

4-15-2019

## Walther on Confessional Agreement and Church Fellowship

Christian J. Einertson

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, einertsonc@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/grapho>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Einertson, Christian J. (2019) "Walther on Confessional Agreement and Church Fellowship," *Grapho : Concordia Seminary Student Journal*: Vol. 2: Iss. 1, Article 3.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/grapho/vol2/iss1/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Grapho : Concordia Seminary Student Journal by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

## Walther on Confessional Agreement and Church Fellowship: A Historical Response to the Commission on Theology and Church Relations

*Christian J. Einertson*

In its report, *Church Relations in the 21st Century*,<sup>1</sup> the Commission on Theology and Church Relations (CTCR) addresses many of the challenges faced by the Missouri Synod as she enters a new era of global interconnection and is consequently confronted with a variety of church bodies near and far who seek support from, cooperation with, and even altar-and-pulpit fellowship with her. In this report, the CTCR helpfully points out that the differing histories of other church bodies around the world have caused their assumptions regarding ecumenical relationships to differ from those of the Missouri Synod, which were themselves shaped by her own history and the broader history of Lutheranism in America. In light of those differing assumptions, the CTCR puts forward the following proposal on how to approach the question of confessional agreement with other church bodies who seek fellowship with the Missouri Synod:

It does not seem appropriate to impose our synod's history or church orders upon Lutheran church bodies in other countries, or to view them through the lenses of the histories of Lutheran churches in North America (e.g., Germans and Norwegians with reference to the Formula of Concord). Where we do not share histories of theological disagreement or controversy (especially with "emerging church bodies"), it may be more appropriate to begin with the assumption that we are in confessional agreement with those who have subscribed unconditionally to the entire *Book of Concord* until we are shown otherwise. In cases where an emerging church body does not have vernacular access to the entire *Book of Concord*, a similar assumption of agreement may be in order with those who have subscribed only to the parts of the *Book of Concord* which are available to them. Finally, in cases where a church body has chosen not to subscribe to a confessional writing (such as the Formula of Concord), we should seek to determine whether the reason for non-subscription has more to do with custom or history

before simply assuming that it represents substantive, doctrinal disagreement (e.g., churches which were planted by Scandinavian missionaries and which are in agreement with the teachings of the entire *Book of Concord*, without formally subscribing to the entire book).<sup>2</sup>

While the story of the Germans and the Norwegians and their relationships to the Formula of Concord is a long and multifaceted one, the CTCR did not describe in any further detail what it meant to express in alluding to it. With this lack of detail, it seems to caution against the use of a potentially helpful historical example. In an effort to reinforce the CTCR's broader proposal, this paper will explore the historical relationship between the Missouri Synod (and, more specifically, Dr. C. F. W. Walther) and the Norwegian Synod during the nineteenth century to show how they approached the issue of confessional agreement and church fellowship with one another. In the end, this should show that at least one instance of the very historical parallel that the CTCR seems to caution against drawing (i.e. "Germans and Norwegians with reference to the Formula of Concord") actually lends historical support to their recommendations and reinforces their broader proposal for approaching church fellowship in the twenty-first century.

In order to consider the historical relationship between the two synods, it is useful to begin with the founding of the Norwegian Synod. After one abortive attempt at a constitution,<sup>3</sup> the Norwegian Synod was founded in 1853 with the following confessional basis enshrined in her constitution:

The church's doctrine is that which is revealed by God's holy Word in the canonical scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, interpreted in agreement with the Norwegian Church's symbolical books or confessional writings, which are: 1) the Apostles' Creed, 2) the Nicene Creed, 3) the Athanasian Creed, 4) the articles of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, which were delivered to Emperor Charles V in Augsburg in 1530, 5) Luther's Small Catechism.<sup>4</sup>

Quickly apparent to Missourians past and present is the fact that this confessional basis appears somewhat abbreviated, as it lacks the Large Catechism, the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles, the Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope, and the Formula of Concord. Despite such an appearance, however, the confessional basis was not intentionally truncated. On the contrary, the founders of the Norwegian Synod considered this to be a full confessional subscription, as the Lutheran Church in Denmark and Norway had never adopted these other confessional writings as her own symbols.<sup>5</sup> This does not mean that the Norwegians were ignorant of the other confessional writings in the Book of

Concord; the clergy considered study of these other symbols to be indispensable to a seminary education.<sup>6</sup> Yet even though the clergy of the Norwegian Synod were well acquainted with the Book of Concord but did not subscribe to it, there is no reason to suspect that they disagreed with any of its contents. Rather, it appears that they shared the belief common among Scandinavians that subscription to the Augsburg Confession was tantamount to a subscription to the whole Book of Concord, the rest of which was seen as the authoritative explanation of the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession.<sup>7</sup>

Only a few years after the approval of this constitution, the Norwegian Synod came into formal contact with the Missouri Synod as a result of the former's attempt to find a suitable institution of theological education for the training of pastors, more of which were desperately needed on the ever-expanding frontier.<sup>8</sup> In their preliminary interactions with Dr. Walther and the Missourians during their visits to the schools in St. Louis and Ft. Wayne, Norwegian Synod pastors J. A. Ottesen and N. Brandt recognized these Germans as brothers who shared the same confession of faith, with the result that they recommended Concordia College in St. Louis as the ideal home for a Norwegian theological professorship, a recommendation that the Norwegian Synod in convention readily adopted. That this perception of brotherhood and common confession was reciprocated by the Missourians is evident in the subsequent decision of the Missouri Synod to extend the hand of fellowship to their brethren in the Norwegian Synod.<sup>9</sup> Noteworthy in the present discussion is the fact that the Missourians, known for strictly requiring their clergy to subscribe unconditionally to the entire Book of Concord,<sup>10</sup> did not mention the more limited confessional basis of the Norwegian Synod in the account of the convention.

The absence of any mention in the Norwegians' confessional standard of the Book of Concord or the bulk of the symbolical books contained therein did not escape the notice of the Missourians, however. Indeed, as one might expect, the issue of how two church bodies with different confessional bases could properly be in fellowship with one another came to the fore during Dr. Walther's report on his recent work, *The Proper Form of an Evangelical Lutheran Local Congregation Independent from the State*,<sup>11</sup> at the synodical convention of 1863.<sup>12</sup> As Walther was speaking on the confessional subscription that should be required of pastors and congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, the question was asked: "If we thus require our congregations to confess (at least indirectly) all of the Symbols, if the servants of our churches are bound to all of the Symbols, do we consider it necessary for other churches, such as the Norwegian Church, for example, to be bound to the Symbols in the same way if we are to recognize them as proper Lutheran churches?"<sup>13</sup> This question was of particular consequence because of the sizeable Norwegian



delegation present at the convention.<sup>14</sup> In his response to the question, Walther gives his reasoning for how it is possible for the Missouri Synod to enter into and remain in fellowship with a church body that does not subscribe to the whole Book of Concord:

Each of us will agree that when the matter of obligation to all of the Symbols comes to the record, we don't wish to say that a church is not truly Lutheran if she does not proclaim the whole array of our Symbols as her own confession. The Danish-Norwegian Church has not officially adopted the Large Catechism, the Smalcald Articles, or the Formula of Concord as her confession, yet she has always been recognized as a true Lutheran church. Norway was so fortunate that no Crypto-Calvinists, Crypto-Papists, or other fanatics, against whom the Formula of Concord had to be laid down in Germany, caused unrest in her church, though that land was not without a few individual secret Calvinists. If the Danish-Norwegian Church had wished to introduce these confessional writings in the land, she would have been in danger of inducing quarrels and unrest within herself. This is thus the reason why these confessional writings were not officially adopted in that church. It is false and wrong when one so often reads that the Norwegian Church is not so confessionally constituted as the German, for even if all of the Symbols have not been officially adopted there, theologians such as Brockmann,<sup>15</sup> Lassenius,<sup>16</sup> and others demonstrate that the Book of Concord has consistently been looked upon as the book of the Lutheran faith and confession. Incidentally, not only are the faithful Norwegian Lutherans in this country seeking to adopt the whole Book of Concord, but it is currently being translated into Norwegian in Norway.<sup>17</sup>

Here we see Walther's expectations of how the Missouri Synod should assess doctrinal agreement before entering into fellowship with another church body. While he was certainly not lax on the issue of unconditional subscription to the Confessions,<sup>18</sup> *quia* subscription to the entire Book of Concord did not constitute the *sine qua non* of church fellowship for Walther. Rather, he describes the Lutheran Church in Denmark and Norway (and, by extension, the Norwegian Synod) as "a true Lutheran Church," despite her lack of subscription to the entire Book of Concord. This is because Walther recognized that the Norwegian Synod's reasons for a more limited confessional subscription than Missouri's "ha[d] more to do with custom or history" than with "substantive, doctrinal disagreement," to borrow language from the CTCR.<sup>19</sup> Thus, for Walther, it was agreement on the doctrine

found in the Book of Concord, not a particular confessional subscription, that constituted the *sine qua non* for church fellowship.

Further, not only did the Norwegian Synod come out of a tradition that did not require subscription to the whole Book of Concord, she also lacked access to vernacular translations of the entirety of the symbols contained therein, though Walther notes that a translation project<sup>20</sup> was underway. Yet she willingly subscribed unconditionally<sup>21</sup> to those symbols to which she had access in the Norwegian language with the exception of Luther's Large Catechism, as W. A. Werels's translation of that document was seen by the Norwegians as having been "irresponsibly changed in many respects."<sup>22</sup> Walther also appeared to share the hope of the Norwegians that the entire Book of Concord could be given confessional status in the Norwegian Synod after the remaining symbols were translated into Norwegian,<sup>23</sup> a progression similar to that which he outlined for individual (presumably German) congregations who were not yet willing to subscribe to all the symbols due to a lack of familiarity with them.<sup>24</sup>

Thus, it appears that the Missourian approach to fellowship with the Norwegian Synod as explained by Walther bears a striking resemblance to the CTCR's proposal for determining confessional agreement with other church bodies who do not share Missouri's unique theological history. Admittedly, the confessional situation of the Norwegian and Danish churches is somewhat unique in the history of global Lutheranism, yet the fact remains that in actions and words, Walther demonstrated both a willingness to assume confessional unity with a synod who subscribed unconditionally to those parts of the Book of Concord that were available to her and an understanding that a custom of more limited confessional subscription did not necessarily indicate disagreement with the doctrine found in the Book of Concord. In this regard, the relationship between the Missouri Synod and the Norwegian Synod during the latter half of the nineteenth century is not only a helpful historical lens through which to view church relations in the twenty-first century but also a connection to Missouri's past that quite effectively reinforces the CTCR's broader proposal for her as she strives for a faithful witness in matters of church fellowship moving forward.

Appendix: Translation of an Excerpt from Discussion of §21 of Prof. Walther's Report on "The Proper Form of an Evangelical-Lutheran Congregation that is Independent of the State"<sup>25</sup>

As to note #4, the Synod gave the following clarifications: These days it has become the rule that when one speaks of the symbolical books, one speaks of them as a loathsome burden that is laid on a person's neck by the Church, a burden from which he must free himself. He must only see that he is not deceived by figures of speech! One ensures freedom for the congregations if they just throw off this yoke. But it is precisely because such a person wishes to take away the congregations' freedom that he seeks to steal the confessional writings from them. The Confessions are exactly that which the Lutheran congregations preserve so that they may not become knaves and so that they do not need to accept any preachers who preach what seems good to themselves. The Confessions are the safeguard of freedom, the bulwark, so that congregations do not need to let themselves be yoked by every random preacher and listen to him. With the Confessions in hand, they can confront every preacher and say, "It stands written here how the Bible must be interpreted in the Lutheran Church. If you don't interpret it this way, just leave us alone. We don't want any other pastor [*Seelsorger*] than the one who binds himself with a holy obligation to interpret the Holy Scriptures according to these books since we have come to recognize that the teaching laid out in them agrees in all its articles with the Word of God. For this reason, the teaching of the Confessions is the heavenly, eternal truth." If such a person does not wish to have this obligation placed upon him, he shows in this way that he does not intend to proclaim the entire Lutheran truth. Rather he wishes to secure freedom for himself to preach whatever seems good to him. Not only the General Synod but also the so-called "strict Lutherans," such as the Iowa Synod,<sup>26</sup> for example, write publically in this manner: "Not everything contained in our Confessions constitutes our confession because it is in the Confessions. It is necessary to interpret and understand the symbolical books historically, that is to consider how things looked 300 years ago, to take the history of the Reformation as our aid, so that we can see what the antithesis was of many of the things said [in our Confessions]. Then one will find that, because of certain prevailing circumstances, our Symbols declare many things that no longer apply because our situation has changed. They are a historically valuable, venerable document, but now we live in a different time with different antitheses. While the Confessions employ certain expressions against the pope and the papacy, these must be understood according to the perspective of the confessors at that time. For example, when they call the pope the Antichrist, it should be understood that they stood at the beginnings of the development of doctrine, but this development continues to take rapid steps toward its consummation." On the contrary, under

these circumstances, we ought to consider what a magnificent treasure we have in the Symbols and thank God that he has fixed and established us upon them with our confession. What and where would the Missouri Synod be if we did not have these books and confess them with our whole heart!

Here this reservation was made known: if the pastors are to be bound to all the symbolical books, whether one can be content if congregations only constitutionally require their members to bind themselves to the Small Catechism and the Augsburg Confession in order for them to enter the congregation. The following response was made to that reservation: it is presupposed that each preacher has not only read the whole Book of Concord but has also carefully examined whether every article of doctrine [*Lehrsatz*] contained therein is in agreement with the Holy Scriptures. Yet that cannot be required of every congregation member, and it is indeed impossible for someone to be bound to something that he does not know. What good does it do if over the door of the congregation one finds, "This congregation confesses all of the Symbols," but the people walking through the door don't know them? On the contrary, if they not only know the Small Catechism and the Augsburg Confession but also confess them from their hearts, they will hear passages from the other confessions and not recoil from them, reject them, or despise them but rather heartily rejoice when this or that part of their catechism is illuminated by the other confessions. Furthermore, it is good to remember that the symbolical books themselves in one passage say that the Small Catechism is adopted as the confession of the laity, and another passage calls the Augsburg Confession such a common confession, which all Christians confess in common. On the basis of these two passages, the Confessions themselves indicate that it is enough for ordinary Lutheran Christians to be bound to the Small Catechism and the Augsburg Confession. It cannot be denied that it is actually burdensome to consciences to bind all members of Lutheran congregations to the whole Book of Concord, no matter how well-intentioned and laudable the zeal for our confessional writings to which the aforementioned reservation speaks.

The above argument was not universally satisfying, and thus the question arose again whether it were not indeed necessary to bind the members of congregations to all of the Symbols, so the Synod felt itself compelled to clarify the matter still further: the practical result of regarding such a thing as necessary would primarily be that a pastor, if he receives a call from a congregation, would have to say, "I cannot accept this call until I am convinced that you all know the Symbols. Thus, I must first go over the symbolical books with you for a suitable length of time." Therefore, what is required of the congregation is actually not to be bound to the Symbols but rather a confession of them. If, then, a congregation confesses the Small



Catechism and the Augsburg Confession, she confesses the doctrine that simply finds its further exposition in the other symbols. It is true in a certain sense that the whole Book of Concord is not for every true Christian. What we want to say, however, is only that not every true Christian has the aptitude and gift to understand it and to employ it properly. That is why our church has various Symbols. She has something for the children and for the simple-minded, which is the Small Catechism. She also has something for the more advanced, which is the Augsburg Confession. Finally, she has something for the well-read and gifted people, particularly her preachers and teachers, such as the Formula of Concord. By that we do not mean, though, that the congregations should not accept the symbolical books as a whole. No, for there are always among them people whom they can teach and instruct about the Symbols and who will have confidence in them. So when a congregation hears that her pastor is bound to books other than the Small Catechism and the Augsburg Confession, she still trusts him because she sees that this man always contends for our Catechism, and everything that he draws from the other confessions agrees ever so magnificently with the Catechism.

In the event that a Lutheran congregation wants to call a man to be her pastor but notices in conversation with him that he expresses all sorts of criticisms of Luther and his writings, what will happen then? She will think and say, "That is not the right man for a true Lutheran congregation; we won't choose him." Much more will this be the case if he attacks the Book of Concord, for the congregation knows that Luther, Chemnitz, Arndt, Heinrich Müller and others have all held fast to the confessional writings and have bound themselves to teach strictly in accordance with them, and they were all orthodox men of God who also proved themselves many times through their writings to be true guides to eternal life.

When a candidate is sent from us to a new — indeed, still raw — congregation, until now he has always been instructed to demand nothing more than this: that no one can be or become a member of that congregation unless he believes that the Small Catechism contains the pure Christian truth. He also ought to set it forth as desirable that, in addition to this, a confession of the Augsburg Confession ought to be demanded. Should the congregation, however, have reservations about doing the latter because she does not know the Augsburg Confession, he should be satisfied with the former, which is sufficient. From the catechism every congregation can be led through all the other confessions, and when this takes place properly under the direction of a pastor, the congregation will desire on her own in a few years to confess the Augsburg Confession and maybe in ten years the all the Symbols. An analogous situation is what we pastors do in confirmation, that is to say, we require

of the less gifted that they at the very least know the text of the Small Catechism as their confession, but this is not to say that they should not also confess the interpretation.

Here the question came up: if we thus require our congregations to confess (at least indirectly) all of the Symbols, if the servants of our churches are bound to all of the Symbols, do we consider it necessary for other churches, such as the Norwegian Church, for example, to be bound to the Symbols in the same way if we are to recognize them as proper Lutheran churches? Answer: Each of us will agree that when the matter of obligation to all of the Symbols comes to the record, we don't wish to say that a church is not truly Lutheran if she does not proclaim the whole array of our Symbols as her own confession. The Danish-Norwegian Church has not officially adopted the Large Catechism, the Smalcald Articles, or the Formula of Concord as her confession, yet she has always been recognized as a true Lutheran church. Norway was so fortunate that no Crypto-Calvinists, Crypto-Papists, or other fanatics, against whom the Formula of Concord had to be laid down in Germany, caused unrest in her church, though that land was not without a few individual secret Calvinists. If the Danish-Norwegian Church had wished to introduce these confessional writings in the land, she would have been in danger of inducing quarrels and unrest within herself. This is thus the reason why these confessional writings were not officially adopted in that church. It is false and wrong when one so often reads that the Norwegian Church is not so confessionally constituted as the German, for even if all of the Symbols have not been officially adopted there, theologians such as Brockmann, Lassenius, and others demonstrate that the Book of Concord has consistently been looked upon as the book of the Lutheran faith and confession. Incidentally, not only are the faithful Norwegian Lutherans in this country seeking to adopt the whole Book of Concord, but it is currently being translated into Norwegian in Norway.

## Endnotes

- 1 Commission on Theology and Church Relations, *Church Relations in the 21st Century* (St. Louis: The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, 2009).
- 2 *Church Relations in the 21st Century*, 5.
- 3 The attempt to form a synod with the constitution approved in 1851 failed because of an error confessional basis (specifically Grundtvigianism) written by Pastor J. W. C. Dietrichson. For this reason, the Synod effectively declared the previous constitution null and void in 1852 and reworked their confessional basis. E. Clifford Nelson and Eugene L. Fevold, *The Lutheran Church Among Norwegian Americans: A History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1960), 154–157.
- 4 H. Halvorsen, *Festskrift til Den norske Synodes Jublaum: 1853-1903* (Decorah: Den norske Synodes Forlag, 1903), 57. All translations from Norwegian and German sources are the author's.
- 5 *The Lutheran Church Among Norwegian Americans*, 159.
- 6 *Kirkelig Maanedstidende for den norsk-evangelisk-lutherske Kirke i Amerika* (1860), 303–304. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/005972940>.
- 7 This is the understanding of the Norwegian Synod's committee that met in October 1859 to consider the issue of adopting the entire Book of Concord, as recorded in *Kirkelig Maanedstidende*, 35–37. Indeed, the Book of Concord itself describes most of the other symbols not as documents standing on their own but as the authoritative explanations of the Augsburg Confession, as in Preface 15 and FC SD Rule and Norm 6–7, 13.
- 8 Christian J. Einertson, "Sorrow and Gladness: Norwegian Studies at Concordia College," *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly* 91, no. 1 (Spring 2018): 33–44.
- 9 "Delegation der norwegischen Synode; Errichtung einer norwegischen theologischen Professur im Concordia-College zu St. Louis." In *Neunter Synodal-Bericht der allgemeinen Deutschen Evang.-Luth. Synode von Missouri, Ohio u. a. Staaten vom Jahre 1857*, 53–54. Proceedings, Ft. Wayne, IN. (St. Louis: Synodaldruckerei Von Aug. Wiebusch U. Sohn, 1858).
- 10 Walther and Missouri's relationship to the Formula of Concord specifically is documented in Charles P. Arand, *Historiography of the Lutheran Confessions in America, 1830-1930*, Master's thesis (Concordia Seminary, 1987), 177–188.
- 11 Walther's presentation was specifically on the topic of §21 in this work, which is concerned with how a congregation is to call a pastor. The relevant portion on confessional subscription reads: "In the document of vocation the person chosen is to be bound by the congregation to the Scriptures of the prophets and the apostles of the Old and New Testaments as to God's Word, as also to the public Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church and to the faithful administration of the holy ministry of the Word in all its parts." C. F. W. Walther, *Walther on the Church*, trans. John M. Drickamer, Selected Writings of C. F. W. Walther (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1981), 136–137.
- 12 "Verhandlung über §21 des Referats von Herrn Prof. Walther über 'die rechte Gestalt einer vom Staate unabhängigen Ev.-Luth. Ortsgemeinde.'" In *Elfter Synodal-Bericht der allgemeinen Deutschen Evang.-Luth. Synode von Missouri, Ohio u. a. Staaten vom Jahre 1863*, 30–58. Proceedings, Ft. Wayne, IN. (St. Louis: Synodaldruckerei Von Aug. Wiebusch U. Sohn, 1864).

- 13 "Verhandlung über §21," 42.
- 14 According to the proceedings, Pastor B. J. Muus and Pastor V. Koren were present as delegates. Prof. L. Larsen, Prof. F. A. Schmidt, President H. A. Preus, Pastors N. Brandt, A. B. Hjort, H. P. Duborg, P. A. Rasmussen, N. Amlund, A. Mikkelsen, J. Krohn, O. J. Hagestad, E. F. Magelsen were also present. Pastor L. Björn came late, and Pastor J. A. Ottesen arrived toward the end of the convention after returning from Norway. "3. Namen Der Berathenden." In *Elfter Synodal-Bericht*, 4.
- 15 Perhaps a reference to Jesper Rasmussen Brochmand, a seventeenth-century professor at the University of Copenhagen. cf. John M. Jensen, *The Encyclopedia of the Lutheran Church*, ed. Julius Bodensieck, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965), s.v. "Jasper Rasmussen Brochmand."
- 16 Johann Lassenius, a seventeenth-century Pomeranian theologian who was court preacher in Copenhagen. cf. *Lutheran Cyclopedia*, ed. Erwin R. Lueker (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1975), s.v. "Lassenius, Johann(es)."
- 17 *Elfter Synodal-Bericht*, 42.
- 18 C. F. W. Walther, "Why Should Our Pastors, Teachers and Professors Subscribe Unconditionally to the Symbolical Writings of Our Church," trans. Alex. Wm. C. Guebert, *Concordia Theological Monthly* XVIII, no. 4 (April 1947): 241-253, <http://www.ctsfw.net/media/pdfs/WaltherWhySubscribeUnconditionallySymbolical.pdf>.
- 19 *Church Relations in the 21st Century*, 5.
- 20 That translation project would be completed and accessible to the Norwegians in America within a few years of Walther's report. *Kirkelig Maanedstidende*, (1867), 133-137.
- 21 Erling Telgen correctly points out that the language of the 1853 constitution amounts to a *quia* subscription to the symbols of the Norwegian Church in Erling T. Telgen 2011. "Quia subscription to the confessions: examining the question of hermeneutical direction." *Logia* 20, no. 2: 8. *ATLA Religion Database with ATLASerials, EBSCOhost* (accessed August 4, 2017). At any rate, the revised constitution that began circulating in 1861 and was approved by the synodical convention of 1865 contained a more unambiguous *quia* subscription in its confessional standard, which in its final form read, "§2. The only source and rule for the Synod's faith and life is God's holy Word, revealed in the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments. §3. The Synod subscribes to the symbolical books or confessional writings of the Norwegian Lutheran Church because they give a pure and unadulterated statement of the doctrine contained in God's Word. These confessional writings are a) the three old symbols: the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian; b) the Unaltered Augsburg Confession; c) Luther's Small Catechism. Note: The reason that the other symbols of the Lutheran Church are not yet considered among the symbolical books of our Synod is only that they are hitherto mostly unknown to our congregations." *Kirkelig Maanedstidende*, (1861), 187 and (1865), 69.
- 22 *Kirkelig Maanedstidende* (1860), 37.
- 23 *Kirkelig Maanedstidende* (1861), 230.
- 24 *Elfter Synodal-Bericht*, 40-41.
- 25 As found in "Verhandlung über §21," 39-42.
- 26 For more on the confessional identities of the General Synod and the Iowa Synod and how they compared to that of Walther and the Missourians, cf. Charles P. Arand, *Testing the Boundaries to Lutheran Identity* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2012).