death, the Apostle would have us understand, does not break the bond between the believer and Christ; and so those who have died will suffer no loss, even though the Lord should come in our lifetime: "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him."

God will bring the departed again also to meet their friends; yes, all the saints in Christ will meet before God on the great day of Judgment. Look at the word "bring": "Will God bring with him." It means so much here. The old Lutheran commentator, Bengel, exclaims about this "bring": "Sweet word! It is spoken of living persons." The dead for whom we mourn are not dead. They are all alive unto God, and when the great day comes God will bring those who have gone before and unite them to those who have been left behind. When we shall see Christ at His coming we shall also see those who have fallen asleep in Jesus.

This is in brief the doctrine of verse 14 of our text. And to fortify and strengthen our faith, the Apostle Paul explains this truth in the rest of the text in considerable detail. He has received it from the Lord, and therefore it is worthy of all acceptance. It is to be believed: "For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep." That is, we shall not prevent or precede them in enjoying the glories of eternal life before them. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first; Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

These words are so beautifully simple and clear that they hardly need an explanation. Not only do we know that on the last day, when Christ returns to judge the quick and the dead, these dead in Christ will rise from the dead with a glorious body fashioned like unto the body of Christ, but we also know that we shall meet them again, for we shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and both we and they will enter into life eternal, for all of us shall ever be with the Lord. It is as beauti-

fully simple as that.

"Wherefore comfort one another with these words," (v. 18) Which words? These words which Paul had just written, for they are the words of the Lord. They are part of that of which the Lord himself said, that heaven and earth shall pass away but not His word. It is something solid on which to build your comfort. It is not a false comfort. We could have said many other things to try to comfort you on this sad occasion, but if what we said was not based on the Word of the Lord you would have sooner or later called me, as Job once did some of his well-meaning but misinformed friends, "miserable comforters!"

Dear mourners, today there is so much on your mind: You have been hit with such a hard blow -- the death of mother was so sudden so needless apparently, when she could have been of such great help and comfort -- and father so severely injured, lying possibly at the point of death in the hospital. The Thessalonian Christians, you might be saying in your mind, could contemplate these wonderful truths of Paul under more normal circumstances, and why can't we, you ask.

Do you remember the pressures under which the congregation at Thessalonica came into existence and lived from day to day. Paul had preached there only three Sabbath days or three weeks, reasoning "with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging, that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ." (Acts 17, 2,3) As a result of this preaching there was a riot among the Jews. It simply wasn't safe to be a Christian. These Thessalonian Christians were maligned and falsely accused of trying to destroy the government. These Jewish Christians were rejected by the Jews and held in contempt by the Greeks. This entire letter of Paul to the Thessalonian Christians, carefully read, indicates that they were living as Christians under great stress. They became followers of the Lord "having received the word in much affliction" (1, 6). (Cf. 2, 2; 3, 3.4) Some may have been martyred for their faith; there may have been sudden and violent death among them; no doubt there was. Life is that way. It is the Lord's way of dealing with His children. Some the Lord calls so quietly and slowly that we hardly know the precise moment when their souls have departed. As the poet says:

"As virtuous men pass mildly away,
And whisper to their souls to go,
While some of their sad friends do say,
The breath goes now, and some say no."

Others the Lord calls home by sudden death, as the poet again states that so often death "doth with poison, war and sickness dwell."

But St. Paul's point still is: "Comfort one another with these words," because it makes no difference to the believer how or when he is called by our loving Savior. At every turn of our life we are linked to God by a living faith. Your mother was buried with Christ by baptism into death, and like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, so she walked in newness of life. As a Christian, she lived not to herself but unto the Lord.

Our task, as the living, is to nourish and strengthen our faith through the Gospel,

to be constrained by the love of Christ so that we live to Him who died for us and rose again. We are to remember that through a living faith we are the Lord's; "For none of us liveth unto himself, and no man dieth unto himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we live therefore or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living." (Romans 14, 7-9)

"Wherefore comfort one another with these words." Amen.

Sermon Delivered by Prof. B.W. Teigen

"KING SVERRRE'S ECCLESIASTICAL CONTROVERSIES

Part V

(Continued from June issue)

Before we take up the major matter of Innocent's excommunicating Sverre and placing Norway under the interdict, we shall briefly tell of another matter in which they disagreed. This is the matter of the alleged letters of pardon which Sverre claimed that Pope Celestine III had sent to Sverre by means of some envoys that had gone from Norway down to Rome. In a footnote, Bull relates the alleged incident as follows:

The saga states that Bishop Tore and Master Rikard (the envoys) were sent northward from Rome together with a papal legate who was a cardinal; but when they came to Denmark, they all were suddenly taken sick and died. Sverre said that he knew they had been guests at a priest's home, and in the evening poison had been placed in their drink, so that they died. Meanwhile Sverre got hold of letters that were left with them, furnished with the Pope's bull. These letters Sverre had read up in the choir in the Christ Church, and there it was written that as soon as the Pope got to know the truth, that the king was more in the right than the archbishop, the Pope released him and his whole kingdom from the excommunication. 77

The point of controversy revolved around the question: Were these letters genuine? If they were, the Pope had actually released Sverre and his kingdom from the excommunication. If they were not, the sentence still held, and much worse, either Sverre or someone else was guilty of forgery. Sverre held them to be genuine. Celestine, and later Innocent, vehemently denied their authenticity, and declared them to be a forgery.

⁷⁷ Bull, Det Norske Folks Liv Og Historie Gjennem Tiden, p. 247.

This issue, like that of Sverre's ancestry, is a moot question which will probably never be settled, and one in which the writer cannot feel he should take a definite stand. Falsen, whose history is marked by a rather decided patriotism, and who therefore may be a bit prejudiced, prefers the version that the letter of the Pope is genuine, and therefore he is inclined to agree with Sverre.⁷⁸ Others also are inclined to adopt that view, perhaps because they feel Sverre could hardly be either so stupid or naive as to believe in a forgery someone else committed, or so unethical or dishonest as to have committed one himself.

There are those who hold the position that the letters were forgeries. Bang feels that they were not authentic. He states:

It lies in the nature of the case that these documents must have been unauthentic. But whether Sverre himself had fabricated them, or whether his messengers had obtained them from forgers in Rome, who at that time profitably carried on such traffic, cannot be determined definitely.⁷⁹

Likewise the Swedish scholar, Cederschiold, believes that the letters were forgeries. But it is his opinion that Sverre believed them to be authentic. Sverre might have believed that the old and weak Pope Celestine III, who now above all wanted to get a crusade going, had decided to revoke the excommunication and postpone action against Sverre until later. He maybe even hoped for help from Sverre.⁸⁰ That hardly seems plausible. Celestine had definitely taken a stand against Sverre. Furthermore, the help that the warring Sverre could spare to give to Celestine would be little.

Edvard Bull also questions the authenticity of the letters. He claims that at least a half year separates the death of the cardinal legate and that of Bishop Tore. So he feels that in his letter of October 6, 1198, Pope Innocent III was justified in accusing Sverre of forgery.

Although it cannot be proved either way, it seems difficult to believe that Sverre was guilty of that forgery. It is hardly in keeping with his character which is otherwise candid and straight-forward. He seems to have possessed virtues like honesty and integrity as well as bravery and zeal to a remarkable degree. Furthermore, Sverre's many enemies, in finding fault with him, did not mention that he had forged those letters. That would have been one of their best cards to play, and if he really committed the forgery, it seems that they would have made more of a point of it than they did.

The real controversy between Innocent and Sverre was not about those letters, however. It was rather about Sverre's resistance against and opposition to Archbishop Erik and the hierarchical principles which he set forth. Sverre's independent stand and his refusal to yield ground to the church in temporal matters made it inevitable that Innocent III would

⁷⁸ Falsen, Norges Historie under Kong Harald Haarfager og Hans Mandelige Descendenter (Christiania, 1824.) pp. 138 f.

⁷⁹ Bang, Udsigt over den Norske Kirkes Historie under Katholicismen (Kristiania, 1887) pp. 104 f.

⁸⁰ Gustaf Cederschiold, Konung Sverre (Lund, 1901), pp. 130 f.

attack him. And attack him he did in a most vehement manner in the fall of 1198.

On October 6 of that year, Innocent sent out five letters to church leaders and royalty in which he denounced Sverre. In so doing, he used vituperative language, as Paasche mentions in his book. Examples are: Sverre's "tyrannical barbarousness (or barbarity)", "monster;" "member of the devil;" "son of perdition"; "deceitful murderer"; "tyrant"; murderer of kings"; "a man who has blood guilt on himself." 81

To give a better idea of what Innocent wrote, we shall quote a portion of his letter to Archbishop Erik and the bishops and prelates of Norway. In that letter he brings forth some terrible accusations against Sverre:

We assuredly believe that the Lord must have wanted to punish the sins of you and all the Norwegian people, inasmuch as he has permitted the tyrannical cruelty and abominable violence of Sverre to gain power over you and the whole kingdom to the extent that he not only has seized the kingship -- and that as we hear neither according to choice of the chieftains nor hereditary right -- but also even though, as it is said, he himself has formerly held an ecclesiastical office, nevertheless rages against the churchmen, oppresses the churches, persecutes the clergymen, torments the poor and is violent toward the powerful ---- so that people must believe that it is in accordance with God's own judgment that he, although on account of his illegitimate birth he ought not to have been given any ecclesiastical position of honor, and nevertheless contrary to the canonical definitions has been accepted to such a position, therefore, also does he so much the worse rage against them who by consecrating (ordaining) him have transgressed those definitions. But we do not marvel concerning God, who for your chastisement has hitherto endured his tyranny, or concerning himself, (Sverre), whose evil and stiff-necked spirit is not able to desist from sin, but concerning those who in fool-hardy and impudent unholiness venture to follow this apostate and insolent (skjaendige) violator of things sacred, yea (those who) favor and help him, although they ought rather use their powers to persecute his tyranny. But though commands have often gone out from the apostolic chair to restrain his cunning, it has nevertheless hitherto not been possible to bridle his wickedness, since some to the detriment of their souls still hold fast to him and by their help he is still able to remain a part of Norway, where he surpasses the North wind (Emperor Henry VI of Germany) himself in severity. 82

Such is the language of the great church leader. It reveals Innocent to be what he was -- a powerful politician, and not primarily a theologian. At that time such language

81 Fredrik Paasche, Kong Sverre (Oslo, 1948), p. 192 - 194.

82 Overland, O.A., Illustret Norges Historie (Kristiana, 1889, Vol. III, pp 289f.

was more common than today, however, and we must take that into consideration. Nevertheless, one would have to search a long time to find such vituperative and abusive language in either The Saga of King Sverre or in The Speech Against the Bishops, for both of which Sverre was at least partly responsible.

It is significant that Innocent also rebukes the clergy of Norway along with the rest of the people, and maintains that God punished the people for their sins by having Sverre rule over them. He also specifically takes those to task who had ordained such a person, illegitimate at that, as a priest. Then after his denunciation of Sverre, he states that Sverre is even worse than the "North Wind", namely Emperor Henry VI of Germany.

Later in the same letter, he announces the excommunication to Sverre, and warns the people to renounce their allegiance to their king. If they do not do so, he will place the country under the interdict. He says:

In order that his wickedness shall no longer rage against those who are innocent, we command you each and all to admonish the Norwegian people most carefully that it must be understood that they must no longer follow him or yield him any help and assistance. Otherwise you shall declare all those who do not heed this warning to be excommunicated, you shall close the churches and in that entire part of Norway which obeys him, you shall not administer any of the sacraments of the church except infant baptism and the confession of those who are dying, just as you shall also deny his adherents Christian (Kirkelig) burial at their decease.⁸³

There Innocent defined the interdict which he actually did place upon Norway. This pronouncement had a tremendous effect upon the bishops of Norway. "None of the bishops dared any longer remain loyal, and an opportunity was given, not only those who were at heart disloyal, but all the indifferent and faint-hearted to sever their allegiance."⁸⁴ However, as we shall see below, there were those who stood by Sverre.

As stated above, Innocent wrote five letters to people of prominence in the Scandinavian countries in which he condemned Sverre. The one quoted above in part was to the archbishop, bishops and prelates in Norway. Another was to Archbishop Erik alone. A third letter was to the King of Denmark, a fourth to the King of Sweden, and a fifth to Jari Birger Brosa, to whom Sverre had gone during Christmas that time some twenty years earlier. Innocent hoped that all of those rulers would take definite action against Sverre. In that matter Innocent was disappointed, for all three of the men to whom he wrote letters were friendly to Sverre. In fact, if Sverre really was the son of Sigurd Mouth, he was in some way related to all three, if not by blood then by marriage. Furthermore, at that particular period of Scandinavian history, the relations between the three countries were amicable, and none of the rulers was desirous of stirring up trouble.

It must be borne in mind that Sverre at this time was engaged in a war at home. The Bagler and the Birkebeiner were fighting a war which may roughly be compared to the

83 Loc. cit.

84 Knut Gjerset, History of the Norwegian People, (New York, 1915), I, p. 398

Guelph (Wolf) and the Ghibelline struggle in Germany and Italy, except for the fact that in the case of Norway it was not the clergy against the nobility, but it was the clergy and the nobility (Bagler) against Sverre and the common people (Birkebeiner). When one considers the fact that in addition to that serious war Sverre was now placed under excommunication and the people who adhered to his party were threatened with the interdict in addition to excommunication, one wonders that Sverre did not completely break.

Sverre did, however, have the Birkebeiner to carry on his cause. He also had many others who did not belong to that class. Even a large number of the lower clergy remained faithful to him under the great difficulty.

The fact that the lower clergy as a class tended to side with Sverre undoubtedly played a very important role in enabling him to stand up against Pope Innocent. The ideas of the lower clergy in matters of church and state were traditional. Sverre built on those traditions. The universal-church ideas opposed their chief interests both personally and as a class. ⁸⁵

In the words of Paasche,

During the conflict with the papacy the ruler (Sverre) to a great extent received help from the ecclesiastics in his own country. He received it because "the freedom of the church" early revealed itself to be a two-edged sword. Indeed the watchword made it (the church) free from the king, but at the same time, more and more expressly, it laid the whole freedom into the hands of the Pope. And many of the church's men preferred the power of the king, even if it came with "gammel landsrett" as a consequence, to a church power which through and through was the power of Rome. ⁸⁶

Cederschiold gives the following reasons why the threats of Innocent III did not carry in Norway:

1. The Norwegian church was not very closely patterned after the churches in other countries, and was still rather closely tied to the state.
2. There was little difference at the time between the clergy and the laity in Norway.
 - a. The higher clergy were very similar to the aristocrats and the nobility.
 - b. The lower clergy were much like the citizens (borgers) and peasants (bonder).
 - c. Celibacy was in general confined to monastics, and was not enforced upon the secular clergy. ⁸⁷

85. Bull, op. cit., p. 240.

86. Paasche, op. cit., p. 226.

87. Cederschiold, op. cit., pp. 132f.

To that we can add a third very important reason for the lack of success of Innocent's threats: Sverre himself was not only a brave and skillful general and leader of men. He was also a wise and prudent ruler. Furthermore, he was a learned man, well versed in both religion and law, in fact both an ecclesiastic and a king himself. Through and through Sverre was the leader. He served to keep up the spirits and morale of his followers. At times he had to talk sternly to his men, and severely rebuke them. It was he who had to inspire and lead his men, not vice versa. In the darkest hour he appealed to his people, and there were many who took his part. Also, with the aid of another man who did the actual writing he expressed his views and answered his opponents' arguments. We shall now briefly consider his answer, the well-known Speech Against the Bishops.

(To Be Continued)

R. E. Honsey

DR. F. PIEPER ON "DOCTRINAL DISCIPLINE"

Translated from Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches by Prof. M. H. Otto

Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches in Lehre und Wehre. Vol. 36, 1890, Aug. issue, p. 262 ff.

The Missouri Synod and the General Council. Under the title "Out of America" a reporter for the Luthardt church-paper announces that the old feud between the Council and the Missouri Synod "has in recent times again developed two foci where all is in flames." * He meant the Emigrant-house affair and the controversy brought on by the Grosse book. In the Emigrant-house affair he granted that the Missourians were right, remarking, "They could undoubtedly have proceeded more gently, but that is not their trait, and, as a rule also not the most practical...."

In the second affair the reporter stands on the side of the Council. And this has a two-fold basis. For one thing, there exists a great difference in principle between him and Missouri in regard to the question when a church-body is to be held responsible for the aberrations of individual members: for another, he is poorly informed on the pertinent facts. With respect to what concerns the first point, he writes, "He (Grosse) selects excerpts out of the private writings of individual fellowmembers of the Council and throws that up to the Council as its false doctrine. It is true that the Council in an irresponsible way lets its leading men teach and write what they wish, without rapping them on the fingers. One is justified in confronting the Council with this indifference and lack of discipline; but the sins of individual members are not quite also the sins of the corporation. IT is known that Dr. Seisz of Philadelphia, one of the leaders of the Americans in the Council, most recently the successor of its President Dr. Spaeth, is

* C. Johannes Grosse published a book in 1889 which highlighted the difference among Lutherans at that time and which called the General Council a church body which tolerated false doctrines on a number of points. Published by Concordia-Verlag, St. Louis, the present day CPH. -- M.H.O.

an out and out Chiliast. This chiliasm of Seisz, Grosse ascribes to the Council."

Here we must note the following: It is by no means our custom at once to impute the sins, specifically doctrinal sins, of individual members to the whole body, but we do it then first when the church-body makes the sins of the individuals its own by remaining silent concerning them, that is, does not take into discipline the people who promulgate false doctrine by word and pen but lets them go on undisturbed. This, however, ^{is} the case with the Council, as the reporter himself admits when he writes, "It is true that the Council in an irresponsible way lets its leading men teach and write what they wish, without rapping them on the fingers." And because this is so, we Missourians have maintained and still maintain that the Council has made itself partaker of the doctrinal sins of its individual members and must, according to all that God's Word says on this point, be held responsible.

With the former admission the reporter has actually justified us Missourians in our judgment concerning the Council. To be sure the reporter refers to the "official" confession of the General Council, which is correct. There we again confess that we Missourians do not judge a body by the doctrine which according to the official *****
* ** Confession should be there but by the doctrine which actually and unopposed sounds forth within a body. We hold that one would otherwise finally have to regard every sect as orthodox, if it on the grounds of expediency chose to profess the confession of the orthodox church. If the reporter does not want to hold the Council accountable for the false teachings of its individual members, although it "in an irresponsible way lets its leading men teach and write what they wish, without rapping them on the fingers", then there is no sin at all against which Scripture warns with the words, "neither be partaker of other men's sins." (I Tim. 5, 22)

The Missouri view is therefore this: As unfair and unjust as it would be to impute false doctrine to a body which practises doctrinal discipline and according to God's Word seeks to put away the emerging false teachings of individual members,* so fair and just it is, and demanded by God's Word, to do just that when a body lets its individual members, and now even its leading men, "say what they wish." We Missourians hold a church-body, as a body, orthodox only then when the true doctrine resounds from all the pulpits and lecture desks of the same, and in all the writings which reach the public from within the body, every false doctrine, however, being removed in the divinely ordained way as soon as it comes to the surface. By this standard we judge others; by this standard we also want to have ourselves judged. We Missourians must and want to con-

* The same finds its application in church practice. Thus a notice recently made the rounds in publications hostile to us that a new congregation of the Missouri Synod in Portland, Oregon, promoted an excursion with a dance. The papers themselves in part note that Missouri does not tolerate such a thing. Nevertheless this incident is ascribed to the Synod with malicious remarks. One publication notes, "Swing your whip here, you lords from St. Louis." The observation comes too late. The investigation of this case has been instituted long ago. Thus our opponents are those, who contrary to all divine and human right, charge the body with the sins of individuals.

sent to this that one judge us by that doctrine which is espoused by our individual pastors, be it in San Francisco or New York, St. Paul or New Orleans, or that in our publications, whether they come before the public officially or unofficially. If it were shown us that only one pastor preached false doctrine or only one periodical served the interests of false teaching, and we were not to put away the false doctrine, we would therewith have ceased to be an orthodox Synod and would have become a unionistic communion. In brief, the distinguishing mark of an orthodox body is that throughout the same the right doctrine not only has official acceptance but actually holds sway.

Upon that rests our whole church practice. We, for example, release members from our St. Louis congregations to our sister congregations in San Francisco without any hesitation; but that happens only because we know that the released members find the pure doctrine in all respects in these congregations. On the same supposition other congregations release their members to the St. Louis congregations. This unhesitating release of members to other congregations of our communion would, however, be conscienceless if we could not take for granted that the pure doctrine sounds forth from all the pulpits within the Synodical Conference. If we were to define an orthodox body differently, if we were to say: it does not depend on the actually prevailing but only on the officially accepted teaching; - if we held that it were sufficient when (perhaps) the majority of pastors promulgated pure doctrine, we would already have given up the distinction between orthodox churches and unionistic communions, and we would be deceiving orthodox Christians if we directed them without hesitation to affiliate with any one of our congregations.

Perhaps, the reporter says, these are Utopian ideas of unity in doctrine; such a unity is impossible. Such a unity can by the grace of God be preserved only then if the study of doctrine is continually pursued at pastoral conferences and in synodical conventions, and possible rising doubts and differences of opinion are constantly brought to light and removed by God's Word. So much on what Missourians understand by doctrinal discipline and why they ascribe teachings publicly tolerated in the Council to the whole body...

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE STATE OF THE CHURCH CONFERENCE (MISSOURI SYNOD) MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN, MAY 15 - 16, 1961 (unofficial copy)

BRIEF STATEMENT

RESOLUTION # 1

WHEREAS, in its Constitution adopted in 1847 Synod established its confessional standard: Article II namely:

Synod, and every member of Synod, accepts without reservation:

1. The Scriptures of the Old and the New Testament as the written Word of God and the only rule and norm of faith and practice,
2. All the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church as a true and unadulterated statement and exposition of the Word of God, to wit: the three Ecumenical Creeds (the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Athanasian Creed), the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles, the Large Catechism of Luther and the Formula of

Concord, and

WHEREAS, in the year 1894 and again in 1956 Synod reaffirmed its confessional stand-
ard in its Articles of Incorporation; Article II - Objects:

- a. To unite in a corporate body the members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church who acknowledge and remain true to the Book of Concord of the year of our Lord 1580 as a true exhibition of sound Christian doctrine; and

WHEREAS, Synod adopted the Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Missouri Synod in 1932, and explicitly declared that it correctly presents the doctrine of Holy Scripture and the Confessions:

in 1941, "...we do not mean to dispense with any doctrinal statement made in our Brief Statement, - for we believe that it correctly expresses the doctrinal position of our Synod...Unanimously adopted" (Proceedings 1941, 304 f.)

in 1947 "...That our Synod again declared that the Brief Statement correctly expresses its doctrinal position." "It was resolved that the Brief Statement, adopted by Synod...in 1932, be incorporated in the official Proceedings of this convention." (Proc. 1947, 476). Report of Committee on Doctrinal Matters:...Synod has again declared its doctrinal position by unanimously re-affirming its loyalty to the Holy Scriptures, the Lutheran Confessions, and the Brief Statement," (P. 524.)

in 1956 "...That we reject any and every interpretation of documents approved by Synod which would be in disagreement with the Holy Scriptures, the Lutheran Confessions, and the Brief Statement," (proc. 1956, 546):

WHEREAS, The Pastors, teachers, and professors of Synod at the Time of their ordination and installation pledge themselves to be faithful to the Holy Scriptures and to the Lutheran Confessions (... "solemnly pledge to the Scriptures as the inspired and inerrant Word of God and to the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church as a true exposition of the Scriptures...") therefore be it

Resolved, That the State of the Church Conference memorialize Synod in Convention assembled in 1962 to amend Article II of the Constitution of The Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod by adding the following:

3. The Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Missouri Synod, as a true and unadulterated statement and exposition of the Word of God.

and instruct and direct the appropriate officers, upon adoption of this amendment as provided in the Constitution, to make all necessary changes or additions in other articles of the Constitution, in its By-Laws, in Synod's books of forms, and in its Articles of Incorporation to bring them into consonance with the amendment,

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That all congregations, pastors, and teachers be urged likewise to submit this memorial to the 1962 Synodical Convention and to devote their efforts to securing its adoption.

CORRECTION OF ERROR

RESOLUTION #2

WHEREAS, Some members of Synod have publicly challenged or denied such teachings of Scripture as these:

- 1) That the early Old Testament patriarchs knew and believed that there is only one God and that He is Triune.
- 2) That Holy Scripture is in all its parts and Words the revealed Word of God, factually precise and infallible;
- 3) That there will be a resurrection of the flesh and that the soul continues its existence after death;
- 4) That orthodoxy is attainable in this life; and

WHEREAS, Such challenges or denials of Holy Scripture's clear teaching have not been corrected and repudiated up to this time; therefore be it

Resolved That the State of the Church Conference fervently pray that the Lord of the Church will still in mercy lead our Synod in faithfulness to His Word and give wisdom and strength to our Synodical officers to conserve the pure teaching of Holy Writ; and be it further;

Resolved, That this conference request the 1963 Synodical Conference

- A. To direct all officers, boards, and committees to whom Synod has delegated responsibility for doctrinal supervision (Constitution, Art. XI, B, 1-3 Art. XII, 6-8; By-Laws 4, 101, 5.23 5.25, 6.39a, 6.75, 6.83, 6.165a, 11.23a) faithfully and diligently to discharge their duties to maintain Synod's doctrinal standard, Const. Art II; and
- B. Likewise to direct the officers responsible for carrying out the directives cited promptly to secure the retraction, because of the errors they contain, of the articles and essays "God Is One" (Luth. Quarterly, Aug. 1959), "The Bible As Record, Witness and Medium (N. III., April 1959). "Revelation and Inspiration" (Western District, Oct. 1959), "Resurrection of the Body and Immortality of of the Soul" (Seminarian, March 1958), and such other articles, and public teaching as have been and need to be protested against, on valid Scriptural grounds; and that, if such retractions are refused, the officers proceed without delay to apply the Synodical discipline prescribed in the By-Laws cited; and be it further

Resolved, That all congregations, Pastors, and teachers be urged likewise to submit this memorial to the 1962 Synodical Convention and to devote their efforts to securing its adoption.

MATTHEW 18

RESOLUTION # 3

WHEREAS, Our Lord has specifically committed to each congregation of Christians the duty and authority to carry to conclusion the steps of discipline set forth in Matt. 18, and has accorded no such authority to others; and

WHEREAS, On the other hand, Synod is a confessional organization which has the right to establish standards of membership in it and has the duty to its members to enforce those criteria of fellowship; and

WHEREAS, Scripture clearly teaches in 1 Tim. 5:20 and Gal. 2:11 14 that in instances of public sin public rebuke is in order; therefore be it

Resolved, that

- 1) We recognize that there is a distinction between congregation discipline (Matt. 18) and the discipline properly exercised by a synodical body for the maintenance of the confessional standard upon which membership is conditioned;
- 2) It is not Scripturally legitimate to require the application of the first two steps of Matt. 18 in the case of public sin within a congregation or in the application of synodical discipline to instances of public error;
- 3) We reject appeals to a vague and formless "law of love" unsupported by clear Scripture, and we maintain that the use of such appeals is not permissible to justify failure to practice truly evangelical synodical discipline;
- 4) We hold that it is the responsibility of officers of Synod to carry out synodical discipline in accord with the Constitution, Articles III, 1.8, VI, XI, XII; and be it further.

Resolved, That we prayerfully petition Synod in its 1962 convention to reiterate its agreement with the principles set forth above; and be it further

Resolved, That all congregations, pastors, and teachers be urged likewise to submit this memorial to the 1962 Synodical Convention and to devote their efforts to securing its adoption.

THE THEOLOGY OF FELLOWSHIP

RESOLUTION # 4

WHEREAS, in such passages as Matt. 7:15; Rom. 16:17, Titus 3:10; 2 John 9-11; 1 Tim. 6:3-5; 2Thes. 3:14; 2Cor. 6:14-17 Holy Scripture in broad, inclusive terms forbids church fellowship with individuals and groups who hold to error; and

Whereas, The Lutheran Confessions speak in the same fashion (Smalcald Articles, Trig, 516; Formula of Concord Trig, 1061); and

Whereas, Our Synod has so understood and applied these passages and has repeatedly recognized and declared that they apply to pulpit, altar, and prayer-fellowship.

(Cf e.g., Dr. Schwan, Syn. Proc. 1867: "Accordingly, unity in faith is an absolutely indispensable prerequisite for church fellowship." Syn Proc. 1881, 31: "We tell everyone who champions a different doctrine among us..." We do not belong together... We can no longer walk together. Hence, we can no longer pray together." Brief Statement 1932: "We repudiate unionism, that is church-fellowship with the adherents of false doctrine." St. Louis Faculty Opinion on Prayer-Fellowship, 1941" "All texts in which we are warned against false teachers and their false doctrines, as Jer. 23:31-32; Matt. 7:15; Rom. 16:17; Col. 1:8, 20-22; 2 Tim. 4:2-4; 1 John 4:1, forbid pulpit-fellowship, altar-fellowship, and prayer-fellowship with the heterodox." Proc. 1941, 303 "...it is understood that no pulpit, altar, or prayer-fellowship has been established between us and the American Lutheran Church,; and

WHEREAS, "The Theology of Fellowship," prepared by a committee within the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, in Part II limits the scope and applicability of a number of the aforementioned passages without Scriptural warrant and proposes a novel exposition of

some (cf. p. 40, "false prophets...are men who falsely claim to be prophets, that is inspired (emphasis added) - spokesmen for God"; doctrine...cannot be simply equated with any formal system of doctrine or with any individual unit of such a system (emphasis added) p.45 on Rom. 16:17-18; Matt. 7:15; and

WHEREAS, The Document denies the specific applicability of any passage of Scripture to an erring group p. 41, "The Apostolic indicatives and imperatives cannot be automatically transferred to present-day confessional-organizational groups. Rather, their intent must be faithfully understood and brought to bear on the altered and complex contemporary situation"; and

WHEREAS, The document replaces the clear objective injunctions of God's Word, which make the practice of fellowship dependent on unity in correct confession, with a procedure that requires the ability to read hearts and to determine spiritual status apart from the confession made (P. 42); and

WHEREAS, The document repeatedly disparages "confessional-organizational forms of fellowship" , e.g. .

P. 42: "They should not be treated as absolutes, that is, defining with divinely ordained and final authority the limits within which Christian fellowship may be exercised and beyond which it dare not go." They (Matt. 7:15; Rom. 16:17-18) must not, however, be applied to Christians in a confession-organizational fellowship other than one's own. "

and thus, in effect nullifies Synod's Constitution, Articles II (Confession), III; I (Objects) and VI (Conditions of Membership) and eliminates a basic reason for the existence and continuance of a confessional synodical fellowship; and

WHEREAS, The document makes the permissibility of joint prayer contingent, for example, on probabilities ("probable effect", p. 45) and thus again, without Scriptural warrant, sets man's subjective judgment and guess as to probabilities over against the plain commands of God's Word; and

WHEREAS, The document in many places employs vague terminology; and

WHEREAS, The document, p. 46, 2, in substance employs the reasoning that the end justifies the means; and

WHEREAS, The tenor of the document is to remove all objective Scriptural criteria for church-fellowship, and to make its practice dependent, in reality, on a subjective evaluation or Scripture's spirit in general' and upon men's philosophizings' and rationalizations; and

WHEREAS, The document in effect constitutes a repudiation of Synod's historic Scriptural position; therefore be it

- 1) Resolved, That the State of the Church Conference holds "The Theology of Fellowship" to be unsupported by Scripture and therefore rejects it; and be it furthermore
- 2) Resolved, That this free conference ask the 1962 Synodical Convention to re-

pudiate the document for the reasons noted; and be it further

- 3) Resolved, That the officers of this conference be instructed to transmit a copy of these resolutions of "The Theology of Fellowship" to the President of the Synodical Conference, to Pres. Behnken, immediately, for presentation to its convention in the next days; and be it further
- 4) Resolved, That all congregations, pastors, and teachers be urged likewise to submit this memorial to the 1962 Synodical Convention and to devote their efforts to securing its adoption.

FORM AND FUNCTION OF SCRIPTURE

RESOLUTION # 5

WHEREAS, Synod and we members of Synod hold and confess that the Holy Scriptures are verbally inspired, "in all their parts and words the infallible truth" (Brief Statement, 1); and

WHEREAS, The language of "A Statement on the Form and Function of the Holy Scriptures, adopted by the St. Louis Seminary faculty, is so imprecise and capable of erroneous interpretation, e.g. (emphases added),

- 1) "The authors...chosen and inspired", Lutheran theologians have regularly pointed out that Scripture speaks of the fact that the words, not men, are "God'-breathed, " inspired.)
- 2) "...they record what God said and did in and through the historical events as they present them. In their words God discloses himself..." (This does not inescapably declare that the words written by these men are infallible.)
- 3) "These human inspired words give men knowledge of the mind and work of God. (Same objection. Why this curious "human inspired"?)
- 4) "The Scriptures express what God wants them to say and accomplish what God wants them to do. In this sense and in the fulfillment of this function they are inerrant, infallible, and wholly reliable. Their truthfulness, their infallibility as the only rule of faith and practise..." (As far as they go these statements may be understood correctly, but they do not unmistakably include confession that the Holy Scriptures are "in all their parts and words the infallible truth, also in those parts which treat of historical, geographical, and other secular matters," Brief Statement).
- 5) "God Himself has spoken in the inspired words of the Scriptures." (This statement does not include all of the words of Scripture); and

WHEREAS, It is the notorious practice of liberals to seize upon and use ambiguous phrases as a justification and cloak for their refusal to confess that Scripture in all its parts and words is inerrant and infallible, and phrases of this "Statement" could be used for that purpose; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the State of the Church Conference memorialize the 1962 Synodical Convention to declare that "A statement on the Form and Function of the Holy Scriptures" is not acceptable because of its lack of clarity and dubious expressions; and be it further

RESOLVED, That all congregations, pastors, and teachers be urged likewise to submit

this memorial to the 1962 Synodical Convention and to devote their efforts to securing its adoption.

PUBLICATIONS OUT OF PRINT

RESOLUTION # 6

WHEREAS, There is much doctrinal confusion in our times, and attacks on Scripture are ever increasing; and

WHEREAS, Many of the eminent orthodox theological publications of our Church are no longer in print and are eagerly sought by both clergy and laity; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

This conference urge Synod in its 1962 convention to instruct our publishing house to make available Outlines of Doctrinal Theology, A.L. Graebner, Walther's 1958 essay. Why are the Symbolical Books of Our Church to Be Subscribed Unconditionally By Those Who Wish to Be Its Servants? Scripture, Cannot be Broken and Reason and Revelation by Theodore Engelder, and the Concordia Triglotta with its Historical Introduction; and be it furthermore

Resolved, That all congregations, pastors, and teachers be urged likewise to submit this memorial to the 1962 Synodical Convention and to devote their efforts to securing its adoption.

LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION AND
NATIONAL LUTHERAN COUNCIL

RESOLUTION # 7

WHEREAS, Both the Lutheran World Federation and the National Lutheran Council are unionistic in character and work, and embrace groups that are not in doctrinal agreement with the Missouri Synod; and

WHEREAS, Both organizations are addicted to an emphasis on "social gospel;" therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, THAT

The 1962 Synodical Convention be requested to direct Synod's officers to sever all connections involving worship or joint religious work which Synod or any of its subsidiary agencies may have with either organization and to avoid any such ties as long as the organizations mentioned maintain their present position and activity; and be it further

Resolved, That all congregations, pastors, and teachers be urged likewise to submit this memorial to the 1962 Synodical Convention and to devote their efforts to securing its adoption.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES AND
THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

RESOLUTION # 8

WHEREAS, The National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches hold and advocate doctrines and practices contrary to Synod's stated position and

WHEREAS, Evidence is at hand that some in leading positions in these organizations have lent their support, wittingly or unwittingly, to ideologies and movements that threaten to destroy our God-given freedom as a nation; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, THAT

The State of the Church Conference memorialize Synod's 1962 convention

- 1) To direct individual members and subsidiary bodies of Synod now associated with the National Council of Churches or the World Council to sever such connections immediately, and
- 2) By resolution to record its stand against the position and practise of the National Council and the World Council; and be it further

Resolved, That all congregations, pastors, and teachers be urged likewise to submit this memorial to the 1962 Synodical Convention and to devote their efforts to securing its adoption.

COMMUNISM

RESOLUTION # 9

WHEREAS, Communism has declared itself and is known to be militantly opposed to Christianity and subversive of the principles upon which our nation was founded; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, THAT

The State of the Church conference petition Synod

- 1) To instruct the Board for Higher Education to direct the teachers of social sciences in Synod's institutions to instruct their pupils as to the destructive character and tactics of the communist and related ideologies; and
- 2) To instruct the appropriate department or board of Synod to compile and publish for our congregations a list of competent lecturers on the evils of Communism and related ideologies; and be it further

Resolved, That all congregations, pastors, and teachers be urged likewise to submit this memorial to the 1962 Synodical Convention and to devote their efforts to securing its adoption.

BIBLE TRANSLATIONS AND PARAPHRASES

RESOLUTION # 10
(Revised)

WHEREAS, Each congregation has and retains the right to determine the orthodox books of worship and instruction to be used in its midst; and

WHEREAS, Much study and evaluation of the multiplying new Bible translations and paraphrases is still needed; and

WHEREAS, We find the King James Version of Scripture still to be the most fluent and doctrinally faithful translation we have, and that its language continues unmatched in beauty and majesty; and

WHEREAS, None of the present modern translations is adequate in accuracy and language

to serve as a Bible text in a catechism, Bible history, or other material of our Church, and

WHEREAS, Our Christians should have a Bible which is in their own language and in which they can trust every word from cover to cover; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

The State of the Church Conference memorialize the 1962 Synodical Convention

- 1) That we direct that all statements in Synod's official publications regarding Bible translations and paraphrases be confined to objective analyses, and that synodical agencies refrain from propoganda for a particular version, especially for the Revised Standard Version; and
- 2) That we do not use the Revised Standard Version or other modern translations, which by their errors are disqualified from becoming the Bible of our Church, in our catechism, Bible history, liturgy, or instructional materials but await the production of an accurate modern Bible for the use of our Church; and
- 3) That we encourage Synod's pastors, teachers, and lay people to work for a Bible that is accurate and in the language of the people and urge our Christian scholars to cooperate in producing such a Bible; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of this Free Conference urge our brethren in the Church meanwhile to continue to use the King James Version in public instruction and worship; and be it further

Resolved, That all congregations, pastors, and teachers be urged likewise to submit this memorial to the 1962 Synodical Convention and to devote their efforts to securing its adoption.

VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY

RESOLUTION # 11

WHEREAS, Valparaiso University presents itself as a Lutheran University serving the needs of our Church, and students, parents, and contributors alike therefore expect that the teaching and publications of such an institution will be in accord with the doctrinal position of Synod; and

WHEREAS, Valparaiso University receives large contributions from Synod-wide solicitation of funds authorized by the Board of Directors of Synod; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, THAT

We petition the 1962 Synodical Convention to direct Synod's Presidium and Board of Directors

- 1) To call upon the university to conform its teaching and publications (both faculty and student) to the doctrinal position of Synod; and
- 2) If the university cannot or will not do so, to refrain from authorizing further Synod-wide solicitation of funds for the school; and be it further

Resolved, That all Congregations, Pastors, and Teachers be urged likewise to submit this memorial to the 1962 Synodical Convention and to devote their efforts to securing its adoption.

CONTINUATION OF CONFERENCE OBJECTIVES

RESOLUTION # 12

WHEREAS, There is evident need for this conference and for the continuation of its work and objectives; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED:

- A. That the Executive Board, Conference, Offices, and Invitational Committee continue their work by
 - 1) Directing the resolutions of the free conference to the appropriate officials and organizations of Synod, together with papers delivered at this conference which pertain thereto;
 - 2) Calling further meetings and conferences;
 - 3) Appointing area representatives to establish discussion groups for study and information on vital doctrinal matters confronting our church;
- B. That all registered members of this free conference and others of like mind be urged to volunteer their talents, time, and support for the furtherance of this work;
- C. That the executive officers of the conference study the feasibility of publishing a journal of theology to disseminate the essays here presented and similar material for the preservation of the pure Word, as it has been confessed historically in Synod's theological position.

THANKS

RESOLUTION # 13

BE IT RESOLVED, THAT

- A. The Conference thank the essayists for giving so generously of their time and talents in order to present and preserve the sound Scriptural position upon which our Church was founded and flourished;
- B. The Conference thank all officers and committees for the excellent work that made this free conference possible;
- C. The Conference especially thank our chairman and moderator, the Reverend C. A. MacKenzie for his able service in that capacity.

The Resolutions on Church Union Matters
Adopted by
The Thirty-Sixth Biennial Convention
of the Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod
Assembled at Wisconsin Lutheran High School
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
August 8-17, 1961

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Men and Brethren:

In fear and love toward God, with a deep sense of the awesome responsibility resting upon us, with concern for the souls bought with the blood of God's own Son and already given or yet to be given into our care, with a like concern for the spiritual health and welfare of our sister synod, the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, in the attitude of men who each Sunday publicly implore their God and Savior "increase...in us true obedience to Thy Word," with hearts from which we have sought to banish the legalism which delights in sitting in judgment on others--in this spirit we have worked to furnish our report and now present it to you.

All our committee members but one have agreed to present this as our report to the Synod in convention. Pastor Hugo H. Hoenecke formally dissents from the majority opinion expressed in the report.

Yet truthfulness requires this to be said: The agreement mentioned above does not mean that all members of Committee No. 2 are in full accord with everything said in this report. Several expressed reservations, but did not wish to enter a formal dissent. Others did not express themselves. No pressure was exerted in the committee to secure such an expression. But all but one agreed that this is the report that ought to be presented to the Convention.

(Presented as a part of the entire report by unanimous
decision of Committee Number 2.)

REPORT OF THE FLOOR COMMITTEE NO. 2 ON DOCTRINAL MATTERS

RESOLUTION NO. 1

SUBJECT: The Report of the Commission on Doctrinal Matters.

- WHEREAS, The Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod has lodged many admonitions and protests with the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod during the past twenty years to win her from the path that leads to liberalism in doctrine and practice (Cf. Proceedings 1939..page 159; 1941..page 43f; 74ff; 1947..page 104ff; 114f; 1949..page 114ff; 1951..page 110ff; 1953.. page 95ff.); and
- WHEREAS, Our admonitions have largely gone unheeded, and the issues have remained unresolved; and
- WHEREAS, Many of the policies and practices which called forth our admonitions were in the field of fellowship; and
- WHEREAS, The 1959 Convention of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod therefore gave its Commission on Doctrinal Matters the directive "to continue and accelerate the discussions in the Joint Union Committees to bring about complete unity of doctrine and practice in the Synodical Conference to give primary consideration in their discussions to the area of fellowship...to continue its efforts in the Joint Union Committees until agreement can be brought about." (Wisconsin Synod Proceedings, 1959, p. 195); and
- WHEREAS, The Commission has faithfully carried out this directive but now regretfully reports that differences with respect to the Scriptural principles of church fellowship--differences which it holds to be divisive--have brought us to an impasse; and
- WHEREAS, Our Commission's Theses on Church Fellowship are not to be considered a formal confessional document. (Otherwise it would be advisable to expand them considerably, for instance, to preface them with the Doctrine of the Church, the Marks of the Church, etc. They were set up and used simply as a working document in the discussions of the Joint Doctrinal Committees. As such they were to express the Scriptural and historical principles of the teaching and practice of church fellowship held by the Synodical Conference.); and
- WHEREAS, The substance of these Theses is an expression of the Scriptural principles on which the Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod has stood and which have guided it in its practice for many years (Cf. FELLOWSHIP THEN AND NOW); and
- WHEREAS, In the Statement of the Overseas Committee, FELLOWSHIP IN ITS NECESSARY CONTEXT OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH, we have found nothing to warrant any modification of our position on church fellowship; and

REPORT -- FLOOR COMMITTEE NO. 2

DOCTRINAL MATTERS

Page 2

- WHEREAS, In the new forum suggested by the Overseas Committee and adopted by the Synodical Conference we see no avenue leading to the removal of the difference in regard to church fellowship principles which now exists between the Lutheran Church -- Missouri Synod and our Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod; and
- WHEREAS, The doctrine of the Church has not been slighted in the intersynodical discussions in the past (Cf. Synodical Conference Reports 1946), 1948, 1950, 1952, 1954); and
- WHEREAS, The Lutheran Church -- Missouri Synod has not retreated from the unscriptural position long held by it and also expressed in THE THEOLOGY OF FELLOWSHIP, Part II, but continues to defend that position and carries on fellowship practices which conform to that position (e.g. the two meetings with the National Lutheran Council on Co-operative activities, July 7-9, 1960 and November 18 and 19, 1960, with a third meeting to be held October 30-November 1, 1961; The National Lutheran Education Conference, Jan. 8-10, 1961; the Conference of Lutheran Professors of Theology, June 5-7, 1961 -- all of these including conference devotions); and
- WHEREAS, We recognize our sacred trust and the obligation to "contend for the faith once delivered unto the saints," and also to give vigorous testimony on Church Fellowship before the church and the world, be it
- RESOLVED: a) That we now suspend fellowship with the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod on the basis of Romans 16:17-18 With the hope and prayer to God that the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod will hear in this resolution an evangelical summons to "come to herself" (Luke 15:17) and to return to the sister from whom she has estranged herself; and be it further
- RESOLVED: b) That under conditions which do not imply a denial of our previous testimony we stand ready to resume discussions with the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod with the aim of reestablishing unity of doctrine and practice and of restoring fellowship relations, these discussions to be conducted outside the framework of fellowship; and be it further
- RESOLVED c) That we are not passing judgment on the personal faith of any individual member of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, but that we are addressing the stern admonition required by love to the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod as a corporate body; and be it further

Footnotes.....*The word "suspend" as used in the resolution has all the finality of termination during the duration of the suspension, but contains the hope that contains the hope that conditions might some day warrant the reestablishment of fellowship. ** "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple."

REPORT -- FLOOR COMMITTEE NO. 2

DOCTRINAL MATTERS

page 3

- RESOLVED: d) That we are ready to continue our support of the joint projects carried on by the Synodical Conference and by groups within the Synodical Conference until we can adjust to the new conditions brought about by the suspension of fellowship with the Lutheran Church -- Missouri Synod; and be it further
- RESOLVED: e) That we call upon all our members to manifest the understanding, consideration, and patience of love during this period of change and adjustment. (We also direct attention to the fact that this Convention has already taken note of the problems that will arise and has approved a study committee that would supply helpful counsel and guidance. See the Report of Committee No. 4, Resolution 2.) and be it further
- RESOLVED: f) That the action taken in our resolution of suspension does not apply to our fellowship relations with the Evangelical Lutheran Synod, the Synod of Evangelical Lutheran Churches, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Australia, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of England, the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church (Evangelisch-Lutherische Freikirche), the Evangelical Lutheran (Old Lutheran) Church (Evangelisch-Lutherische altlutherische Kirche), and the Igreja Evangelica Luterana do Brasil, as well as any other church bodies outside the Synodical Conference with whom we have been in fellowship; and be it further
- RESOLVED: g) That we declare our desire to discuss the principles of church fellowship further with the church bodies that were represented by the members of the Overseas Committee, and that we initiate such steps as might be necessary to carry out such further discussions; and be it further
- RESOLVED: h) That we encourage all who are of a like mind with us in this matter to identify themselves with us in supporting the Scriptural historical position of the Synodical Conference; and be it further
- RESOLVED: i) That the president of our Synod transmit copies of this report to the president of the Lutheran Church -- Missouri Synod, to the presidents of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod and of the Synod of Evangelical Lutheran Churches, and to the president of the Synodical Conference; and be it finally
- RESOLVED: j) That the resolutions adopted by this Convention constitute our answer to the letters and memorials which we have received on this matter.

W. Franzmann, Chairman
V. Weyland, Secretary

THE RESOLUTION AS ADOPTED

Oscar J. Naumann
President

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED REGARDING DOCTRINAL MATTERS

The 44th Regular Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod
Bethany Lutheran College, Mankato, Minnesota

August 22-27, 1961

I.

WHEREAS, The position taken by the theological faculties and the Doctrinal Committee of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod on the doctrine of Fellowship, as expressed in "The Theology of Fellowship, Part II, " all but rules out the application of Matt. 7, 15-16; Romans 16, 17-18; Titus 3, 10; etc. so far as the church today is concerned, and fails to state clearly the principle that church fellowship is exercised here on earth between Christians on the basis of their confession to the pure marks of the Church (means of grace - Word and Sacraments), as is stated in several ways in the presentations of the Overseas Brethren and the other synods of the Synodical Conference;

WHEREAS, The presentation of the theological faculty of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, "A Statement on the Form and Function of the Holy Scriptures," excerpts of which appeared in the Lutheran Witness, April 4, 1961, ("The Scriptures express what God wants them to say and accomplish what God wants them to do. In this sense and in the fulfillment of this function they are inerrant, infallible, and wholly reliable") is, to say the least, extremely unclear and does not include a clearcut confession of the fact that the Holy Scriptures are, to quote the Brief Statement, "in all their parts and words the infallible truth, also in those parts which treat of historical, geographical, and other secular matters, John 10, 35," which presentation gives us great concern regarding the position of that seminary faculty towards Scripture;

WHEREAS, Despite the fact that we have been informed that official Synodical discipline is being practised within the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod, nevertheless gross error publicly promulgated goes publicly unrepudiated, I Tim. 5, 17-20;

WHEREAS, It is the announced intention of the Doctrinal Committee of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod to meet again with the National Lutheran Council, thus rejecting the plea of the Synodical Conference; be it

1. RESOLVED, That with deep sorrow we, on the basis of Romans 16, 17, reaffirm our act of suspension of fellowship relations with the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod, which to us, as to our Brethren of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, means "terminate", and also with them entertains the hope that conditions might some day warrant the re-establishment of fellowship.

II.

WHEREAS, The fact that we together with the other synods of the Lutheran Synodical Conference have not been able to prevail upon the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod to maintain and uphold a doctrine and practice in its midst that is in conformity with the orthodox confessional standards of the Lutheran Synodical Conference;

WHEREAS, The Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod also has suspended fellowship with the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod; be it further

2. RESOLVED, That the Evangelical Lutheran Synod declare that, as matters now stand, by its membership in the Lutheran Synodical Conference, it is not expressing and con-

fessing a unity of spirit existing among the constituent synods.

III.

WHEREAS, It is evident that the Lutheran Synodical Conference is no longer functioning according to the prime purposes stated in its Constitution, and its existence, as its membership is presently constituted, is no longer truthful; be it

3. RESOLVED, That the Evangelical Lutheran Synod direct a memorial to the 1962 convention of the Lutheran Synodical Conference to institute measures to dissolve the Lutheran Synodical Conference; and be it further

4. RESOLVED, That we are ready to continue our support of the joint projects carried on by the Lutheran Synodical Conference and by groups within the Lutheran Synodical Conference until we can adjust to the new conditions brought about by this present action.

IV.

WHEREAS, Conditions in the Lutheran Synodical Conference are such as to have made the action defined above necessary; and

WHEREAS, The official representatives of our Synod may be asked to take part in meetings of the Lutheran Synodical Conference during the interim; therefore be it

5. RESOLVED, That it is understood that the official representatives from our Synod do not meet in a fellowship framework in Lutheran Synodical Conference meetings where the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod participates.

V.

WHEREAS, It is our fervent prayer that the 1962 convention of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod will do something to change the situation which has prompted the above resolutions; be it

6. RESOLVED, That the officers of the Synod be instructed to schedule our 1962 convention during the time between the convention of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod and that of the Lutheran Synodical Conference; and be it further

7. RESOLVED, That our Synod send observers to the next convention of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod.

VI.

WHEREAS, We realize that there are many among those with whom we have had fellowship who stand with us in doctrine; and

WHEREAS, Our present action of terminating fellowship relations may be misunderstood by some; therefore be it

8. RESOLVED, That our resolutions do not pertain to or affect the fellowship relations that have heretofore existed between our Synod and the Synod of Evangelical Lutheran Churches (Slovak), the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, the National Evangelical Lutheran Church (Finnish), and the brethren from overseas who have all along been regarded as affiliated with us; and be it further

9. RESOLVED, That we in addition invite such others as agree with us to identify themselves with us in supporting our Scriptural position.

VII.

10. BE IT RESOLVED, That these resolutions be regarded as our answer to, and rejection of, resolution III of the 1961 Lutheran Synodical Conference recessed convention on Doctrinal Matters, asking that the presentations of the four synods on Fellowship be held in abeyance, that a new approach and effort be made, and a Doctrinal Commission of the Lutheran Synodical Conference be established.

VIII.

11. BE IT RESOLVED, That copies of these resolutions, be sent to the Lutheran Synodical Conference officials and to the presidents of the constituent synods of the Lutheran Synodical Conference.

IX.

WHEREAS, Various memorials from individuals and groups within the Synod have been addressed to this convention relative to these matters; be it

12. RESOLVED, That the resolutions adopted above shall be the Synod's answer to them all.

PIEPER'S DOGMATICS PUBLISHED IN FINNISH

Condensed edition of 1946

Reported by -

A. Aljal Uppala, Pastor
Free Lutheran Church, Finland

Small nations have their own natural limitations. This is especially apparent when we think of the smallest individual groups of a small nation. That which elsewhere is of a routine nature may to those in different circumstances be a wonder of God.

The first standard dogmatics in the Finnish language appeared as late as the year 1924 and only two other dogmatics have appeared since then. These dogmatics are not, however, Confessional Lutheran doctrinal presentations. The fact that the first standard dogmatics in the Finnish language appeared at such a late date can be explained by the fact that the main Western languages are studied in Finland's schools and therefore our universities also use textbooks in these languages. It should also be remembered that Swedish is still the second official language of Finland.

When theological liberalism prevailed generally in Finland (around the year 1919 for example), we thought that we alone would have to unearth the truly Lutheran theology. At that time we knew nothing about the Confessional Lutheran churches in other countries. In an extraordinary manner God permitted us to become acquainted with these churches (1920-). At that time small Finnish groups began using the German language literature of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod. When our Free Ev. Lutheran Church of Finland came into being (1923), these State Church groups supporting Lutheran doctrine, began opposing us strongly, and the theological literature of the Missouri Synod was largely abandoned at the same time. However, at least Pieper's Dogmatics continued to exert some influence on these groups.

After the last war we had a series of free conferences with some of the State Church

pastors belonging to these groups and as a result the attention of one of the younger leaders of a certain State Church organization was especially directed to Pieper's Dogmatics. This work pleased him but he noticed the difficulty involved because of the fact that the work was in a foreign language. He was interested in getting the condensed edition (Pieper-Mueller 1946) translated into Finnish so that it could be made available for more general use. With this purpose in mind he approached me in 1949. At that time because of the war and the heavy war reparations, our country was in an extremely difficult position economically. Thus it can be understood that even a relatively large organization did not dare to undertake such a costly task. The number of copies of a work of this type that can be expected to be sold in Finland is only in the hundreds. When the economic situation improved somewhat in 1955, and some financial assistance had been received for the work of translating, this organization decided to publish the work. The translating was done during the years 1958 - 1959 and the completed work was published at the beginning of March 1961.

The translator, Pastor Heikki Koskenniemi, Ph. D., has performed his task in an especially faithful manner to which I can attest with deep satisfaction in my capacity as examiner of the translation.

In our own midst an impressive Pieper-festival was held on March 12. The program included among other numbers the reading of an address, which Dr. Pieper delivered in 1930, on Jes. 66:26, and the reading of some of Dr. Pieper's examination questions and their answers. A copy of the Finnish Pieper Dogmatics was given to each of our Theological students and a framed photograph of Dr. Pieper was presented also to the translator.

This Finnish translation of Pieper's Dogmatics is the very first faithfully Lutheran standard dogmatics in Finland. Its appearance here is therefore a once-in-a-century event, and this year of its publication is to us a year of jubilee. Even many of our laymen are reading the work and it has already been purchased by many in the State Church who are interested in Lutheran doctrine. Pieper's Dogmatics in Finnish is strengthening pure Lutheran doctrine throughout all of Finland and will continue to do so in the future. The entire circumstances of the birth of this work are a testimony in actual deed of the significance of the vanguard position of true, Confessional Lutheranism, despite the fact that its activity, judging outwardly, is small. From this work has risen a great and widespread and an ever-spreading blessing.

God's Word and Luther's and Pieper's doctrine
will never vanish, not now or never, no never.

A. Aijai Uppala (Wegelius)
A student of Pieper 1922-23
Pastor, Free Luth. Church,
Finland.

CLC CONVENTION

By Prof. Glenn Reichwald

The CLC (The Church of the Lutheran Confessions) held its 1961 convention at the end of August in Spokane, Washington. Its paper, The Lutheran Spokesman, devoted its September issue to reporting the convention.

Several items of general interest were contained in those reports. The body now numbers about 7,000 souls. Its president is the Rev. Paul Aibrecht of Bowdler, South Dakota, and its Vice-President the Rev. M.J. Witt of Spokane, Washington. The convention committed itself to a synodical budget of \$54,216.50, established a church extension fund, and committed itself ultimately to making its college, Immanuel College of Mankato, Minnesota, into a four-year institution. Three doctrinal papers, evidently reflecting the interest of the CLC, were read at the convention: "The Scriptural Teaching Concerning Excommunication and the Termination of Fellowship," "The Meaning of Ekklesia in the New Testament", and "On the Relation of Synod and Local Congregation to the Holy Christian Church". These essays were referred to a general pastoral conference to be called later.

Of specific interest is the reaction of the CLC to the action of the Wisconsin Synod in suspending fellowship with the Missouri Synod. Though the CLC was formed because the Wisconsin Synod had delayed breaking with the Missouri Synod, there seems to be little rejoicing in CLC circles that this step was finally taken. The report of the CLC's Board of Doctrine was summarized as follows: "The suspension of fellowship with the Missouri Synod by the Wisconsin Synod was noted, but also noted was that this suspension of fellowship does not in itself remove the real issues that lie between Wisconsin and ourselves, namely: deviation from the Scriptural doctrine of church fellowship, and the doctrine of the Clarity and Authority of the Scriptures, as well as instances of violation of the sanctity of the call." (pp. 13-14)

The meaning of the above statement is more fully explained in a separate article in The Lutheran Spokesman by G.S. (Gilbert Sydow?). Three specific criticisms are brought against the Wisconsin Synod: 1) The Wisconsin Synod, in delaying its break with the Missouri Synod, developed a false doctrine of church fellowship; 2) The essence of the false doctrine of fellowship held by the Wisconsin Synod is that it placed the setting of the time for a break in the realm of "sanctified Christian judgment" (p. 8); and 3) the size of the minority vote in the vote to suspend relations with the Missouri Board, 49 to 129, indicates that the Wisconsin Synod is not united on the doctrine of church fellowship. "The Wisconsin Synod in itself continues as a unionistic body." (p.8) Only a unanimous vote would eliminate this charge.

Since the undersigned was not present at the CLC convention, he can only base his comments on available material. It would seem that the position of the CLC rests upon making the "mark" and "avoid" of Romans 16:17 coordinate in time. The whole concept of taking time in dealing with people - or synods - while holding to a conservative doctrinal position seems to be ignored. Pushed to its logical conclusion, it would seem that every member of the CLC who waited any longer than the first member to leave the Wisconsin Synod would be guilty of sin. With regard to the vote of the Wisconsin Synod, one missed a note of joy in the CLC that a majority in the Wisconsin Synod finally voted for a position which they had been urging. As to the vote showing two doctrines of church fellowship in the Wisconsin Synod, only time will tell whether the vote represented a real difference in the doctrine of

church fellowship or a difference of opinion on timing the suspension. That it meant the former to some is evident, as some have left the Wisconsin Synod.

The conclusions reached by the CLC at its convention seem rather unfortunate. This wound in the Lutheran Church shows no sign of healing.

ADVICE IN THE ART OF INTELLECTUAL DISHONESTY?

The February, 1961 issue of The Ambassador, a publication of the student body of Wartburg Theological Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa, of the American Lutheran Church, reveals that the documentary hypothesis of the Pentateuch has gained a firm foothold in that institution. The two feature articles reveal this.

The first article, written by a second-year seminary student, advocates dissection of the Pentateuch according to JEDP. The second article, written by Dr. Horace Hummel, Assistant Professor of the Old Testament at Wartburg Seminary, is entitled "How Do I Teach This To Laymen?"

This is an unfortunate article in two ways. Not only does it show that the JEDP hypothesis has found a place on Wartburg's staff, but the very purpose of the article is even more unfortunate. Its intent is to show pastors how to teach this hypothesis to laymen, often through seeming subterfuges. A few quotes will illustrate this.

"I believe that the main focus of the pastor's efforts to mediate the results of modern Biblical research to his laymen should be to the youth of his church... He should then concentrate on the confirmation and high school levels..." "The pastor or teacher should be in no great haste to identify himself as a champion or defender of the newer viewpoint to be introduced." "Similarly, a non-literal, parabolic interpretation of certain narratives, especially in Genesis, can be introduced by comparison with the parables of our Lord..." "For obvious reasons, terms as 'myth,' 'legend,' 'primitive,' et cetera, should be scrupulously avoided except with the most advanced individuals or groups... But among laymen, who will scarcely distinguish their popular and their technical, scholarly uses, they will be little more than 'red flag' terms. Acceptable substitutes such as 'parable,' 'sermon illustration,' and the like are easy to find."

Though the writer of this latter article may speak about a doctrine of inspiration, it certainly cannot be the historic, Biblical doctrine of Lutheranism. What is even more unfortunate is that the writer professes a doctrine of "Biblical dissection" which he recognizes many Christians cannot accept when directly stated, so he offers ways of subterfuge. This is not speaking as an oracle of God, I Peter 4:11.

BOOK REVIEW

"THE BIBLE AS HISTORY," translated from the German of Werner Keller by William Neil; "A CONFIRMATION OF THE BOOK OF BOOKS." Published by Morrow & Company.

Such is the title and sub-title of a book which covers the whole field of Bible Archaeology from the first chapter of Genesis to the last book of the New Testament. The author's purpose is expressed in the words:

"In view of the overwhelming mass of authentic and well-attested evidence now available, as I thought of the skeptical criticism which from the eighteenth century onward would fain have demolished the Bible altogether, there kept hammering in my brain this one sentence: "The Bible is right after all!"

The writer is a journalist and writes for the laymen as well as for the expert archaeologist. Thus his style is popular and the pages are not loaded down with notes and critical apparatus. A considerable bibliography makes up to the average reader for this lack of references.

The writer, unfortunately, does not always stick only to the facts in the case, but offers rationalistic explanations for many of the miracles recorded in the Bible instead of accepting them as miracles beyond human understanding or analysis. Thus he explains the miracle of manna from heaven as really no miracle at all; manna was simply a substance which exuded from certain bushes in the Mt. Sinai region in quantities sufficient to feed many people. At the same time, the author admits that this natural explanation does not satisfy all the facts in this case, when he writes: "So much for natural science. However, having thus recorded the limits of scientific investigation, we enter the realm of the unexplorable, the realm of the divine miracle. For there can be no doubt that the Bible relates this phenomenon not as something ordinary and normal, but as a miraculous occurrence, a gift sent by God to His people in their hour of need. And the same applies, "mutatis mutandis," to the appearance of the quails." Consider also the use our Lord made of the account of manna in the wilderness in His sermon on the Bread from Heaven in St. John 6, 49ff.

This book is profusely illustrated and is reasonably priced.

G.O.L.

FROM THE EDITORS

We are including in this number of our "Quarterly" the most important resolutions passed by the various Conventions which met this past summer. The paper read by Prot. Lillegard at the 1960 Theological Conclave on the Ecumenical Movement is being mailed along with the 1961 Resolutions as a sort of "Bonus with the Quarterly". Prof. B.W, Teigen's paper on "Conditions in the Church of Norway" will appear in future issues of our Quarterly.

It is significant that now, when Dr. Pieper's Dogmatics is being attacked from various quarters and no longer guides the studies and research of leading members of the Missouri Synod,--it should be valued so highly as it is by Lutheran theologians in other countries.

Not only has it been widely used in Norway and other Lutheran lands, but it has even been translated into the Finnish language for the benefit of "lay and learned.." Pastor Wegelius (or Uppala) gives us the interesting story of this work, in letters sent to Synodical Conference officers and editors.

Dr. Pieper's brief article on "Doctrinal Discipline," is of the first importance now that doctrinal discipline is obviously demanded by the conditions in the Synodical Conference. The disease of error in the Lutheran Church must be treated with the surgeon's knife, if it is not to poison the whole body.

G.O.L.

THE CLERGY BULLETIN
% Bethany Lutheran College
Mankato, Minnesota