Concordia Theological Monthly

Volume 32 Article 47

8-1-1961

The Historical Background of "A Brief Statement." (Continued)

Carl S. Meyer
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

The Historical Background of "A Brief Statement"

(Continued)

By CARL S. MEYER

III

MOVEMENTS WITHIN LUTHERANISM IN AMERICA, 1887—1932

Important as are the major theological movements in America and Germany between 1887 and 1932 for an understanding of the Middle Period of the history of the Missouri Synod, even more important are the movements within Lutheranism in America during this time. These movements, to state the self-evident, have their roots in previous periods. Without an understanding of these movements, however, the doctrinal formulations of the Missouri Synod, especially of *A Brief Statement*, cannot be understood adequately.

When the Missouri Synod was organized in 1847 Lutheranism in America was in, what Jacobs calls, the period of revival and expansion (1817—60).[1] Early in that period the General Synod had been organized (1820) by the Pennsylvania Ministerium, the New York Ministerium, the North Carolina Synod, and the Maryland and Virginia Synod.[2] The importance of this organization has been stated by Wentz from his point of view as follows:

> It provided the means and agencies for prosecuting independent Lutheran educational, missionary, and charitable operations. Above all, it gave to the church of this country, even to those who did not at once become members of the General Synod, a nationwide outlook and interest and a sense of permanent citizenship in this Republic.[3]

The withdrawal of the Pennsylvania Ministerium in 1823 from the General Synod could have permanently disrupted this body. The efforts of Samuel S. Schmucker, however, kept the remnants of the General Synod together and rallied them around the founding of a theological seminary at Gettysburg (1826).[4] The General Synod had resolved:

> In this seminary shall be taught, in the German and English languages, the fundamental doctrines of the sacred Scriptures as contained in the Augsburg Confession.

It required that every instructor on the

---

[1] Henry E. Jacobs, *A History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States*, Vol. IV: *The American Church History Series*, ed. Philip Schaff et alii; 5th ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907), p. 349.

[2] J. W. Early, "The Ministerium of Pennsylvania and the Organization of the General Synod," *The Lutheran Church Review*, XI (January 1892), 61—70; ibid., XI (April 1892), 172—186; Jacobs, pp. 351—361; Fr. Bente, *American Lutheranism* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1919), II, 12—175; Abdel R. Wentz, *A Basic History of Lutheranism in America* (Philadelphia: The Muhlenburg Press, 1955), pp. 78—84.

[3] Ibid., p. 80.

[4] Abdel R. Wentz, *History of the Gettysburg Theological Seminary* (Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1926).

teaching staff of the seminary subscribe to the statement:

> I believe the Augsburg Confession and the catechism of Luther to be a summary and just exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God.[5]

The changes made in the Augsburg Confession by Schmucker, therefore, in the "Definite Synodical Platform" of 1855 must be regarded as deviations from the adopted stand of the church body. Schmucker maintained that the Augsburg Confession approved the ceremonies connected with the Roman Mass, condoned private confession and absolution, and taught incorrectly on the Lord's Day, baptismal regeneration, and the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper.[6] As early as 1834 Schmucker indicated his views regarding the Lord's Supper:

> After a protracted and unprofitable struggle, the Lutheran church has long since settled down in the happy conviction, that on this, as on all other subjects not clearly determined by the inspired volume, her sons shall be left to follow the dictates of their own conscience, having none to molest them or make them afraid. In the Lutheran church in this country, each of the above views has some advocates, though the great body of our divines, if we mistake not, embrace either the second or the third.[7]

The Definite Platform was an attempt to make Lutheranism more conformable to the American ecclesiastical scene, Puritan in its outlook and Calvinistic in its theological orientation. However, only three small Lutheran synods accepted it — the Olive Branch Synod, the Wittenberg Synod, and the East Ohio Synod. The organization of the Melanchthon Synod by followers of Schmucker in 1857 caused further misgivings within the General Synod, into which it had been admitted, up to the time of its reunion with the Maryland Synod (1869).[8] The young

---

[5] Quoted by Jacobs, p. 367 from *Catalogue and Constitution for 1840,* p. 10. The Constitution of the General Synod had no confessional paragraph. See the English translation by Dr. Endress in S. S. Schmucker, *Elements of Popular Theology,* 5th ed. (Philadelphia: S. S. Miles, 1845), pp. 451—457. The "Formula for the Government and Discipline of the Evangelical Lutheran Church," Appendix I, ibid., pp. 420 to 450, likewise had no doctrinal paragraph beyond that which affirmed a belief in the revelation "contained in the books known in Protestant Christendom as the Old and New Testaments." (P. 240)

[6] *Definite Platform: Doctrinal and Disciplinarian, for Evangelical Lutheran District Synods; Constructed in Accordance with the Principles of the General Synod,* 2d ed. (Philadelphia: Miller & Burlock, 1856). See also "Americanisch-lutherische Kirche," *Lehre und Wehre,* I (October 1855), 319, 320.

[7] Schmucker, *Popular Theology,* p. 305. The "second view" referred to is: "That the bread and wine remain in all respects unchanged; that the glorified human nature of Christ is not substantially (essentially) present at all, but only influentially, efficaciously and virtually; that is, by a special supernatural influence exerted on all communicants at the time when they receive the bread and wine" (p. 300, in italics in the original). The "third view" is: "The third opinion is, that there is no presence of the glorified HUMAN nature of the Saviour, either substantial or influential, nor any thing mysterious or supernatural in the eucharist; yet that whilst the bread and wine are merely symbolic representations of the Saviour's absent body by which we are reminded of his sufferings, there is also a PECULIAR and SPECIAL spiritual blessing bestowed by the divine Saviour on all worthy communicants, by which their faith and Christian graces are confirmed." (P. 303; italics in the original)

[8] The best account of this episode in American Lutheranism is still Vergilius Ferm, *The Crisis in American Lutheran Theology: A Study of the Issue Between American Lutheranism and Old Lutheranism* (New York and London: The Century Co., 1927). H. Hoyer, "Die sogenannte

Missouri Synod followed the events in the General Synod with interest, but found the *Definite Platform* very inadequate.[9] This document, nevertheless, had one very perceptible influence on the Missouri Synod: it was the immediate occasion for Walther's invitation for free conferences of all Lutherans subscribing to the Augsburg Confession.[10]

These free conferences, held in Columbus (1856), Pittsburgh (1857), Cleveland (1858), and Fort Wayne (1859), discussed the Augsburg Confession. The fifth conference was not held, partly because of Walther's absence (he was in Europe for reasons of health). Representatives of the Ohio Synod found it undesirable to participate further.

> Thus a great attempt to unite Lutherans in America came to an end. That the Conferences produced results, however, cannot be doubted. The formation of the Synodical Conference of 1872 may safely be listed among the fruits of these endeavors.[11]

Indirectly, these free conferences were a factor also in the formation of the General Council. They had helped to strengthen Lutheran confessionalism and in that way served to bring together some of the synods that met in Fort Wayne in 1867 to organize the General Council. These synods were: The Pennsylvania Ministerium, the New York Ministerium, the Pittsburgh Synod, the English District Synod of Ohio, the English Synod of Ohio, the Canada Synod, the Augustana Synod, the Wisconsin Synod, the Michigan Synod, the Minnesota Synod, and the Illinois Synod.[12] Representatives of the Iowa Synod and of the Ohio Synod were present, but these synods did not join the General Council in 1867. The Ohio Synod raised the "Four Points" — questions which are still being asked in American Lutheranism. They pertained to "Chiliasm," "Mixed Communions," "exchanging pulpits with sectarians," and "secret or unchurchly societies."[13] The Illinois Synod and the Minnesota Synod withdrew from the General Council in 1871 because the answers of the Council on the "Four Points" were unsatisfactory.[14] The Iowa Synod, too, in 1872, expressed its dissatisfaction with the General Council's stand on these questions.[15] The Wisconsin

---

Americanische Überarbeitung der Augsburgischen Confession," *Lehre und Wehre*, I (November 1855), 336—341.

[9] Ibid., I (December 1855), 381f.; ibid., II (January 1856), 28; ibid., II (March 1856), 95, 96; ibid., II (July 1856), 223, 224; ibid., II (October 1856), 320; these are all news notes. See H. Hoyer's review of W. J. Mann's *A Plea for the Augsburg Confession in Answer to Objections of the Definite Platform* in *Lehre und Wehre*, II (March 1856), 75—83; "The Broken Platform," ibid., II (March 1856), 92 to 94; *Definite Platform*, ibid., III (January 1857), 27, 28.

[10] [C. F. W. Walther], "Vorwort zu Jahrgang 1856," ibid., II (January 1857), 1—5.

[11] E. L. Lueker, "Walther and the Free Lutheran Conferences of 1856—1859," CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, XV (August 1944), 529—563.

[12] S. E. Ochsenford, *Documentary History of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America* (Philadelphia: General Council Publishing House, 1912), p. 147; Bente, *American Lutheranism, II*, 176—227.

The influence of the immigrant Midwest Lutheranism on Lutheranism in the East is analyzed in detail by Carl Mauelshagen, *American Lutheranism Surrenders to Forces of Conservatism* (Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia, Division of Publications, 1936).

[13] Ochsenford, p. 155 and pp. 328—380.

[14] Ibid., pp. 235, 336.

[15] Ibid., p. 236. The question of pulpit and altar fellowship was not answered satisfactorily for the Iowa Synod.

Synod had withdrawn already in 1869, rejecting "each and every form of Chiliasm," warning against membership in secret societies as "anti-Christian and soul endangering," and designating altar and pulpit fellowship with non-Lutherans "as a unionistic practice." [16]

Besides the General Synod and the General Council there was a third group which went into the composition of the United Lutheran Church in America on Nov. 16, 1918. This group, the United Synod of the South, organized in 1876, was the product of a union of the General Synod of the South (1863), the Tennessee Synod (1820), and the Holston Synod (1861).[17] These three groups, numbering 45 district synods in North America, in effecting the ULCA brought about the union of a powerful organization within Lutheranism. However, it was more distantly removed from the Missouri Synod than the Midwest synods. In its constitution the ULCA spelled out its doctrinal basis: all the canonical books of the Bible as the inspired Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice; the three ecumenical creeds of Christendom; the Augsburg Confession; the other Lutheran Symbols as in harmony with the Augsburg Confession.[18]

The action of the ULCA in joining the Federal Council of Churches in 1922 on a "consultative" basis caused a writer of the Missouri Synod to call for free conferences within the Lutheran Church so that there would not be a closer alignment with the Federal Council by the ULCA. These conferences, he wrote, should be continued until, D. v., full unity had been attained.[19]

Of greater consequence, as indicated, were the relationships between the Missouri Synod and the synods which entered into the American Lutheran Church in 1930. These were the Buffalo Synod, the Iowa Synod, and the Ohio Synod. It is not the intention here to review the relationships in the period from 1847 to 1887 in any detail. A reminder of principal differences between each of these synods and the Missouri Synod as they persisted into the Middle Period may, however, be in order.

The differences between the Missouri Synod and the Buffalo Synod centered in questions of church polity. The *Hirtenbrief*

---

[16] Ibid., p. 332.

[17] Wentz, *Lutheranism in America,* pp. 279ff.; F. B[ente], "The United Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the South," *Lehre und Wehre,* LXIII (January 1917), 7 to 16 (the article is in German).

The Missouri Synod criticized the ULCA merger of 1918 because the uniting bodies deviated from sound Lutheran practices and allowed errors by men in their midst who denied verbal inspiration, taught co-operation in conversion, tolerated evolutionism, supported the prohibition movement, permitted lodgery, and condoned unionism. [Th.] G[raebner], "The Merger," *Lutheran Witness,* XXXVII (Oct. 29, 1918), 340—342; ibid., XXXVII (Nov. 12, 1918), 354—356; ibid., XXXVII (Nov. 26, 1918), 372, 373; ibid., XXXVII (Dec. 10, 1918), 386, 387; ibid., XXXVII (Dec. 24, 1918), 403 to 406. Idem, "Two Types of Lutheranism," ibid., XXXVIII (June 10, 1919), 180—183.

[18] Wentz, *Lutheranism in America,* p. 284; *Doctrinal Declarations: A Collection of Official Statements on the Doctrinal Position of Various Lutheran Synods in America* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, n. d.) p. 3; also see F. B[ente], "Lehrbasis der Generalsynode seit 1913," *Lehre und Wehre,* LXII (January 1916), 1—7; ibid., LXII (February 1916), 58—69.

[19] F[riedrich] B[ente], "The United Lutheran Church und das Federal Council," *Lehre und Wehre,* LXVIII (August and September 1922), 257; see pp. 248—257 for the entire article.

of J. A. A. Grabau in 1840 had brought about a rejoinder from the Saxons who later participated in the organizing of the Missouri Synod. They disliked the strong clericalism of the Prussian group. A colloquy in 1866 discussed the doctrines of the ministry, the church, ordination, and excommunication, questions which were not downed by the conference. The conference resulted in a split within the Buffalo Synod, some of the pastors joining the Wisconsin Synod.[20] The Buffalo Synod was not a large group at any time after that; it numbered only 35 pastors and 6,800 members in 1930, at the time of the organization of the American Lutheran Church. The Missouri Synod, nevertheless, remained conscious of her differences with this church body,[21] perhaps because the doctrines of the church and the ministry had been faced with almost traumatic acuteness in the early years of her congregations' existence.[22]

The Iowa Synod, too, appeared early in the history of the Missouri Synod. Wilhelm Loehe had a hand in promoting the Iowa Synod, as he had helped the Missouri Synod. The Iowa Synod, in fact, is a product of the differences on the questions of the church and the ministry between Loehe and the Missouri Synod. It was organized in 1854 by G. M. Grossmann, John Deindoerfer, and others, who had been in the Franconian settlements in Michigan — settlements sent over by Loehe that had become organized congregations belonging to the Missouri Synod. To the Missourians it was the *Iowaische Oppositionssynode.*[23] In 1867, the year after the colloquy with the Buffalo Synod, the Missourians met in colloquy with representatives of the Iowa Synod. The position on the Lutheran Symbols, open questions, chiliasm, the doctrine of the Antichrist, the doctrine of Sunday, and the question of the first resurrection were discussed, but not the doctrine of the church and the ministry. No agreement, however, was reached.[24]

---

[20] Chr. Hochstetter, *Die Geschichte der Evangelisch-lutherischen Missouri-Synode in Nord-Amerika, und ihrer Lehrkämpfe* (Dresden: Heinrich J. Naumann, 1885), pp. 179—278; Roy A. Suelflow, "The Relations of the Missouri Synod with the Buffalo Synod up to 1866," *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly,* XXVII (April 1954), 1—19; ibid., XXVII (July 1954), 57—73; ibid., XXVII (October 1954), 97—132.

[21] So, e.g., C. F. W. Walther wrote to Pastor Fr. Brunn in Steeden, Nassau, Germany, in 1861: "Unser Kampf mit Buffalo ist ein Kreuz, das uns fort und fort fast zu Boden drücken will." L. Fuerbringer, editor, *Briefe von C. F. W. Walther an seine Freunde, Synodalgenossen und Familienglieder* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1915), I, 160.

[22] Hochstetter, pp. 32—60; Walter O. Forster, *Zion on the Mississippi* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1953), pp. 507—534; Carl S. Mundinger, *Government in the Missouri Synod* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1947), pp. 109—162.

[23] This phrase is used by Hochstetter, p. 278. For the Iowa Synod and more specifically Iowa-Missouri relations to 1867 see ibid., pp. 278 to 309; J. Deindoerfer, *Geschichte der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Synode von Iowa und anderen Staaten* (Chicago: Wartburg Publishing House, 1897), pp. 3—23; G. J. Fritschel, *Quellen und Dokumente zur Geschichte und Lehrstellung der Iowa Synode* (Chicago: Wartburg Publishing House, 1916), passim.

[24] Besides references cited in footnote 23 see J. P. Beyer, *Stenographisch aufgezeichnetes Colloquium der Vertreter der Synode von Illinois* [*sic* for Iowa, given correctly on cover] *und der von Missouri, Ohio, u. a. St., . . .* (Chicago: Chicago Union, 1868), pp. 1—175.

Siegmund und Gottfried Fritschel, *Iowa und Missouri: Eine Verteidigung der Lehrstellung der Synode von Iowa gegenüber den Angriffen des Prof. {F. A.} Schmidt* (Chicago: Wartburg Publishing House, n. d.), was written in 1878 (cf. p. 289). In it Iowa's chiliasm, its *Richtung,* its

The third synod which made up the American Lutheran Church in 1930 was the Ohio Synod. It is the oldest of the three synods, having been organized already in 1818, a Western outpost of the Pennsylvania Ministerium. However, in 1820 it refused to join the General Synod. The influence of Paul Henkel, and later Andrew Henkel, was in the direction of Lutheran confessionalism, a tendency strengthened by W. F. Lehmann and Matthias Loy in the second half of the century. The free conferences of the 1850s helped to draw at least a portion of the Ohio Synod clergy closer to the Missouri Synod. It participated, as did the Missouri Synod, in the preliminary convention of the General Council (1866),[25] but did not join the council in the following year, although its delegates were present.[26] It was the Ohio Synod that raised the question of the "Four Points" in 1867 and forced the protracted discussion of them in the convention of the following year.[27] In this year (1868) fraternal relations were established with the Missouri Synod,[28] the first step toward the formation of the Synodical Conference in 1872, for which the Ohio Synod gave the impetus.[29]

Between 1868 and 1880 the Ohio Synod and the Missouri Synod enjoyed fraternal relationships. It was the Ohio Synod Seminary which in 1878 awarded C. F. W. Walther an honorary doctor of divinity degree.[30] It was Lehmann who became president of the Synodical Conference in 1873, a position to which he was reelected for one-year terms in 1874, 1875, 1877, and 1879, a position he held at the time of his death (1880), in the midst of the *Gnadenwahlstreit*.[31]

This controversy on election caused a breach between the Ohio Synod and the Missouri Synod which has remained until the present time. The breach is one of the major factors which helped shape the course of Lutheranism in America in the period between 1887 and 1932, because the relationships between the Missouri Synod and the Ohio Synod remained essentially unfavorable throughout the period.

The Norwegian Synod, too, withdrew from the Synodical Conference because of the controversy on predestination.

---

position on the symbols, and its open questions are defended.

[25] Ochsenford, p. 133.

[26] Ibid., pp. 148, 154.

[27] Ibid., pp. 328 ff. A. G[raebner], "Zur Geschichte der 'vier Punkte,'" *Lehre und Wehre*, XXXIV (June 1888), 167—173; ibid., XXXIV (July and August 1888), 217—224; ibid., XXXIV (September 1888), 257—264; ibid., XXXIV (October 1888), 302—310; ibid., XXXIV (November and December 1888), 342 to 354.

[28] *Proceedings*, Joint Ohio Synod, 1868, pp. 32, 33; see Paul E. Kretzmann, "Documents Regarding Church Affiliation and Organic Union in the Lutheran Church of America," *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly*, IV (October 1931), 88, 89; ibid., V (October 1932), 109, 110.

[29] *Denkschrift, enthaltend eine eingehende Darlegung der Gründe weshalb die zur Synodal-Conferenz der evangel.-luther. Kirche von Nord-Amerika zutretenden Synoden sich nicht an eine der hierzulande schon bestehenden lutherisch benannten Verbindungen von Synoden haben anschliessen können* (Columbus: Schulze und Gassmann, 1871), p. 3.

[30] See file on "honorary degree" in Walther papers, Concordia Historical Institute, St. Louis.

[31] *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1873, p. 31; *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1874, p. 54; *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1875, p. 36; *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1877, p. 52; *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1878, p. 68; *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1879, p. 51.

> . . . not because of disagreement in doctrine with the other synods, but because it was hoped that a settlement of the controversy which raged within the Synod itself thereby might more easily be reached. Since the discussions in the Synodical Conference were carried on in the German language, which was not understood by the majority of the Norwegians, it was feared membership in this body might complicate matters and make a settlement more difficult.[32]

This Synod was organized in 1853; early in its history it established fraternal relations with the Missouri Synod, utilizing its Seminary for the training of pastors, and joining with the Ohio and Missouri synods in the organization of the Synodical Conference.[33]

The Wisconsin Synod, which now includes the Minnesota Synod, is the only charter member of the Synodical Conference, besides the Missouri Synod, which has retained its membership in that body. The Illinois Synod joined the Missouri Synod and became an integral part of it (1880). By 1872 earlier unionistic and doctrinally loose tendencies within the Wisconsin Synod had given way to a stanch Lutheran confessionalism.[34] The Wisconsin Synod remained solidly on the side of the Missouri Synod in the controversy on election.[35]

Regarding the controversy on election it need only be pointed out now that the basic question at issue was, as Charles Porterfield Krauth of the General Council phrased it from a vantage point outside the controversy itself, "Is our faith a cause of God's election, or an effect of it?"[36] The term *intuitu fidei*, as used by older Lutheran dogmaticians, was interpreted, misinterpreted, defended, and attacked in the controversy.[37] Missouri's formulation of the "Thirteen Theses,"[38] was approved both by the Missouri Synod[39] and by the Synodical Conference.[40] The "we believe, teach, and confess" of each of the theses has the ring of a creedal statement.

Looking back, this is the situation in 1887. The General Synod (1820), the General Council (1867), and the United Synod of the South (1876), the Iowa (1854), Ohio (1818), and Buffalo (1845) synods, the Norwegian Synod (1853), and the synods of the Synodical Conference

---

[32] Chr. Anderson, "Historical Sketch of the Beginnings, Growth and Development of the Norwegian Synod," *Grace for Grace: Brief History of the Norwegian Synod*, ed. S. C. Ylvisaker (Mankato, Minn.: Lutheran Synod Book Co., 1943), pp. 61 f.

[33] Ibid., pp. 57 ff.; S. C. Ylvisaker, "The Missouri Synod and the Norwegians," *Ebenezer*, ed. W. H. T. Dau; augmented ed. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1922), 264—272; Gerhard Belgum, "The Old Norwegian Synod," unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Yale University, 1957, on microfilm in Concordia Historical Institute.

[34] *Continuing in His Word: The History of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, 1850—1950* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1951), pp. 13—26.

[35] *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1882, p. 64; *Continuing in His Grace*, p. 79.

[36] Jacobs, p. 505, quoted from *Lutheran Church Review*, III, 68 ff.

[37] No attempt will be made in any way to cite the literature on this controversy. A definitive study of the controversy is a desideratum.

[38] They are found most easily in Erwin L. Lueker, ed. *Lutheran Cyclopedia* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1954), pp. 1057, 1058, sub "Thirteen Theses."

[39] *Proceedings*, Mo. Synod, 1881, p. 41.

[40] *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1882, p. 79, ". . . dass sich die Synodalkonferenz zu den dreizehn Thesen . . . von der Gnadenwahl bekenne, . . ." In italics in the original.

(1872), chiefly the Missouri (1847) and the Wisconsin (1850) synods, were the chief Lutheran church bodies in America. The doctrines of election, the church and the ministry, confessional subscription, and the "Four Points" were the chief issues which separated them.

The appearance in 1889 of Grosse's popularly written comparative symbolics in 132 pages highlighted the doctrinal differences among the Lutherans. He began with the Buffalo Synod, its "false doctrines" *(falsche Lehre)* concerning the church, the office of the keys, the ministry, ordination, synods, and church government. He then turned to the Iowa Synod. Its false doctrines were: Chiliasm, concerning the Antichrist, open questions, the ministry and church government, free will, conversion, and election, and its stance toward the Lutheran Confessions. The Ohio Synod taught falsely, according to Grosse, on conversion, justification, election, or predestination, and the certainty of election or salvation; moreover, its readiness to take doctrinal formulations of the fathers as a foundation for faith was scored. The General Council was called a unionistic church body, which tolerated false doctrines concerning conversion and justification, condoned pulpit fellowship with sectarian churches, altar fellowship with the heterodox, and permitted lodge membership even among its pastors. In addition, its teachings on church government were regarded as false and dangerous. The General Synod, so Grosse maintained, was not truly Lutheran in its intent and doctrinal position, thoroughly unionistic in its practices.[41]

On behalf of the Iowa Synod, at least, an attempt was made to refute the charges of false doctrine levied by Grosse.[42] Both the Iowa and the Ohio synods, however, were regarded as harboring "false prophets" and false teachings in 1905. By that time the question of the *analogia fidei* had been added to the doctrinal differences between these synods and the Missouri Synod. The question of the *analogia fidei* deals with the question whether the clear Word of God alone is the source and norm of faith or whether it is subject to enlightened reason.[43] In the "Lehre von der Bekehrung, Gnadenwahl und Schriftanalogie sind die Ohioer and Iowaer falsche Propheten," it was said.[44] There were ample reasons, it was stated and detailed, why the Missourians should avoid them.[45]

It is not at all surprising that the Iowa and Ohio synods should attempt to reach doctrinal agreement and perhaps organic union. It is surprising that the latter was not accomplished until 1930. Meanwhile a series of conferences and theses prepared the way for such a union.

In July 1893 representatives of the Ohio and of the Iowa synods met in Michigan City, Ind. They adopted six theses dealing

---

[41] C. Johannes Grosse, *Unterscheidungslehren der hauptsächlichsten sich lutherisch nennenden Synoden sowie der namhaftesten Sectenkirchen in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nord-Amerika* (St. Louis: Lutherischer Concordia-Verlag, 1889), pp. 1—57.

[42] S. Fritschel, *Die Unterscheidungslehren der Synoden von Iowa und Missouri* (Chicago: Wartburg Publishing House, n. d.), 94 pages, according to p. 3 a reprint from the *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* of 1891 and 1892.

[43] F. B[ente], "Warum können wir keine gemeinsamen Gebetsgottesdienste mit Ohioern und Iowaern veranstalten und abhalten?" *Lehre und Wehre,* LI (March 1905), 98 f.

[44] Ibid., p. 101.

[45] Ibid., pp. 98—115, especially pp. 103 to 115.

with the Church, the Ministry, the Symbols, Open Questions, Chiliasm and the Antichrist, Predestination and Conversion.[46] Especially the last thesis was directed against the Missouri Synod and was condemned within the Missouri Synod.[47] This condemnation, however, seems not to have been on the official level. The same theses were discussed again and adopted with some changes[48] when representatives of the Ohio and Iowa synods met in Toledo, Ohio, Feb. 13—15, 1907.[49] They were promptly dubbed *"Die Toledoer Unionsthesen"* in Missouri circles. It was predicted that eventually the Ohio Synod would enter into church fellowship with the General Council and the General Synod.[50] The Iowa Synod accepted the theses in convention assembled in Mendota, Ill., June 20—25 of the same year, and declared church fellowship with the Ohio Synod.[51]

However, the Ohio Synod, meeting in Appleton, Wis., in 1908, resolved that it could not enter into pulpit and altar fellowship with the Iowa Synod, because of Iowa's friendly relations with the General Council.[52] The Iowa Synod gave an explanation to the Ohio Synod, admitting that it had exchanged delegates as an expression of church fellowship and pleading for fellowship with the Ohio Synod.[53] This meeting at Richmond (1910) welcomed the statement of the Iowa Synod, acknowledged it as an orthodox Lutheran body, but pleaded for the removal of certain differences in doctrine before altar and pulpit fellowship was established.[54]

In 1912 the representatives of these two bodies met again in Toledo. The question of pulpit and altar fellowship between Iowa and the General Council still caused misgivings on the part of the Ohio Synod.[55] N. Rasmussen of the Ohio Synod issued a pamphlet entitled *Can We Unite With Iowa?* He stated the Ohio and Iowa synods agreed on open questions and a *quatenus* subscription to the confessions. The question of the Antichrist is not divisive; other points, he said, showed no significant differences.[56]

In 1918 altar and pulpit fellowship was

---

[46] F[ranz] P[ieper], "Das Colloquium der Synoden von Ohio und Iowa," ibid., XXXIX (September 1893), 257—264.

[47] Idem, "Zur Beurtheilung des ohioisch-iowaischen Colloquiums," ibid., XXXIX (October 1893), 289—293.

[48] So Meisinger of Baden as quoted by F. B[ente] in "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," ibid., LIII (November 1907), 518 f. The doctrine of the Antichrist was not included in the Toledo theses.

[49] *Doctrinal Declarations*, pp. 5—7; the date 1908, however, should be corrected to 1907. G. J. Fritschel, ed., *Quellen und Dokumente*, No. 114, pp. 362—364.

[50] F. B[ente], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LIII (June 1907), 278—284.

[51] Idem, "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," ibid., LIII (October 1907), 469—471.

[52] Idem, "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," ibid., LIV (October 1908), 462—465.

[53] From the *Kirchenzeitung* [1910], pp. 543 f. as reported by F. B[ente], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LVI (September 1910), 409—411.

[54] From the *Kirchenblatt* (Sept. 24, 1910), as quoted by F. B[ente] in "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LVI (December 1910), 561.

[55] E. P[ardieck], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," ibid., LVIII (June 1912), 270, 271, with a quotation from the *Kirchenzeitung*. *Lehre und Wehre*, LVIII (September 1912), 414, 415.

[56] Summarized by E. P[ardieck], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," ibid., LIX (January 1913), 32—35.

declared between the Ohio and the Iowa synods.[57] Doctrinal agreement between the Iowa and Buffalo synods was declared in 1919.[58] In this year representatives meeting in Chicago adopted (March 11, 1919) the *Chicago Theses.* The Augustana Synod, the Iowa Synod, the Joint Synod of Ohio, the Lutheran Free Church, the Norwegian Church of America, the United Danish Church, and the United Lutheran Church were represented at this meeting.[59] The theses deal with general questions of Christology and soteriology.

This year 1918 (or the years 1917, 1918, and 1919) must be regarded as crucial in the history of the Lutheran Church in America, even though they merely divide the Middle Period in the internal history of the Missouri Synod into two parts. It is not only that altar and pulpit fellowship was declared between the Iowa and the Ohio synods; in 1917 the Norwegian synods had united.

The union movement among the Norwegians was of momentous importance to the Missouri Synod and governed its actions to a greater extent than has been readily admitted or recognized. The close fraternal ties which had existed between the Missouri Synod and the Norwegian Synod before the *Gnadenwahlstreit* continued, even though they were not as extensive as previously. In 1903, e.g., the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Synod, Concordia Seminary conferred honorary degrees — a rare event in those days — on Laur. Larsen, U. V. Koren, and H. A. Stub; the Norwegian Seminary reciprocated with honorary degrees for Francis Pieper and A. L. Graebner.[60] Between 1903 and 1917, however, the Norwegian Synod drew closer to the elements within its own ethnic group that had been antagonistic to the Missouri Synod.

In 1887 this antagonism to the Missouri Synod crystallized in the formation of the Anti-Missouri Brotherhood. To find the roots of this antagonism merely in the controversy on election or in ethnic differences would be to disregard the earlier controversy on slavery among the Norwegians, perhaps even the controversy on lay preaching, and the pietistic leanings among some Norwegians. In 1876 another Norwegian group had effected a reorganization out of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (the Eielsen Synod, so named after its leader, Elling Eielsen). This reorganized group chose the name Hauge's Evangelical Lutheran Synod, after the influential Norwegian layman Hans Nielsen Hauge (d. 1824). The Norwegian Augustana Synod (1870) and the Conference for the Norwegian-Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (1870) had not been orientated toward the Missouri Synod. When, therefore, the anti-Missourians in the Norwegian Synod looked for partners, they found them among these two groups,

---

[57] [Th.] G[raebner] in "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," ibid., LXIV (October 1918), 473 and 474.

[58] *Der Lutheraner,* LXXV (Dec. 2, 1919), 389.

[59] *Doctrinal Declaration,* pp. 22, 23, for the theses. These theses must be distinguished from the (Chicago) Intersynodical Theses of 1928. See also [Th.] G[raebner] in "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre,* LXV (April 1919), 183—187; Lueker, ed. *Lutheran Cyclopedia,* p. 193.

G. M. Bruce, *The Union Documents of the Evangelical Lutheran Church with a Historical Survey of the Union Movement* (Minneapolis: Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, 1948), pp. 84, 85.

[60] Ylvisaker, in *Ebenezer,* ed. Dau, p. 269.

even though the Hauge Synod and the smaller Eielsen Synod did not join them. In 1890 the United Norwegian Lutheran Church was organized.[61]

Already before 1890, however, efforts had been made among the various Norwegian groups toward union. In the 1870s, perhaps because of the free conference of the 1850s,[62] the Norwegian Synod promoted free conferences among the Norwegians. The Rushford (Minnesota) conference and the Rock Prairie (Wisconsin) conference did not settle differences in doctrine among the Norwegians. Yet regional conferences in 1877 and 1878 served to prepare the way for union meetings in the 1880s. The St. Ansgar (Iowa) conference in 1881, the Roland (Iowa) conference in 1882, and the Holden (Goodhue County, Minn.) conference in 1883 were free conferences in which the doctrines of objective justification ("justification of the world"), faith, and absolution were discussed. The free conferences then gave way to joint meetings as the result of the election of official committees to carry on negotiations with the other synods by the Norwegian Synod, the Norwegian-Augustana Synod, the Norwegian Conference, and the Hauge Synod. Joint meetings were held at Chicago in 1885, in Goodhue County (Minn.) in 1886, and at Willmar (Minn.) in 1887. At the Willmar meeting the doctrine of justification ("justification of the world") was discussed. The year 1887, however, was the year in which the Anti-Missourians left the Norwegian Synod because of the controversy on election.[63] The meetings at Eau Claire (Wis.) in 1888, at Scandinavia (Wis.) in the same year, and Minneapolis (1890), which brought about the formation of the United Lutheran Church,[64] belong to the series of conferences and meetings which continued even after 1890.

Not all of the meetings need be mentioned. It is important to note, however, that in 1889 the Minnesota District of the Norwegian Synod adopted a memorial, petitioning the Synod to continue efforts to bring about a union of all Norwegian synods. A resolution of the Synod accepted the essentials of the memorial. Thus in 1890 the initiative for an eventual union between the Norwegian Synod and the United Synod already had been launched by the former. The 1892 meeting in Willmar (Minn.) showed that the questions of prayer fellowship, the inspiration of the Scriptures, and the place of the *Book of Concord* had to be added to the questions which divided the Norwegian Lutherans. A free conference at Lanesboro (Minn.) in 1897 showed up differences in the doctrines of conversion and election. In 1899 two free conferences, one at Austin (Minn.) in January,[65] and the second at Northwood (Iowa) in October,[66] continued the discussions on conversion and election.

In 1900 the district conventions of the

[61] E. Clifford Nelson and Eugene L. Fevold, *The Lutheran Church Among Norwegian Americans* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1960) in two volumes tell the story in detail; see the review of this work by Robert Preus in the *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly*, XXXIII (January 1961), 126, 127. Bruce, pp. 1—6.

[62] Supra, footnote 11.

[63] Nelson and Fevold, I, 302—335.

[64] Ibid., II, 3—37.

[65] Ibid., II, 129—138.

[66] *Lehre und Wehre*, XLV (December 1899), 378 f.

Norwegian Synod invited the district presidents and the theological faculties of the United Norwegian Synod to join their compeers in colloquy. Two meetings were held. The talks were broken off; however, conversations were resumed again in 1905, when the Hauge Synod, the Norwegian Synod, and the United Norwegian Synod met to discuss doctrinal differences. A set of theses on absolution, drawn up in 1874, were discussed, accepted by the committee (1906), and ratified by the three synods which they represented (1912). In that same year (1906) theses on lay preaching were adopted by the committees and later (1912) ratified. The following year (1907) theses on the call, and a year later (1908) theses on conversion, were agreed on.[67] All of these theses, however, lack antitheses, and the lack of antitheses, it was held, was a serious defect.[68] Most important was the action in 1908, when the United, the Haugean, and the Norwegian Synod representatives met in Chicago. The theses regarding the call and conversion were accepted for submission to the bodies represented. The representatives of the Norwegian Synod, as visitors, explained to the Synodical Conference (in August 1908) that their Synod would take no action on these theses and that these theses still lacked antitheses.[69] Antitheses, however, were not produced. In 1910 these 1908 theses were endorsed by the Union Committee. Union was delayed when the theses on election, prepared by H. G. Stub, caused protracted discussions (five meetings between 1908 and 1910).

Within the Missouri Synod, Stoeckhardt scrutinized the theses on calling and conversion and on election[70] and found them "ambiguous and misleading."[71] He warned against indifference and unionism.[72] Pieper pointed out that already in 1884 he had voiced objections to a set of theses drafted in the Norwegian Synod, which were materially very similar to the 1908 theses.[73] The Wisconsin Synod *Quartalschrift,* too, found the theses defective.[74]

However, when the Union Committee of the three Norwegian bodies met in Minneapolis (Dec. 13, 1910), another set of theses [Eastvold's theses] were also presented. The Hauge Synod and the United Synod approved these theses. The Norwegian Synod withdrew from the meeting.[75] Nelson dubbed it "a theological log jam."

---

[67] Anderson, "Historical Sketch, etc.," *Grace for Grace,* ed. Ylvisaker, pp. 92—102; pp. 156 to 160 (theses on absolution); pp. 137—140 (on lay preaching); p. 193. Nelson and Fevold, II, Appendix C, pp. 344—355, also have the theses. Bruce, pp. 28—38.

[68] Anderson, "Historical Sketch, etc.," *Grace for Grace,* ed. Ylvisaker, p. 97.

[69] F. B[ente], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre,* LV (February 1909), 77, 78. The Synodical Conference *Proceedings,* 1908, do not report this incident, although they record, p. 4, that J. Nordby and O. E. Brandt were present.

[70] G. St[oeckhardt] and F. P[ieper], "Beleuchtung der norwegischen Vereinigungsthesen," *Lehre und Wehre,* LVI (October 1910), 433 to 456.

[71] Ibid., p. 441.

[72] Ibid., p. 456.

[73] Ibid., pp. 456—466 with reference to *Lehre und Wehre,* XXX (May 1884), 183, n. 1; XXX (June 1884), 212, n. 1; see also references to Koren's position, ibid., XXX (May 1884), 170—183; ibid., XXX (June 1884), 209—212.

[74] J. Schaller "Die Vereinigungssache bei den norwegischen Synoden," *Theologische Quartalschrift,* VIII (April 1911), 81—98.

[75] D. [Dau?], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre,* LVII (January 1911), 31 f., with reference to the official minutes published in *Kirketidende* and in *Lutheraneren. Grace for*

In 1912, nevertheless, a basis for agreement was reached by the new union committees elected in the previous year. "Two forms of presentation" on election were given (Feb. 22, 1912) in the *Opgjoer*, the Madison Agreement, the one according to Article XI of the Formula of Concord and the other according to Pontoppidan.[76] Pieper criticized it almost immediately for allowing *intuitu fidei finalis*.[77]

The union movement among the Norwegians, indeed, caused Pieper to take another long hard look at the differences among Lutherans because of the doctrine of election.[78] He voiced the hope that all Lutherans would agree fully on *sola gratia*. "Sind wir erst wieder in der 'Kernfrage' einig, so dürfte bald die Einigkeit in den übrigen Punkten folgen."[79] In 1913 his *Zur Einigung der amerikanisch-lutherischen Kirche in der Lehre von der Bekehrung und Gnadenwahl* appeared in both the original version and in a translation by W. H. T. Dau.[80]

The Madison Agreement was soon ratified by the Hauge Synod and the United Norwegian Church. The district conventions of the Norwegian Synod accepted the theses. To the more general satisfaction expressed in the Lutheran periodicals, the *Lehre und Wehre* remarked that the action seemed a compromise and a surrender.[81] The mystery between the *universalis* and *sola gratia* and the *cur alii prae aliis* remained.[82] The Synodical Conference convention of this year asked the Norwegian Synod to remove the thesis which permitted the teaching of the second form, to formulate an antithesis which would indict every statement finding a cause of conversion in man, and to clarify the earlier theses on conversion and election. A committee, consisting of W. Dau, F. Pieper, and J. Schaller, was appointed to present these points to the Norwegian Synod.[83]

Bente called the *Opgjoer* "ambiguous" and unionistic.[84] Pardieck found a mixture of fanaticism, indifference, lack of seriousness, and misunderstanding among the Norwegians.[85] Within the Norwegian

---

Grace, ed. Ylvisaker, pp. 193, 194. Nelson and Fevold, II, 139—169.

[76] *Doctrinal Declarations*, No. 6, pp. 8—10. *Grace for Grace*, ed. Ylvisaker, pp. 194—198; *Ebenezer*, pp. 272—274. Nelson and Fevold, II, 169—182; Appendix C., pp. 356, 358. Bruce, pp. 38—57 for the Madison Agreement; pp. 62 to 67 the Austin Agreement.

[77] F. P[ieper], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LVIII (May 1912), 222, 223.

[78] Idem, "Welch Schwierigkeiten es für Lutheraner macht, in der Lehre von der Gnadenwahl, wie sie in der Schrift gelehrt und im Bekenntnis unserer Kirche bekannt ist, nicht einig zu sein," ibid., LVIII (May 1912), 193 to 198; ibid. LVIII (June 1912), 241—251.

[79] Ibid., pp. 250, 251.

[80] Both published by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis.

[81] E. P[ardieck], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LVIII (August 1912), 367. *Grace for Grace*, ed. Ylvisaker, pp. 99 to 105.

[82] *Lehre und Wehre*, LVIII (August 1912), 369.

[83] E. P[ardieck], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," ibid., LVIII (September 1912), 413. *Proceedings*, Synodical Conference, 1912, pp. 14—24.

[84] F. B[ente], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre*, LVIII (November 1912), 515. Cf. pp. 511—515 for additional views.

Bente was faulted for reading more into the journal items, especially in *Amerika*, than they actually said. See F. B[ente], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," ibid., LIX (February 1913), 81, 82.

[85] E. P[ardieck], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschicht-

Synod itself doubts and misgivings were mollified by statements that the *Opgjoer* did not alter the doctrines of conversion and election as professed by that Synod.[86] Repeatedly the plea was made within the Missouri Synod that the *Opgjoer* be tested thoroughly as to its Scripturalness and that all ambiguity be removed from it.[87]

The events which led from the Madison Agreement in 1912 to the Austin Settlement in 1916 and the merger in 1917 must be summarized briefly. The minority group within the Norwegian Synod at the special convention in 1913 was organized more effectively for the 1914 convention. The special convention of 1915 postponed action on the merger until the 1916 convention. On resolutions for merger in this 1916 convention the minority mustered 203 votes against 520 votes. Then followed the Austin Agreement and the consummation of the merger.[88]

What about the reaction of the Missouri Synod to the moves within the Norwegian Synod between 1912 and 1917? Selected parts of Pieper's *Zur Einigung* were circulated among the pastors of the Norwegian Synod in a Norse translation (by M. F. Wiese).[89] The 1914 convention of the Synodical Conference heard the correspondence between its committee and the church council of the Norwegian Synod. The council declined permission to the Synodical Conference delegates to appear before their body. It elected a special committee to deal with the committee of the Synodical Conference. The Synodical Conference committee stated that it had no instructions for such a procedure, but Dau and Pieper offered to meet with the Norwegian committee as private persons upon their own responsibility. No meeting resulted. The Norwegian Synod endorsed the action of its council (1913); the Synodical Conference, of its committee (1914). It appointed another committee with broad powers to deal with the Norwegian Synod. Pieper, Dau, and Schlueter were members of this committee.[90]

The articles of agreement between the three Norwegian church bodies of 1914 are to be distinguished from the *Opgjoer.* The former are constitutional. They provided, e. g., that the churches would not co-operate with those "who do not share the same faith and confession." This constitutional provision meant a separation from the Synodical Conference, Graebner said.[91] The Norwegian Synod's *Lutheran Herald* made of this remark an excommunication. In reply Graebner stated that the Norwegians were still regarded as brethren, of the household of faith, but that they were being warned against taking a step that would lead to separation.[92]

liches," ibid., LVIII (December 1912), 563. Also see pp. 562, 564.

[86] Ibid., LIX (January 1913), 32; ibid., LIX (May 1913), 227.

[87] E. g., F. B[ente], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," ibid., LIX (February 1913); E. P[ardieck], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," ibid., LIX (April 1913), 176, with a quotation from the *Herald,* endorsing the action of the Madison-Chicago special conference of the Norwegian Synod asking for a "basis of union clearer than the (Madison) Agreement."

[88] *Grace for Grace,* ed. Ylvisaker, pp. 101 to 110; Nelson and Fevold, II, 183—225.

[89] *Grace for Grace,* ed. Ylvisaker, p. 112.

[90] *Proceedings,* Synodical Conference, 1914, pp. 33—44.

[91] [Th.] G[raebner], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre,* LXI (March 1915), 132.

[92] Ibid., LXI (July 1915), 324—326; which also quoted the *Lutheran Witness* to the same

Between 1914 and 1916 the efforts of the Synodical Conference committee to meet with the committee of the Norwegian Synod were futile. Nevertheless, the 1916 convention instructed the committee to proceed with conferences ("alle ihm sonst noch zweckentsprechend erscheinenden Lehrbesprechungen").[93] When the Synodical Conference met again in 1920, no such meeting had been held because the Norwegian church council regarded a colloquium at this time inappropriate. "Our people need peace and rest."[94] In 1918 the small, nonmerging minority organized into the Norwegian Synod of the American Lutheran Church; in 1920 this "Little Norwegian Synod" was accepted into membership in the Synodical Conference.[95] They had been counseled by the Synodical Conference committee (at a meeting in the Aberdeen Hotel in St. Paul on June 5, 1916) to testify; propriety, however, forbade Dau and Pieper to participate in the planning of an opposition organization.[96] In 1917 President Pfotenhauer reported a "grave" status among the Norwegians, but no action was taken by this Missouri Synod convention.[97]

However, between 1912 and 1920 the union movement among the Norwegian bodies also renewed within the Missouri Synod theological questions connected with the doctrine of election. Election to faith, it was shown again, was the Scriptural teaching.[98] With this question was coupled the whole question of Lutheran unity.[99] Pieper's *Zur Einigung der amerikanisch-lutherischen Kirche in der Lehre von der Bekehrung und Gnadenwahl* belongs to the stream of Lutheran union movements in 1913. It was written specifically, as the subtitle states, *Im Anschlusz an die norwegischen Vereinigungssätze und deren Kritiken.* Pieper compared *Opgjoer* very carefully with Article XI of the Formula and the judgments of the old dogmati-

---

effect and the reply to the *Lutheran Standard,* ibid., pp. 326—328.

The United Norwegian Church *(Forenede Kirke)* was characterized as synergistic, indifferent to pure doctrine or doctrinal differences, and demonstrated Reformed tendencies in its teachings regarding Sunday, chiliasm, the inspiration of Scripture, and in its revivalistic activities. Nor was the Hauge Synod regarded as being in line with the traditional teachings of the Lutheran Church, particularly in its attitude toward lay preaching. The compromise of the *Opgjoer* made it unacceptable. This was the position taken by Th. Graebner in a rather thorough examination of the *Forenede Kirke* and the Haugeans. [Th.] G[raebner], "Lehrstellung der Forenede Kirche und der Haugesynode," *Lehre und Wehre,* LXI (March 1915), 97—108; ibid., LXI (April 1915), 200—210.

The terminology of the *intuitu fidei* doctrine in the *Opgjoer* was a toleration of this doctrine not in "the sense of Missouri." This doctrine was to make room for a correct disposition of a person, at least a person's readiness to believe, as the cause of his election. Wiese's pamphlet in 1915 showed the compromising character of the Madison Agreement. [Th.] G[raebner], "Kirchlich-Zeitschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre,* LXI (June 1915), 278—280.

[93] *Proceedings,* Synodical Conference, 1916, pp. 62—79.

[94] *Proceedings,* Synodical Conference, 1920, p. 20.

[95] Ibid., pp. 22, 23. *Grace for Grace,* ed. Ylvisaker, pp. 115—122.

[96] *Proceedings,* Synodical Conference, 1920, pp. 19, 20.

[97] *Proceedings,* Mo. Synod, 1917, p. 8.

[98] [L. Aug.] H[eerbot]h, "Die 'Wahl zum Glauben' ausdrücklich in der Schrift gelehrt," *Lehre und Wehre,* LIX (October 1913), 433 to 439.

[99] Pieper himself stated that it was "historisch stark veranlaszt" by the Norwegian union theses. F[ranz] P[ieper]. "Wird Einigkeit werden?" ibid., LX (February 1914), 50.

cians.[100] He pleaded: Unity in the truth must be sought; *sola gratia* and *gratia universalis,* the two fundamental doctrines of conversion and election, are to be maintained in their purity.[101] The explanation of the *discretio personarum* is not the *verschiedenes Verhalten.*[102] In an irenic but firm spirit, as also Lutheran writers of other synods admitted, Pieper pleaded for an adherence to the teachings of Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions as the basis for true unity.[103]

The charges of Calvinism, lack of charity, and a want of spirituality were brought against Missouri.[104] Not the Norwegians — they largely disregarded Pieper's *Zur Einigung* — but the representatives of the Ohio and Iowa Synod took up the plea, in some instances were ready to drop these charges, and asked that the white flag be hoisted and peace declared. Party considerations, *Parteigeist,* alone hindered the possibility of unity in doctrine and practice, they declared.[105]

Pieper's plea for unity in the Lutheran Church in America had a greater response in the circles of the General Council, for instance, than it did among the Norwegians. The General Synod's *Lutheran* pleaded for spiritual unity ("Our Church in America at this moment is forgetting that the underlying preliminary to Church unity is not wholly doctrinal, nor practical, but spiritual").[106] Agreement with other Lutheran bodies, Pieper replied, depended on agreement in doctrine and practice,[107] especially agreement in the doctrines of conversion and election; the repudiation of the explanation for election in differing attitudes *("verschiedene menschliche Verhalten")* must first be made.[108]

To the cluster of Lutheran mergers around 1917 and 1918 the formation of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States (1919) must be added. The first Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Wisconsin was founded in May 1850;[109] the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Michigan and Other States was organized in December 1860;[110] the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Minnesota was organized in 1860.[111] In 1892 these three synods formed the Ev. Luth. Joint Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, and Other States.[112] This was not, however, a complete merger. The Nebraska mission field grew into the Nebraska District and then in 1904 into the Nebraska Synod.[113] By 1917 a more closely knit

---

100 Pieper, *Zur Einigung,* pp. 27—91.

101 Ibid., pp. 11—13; E. P[ardieck], "Zum 'richtigen Verhalten,'" *Lehre und Wehre,* LIX (December 1913), 529, 548.

102 Emphasized by F. P[ieper] in "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre,* LX (January 1914), 34 f.

103 F[ranz] P[ieper], "Wird Einigkeit werden?" ibid., LX (February 1914), 49—60; ibid., LX (March 1914), 97—105; ibid., LX (May 1914), 193—201; ibid., LX (June 1914), 241—256.

Also see the editorial, "Lutheran Union," *Lutheran Witness,* XXXII (June 19, 1913), 97.

104 See the quotation from the *Lutheran* in *Lehre und Wehre,* LX (March 1914), 97—105; from the *Lutheran Herald* in ibid., LX (April 1914), 178—181.

105 Ibid., LX (June 1914), 25, as quoted by Pieper.

106 Quoted by F[ranz] P[ieper], "Wird Einigkeit werden?" ibid., LX (February 1914), 58.

107 Ibid., LX (March 1914), 103.

108 Ibid., LX (June 1914), 251 f.

109 *Continuing in His Word,* p. 14.

110 Ibid., p. 85.

111 Ibid., p. 101.

112 Ibid., p. 109.

113 Ibid., p. 115.

union of this group was needed. The semi-independent synods, Minnesota and Nebraska, surrendered the measure of autonomy they had enjoyed. The revised constitution was accepted in 1919, and the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States came into being.[114]

Other plans had been considered, among them the plan for a unification or amalgamation of all the synods of the Synodical Conference.[115] This plan was advanced in 1914, and a Missouri Synod committee had been called into being to work out, if possible, a plan of union with the other Synodical Conference synods.[116] A committee of the Wisconsin Synod agreed with the Missouri committee on amalgamation, but the moves within the Wisconsin Synod stymied these plans.[117]

In 1918, too, the National Lutheran Council was organized, a major move toward associating Lutherans in an overarching organizational structure. Member bodies included the synods which went to make up the ULCA, the Norwegian Lutheran Church, the Ohio, the Iowa, and Buffalo synods — the Iowa Synod withdrew in 1920; the Buffalo Synod, in 1925; the ALC became a member in 1930 — and a number of smaller Lutheran synods. The synods of the Synodical Conference did not join.[118] No moves were made between 1918 and 1932 to bring the Missouri Synod into the National Lutheran Council. In general the attitude within the Missouri Synod toward the council remained critical.[119] The organization, however, caused less apprehension than did the union of the Norwegian bodies in 1918.

---

114 Ibid., p. 37. See also Wentz, *Lutheranism in America,* pp. 272—278.

115 E. P[ardieck], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre,* LIX (August 1913), 370, 371.

116 *Proceedings,* Mo. Synod, 1914, p. 175.

117 *Proceedings,* Mo. Synod, 1917, Germ. ed., pp. 152, 153; Engl. ed., pp. 75, 76.

118 Wentz, *Lutheranism in America,* pp. 302 to 308; [Th.] G[raebner], "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Lehre und Wehre,* LXIV (November 1918), 520—523; ibid., LXV (February 1919), 86—89.

119 See, e.g., E. P[ardieck] in *Der Lutheraner,* LXXV (Dec. 30, 1919), 427, 428. [Th.] G[raebner] said: "Our criticism of the National Lutheran Council has never been a sweeping and unreserved condemnation," *Lutheran Witness,* XL (April 12, 1921), 118. The first part of the sentence was in bold face type in the original.

(To be concluded)