

Durham E-Theses

The doctrine of the church in Norway in the nineteenth century

E. Kaasa, Harris

How to cite:

Kaasa, Harris, E. (1960) The doctrine of the church in Norway in the nineteenth century. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/8395/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

THE DOCTRINE OF
THE CHURCH
IN NORWAY
IN THE
NINETEENTH
CENTURY

by

Harris E. Kaasa

Submitted to the University of Durham
in partial fulfilment of the require-
ments for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy. June, 1960.

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH IN NORWAY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The object of the thesis is to trace the doctrine of the Church in Norway during the 19th century, a period of unique importance both in the thought and Church-life of the country. An attempt will be made to show that the problems involved in the doctrine had a profound effect upon the whole current of Norwegian Church-life.

On the basis of a theocentric approach and a dynamic, personal conception of Revelation, Martin Luther adopted a dialectical view of Christian doctrine as a whole and the doctrine of the Church in particular, and a functional concept of the Ministry. Through the re-introduction of an intellectualist conception of Revelation, however, these insights were lost in the later history of Lutheranism. The unity of the doctrine of the Church was broken, and a dualism of "Objectivism" and "Subjectivism" arose.

Informed by an Idealist metaphysic but virtually dependent upon an Empiricist epistemology, 19th century Norwegian theology was unable to overcome this dualism and to re-establish the dialectical view. It displayed a wide range of ecclesiological positions, from Catholic Sacerdotalism (Krogh-Tønning) and Hegelian Erastianism (Monrad) on the one hand, to Low-Church Orthodox-Pietism (Gisle Johnson) and Associational Independency (Sverdrup) on the other. The crisis in the doctrine of the Church was clearly reflected in the practical Church-life of the period, which

was characterized by a gradual but definite trend in the Low-Church direction.

The Grundtvigian party, seeking an objective authority, found it in the Church and its historic Creed. But the traditionalism and Sacramentalism of this party were sharply opposed and finally overcome by the Orthodox-Pietists.

The introduction of Revivalism, with its associational idea of the Church and charismatic concept of the Ministry, gave rise to the Inner Mission and Foreign Mission movements, and created tremendous tensions within the Church. After a protracted struggle, the "free organizations" and lay-preaching gained legal and ecclesiastical recognition.

The Erastianism of the Church of Norway led to a reaction in the form of a vast movement for political reform. But failure to agree on a sound Lutheran doctrine of the Church within the movement and political pressure from without prevented the realization of its objectives.

The question of Church discipline within the national Church provided the occasion for several small separatist movements, which, although relatively insignificant, illustrate the ecclesiological tensions.

Thus, the unity of the Church in Norway was shattered during the 19th century. What was needed was a return to the dynamic conception of Revelation and dialectical view of Luther and the Confessions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

- I. The Doctrine of the Church in the History of
Lutheranism from Luther to the Nineteenth Century....1

Luther, 1 -- The Lutheran Confessions, 21 -- The
Age of Orthodoxy, 36 -- Pietism, 46 -- The Enlight-
enment, 58.
- II. Norway in the Nineteenth Century.....68

Political and Literary History, 68 -- Philosophy, 75
-- Church Life, 91.

PART ONE: THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH IN NORWEGIAN THEOLOGY DURING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.....	96
I. S. B. Hersleb and S. J. Stenersen.....	100
II. C. N. Keyser and J. M. P. Kaurin.....	109
III. Gisle Johnson.....	111
IV. Andreas Grimelund.....	142
V. M. J. Monrad.....	151
VI. Fredrik Petersen.....	164
VII. E. F. B. Horn.....	176
VIII. J. J. Jansen.....	193
IX. Gustav Jensen.....	202
X. Knud Krogh-Tonning.....	211

PART TWO: THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH IN NORWEGIAN CHURCH-LIFE DURING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.....	234

I. Grundtvigianism

N.F.S. Grundtvig, 234 -- The Rise of Norwegian
Grundtvigianism; W. A. Wexels, 252 -- The Catechism
Controversy and the Alienation of the Laity; Olaus
Nielsen, 270 -- Grundtvigianism in Ascendancy:

F.A. Wexelsen and J.W.C. Dietrichson, 289 -- The Campaign against Grundtvigianism: Gisle Johnson and C.P. Caspari, 300 -- The Collapse of the Grundtvigian Party, 308 -- The Grundtvigian Doctrine of the Church: Loss and Gain, 310.

II. The Inner Mission Movement

The Haugean Revival, 316 -- The Repeal of the Conventicle Act, 323 -- The Johnsonian Revival and the Foundation of Inner Mission, 331 -- The Change of Direction in the Inner Mission Movement and the Foundation of Lutherstiftelsen, 345 -- The Development of a National Inner Mission, 359 -- The Final Conflict over Lay-preaching: J.C. Heuch and Jakob Sverdrup, 367 -- The Close of the Controversy on Lay-preaching, 397.

III. The Foreign Mission Movement

The Origins of the Foreign Mission Movement, 405 -- The Foundation of the N.M.S. and H. P. S. Schreuder, 408 -- The Conflict Between Schreuder and the Board of N.M.S., 416 -- The Madagascar Question and Lars Dahle, 425 -- Other Missionary Enterprises Founded During the 19th Century, 432 -- The Formation of the China Missionary Association, and Ludvig Hope, 435.

IV. The Reform Movement

Introduction, 448 -- The Constitution of 1814 and The First Attempts at Reform, 453 -- The Movement for Reform, 1840-1850, 457 -- The Reform Movement, 1850-59: Gisle Johnson: The Grundtvigians, 468 -- The Royal Commission of 1859, 479 -- Dissension Within the Reform Movement: Jakob Sverdrup and the Bergen Party, 488 -- The High Church Party and Reform, 496 -- The Appeal of 1883 and the Synods of 1885 and 1887, 503 -- Conclusion, 509.

V. Separatism

Introduction, 514 -- The Passage of the
Dissenter Act, 520 -- G.A. Iammers and the
Separatist Congregation at Skien, 525 --
Nils Poulsen and the Separatist Congrega-
tion at Eker, 546 -- The Rise of Other
Dissenting Bodies in Norway, 554 -- The
Establishment of the Lutheran Free Church,
556 -- The Later History of Separatism;
The Movement for Free Communion, 570 --
Conclusion, 575.

CONCLUSIONS.....578

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

KF	Kirkelig Folkeblad (1857-70, 1887)
KT	Kirkelig Tidende (1848-57)
LK	Luthersk Kirketidende (1863--)
LU	Luthersk Ugeskrift (1877-93)
MTIM	Maanedstidende for den Indre Mission (1868-76)
NBL	Norsk Biografisk Lexicon
NK	Norsk Kirketidende (1856-62)
NLK	Ny Luthersk Kirketidende (1877-81)
NMS	Det Norske Misjonsselskapet
NTT	Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift (1900--)
NTU	Nordisk Teologisk Uppslagsbok
TT	Theologisk Tidsskrift for den Norske Kirke (1846-55)
TTK	Tidsskrift for Teologi og Kirke (1930--)
TTLKN	Theologisk Tidsskrift for den Evangelisk- Lutherske Kirke i Norge (1858-91)

NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY

In a thesis where the source material is in a foreign language, problems of terminology inevitably arise. I have at all times sought to render the Norwegian terms by the correct English equivalents.

I have used the translations "doctrine of the Church" and "Churchmanship" for the Norwegian terms KIRKEBEGREP and KIRKESYN. Where there is no English equivalent, as in the case of the adjectives KIRKELIG and UKIRKELIG, I have had to coin the terms "Churchly" and "unchurchly".

The Church of Norway was normally described in the 19th century as the State Church (STATSKIRKEN). This correctly defines its status under the Constitution. The term "Folk-Church" (popular in Grundtvigian circles) was rarely used during the period. It originated in Denmark, where it was introduced into the Constitution of 1849 by the Prime Minister, D. J. Monrad. As defined by Professor Hal Koch, the Folk-Church is simply the Church of the majority, without any essential connection with the State.¹ It represents the recognition of a factual situation, not a national need. On this definition, it is clear that the Church of Norway was a State Church and not a Folk-Church during the period. It is even open to question whether it could be properly designated a Folk-Church today, in view of its status under the Constitution.

¹ "Den Danske Folkekirken", in Nordisk Teologi: Festskrift till Ragnar Bring, Lund, 1955.

A particularly confusing problem is presented by the two words KIRKE and MENIGHET (Congregation). In Norwegian usage, the word KIRKE may possess all the ambiguity associated with the English "Church". Generally, however, it is used of the larger entities (the national or the universal Church). The word MENIGHET is used in the translation of the Bible to render the Greek ἐκκλησία. There is, however, the possibility of a similar ambiguity as with the term KIRKE. It is frequently used to denote the "Invisible" Church, as well as the local congregation. In some quarters, it has assumed a more "spiritual" connotation than the word KIRKE. I have translated it sometimes as "Church" and sometimes as "congregation", according to the context.

I have sought to render the distinction between the terms KIRKEORDEN and KIRKEFORFATNING by the English words "Church order" and "Church polity".

The terms "High-" and "Low-Church" were originally imported into Norway from Britain. In the Lutheran Church, they generally bear the same meaning as in the Anglican Communion. It is to be noted, however, that, while Norwegian High-Churchmen emphasize the value of historical continuity, they attach no importance either to the Historic Episcopate (which does not exist in Norway) or the three-fold Ministry. Certainly they do not regard either as being of the ESSE of the Church.

But in addition to this emphasis upon the Ministry as a divine institution, there is a further characteristic of

Norwegian High-Churchmen, the stress upon the institutional and collective aspects of the Church. At this point, High-Churchmanship could take one of two forms. It could be linked with an Erastian view of the relationship between Church and State, particularly in circles most directly under Hegelian influence. On the other hand, other High-Churchmen (perhaps in greater harmony with the spirit of the movement) adopted a strongly anti-Erastian attitude.

On the other hand, the Low-Churchmen strongly emphasized the Universal Priesthood of Believers, and deduced the necessity for the Ministry from it in purely functional terms. They considered the Ministry to be not an estate (STAND) but an office (AMT). They stressed the nature of the Church as the Communion of Saints, with the object of throwing into stronger relief the personal character of its human membership than the fact of its divine origin as an institution. There was a tendency for the accent to fall upon the individual rather than the collective. They were invariably anti-Erastian in outlook, and preferred to stress the distinction rather than the unity of the Two Realms of classical Lutheran theology.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH
IN
THE HISTORY OF LUTHERANISM
FROM LUTHER TO THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH IN THE HISTORY OF LUTHERANISM

Luther

In the last decade of his life, Martin Luther wrote:

"In our day, thank God, any seven-year-old child knows what the Church is!"¹ In context, the significance of these words is clear: Luther was asserting that the Roman Catholic Church taught a false and erroneous ecclesiology, and that he and the other Reformers had re-discovered the true concept of the Church and had stated it so clearly that a child could understand it.

This was a sweeping assertion, put forth by a man much given to sweeping assertions. It is not our task here to subject Luther's ecclesiology to a critical examination. This is not a treatise on Luther, but an enquiry into the doctrine of the Church as it is exhibited in 19th Century Norwegian theology and Church life. It is, however, clear that the present study must be introduced by a brief statement of Luther's ecclesiology and an assessment of its value if we are to evaluate later developments with any degree of success. Norway has been a Lutheran nation since the Reformation, and in no Church body does a single individual assume greater importance than does Luther in that branch of Christendom which (contrary to his will) bears his name.

Luther has been severely criticized for the alleged

¹ Schmalkaldic Articles, III, 12.

inconsistency of his theology. It is indeed true that he created no closed dogmatic system. Nevertheless, there is a basic unity in his theology which is apparent once we get the key to his thought. But it is a unity in dialectic.² Luther was a profoundly dialectical theologian. He often placed apparently contradictory truths side by side. The synthesis of the two antitheses was for him transcendent, not immanent, and lay in the Being of God Himself.

The unifying principle in Luther's theology is to be found in the cardinal doctrine of Justification by Faith, or, rather, Justification by Grace alone received through Faith, "Sola Gratia, Sola Fide, Propter Christum", which later came to be called the "material principle" of the Reformation. The emphasis was not upon human faith, but upon Divine, prevenient grace. The doctrine of Justification by Faith came to Luther through an existential experience. After a long period of searching for the "Gracious God", Luther at last found, or was found by Him in the famous "tower experience".³ As a consequence, Luther conceived of God's self-revelation in dynamic, personal, relational, existential terms.⁴ Because the medium of this revelation

² The word "dialectic" is used here in the sense defined by H. Ording, Dogmatisk Metode, p. 144: "The dialectic relation is a relation between relative opposites which contribute positively although in tension to understanding where this cannot be expressed in a simple sense and which constantly proceeds out from and toward a hidden synthesis." Ording distinguishes dialectic from paradox, which he defines as "an abbreviated sharpening (pointering) of a truth simple in itself".

³ cf. H. Boehmer, Road to Reformation, Philadelphia, 1946.

⁴ cf. R. Bring, "Luthersk Bibelsyn" in En Bok om Bibeln, Lund, 1948.

had been Holy Scripture, "Sola Scriptura" became the "formal principle" of the Reformation.⁵ The formal and material principles were inextricably bound up together, the former representing revelation and the latter faith.

It has been said that Luther achieved a "Copernican revolution" in the realm of theology, by replacing the essentially anthropocentric Medieval Scholasticism with a theocentric theology.⁶ This assertion has, however, been disputed on the grounds that Medieval Scholasticism was not essentially anthropocentric. Whatever opinion may be held of Scholasticism, it is certainly beyond dispute that Luther's own theology was theocentric. Justification by Faith was the starting point and the central unifying theme of all doctrine. "The proper object of theology is man as guilty on account of sin, and lost, and God the Justifier and Saviour of man as a sinner."⁷ The doctrine of Justification by

6 "Sola Scriptura" did not mean for Luther what it has come to mean for some modern-day obscurantists. Luther was neither a Biblicist nor a Fundamentalist, nor did he regard all parts of the Bible as possessing equal value. (cf. his evaluation of the Epistle of James and of the Apocalypse.) His criterion was the extent to which a particular passage or book "drove home" (TREIBT) Christ, i.e. how closely it was related to the central doctrine, Justification by Faith. *ibid.*, pp. 255ff. Luther did not rule out the place of tradition, though he drew a careful distinction between the tradition and the traditions. (cf. H. Preus, The Communion of Saints, pp. 15-16.) The experience of the Church through the ages weighed heavily with him. His writings are filled with references to the Fathers. Nor did he rule out the place of reason, although he was contemptuous of Scholastic philosophy. Sola Scriptura for Luther meant that Scripture was the supreme touchstone in all matters of doctrine.

6 Cf. A. Nygren, Agape and Eros, and P. Watson, Let God be God.

7 M. Luther, SW, I, p. 65, quoted in P. Watson, *op.cit.*, p. 23.

Faith became "the article upon which the Church stands or falls". This doctrine represented the essential content of the Gospel. Everything revolved about it, like the ripples that radiate when a stone is dropped into the water. Here is no innovation in doctrine, but "an immense reduction, a concentration on the one article of saving faith in Christ."⁸ As Einar Billing puts it, "never imagine you have rightly grasped a Lutheran idea until you have succeeded in reducing it to a simple corollary of the forgiveness of sins."⁹ And the direction of the act of justification, conceived primarily in forensic terms, was entirely from God to man. Armed with this theocentric approach, Luther proceeded, as he put it, "to alter the whole religion of the Papacy". His chief concern was to ensure that the Gospel of Justification by Faith was free and unfettered.

Within the unity of Luther's theology ran a profound dialectic, with significant implications for his ecclesiology. There was One God, but Luther could speak of Him as both hidden (DEUS ABSCONDITUS) and revealed (DEUS REVELATUS). God's self-revelation formed a unity, but it occurred in two forms, Law and Gospel, representing primarily wrath and love respectively. God's reign was one, but He reigned over two Realms (Reichen, or Regimenten). The dialectic was sharpened by the fact that it was necessary for Luther and the conservative Reformation to fight on two fronts: against

8 S. Cave, The Person of Christ, p. 139

9 E. Billing, Vår Kallelse, pp. 6-7.

Rome on the one hand and against the Enthusiasts on the other.

According to Luther, God confronts us as Deus Revelatus, particularly in the Person of Christ. But, because no man can see God face to face, He also confronts us as Deus Absconditus, behind certain "masks" (LARVAE). Even the divinity of Christ was "hidden" in His humanity. The various orders of His creation are "masks" for God: the family, the **ἐξουσία** (OBRIGKEIT) of the State, and "outward Christendom, or the empirical Church. In this way, God's reign extends over two kingdoms, which Luther designated as the kingdom on the Right and the kingdom on the Left, or the Spiritual and the Secular realms. In the secular realm, the hidden God confronts all mankind through the masks. This is His kingdom of power, in which He meets us primarily in His wrath, but also in His love, since confrontation here takes place through God's Law, which is good but incapable of working salvation. The spiritual kingdom is the kingdom of Grace, in which we meet only His love through the Gospel. For Luther, every individual is related to God, either under His love or under His wrath.

Both realms are under God's rule; Hence, Luther's rather positive view of the created world, despite his relative dualism. The secular kingdom, although strictly temporal, yet has a useful function to perform in this world. It is designed to preserve order, to prevent

corrupt mankind from destroying itself, and particularly to make possible the free proclamation of the Gospel, so that the Holy Spirit may gather at least some into the spiritual realm as well. The Christian is paradoxically a member of both realms. He is in a real sense in the world, but not of it.

Commenting on Gal. 2:14, Luther wrote: "This place, touching the difference between the Law and the Gospel is very necessary to be known, for it contains the sum of all doctrine." Any demand of God is Law, any promise Gospel.¹⁰ Both are the Word of God, but the Gospel is the predominant aspect. The Law is largely preparatory. Through it, God carries out His OPUS ALIENUM, but it is through the Gospel that He carries out His OPUS PROPRIUM. These two must be carefully distinguished, but not separated. They constitute one of the most significant and basic examples of unity-in-dialectic in Luther's theology.

Although Luther adopted different tactics in dealing with Rome on the one hand and the Enthusiasts on the other, his basic charge against them was the same: that they had perverted the Gospel. Luther saw three errors in Rome's

¹⁰ This distinction may not, however, be applied to Scripture in a Biblicist manner, for it is the living Holy Spirit who speaks the Word. This is in keeping with Luther's dynamic concept of revelation. He also emphasized the importance of the preached Word. cf. R. Bring, op. cit., and J. Whale, The Protestant Tradition, p. 130.

conception of the Gospel. In the first place, it was intellectualistic; The Gospel was identified with a dogmatic system. It was "nomistic"; The Gospel was transformed into a new Law, which must be fulfilled in order to merit grace. It was sacramental-magical, conceiving of grace not in terms of personal mercy, but in terms of substance. For Luther grace is always conceived as the attitude and activity of a person rather than as an entity in itself. He was inexorably opposed to any tendency towards what has been called "the reification of grace." All of this had far-reaching ecclesiological consequences. The dogmatic system rendered the Church dependent upon a hierarchy and created a separate "Teaching Church". The Church became a legal institution and the hierarchy legal authorities. And substantial grace was "infused" through the hierarchy. Thus, the Gospel had been dethroned, and the Papacy had taken its place. In consequence, Rome had become a false, apostate Church, in so far as it was built upon a false foundation, and the Papacy had become anti-Christ. Yet, Luther also maintained that the Church continued to exist under the Papacy, because the Gospel was not completely suppressed. God had upheld the Gospel "with power and wonders." The Papacy was anti-Christ, but the Pope still sat in the temple of God.

The concept of revelation held by the Enthusiasts was at the opposite extreme. They asserted the absolute independence of the Holy Spirit from any means of grace.

Luther was convinced that this supposed freedom would in fact lead to enslavement. The Enthusiasts would be forced to look within themselves for spiritual assurance. This amounted to enslavement by the subjective. It would be to build the Church, not upon the Gospel, but upon subjective experience. "What Luther above all sought to avoid was a subjective orientation of the concept of the Church."¹¹ It was opposition to the Enthusiasts which moved Luther to write: "God does not give His grace and His Spirit except in and through the external Word."¹² The

The unity and the dialectic of Luther's theology extends to his doctrine of the Church. Luther's ecclesiology displays the same theocentric approach, the same overriding concern for the Gospel. His doctrine of the Church is "an implication of his doctrine of Justification by Faith."¹³ Luther's primary question was: How is the Church constituted? (Was macht die Kirche?). It is in answering this question that Luther made his greatest contribution in this branch of dogmatics. For Luther, the Church is always the creation of the Holy Spirit. Modern associational and sociological ecclesiologies were foreign to him. The one constant constitutive factor is the Gospel. The Gospel is the "subject" of the Church. As Bishop Aulén says, this is of "fundamental significance" for Luther's position. Unless this is

¹¹ G. Aulén, Till Belysning om den Lutherska Kyrkoideen, p.23.

¹² Smalkaldic Articles, VIII.

¹³ J. MacKinnon, Luther and the Reformation, p. 280, vol.III.

clear, it is impossible to understand or evaluate the Lutheran doctrine of the Church. It is Luther's "most profound motif" and that which gives unity to his ecclesiology. Otherwise, his view becomes a mixture of heterogeneous and contradictory elements.¹⁴

This fundamental starting point comes sharply into focus in the explanation to the Third Article of the Creed in Luther's Small Catechism (1529). He writes: "I believe that I cannot of my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ my Lord, or come to Him, but the Holy Ghost has called me through the Gospel, enlightened me by His gifts, and sanctified and preserved me in the true faith; Even as He calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies the whole Christian Church on earth, and preserves it in union with Jesus Christ in the one true faith; In which Christian Church he daily forgives richly all my sins and the sins of all believers..."

The theocentricity of the passage is clear. It is the Holy Ghost who calls, gathers, etc., and He does it through the Gospel.

Yet there are also dialectic elements in Luther's ecclesiology. These must be seen against the background of his evangelical starting point. When one or another of these elements is removed from its starting point or overemphasized at the expense of its antithesis, it is impossible to be true to Luther and to retain the unity of his ecclesiology. We

14 G. Aulén, op. cit., pp. 19, 23.

shall discover repeated instances of this process in later Church History.

The fundamental dialectic is the antithesis between what we shall call the "personal" and the "institutional" or "functional" aspects of the Church. These correspond to the dialectic relation between revelation and faith.

The Church is "personal" in the sense that it is composed of a community of believing persons. To this extent, the Church is a result of faith. Luther's favourite expression for the Church was "the Communion of Saints". He identified the two phrases in the Creed "the Holy, Catholic Church", and "the Communion of Saints". In view of later controversy on the point in Norway, it is worth noticing that ^{he} substituted the word "Christian" for "Catholic" in order to distinguish the Church of Christ from the Roman Church. Although this identification of the two clauses is historically erroneous, Luther's interpretation is theologically defensible. As the equivalent of "Communion", Luther used the German word "Gemeinde" and rejected "Gemeinschaft" as too weak a term to express the fundamental idea. He evidently wished to avoid a sociological interpretation. Luther thus views the Church in concrete, not abstract terms, and interprets this phrase to mean the congregation, not the spiritual fellowship between believers. For Luther, the congregation (Gemeinde) is essentially the same as the Church (Kirche).¹⁵ In defining the essence of

the Church, Luther never conceived of it as anything but

¹⁵ R. Hauge, Forelesninger...p. 25.

"a solidarity of persons".¹⁶ This represented Luther's front against Rome.

On the other hand, the Church also has an institutional or functional side. The Church is a pre-condition for faith, and a means of propagating it. Faith is necessary for the Church and for Christian preaching. Not in the Donatist sense of making the means of grace dependent upon the spiritual condition of the human instrument, but in the light of the obvious fact that where the Gospel is not believed, it will not be proclaimed. On the other hand, the function of the administration of the means of grace (the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments) is essential to faith, and where this function is carried out, faith will result. "Wherever Christ is believed on and preached, there is the Holy Church". (Ubi Christus creditur, praedicatur, est sancta ecclesia.) The Gospel is the constitutive factor in the Church, and because it must be proclaimed in word and action, an order and a Ministry is necessary. This aspect represented Luther's front against the Enthusiasts.

Luther's concern for the Gospel as the constitutive factor in the Church and his emphasis upon the functional aspect is clearly evident in the list of "Marks" which he included in his Of the Councils and the Churches (1539).

16 E. G. Rupp, The Righteousness of God, p. 315. However, to say that "every other aspect of the meaning of the Church is subordinate to this fact" is to fail to do justice to the dialectic of Luther's ecclesiology.

We need not be in doubt as to the existence of the Church, for, says Luther, she has the following marks:

1. The preaching of the Word
2. The Sacrament of Baptism
3. The Sacrament of the Altar
4. The Keys
5. A Ministry called and consecrated
6. The public worship of God
7. Suffering

The Gospel is at the heart of each of the marks, with the possible exception of the rather peculiar final mark. The Keys were regarded as simply another aspect of the Ministry of the Word. The loosing key was predominant, the binding key subordinate. Thus it might be possible to argue that Church discipline was of the ESSE of the Church; Indeed, this very question was at stake in some of the 19th Century controversies which we shall pass under review at a later stage. Yet even so, the question of Church discipline, however important, was not assigned the same importance by Luther as it had for Calvin, and was set against a wholly different theology of the relation of Law and Gospel.

We shall see how Norwegian theologians in the 19th Century repeatedly overemphasized either the personal or the institutional aspect of the Church, thus disturbing the delicate dialectical balance of Luther's ecclesiology.

Luther's emphasis upon the objective Gospel as the constitutive factor also shaped his thinking on the very difficult problem of the limits of the Church. Rome identified the Church of Jesus Christ with the Holy Roman Church. The Enthusiasts sought to draw strict limits on the basis of

subjective experience. Luther rejected all attempts to draw limits to the Church. The Church cannot be identified with any one historical organization, and an appeal to subjective experience can be a dangerous source of false pride, Phariseeism, and hypocrisy. The only limits that can be drawn are the limits of the Gospel. Wherever it is proclaimed, there is the Church, for God has promised that His Word will not return void. Luther was willing "by the criterion of love" to recognize all baptized persons as members of the Church. On the other hand, because we are not competent to judge anyone "by the criterion of faith", this recognition has only provisional significance, for this life.

Luther spoke of the Church as both visible and invisible. He used these terms dialectically; For him, there was but one Church. He emphasized the invisibility of the Church against Roman institutionalism. The Church is an object of faith. Commenting on Matt. 16:18, Luther wrote: "Just as the rock is without sin, invisible and spiritual, so must the Church...be invisible and spiritual, to be grasped only by faith."¹⁷ He described the Church as UNSICHTBAR, not in the Platonic sense, but in the sense that it is hidden. Its limits are known only to God. At the same time, it is visible in the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments. Even the subjective side of the Church is made visible in confession of

17 Weimar Ausgabe, VII, 710. Quoted in H. Preus, op.cit., p. 86

faith. The Church is a present historical reality. Luther speaks of it as possessing both a body and a soul.

There is a real connection between the Church in its essence and its empirical form (GESTALT), and the connection lies in the Gospel as the constitutive factor. Luther distinguished between the Church and "outward Christendom". We have noted that the Christian is a member of both the kingdom on the Left and the kingdom on the Right. What is true of the individual is also true of the Church.¹⁸ The empirical form of the Church partakes of the character of the Church precisely to the extent that it is a creation of the Gospel. It is the continual task of the essential Church to realize itself within the framework of the empirical form, and to progress toward an identification of the two. To St. Jerome's question whether the Galatians constituted a true Church, Luther adopted the same standpoint as he did toward the Church of Rome. Both are Churches to the extent that the Gospel is present and creative. Thus, for Luther, the empirical Church really partakes of the nature of the Church. His concept of the Church is not spiritualistic, but bound to the concrete, historical congregation. This connection gave impetus to his entire programme of reform.¹⁹

18 cf. G. Forell, Faith Active in Love.

19 Bishop Aulén uses the following illustration to characterize Luther's viewpoint here: The Church and its form are like two transparent tablets superimposed upon one another, which only reveal their true appearance when held up to the light.

In accordance with the doctrine of the Two Realms, Luther drew a sharp distinction between ecclesiastical power and the secular authority. He could be, and, as we shall see, was quoted in support of separation of Church and State. On the other hand, excommunicated by the Pope and outlawed by the Emperor, Luther himself sought the support of the princes in carrying out the Reformation. He thus bequeathed to the Lutheran lands the continental State Church, with its many subsequent problems in the relation of Church and State. Political considerations appear to have played a part in this action. The KIRCHENORDNUNG of 1527 is sometimes seen as a concession to the hard realities of a chaotic situation. It made the Elector responsible for the ordering of Church life within his territory. This temporary form of polity was later replaced by a Consistory of theologians and jurists under the Elector. In the KIRCHENORDNUNG, an attempt was made to distinguish between the secular and the ecclesiastical authority; The Elector was not "to teach and exercise spiritual rule", but only "to prevent division, sects, and tumult among his subjects". Placing authority in the Elector's hands was fully consistent with Luther's theology.²⁰ According to the doctrine of the Two Realms, it is incumbent upon the State, as one of the orders of creation, to ensure an orderly and peaceful society, so that the Gospel may do

20 cf. J. MacKinnon, op. cit., p. 284: "The reasoning on which he based the right of the State to intervene in the affairs of the Church is theological, not juristic."

its work. In accordance with the doctrine of the Universal Priesthood, it is also the obligation of every Christian to further the cause of the Gospel within his own particular vocation. Whether or not the princes were truly Christian, no one could say. It was not, however, primarily a question of their right to intervene in Church affairs, but of their duty. As members of a Christian society, they had access to the Gospel and shared in its blessings. They were therefore bound to make provision for its further proclamation.

The doctrine of the Two Realms was a two-edged sword. Its dialectic was later to be ignored and Luther cited as an authority both for the retention of the State Church and for the separation of Church and State. It is important to note that the doctrine of the two realms precludes any concept of a "Christian State" in Luther. The State belonged to the kingdom on the Left. Yet Luther's political philosophy was theonomous, not autonomous. Moreover, he lived in a society in which the entire nation belonged to "outward Christendom". He approved the idea of a national Church.²¹ In the 19th Century, however, owing to the rise of a secularized society and a liberal, humanistic, "neutral" State, conditions were quite different.²² This problem was never solved in principle in 19th Century Norway, but its existence underlay many of the Church conflicts of the day.

21 cf. E. G. Rupp, op. cit., pp. 323-324.

22 cf. E. Berggrav, Staten og Mennesket, Oslo, 1945, pp. 45ff.

Luther's teaching on the Sacraments is closely related to his doctrine of the Church. Since it is the Gospel which gives the two Dominical Sacraments their character, they are means of grace, whereby the Holy Spirit creates the Church. Baptism is the Sacrament of initiation, the Lord's Supper the Sacrament of renewal. Luther taught Baptismal regeneration, conceived as the initiation of a relationship with God, and retained infant Baptism. He maintained that infants can have faith, although he did not base infant Baptism on this postulate. Luther's emphasis was on God's prevenient grace; It is this, and not our faith which makes Baptism what it is. In Baptism, God establishes a covenant with us. He never breaks His vow, even though we may be unfaithful. For Luther, Baptism was the constant source of assurance in times of doubt and despair. (I have been baptized!) He emphasized the need for growth in this covenant relation; His type of Christianity started from the expectation of Christian nurture and not from the crisis of conversion.

In the Eucharist, Luther was primarily concerned to uphold the doctrine of the Real Presence against the left-wing of the Reformation, while at the same time, he rejected Transubstantiation. His theology of the Sacrament was closely related to his theology of the Incarnation. He regarded the celebration of the Sacrament as the climax of the Sunday worship. Next to the forgiveness of sins, the aspect of the Sacrament which was uppermost in his mind was that of

communion, communion with Christ and with other believers. For Luther, the Church is never so much the Church as when she celebrates the Holy Communion. Finally, in keeping with his idea of the predominance of the Gospel over the Law, he regarded the Eucharist as primarily a means of grace, not as a means of discipline. He was not as concerned as Calvin to ensure that "unworthy" participants be excluded.

Luther's doctrine of the Ministry is a corollary of his basic assertion that the Gospel is the constitutive factor in the Church. We have said that because the Word and Sacraments must be administered, a Ministry is necessary. In this sense, we may say that it is of the ESSE of the Church. Luther's concept of the Ministry is functional; It is a service of the means of grace. Consequently, it is always subordinate to and never above the means of grace.

There is a dialectic also in Luther's concept of the Ministry. He maintains both the direct institution of the Ministry by Christ and its deduction through the Universal Priesthood of Believers. According to Scripture, all Christians are priests, with free access to God through Christ. (II. Cor. 3:6, I. Peter 2:9, et.al.) We receive this SACERDOTIUM in Baptism. The only other priesthood is the high priesthood fulfilled in Christ Himself. There is no special priestly estate (STAND). All have the right and duty to bear witness to the Gospel. On the other hand, there is a special clerical office (AMT, MINISTERIUM), to which God calls men through the Church. Not all who have the Universal Priesthood also possess the Ministry. No one may assume this

Office without the outward call of the Church as well as the inner call.²³ Luther follows St. Jerome in classifying ministers into four groups: Those called directly by God, those called by God through men, those called by men but not chosen by God,²⁴ and those called neither by God nor men (the Enthusiasts). He does not deny the possibility of an immediate call. The apostles and prophets were called in this manner. But the normal procedure in our day is a mediate call exercised by God through the Church. The office is received, not through ordination by a Bishop in Apostolic Succession believed to convey an indelible character, but through the call. Thus, for Luther ordination is not regarded as a Sacrament but as the public confirmation of the call of the Church. The office continues only so long as it is exercised. Yet in the case of the movement of a pastor from one parish to another, no re-ordination took place. It must, however, be remembered that this practice was unusual in Luther's day, and in practice, ordination and installation tended to be identified.²⁵ Luther maintained the essential unity, JURE DIVINO, of the clerical office. JURE HUMANO, there are differences in duties and in authority. He favoured the retention of the three-fold form of the Ministry so long as it served

²³ E. G. Rupp, op. cit., p. 316.

²⁴ Here Luther avoids the Donatist conception of the Ministry. He does not make participation in the Universal Priesthood an absolute requirement for a valid Ministry.

²⁵ R. Prenter, Skabelse og Genl sning, Kbhvn., 1955, p. 576n.

a purpose, but did not regard it as essential. The question of the form of the Ministry was to become a minor source of controversy in 19th Century Norwegian theology, though naturally on Lutheran premises it could not be expected to prove a burning issue.

Thus, in his doctrine of the Ministry there are clear indications of the double front on which Luther's whole theology operates. As against Rome, he emphasized the Universal Priesthood;²⁶ As against the Enthusiasts, he maintained that the Ministry was directly instituted by Christ. In his earlier years, the emphasis fell upon the Universal Priesthood, later the divine institution of the Ministry was placed in stronger relief. But both poles of the dialectic are always present in Luther. This was to provide a source of strong tension in the Church of Norway in the 19th Century.

²⁶ This is presented in particularly strong form in the letter to Prague, Church and Ministry, II.

The Lutheran Confessions

The idea of confessional writings or symbolical books originated within Lutheranism. The Confessions grew out of controversy, and are a natural outgrowth of the fact that the Lutheran Reformation was primarily concerned, not with abuses in the practice of the Church, but with its doctrine.

The basic Lutheran confessional document is the Augsburg Confession of 1530. The Emperor Charles V directed the Lutheran princes to submit a statement of doctrine to the Diet, with a view to healing the ecclesiastical breach that had arisen in his realm. The Augsburg Confession was presented in a German and a Latin text. When the Roman theologians presented a refutation, Philip Melancthon countered with the much longer Apology for the Augsburg Confession. Other symbols followed until, in 1580, the combined Confessions were published in the Book of Concord. Included were: the three ecumenical Creeds, Luther's Small and Large Catechisms (1529) and his Smalkaldic Articles (1537), the Augsburg Confession and its Apology (1530), and the Formula of Concord (1577). The three Creeds, the Small Catechism, and the Augsburg Confession were early adopted in Norway. The other Confessions were never officially adopted. It was feared that the doctrinal strife which occasioned the Formula of Concord in Germany might be transplanted in the North. Hence, the Book of Concord was banned in the kingdom of Denmark-Norway when it appeared. For this reason, and because the Formula and the Smalkaldic

Articles contain little or nothing on the Church, we shall confine our investigation to the Augsburg Confession and its Apology.

The general tone of the Augsburg Confession is conciliatory, catholic, and positive. The Preface speaks of the religious dissensions, and expresses the hope that "these things may be harmonized and brought back to the one simple truth and Christian concord; So that hereafter the one unfeigned and true religion may be embraced and preserved by us, so that we may live in the one Christian Church..." The Confession is concerned to show that, as the conclusion puts it, "in doctrine and ceremonials among us there is nothing received contrary to Scripture or to the catholic Church...We have diligently taken heed that no new and godless doctrines should creep into our Churches..." Both the Confession and its Apology repeatedly quote Scripture and the Fathers in their support. The title "Lutheran Church" does not occur; Rather, the Confession speaks of "our Churches" or "the Church here". As von Ranke has pointed out, it was not until the 1560's that the breach with the Roman Church came to be considered permanent.

The Augsburg Confession was drafted by Melancthon, , but Luther, although he admitted that he "could not have spoken so softly", approved it wholeheartedly. He "would not change a word of it". It is easy to understand his approval. The Augsburg Confession clearly embodies

Luther's teaching on every important point. In general, it establishes the same double front, against Rome and the Enthusiasts respectively.

The Confession confirms Luther's objective, theocentric approach to doctrine, and like him, places the doctrine of Justification by Faith in the centre, as representing the essential content of the Gospel. The order of its articles is significant: Article I deals with God, Article II with Original Sin, Article III with the Person of Christ, and Article IV states the doctrine of Justification by Faith. Article V, "Of the Ministry of the Church", clearly emphasizes prevenient grace and the theocentric approach. It sets forth a functional concept of the Ministry, and asserts the need for "outward" means of grace. It recognizes the Gospel as the constitutive factor in the Church, and carefully defines the Gospel in terms of Justification by Faith:

"For the obtaining of this faith, the Ministry of teaching the Gospel and administering the Sacraments was instituted.

For by the Word and Sacraments, as by instruments, the Holy Spirit is given: Who worketh faith, where and when it pleaseth God, in those that hear the Gospel, to wit, that God, not for our merit's sake, but for Christ's sake doth justify those who believe that they for Christ's sake are received into favour.

They ["our Churches"] condemn the Anabaptists and others, who imagine that the Holy Spirit is given to men without the outward Word, through their own preparations and works."

The classic Lutheran definition of the Church appears in Article VII:

"Also they teach that one holy Church is to continue forever. But the Church is the congregation of saints (German text, the assembly of all believers), in which the Gospel is rightly taught (German text, purely preached) and the

Sacraments rightly administered (German text, according to the Gospel).

And unto the true unity of the Church, it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments. Nor is it necessary that human traditions, rites or ceremonies instituted by men should be alike everywhere, as St. Paul saith: "There is one faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all'." 27

The Augsburg Confession gives expression to the same basic dialectic in the essence of the Church as we noted in Luther. The Church is "personal" in the sense that it is "the congregation of saints", or "the assembly of all believers". But the Church also has an institutional or a functional aspect: It is the community "in which the Gospel is purely preached and the Sacraments administered according to the Gospel". In Article VII, as in Article V, the objective, theocentric approach is employed, and the Gospel established as the constitutive factor in the Church. This is shown by the statement on the unity of the Church:

"For the true unity of the Church, it is sufficient to

27 Latin text: "Item docent, quod una sancta ecclesia perpetuo mansura sit. Est autem ecclesia congregatio sanctorum, in qua evangelium pure docetur et recte administrantur sacramenta. Et ad veram unitatem ecclesiae satis est consentire de doctrina evangelii et de administratione sacramentorum..."

German text: "Es wird auch gelehret, dass alle Zeit müsse ein heilige Christliche Kirche sein und bleiben, welche ist die Versammlung aller Gläubigen, bei welchen das Evangelium rein gepredigt und die heiligen Sakrament laut des Evangelii gereicht werden. Dann dies ist gnug zu wahrer Einigkeit der Christlichen Kirchen, dass da einträchtiglich nach reinem Verstand das Evangelium gepredigt und die Sakrament dem göttlichen Wort gemäss gereicht werden. Und ist nicht not zur wahren Einigkeit der Christlichen Kirche, dass allenthalben gleichformige Ceremonien, von den Menschen eingesetzt, gehalten werden, wie Paulus spricht zum Ephesern am 4: 'Ein Leib, ein Geist, wie ihr berufen seid zu einerlei Hoffnung euers Berufs, ein Herr, ein Glaub, ein Tauf.'"

agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments..."

The meaning of this statement can only be that unity is inherently one of the attributes of the Church, and that it is constituted by the Gospel. Wherever the Gospel is proclaimed, this spiritual unity will exist, regardless of the disunity of the empirical Church. The statement also contains an implicit criticism of the Roman attitude to traditions. (Cf. also the phrase "the true unity of the Church".)

The question has been raised whether there is not a tendency to intellectualize the concept of revelation already in this Article, where it is demanded that the Gospel be purely preached (REIN GEPREDIGT, PURE DOCETUR) and the Sacraments be rightly administered (RECTE ADMINISTRANTUR). When, however, we bear in mind that it is the Gospel, Justification by Grace received through Faith, and not a dogmatic system which is to be purely preached, there is no need to conclude that an intellectualization has taken place. This is borne out even more clearly in the German text, where we read that the Sacraments are to be administered "according to the Gospel" (LAUT DES EVANGELII).²⁸

We shall see, however, that an intellectualization of the concept of revelation and of the Gospel did in fact take place in the Age of Orthodoxy. This led to an overemphasis

²⁸ The phrase "according to the Gospel" throws light upon the general Lutheran position that the Sacraments need not be administered in precisely the same manner as in New Testament times.

upon the institutional side of the dialectic. We shall also see how, as a reaction against intellectualism and institutionalism, Pietism overemphasized the personal side of the dialectic and introduced a subjective approach to the doctrine of the Church. The personal side, the designation of the Church as CONGREGATIO SANCTORUM, is grammatically the main clause in the definition. It might be natural therefore to conclude that it is also the main clause theologically. Such an inference would, however, disturb the dialectic relationship and would constitute a subjective approach to the doctrine of the Church. It would mean a disavowal of Luther's theocentric approach and a setting aside of the principle that the Gospel is the sole constitutive factor in the Church.

The Augsburg Confession, and the Apology as well, recognize only two marks (NOTAE) of the Church: The pure preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments according to the Gospel. This represents no departure from Luther, but only a concentration. All of his marks, with the possible exception of the puzzling mark of suffering, may be subsumed under these two. The fact that the Ministry is absorbed by the two marks is evidence of the functional character of the Lutheran doctrine of the Ministry. The Keys are regarded as another aspect of the Ministry of Word and Sacrament. Lutheran teaching on the Keys represents a broad departure from the Roman penitential system. Private confession was retained, but it was expressly

stated that confession was "of human right only" and that (German text) "It is not commanded in Scripture, but has been instituted by the Church". It was retained "on account of the very great benefit of absolution"; Moreover, "the enumeration of sins is not necessary...because very many sins they neither see nor can remember".²⁹ The absolving key is predominant. In view of controversy over the point in 19th Century Norway, it is worth noting that the Augsburg Confession assumes that confession and absolution will precede participation in the Lord's Supper. "It is not usual (NON ENIM SOLET) to communicate the Body of our Lord except to those who have been previously examined and absolved."³⁰ The element of discipline is present in Lutheran doctrine and practice. But it is definitely subordinate to the idea that the Sacrament is a means of grace. It is nowhere stated that Church Discipline is an essential mark of the Church.

With regard to the limits of the Church, the Augsburg Confession displays the same cautious attitude which characterized Luther. Article VIII, "What the Church Is", states:

"Though the Church be properly (PROPRIE) the congregation of saints and true believers, yet seeing that in this life many hypocrites and evil persons are mingled with it, it is lawful to use the Sacraments administered by evil men, according to the voice of Christ (Matt. 23:2), 'The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat, etc.'. And the Sacraments and the Word are effectual, by reason of the institution and command of Christ, though they be delivered by evil men..."

 29 Augsburg Confession, Article XXV. Cf. also Art. XI.

30 *ibid.*, Art. XXV

The Article concludes with a condemnation of Donatism.

It is therefore clear that the Lutheran reformers regarded the Church both as a home for saints and as a school for sinners. However, the qualification of "the Church" by the adverb "PROPRIE" was significant for later developments. The hypocrites do not appear to have any real relation to the Church. This may represent the beginnings of a weakening of the close relationship maintained by Luther between the true Church and "outward Christendom". The language of the Apology on the point is stronger in its insistence that these hypocrites "are members of the Church with regard to participation in the use of the outward marks". (Art. VII) The terms "Visible" and "Invisible" Church do not occur in the Augsburg Confession or its Apology. If, however, the close connection between the congregation of saints and the empirical Church be weakened, it is only a short step to dualism. The Apology finds it necessary to state that "we are not speaking of an imaginary Church, that is nowhere to be found..., a Platonic state,...but...this Church...exists and is to be found over the whole earth." (Art. VII).

Another evidence of the Lutheran reluctance to draw limits to the Church and to make discipline essential is found in the Formula of Concord. This symbol condemns the Anabaptist teaching that that is not a true Christian Church "in which any sinners are yet found" and "in which there is not in full force public excommunication and some formal mode of excommunication". (Art. XII)

The Sacraments are dealt with in Articles IX,X,XIII, and XXII. Article IX declares that Baptism is "necessary to salvation", that by it "the grace of God is offered", and "that infants are to be baptized". Article X simply states the doctrine of the Real Presence, and Article XXII argues for the administration of the Eucharist in both kinds to the laity. Article XIII stresses the theocentric approach to the Sacraments: "They were ordained not only to be marks of profession among men, but rather that they should be signs and testimonies of the will of God toward men..." Those who teach that the Sacraments justify EX OPERE OPERATO are condemned.

The Augsburg Confession maintains Luther's doctrine of the Two Realms, and preserves the dialectic relation between them. Article XVI, "Of Civil Affairs", emphasizes the affinity of the two realms. This Article, directed against the Anabaptists, asserts that "such civil ordinances as are lawful are good works of God...". While conceding that the Gospel teaches "an everlasting righteousness of the heart", the Confession insists that "it doth not disallow order and government of commonwealths or families, but requireth especially the preservation and maintenance thereof, as of God's own ordinances, and that in such ordinances we should exercise love. Christians, therefore, must necessarily obey their magistrates and laws, save only when they command any sin; For then they must obey God rather than men (Acts 5:29)". This is restated in Article

XXVIII, "Of Ecclesiastical Power". Both the power of the sword and the ecclesiastical power are "because of God's commandment...dutifully to be revered and honoured, as the chiefest blessings of God upon earth". On the other hand, continues Art. XXVIII, "our teachers were compelled, for the comfort of men's consciences, to show the difference" between them. "Now their judgement is this: That the power of the keys, or the power of the Bishops, by the rule of the Gospel, is a power or commandment from God, of preaching the Gospel, of remitting or retaining sins, and of administering the Sacraments...The ecclesiastical power concerneth things eternal, and is exercised only by the Ministry of the Word...The political administration is occupied about other matters than is the Gospel. The magistracy defends not the minds, but the bodies...and coerces men by the sword...that it may uphold civil justice and peace. Wherefore the ecclesiastical and civil powers are not to be confounded..." Although the dialectic relation is preserved, the emphasis in this Article is clearly upon the distinction between the two realms. The distinction was relevant, not only against Rome, but also against theocratic tendencies among certain of the Enthusiasts (Cf. the Peasants' Revolt, 1525.)

The balance of the teaching of the Augsburg Confession on the Ministry falls upon the Ministry as an office or a function. We have already noted this with reference to Article V. The one essential function and purpose of the

Ministry is the administration of the means of grace. The incumbent of the office is a servant of the Word and subordinate to the Gospel. Starting with this basic assumption, the Confession displays evidences of Luther's own dialectic view of the Ministry. It is implicit in Article XIV, "Of Ecclesiastical Orders" (German text, "Church Government", KIRCHENREGIMENT): "...they teach that no man should publicly in the Church preach or administer the Sacraments, except he be rightly called (RITE VOCATUS; German text, "without a regular call", OHNE ORDENTLICHEN BERUF).

The doctrine of the Universal Priesthood is not directly stated in the Augsburg Confession. Nevertheless, it must be regarded as implicit in the ecclesiology of the Confession taken as a whole. There are several indications of this fact. The definition of the Church as the congregation of saints and the omission of the Roman distinction between teaching and learning Church is one indication. The insistence on Both Kinds for the laity in the Sacrament of the Altar is another. The doctrine also underlies Article XIV, in the requirement that the clergy have a regular call from the Church. It is assumed that God has given the function of the Ministry to the Church (i.e., to the Universal Priesthood) and that the Church mediates God's call to the clergy and transfers this function to them. This is not to say that the Ministry originates in or derives from the Universal Priesthood in a democratic

manner. The Apology states categorically (Art. XIII) that "the Ministry of the Word is instituted and commanded by God Himself". But, it continues, "the Church has God's command to install preachers and deacons...and we know that God will preach and work through men...who are chosen by men." This could even be independent of the participation of the minister in the Universal Priesthood. We have already noted how the Confession carefully avoids a Donatist view of the Ministry. The doctrine of the Universal Priesthood also provides the basis for the assertion that the Churches are under divine command to refuse obedience to Bishops whose teaching is contrary to the Gospel (Art. XXVIII).

Article XIV is, however, a sword which cuts two ways. It constitutes the recognition that an office of the Ministry, distinct from the Universal Priesthood, is necessary. Because its function is of the ESSE of the Church, so is the office. The Article discourages or even forbids anyone to preach and administer the Sacraments without the call of the Church. It undoubtedly represents a safeguard for the order of the Church against Enthusiasm. Article XIV will be of considerable importance later in this study. In 19th Century Norway, it was the focal point of a bitter intra-Church conflict over the question of lay-preaching. Unfortunately, the Article is brief, and its essential content is not further interpreted in the other Confessions. For the present, however, we should note that the Latin text reads "NEMO DEBEAT DOCERE," ("no one should preach"), not "NEMO POTEST

DOCERE" ("no one is capable of preaching"). The prohibition would seem, therefore, not to be absolute.

Thus, the Augsburg Confession was conservative in the matter of Church order. It recognized the Ministry as of the ESSE of the Church. It did not, however, ascribe this status to any one particular form of Church order. Indeed, no article on the subject appears in the Confession. Article XXVIII assures the Emperor that "our meaning is not to have rule taken from the Bishops". But, it continues, "this one thing only is requested at their hands, that they would suffer the Gospel to be purely preached, and that they would relax a few observances, which cannot be held without sin". It warns them not to be imperious or obstinate lest they afford cause for schism. But the use of the term "Bishop" in Art. XXVIII should not lead us to the conclusion that the reformers regarded the episcopal order as essential. It represents merely the recognition of a DE FACTO situation. The Augsburg Confession acknowledges no grades within the Ministry as existing by divine right (JURE DIVINO). The functions ascribed to the Bishops in Art. XXVIII are precisely the same functions carried out by all pastors: administration of Word and Sacraments, exercise of the power of the Keys, and exercise of doctrinal discipline. In these matters, "the Churches ought by divine right to render obedience unto them...". In all other matters, they exercise power and jurisdiction by human right (JURE HUMANO) only. Yet this DE FACTO recognition of the episcopacy at the time of the Reformation could be made the

pretext for raising question on the subject at a later date, as occasionally happened in 19th Century Norway.

To sum up, we may say that the ecclesiology of the Augsburg Confession is in substantial agreement with Luther in every respect. There are, however, three minor features which disturb an otherwise harmonious picture. They are particularly raised in the Apology. In Article VII, the Confession's Article VII is expanded as follows:

"The Church is not only a society on the strength of outward things and ritual signs, like other worldly societies ...but consists essentially in an inner communion and is a communion of faith and of the Holy Spirit in the heart. But this Church has outward marks...Where God's Word is purely preached and the Sacraments administered according to Christ's Gospel, there is surely the Church, there are the Christians, and only this Church are what Scripture calls Christ's Body..."

This is a thoroughly Lutheran statement. The reference, however, to the means of grace as "outward" marks, repeatedly made in the Apology, is disturbing. This seems to assign them less than their rightful position as constitutive factors and to place them in a secondary relation to the Church.

In the second place, we have noted that the Confession (Art. VIII) uses the term "the Church Properly speaking" (PROPRIE). The Apology (ART. VIII) makes a distinction between "the Church broadly speaking, including good and evil men" (ECCLESIA LAPGE DICTAM COMPLECTI BONOS ET MALOS) and "the Church properly speaking, being the congregation of saints" (ECCLESIA PROPRIE DICTAM ESSE CONGREGATIONEM SANCTORUM). This distinction tends to deprive the empirical Church of all real Churchly character.

Finally, there is the hint of a tendency to intellectualize the Gospel, in the frequent use in the Apology of the terms EVANGELIUM and DOCTRINA as synonyms. This identification threatens the permanence of the Church; The Middle Ages would constitute a breach, for was not Medieval Roman doctrine false? Moreover, if the Gospel and doctrine are synonymous, the Church becomes primarily a teaching institution, and the distinction between ECCLESIA DOCENS and ECCLESIA DISCENS inevitably arises. This opens the way for institutionalism.

These weaknesses in the Confessions represent the thin edge of the wedge which drove deeply into the Lutheran doctrine of the Church in the ensuing period.

The Age of Orthodoxy

It is customary to divide the history of Lutheranism from the publication of the Book of Concord to the beginning of the 19th Century into three epochs: The Age of Orthodoxy (to ca. 1700), of Pietism (to ca. 1750), and of the Enlightenment. These dates are only approximations, representing the periods in which each was predominant. There was much overlapping. Moreover, the three movements were different in character: Orthodoxy was mainly theological, Pietism devotional and practical, and the Enlightenment philosophical. They could therefore co-exist, at least for a time, in parallel streams. Indeed, it must be said that they were all mutually interrelated, and that each exercised both a positive and a negative influence upon the others. Each had some characteristics in common with the others; Each represented a reaction to the others. Orthodoxy, for example, shared with the Enlightenment great confidence in human reason, but the way in which it was employed led them to very different theological conclusions. Orthodoxy and Pietism were dogmatically congenial, but opposed in their approach to the practice of religion. Pietism and the Enlightenment were both subjective in approach, but they were dogmatically poles apart. It must also be remembered that all three movements were a part of a larger context embracing the entire Western world. Finally, with special reference to the Norwegian scene, we must note that the predominant

spiritual and intellectual influence throughout this period, indeed until recent times, was German. Theologically, Norway might be described as a German colony. Movements which originated in Germany inevitably gravitated to the North, although they were usually delayed and much modified and simplified in the process.

Periods of creative genius in history are almost invariably followed by periods of consolidation and development. Such a period was the Age of Orthodoxy. This was an age in which each State and each religious communion strove for uniformity within its realm. It was an age of strife and intolerance, of religious wars, and of theological dispute. Lutherans found themselves in conflict, not only with the Roman Church, the Enthusiasts, and the Socinians, but not least with the Calvinists. This was the age in which were developed the great Lutheran dogmatic systems. Still, the epithet "dead Orthodoxy" is not entirely appropriate. Although Orthodoxy grew more arid as it developed, the age was also marked by "a respect for the Word and a God-fearing attitude unparalleled before or since"³² and a flourishing devotional life. From the monarch downwards, there was deep concern for Christian nurture, to be carried out if necessary by force.³³

31 Orthodoxy was the only one of the three movements under discussion to win the allegiance of the popular majority.

32 I. Welle, Kirkens Historie, II, 2nd Edn., p. 11. This was also the "golden age" of Lutheran hymnody.

33 P. Lindhardt, Den Nordiske Kirkes Historie, pp. 142-3.

The father of Orthodoxy was Philip Melanchthon (1497-1560). His contribution has been variously assessed. He was the acknowledged leader of the Reformation through the difficult period following Luther's death, but his synergist views and his tendency to sacrifice doctrinal positions for the sake of unity ("unionism") led to the repudiation of "Philippism" in the Formula of Concord. He has since become "a symbol of all that is suspect and reprehensible in theology".³⁴ Nevertheless, his influence on Post-Reformation Lutheran theology can scarcely be overestimated. Under the influence of Humanism, he completely altered current theological methodology. Even the first edition of his main work, Loci Communes, (1521), represented a departure from Luther's "radial" thinking. Despite the fact that the Formula rejected his position, his opponents came to adopt his philosophy and psychology. Henceforth, Aristotelian philosophy after the manner of the Medieval Scholastics became increasingly predominant in Lutheran theology. Indeed, the Age of Orthodoxy is also called the Age of Lutheran Scholasticism. Besides Melanchthon, the leading theologians in the early stage were Jacob Andreae, Johan Brenz, Aegidius Hunnius, Leonhard Hutter, and Martin Chemnitz, Melanchthon's principal opponent. They were followed by the systematizers of High Orthodoxy: Johan Gerhard (1582-1637), Abraham Calov, Andreas Quenstedt, David Hollazius, George Calixtus, and

³⁴ J. Pelikan, From Luther to Kierkegaard, p. 26.

others. One of the men who criticized Orthodoxy from within was Johan Arndt (1555-1621), whose True Christianity became the best-loved devotional classic in the Lutheran Church. It has been said that Arndt exercised an influence on Lutheran Church life second only to that of Luther himself.³⁵

In the united kingdom of Denmark-Norway, the Philippist party was predominant until ca. 1600, when the theology of the Formula gained control. Orthodoxy then reigned unchallenged throughout the 17th Century; It constituted one aspect of the general trend, which also led to the establishment of the absolute monarchy in 1660. The leading figures here were two Danes, Bishop Hans Resen (1561-1638), and Bishop Jesper Brochmand (1585-1652), whose Universae Systema Theologiae was the standard dogmatic for more than a century.³⁶ In addition to the doctrinal uniformity secured by Brochmand's work, the kingdom also achieved uniformity in liturgy and in ecclesiastical law, by the famous Kirke-Ritual of 1685 and Christian V's Danish (1683) and Norwegian (1687) legal codes. These legislative landmarks are important for us, since their essential provisions remained in force throughout the 19th Century.

Protestant Scholasticism was the equal of Medieval Scholasticism in learning, acumen, and in completeness, if not in originality and boldness of speculation.³⁷ It strove

³⁵ I. Welle, op. cit., p. 15.

³⁶ P. Lindhardt, op. cit., p. 144

³⁷ R. S. Franks, in Dogma in History and Thought, p. 112.

to incorporate the distinctive doctrines of the Reformation into a system built on the old philosophy. It conceded a much greater place to reason than Luther had done. In the process, however, it obscured Luther's theocentric approach and intellectualized the concept of revelation. Truth and revelation were conceived in propositional terms. The Gospel and "pure doctrine" were identified. Orthodoxy displayed an "insensitiveness to the symbolic nature of religious thought" and presupposed "something very like omniscience in spiritual things".³⁸ An excessive zeal to safeguard and buttress the propositions of revelation led to the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of Scripture. Scripture and the Word of God were thus rigidly identified. As a result, the concept of revelation became nomistic, the whole approach to Scripture became legalistic, and the Gospel assumed something of the character of a New Law, however greatly the theologians strove to keep Law and Gospel distinct. A central place was still given to the doctrine of Justification by Faith, but it was forced to share this position with the doctrine of verbal inspiration. Faith as well as revelation was intellectualized. Paul Tillich puts the same fundamental point slightly differently in his assertion that the central Protestant principle of Justification by Faith was "ideologized".³⁹ Instead of emphasizing Justification by Faith as the essential content of the Gospel, Orthodoxy tended to identify

³⁸ H. R. MacKintosh, Types of Modern Theology, p. 9.

³⁹ P. Tillich, The Protestant Era, p. 246.

the entire dogmatic system with the Gospel and to require assent to the entire system. Finally, Orthodoxy failed to maintain the dialectic character of Luther's own theology. Emil Brunner has said that the history of Protestant theology since the Reformation is the history of the collapse of the "paradox of unity" and of a disintegration into non-paradoxical, one-sided half-truths.⁴⁰

These developments had fateful consequences for the doctrine of the Church. The tendency to intellectualize the concept of revelation and to identify the Gospel with doctrine led to an overemphasis upon the institutional aspect of the nature of the Church. Lutheran theologians continued to define the Church as the Communion of Saints, but they tended to regard it primarily as a teaching institution. They continued to teach that the Gospel was the constitutive factor, but the content of the Gospel had greatly expanded. A distinction between the ECCLESIA DOCENS and the ECCLESIA DISCENS inevitably arose. It is also important to note that the Age of Orthodoxy became anthropocentric in the same way as Medieval Scholasticism. This can be illustrated from the doctrine of the Church, where a subjective approach to the question inevitably led to a preoccupation with the problem of the Visible and Invisible Church.

These tendencies are evident as early as the 3rd edition of Melanchthon's Loci (1543): Melanchthon avoids

40 E. Brunner, The Philosophy of Religion..., p. 31.

describing the Church as invisible; His emphasis is upon the Visible Church. The Visible Church is composed of those who are baptized and give assent to the pure doctrine; At the same time, it is the place where God "regenerates many".⁴¹ But the congregation of saints is only perceptible in the Visible Church to the eyes of faith. In thus distinguishing between the Visible Church and the Communion of Saints, Melanchthon opens the way for a dualist interpretation of the dichotomy of the Visible and Invisible Church. Moreover, he recognizes three Marks of the Church: to the Word and the Sacraments, he adds the Ministry.

The later Orthodox theologians, reacting both against Melanchthon and against the standpoint of Cardinal Bellarmine ("The Church is as visible as the Kingdom of France or the Republic of Venice") posited a clear dualism of the Visible and Invisible Church. We might illustrate their view of the relationship between Visible and Invisible by drawing two concentric circles. The Visible Church was visible because its limits could be known and because God used visible means to gather it. It was the Community of the Called (COETUS VOCATORUM), and not really a true Church (ECCLESIA VERA) at all. At the same time, the Orthodox theologians were forced into the logical contradiction of admitting that the Visible Church was an ECCLESIA VERA, because it possessed the true doctrine, which it was its right and duty to teach.

⁴¹ G. Aulén, op. cit., p. 91.

On the other hand, the Community of the Elect (COETUS ELECTORUM) was said to be invisible, because its limits could not be known and because Christ, its Head, was invisible.

It is clear that the approach of Orthodoxy to the question of the Visible and Invisible Church was subjective. This tendency was further developed in the declining stage of the Age of Orthodoxy, under influence from Pietism. Associationism or voluntarism entered into ecclesiology. The Visible Church became a mere association of persons voluntarily uniting for cultic purposes. On the other hand, there were attempts to make visible the Invisible Church, to gain some assurance that the Church really did exist. Various new Marks of the Church, all of them subjective, were recognized: Church discipline, good works, piety, and the like. In this stage, it was only natural that the institutional aspect of the Church, having been deprived of its religious value and coming under criticism from Pietism, should decline.

Because the dialectic of the Church's nature as both visible and invisible had broken down, the dialectic of the Two Realms also collapsed. The result was both a dualism and a false synthesis. When the Invisible Church and "outward Christendom" (i.e., the Visible Church) were strictly separated (contrary to Luther's view), the Communion of Saints lost its concreteness and historicity. A dualism thus arose which made of the Church a Platonic

State and opened the way for an eventual secularization of the Kingdom on the Left. Then, as the Visible Church lost its religious significance, it became all the easier to incorporate the Visible Church into the State. Caesaropapism increased apace in this period, not least in Denmark-Norway.⁴² A case could be made out for this; Luther placed the Visible Church together with the State in the Kingdom on the Left. What was forgotten in Orthodoxy, however, was the fact that the Visible Church is a Church and that she provides for the administration of the means of grace, and this is not a function of the State. The incorporation of the Visible Church into the State represented a false synthesis.

We have noted that the change which occurred in the concept of revelation led to a corresponding change in the doctrine of the Ministry. Luther's dialectic of the Ministry gave way to an exaltation of the clerical office at the expense of the Universal Priesthood, as illustrated by the distinction between the ECCLESIA DOCEMS and the ECCLESIA DISCENS. The Gospel lost some of its inherent power, and was identified with pure doctrine. Some of its authority passed to the office, and inevitably to the persons of the clergy. One indication of the enhanced status of the clergy was the part which they played in Church Discipline. We recall that Luther considered the Power of the Keys as an

⁴² P. Lindhardt, op.cit., pp. 150-151. Lindhardt says that Danish Absolutism combined the idea of natural rights (i.e. dualism) with the idea of theocracy (i.e. a false synthesis).

aspect of the Ministry of the Word, to be the possession of the whole Church, and the authority of the clergy in this regard as purely delegated. He rejected the Roman distinction between the power of order and the power of jurisdiction. The Age of Orthodoxy revived this distinction. The power to judge, to prescribe penance, and to excommunicate (sometimes with the aid of the secular arm) became the prerogative of the clergy. Denmark-Norway introduced the first ordinance for Church Discipline in 1629. A form of the Calvinist office of elder (the so-called "lay-assistants", MEDHJELPERE) was introduced, but its incumbents were appointed by the parish vicar. It should also be noted that, whereas Luther had emphasized absolution, the Age of Orthodoxy, in accord with its nomistic-intellectualistic concept of revelation, so emphasized Church discipline that the power of "binding" came to obscure the power of "loosing".

Thus, in the period 1530-1700, a great development occurred in Lutheran theology. But it was a development which worked untold harm. The Age of Orthodoxy offered inferior substitutes for Luther's ingenious approach, his concept of revelation, and his dialectic theology. Intellectualism, legalism, and subjectivism had entered, and had radically altered the Lutheran doctrine of the Church.

Pietism

The dividing line between Classical Protestantism and Modern Protestantism is usually drawn at the point where the Age of Orthodoxy gives way to the period of Pietism. It is correct to do so, provided we bear in mind the fact that the declining years of Orthodoxy, as described in the foregoing, shade almost imperceptibly over into Pietism. Modern Protestantism, embracing the two movements Pietism and the Enlightenment, is a vastly different thing from Classical Protestantism, and "the difference between them can largely be described as a difference in the concept of the Church".⁴³ There were two factors in particular which contributed to the collapse of Classical ecclesiology: 1) The decline of the Gospel from its position as the constitutive factor in the Church, and 2) The decline of faith in the Word as a present and active Word of God. These factors represent the consequences of the intellectualism and subjectivism described above.

What is known in the Lutheran Church as Pietism was part of the great international revival movement which ran through the entire Protestant world in the 18th Century. It not only resembled but also directly influenced the Methodist Revival in England. Father of the movement was Philip Jacob Spener (1635-1705), a German pastor. His -----
⁴³ G. Aulén, op.cit., p. 112.

little book Pia Desideria, published in 1675, clearly outlined the Pietist programme in six points: 1) Intensified Bible study, to increase personal spirituality; 2) Increased lay activity in the Church, based on the principle of the Universal Priesthood; 3) Emphasis upon the practical rather than the intellectual in the religious life; 4) Charity in religious controversy, so that the pursuit of the truth might take precedence over the scoring of theological victories; 5) Reorganization of the theological curriculum with a view to increasing the piety of both professors and students; and 6) A more evangelical and edifying type of preaching. After Spener's death, leadership passed to August Herman Francke (1663-1727), professor at the new university at Halle, which now became the main centre of the movement. Here were built the famous Halle educational and charitable institutions. But Pietism was a heterogeneous movement. It included a radical wing in the tradition of German Mysticism and related to Quakerism. It also included the Moravians, so-called because the original nucleus of the group were Moravian refugees. They originally settled at Herrnhut, on the estate of the remarkable Count Nicholas von Zinzendorf (1700-1760). Pietism came under attack from some Orthodox theologians, and there was constant tension within the movement itself.

Pietism in all three forms entered Denmark-Norway through revival movements about 1700. For the next two generations, it was the leading party in Northern Church

life, and remains to this day a strong factor in the Norwegian Church. It early won a place at the royal court of Fredrik IV, and it gained control of the country in the form of "State Pietism" under Christian VI (1730-46). Halle Pietism and Moravianism vied for leadership; It was the former which emerged victorious, owing to the fact that it was better adapted to the conditions of the State Church. In 1741, the Crown issued the famous Conventicle Act, which placed religious activities outside the regular services under strict clerical control. This law is important for our purposes because it remained in force in Norway until 1842. The Moravians were partly suppressed, but in 1771 they obtained permission to found the colony at Christiansfeld, Denmark, which became the Moravian centre in the North. The influence of radical Pietism was sporadic and brief, but both Halle Pietism and Moravianism continued to influence Norwegian Church life into the 19th Century. Here (unlike Germany and England) the Moravians remained as a party within the State Church and did not separate from it.

One highly significant achievement of Pietism was the introduction of Confirmation in 1736. From 1738, the standard Catechism was Bishop Erik Pontoppidan's Truth unto Godliness (SANDHED TIL GUDFRYGTIGHED). The importance of this little volume for Norwegian Church life can scarcely be overestimated. It was the cherished dogmatics textbook of the laity, the iron rations of the Christian, for

a century and a half. It became the principal means of inculcating the pure doctrine and the Pietist ETHOS, and served as the foundation-stone of later revival. It was largely due to Pontoppidan's Catechism that Pietism passed into the life-stream of Norwegian Christians. His Collegium Pastorale, also, was an influential work in practical theology for over a century.

The chief concern of Pietism lay rather with the life of the Church in general than with doctrine in particular. Its roots lay in the mystical tradition of Augustine, Bernard, and Johan Arndt, although it was also influenced by Reformed Puritanism. In general, it maintained the Orthodox doctrines, especially Justification by Faith and the Verbal Inspiration of Scripture. It thus united conservative theology with revivalist piety. We shall trace at a later stage the important part played by this combination of forces in 19th Century Norwegian Church life. But Pietism also contributed to the break-down of the influence of Lutheran Scholasticism. While it certainly revived the Reformation emphasis upon the essentials of the faith, it was not confessional and, provided that the cardinal doctrines were safeguarded, it displayed no great sensitiveness to theological error. Its interpretation of Scripture tended to be Biblicist. It was therefore tolerant toward Calvinism, but not toward Rome, since it regarded Rome as having erred on both of the essentials, the Sola Scriptura and the Sola Gratia, Sola Fide. Pietism's

greatest weakness was its thoroughly subjective approach to religion. "The watchword of Pietist teaching came to be the New Life, viewed as a subjective process, rather than Justification, which is the act of God."⁴⁴ Whereas Orthodoxy tended to intellectualize faith, Pietism tended to psychologize it. On the basis of his own conversion experience, Francke laid down as normative a psychology of faith which included four steps: 1) Repentance and contrition; 2) Decision of the will; 3) Faith and assurance; And 4) The New Life. Whereas Orthodoxy emphasized the faith that is believed (FIDES QUAE CREDITUR), Pietism emphasized the faith with which we believe (FIDES QUA CREDITUR). Orthodoxy's "Christ for us" was replaced by Pietism's "Christ in us". Orthodoxy was collectivistic; Pietism was individualistic. It was as difficult for Pietism as it had been for Orthodoxy to maintain the dialectic of Lutheran theology. It tended to swing to the opposite extreme. Sometimes, opposing factions developed within the movement itself. Both Halle Pietism and the Moravians operated within the Lutheran scheme of Law and Gospel. But, whereas Halle emphasized repentance and greater ethical seriousness, the Moravians were hyper-evangelical and sometimes excessively sentimental (cf. Zinzendorf's hymns). Halle was therefore legalistic and ran the risk of leaving people under the Law; Lindhardt says that the Moravians served as a sort of

⁴⁴ H. R. Mackintosh, op.cit., p.11.

"ambulance service" for these convicted souls. In general, however, the ETHOS of the Pietist Revival was ascetic. In the celebrated controversy over the "Adiaphora", the Pietists denied the existence of these "indifferent things" in morality, and shunned such things as smoking, drinking, dancing, and the theatre. This attitude is strikingly revealed in Pontoppidan's Catechism.

The rise of this subjectivist, individualist, and revivalist movement was bound to have a profound effect upon the doctrine of the Church. In the first place, it accelerated the trends begun in late Orthodoxy. The emphasis of Pietism upon subjective experience and its inherently subjective approach led to an associational and sectarian view of the nature of the Church. Human volition replaced the Gospel as the constitutive factor. "Instead of the Church as the mother of the individual", (as in Luther), Pietism regarded "the individual as the mother of the Church".⁴⁵ In this, Pietism was influenced by the new social and political theories of Grotius, Locke, Hobbes, and Thomasius: If the State is a voluntary organization formed by the people, the Church represents a parallel case, particularly in an age of Caesaropapism. This concept lay somewhat below the surface in Pietism, but came to full maturity in the Enlightenment, when it could build on the foundation of natural religion.

⁴⁵ G. Aulén, op. cit., p. 119.

In defining the nature of the Church, Pietism did good service in re-asserting the personal side of Luther's dialectic. In insisting that the Church was the Communion of Saints, Pietism saved the Lutheran Church from the institutional tendencies within Orthodoxy. It tended, however, to go to the opposite extreme. The Church was regarded more as a home for saints than as a school for sinners. This is evident in Pietism's insistence on a specific conversion experience. It is also evident in the way in which Spener sought to realize his six-point programme. He introduced the so-called COLLEGIA PIETATIS, small Bible study groups. These were intended to expand into larger groups. Often, however, these ECCLESIOLOE IN ECCLESIA tended to supplant the fellowship of the Church, and were sometimes an inducement to separatism.

Pietism exhibited a tendency to add new Marks to the two recognized in the Confessions. Church discipline was particularly emphasized, and renunciation of the Adiaphora made a mark of faith. The Revival felt the need to draw stricter limits to the Church. It eagerly adopted the Orthodox dualism of Visible and Invisible Church. The Visible Church was defined as the great mass of church-goers, while the true believers constituted the Invisible Church. Radical Pietists condemned the Visible Church as a veritable Babel. Generally, however, Pietists were more concerned to render visible the Invisible Church. The ECCLESIOLOE were designed to fulfil this function.

Lindhardt writes: "Pietism's Churchmanship was definitely Low-Church. It attempted--without success-- to revise the Liturgy in this spirit by abolishing candles, vestments, chanting, etc., and to introduce conditional Absolution. Pietism was offended by the fact that both the CONFITEOR... and the Benediction were applied to the same people. Behind this lay that thought...that the invisible Church was, after all, the true Church..."⁴⁶ Pietism was not content, as Luther had been, to regard the Church as hidden, an object of faith. The movement had lost Luther's boundless confidence in the power of the Gospel to create the Church.

Like most revival movements, Pietism emphasized preaching rather than the Sacraments. It showed great concern for Christian nurture⁴⁷, but it conceived of nurture more as a prelude to conscious faith than as the development of the Baptismal covenant relationship. Instead of seeking assurance in Baptism, in Luther's own fashion, Pietism was on guard against undue confidence in the Sacrament of Initiation. What was important was a living faith for today.

The attitude of Pietism toward the Two Realms was ambiguous. Here again, Pietism failed to maintain Luther's dialectic view. There were tendencies **both** toward a theocratic synthesis of the Two Realms and a strict separation between them. Radical Pietism favoured the complete separation of Church and State. The Moravians lacked appreciation for the secular realm; Their theocracy was limited to

⁴⁶ P. Lindhardt, op. cit., p. 165.

⁴⁷ Some of its best work was done in the field of education.

life within the conventicle itself. The dominant party, representing "State Pietism", sought to remove Church discipline from the realm of civil punishment and to make it a matter of pastoral care. Nevertheless, its standpoint was fundamentally theocratic; The end result of State Pietism was a strengthening of the State-Church bond. Pietism strove to realize the ideal of the Christian State. "No movement has insisted more strongly upon the old demand: Each man shall be a Christian in the king's realm. And it added: A personal Christian. No one has appealed more strongly to the Crown to intervene against religious and moral decay than the Pietist clergy."⁴⁸

The Pietist concept of the Ministry reflects the same individualist, subjectivist, and spiritualist tendencies which we have observed in its doctrine of the Church. It failed also to maintain Luther's dialectic here. Pietism attempted to revive the concept of the Universal Priesthood and actually succeeded in stirring numbers of the laity to responsible participation in the life of the Church. It might be said that Pietism overemphasized the Universal Priesthood, but perhaps it is more correct to say that it presented a new interpretation of the concept, an interpretation so subjectivistic and spiritualistic that it virtually ended in a Donatist doctrine of the Ministry.

The basic reason for this error lay in the fact that,

48 A. Seierstad, Kyrkjelegt Reformarbeid i Norig i Nittande Hundreåret, p. 8.

for the Pietists, the Word of God had lost its creative power. As a result, a guarantee for validity had to be sought in the person of the minister. Pietism did not deny outright the efficacy of the Word. Indeed, Spener expressly affirmed that "the power and fruit of the office of the Ministry...are derived from the Divine Word." But, he adds, "the prime requirement of a teacher is the love of Christ.. if he lacks this, (which in turn requires knowledge of Divine truth and the order of salvation which the teacher must teach his congregation) in his soul, he does not possess the most powerful and the most necessary requirement".⁴⁹ Whereas Orthodoxy had institutionalized the Ministry, Pietism went to the opposite extreme and derived the authority of the Ministry from the inner spiritual enlightenment of the individual. Pietism believed as firmly as Orthodoxy that the Ministry is ordained of God, but it had a different idea of how God called men into the Ministry. Orthodoxy held that God's call to the Ministry was mediated through the Church, and derived a certain security from this belief. Pietism revived the distinction between the inner and the outer call, but regarded the former as decisive. It alone is divine; The latter is purely human and without religious significance. An inner experience was regarded as the necessary requirement for any true pastor.

This meant that the Holy Spirit only works through regenerate

⁴⁹ Quoted in F. Holmström, et.al., En Bok om Kyrkans Ambetet, p. 212.

preachers. Spener wrote that the reason for the varying efficacy of the Word was that "one preacher treats the Scripture only through his own understanding, whereas the Holy Spirit is united with another, thus giving power to the Word".⁵⁰ Thus, the Spirit was separated from the Word in a Spiritualist manner. Orthodoxy rejected false doctrine, but it could retain a godless pastor; Pietism rejected the unregenerate pastor, and his doctrine in consequence. It was unthinkable for the Pietists that a godless pastor could be anything but harmful to the Church. This amounted to a Donatist (EX OPERE OPERANTIS) view of the Ministry. In consequence, a new turn was given to the doctrine of the Universal Priesthood. In theory, the Pietists accorded to all Christians the right and duty of proclaiming the Gospel. However, like Luther, they distinguished between this Priesthood and the Ministry. Halle (or State) Pietism was as opposed to uncontrolled lay-preaching as Orthodoxy had been (cf. the Conventicle Act). But whereas Luther had held the inner and outer call together, Pietism separated them. The outer call was given only to those who possessed a special spiritual anointing, a CHARISMA, over and above the mere fact that they were Christians. The presence of such a gift could only be determined subjectively. This Charismatic principle opened the way for a frequent phenomenon in 19th Century Norway, the claim made by unordained men of the right to come forward and preach.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 218.

Whereas Luther had emphasized the right of the Universal Priesthood to transfer the preaching office through the outer call, Pietism, with its emphasis upon the need for the preacher to share in the Universal Priesthood and to possess a special gift could come to the conclusion that anyone who possessed this gift had the right to be heard. Thus, the conceptions of the Universal Priesthood and of the Ministry were individualized, subjectivized, and spiritualized.

It is also evident that the Pietist view of the Ministry, no less than the Orthodox, represented a departure from the predominantly functional view of the Ministry taught by Luther. Orthodoxy created a kind of priestly estate, and Pietism was unable to restore the balance correctly. It was led by its subjectivism to approach the doctrine of the Ministry from the standpoint of the personal character of the clergy rather than from the functions inherent in their office.

The Enlightenment

So far we have been concerned with Luther and with movements within Lutheranism itself. In the period of the Enlightenment, however, Lutheranism was influenced by a movement of thought wider than its own internal dialectic and rooted not primarily in the Christian tradition but in Renaissance Humanism.

The Enlightenment brought to fruition the efforts to emancipate the human spirit and particularly human reason begun in the Renaissance and carried forward by thinkers like Descartes. It was an extremely heterogeneous movement, representing a wide range of opinions. In general, however, it was subjectivistic, individualistic, moralistic, and optimistic. In contrast to Scholastic thought, the self-conscious subject became the fundamental factor in epistemology. The Enlightenment was preoccupied with religious questions, and generally supported belief in God, freedom, and immortality. Yet it tended to break down the traditional faith by its demand for a greater appreciation of "natural religion". It has been described as "a movement from Christianity to religion in general, then from religion in general to mere morality, and finally from morality to eudaimonism, the doctrine of happiness".⁵¹ Its basic problem was the relation between reason and revelation, and, as the movement developed, reason gradually

⁵¹ R. Kübel, in Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, III, p. 1997.

gained the upper hand. It came to have an almost unbounded confidence in human nature and its perfectibility. Hence, it had great faith in education. It eventually reduced the Christian religion to a simple, rational moral code based on the teachings of Jesus. Indeed, we might say that it altered Christianity to the religion of the natural man. Because of its tendency to make all things relative, it was naturally tolerant of other creeds. The Enlightenment deeply affected the upper and middle classes, but like most movements of thought, did not permeate the great mass of people until it was on the wane. In the philosophy of Emmanuel Kant, the Enlightenment met both its final climax and its nemesis. He dealt the decisive blow to the idea that the existence of God can be proved rationally, but his discovery of God as a postulate of the practical reason gave to revelation a sphere relatively independent of reason. The French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars also helped to break down the optimistic anthropology which lay at the heart of the Enlightenment. At the beginning of the 19th Century, it was forced to yield to Idealism and Romanticism.

For our present purposes, it will be sufficient to note the influence exerted by the Enlightenment upon Lutheran theology and Church life, and to call particular attention to its bearing upon the doctrine of the Church.

The Enlightenment in Germany and Scandinavia was generally more conservative than in Britain and France. It was also less empirical and more speculative. There were

several points of contact between the movements under discussion here. The intellectualism and rational approach of Orthodoxy prepared the way for the Enlightenment. Late Orthodoxy and early Enlightenment both sought to explain and defend Scriptural truth by the use of reason. The Enlightenment shared certain characteristics of Pietism: subjectivism, individualism, and moralism. Especially in its earlier forms, the Enlightenment was often looked upon as an ally instead of an enemy. A man like Bishop Pontopidan, a typical transition figure, combined Orthodox doctrine and Pietist religion with Enlightenment apologetics and interest in natural science. In time, however, the Enlightenment outdistanced both Orthodoxy and Pietism.

We may distinguish two stages in the theology of the Enlightenment. The first is known as Supranaturalism. Its leading figure was the philosopher Christian Wolff (1679-1754), professor at Halle. A pupil of Leibniz, he was removed by the Pietists but later re-instated by Frederick the Great. He regarded himself as orthodox and sought in a Scholastic manner to construct a system wherein God, morality, and immortality were rationally deduced. Orthodoxy had distinguished between what was above reason and what was contrary to reason, and between regenerate and unregenerate reason. Wolff drew a sharp distinction between natural and revealed theology. He held that everything which is valid in natural theology must be found in revealed theology, but that not everything which is found in revealed theology is valid in natural theology. He

regarded revelation as necessary in addition to reason, but it must not be contrary to reason or experience. Wolff exercised profound influence on Scandinavian students at Halle.

G. E. Lessing (1729-1781) carried rationalism a step further. He argued that the content of revelation is identical with that of reason. He therefore rejected the idea of an absolute religion. He also distinguished between the historical and the eternal in religion. The "accidental" truths of history cannot become the proof of the necessary truths of reason. With Lessing, Deism entered Continental theology. The leading theologian of this period was J. S. Semler (d. 1791), who has been called the father of modern Biblical criticism. He was comparatively conservative; But H. S. Reimarus (d. 1768) and K. F. Bahrdt (d. 1792) were more radical. They represent true Rationalism, the final stage in the Enlightenment. Whereas the Supranaturalists had sought to defend the faith of the Bible by reason, the Rationalists ended by subjecting the entire Biblical revelation to the judgement of reason. After a long development, the approach to theology had become completely anthropocentric, and as MacKintosh says, "the majesty and power of the Christian Gospel vanished".⁵² In the process, virtually everything distinctively Lutheran was lost: The theocentric approach, historical revelation, Justification by Faith, the principle of Sola Scriptura, and the dialectical

⁵² H.R. MacKintosh, op. cit., p. 15.

approach to theology. The break-down of Church life which had begun under Pietism was accelerated. Preaching often degenerated into moralism or sentimentality, and Church attendance decline; The laws of compulsory attendance were no longer enforced. Occult sects appeared; Freemasonry flourished. The demand was made that the Churches be turned into schools. The liturgical reforms carried out in Denmark-Norway were typical of the Enlightenment: Exorcism was removed from the Baptismal ritual, a number of holy days were abolished, and a Rationalist hymn-book introduced. The later Rationalists "regarded the Church as irrelevant to the true religion, an institution which could be useful to the common people and the unenlightened, so long as it remained tolerant and worked for the general welfare".⁵³

In view of what has been said about the Enlightenment in general, it is hardly surprising that its contribution to the doctrine of the Church was completely negative. Ludvig Selmer writes that the Enlightenment found it more difficult to deal with the doctrine of the Church than with any other doctrine. It had no capacity for understanding the Lutheran, thoroughly religious concept of the Church, and tended to "secularize" this doctrine.⁵⁴ The inroads of historical criticism led to a loss of faith in the means of grace as possessing the power to create the Church, and it was in consequence necessarily regarded

⁵³ P. Lindhardt, op.cit., p. 170.

⁵⁴ L. Selmer, Opplysningsmen i den Norske Kirke, p. 141.

as a creation of men. The subjective, anthropocentric approach to religion, enhanced by a concept of society based on a secularized natural law, led the Enlightenment theologians to define the Church in purely associational terms. The German systematic theologian Griesbach defined the Church as "the community of people who agree to worship God according to the teaching of Jesus Christ", and its task as that of "maintaining and transplanting Jesus' teaching and promoting its practice by common institutions and rites".⁵⁵ This quotation illustrates the fact that, even where the Enlightenment believed in a concept of revelation, it was conceived in intellectualistic, nomistic terms. Truth consisted in logical propositions.

Perhaps by way of reaction to Pietism, the Enlightenment was not concerned to draw limits to the Church. It accepted the dichotomy of the Visible and Invisible Church, and interpreted it in dualistic fashion. The Invisible Church was composed of all who know the truth (as defined above) and who live virtuous lives. The Visible Church included all who outwardly espouse Christianity and who participate in its cultus. However, because the historical revelation had lost its significance, there was no necessary connection between the two. Thus, the Visible Church lost all religious significance, and the Invisible Church was regarded as what the Apology to the Augsburg Confession

55 Ibid., p. 142.

expressly disavowed, a Platonic State. The unity which Luther had striven so hard to maintain in his ecclesiology was lost.

The Enlightenment had little appreciation for the Sacraments. The sermon became supremely important, and in some Churches, the pulpit was built into the altar. Baptism and Holy Communion lost their relation to the worship of the congregation and were retained as symbolical ecclesiastical rites that could be helpful to the unenlightened. Whereas Orthodoxy stressed Baptismal regeneration, and Pietism conversion, the Enlightenment tended to disregard both.

The rise of the new secularized concept of both Church and State served to cement the two more solidly together. The false synthesis of the Two Realms begun in State Pietism was completed in the Enlightenment. It was the State which now controlled the Church, not the Church which attempted to create a theocracy. The clergy became "teachers of religion" for the State, and were often overburdened with administrative work as well as underpaid. In accordance with their tolerant attitude and their strong faith in popular enlightenment, they were so indifferent toward Church Discipline that it virtually disappeared. There was one notable exception to this rule: The clergy of the Enlightenment reacted strongly against anything resembling Enthusiasm. Evidence of this is provided in Norwegian Church history by the Hauge case.

The Enlightenment had an exalted concept of the Ministry. It was based, however, not on the function of administering the means of grace, but upon the position of the clergyman in society. The Enlightenment could not be expected to maintain Luther's dialectic here. Its basic presuppositions were very different. It completely institutionalized and secularized the concept of the Ministry; Its view could be described as a secularized, State-High-Churchmanship. A typical Rationalist Churchmanship is found in the ordination addresses of Dr. Peder Hansen, Bishop of Christiansand in Norway until the year 1804.⁵⁶ Hansen studiously avoids mention of any of the cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith. Instead, he talks of knowledge, virtue, duty, progress, and immortality. Christ is "the omniscient Jesus", who saved His brothers and sisters by "virtue". Hansen's favourite title for the clergy is "teachers of religion". He regards everyone as servants of the Lord, each in his own calling, each with his own spiritual gift. This in itself is a valid Lutheran view; But he goes on to deny that the clergy have any extraordinary call. They are no different from other servants of the State. "We now know that the so-called inner and outer call, of which the teachers of religion in the last century were so proud, and which they ascribed to a special providence of God, is nothing."⁵⁷

⁵⁶ P. Hansen, Skilderie af den Christelige Religions-lærer i fire Ordinations-Taler, 1803.

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 10

The task of the clergy is to do Jesus' work, "to ennoble man to the extent that he can enjoy this life in happiness and be prepared for a higher sphere". The office is "most necessary" to guide people into truth and virtue. That is not to say that the teacher has the keys to heaven; Every Christian must do his own thinking. Mankind goes steadily forward, and the parson must progress with it. The "glory of his office" and his "personal honour" rest upon his own "increased knowledge".⁵⁸ The school should be his "real temple". His calling is "to take men as they are and to make them what they should be. He thus resembles no less an ideal than the Creator Himself".⁵⁹ Hansen's little book also included a letter to the clergy of his diocese in which he attacked the "fanatic opinions" of the Haugeans. So long as he was in Norway, the Bishop was their most implacable enemy.

The Enlightenment came late to Norway. When it did come it appeared in a moderate form and failed to permeate deeply into the people, where Orthodoxy and Pietism still reigned. In Norway, the movement followed the same pattern as in Germany, but without radical Rationalism or attacks upon the Church or Christianity. By the year 1800, the clergy were largely under the influence of a rather weak Supernaturalism. Four of the five Bishops were men of the Enlightenment; The exception was the Orthodox J. N. Brun

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 14.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 15.

(d. 1816) in Bergen. Besides Hansen, the most radical was Bishop F. J. Bech in Christiania (d. 1822). The Enlightenment remained a force in the Norwegian Church after it had been supplanted elsewhere. It exercised a certain influence throughout the first half of the 19th Century. One of its beneficial effects was the establishment of the Royal Fredrik University in Christiania in 1811. This development made possible a distinctively Norwegian theology, and ironically, it proved to be the most important factor in the decline of Enlightenment theology.

NORWAY

IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

NORWAY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Political and Literary History

It is necessary, before we turn from introductory considerations to the proper subject of this thesis, to sketch briefly the political and intellectual history of Norway in the 19th Century.

The 19th Century was undoubtedly the most glorious period in the history of the Norwegian people heretofore. It was "a time of awakening of story-book propostions", an age of revolutionary development...which forms a sharp contrast to the preceding centuries".⁶⁰

Norway had enjoyed no political independence since the union of the three Scandinavian countries at Kalmar in 1397. For a time, the Archbishopric of Nidaros (Trondhjem) helped to safeguard national interests, but the Reformation, which in Norway was "a purely political affair"⁶¹, introduced by force from Denmark, placed Norway under strict Danish control. For the following three centuries, the country was ruled from Copenhagen. The only university was located in the Danish capital, Danish became the cultural language, and the Danish Bible and hymnal were adopted by the Norwegian Church. The climax of Danish rule was reached after 1660, when the monarchy was made absolute in both realms.

The Enlightenment tended to foster nationalist sentiment

⁶⁰ E. Molland, Church Life in Norway, p. 2.

⁶¹ P. Lindhardt, *op. cit.*, p. 119. There was "a weak Lutheran movement", but it was only scattered and temporary.

in Norway. After the Napoleonic Wars, in which Denmark had sided with Napoleon, the great powers separated Norway and forced her into a union with Sweden as compensation to Sweden for the loss of Finland to Russia. The Norwegians, however, seized the opportunity to adopt a liberal constitution (at Eidsvold, 1814) based upon the ideals of the French and American revolutions. They desired independence, and even elected Prince Christian Fredrik of Denmark as king. He was, however, never crowned. Pressure from the great powers and Norway's relative military weakness left the Norwegians no choice but to submit. The Swedes did, however, recognize the 1814 Constitution, and Norway's independence in a personal union under a single Crown.

In the 19th Century generally, there were two main parallel developments: The growth of liberal democracy, and a rising nationalism which eventually led to full independence in 1905. At first, political leadership remained in the hands of the official class, but gradually passed to others. The first group to rise to political maturity were the freehold farmers ("BØNDENE"), who gained temporary control of the Storting (Parliament) in 1833. In 1837, local self-government was introduced. An early, non-Marxist labour movement (1848-50) experienced phenomenal growth, gaining nearly 21,000 members. Since industrialization did not come to Norway until very late in the Century, this was more a class movement of the poor, including cottars and the poorer farmers.

It was summarily crushed, but the movement returned in Marxist form and in great strength in the 20th Century.

The principal expression both of democracy and nationalism was the struggle for power between Government and Storting which marked the last half of the 19th Century. The Constitution included the checks and balances of the American Constitution. The executive, legislative, and judicial branches were separated in such a way that they could provide a balance of power. The Ministers of the Government, who were regarded as the King's men, could not speak in the Storting, nor could they be called to account there. The conflict raged round two matters, the attempt of the Storting (on the lines of the British Parliamentary system) to make Government ministers accountable to itself, and the nature (whether suspensory or absolute) of the power of veto possessed by the Crown with regard to amendments to the Constitution. It was intensified by the fact that at the time the throne was occupied by a Swede, and it could therefore be claimed that national and democratic interests were at stake. The Storting was eventually victorious in 1884, when the Parliamentary system was introduced. Trial by jury was introduced in the same year. Unfortunately, in the political struggles of the 19th Century, Christianity and the Church were often identified with the forces of conservatism or reaction.

The Century witnessed a great economic advance. This was most spectacular in the shipping industry. Here, between

1850 and 1880, merchant marine tonnage was increased five-fold, and Norway became the world's third maritime nation. Internal transport and communication made great strides (the first railroad, 1854); Agriculture made gradual but steady progress.

Emigration was a factor of major importance. Between 1860 and 1910, ca. 700,000 Norwegians emigrated to America, most of them in the prime of life. (The population of Norway in 1855 was 1,490,047, and in 1900, 2,240,032.⁶²)

Popular education was extended to all children between the ages of 7-14 in 1860. Thus the literacy rate of the Norwegian people in the second half of the century was high, and the teacher became a person of great importance in the community, often superseding the pastor. The creation of a reading public also enabled two other classes of people to gain power and prestige: The journalist and the author. The popular press grew to maturity in the 19th Century, and came to exert strong influence on Norwegian Church life. It was generally conservative, and favoured the Church until the 1870's, but about that time were founded a number of papers with a radical bent both in politics and religion. In addition to the daily newspapers (*Dagbladet*, *Verdens Gang*), there were such periodicals as the agrarian Søren Jaabaek's anti-clerical and anti-Church *Folketidende* (circ. 17,000) and Professor J. E. Sars' *Nyt Norsk Tidsskrift*, the organ of Positivism in Norway.

⁶² *Norges Offisielle Statistik*, C No. 1, 1868-69, and 4R, VII, 1900.

But no part of Norwegian life enjoyed a greater renaissance than its literature. After several centuries in which the cultural stream had run underground in folk literature, the literary genius of the Norwegian people experienced a golden age which brought it to the pinnacle of world prestige in a man like Henrik Ibsen, the father of the modern drama. Only the main trends in this development can be considered here.

The nationalistic and democratic elements which we have noted in the political and economic spheres were predominant also in literature. Rationalism was aristocratic and foreign. But from the 1830's, what Norwegian literary historians call "the national break-through" began. This movement is sometimes known as "national-romanticism", but the first part of this description is more accurate, since Romanticism was only one of the streams involved, and did not even occupy the dominant role.⁶³ Considerable interest, for example, was aroused by the "folkelige". The poet Henrik Wergeland (1808-45) was the morning-star of this national movement in literature. In his brief life, he "contrived to embody in their most idealistic form the national aspirations which were latent in every class of society",⁶⁴ and remains to this day the hero of Norwegian Independence Day celebrations. At the same time, Ivar Aasen began to collect the country

⁶³ E. Paascher and F. Bull, Norsk Litteratur-Historie, III, pp. 326-327.

⁶⁴ T.K. Derry, A Short History of Norway, p. 148.

dialects into one "Norwegian" language (Landsmaal or Nynorsk) as opposed to the Danish of the cultured classes. P.A. Munch founded a national historical school. Ludvig Lindeman roamed the country gathering folk melodies. Asbjørnsen and Moe performed a similar service for the folktales. A native hymnody arose (M.B. Landstad).

Romanticism reached its climax in the years 1845-50. After 1850, a realistic tendency became predominant. Irony, doubt, and satire entered the picture. Lyric poetry, the leading medium in the first half-century, gave way to the novel. Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson (1832-1910) and Henrik Ibsen (1828-1906) both made their debuts in the 1850's. But the golden age of the movement began about ten years later, when the two leaders were joined by Alexander Kielland, Jonas Lie, and Arne Garborg. Each of these had his own peculiar genius, but all represented the same basic life-view. All of them had grown out of a Romantic background and represented a kind of Christian Humanism. They were optimistic positive, progressive, with a great faith in men which enabled them to make great demands upon men.

Then, suddenly, in the 1870's, the wind shifted. To a man, the great authors broke with traditional Christianity and went over to what they called Naturalism. Idealism was replaced by Empiricism. Darwin's work made a great impact. If Marxism as yet made no great impression, the Romantic conception of nature and man was replaced by a materialistic and utilitarian attitude to life. The great literary figures

adopted these new views in advance of the scholars, and consequently they were in the van of their introduction into Norway. It has been said that they spread philosophy like an insect spreads pollen. They now abandoned personal and national subjects in favour of social and universal problems. With great fervor, they demanded freedom for the individual to be himself. Among the first to be attacked was the Church and its authoritarian clergy. The lectures of the Danish literary critic Georg Brandes in Christiania in 1876, which offered a Positivist interpretation of Søren Kierkegaard, gave rise to a whole series of religious crises, even among some of the clergy. In the 1880's, the tone became even more crassly naturalistic and critical. Determinism and Positivism were the new gospels, and the Christian religion itself came under attack. The Christian concept of the family was threatened by a Bohemian movement in Christiania, its leading figure the writer Hans Jaeger.

After the excesses of the 1880's, a reaction set in, under foreign influence, in the 1890's. A new Idealist tendency attempted to penetrate beyond the material, into the mysterious life of the soul. Lyric poetry revived, and the "four great" writers were ridiculed by the young Knut Hamsun as "the four-headed idol".

The work of the great authors had no direct influence upon the theological formulations of the doctrine of the Church. Yet clearly it made a considerable impact upon contemporary Church life, especially in the disastrous

last quarter of the Century. Indeed, these men must bear a considerable share of the responsibility for the secularization of Norway. While it is impossible to treat this aspect of 19th Century Norwegian life in greater detail, it is well to keep it in mind as we examine the practical expressions of ecclesiology.

Philosophy

The Rationalism of the Enlightenment broke down under the impact of the critical philosophy of Emmanuel Kant (1724-1804). His major work, "The Critique of Pure Reason", opens with an enquiry into the possibility of "deducing the categories" or of establishing rationally that what is regulative for thought is also constitutive of Reality. Its failure led to an unbridgeable gap between Thought and Reality which was to prove fatal to the older Rationalism of the systems of Leibniz and Wolff. The attempt to provide for a Natural Theology based upon the traditional "proofs" of the Existence of God was a will of the wisp. A Dualism between phenomena and noumena was therefore set up. Kant was not himself prepared to dispense with God, Freedom, and Immortality, but he claimed that their right place in a system of philosophy was to be found as postulates of the practical reason and not as the conclusions of a system based upon the pure or theoretical reason. If a bridge between thought and reality was to be found, it could only rest upon the so-called categorical imperative of moral duty and its implications.

Henceforth the real task of the theoretical reason was to concern itself with codifying and organising the reality of experience.

The task of Nineteenth Century philosophy can from one point of view be understood as a long attempt to recover from the devastating critique of Kant. Here the most significant name was that of G.W.F. Hegel (1770-1831), whose axiom was an identification of thought and reality and therefore the virtual denial of the validity of the Kantian critique. His philosophical method was that of a dialectic working through a dualism of thesis and antithesis to a synthesis, applied to field after field of philosophical thought. There is little doubt that Hegelianism in one form or another was the dominant system in 19th Century philosophy. At first sight, it might appear to be the older Rationalism of the Enlightenment under new management; In effect, it was Rationalism trying to carry on as if the Kantian critique had not occurred.

If Hegel tried to bridge the Kantian gap from the side of reality, other systems adopted the opposite technique and attempted to find something on the side of experience which could serve their need. Here, Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834) started from the feeling of absolute dependence and prepared the way for the later important Ritschlian school of theology which combined the starting points of Schleiermacher with the robust ethical insights of Kant himself.

For our purpose here the following points should be noted. (i) We have already spoken of the dialectical approach of Luther himself. There might indeed appear to be a parallel to the methodology of Hegel, and this might not in itself be surprising in view of the fact that Hegel, like most of the great figures in German philosophy, came from a Lutheran background. But, if the interpretation of Luther given here is at all correct, the dialectic of Luther finds its synthesis only in that which is hidden, whereas the Hegelian dialectic operates upon a single plane. Yet, as we shall see, the Hegelian philosophy might appear to offer a suitable buttress to an orthodox theology. The rising tide of Hegelianism could be used as some measure of support for the older Scholastic Orthodoxy, although in the event, Hegelianism was to prove a somewhat brittle weapon in the hands of the theologian.

(ii) The Empiricism of the Kantian movement might appear to have natural affinities with the reinterpretation of Lutheranism in subjective terms which had already gone some distance in Pietism. It is certainly no accident that Schleiermacher himself was brought up under Pietist influences.

In general, it is fair to say that the Lutheran tradition has never concerned itself so deeply with philosophy as (for example) the theologians of the Roman Catholic Church. This allergy to philosophy can indeed be found in Luther himself; He railed against the Medieval "Sophists"

and insisted that, so far from Aristotle being necessary to theology, no one could be a theologian who did not discard Aristotle. Even Orthodoxy was suspicious of speculation. This anti-philosophical bias in Lutheranism was enhanced by the Pietist influence. Wherever the Lutheran tradition of Sola Scriptura and Sola Fide, Sola Gratia is strong, Philosophy is suspect. And they were strong in 19th Century Norway.

In his recent, definitive biography of the philosopher Marcus J. Monrad, H. O. Christopherson has distinguished five lines in the history of thought which converged in 19th Century Norway and in his subject. These were the traditions of the natural rights of man, of Lutheranism, of Idealism, of Classicism, and of Romanticism. They enjoyed, he says, a relatively harmonious existence together and formed the basis for Norwegian intellectual life throughout the greater part of the Century. In the course of the later, decades, however, each in turn was called into question and lost its leading position. The complex was replaced in great measure by a philosophy informed by Positivist, materialist, secularist, and pragmatic influences.

This is a true description of what occurred in the public or popular philosophy of 19th Century Norway. A. Aall has distinguished two periods in popular philosophy: The first (which prevailed until the 1860's), a "speculative" period, "when all philosophy was systematic thought in schoolroom form", and the second, a "realistic" period,

"when philosophy too was marked by the new life-views (liberalism) and the new natural science (empiricism)".⁶⁵ As we have already seen, this popular philosophy found expression particularly in two areas: politics and literature.

Academic philosophy, as taught in the Department of Philosophy in the university, did not follow the pattern of evolution outlined by Christopherson. It was, in fact, completely dominated by the Idealist tradition, first in the form of the Supranaturalism of Leibniz and Wolff, and later, from 1845 to the end of the Century, of Hegelianism. It was conservative, if not downright reactionary in character. Here, Hegelianism reigned "more securely than anywhere else in the philosophical world".⁶⁶ Because Norway had no university prior to 1811, she was completely lacking in a native philosophical tradition. The new university treated the study of philosophy like an orphan. In 1840, Professor Hansteen stated that, while the professor of philosophy could not be expected to step in and teach any and all other subjects, every lecturer in the university ought to be able to lecture in philosophy. This seems to have been university policy.⁶⁷ Norwegian philosophy lacked originality. Here, as elsewhere, Norway was a colony of Germany, though English and French influences (particularly early and late in the Century) were not lacking. Aall says that

65 A. Aall, in Edda, VII, 1917, p. 102.

66 A. Aall, Festskrift, p. 385.

67 Ibid., p. 397.

Norwegian philosophy was "without hallmark" (Hjemmemerke). While Norway produced figures of international renown in the fields of science and literature, she has never given to the world a philosopher of rank. Thus, as the 19th Century progressed, academic philosophy became more and more isolated from popular philosophy. Winsnes has said that the study of philosophy "has never struck especially deep root in Norwegian culture". Academic philosophy took the form of a closed system, and this fact made any dialogue with popular philosophy virtually impossible. In 1911, Aall could write: "In Norway, university philosophy has had no association with or positive relation to the national sentiment, to its national politics, or to the spiritual growth of the people."⁶⁸

The first professor of philosophy in the university and one of the two leading figures in philosophy in 19th Century Norway was Dr. Theol. Niels Treschow (1751-1833). He had been professor in Copenhagen from 1803-1813, and thereafter until his death he occupied the same position in Christiania. During his years in Norway, however, he also served (rather ineffectually) as Minister for Church Affairs in the new Norwegian Government. He therefore lectured only sporadically, but continued to write prolifically. Treschow had been brought up in Moravian circles, and throughout his life he played an active part in the religious life of the country. He encouraged the formation

of the Norwegian Bible Society, contributed to missions, and received a six-hour visit from Schleiermacher as he lay on his death-bed. Treschow's major works in the philosophy of religion were: Christendommens Aand (1828), and Om Gud, Idee, og Sandseverdenen, samt de Førstes Aabenbarelse in den Sidste. Et Philosophiske Testament. ("Of God, the Idea, and the world of sense, and the revelation of the first two in the latter", 1832).

Treschow was a typical product of the Enlightenment. His philosophy was eclectic, although he displayed some originality. His metaphysic was basically the Supranaturalism of Leibniz and Wolff. Epistemologically, he sought to follow the empiricism of Locke, though not with complete success. He posited the identity of the spiritual and the material; For him, all things were originally one (cf. Leibniz' Monads). The world of sense, though it is indeed real, is dependent upon the world of ideas. Matter is power which strives toward the realization of its eternal idea.⁶⁹ Although Treschow refused to recognize the validity of Kant's criticism of reason (he retained the classical proofs for the existence of God), as time went on he learned something from Kant's philosophy. Winsnes calls Treschow a representative of the PHILOSOPHIA PERENNIS. Even though the members of the faculty of theology had already largely moved away from the Rationalism which he represented, the speculative philosophy of Treschow must have exerted considerable influence

69 K. Kristiansen, Niels Treschow..., pp. 36ff.

upon the Church, chiefly no doubt through his literary production.

During Treschow's absences, his lectures were taken over by a series of temporary replacements: The theologian F.P.I. Dahl(1816-17), the philologist Georg Sverdrup (1817-31, from 1831-41 the second professor of philosophy), the jurist Claus Winther Hjelm (1824-26). The Dane Poul Möller lectured in philosophy from 1826-30, but he then returned to Denmark, where his influence was considerable, not least upon Kierkegaard. From 1840-68, the poet Johan Sebastian Welhaven lectured in philosophy, but his contribution to Norwegian intellectual life lies rather in his poetry and his literary criticism. As a philosopher, he was insignificant.

The second philosopher of note in 19th Century Norway was Marcus J. Monrad (1816-97), who lectured in philosophy from 1845 almost until his death (professor, 1851-97). It was Monrad who introduced Hegelianism into the Norwegian academic philosophy and secured by his very considerable influence its undisputed reign until the end of the Century. He was a leading university personality.

Monrad, says Aall, displayed "an exaggerated conservatism" in "all his work, thought, and judgement".⁷⁰ He was a Christian by conviction, by training a theologian, and both lectured and wrote in the field of philosophy of

⁷⁰ A.Aall, *Festskrift*, p. 402. Christopherson says that Monrad was a "mild liberal" until 1855, but reacted against nationalism and economic liberalism and became a staunch conservative in the later 1850's.

religion. (We shall examine his major work: Religion, Religioner, og Christendommen, 1885, in the next section of the thesis.) Monrad's position was thoroughly Hegelian. Like his teacher, he maintained the essential unity of faith and reason, accepted the classical arguments for the existence of God in ascending order (culminating in the ontological argument), and emphasized the collective character of religion. As we shall see, the concept of the Church was extremely significant for Monrad.

Hegelianism captured the second chair in the Department in the person of Monrad's pupil G. V. Lyng (1827-84, professor 1869-84). When Lyng died, a minority in the Historical-Philosophical Faculty made an effort to secure the appointment of an empiricist, but the attempt stranded on the authority of Monrad and the appointment by the Sverdrup Government (Pastor Jakob Sverdrup, Minister for Church Affairs) of another Hegelian, the Swede Pontus Wikner, without competition. Wikner was in turn succeeded by still another Hegelian, J. Mourly Vold, in 1890. A Positivist, Waldemar Dons, was teaching assistant (Universitetsstipendiat) from 1875 to 1882, but never secured a post on the Faculty. Non-Hegelian standpoints in philosophy first entered the University by the back way, through the Science Faculty and the Department of History.

It is of particular importance for us to determine the philosophical pre-suppositions which formed the basis for Norwegian theology in the 19th Century, and to examine the

relationship between theology and philosophy. This is not an easy task, for often the theologians did not clearly state their philosophical assumptions, and we are left to infer them.

In general, we may say that the theologians operated within the framework of an Idealist metaphysic. "Idealist thought-forms were inherent among learned men in Norway until far into the 19th Century."⁷¹ Nevertheless, academic philosophy does not appear to have directly influenced theology to any great extent. Christopherson prefers the conclusion that philosophy was reduced to the status of an instrumental science, first for theology and then for natural science.⁷² Moreover, theology gravitated in much the same direction as popular philosophy, thus further isolating academic philosophy. "In Norway, the line in the history of thought, in philosophy of religion, and in theology seems to go through Hegel and speculation, then to seek contact with the physical sciences on an empirical basis, in such a way that the theologians returned more and more to Kant and drew sharper limits between faith and knowledge..."⁷³ During the first thirty years of the university's existence, philosophy and theology were (in the words of Christopherson) bound together by the "umbilical cord" of natural theology. In those days, between one-third and one-half of all students took the theological course. S. B. Hersleb, the first

71 H. O. Christopherson, Marcus Jacob Monrad, p. 13.

72 Ibid., pp. 10-11. Christopherson says that philosophy was under the "guardianship" of theology until near the end of the Century.

73 H. Ording, in NTT, XLVIII, p. 49. Ording says that the Hegelian dialectic returned with the Dialectical Theology of the 20th Century, this time in fruitful form because Revelation had declared its independence from philosophy.

professor of systematic theology, retained the Idealist metaphysic and the dogmatic method of Supranaturalism. He appears not to have been influenced by Schleiermacher, but unlike Treschow, he was greatly indebted to Kant. For Hersleb, rational proof is insufficient and speculation is discouraged. Instead, he emphasized the authority of the Biblical revelation (Sola Scriptura). He attacked the systems of Fichte and Schelling. Thus, while he shared the same philosophical presuppositions as Treschow, his acceptance of Kant and his orthodox Biblicism decisively separated him from the philosopher. In the course of Treschow's conflict with Pastor W. A. Wexels,⁷⁴ Hersleb definitely supported Wexels, although he did not enter actively into the controversy.⁷⁵

The cleft widened as the theological trend toward Orthodoxy grew stronger and philosophical speculation became bolder. Almost simultaneous with Monrad's appointment (after enjoying a stipend to study "philosophy and speculative theology"), natural theology disappeared, never to return. Four years later, the rise of orthodoxy culminated in the appointment of Gisle Johnson as lecturer in systematic theology. He soon forged an alliance between Orthodoxy and traditionally anti-speculative Pietism, represented by the lay movement. Johnson nowhere stated his metaphysic; It may even be doubted whether he had one, since he was not

⁷⁴ See Chapter on Grundtvigianism.

⁷⁵ A. Brandrud, NTT, XII, p. 211.

philosophically inclined. There are, however, definite indications that he shared the common Idealist presuppositions of his day. Still, it is hardly correct to describe him with Lindhardt as a right-wing Hegelian, although he utilized Hegel's dialectic approach to the history of doctrine. Johnson's epistemology was certainly not Hegelian. He accepted the full consequences of Kant's criticism and adopted the empirical method of Schleiermacher in the form used by the confessional Erlangen School. His dogmatic method was regressive, starting from the consciousness of the regenerate individual, not simply as an individual but as a typical Christian in the tradition of the (Lutheran) Church. Natural theology finds no place in his system. Nothing was further from his mind than speculation. The conclusion that Johnson was virtually free of Hegelian influence is strongly confirmed by the fact that he was profoundly influenced by Kierkegaard.

Søren Aabye Kierkegaard (1813-55) is credited with "one of the two or three really important examinations" made of Hegelianism.⁷⁶ He protested violently against Hegel's identification of thought and reality. Against Hegel's extreme Idealism, Kierkegaard posited an "existential" philosophy. Truth, he said, is existential, paradoxical, and subjective. Above all, Kierkegaard was a religious thinker; He opposed the closed system of objective dogmatic truths, and proposed instead the situation of the individual

76 H. R. MacKintosh, op.cit., p. 226n.

standing before God in the "existential moment". "There may be a system of logic, but a system of Being there can never be." "Christianity hangs upon paradox." Against Hegel's historicism and collectivism, Kierkegaard demanded individual "contemporaneousness with Christ". History can neither prove the truth of Christianity nor evaluate its content. Church history is a record, not of perfectibility but of apostasy. There is a qualitative difference between the history of Christianity and the HEILSGESCHICHTE, the historical element in Christian revelation which culminated in the Incarnation. Against Hegel's evolutionism, Kierkegaard stressed discontinuity, the responsibility of the individual toward God in the moment when eternity and time meet, and the danger of offense in discipleship. Against Hegel's intellectualism, Kierkegaard emphasized the crucial importance of a decision of the will in religion. Kierkegaard's works culminated in a bitter attack upon established Christendom. We shall have occasion to examine his ecclesiology later. It is clear that Kierkegaard's theology had certain definite weaknesses. His views were sometimes exaggerated, and he was probably mentally disturbed in the later part of his life. However, in the main the results of his work were highly beneficial. He re-asserted several fundamental theological axioms more clearly than anyone since Luther, notably the theocentric approach and the dialectical nature of revealed truth. More than any other single figure, Kierkegaard is responsible for shattering the nomistic-

intellectualistic concept of revelation and replacing it with Luther's dynamic, personal, relational view.

The consequences of Kierkegaard's philosophy of religion were not immediately realized. Indeed, it is only in our own century that he has been widely read and fully appreciated. Still, there were immediate effects in Scandinavia, and nowhere were they greater than in Norway. Bishop Heuch said in 1864 that Søren Kierkegaard's influence had been stronger in Norway than in Denmark. In point of fact, his influence permeated the whole of Norwegian spiritual life after 1840. But this influence could take one of two forms, which depended in no small measure upon the particular works of Kierkegaard upon which special emphasis was placed. His final attack upon Christendom had the widest currency and was seized upon by a Positivist like Georg Brandes. The great literary figures, Ibsen, Bjørnson, and Lie, read Kierkegaard early and bore the marks of this contact for life. It was, however, the negative side of his work which made the deepest impression upon them. There was hardly any significant churchman in the second half of the 19th Century who escaped his influence. If few penetrated into his more profound philosophical works, many more received impulses from his religious works. Here, interpretations varied, but that of Professor Johnson may serve as an example. He was perhaps the first theologian in Norway to undertake a thorough study of Kierkegaard.⁷⁷

77 G. Ousland, En Kirkehøvding...p. 34.

He was so profoundly influenced that he incorporated much of Kierkegaard into his dogmatic system. Johnson's successor, Fredrik Petersen, spent the greater part of his life in a vain attempt to break loose from Kierkegaard. The cultured Norwegian of the last century was forced to accept or reject Kierkegaard; He could not ignore him.

Thus, the influences of Orthodoxy, Pietism, Biblicism, Kant, Empiricism, and Kierkegaard combined to discourage speculative theology and to separate theology and philosophy. Norway never possessed a Hegelian mediating theology like that of the Clausen-Martensen School in Denmark. Few speculative theologians appeared; E.F.B. Horn and Knud Krogh-Tonning were the only prominent names, and they were kept out of the university for this very reason. Monrad participated in pastoral conferences and wrote prolifically in the daily press on religious matters. He was always positive in his attitude, although critical of many features of Orthodox-Pietism. He was in turn occasionally criticized by some Churchmen; Differences of opinion on peripheral and practical matters were symptomatic of a wider cleavage.

Still, there was no definitive debate or open break between theology and philosophy. In retrospect, it is difficult to see how this was avoided. Perhaps the decisive difference that existed between the theological philosophy of Monrad and the theology of the systematic theologians was not fully appreciated at the time. Indeed, it appears as though Monrad's philosophy actually served as a protecting

wall around theology. "Under the protection of the conservative Hegelian university philosophy, our confessional theology could develop undisturbed by criticism and, little concerned with epistemological difficulties, turn its energies to development and formulation of its own content. The only enemies it had to fight...were found inside the Church... on the one hand, Enthusiastic Pietism and sectarianism, on the other hand, Grundtvigianism."⁷⁸

Religious unity prevailed until the 1870's. Then, Darwinism and Positivism came. It was not, however, in the Department of Philosophy but rather elsewhere in the university and outside it, in literature and in the press, that this influence was felt. The fact that all criticism had been excluded gave to its introduction the appearance of a landslide. In the crisis which followed, the Church's apologists, led by Fredrik Petersen (who had received significant impulses from German neo-Kantianism), turned their backs upon Hegelianism.⁷⁹ They rejected the support of metaphysics for the Christian faith, and sought to assert the existence of categories independent of logic.

To sum up, we may say that 19th Century Norwegian theology and philosophy were both firmly rooted in German Idealism. However, whereas philosophy remained thoroughly Hegelian, theology was more under the influence of Kant and Schleiermacher. The impact of Hegelianism was exerted

⁷⁸ A. Brandrud, NTT, XII, p. 229.

⁷⁹ O. Koppang, Hegelianismen i Norge discusses the relation of Johnson, Petersen, and other theologians to Hegelianism, pp. 214ff.

in a formal rather than a material way. The influence of Kant's criticism grew steadily stronger throughout the Century. Schleiermacher's theology gained no adherents, but his method prevailed from 1850 until ca. 1880. Even after 1880, when Ritschlian theology came on the scene, it rested upon Schleiermacher's philosophy of religion. The influence of Søren Kierkegaard was varied and considerable, perhaps even decisive. Thus, the relationship between theology and philosophy was ambiguous.

Church Life

Norwegian Church life in the 19th Century followed the main western European pattern.

Theologically, there was a steady trend away from Rationalism and toward Orthodoxy for the first three-quarters of the century. The first university professors, S.B. Hersleb and S. J. Stenersen, taught a mild Orthodoxy with remnants of Rationalism. Orthodoxy allied itself with Pietism in the theology of Gisle Johnson, and reigned supreme from 1850 to 1875. Johnson's successor, Fredrik Petersen, was a typical transition theologian, with one foot in Orthodoxy and one in Liberal Theology. He was chiefly engaged in the apologetic task which the period demanded against Positivism and materialism. Liberal Theology gained the upper hand at the university in the 1890's. In 1903, it gained control of the Chair of Systematic Theology; This event provided the occasion for the formation of the Independent Faculty (MENIGHETSFAKULTETET).

In the practical realm, the Century was characterized by revival movements which gradually consolidated into voluntary organizations, by tensions within the Church, by a partial disintegration of the system of the State Church, and, towards the close of the Century, by a rapid secularization of society.⁸⁰ The general trend of practical Church life was clearly toward the left.

Norway experienced three great revivals, as well as several of smaller dimensions. The first was led by the layman Hans Nilsen Hauge, one of the two most important figures in 19th Century Church life. The second was inspired by the other significant personality of the period, Professor Gisle Johnson. The most striking feature of Norwegian revivalism was the remarkable part played by the laity. In the course of the Century, lay activity, especially lay preaching, gradually won legal and ecclesiastical recognition. This development formed a part of the general democratizing trend of the day. The revival movements had a subjectivistic and individualistic orientation. This fact, coupled with the inelasticity of the national Church, determined their organization upon associational lines. Hence, the Foreign Missions movement, organized in the 1840's, and the Inner Mission movement begun in the 1850's, both children of the revival, developed independently of the State Church. This inevitably led to tremendous ecclesiastical

80 E. Molland, Church Life in Norway, pp. 2-3.

tensions. The long drawn-out conflict over the question of Lay-preaching which extended throughout most of the Century was symptomatic of the whole process.

The revival combined with the renewal of theology to inspire a movement on a large scale for the reform of the Church's polity and for a modification of its relationship to the State. At least three different parties advocated some form of reform. They shared the same essential definition of the Church and the same desire for greater independence from the State; But they were in sharp disagreement on the matter of Church Discipline, and their programmes differed widely on points of detail. This movement developed great momentum between 1850 and 1885, and realized a few of its objectives, but was largely a failure, partly by reason of dissension in its own ranks, partly because of political pressure.

Revival also unintentionally gave impetus to various tendencies toward Separatism and sectarianism. For the first time, passage of the Dissenter Act in 1845 made withdrawal from the State Church possible. In extent, these Separatist movements proved to be extremely small, but they are of considerable importance for the main subject of this thesis. The collapse of the movement for reform in the 1870's brought a new Separatist movement and resulted in the formation of a small Lutheran Free Church. The conservatism of the Inner Mission movement, however, served to keep the overwhelming majority of the Norwegian people within the national Church (still ca. 96%).

Another feature of 19th Century Norwegian Church life was the Grundtvigian party. It exerted great influence in the period 1830-1870, and was the dominant party for a few brief years in the 1840's. In 1857, however, the Orthodox-Pietists, under the leadership of Gisle Johnson, launched a two-pronged attack against Separatism on the one hand and Grundtvigianism on the other. While Separatism was checked for the time being, the campaign against Grundtvigianism had a more permanent outcome. It was in fact continued until by the joint efforts of the Theological Faculty, the Government and the "awakened" laity, the party was finally beaten into submission.

These concerns, which were primarily domestic to the life of the Church itself, were interrupted in the 1880's by the sudden onslaught of Positivism, evolutionism, and materialism. These new forces brought about a rapid secularization in the life of the nation. This development, coupled with the challenge of Liberal Theology in the 1890's, caused the Church to devote most of her attention to the apologetic task. The process of secularization was, however, to some extent countered by fresh revivals in this period. The old organizations for Inner Mission and Foreign Mission were strengthened, and new associations founded.

In the life of the Church as a whole, the Low Church forces continued to make progress, as the High Church party completely disintegrated.

Grundtvigianism, the movements for Inner Mission and

Foreign Missions, the movement for reform, and Separatism will all require more detailed treatment at a later stage. Ecclesiological questions played a major part in the history of each of them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A. Aall, "Filosofien", in Det Kongelige Fredriks Universitet, 1811-1911: Festschrift, II... Kristiania, Aschehoug, 1911, pp. 381-422. (Cited as Festschrift).
- A. Aall, "Filosofien i Norden" in Edda: Nordisk Tidsskrift for Litteraturforskning, VII, 1917, pp. 101-141. (Cited as Edda).
- G. Aulén, Till Belysning om Den Lutherska Kyrkoideen, dess Historia och dess Värde, Stockholm and Uppsala, 1912.
- Die Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1952.
- H. Beyer, Norsk Litteratur Historie, Oslo, Aschehoug, 1952.
- H. Beyer, Søren Kierkegaard og Norge, Kristiania, Aschehoug, 1924.
- A. Brandrud "Teologien i det norske universitet, 1811-1911", in Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift (Cited as NTT), XII, 1911.
- E. Brunner, The Philosophy of Religion from the Standpoint of Protestant Theology, London, Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 1937.
- H.C. Christie, "Kirke og Kristenliv" in Norsk Kulturhistorie, (ed. Steen and Bugge) V, Oslo, Cappelen, 1942.
- H.O. Christopherson, Marcus Jacob Monrad: Et blad av Norsk Dannelses Historie i det 19de Aarhundre, Oslo, Gyldendal, 1959.
- T.K. Derry, A Short History of Norway, London, George Allen and Unwin, 1957.
- V. Erichsen, "Søren Kierkegaard's Betydning for norsk aandsliv" in Edda, XIX, 1923, pp. 209-430.
- G. Forell, Faith Active in Love: An Investigation of the Principles Underlying Luther's Social Ethics, New York, The American Press, 1954.
- R.S. Franks, "Dogma in Protestant Scholasticism" in Dogma in History and Thought (ed. Matthews), London, Nisbet, 1929.
- K. Gjerset History of the Norwegian People, New York, The MacMillan Company, 1927.
- S. Göransson, "Orthodoxi" in Nordisk Teologisk Uppslagsbok (Cited as NTU), II, Lund, Gleerup, 1955.
- B. Håggglund, "Upplysningen" in NTU, III.
- R. Hauge, Forelesninger i Dogmatikk, Høstsemestret, 1955, (Unpublished, mimeographed manuscript).
- G. Høk, et. al., En Bok om Kyrkans Ambetet, Uppsala, 1951.
- O. Koppang, Hegelianismen i Norge, Oslo, Aschehoug, 1943.
- K. Kristiansen, Niels Treschow, 1751-1951: Et Minneskrift, Oslo, Cammermeyer, 1951.
- P. Lindhardt, Den Nordiske Kirkes Historie, København, Nyt Nordisk Forlag--Arnold Busck, 1945.
- Hj. Lindroth, "Friedrich Schleiermacher", in NTU, III.
- H. Lindström, "Philip Melanchthon", in NTU, II.

- M. Luther, Works: Church and Ministry, II, Philadelphia and St. Louis, 1958, Vol. 40 (American Edition).
- M. Luther, Primary Works, (ed. Wace and Buchheim), London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1896.
- J. MacKinnon, Luther and the Reformation, III, London, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1929.
- H.R. MacKintosh, Types of Modern Theology, London, Nisbet, 1937.
- C. Mirbt, "Pietismus" in Hauck-Herzog Real-Encyclopedie, XV, pp. 775-815.
- E. Molland, Church Life in Norway, 1800-1950, Minneapolis, Augsburg, 1957.
- E. Molland, Konfesjonskunnskap, Oslo, Land og Kirke, 1953. (English edn. Christendom, London, Mowbrays, 1959).
- A. Nygren, ed., This is the Church, Philadelphia, The Muhlenberg Press, 1952.
- H. Ording, Dogmatisk Metode, Oslo, Gyldendal, 1939.
- G. Ousland, En Kirkehøvdning: Professor Gisle Johnson som Teolog og Kirkemann, Oslo, Lutherstiftelsen, 1950.
- F. Paasche and F. Bull, Norsk Litteratur-Historie, III, Oslo, Aschehoug, 1932.
- P.L. Pedersen, "Luthersk og Reformert Kyrkjesynd", in NTI, 1948, pp. 65ff.
- J. Pelikan, From Luther to Kierkegaard, St. Louis, Concordia, 1950.
- I.C. Petersen, "Luther's Syn på Kirken" in Vår lutherske Arv, Oslo, Norges Lutherlags Forlag, 1937, pp. 187-197.
- C. Piper, Recent Developments in German Protestantism, London, SCM Press, 1934.
- H. Preus, The Communion of Saints, Minneapolis, Augsburg, 1948.
- E.G. Rupp, The Righteousness of God, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1953, pp. 310-329.
- A. Seierstad, Kyrkjelegt Reformarbeid i Norge i Nittende Hundreåret, Bergen, Lunde, 1923.
- A. Seierstad, "Luther og det Almenne Prestedømet" in Korsets Ord og Troens Tale: Festskrift til Prof. O. Hallesbys 70-års Dag, Oslo, Lutherstiftelsen, 1949, pp. 103-117.
- H.B. Smith and P. Schaff, ed., The Creeds of the Evangelical Protestant Churches, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1877.
- N.H. Sørensen and H. Pleijel, "Pietismen" in NTU, III.
- P. Tillich, The Protestant Era, London, Nisbet, 1951.
- O. Valen-Sendstad, ed., Konkordieboken, Bergen, Lunde, 1957.
- P.S. Watson, Let God Be God, London, The Epworth Press, 1947.
- I. Welle, Kirkens Historie, II, Oslo, Lutherstiftelsen, 1951.
- A.F. Winsnes, "Niels Treschow" in Forhandlinger, det Kongelige Norske Videnskabskabers Selskab, 1956, Trondheim, 1956, Brun.
- E. Wolf, "Luther" in The Ministry and The Sacraments (ed. R. Dunkerley), London, SCM Press, 1937, pp. 438-453.

PART I

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH
IN NORWEGIAN THEOLOGY
DURING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

In this part of the thesis we shall pass under review the contribution to the doctrine of the Church made by individual theologians during the period. It will appear that this was not remarkable either in quality or extent. The theologians with whom we shall be concerned were not of equal importance and certainly do not lend themselves to classification by schools or theological traditions. They were not in many cases directly concerned with Systematic Theology as such and, while one of them (Gisle Johnson) certainly made a considerable and lasting impact upon the Church-life of the period, two others (M. J. Monrad and Knud Krogh-Tønning) who are of outstanding interest from the point of view of Systematic Theology exercised relatively little influence upon their contemporaries. There is a certain individualism about the theologians of the period which may arise from various causes. In some cases, it can be explained by the very character and content of their theology as a whole. National temperament may have had its part to play, while the direct absorption in contemporary Church-life and its problems on the part of the majority of those with whom we shall be concerned here militated against the best interests of a scientific theology. If then some resemblance to a catalogue treatment cannot be altogether avoided, the attempt will also be made in the concluding section to define the main issues in the doctrine of the Church round which discussion ranged and to assess the value of the contribution made by particular theologians to their elucidation.

The entire Protestant world faced a crisis in the 19th Century with regard to the doctrine of the Church. Bishop Aulén has singled out two chief contributing factors in this crisis, the "nomistic-intellectualistic" concept of revelation and the subjective approach; Where these are allowed to persist, no lasting solution to the crisis may reasonably be expected. The various efforts to restore the doctrine of the Church fail because they do not deal with the problem profoundly enough and because they involve too many self-contradictory elements.¹

This general crisis was reflected in the Church of Norway during our period. Whether or not the fact was always realized, the doctrine of the Church was one of her most critical theological problems.² There was in fact little discussion of the problem on the level of principle. But, as we shall see in the concluding part of this thesis, many of the problems which were most hotly debated had their roots in the doctrine of the Church.

The problem was approached from several standpoints: From the standpoint of High Church Neo-Lutheranism, of Orthodox-Pietism, and Revivalism, of Grundtvigianism, and of sectarianism. The general theological trend of the Century was toward the right until about 1875, when it swung toward the left. In the field of ecclesiology, however, as in the field of politics, the trend was constantly toward the left.

1 G. Aulén, Till Belysning om den Lutherska Kyrkoideen..., p. 133.

2 Cf. J. Lavik, Spørningen i Norsk Kirkeliv, Oslo, 1946, p. 31: "The past 100 years of Norwegian Church history are marked by the self-defence of the doctrine of the Church."

Godvin Ousland has described it as a movement from a "Church-view" to an "association-view".³ This is a correct assessment provided that it is borne in mind that the associational concept of the Church was already present in Pietism and the Enlightenment. During the Century, however, this tendency was strengthened and given practical expression in relation to the factors in contemporary Church-life which will concern us in the third section of our work.

Unfortunately, no lasting solution to the problems involved in the doctrine emerged during the period. All the theologians with whom we shall be concerned in this chapter fell into the pitfalls either of subjectivism or of intellectualism (or even into a combination of the two).

The history of Norwegian theology really begins with the founding of the Royal Fredrik University in Christiania in 1811. Before this date, the creation of an independent theology was prevented by various factors: The traditionalism of the State Church, the isolation of the country, the absence of institutions of higher learning, and the lack of libraries.⁴ Nor was the task particularly easy in the first years of the university's existence. Christiania was then only a little provincial town; Several Danish scholars were offered professorships and declined them. The first theological Professors,

³ G. Ousland "Fra Kirke- til foreningskirkesyn" in TTK, Oslo, 1951, pp. 69-82.

⁴ A. Brandrud, NTT, XII, p. 201.

S.B. Hersleb and S. J. Stenersen, bore a teaching burden so heavy that they were unable to carry on independent scholarly work. Only gradually did a distinctive Norwegian theology emerge. Hersleb was succeeded as Professor of Systematic Theology by Pastor C. N. Keyser (professor, 1836-1846); Keyser was in turn succeeded by Pastor J. N. P. Kaurin (professor, 1846-1852). Both of these men were competent teachers, but neither made any great contribution to scholarship. It was not until Gisle Johnson was appointed to the Faculty that an original system was produced.

In 1849, the Church of Norway established a special "Practical Theological Seminarium", to provide instruction in practical theology (pastoral theology, catechetics, liturgics, ecclesiastical law, and homiletics) for prospective ordination candidates.⁵ Among the lecturers in practical theology were several illustrious figures, including Pastor W. Wexels (1849-51), Pastor (later Bishop) Andreas Grimelund (1852-56), Pastor (later Bishop) J. C. Heuch (1875-80), Dean Gustav Jensen (1881-88, 1895-1902), and Dr. Knud Krogh-Tønning (1883-86). These men were important for the formulation of Norwegian ecclesiology. We shall consider Dr. Krogh-Tønning, Bishop Grimelund, and Dean Jensen in this section of the thesis. The contributions of Pastor Wexels and Bishop Heuch will be examined in later chapters.

⁵ These subjects are not taught in the academic course leading to the degree of Candidate of Theology in the university.

(I) Svend Borchmann Hersleb (1784-1836) and Stener Johannes Stenersen (1789-1835)

S. B. Hersleb and S. J. Stenersen were native Norwegians who had received their education at Copenhagen. Both were strongly attracted to N.F.S. Grundtvig, who was just then passing through an awakening to Biblical Christianity and was later to become the great opponent of Rationalism in Danish theology. Hersleb, (who had lived in the same college with Grundtvig and was his closest friend during this period), worked zealously in collaboration with his colleague to secure a chair for Grundtvig at the Norwegian university. On his side, Grundtvig named one of his sons after Hersleb in the hope that there would be some resemblance between them.⁶ The two Norwegians corresponded faithfully with Grundtvig until 1825, when Grundtvig made his "matchless discovery" which later developed into the so-called "Churchly View" (KIRKELIG ANSKUELSE). Here, however, they were unable to follow Grundtvig, and the correspondence ceased abruptly. Like Grundtvig, the two Norwegians were anti-Rationalist; Their theology displays an apologetic tendency. But they were never "Grundtvigians" in the true sense of the word. Stenersen wrote against the Churchly View. Although Hersleb's deep antipathy toward theological controversy prevented him from attacking it openly, he nevertheless found it unacceptable.

⁶ A. Brandrud, NTT, XXII, p. 138.

According to Brandrud, Hersleb and Stenersen taught a "Restoration" theology, by which he means the type of theology which heralded the recovery of Lutheran theology from the influences of the Enlightenment. They had "one foot in the Enlightenment and one foot in Orthodoxy". Both retained the intellectualist conception of revelation, and gave a broad place to natural theology. Still, the dominant characteristic of their theology was its Biblicism. Both strongly emphasized the principle of the Sola Scriptura, and it was this which prevented them from becoming Grundtvigians.⁷ Their theological approach tended toward Confessionalism and away from Pietism. Both possessed a rather rigid, aristocratic State-Churchmanship and a fear and distrust of Enthusiasm. Consequently, although they were personal friends of Hauge, they were at the same time critical of certain tendencies within Revivalism, particularly lay-preaching.

Obviously, the Biblicism and renewed Orthodoxy of Hersleb and Stenersen represent a significant reorientation in Norwegian theology. While the more spectacular opposition to Rationalism was carried out by others (notably Pastor W. A. Wexels), the worst dangers of Enlightenment theology were already avoided in the work of the two professors. As far as the doctrine of the Church was concerned, they laid

⁷ They did not, however, hold the uncritical view of Scripture of the older Orthodoxy. Stenersen, for example, could comment on Heb. 6:4-8, where the author holds out no hope of salvation for the apostate, that either this was a reference to the sin against the Holy Ghost, or the author has erred.

the foundation for a moderate Lutheran High-Churchmanship which was later strengthened by other influences, notably German Neo-Lutheranism. Here the leading figure in Norwegian theology was Pastor Wexels.

Stenersen's field was not Dogmatics, but Church History, New Testament, and Ethics. In 1827, however, he published a popular Dogmatic to be used as a school text.⁸ This work bears traces of the influence of Rationalism. Almost half of the book is devoted to natural theology, and an individualistic spirit pervades the whole. Stenersen stresses the "ascetic" value of solitude for self-examination. In the section on the Holy Communion, no mention is made of the communion of Christians with one another, but only of communion with Christ. The individual's struggle toward sanctification is made easier by the fact that all other Christians also struggle, and especially through mutual intercession.

But the most significant feature of the work is the fact that it contains no article on the Church. The doctrine of the Church is relegated to a note on pp. 258-59, which reads as follows:

"The Church, i.e. the community of believers in Christ, is one and catholic, in so far as all who belong to it agree that they can achieve salvation only by faith in Jesus Christ, but it is divided into several Churches...It is a true [Church] insofar as Christ's teaching is rightly proclaimed therein and the Sacraments instituted by Him rightly administered, in error if this is not done, a false [Church] when it denies

⁸ Forsøg til en Laerebog in religionen, til brug for de laerde skolars høiere Classer, Christiania, 1827. Stenersen did not discuss the doctrine of the Church in his general Church History textbook or in his history of the Reformation.

the basic truth [i.e. 'Justification by Faith'] ; It is visible in so far as all who are baptized and adhere to it are reckoned as members...and invisible in so far as it is held to include only those who by a true, living faith are regenerated to eternal life; And finally, it is at present militant...but will be triumphant..."

This statement is not particularly revealing; It is too brief. It does, however, show the influence both of Orthodoxy and Rationalism. The key concept is Justification by Faith; Indeed, this would seem to be the one essential mark of the Church. A Church may be "in error" about the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments without thereby becoming a "false" Church. The Church is "the community of believers", "Those who are regenerated". Wexels once said that it was Stenersen who first showed him "the tremendous difference between moral improvement and regeneration".⁹ On the other hand, he is unwilling to draw narrow limits to the Church. He regards all who are baptized as in some sense belonging to the Church, and he seems to accept on an equal basis the other divisions of Christendom. There is no significant evidence of Pietist influence. The conflicting elements in Stenersen's ecclesiology indicate the crisis in which Lutheranism found itself in this regard in the 1820's.

In 1833, Pastor Wexels published an article in his Tidsskrift for Kirke-Kronike og Christelig Theologi entitled "Are we in Baptism made members of the true Christian Church?", in which for the first time he appeared as a spokesman for

⁹ D. Thrapp, "W.A. Wexels, 1797-1866, Livs- og Tidsbillede", in Forhandlinger i Videnskabs-Selskabet i Christiania, Christiania, 1906, p. 5.

the Grundtvigian Churchly View.¹⁰ The article was traditionalist and anti-Rationalist, and included the following statement: "Those who are baptized into another faith than the above [i.e. word for word, the entire Apostles' Creed] are naturally not really members of the Christian body instituted by Baptism into this [Creed]."¹¹ Stenersen thereupon sharply criticized Wexels' position in the same periodical.¹² He supports Wexels' anti-Rationalist standpoint, but he doubts the wisdom and questions the validity of Wexels' argument. Wexels "does Christianity no service" thereby. Stenersen defends the authority of Scripture against Wexels' traditionalism. Those who place so much stress on the Creed and "the living voice from one generation to another" should remember that Scripture is the best criterion of Apostolicity. Stenersen doubts Wexels' assertion that the Church has used the same Baptismal Creed throughout the ages. He rejects Wexels' boast that the Rationalists cannot find evidences of "an un-Christian, un-Apostolic character in our congregations, ...in their pure form". It is precisely at this point that the Rationalist argument is valid, says Stenersen. He agrees that history proves the divinity of the Christian religion, but denies the assertion that history can be made to prove the genuineness of a Church. He charges his opponent with

¹⁰ It was not, however, so labeled at this time. The expression was first applied to the Grundtvigian view in 1847 by the Dane V. Birkedal. A. Fjellbu, "Den Kirkelige Anskuelse i Norge" in Gamle Spor og Nye Veier, Kristiania, 1922, p. 131.

¹¹ Tidsskrift for Kirke-Kronike og Christelig Theologi, I, p. 17.

¹² Ibid.

self-contradiction; Wexels first speaks as though all denominations were one Church, and then proceeds to unChurch Rome "and probably the Greeks as well". Finally, he attacks Wexels' insistence on the precise wording of the Creed. Are people to be re-baptized if they have not been baptized with the correct formula? Stenersen fears that the Apostles themselves would thus have to be excluded from Wexels' Church, from the Church which they founded.

Wexels was no match for Stenersen in theological debate. He issued a lengthy reply, but admitted his error in assuming the necessity of re-Baptism for those baptized with another formula.¹³

Since he was the first professor of Dogmatics, Hersleb's ecclesiology is of greater significance. He left no published works in the field, but at least two sets of lecture notes made by his students are extant.¹⁴ His lecture method was first to dictate a summary paragraph in Latin and then to expand upon the theme in the vernacular. The Latin paragraphs in the two manuscripts are virtually identical.

Hersleb employed the traditional Dogmatic method. He obviously regarded Dogmatics as a normative and not merely a historical discipline. For him, the Bible is the basic norm, and the Confessions of the Church a secondary norm.

¹³ Ibid., p. 458.

¹⁴ Mss. No's. 5 and 256, Håndskriftsamling, University Library, Oslo. The pages are not numbered.

In accordance with his intellectualist conception of revelation, he finds no discrepancy between the content of Scripture and the content of the Confessions, and this content is identified with revelation. Even in the section on the Church, we read: "The Evangelical Protestant Church acknowledges the Bible alone to be the true doctrinal norm; It is the foundation upon which this Church is built". The Symbolical Books "contain the norm of doctrine, which the doctors of the Church rejoice to follow". But they derive their authority from their fidelity to Scripture. The only authority they possess in their own right is a civil authority. As a civil community, the Visible Church has a right to demand that its teachers follow the Confessions.

Hersleb begins by defining the Church within broad limits: "The Christian Church is the entire community of those who profess that Jesus Christ is the Redeemer of mankind and who embrace the religious teaching set forth by Him".¹⁵ The intellectualism and the tolerancé of the Enlightenment are evident here. He goes on, however, to distinguish between the Visible and Invisible Church. The Visible Church "includes all who outwardly confess Christianity and who do not by open word or deed exclude themselves from it". The Invisible Church "includes all regenerate persons".¹⁶ This distinction appears to have

15 "ECCLESIA CHRISTIANA EST UNIVERSITAS EORUM QUI JESUM CHRISTUM GENERIS HUMANI SERVATOREM ESSE PROFITENTUR ET RELIGIONIS DOCTRINAM AB EO EXPOSITAM AMPECTUNTUR."

Ms. no. 5, paragraph 165, ms. no. 256, paragraph 153.

16 Ms. no. 256, paragraph 153.

occasioned no great difficulty to Hersleb, and no further development is given. The Visible Church can be further classified as "UNIVERSALIS" and "PARTICULARIS". The Church "Particular" (i.e. any one of the various branches of Christendom) may be either an ECCLESIA VERA or an ECCLESIA FAISA. The "CRITERIA" (not NOTAE) of ECCLESIA VERA are the pure preaching of the Word and the right administration of the Sacraments. Hersleb concludes that the Society of Friends is therefore not an ECCLESIA VERA, because it rejects the Sacraments. The Roman Church is, but it is "less pure" (than the Lutheran) because in it "the Sacraments are mixed with human things".

The word *ἐκκλησία*, says Hersleb, is used in the New Testament to mean: 1) An assembly for worship, 2) The community of Christians, and 3) The Invisible Church. It is never used of the clergy alone, still less of a single clergyman. It is, on the other hand, used of the laity as distinct from the clergy (Acts 20:28, I Tim. 3:5):

The attributes "one, holy, catholic, and eternal" belong to the Invisible Church only, and the Roman Church errs in applying them to the Visible Church. Hersleb accepted the statement "outside the Church there is no salvation", but applied it to the Invisible Church only. This, he claimed, was an insight established by the Reformation. He emphasized the point that Christ is the only Head of the Church. "The Church venerates no visible head."

Hersleb held a High-Church Lutheran doctrine of the Ministry.¹⁷ The Ministry was instituted by Christ and the Apostles (Matt. 28:19, John 20:21, I. Tim. 3:13, et. al.). It is based upon "the express testimony of Scripture". It is "transplanted" from the Apostles; They "commissioned (BESKIKKEDE)" the first clergy, although they sought the opinion of the Congregation.¹⁸ Later, the Church elected the clergy, but the higher clergy always performed the act of Ordination. Hersleb emphasized the fact that the Call was Divine, but he was careful to avoid on the one hand the Roman concept of the Ministry and the Donatist heresy on the other: "Ministers of the Church are indeed called by God, whenever the gift is conferred upon them in the Providence of God according to the laws of the Church; This gift does not, however, necessarily extend to sanctity of life, right knowledge, or the ability to teach."¹⁹ There is no room here for a Ministry which is dependent upon the Congregation. Indeed, the Congregation plays no part whatever. This standpoint was typical of Hersleb's generation. Hersleb took a High Church position with regard to the Power of the Keys. This Power "is customarily included in the rights of the Sacred Ministry",

 17 Ms. no. 5, paragraph 166, ms. no. 256, paragraph 154.

18 Here Hersleb refers to Acts 6, which indicates that he regarded the first Deacons as clergy.

19 "MINISTRI ECCLESIAE QUIDEM A DEO VOCANTUR, QUANDO CUMQUE MUNUS SECUNDUM LEGES ECCLESIAE, DEO PROVIDENTE ILLIS CONFERTUR: HAUD ITA TAMEN, UT VITAE SANCTITAS RECTA SCIENTIA ET DOCENDI FACULTAS CUM ILLIS SIMUL COMMUNICETUR."

although "in the strict sense" it perhaps belonged to the Apostles alone; Hersleb obviously did not regard it as a prerogative of the Congregation.²⁰

(II) Christian N. Keyser (1798-1846) and J. M. P. Kaurin (1804-1863).

Hersleb and Stenersen were succeeded by two of their former students, Pastors C. N. Keyser and J.M.P. Kaurin. Each lectured in several fields; Keyser was professor of Dogmatics from 1836-1846, when he returned to the parish Ministry. Kaurin succeeded to his chair in 1846 and held it until his election to the Bishopric of Bergen in 1852. They "represented the Biblicist, moderate Orthodoxy which characterized most of the disciples of Hersleb and Stenersen, but were neither narrowly Pietistic nor strongly confessional, and were therefore open to the influence of the various camps of Restoration theology".²¹

Neither Keyser nor Kaurin published any dogmatic works, and an investigation of the manuscript collection of the University Library in Oslo reveals no lecture notes that might help us. It is therefore very difficult to discover their exact theological position.

There is, however, one source which gives us an excellent insight into their theology at one point in their career. In the year 1839, these two men, together with Pastor Wexels,

²¹ A. Brandrud, NTT, XII, p. 223.

were appointed to serve as a Royal Commission to undertake a revision of Pontoppidan's Explanation of Luther's Catechism. The result was the strongly Grundtvigian Revised Catechism (1842). A bitter conflict followed its publication, and Wexels in particular came under heavy fire. We shall discuss the ecclesiology of the Catechism in a later chapter. Here, we need only note that it was Professor Kaurin and not Wexels who was chiefly responsible for the revisions made. In defence of the Catechism, he states that, whereas his colleagues on the Commission were inclined to be more conservative, he was himself responsible for the thorough-going character of the revision.²² M.B. Landstad wrote in Kaurin's obituary that he had been "strongly influenced by the so-called 'Churchly View' or the Grundtvigian party..." at the time, and that he had been the one chiefly responsible because "he always made the first draft" and the others "seldom if ever disagreed, and never in any essential respect".²³ Landstad says that he later "freed himself" from Grundtvigianism, especially after he began to lecture in Dogmatics. It appears, therefore, that this excursion into Grundtvigianism was only an episode in Kaurin's theological development, and, in view of the thoroughly Grundtvigian character of the Catechism, it will be discussed in a later chapter.

Keyser's position is more difficult to determine, but it is natural to deduce from his acceptance of the revision that, at least at the time, he too was under Grundtvigian influence.

²² J.M.P. Kaurin, Nogle Ord til den norske kirke..., Christiania, 1846, pp 4-5n. ²³ LK, I., 1863, pp. 243-244.

(III) Gisle Johnson (1822-1894)

With the possible exception of Hans Nilsen Hauge, Gisle Johnson was the most significant single figure in the Norwegian Church in the 19th Century. One of his contemporary antagonists offers the following description of the situation at the height of Johnson's power: "He ruled over all the pulpits and meeting house lecterns and through them everything that was called official or private Christianity--the whole country, the entire populace...".¹

Johnson's permanent significance as a theologian may be debatable, but there is no doubt that, as successively lecturer and professor in Systematic Theology in the University at Christiania for 26 years (1849-75), he was the most influential Norwegian theologian of his day. In view of his great importance, we shall consider in some detail not only his ecclesiology but also his dogmatic method and the factors which helped to shape his theology.

Despite original elements in his theology, Gisle Johnson was less of an original thinker than he appeared to his contemporaries. His biographer says, however, that "if he was an eclectic, his was the eclecticism of an independent thinker".²

The classical Lutheran theology was basic to Johnson's thought. He knew his Luther, but was influenced even more by the Lutheran Confessions and the dogmaticians of the seven-

1 The philosopher Waldemar Dons, quoted in E. Molland, Church Life in Norway, p. 41.

2. G. Ousland, En Kirkehøvdning, p. 105.

teenth century. He was militantly confessional and could tolerate no deviation from Orthodox Lutheran doctrine. Part of his inheritance from Orthodoxy is to be found in the "nomistic-intellectualistic" concept of Revelation, with which he operated. But he was also influenced by Pietism, to which can be directly traced his individualism and subjectivism. It was to Pietism and not to Orthodoxy that he was indebted for his empirical method in dogmatic theology, which must be accounted his most important contribution to Norwegian theology and which in effect virtually led to its modernization. Johnson is the leading representative of what has been called "Orthodox-Pietism".

This tension between Orthodoxy and Pietism in Johnson's thought leads directly, as Ousland has pointed out, to a major inconsistency. He begins with an experimental or experiential approach to theology in true Pietist fashion, but tries to combine with it and even to infer from it objective norms in line with the classical Lutheran approach.

But contemporary influences also left their mark upon his theology. There are some indications of the Idealistic metaphysics so predominant in his day. He can speak, for example, of the life of faith as the only form of human existence in which "the IDEA of humanity is realized".³ He concedes that a certain "consciousness of God" is inherent to human nature.

In his new approach to Dogmatics the influence of

³ G. Johnson, Grundrids af den Systematiske Theologi, p. 8.

Schleiermacher is evident, but it came indirectly, through the confessional empirical (ERFAHRUNGS) theologians under whom Johnson studied during his one foreign study tour in Germany: Harless, J.T. Beck, Philippi, and the Erlangen theologians Thomasius and von Hofmann. His dogmatic method is "regressive". Instead of beginning with the authority of Scripture, as the older dogmaticians had done, Johnson takes his point of departure in the subjective consciousness. The task of Systematic Theology isto examine Christianity "in its subjective truth and necessity, in the subjective existence it has given itself in the Christian faith".⁴ Its source is in the "personal faith-consciousness of the subject".⁵ Here Johnson's theology diverges from that of Schleiermacher in a vital respect. Its source is the "self-consciousness or reason not of the natural man, but of the believer or regenerate man".⁶ Systematic Theology is thus essentially "the self-knowledge of the believer". Dogmatics is "TROESLAERE", not only a doctrine "about faith", but a doctrine "in and of faith".⁷ Since faith comes by the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit, it is in reality the Holy Spirit Who is the source of our theology. But since the testimony of the Spirit is always mediated to us through the Word of God (which Johnson identified with Holy Scripture), the authority of Scripture is maintained. Although theology cannot be derived

4 Ibid., p. 1

5 Ibid., p. 2

6 Ibid., p. 2

7 Ibid., p. 3

directly from any objective source, this does not make such sources superfluous. Indeed, the self-consciousness of the believer (considered by Johnson as the subjective source of theology) actually points toward two objective sources: The Confessions of the Church, and Holy Scripture. Thus the faith-consciousness of Schleiermacher leads directly to the NORMA NORMANS of Holy Scripture. This represents a brave, though not wholly successful, attempt in theology to bridge the epistemological gap of Kantian metaphysics.

Gisle Johnson was the first Norwegian theologian to take Søren Kierkegaard seriously, and there is little doubt that Kierkegaard exerted a notable influence upon Johnson. His philosophy of religion, for example, diverges sharply both from Hegel and Schleiermacher and approximates more closely to Kierkegaard. Christian faith, he says, is not a product of a "human organic development", but constitutes a "break" in natural development. Faith may be considered as "necessary" only in so far as it is the only true satisfaction of man's deepest need.⁸ But Kierkegaard has left his mark upon the Johnsonian dogmatic system precisely at its most distinctive point. This is to be found in the section which Johnson called "Pistics" ("The doctrine of the nature of faith"), which together with Dogmatics ("The Doctrine of the truth-content of faith") and Ethics ("the doctrine of the life of faith") constitute the three parts of the system.

⁸ Ibid., p. 8.

Pistics was no mere introduction to theology, but the study of the origin and nature of faith which lays the foundation for what follows. Here, Søren Kierkegaard's three Stages on Life's Way, the aesthetic, the ethical, and the religious, are reformulated as follows: 1) the religious existence of the natural man, 2) man under the law, and 3) the nature of faith. Following Kierkegaard, Johnson held that each stage demanded the next, but that the transition does not occur without discontinuity, without a break with the past. This is particularly true of the transition from the ethical to the religious stage, where Johnson emphasized the existential element in the genesis of faith.

Johnson attempts to build his system around what he regards as the central dogma: Justification by Faith, "which essentially includes the whole system and from which it necessarily evolves".⁹ Each element is to stand in an organic relationship to this central dogma. The three main sections are entitled: 1) The content of faith as the consciousness of salvation (Soteriology); 2) The content of faith as the consciousness of sin (Anthropology); And 3) The content of faith as the consciousness of God (Theology). Here it is interesting to note that in true eclectic fashion, despite Johnson's devotion to the Empirical School and the influence of Kierkegaard, he utilizes the Hegelian dialectic triad: The thesis is salvation, the antithesis is sin, and the synthesis is God. Johnson had some difficulty arriving at

9 Ibid., p. 79.

the proper order; In the earlier lectures, he began with sin and followed with salvation, but in the published Grundriss from 1879, the order is reversed.

One remarkable feature of the system is the fact that ecclesiology is treated in two different places under the main division "Soteriology". Johnson insists that there is only one Church; But, he says, the Church, like faith, has two aspects, a "receptive", "inner", "invisible" aspect, and a "productive", "outer", "visible" aspect. The Church stands in a double relation to faith: It is "a community in faith", and a "community for faith". The Church is an end in itself, but it is also a means for the administration of Word and Sacrament. Redemption is inwardly mediated by the Spirit of Christ, and it is outwardly mediated through the congregation of Christ, through the means of grace. The Church stands in a double relation to the means of grace: It is both a product and a bearer of the means of grace. Consequently, Johnson considers first "the Church as the product of the redemptive activity of Christ", and then "The Church as the bearer of the means of grace". Still, there is but one Church: The Communion of Saints is also the bearer of the means of grace. Johnson thus gives expression to the basic dialectic of Lutheran ecclesiology. Ousland is entirely correct in speaking of a "strong tension" in Johnson's concept of the Church. It is evident throughout his treatment of the doctrine.

Johnson's dialectic is related to the dialectic of Luther

and the Augsburg Confession. It is not, however, identical with it, and the reason can be traced to Johnson's subjective starting point. Luther and the Confession emphasized the theocentric approach in ecclesiology. The reformers began with the objective Gospel and the means of grace; Article V, which treats of the Ministry and the means of grace precedes Article VII. Johnson is faithful to Luther in defining the Church as the Communion of Saints, but after this his divergences from Luther begin. This can be traced in three main ways. The Confession, like Luther, makes the means of grace its starting point, and introduces the definition of the Church as the Communion of Saints at a later stage. Johnson certainly regarded the means of grace as necessary, but delays his treatment of them with the certainly undesigned effect of making them appear almost as an afterthought. Thus, the theocentric emphasis of the Confession, safeguarded by the priority which is assigned to the means of grace, is lessened, and this effect is increased by his emphasis upon the responsibility of the Church, which must be criticized as introducing an anthropocentric element foreign to the intention of the Confession. This impression is only confirmed when Johnson's interpretation of the COMMUNIO SANCTORUM is taken into account as well. In line with his fundamental subjectivism, he starts with the redemption of the individual and then proceeds to the collective. Thus, despite his considerable efforts to maintain the dialectic, it is to be feared that his whole dogmatic approach gives a decidedly subjective emphasis to his doctrine of the Church which is

out of harmony with the teaching both of Luther and of the Confession.

Our next task will be to consider the two aspects of Johnson's ecclesiology. He first turns his attention to the Church as the product of the redemptive action of Christ. It is here that he asserts most plainly the theocentric character of the Church and lays the greatest emphasis upon its nature as a spiritual organism. It is "not the product of outward compulsion or of human voluntary association, but of Christ's gift of life through the Holy Spirit...both as to its origin and as to its continued existence..."¹⁰

Johnson starts from the premise that sin has reduced the human race, which was intended to form the Kingdom of God, to a state of "atomistic separation". As, however, the Christian is received into Communion with Christ, he also enters into an "organic" relationship with other Christians. This living organism in which Christ unites all Christians is the congregation of saints, the *ἐκκλησία*.¹¹ But the term *ἐκκλησία* is ambiguous and can be interpreted either in a broader or a narrower sense. It could mean either "the union of those who have outwardly followed the call and separated themselves from the world", or "the gathering of those who really are called, i.e. have accepted the call and have been regenerated".¹² According to Johnson, the latter

¹⁰ G. Johnson, *Grundrids*, p. 130.

¹¹ In the *Lecture Notes* (1856 and 1860), Johnson prefers to translate *ἐκκλησία* with "congregation" (MENIGHED), but in the published *Grundrids* (1879), he translates "Church" (kirke) throughout.

¹² *Lecture Notes*, Brun, p. 174.

is the original and proper meaning of the word. It is significant that Johnson is immediately plunged into the question of the limits of the Church.

In the New Testament, the congregation is depicted in various ways: As the temple of God, the house of God, the people of God, the Bride of Christ, the Kingdom of Christ. But in line with his emphasis upon the Church as an organism, Johnson's favourite image is that of the Body of Christ. This also serves to distinguish the Church from the world, because while the world has Christ for its Lord, only the Church has Christ for its Head.¹³ Within this organism, Christ's activity extends both to the individual and to the collective whole. The individual receives that part which he is capable of receiving, but the "fulness" of the Christian life must forever lie beyond his grasp. But this limitation does not apply to the Church as a whole. Christ gives a multitude of different Charismata, which create a multitude of different "forms of life". These mutually supplement one another in the organism. Thus the doctrine of the Charismata bestowed upon the organism plays a dominant role in the Johnsonian ecclesiology. This is in complete accord with his whole dogmatic approach.

To this concept of the Church as an organism which is the product of the redemptive activity of Christ, Johnson

¹³ Implicit in this observation is Luther's doctrine of the Two Realms, though this is neither stated nor developed by Johnson.

attaches a discussion of the classical attributes of the Church. Considered as an organism composed of individuals all of whom are governed by the same "life-principle", the Church is one. Since the Church is destined to receive all Christians and does in fact embrace all Christians without restriction of time or space, this inner unity has a corresponding outer unity, or catholicity. As a community of regenerate persons, participating in Christ's holy life, the Church is holy. In unity and holiness, the Church experiences a "progressive development"; It is "ever more realizing its own essence".¹⁴ In its constant renewal and continual growth, the Church goes through the same process as the individual believer. Human finitude and sin make the Church militant in the world, but it will eventually become triumphant. "Christ's Body cannot die."

The Church militant, however, is unable to give perfect expression to its essence in empirical reality. Because it is unable to judge, it must accept as members those who "only outwardly have followed the call of grace, who confess what they do not believe, and thus do not really belong to the Church". There is an "incongruity" between the Church as the community of believers (the Idea) and the Church as a confessing community (the Reality); Moreover, there is an incongruity between the confessing community according to

14 Lecture Notes, Brun, p. 176. Cf. Grundriss, p. 132.

its essence (vaesen) and its reality (virkelighed). According to its essence, the Visible and Invisible Church ought to be identical, but in reality, the former includes some nominal members.

But the Church is also the bearer of the means of grace. It is "an earthly organization which Christ uses in His activity", a "mediatorial (FORMIDLENDE) organ". The two aspects of the Church are interrelated: "Precisely because the Church is the Communion of Saints, whose continued existence and development as such depends upon the means of grace ...it is also the possessor and administrator of these means of grace in the world..."¹⁵ It is called to utilize them for its own intensive and extensive growth. Thus the Church is not only a product of Christ's activity, but the "serving organ" of that activity as well, a "redemptive institution" (FRELSESANSTALT), although it is not a mediator or itself a means of grace. This is not simply the result of an arbitrary outward call, but also of an inner compulsion. Like the individual Christian, the Church reveals its inner nature in confession of faith. Thus the whole life of the Church is bound up with the use and administration of the means of grace. This is its "life work", and the means of grace (the Word and the Sacraments) are the "Marks" of the Church.

It is at this point that Johnson introduces his main discussion of the question of the Church Visible and Invisible,

¹⁵ Grundrids, p. 196

although he has been unable to avoid some discussion of this topic earlier. Yet clearly if the character of the Church as an organism inevitably involved some mention of the relationship between its invisible life and visible reality, the full force of the distinction could hardly make itself felt before the introduction into the discussion of the means of grace. He retains the traditional dichotomy. The Church is both Visible and Invisible, but it is "essentially" invisible, for it is "exclusively an object of that faith for which the invisible is visible". The Church, therefore, is not evident to "immediate sensory perception". It is a spiritual community whose new life is invisible. The means of grace, however, are visible, tangible; And in order to administer them, the Church must assume a visible form. It is the Church as the Communion of Saints whose task it is to administer the means of grace. "As the invisible spiritual community", it is also "a visible community of the means of grace", "a community of confessors of the faith".¹⁶ The command to preach the Word was given to the disciples (Matt. 16:18, 18:18; John 20:22). To them was given the Power of the Keys, which is identical with the administration of the means of grace. According to the "Idea" of the Church, it is at the same time the Communion of Saints and the bearer of the means of grace.

But here again, the reality does not completely correspond to the Idea. In its visible form, the Church is always

¹⁶ Lecture Notes, Brun, p. 237.

a mixture. The "incongruity" between the outer community and the inner is in fact a necessary condition of the existence of the Church in the world.

The relationship between the Visible and Invisible Church is the relationship between "faith" and "confession", between "the subjective efficacy of grace" and "the objective means of grace".

The Invisible Church can only exist within the Visible. It is possible to be a member of the Visible Church without being a member of the Invisible. It is not possible, however, to belong to the Invisible Church without simultaneously belonging to the Visible. The Visible Church is "the only visible form of existence for the Invisible. Moreover, the relationship is "synecdotic". The Visible Church bears the name of Church only because it contains within it the Invisible.

We can also speak in terms of the ECCLESIA PROPRIE (or STRICTA) DICTA and the ECCLESIA IMPROPRIE (or LATE) DICTA. This distinction is related to but not identical with the contrast between the Visible and the Invisible, since the ECCLESIA PROPRIE DICTA is both visible and invisible, while the ECCLESIA IMPROPRIE DICTA is only visible. Scriptural evidence cited here includes the parables of the Wheat and the Tares and the Drag-net. "Many are called, but few are chosen," as Jesus said in connection with the parable of the Wedding of the King's Son. We may also speak of the distinction between the

COETUS VOCATORUM and the COETUS ELECTCRUM. This, however, is easily misunderstood, for the way is left fatally open to introduce the concept of predestination. Consequently, the distinction is better expressed by the terms CONGREGATION SANCTORUM and CONGREGATIO CREDENTIUM.

Again, in discussing the term "The Kingdom of God", Johnson concludes that it has "a wider outreach" in its visible appearance than in its invisible, but that "a certain identity" must exist, for Scripture describes both as the Kingdom of God. He also admits that Paul uses the term ECCLESIA in speaking of the mixed community. Moreover, John 15:1 speaks of "dead" members. Johnson rejects, however, the view that these were never more than members of the outward community. Only "living" members are true members; A dead member must once have been a living member, that is, one who has once been in "spiritual communion" with Christ (regenerate) and not only in "sacramental communion" (through Baptism) with Him.

Johnson now returns to the classical attributes of the Church as seen against the background of the Church's responsibility for the administration of the means of grace. The Church's attributes of unity, catholicity, and holiness are never "adequately expressed" in the Visible Church, for they belong to the Communion of Saints. The same is true of its apostolicity, which consists not "in the imitation of the Apostolic Church in all things", but in faithfulness to the Apostolic teaching in the use and administration of the means

of grace. We have already noted that Johnson regarded the administration of the means of grace as a function which properly belonged to the Invisible Church. In actual practice, however, it is the Visible Church considered as the sole expression of the invisible reality which performs this function. After all, the means of grace are powerful in themselves, independent of the character of the administrator. Here, Johnson is unswervingly faithful to the anti-Donatism of Luther and the Confessions. The Marks of the Church are the pure preaching of the Word and the right administration of the Sacraments, i.e. a usage which corresponds to Christ's will as revealed in Scripture. Sin always distorts the outward manifestation of the apostolicity of the Church. Apostolicity is a "qualitative" category; A non-apostolic Church would be a contradiction in terms. On the other hand, there are, within the limits of apostolicity, many quantitative differences; The various branches of Christendom may be said to be more or less apostolic.¹⁷ The same is true of the unity and the holiness of the Church. The nature of the Church demands agreement in the use of the means of grace, unity in confession, "which, to be sure, does not exclude differences arising from weakness of faith or different stages of development in appropriation, but

17 For Johnson, the Lutheran Church was "the Lord's Church above all others", "the true Christian Church, the true successor to and descendant of the ancient Apostolic Church". It has been most faithful to the Scriptural Revelation. Nogle Ord om Barnedaaben, pp. 10-11.

demands unity in that which comprises the actual substance of the Christian faith".¹⁸ The fact of sin implies that there will always be divisions in the empirical Church, but these merely damage and do not destroy the essential unity of the Invisible Church. The empirical Church must continually strive after unity, but not at the expense of truth.¹⁹ It is not only true that EXTRA ECCLESIAM NULLA SALUS, but EXTRA ECCLESIAM VISIBILEM NULLA SALUS; Outside the Invisible Church in its visible form and with its visible means of grace, there is no salvation.

The Church must protect its holiness. Church discipline is "an essential and necessary element in the administration of the means of grace, " especially in the administration of the Sacraments."²⁰ The Church is not called to distribute its gifts carelessly, but to prove each one who desires them. But Church discipline is to be carried out entirely with spiritual means, by the Word of God; It is essentially different from civil punishment. Here speaks Johnson the Church reformer, but he is no Calvinist for all his insistence on this point. Discipline is not a special NOTA ECCLESIAE, but rather an aspect of the right administration of the means of grace. In a Church which claims to be apostolic, the exercise of discipline may in practice be weak, but it can never be abolished in principle.

¹⁸ Grundrids, p. 200.

¹⁹ Lecture Notes, Brun, p. 245.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 242.

Johnson's doctrine of the Church as we have so far expounded it has certain puzzling features. His method of treatment inevitably means that the attributes of the Church and to a lesser extent the invisibility and visibility of the Church are handled twice. Yet the reason for this rather clumsy procedure seems clear enough, and is to be found in his attempt to expound and clarify both sides of the tension. The first half of the polarity with its strong sense of givenness and collective organic life represents an attempt to do justice to the objective side of the Church's nature, while the second with its accent upon the means of grace gives in his opinion its rightful place to the subjective aspect of the Church. It is not therefore surprising that the attributes of the Church are more deeply considered in the first section and the relation between the visibility and invisibility of the Church in the second. At first sight we might expect the means of grace to fall only on the second half, in which the Church is considered as their bearer, but the point that the Church is also the product of the means of grace (which is fully in line with his tradition) is relevant to the givenness of the Church. Yet for all this careful attempt to provide a balanced doctrine, it is clear that his thought falls over rather markedly towards the subjective side of the tension, and it is probably here that his clearest and most significant thinking is really done. In some ways, Johnson might be considered to be applying to the doctrine of the Church the distinction between symbol and instrument which Oliver

Quick applied with such good effect to the doctrine of the Sacraments.

A similar tension may be observed in Johnson's doctrine of the Ministry. His conception of the Ministry can best be described as functional and charismatic. He attached great importance to the Universal Priesthood, and emphatically rejected any special clerical estate (STAND). On the other hand, he recognized the need for the clerical office.

The Church as the Communion of Saints is called to administer the means of grace, to exercise a MINISTERIUM EVANGELIUM PREDICANDI ET SACRAMENTA ADMINISTRANDI. This call is an integral part of the spiritual priesthood of all believers, although in practice it is the Visible Church which carries out this task. In the nature of the case, the Church can only do so through its individual members. Whenever they confess their faith in Word and deed to the edification of the congregation, there is the Church, carrying out its function as bearer of the means of grace. But this is not sufficient; As the Church appears as a visible reality, it must also assume a definite order. In addition, the organic character of the Body demands that certain gifts be allowed to work in corresponding offices. Thus, "the special office of the Ministry springs with inner necessity from the Universal Priesthood".²¹ The immediate personal relation of

Christ to all the members of the Church excludes any concept

21 Lecture Notes, Brun, p. 247. Cf. Grundrids, p. 201.

of the Ministry as the privilege of a special class; In principle, the function belongs to all without distinction. The selection of those specially equipped for the task represents a "restriction" of the activity of the other members, but not an exclusion from all part in it. In the New Testament Church, the congregation as a whole participated in the election of deacons and in the exercise of Church discipline. There is no difference with regard to the efficacy of the means of grace between the different members of the Church. Christ has not bound the efficacy of the means of grace to any quality in the administrator, neither an inner quality (faith) nor an outer quality (membership in a clerical estate). Thus Johnson rejects both the Donatist and the Roman Catholic concepts of the Ministry. There are elements of truth in both. It is true that it is the ECCLESIA PROPRIE DICTA which is called to administer the means of grace. It is "abnormal" for unbelievers to carry out this task; Such a situation does not, however, invalidate the means of grace. It is also true that a special office to administer the means of grace is "necessary". But there is no evidence in Scripture that this was to be the privilege of a special class. For Catholicism to admit that unordained persons can perform this task in an emergency is in fact to admit the falsity of the whole Roman position.

Johnson denies that the office of the Ministry was instituted in and with the Apostolate, except in a functional sense. For this purpose, the Apostles' successors are the

entire Church. The Power of the Keys was given to the whole congregation. On the other hand, as the foundation of the Church, the Apostles have no successors. There is a difference between the Apostles and "simple believers" but "there exists no third class". On the contrary, Scriptural evidence for the Universal Priesthood makes this "impossible".²² This is not to deny the existence of a special office of the Ministry. Although there is no difference in the relation of all Christians to the Lord, they have different gifts, each with a corresponding vocation in the Church. The Church must choose its servants on the basis of the guidance of the Holy Spirit, which He gives by distributing the various charismata. This charismatic principle goes back to the Apostolic Age.

Ordination is for Johnson the act in which the office is transferred, "an ecclesiastical act of benediction", a CONFIRMATIO ELECTIONIS, a COMPROBATIO VOCATIONIS. It is not a Sacrament; This is a corollary of his denial of a clerical STAND. If it were a Sacrament, it would be the basic Sacrament which gave validity to the others. Scripture gives us no account of ordination in the Apostolic Church, still less any divine mandate. The laying on of hands in Scripture is an act accompanying the Word, and signifies the application of the Word to the person concerned. In the New Testament, it is a means whereby the ordinand is filled with the Holy Spirit. Thus in the Pastoral Epistles, Timothy received a

22 Lecture Notes, Brun, p. 251.

Charisma. But ordination in the Church of our own day is different from the laying on of hands in the Apostolic Church; Now, this act presupposes the presence of a Charisma. The candidate is not "changed" in ordination, but rather receives the authority to utilize in an official capacity a Charisma he already possesses.

The office of the Ministry, says Johnson, is not "a necessary element" in the ORDO SALUTIS, nor a special means of grace, but only a part of the Church Order as Christ willed it.²³ The Ministry stands in a "secondary relation" to the ORDO SALUTIS and can never be established at its expense. The same is true of ordination; We must distinguish here between what is necessary and what is edifying. In an emergency, an unordained person may himself administer ordination. Here again, his standpoint reflects a tension between the institutional and the personal or charismatic aspects of the Ministry.

In conclusion, Johnson raises the question: Did Christ establish the Ministry? He says elsewhere that "Jesus willed it", but he also gives a more explicit answer to the question in this context. The answer, says Johnson, depends on what is meant by the word "establish". He did not "expressly ordain" it, but He did establish it in "an indirect way". He established the Ministry "in a broad sense" when He gave the means of grace to the Church. And He established it "in a narrow sense" when He gave the necessary charismata for the administration of the means of grace.²⁴

²³ Ibid., p. 253.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 254.

In view of its importance in subsequent chapters, it will be convenient here to expound Johnson's doctrine of Baptism.

The classical Lutheran doctrine of Baptism rests upon a dialectic. On the one hand, Baptism is regarded as a regenerative act of God; On the other hand, it is not considered efficacious unless received by faith. For any Lutheran, Baptism is primarily Infant Baptism.

Gisle Johnson attempted to do justice to the dialectic and to defend Infant Baptism, but his emphasis upon the aspect of faith threatened to destroy the delicate balance.

For Johnson, the Word of God was the primary means of grace. This is thoroughly Lutheran; Luther wrote in his Large Catechism that there was actually only one means of grace, the Word, and that it was the Word which gave to the Sacraments their power. But Johnson, in line with his intellectualist concept of revelation, and in unconscious opposition to Luther, identified the Word absolutely with Scripture. This led to a false distinction between Word and Sacrament. Indeed, it could even be argued that for Johnson there was a certain tension between the two. In Johnson, nurture Christianity and conversionism vied for supremacy. Because of his strong Pietist tendencies, Johnson insisted upon the need for a kind of spiritual "break-through" to conscious faith in adult years. This was not exactly the same as conversion, but there were decided similarities.

It is fair to say that Infant Baptism was difficult to incorporate into Johnson's system. In the nature of the case,

Infant Baptism is thoroughly theocentric. It can only be deduced from the consciousness of the mature believer with great difficulty. In true Pietist and empiricist fashion, Johnson tended to psychologize Baptism. His biographer has pointed out that Johnson made surprisingly little attempt to relate the doctrine of Baptism to the central doctrine of Justification by Faith, but treated it in a somewhat isolated manner. Johnson's problem, he says, was how to retain the primacy of the Word and yet to give room for Baptism.²⁵

Johnson starts from the premise that Baptism, like the Word has regenerative power. Regeneration, he says, is normally the result of Word and Sacrament working in conjunction (!). It is difficult to determine their respective roles, but the Word works upon the consciousness, while Infant Baptism works upon the unconscious life.²⁶ Like Luther, Johnson emphasized the continuous character of Baptism (i.e. what is known in Lutheran circles as the "covenant relationship"). His method of procedure, however, is highly questionable. In Baptism, he said, each person "is placed in a peculiar relationship with the Author of regeneration, in which a mediating principle is given for his actual regeneration".²⁷ Johnson proceeds to expound a two-fold effect of Baptism. On the one hand, it has a "sacramental" effect upon all to whom it is administered, which places them in a "mysterious"

²⁵ G. Ousland, op.cit., p. 127

²⁶ G. Johnson, Nogle Ord om Barnedaaben, pp. 70ff.

²⁷ Grundrids, p. 185.

relationship to God, but does not regenerate them. On the other hand, it has a "regenerative" effect, directed toward all but only realized in those who are "receptive".²⁸ Not all, therefore, are regenerated in Baptism. (Johnson is obviously concerned to avoid an EX CPERE OPERATO interpretation.) Some are not regenerated until later, through the Word, but even then Baptism is the "mediating principle". Johnson can even describe it as "a continually efficacious means of regeneration".²⁹ He maintained that it was possible for a person to fall from faith and to be regenerated "many times".³⁰ In each case, conversion would occur "as a fruit of cooperation between the Word and the once-received and still-powerful Baptism".³¹ Johnson held that regeneration apart from Baptism, by the Word of Scripture alone, could only occur where the individual "is not baptized and cannot be baptized". But regeneration by Baptism alone is the only way for Infants.

Johnson harboured no doubts about the inherent sinfulness of Infants and their consequent need of Baptism. Moreover, they are capable of receiving regeneration; Here Johnson emphasized the fact that they have as yet developed no resistance to God's grace. It is not consciousness which makes a person a human being, nor it is consciousness which

²⁸ Nogle Ord om Barnedaaben, p. 82.

²⁹ IK, 1864, pp. 85-86.

³⁰ NK, 1859, p. 182.

³¹ IK, 1864, p. 86. Cf. Nogle Ord om Barnedaaben, p. 87.

Johnson's line of reasoning in this section inspired the Grundtvigian charge that he taught a "double regeneration".

makes him receptive. Adults may be judged by their fruits, but this rule may not be applied to infants. The receptive infant is received into fellowship with God, he receives the gift of the indwelling Holy Spirit, and a "spiritual LIVSSPIRE"(literally, "life-sprout") is planted within him.³² Nevertheless, Johnson can write in a significant passage, "the unconscious regeneration wrought in Baptism is destined in good time to become a conscious regeneration through the aid of the Word, and thus Infant Baptism is predestined to create that which can only be a fruit of the cooperation of both of these means of grace".³³ We must be careful not to equate Johnson's "conscious regeneration" with conversion and thus minimize the part played by Baptism. But Johnson was certainly concerned, in true Pietist fashion, to emphasize the need for a conscious appropriation of regeneration in adult life.

Johnson did not favour the administration of Baptism to all infants. It should only be conferred upon those whose parents are "already related to the Church in such a way as to ensure for them a Christian nurture".³⁴ Thus, Johnson defended the doctrine of Infant Baptism, but asserted that its practice by the Church was weak. What was needed more than anything else was "nurturing evangelical discipline".

³² Nogle Ord om Barnedaaben, p. 117.

³³ Ibid., pp. 117-118.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 118.

It is clear that Johnson's ecclesiology represents a substantial improvement over that of the Enlightenment or even of Hersleb. It is at the same time more true to the Biblical revelation and more profoundly thought out.

Johnson's doctrine of the Church is fundamentally Lutheran. He makes a valiant effort to do justice to the distinctively Lutheran dialectic. In Johnson, there are strong tensions between grace and faith, between the personal and the institutional aspects of the Church, between the individual and the collective, between the "receptive" and the "productive" sides of the Church, between the Sacrament of Baptism and the idea of conversion, between the divinely established office of the Ministry and the Universal Priesthood, between the charismatic principle and the principle of Church order.

Nevertheless, because he has read Luther and the Confessions through the eyes both of Orthodoxy and Pietism, Johnson fails to maintain the dialectic. He proceeds on the basis of the intellectualist concept of revelation and the subjective approach. Because of his empirical starting point, the balance is tipped throughout the system in favour of the subjective aspect. In his basic definition of the Church, Johnson begins with the body of believing persons, the personal side of the dialectic. He finds room for both grace and faith in his system, but his emphasis is upon faith. He does not overlook the collective aspect of the Church, but he begins with the individual. He certainly teaches that

the Church is constituted by the action of Christ, but he emphasizes the "productive" side of the Church. The image of the Church as an organism is faithfully Biblical. Yet there is in Johnson's use of the image something far too Hegelian. The emphasis was upon the "progressive development" of the Church toward the realization of its idea. Johnson resisted the temptation to spiritualize the Church completely, but it was for him essentially invisible. He defended Infant Baptism, but he was chiefly concerned to ensure that those baptized came to a "conscious faith" in mature years. He conceded that the office of the Ministry existed by the will of God, but he deduced it from the doctrine of the Universal Priesthood. He could insist upon the need for Church order, but the proper utilization of the charismata was a consideration which overruled order.³⁵ In this manner, Johnson's ecclesiology provided a sort of charter for the lay movement.

But Gisle Johnson was not merely an academic theologian. He was supremely a practical man, and as a practical Churchman, he exercised unparalleled influence. In the 1850's, he was the central figure in the great revival which bears his name. He founded Luthersk Kirketidende and edited it for twelve years. He was co-editor of Theologisk Tidsskrift for thirty-three years. He was the guiding spirit in the organized

³⁵ It is significant that Johnson wrote a sympathetic foreword to the Norwegian edition of Rudolf Sohm's Church History, in which he spoke of Sohm's "clear and profound understanding of the inner development of religious and Church life". Here the sharp distinction between the pneumatic character of the Apostolic Church and the later emphasis upon ecclesiastical law harmonized closely with Johnson's emphasis upon the charismatic principle both in regard to the Church and the Ministry.

movement for Inner Mission. He was the real leader of the movement for reform of the State Church. It was above all in these two movements that he sought to apply and to put into practical effect his doctrine of the Church. These topics will be discussed in some detail in later chapters.

His central importance for our subject will make it necessary to examine more closely two factors which helped to shape his practical Churchmanship.

The first may be found in his early training. He was clearly raised in an atmosphere of deep piety and seriousness.³⁶ He was early influenced by the Haugeans. Moreover, he passed through a profound spiritual crisis at the age of 20. His personality was introverted; His reticence was almost legendary. Ousland denies that either Johnson or his parents were Pietists and attempts to remove this stigma from his theology.³⁷ This, however, can not be sustained. It is true, as Ousland says, that Johnson never attempted to found a "pure" Church. Others have called attention to the fact that, while he sought to create ECCLESIOLOAE, he intended them to expand, not to withdraw. But this was the intention of historic Pietism as well. We ought not, perhaps, to quarrel over labels. Yet Johnson's subjective, individualist, and revivalist approach, his personal ETHOS, and his concern to create ECCLESIOLOAE are all manifestly Pietistic traits. Moreover, as we shall see in later chapters, Johnson had what

³⁶ Cf. the letter he received from his father at Confirmation, Ousland, op. cit., p. 11.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 149.

amounted almost to an obsession for attempting to draw limits to the Church. This was a direct result of his subjective approach. If great emphasis is placed upon the Church as the congregation of saints, it becomes very important to determine who the saints are. In true Pietist fashion, Johnson was concerned to make visible the Invisible Church.

The second main influence is to be found in the writings of Søren Kierkegaard. While a Churchman with revivalist tendencies like Johnson would naturally be critical of the State Church, there is no doubt that here, as elsewhere, the impact of Kierkegaard can be traced.³⁸

Although in some respects the religious thought of Kierkegaard was beneficial, as far as the doctrine of the Church was concerned his influence was largely negative. Various modern writers have called attention to the fact that individualism and subjectivism were the fatal weaknesses in his conception of Christianity.³⁹ Nor did this fact pass unnoticed at the time.

Rejecting the historicism and collectivism of the Hegelians, Kierkegaard went to the opposite extreme. He stressed the responsibility of the individual standing before God and the need for "contemporaneity with Christ". His principal accusation against the Establishment was that it had ceased to be militant and had anticipated a triumphant

³⁸ Ibid., p. 95

³⁹ P. Lindhardt, op. cit., p. 221. D. Patrick, Pascal and Kierkegaard, II, pp. 397-398. J. Pelikan, From Luther to Kierkegaard, p. 118. H. MacKintosh, op. cit., pp. 257-8.

character. The State Church emphasized "the race, human society, the partnership, the corporation, which as a matter of course, assumes possession of the truth". It ought rather to concern itself with "every individual who, responsible before God, has to decide for himself whether he will walk in the way or not, regardless...whether no one else or all men are following the same way..."⁴⁰ Established Christianity is, it does not become. The Church ought to be militant to the end of the age. Moreover, the true Church is "a small and despised flock".⁴¹ Kierkegaard virtually elevated suffering to the position of a Mark of the Church. He was deeply concerned to preserve the purity of the Lord's Table.⁴² At the same time, Kierkegaard was not in favour of separation of Church and State, because the only way this could be accomplished was by popular ballot, and this would be "sheer worldliness". He considered the doctrine and the order of the Church to be "very good"; what was needed was "the reformation of us all" as individuals.⁴³ He did not attack the Sacraments as such, although he was sharply critical of the practice of their administration. There are definite indications that the views of Kierkegaard were deliberately exaggerated and that he regarded his function as that of a

40 S. Kierkegaard, Training in Christianity, p. 205. It was Kierkegaard's genius to see that the root cause of this problem was a false concept of revelation. Christianity had, he said, come to be regarded as a "dividend", a truth that is thought, when in reality it was a truth that is existence.

41 S. Kierkegaard, Journals, p. 451 (1851).

42 S. Kierkegaard, Ibid., p. 78 (1839).

43 S. Kierkegaard, Training in Christianity, pp. 428-9.

catalyst.

The effects of Kierkegaard's influence upon Johnson were both good and bad. On the positive side, Kierkegaard's criticism of Christendom spurred the Johnsonians to new and greater effort to evangelize the nation and to reform the structure of the State Church. But negatively it tended still further to weaken the sense of the importance of the Church (already affected by the influence of Pietism) in Johnson and his vast following. A contemporary observer has said that Kierkegaard's "immeasurable deficiency" in this respect was reflected "in the entire revival of the 1850's". The Johnsonian clergy, he says, generally regarded themselves as "the representatives of Christianity in the dead parishes of the State Church".⁴⁴

While Johnson himself both in theology and in his practical contribution to the life of the Church attempted to hold together two sides of a tension, the balance seems always to fall on the subjective aspect. Unfortunately, his disciples, as we shall see, using his approach not only carried his subjectivism still further in theology but also in large measure frustrated his plan for the reform of the Church and led the Inner Mission movement in which he had so large a hand away from the Church and its order.

⁴⁴ Georg Sverdrup (Cand.Theol., 1871). Quoted in A. Helland, Georg Sverdrup: The Man and His Message, Minneapolis, 1947, The Messenger Press, p. 33.

(IV) Andreas Grimelund (1812-1896)

Andreas Grimelund was prominent among that group of Norwegian Churchmen who "mediated the transition from High-Churchmanship to lay activity and voluntary organizations".¹ He was strongly influenced by Moravianism in his youth, was trained under Hersleb and Stenersen,² and learned the value of the Sacraments from Grundtvig.

It is difficult to form a clear picture of Grimelund's philosophical presuppositions, but there are signs that he builds upon the common Idealist foundation then current. He has probably not thought this matter through. He was not a great or original thinker, and his views are somewhat eclectic. He was a confessional Lutheran theologian in whom High- and Low-Church elements were blended. Grimelund's theological and ecclesiological views underwent a considerable development in a Low-Church direction. In his work from 1856, there are definite signs of Grundtvigian influence, but we know that he opposed the Churchly View in the later decades.³ Grimelund is interesting because he may be regarded as typical of large numbers of the Norwegian clergy in the second and third quarters of the 19th Century.

In his Forelaesninger over Practisk Theologie (1856), Grimelund devoted a section each to Liturgics, Homiletics, and Pastoral Theology; But he also added an unusual fourth

1 H. Blom-Svendsen, "Andreas Grimelund" in NBL, IV, p. 624.

2 G. received the degree of Cand. Theol. in 1835.

3 See the Gunnerus case, examined in the chapter on Grundtvigianism. Grimelund was Gunnerus' Bishop at the time, and made no effort to help him.

section entitled "Ecclesiastik", in which he discussed the Church and its activity. His aim was to enable the pastor to see the unity of the other three parts, and to provide a "firm standpoint" and a "guiding principle" for his work.

Grimelund prefaces his discussion of the Church with some more general considerations. Man seeks God, in whose image he is created. Man is separated from God, not by the fact that he is a creature or that he is finite, but because of sin.⁴ In other words, the opposition is not metaphysical but ethical. Man needs atonement. God has not only provided an objective Atonement in Christ, He has also instituted the Church, to bring the Atonement within reach of the subjective experience of everyone.

Grimelund can speak of the Church as a "redemptive institution". This phrase (which might in some quarters suggest the notion of the Church as the "extension" of the Incarnation and Atonement) simply connotes the Church as the organ through which the Redemption of Christ is mediated to mankind through the administration of the means of grace. It was a common usage among High Church clergy of the period, notably Wexels, and received special impetus from the Neo-Lutheran movement in Germany. There is a similar phrase in Johnson which expresses the same idea but guards against its misinterpretation: The Church is a "mediatorial organ" but not a "mediator".

⁴ A. Grimelund, Forelaesninger over Practisk Theologie, p. 245.

This is a perfectly valid Lutheran idea consistent with the divine origin and theocentric character of the Church as opposed to the term "Communion of Saints" interpreted in a subjective manner.

It is evident that Grimelund has a strong sense of the historicity of the Church, for he regards it from the standpoint of its origin, its development in history, and its goal. The Church is a historical entity, and so must be traced genetically if it is to be clearly seen and grasped.⁵ It was instituted by Christ in the Apostles, but realized in the event of Pentecost, when the Spirit of Christ became the new "Life-principle" in them.⁶ Its final goal is the full revelation of God's Kingdom on earth. Between its genesis and its goal, the Church is undergoing a period of "development", a favourite term of Grimelund. From the Church's genesis and goal, we can deduce its essence, its attributes, and its "working means" (i.e. the means of grace). Grimelund's discussion of the Church is organized around these three terms.

Grimelund's discussion of the essence of the Church displays a marked similarity to that of Gisle Johnson. Like Johnson, Grimelund regards the Biblical image of the Body of Christ as the best expression of the Church's essence. The

5 Grimelund's use of the word "genetic" must not be confused with the "real-genetic" method of Johnson. The latter is indicative of a whole empiricist approach, the former merely a historical method of treatment.

6 Forelaesninger over Practisk Theologie, pp. 247-8.

Church is "a spiritual organism of believers" created by the Holy Spirit. Again, like Johnson, Grimelund is immediately involved in a discussion of the visibility and invisibility of the Church, in which he too speaks not of the Visible and Invisible Church, but of the visible and invisible aspects of the Church. As the Communion of Saints, the Church is invisible; Its Head, Spirit, and powers are all invisible, as well as the relation of its members to Christ and to one another. The Church is supersensual, the object of faith. But as a confessing community, "the sum total of all who confess the objective Christian faith and gather round God's Word and Sacraments",⁷ it is visible, as the designation "Body" indicates. Its historical origin, its means of grace, its confession of faith, its common worship and its communal life are all visible. In stressing the tangibility of the Church, Grimelund reflects the influence of Grundtvig. Like Grundtvig, he asserts that the Church has one outward, objective Mark which distinguishes it from all other communities, its symbol, the Apostles' Creed used in conjunction with Baptism.⁸

Grimelund concedes that these two aspects of the Church do not absolutely coincide while the Church is in process of development, but he insists that they must be held together if the opposite pitfalls of Spiritualism and materialism are

⁷ Ibid., p. 250.

⁸ Ibid., p. 249. Grimelund does not, however, explicitly follow Grundtvig in his theory of the historical preservation of the Creed, the hallmark of the Churchly View.

to be avoided. The prototype as well as the basis of the Church's essence is to be found in the union of the two Natures in Christ. The situation of the Church during its development requires an outward polity. This should express the nature of the Church as both a redemptive institution and a community-in-faith, but may vary with the various stages in the Church's development. No one form of polity belongs to the essence of the Church.

On the other hand, Word and Sacraments form the "substantial basis" of the Church. Their continual and orderly administration is essential to its existence. Grimelund regards the Apostolicity of the Church as residing in pure Scriptural doctrine. For him, the pure Word is identified with Holy Scripture, in which "the Apostolate is always present in the Church".⁹ He regards the Church as holy, not because of its members (many hypocrites are mingled with it), but because of its origin, goal, and call, and because it is the workshop of the Holy Spirit and the home of the means of grace. But he adds that the Church must aim at the sanctification of its members. In discussing the Church's unity and catholicity, Grimelund also stresses its diversity within the single "organism". Different ages and individuals complement one another to present the complete image of Christ's Body. This causes no breach in the Church's "essential inner unity", although the effect of sin has been the loss of its outward unity.

⁹ Ibid., p. 251.

But any body which has Word and Sacraments and which subscribes to the Ecumenical Creeds must be regarded as part of the Church catholic. The truest expression of the Church's nature is to be found in the local congregation. It is worthy of note that after his clear discussion of the essence of the Church, Grimelund conflates his discussion of its attributes and working means. For him, the third concept was more important than the second.

Grimelund sees the Church's activity as two fold: missionary and edifying. As a lecturer in practical theology, it is the latter with which he is chiefly concerned. It includes: 1) cultus, 2) pastoral care, and 3) catechetical instruction. Its "highest principle" is "teleological", and presupposes a "soteriological principle" mediated in Baptism.¹⁰

Grimelund begins his section on the Ministry and its origin by asserting the Low-Church principle that the whole Church, not a special clerical estate is the "subject" of the Church's edifying activity. Since it is also the object of this activity, and since all cannot possibly serve all, there arose the need for a special Ministry. But Grimelund also says in High-Church fashion that the MINISTERIUM ECCLESIASTICUM (understood in functional terms) was directly instituted by the Lord through a positive command.¹¹ The Church needs a special CLERUS (he is not afraid to use the term

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 253.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 215. "It is instituted in and with the means of grace and originally coincided with the Apostolate..."

STAND), partly for the sake of order and partly to ensure a "right" administration. Like Johnson, Grimelund emphasized the charismatic principle. The Holy Spirit has indirectly (MIDDELBART) chosen the members of this STAND through His distribution of charismata. The STAND is not a continuation of the Apostolate, which was unique. The office inevitably arose out of the organic character of the Church. The various degrees of office exist purely for "order and supervision", and imply no distinction in the right to administer the means of grace.

The clergy are not "divinely privileged", but receive their offices from the Church in the call. The Church in turn must not fail to call, nor may it call arbitrarily, but must issue the call on the basis of the charismata. An examination of candidates is expressly commanded in Scripture (I. Tim. 3:10). The call of the Church is a "mediate" call from God. It "recognizes and seals" the inner call of the Spirit. On the other hand, it presupposes an inner call, and where this is lacking and the pastor teaches contrary to the Gospel, the Church is in duty bound to retract its call.

Thus the Lutheran Church holds both to the Universal Priesthood and to "bodily" means of grace administered by a regularly called clergy.¹²

In a chapter on "The relationship of the clergy to the congregation and its Lord", Grimelund holds that the pastor is neither above nor outside the congregation, but rather he

¹² Ibid., p. 217.

is one of them. He is their leader, but derives his power and authority from the office (it is "immanent" there) which the congregation has transferred to him on God's behalf. He is Christ's messenger and a steward of the means of grace. Doctrinal discipline is a matter for the Church body as a whole (e.g., the national Church). The best titles for the clergy are "pastor" and "servant of the Word". They are primarily servants, and have no power but that of the Word.

In a chapter entitled "The work and struggle of the Ministry", Grimelund raises the question of whether the pastor should attempt to form ECCLESIOIAE IN ECCLESIA. He answers in the negative, if by that is understood the formation of "a smaller, closed community with special communal bonds and means and times of edification", but in the positive, if is meant "the awakening of congregational-consciousness and the gathering of believers more closely together through the common Church bonds".¹³ Grimelund regards "subjective theology"¹⁴ as one of the threats to the Ministry, for it weakens the Church and confessional bonds. He accuses the system of the State Church of placing the Ministry in "a false position", calling attention to its enormous parishes, its lack of Church discipline, and its legal compulsion. The Ministry thus becomes "a service of law" instead of a service of the Spirit and the Word, and congregational life is rendered impossible.¹⁵

¹³ Ibid., p. 224.

¹⁴ Possibly this is an allusion to Schleiermacher.

¹⁵ Forelaesninger over Practisk Theologie, p. 226.

Finally, Grimelund has a chapter on "The conditions for the proper exercise of the office", in which he expands his view of the call. He takes first the "subjective" call: The prime attribute of a pastor is that he is himself a "Churchly Christian", that he is conscious of sharing in the Church's Apostolic faith and Baptism. But Grimelund also maintains the necessity of an "objective" call. This is "the act whereby the office is transferred to the individual with positive divine sanction".¹⁶ It may occur mediately or immediately. The latter was characteristic of the Apostolic Age, the former of our age. Grimelund concedes that the immediate call may still occur (God's Spirit is not bound), but he regards it as extraordinary and asserts that it must evidence its legitimacy by "sure signs". The "proper" call is now the mediate call, proceeding from legitimate ecclesiastical authority. An immediate call which despises the mediate is surely not genuine.

Grimelund devotes only a paragraph to ordination. It is the final fulfillment of the mediate call, by which the *POTESTAS MINISTERII* is conferred. Without actually being a Sacrament, there is a sacramental element in ordination. In it, the Holy Spirit transfers the office, gives the ordinand authority, and assures him of His assistance. The right to ordain belongs not to the State but solely to the Church, and can only be carried out by one of its ordained servants.¹⁷

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 236.

¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 238-9.

(V) Marcus Jacob Monrad (1816-97)

Professor Marcus J. Monrad's principal work in the Philosophy of Religion appeared relatively late in the Century (1885), at a time when Hegelianism had long been regarded as a spent force on the Continent. Reaction to the book was varied. An anonymous reviewer in *Morgenbladet* found Monrad's conclusions "in good harmony with the teaching of the Church", and regarded the book as a powerful defence against Positivism.¹ On the other hand, Pastor M. J. Faerden, while he found Monrad's work "very valuable", made it clear that Monrad was not always orthodox and that he had departed in some respects from the Biblical realism.²

Faerden's assessment was undoubtedly correct. The book strikes the present-day reader as strange and unrealistic. Koppang maintains that one of Monrad's greatest weaknesses was his lack of contact (*INNLEVELSE*) with historical reality.³ Religion, Religioner, og Christendommen gives the impression of being altogether too theoretical and speculative a work. It is often in sharp conflict with the Biblical dualism of the Lutheran tradition. Moreover, many of the views expressed in it were in diametrical opposition to the currents running in the 1880's. These are no doubt the reasons why Monrad failed to exert any significant influence upon the Norway of his day.

1 *Morgenbladet*, no. 608, 1885.

2 Kirkelig Litteraturtidende for de Skandinaviske Land, II, 1889, pp. 9-15.

3 O. Koppang, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

Nevertheless, this large (504pp.) book was an important work. Monrad is clear, consistent, and sometimes profound. He is a Hegelian who not only maintained the metaphysical Idealism but also consistently used the Hegelian dialectic triad. The outline of the book is embodied in its title: The first section deals with "The Universal Idea of Religion" (the thesis), the second with the various forms religion has taken in history, up to and including Judaism (the antithesis), the third with Christianity as the "Absolute" Religion, the goal and realization of the Idea (the synthesis). Like Hegel, Monrad regarded religion and philosophy, faith and knowledge, as one. Consequently, the book actually includes the rudiments of a dogmatic system, in which Monrad consistently upholds the orthodox Christian dogmas, though not without distortion. Before we examine what Monrad has to say about the Church, we must look briefly at the first section of the book.

"RELIGIONENS IDEE" is again divided into three sections: 1) The Object of Religion (thesis); 2) The religious subject (antithesis); And 3) Their union in "the true, subjective-objective religion" (synthesis).

The Object of religion is, of course, God, whose existence is posited "PER DUPLICEM NEGATIONEM". Since "the knowledge of the limit removes the limit", the finite presupposes the infinite just as the relative implies the Absolute. In harmony with this starting point, Monrad, while accepting the cosmological and teleological arguments as

well, maintained that there is "complete truth in the ontological proof" as formulated by Descartes.⁴ God is the Absolute Spirit, the Absolute Idea, and He realizes Himself by giving existence to that which before its existence was in Him. This process includes Creation and Revelation. The Idea thus proceeds from and returns to itself eternally, and in this procession and return develops its full essence and life. God is thus the CAUSA FINALIS of the world, as well as its CAUSA EFFICIENS. Monrad quotes with approval the opinion of Bishop Martensen that every genuinely religious view must contain a pantheistic element.⁵ Although he agrees with Schleiermacher that religion is a feeling of absolute dependence, he holds that our conception of God is independent of this.

Monrad at this point seems to adopt the objective approach. He begins with God, and the Absolute Idea realizes itself in Creation and Revelation. But an element of subjectivity enters into his system through the fact that God is virtually regarded as the object of human reflection. It is precisely this which provoked Luther's objection to the "Sophists" of his day and which lies at the root of the Lutheran distrust of philosophical speculation, which must proceed from man to God. Here Monrad seems to depart radically from the classical Lutheran tradition.

Monrad's fundamental Monism is also illustrated by his

⁴ Religion, Religioner, og Christendommen, p. 10.

⁵ Ibid., pp. 41-50.

Anthropology and Soteriology. Man, as well as all that exists, must have his origin and goal in the Eternal. Since man is a rational creature, his relationship to the Eternal must take a rational form. He is both one with God and in opposition to Him. He realizes his unity with God only through first realizing his separation from God, and being reconciled to God.⁶ Man, creation, and history all share in the cosmos, the ordered, harmonious system of Ideas originating from the same creative Wisdom.⁷ We may depict Monrad's conception of history as an hourglass, in which the race gradually narrowed to a "central people" and "a central individual", thereafter to widen again. Its final goal is to encompass all of mankind. Thus, (in common with all Monistic thinkers), Monrad strongly emphasizes the collective in opposition to the individual. Individual man has both the ability and the duty to emancipate himself from his individuality and to realize the universal human Idea.⁸ "In and through Jesus Christ, the true, divine community-spirit as universal-human and as the spirit of the individual has come to consciousness in mankind."⁹ So Jesus is not merely an individual, but the "ideal Christ, which is identical with the ideal humanity" (p. 324). In other words, He realizes the Idea of the race, a goal which has now become the object of the conscious striving of the human individual.¹⁰

⁶Ibid., p.5

⁷ Ibid., pp. 17, 19.

⁸ Ibid., p. 53.

⁹ Ibid., p. 426.

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 425-6.

Monrad stresses the "Objective Atonement". Through all of history runs the divine atoning principle; It is perfected and consciously realized in Christ. His spirit of self-sacrifice must now permeate the whole of the race, so that it gives up its individuality in favour of the collective.

Yet for all his insistence upon the fact of the Atonement, it becomes interpreted as the self-realization of a principle and as the assertion of the collective over the individual. Indeed, it is not difficult to see that for Monrad not only Revelation and the Incarnation, but also man, sin, and the Atonement all become something other than what they are in traditional Lutheran theology.

With his tremendous emphasis on the collective, Monrad had perhaps a deeper appreciation of the Church than any of his contemporaries. Notwithstanding the subjective element in his idea of God, he had the decided merit of emphasizing the objective approach. He repudiates all vestiges of "subjectivism". Moreover, he understood the necessity of maintaining the connection between religion and culture. These advantages were, however, more than outweighed by the fatal weaknesses of his system, and by the fact that he inevitably held an intellectualistic concept of revelation. For Monrad religion was primarily a matter of the intellect, in contrast to the fundamental Lutheran emphasis upon the will, and Christianity was essentially a "doctrine", with certain "basic propositions".

In examining Monrad's ecclesiology, we must first return to his hourglass conception of history. In the providence of God, it was the special mission of the pre-Christian community to evolve the "personal Ideal". Then began a new development, in which the insemination (FORPLANTNING) of the true spirit of community is carried out in a free society, not bound by nature. Monrad repeatedly emphasizes the difference between the pre-Christian "natural" community and the Christian "spiritual" community. "The Christian faith is essentially participation in the development of the race...first and last a community faith, a community consciousness." Christian faith is "appropriation of the most profound idea of the community". The universal human community must be reflected temporarily in a narrower community (until it "abolishes itself in the great common humanity"), the Christian Church, in which Christ's Spirit, the Holy Spirit of God dwells.¹¹

According to Monrad, "Church" (KIRKE) and "Congregation" (MENIGHED) are essentially the same. But he then proceeds to contradict himself by distinguishing decisively between them: KIRKE denotes the community as an objective institution, and MENIGHED the gathering of individuals.¹² These constitute

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 428-9.

¹² Here Monrad posits the fundamental Lutheran dialectic between the personal and institutional aspects of the Church. But he errs in identifying the two aspects with the terms "Church" and "congregation". This error was frequently made in Norwegian theology and still persists today.

the thesis and antithesis of Church history. In the Apostolic Church they were identical. The Medieval Roman Church over-emphasized the "Church". Protestantism is in constant danger of overemphasizing the "congregation". "We see the same laws of development...the one-sidedness and errors, repeated everywhere."¹³ The synthesis between them has not yet been attained. Here, there are superficial similarities with the thought of Luther, but while Monrad's synthesis lies historically in the future, Luther's approach is fundamentally eschatological and his synthesis is not so much future as "hidden".

The Holy Spirit is active in the Church. The Church contains essentially *FIDES QUAE CREDITUR*, "faith from its objective side", and is the "preserved" and "continued" divine revelation.¹⁴ Here the absence of stress upon the *FIDES QUA CREDITUR* may be significant of Monrad's intellectualism and his lack of interest in the individual and the subjective.

Of all the attributes of the Church, Monrad naturally stresses the unity and catholicity of the Church, independent of "temporal barriers". Monrad found the apostolicity of the Church in Holy Scripture. He had great respect for the historical tradition("a spiritual treasure"); But tradition must always be subject to "God's changeless Word", which he found in Scripture. The Church must have and preserve an authoritative doctrine, a confession, but this must be tested by Scripture. In this section, Monrad quoted Luther, the

¹³ Ibid., p. 431.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 431.

Augsburg Confession, and Pontoppidan's Catechism.

Monrad defended Infant Baptism. While he admitted that it was not practiced in the Apostolic Church, he regarded it as the result of a historical development, and held that its rejection would amount to an indefensible retreat. Baptism is the act of reception into the holy community. He could even write of it as a covenant, but emphasized more its character as a covenant between the individual and the Church than between the individual and God.¹⁵ He spoke of Baptismal regeneration, and his distinction between "birth" and "rebirth" represents an application to Baptism of the distinction between natural and spiritual which we have already noted in his treatment of the Church. In this context, he defines the Church as a spiritual community in which "the individual becomes conscious of and realizes himself as spirit". Monrad declined, however, to speak of the faith of infants and stressed by preference the distinctive character of Christian nurture. It is the family as a unit and not merely the sum total of its individual members which belongs to the Church.¹⁶

Monrad repeatedly emphasizes the nature of the Church as "a living organism" with Christ as its "indwelling principle". He inveighs against the "opposite" view, that the Church is "an aggregate or association" of individuals "outside" one another, who stand in "an essentially external"

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 440

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 444.

relationship to a Christ who is "outside" them.¹⁷ This principle is especially utilized in his treatment of the Eucharist, where he also advocated actual breaking of bread in order to bring the community aspect into greater prominence.¹⁸

Monrad makes no reference whatever to the problem of the Visible and Invisible Church which was so prominent among the 19th Century theologians. We can only conclude that in a Monistic system like his, the problem did not exist. Where the duality of the Incarnation is ignored, and all humanity regarded as one with God, there will be no sharp distinction between Christian and non-Christian and hence no place for a dichotomy between the Visible and Invisible Church.

In his doctrine of the Ministry, Monrad commits himself definitely to a High-Church Lutheran position.

Because the administration of the means of grace must be done with the Church's authority, the Church must have a definite order, including an office of the Ministry and a priesthood (Monrad uses the term STÅND). The priesthood requires special gifts, learning, and "a spiritual standpoint" in order properly to expound the Church's doctrine. They must be "The Church's men and God's servants, equipped with the Church's authority".¹⁹ Independent lay preachers, said Monrad, did more harm than good. The doctrine of

17 Ibid., p. 451; Cf. also p. 473.

18 Ibid., p. 456n.

19 Ibid., p. 469.

Apostolic Succession attaches too much importance to an "external", but it contains the valuable truth that the office springs from the one, catholic Church. The local congregation cannot make anyone a pastor. Monrad emphasizes the authority of the clergy and of preaching; But he refuses to regard the STAND as a "privileged holy class", with a monopoly of God's Word. The teaching office is not infallible. The Authority of the clergy is not that of their persons, but of the Word. Still, the Ministry is not to be deduced from the Universal Priesthood or the charismatic principle. Just as the congregation is not an arbitrary association of individuals, and the Church is not an association of local congregations, where the majority rules, so the Ministry is not the creation of the congregation. "Ecclesiastical democratism" leads to Donatism, "deification of the clergy" (PRESTEFORGUEDELSE), and enslavement. Though it presumably proceeds from an attempt to uphold the freedom of the individual, it ends in undue dependence upon persons, whether on the part of the clergy or of the congregation.²⁰

Contemporary Norwegian theology stressed the distinction between the two Realms. (Art. XXVIII of the Augsburg Confession). In conformity with the philosophical basis of his teaching, Monrad naturally emphasized their unity. The secular authority is also derived from God, and the Christian

²⁰ Ib.d, p. 474.

cannot "divide himself in two".²¹ In this connection, Monrad returned to his hourglass view of Church history. Beginning as a small nucleus, the Church was destined to expand. It had an essential missionary purpose. Not only individuals but nations as such (FOLKENE) were to be Christianized. (Matt. 28:19).²² Because the early Church was a self-sacrificing martyr Church, it was able to triumph over the world.²³ After the establishment of the State Church, Christianity was in danger of losing its "super-worldly life-principle". A double reaction then occurred, the Roman Catholic theocracy and an "anachoretism", an "asceticism". The true Christian idea of self-sacrifice was lost in both. The Reformation re-united Church and State, a development which, according to Monrad, was true to the spirit of Christianity. But the new synthesis was different from that of the original State Church. Whereas then the Church had swallowed the State, now the State absorbed the Church, thus giving it the best chance to realize its ideal of self-sacrifice by permeating the State with its spirit and so creating a Christian State. Nevertheless, he denies that the Church is to disappear, to be superseded by the

²¹ Ibid., pp. 478ff.

²² This is in full accord with his treatment of the family in his discussion of Infant Baptism.

²³ Monrad criticizes the modern "subjectivists" who assume that the secular community is un-Christian and so withdraw from it, but who still expect it to be Christian enough to protect them. This he believes to be in marked contrast to the martyr spirit of the early Church. p. 479.

State. God and religion must be absolute, superior to the State. The Church must have an element which raises it above the situation and enables it to feel it is a part of the universal human community, that it is rooted in the Eternal and moving toward the Eternal. The Church may, however, justifiably be subject to the State "outwardly". He opposes the slogan of Cavour, "A free Church in a free State". The State must have an official religion. It can tolerate other religions, but it cannot be "confessionless". On these premises, all State officials must confess to the State religion. The State is based upon its official religion, and the officials act on the authority of the State. It is not to be expected that all inhabitants will be Christians in a community where Christianity is in process of development; But they must be counted as Christians when they acknowledge the Christian religion as the "reigning principle" in their lives. Monrad holds that only a Christian State and a Christian individual are suited to work for the "civilization" of mankind. But he is opposed to the use of revivalist methods to secure converts.²⁴ It is evident that Monrad's line of reasoning in this section follows a tortuous path. We can only attribute it to a bold but unsuccessful attempt to fit the facts of Church history into the rigid mould of the Hegelian dialectic system.

²⁴ Ibid., pp. 476-497.

Monrad's ecclesiology, as well as the rest of his dogmatic system, betrays a significant departure from the Lutheran tradition. This is the result of his Monistic metaphysic, which carries with it the tendency to synthesize the dialectic elements which exist in Lutheran ecclesiology but which actually defy all attempts at synthesis in any human system. He correctly begins with the objective elements in the doctrine of the Church. But he had little appreciation of the subjective element, the Church as CONGREGATIO SANCTORUM, which appealed so strongly to most contemporary Churchmen. He correctly declined to draw limits to the Church, but his view tends to deny in principle that any limits exist.

Theologically, Monrad was isolated. He found himself inevitably at odds with the reigning Orthodox-Pietism. He had a strong aversion to any kind of party spirit in the Church, and consistently opposed many aspects of the Church-life of his day: The organization of the Inner Mission movement, the movement for reform, and the tendency on the part of Pietistic pastors to draw sharp limits to the Church, as evidenced for example by their refusal to marry divorced persons. He seems however never to have clashed directly with Gisle Johnson, although he engaged in controversy with Bishop Grimelund. Monrad was most attracted to the Neo-Lutheranism of Pastor Wexels, though he was not uncritical of Grundtvigianism. In effect, Monrad was a first class

exponent of Speculative Idealism. But, despite the many traces of Hegelian influence even among those whose main interests and background lay elsewhere, the Norwegian Church of the 19th Century was not a fertile seed-plot for the cultivation of such systems and was steadily moving further away from them both in theology and in Church-life.

(VI) Fredrik Petersen (1839-1903)

Professor Fredrik Petersen was a unique figure in the Church of Norway. In him, several streams converge. Not only was he exposed to various influences, but his own thought underwent considerable development. As a typical transition theologian, he is difficult to classify. Still, there is a consistency about his life-work, which is well summed up in something he wrote in an examination paper as a student. Writing on the subject of speculative theology, Petersen defended an attitude of freedom, without which theology would descend to the level of mere Scholasticism. But it must constantly submit the results of its enquiry to the Church and accept its judgement. This combination of freedom of thought with submission to the authority of the Church is the key to the whole of Petersen's life-work.¹

¹ L. Selmer, Prof. Fredrik Petersen og hans Samtid, p. 34. Cf. C. Ihlen, in NBI, XI, p. 37: "In Petersen, the Biblical and Churchly, conservative and reformativ-progressive elements generally interacted upon and mutually stimulated one another--whereas in the years to come, they became opposites in sharp theological conflict."

The character of Petersen's thought was determined in no small measure by the troubled age in which he lived. He succeeded to Gisle Johnson's chair of Systematic Theology in 1875, at the time when Positivism and evolutionism were entering the Norwegian scene. Unlike many others, Petersen experienced no personal crisis, but was nevertheless forced to fight his way to an expression of the Faith which he considered intellectually tenable. In the turbulent 1880's, he became the leading apologist of the Norwegian Church, and most of his scholarly work was of an apologetic nature. Among the writings of this type the following works are outstanding: Om Skabelsen, Opholdelsen, og Styrelsen (I, Forskningen, 1883, and II Theologien, 1885) and Tritaenkerne og Kristentroens moralske Vaerd, (1891).

In his first series of lectures, Petersen had operated on the basis of the traditional dogmatic as it was represented in Norway by Johnson. Gradually, however, he grew more independent. As early as 1881, when he delivered his famous lecture, "How ought the Church to meet modern infidelity?", Petersen cautiously challenged the Church to reformulate its dogmatic system. Although he retained a positive attitude toward Scripture and Confession, he discarded the method and presuppositions not only of the older Orthodoxy but also of the Johnsonian system.

Several factors contributed to this development. Petersen had, of course, inherited the Kantian "PROBLEMSTELLUNG". One of his chief concerns was the epistemological problem. He had been early and profoundly influenced by

Søren Kierkegaard. Despite the fact that after a long struggle he succeeded in producing a massive critique of Kierkegaard,² he was marked for life by Søren Kierkegaard's thought. Petersen was a life-long opponent of Speculative Rationalism; He found the Hegelian system "heathenish", and asserted that speculation "tries to gaze more deeply into the mystery than Revelation itself allows". Like Kierkegaard, he asserted the independence of faith in relation to reason. A certain antipathy doubtless existed between faith and reason, but it lay rather in their source than in their character. Reason was the product of "natural" life, while faith springs from the regenerate life. But he could not rest content with Kierkegaard's conclusion that faith and reason are diametric opposites, and never gave up the possibility of developing a Christian philosophy. Petersen conceded that faith encounters "mysteries", but he refused to admit the existence of absolute paradoxes. He was widely read in post-Hegelian German philosophy, and came to be strongly influenced by the rising movement known as Neo-Kantianism. He was deeply conscious of the fact that the philosophical foundation of Western thought had shifted. Traditional Greek philosophy had become obsolete. The Church was now living in an empirical age, and must therefore develop an empirical dogmatic.³ He accepted the phenomenalism of Kant; The DING-AN-SICH is inaccessible to us. He rejected the natural theology of Orthodoxy and the traditional

² Dr. Søren Kierkegaard's *Christendomsforkyndelse*, (1868-77), 897pp.

³ Lecture Notes taken by Lyder Brun, ms. no. 709, University Library, Oslo, pp. 30-31. Brun later became a professor at the University in the field of New Testament.

proofs. "Our ability to comprehend the empirical is too weak" to permit proofs, although there are plenty of connecting points or motifs which can help us to assume the existence of God.⁴ Petersen's philosophy of religion bears a marked similarity to that of Schleiermacher. On the basis of man's religious need and capacity, Petersen first posits the validity of a religious category. Among the various religions, Christianity is undoubtedly the highest form. This line of reasoning lays the foundation for Petersen's dogmatic.

In formulating his dogmatic, however, Petersen diverges sharply from both Schleiermacher and Johnson, whom he regarded as "too subjective"⁵, and approaches the theology of the Ritschlian School. The most striking feature of his dogmatic prolegomena is his repeated emphasis upon the historical Revelation as the only source of Christian doctrine. "The foundation [of dogmatics] is the Revelation Christ brought. This Revelation is first and foremost history."⁶ It occurs in "a series of historical facts through which God unfolds His relation to man". It is always "miraculous". Petersen admitted that there were several "presuppositions" (FORUTSETNINGER) or preparatory disciplines upon which dogmatics must build, such as scientific exegesis and

4 Ibid., p. 26.

5 Petersen regarded Johnson's "reproduction" as implying a "production", or, in other words, he believed that Johnson elicited more from the regenerate consciousness than was actually there.

6 Ibid., p. 5.

philosophy. Dogmatics must be regarded as a "philosophical science" presenting the Faith of the Church at a particular period and in a given age; Exegesis on the other hand concerns itself with the faith of the Biblical writers. Philosophy is a formal discipline. Having received the content of revelation in the form of empirical data, the theologian utilizes philosophy to expound this content intellectually. Since the thought forms of mankind vary from age to age and the theologian as a man of his times is committed to these changing forms, philosophical training is necessary for the theologian. But the true source of dogmatics is Revelation, which can never be identified with its philosophical dress. He also rejects the history of doctrine as a source, on the grounds that history does not constitute an uninterrupted development but on the contrary includes "leaps". The one source of revelation is to be found in Holy Scripture, although experience could also be regarded as a source "in a derivative (AVLEDET) sense". Petersen holds that all dogmatics must have a Biblical basis. Still, he is no Biblicist; The formulation of doctrine must rest not so much upon the exegesis of particular texts as upon the Biblical data taken as a whole.⁷

Petersen distinguished between the unchanging content

⁷ Petersen was able to some extent to break out from the intellectualistic concept of Revelation. He was the first Norwegian theologian to attempt to combine faith in the Bible as God's Word with historical criticism. It is worthy of note that Gisle Johnson defended his standpoint; Cf. IK, 5R, III, pp. 217ff.

of revelation and its changing formulations.⁸ Because of the mutual interaction between current philosophy and revelation, the Christian religion could never be identified with any dogmatic system; On the contrary, doctrinal formulations must undergo constant re-examination in the light of Scripture. Petersen himself never published a system, and it has been said that he was more of a critical and analytic than a creative theologian. Like Ritschl, Petersen emphasized the practical side of religion. He regarded the existential aspect as the one valuable element of Johnson's system. In order to understand a thing it was necessary to "live" it (Cf. Søren Kierkegaard.) Therefore, Petersen stressed the life and work of Christ as divine Revelation. Unfortunately, however, his theology suffers from the same weakness as that of Ritschl: The content of revelation is identified more with the teaching of Jesus than with His Person.

Petersen follows generally the traditional sequence, developing his dogmatic under the headings of God, Creation, Man, Sin, Christology, and the like. He treats the doctrine of the Church under Part IV, "The Activity of the Holy Spirit."⁹

Petersen's eclecticism is evident also in his ecclesiology. Elements from the various currents which influenced him are placed side by side. While we must not lose sight of the essential difference between the theology of Petersen

⁸ Lecture Notes, Brun, p. 7.

⁹ Lecture Notes, Brun, Vol. IV. The pages in this volume are not numbered.

and that of Monrad, it is worthy of note that Petersen can use a number of Idealist expressions. Like Monrad, Petersen stresses the collective aspect of Christianity. Man was created for fellowship. "In the congregation, the human race realizes its Idea." "The first act of the Holy Spirit was the gathering and creation of a community." The Church is the "starting point" for the extension of the Kingdom of God. Petersen inveighs against the individualism of the Enlightenment. Only through the Church can men participate in salvation. "What each individual is and receives, he is and receives only as a member of the Church."

For Petersen, as for Ritschl, the Kingdom of God is a key concept. Here, like Monrad, he distinguishes between the New Testament "spiritual" kingdom and the Old Testament kingdom of the "flesh". The spiritual kingdom is a kingdom of free, ethical decision. As Christianity is the only truly universal religion, so the Church is the only universal kingdom. All other religions are constituted by natural need or by force. Although he repeatedly underlines the fact that the Church is the creation of the Holy Spirit, Petersen is unable to avoid some of the associationalism of Schleiermacher. However, in opposition to Idealism, he stresses the Personality of the Holy Spirit in the Church. Schleiermacher is correct when he says that the Church has her spirit in the same way as other communities, but "one-sided" when he restricts himself to this conclusion. Modern "spiritual" (social) organizations have learned from Christianity. They are "particular and ephemeral", but the spirit

in them is only a development of the created human spirit. The Spirit of the Church is not just the spirit of the community and its activity, an "effect upon the souls of the disciples which is transplanted further", but it is the Person of the Holy Spirit. Life in Christ is something new, unique, and distinct from natural human life. If the Spirit were only a human endeavour (INDSATS), it would be assimilated and we should sense no tension between "spirit" and "flesh", i.e. between life in Christ and natural life. The Spirit is not conjured up by the congregation, but bestowed upon it by God. The supernatural element (life in Christ) is given through the means of grace, and must be personally received. It can never be "the immediate possession of the race". The uniqueness of the Church is also shown by Jesus' parabolic teaching on the Kingdom of God. Jesus' answer to the question on the tribute-money shows that the Church shares neither purpose nor instrumentality with any earthly kingdom. Since Christ's Kingdom is not of this world, Church and State cannot have "colliding boundaries".

Like Monrad, Petersen distinguishes between Church ("the community according to its institutional side") and congregation ("the community according to the life it lives through its members"), and devotes considerable space to the relation between the two. A distinction between the institutional and the personal is certainly valid, but, as we have seen, to identify the two elements with the terms "Church" and "congregation" is erroneous.

Petersen plainly regards the Church primarily as a school for sinners. He is reluctant to draw limits, and like Ritschl, relegates the wrath of God to the ESCHATON. If the Church is to be the one way to salvation, it must open its doors to all, be "a kingdom of nurture" for all, and thus embrace both good and evil men. Those who refuse to be nourished must indeed be expelled, but only in the final judgement, when the Church enters the state of perfection. This is not to exclude the possibility of Church discipline. However, in very un-Johnsonian fashion, Petersen holds that Church discipline is not a judgement (judgement belongs to the Lord) but "a means of nurture" to win back those who are under discipline. The Church "is...the kingdom of those who are to be saved, not of those who are saved".

There is a "permanent difference" between the "outward reality" of the Church and its "inner, driving power". Outwardly, the Church is the sum total of all baptized persons (with the exception of those who have withdrawn or been expelled). This outward community bears the name of Church because of the "life-power, the Spirit" active in it. As long as this is present, it is the Church. Here Petersen drew an analogy from human life: A man is a man as long as he is alive, only when the body is cold is it a corpse. From the Spirit in the centre of the Church, an organic activity flows out to the whole organism.

It is interesting that Petersen rejects the terminology of both Idealism and Orthodoxy. He will speak neither of

the "Idea and Reality" of the Church nor of its "Visible" and "Invisible" character. The glosses "visible" and "invisible" were historically conditioned by the situation of the Reformation. The emphasis of the Reformers on the holiness of the Church (COMMUNIO SANCTORUM) was a "new one-sidedness".

The Church has a two-fold task of "nurture" and of "mission", the former corresponding to the pastoral care exercised or intended in the State Church, the latter to the task of revival on the home front. Both are equally necessary. To carry out this task, Jesus has, through the Holy Spirit, given the Church the necessary Charismata. Petersen devotes considerable attention to the relation of institution and Charismata, probably because it was a subject much under discussion in the Church of his day. It is here that the Johnsonian element in his ecclesiology is most clearly displayed. Indeed, he goes beyond Johnson, and reveals himself as a definitely Low-Church Lutheran in his doctrine of the Ministry, which he bases upon the Charismatic principle.

Petersen notes that the question whether the Charismata are "hyper-supernatural and miraculous" or natural gifts under the influence of the Christian spirit (small "s") is still under debate. He deplores the one-sidedness of the advocates of the first position, but regards the Holy Spirit as the source of the Charismata. The "natural

gifts" are "what the Holy Spirit utilizes". "The Spirit is free, He works where He will."

These Charismata form the basis for all Christian service, in particular ideally for "official", i.e. clerical service. The office of the Ministry should be filled by "members of the congregation who possess the corresponding gifts". Those unsuited for this kind of service are to be used elsewhere, "for they are to be used". Petersen distinguishes between the ordinary Charismata (which are always necessary) and the extraordinary (which are demanded by special circumstances). The latter are not necessarily miraculous. Miraculous Charismata were "perhaps" confined to the Apostolic Age. Luther possessed extraordinary but not miraculous gifts. Petersen regarded repentance and faith as the "ethical presupposition" for reception of spiritual gifts.

On the other hand, Petersen stresses the fact that the Charismata must be utilized in a manner appropriate to life in the community. All activity of the congregation is community activity. God is a God of order. Therefore, in order that "the entire life of the Church may be healthy and regular", "community organs" (i.e. the institutional side of the Church) are necessary. The office of the Ministry is not purely a matter of convenience, for the administration of the means of grace is necessary to the life of the Church. The details of Church order are, however, a matter of convenience, although all activity of the congre-

gation should be harmonious and coordinated. Petersen is apparently a friend of lay activity, although he also stresses the fact that Scripture requires obedience to the leaders of the Church.

Petersen traced the tension between the Charismatic and the institutional principles through Church history. The Apostolic Church overemphasized the Charismatic principle, the early State Church and the Medieval Roman Church the institutional. The Reformation had to oppose Rome's hierarchical ambitions and to re-emphasize the means of grace and the "servant" character of the Ministry. Petersen is in agreement with the Reformers, although he regards some of their views as "somewhat exclusive" and historically determined.

Finally, he takes up the question of the means of grace. Petersen's view of Baptism falls entirely within orthodox limits. It is an act of reception into the congregation and an ingrafting into the Body of Christ. It establishes a covenant relationship with God, after the manner in which pacts are made with God: "He gives His gifts and thereby places us under obligation". It regenerates, "normally, but not always", where there is no hindrance. "For those who are receptive", it brings forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. Petersen's arguments for Infant Baptism are traditional with the sole exception of the absence of any mention of original sin. Here we may trace the influence of Ritschl, who was sharply opposed to the concept. Petersen confines himself to the statement

that in fact an infant can receive the forgiveness of sins. Otherwise, the most distinctive feature of Petersen's doctrine of Baptism is his stress upon the community character of the Sacrament. Baptism is not "a private means of grace", but reception into the community. On the human side, "it is the community which acts in Baptism".

(VII) E. F. B. Horn (1829-99)

The problem of the relationship between faith and reason is a perennial one, but there are times at which it becomes especially acute. Such a period was the post-Johnsonian era in Norwegian theology, after 1875, when it occupied the attention of all the leading theologians. As we have seen, Petersen made it his life-work to reconcile the two. The problem was also prominent in the work of two of Norway's most scholarly pastors, Dr. E.F.B. Horn and Pastor J. J. Jansen. Neither of them constructed any dogmatic system, but both wrote scholarly dissertations on the Church and the Ministry. Both managed to remain free of party affiliation, and were indeed lonely figures. Horn was a Low-Churchman, critical both of Pietism and Orthodoxy. Jansen was a moderate High-Churchman, who crossed swords not only with Jakob Sverdrup but also with Krogh-Tønning and Bishop Heuch.

Dr. Horn was a frustrated scholar who held several pastorates, ending with that of the Garrison Church in Christiania. He was probably the most versatile thinker in

Norway, and wrote voluminously on a fantastic range of subjects, including theology, philosophy, psychology, and even philology. Horn was a philosophical theologian.¹ For him, philosophy and theology formed a unity. In Tro og Taenkning (Faith and Thought), 1866, he adopted the position that, although reason must acknowledge its limits, it need not conflict with faith.² Horn was able to combine in his own person a warm faith with fresh and original thought. He was kept out of the University by a suspicious Orthodoxy. Upon his death, IK wrote that his importance lay rather with his ability to stimulate thought than with his ability to construct a system.³

As a thinker, Horn stood in the Idealist tradition. He was strongly influenced by the thought of Hegel and Schelling, although he was not uncritical of it. In 1871, he wrote a treatise on "The Applicability of the Hegelian method in Theology",⁴ in which he endorsed the Hegelian method with the reservation that it "must, like the inductive method, take Phenomena as its starting point. Only in so far as these are accessible can we get at the essence of things."⁵

1 In 1867, he was awarded the degree of Ph.D., with a thesis entitled: "On the Concept of Honour".

2 Horn held that there was "A theoretical thought according to categories, a practical thought according to conscience, and an intuitive, which sees the interrelatedness of all living things,...But all this thought only evokes a desire for something corresponding in the object...no certainty... Faith must give me certainty...an answer to reason's question." Quoted in a review of his book, IK, 5R, XXII, 1897, p. 32.

3 IK, 1899, II, pp. 177f.

4 Teologisk Tidsskrift for den evangelisk-lutherske kirke i Norge, NR I, 1871, pp. 430ff.

5 Ibid., p. 450.

This treatise reveals a basically Monistic metaphysic, but his knowledge of Kant makes him epistemologically cautious. Hegel, he says, is correct in seeing a Monistic essence behind all the dualistic Phenomena.⁶ His dialectic is the answer to the inner contradictions in the Christian religion, as for example, between visible and invisible, the individual and the collective in ecclesiology. The universal character of the Hegelian method is shown by the fact that it enables the Idea to unfold its real inherent opposites and then proceeds to a resolution of the conflict.⁷ But it must not attempt to go beyond the accessible Phenomena of Revelation, if it is to avoid fantasy. It can only penetrate the inmost cause (INDERSTE GRUND) of Phenomena in so far as there is an inner necessity between cause and Phenomenon. Where freedom is involved (as, e.g., in the doctrine of sin), there is a mystery which reason cannot penetrate.

The influence of Hegel upon the thought of Horn was, therefore, strong and persisted throughout his life. Even in his later years, when his restless mind turned to the study of Positivism in its relation to Christianity, he did not relinquish his basically Idealist position. In 1890, he could still deny the existence of matter and compile the following list of "great philosophers": Plato, Kant, Berkeley, Lotze, Hegel, Fichte, Schopenhauer, and Boström.⁸ In 1898, he evaluated Monrad's contribution to

⁶ Ibid., p. 444.

⁷ Ibid., p. 448.

⁸ LK, 1890, 5R, VII, p. 229.

the Norwegian Church,⁹ and while he declined to call himself a Hegelian, he endorsed the Hegelian method, in so far as the philosopher has a "good intuitive insight (ERKJENDELSE), i.e. a certain holy immediacy" (which may possibly be equated with Revelation).

Yet his admiration for Hegel was not uncritical. His epistemology (as we have seen) bears traces of the impact of Kant. In 1871, he studied the work of C. J. Boström, the leading philosopher in Sweden, on a stipend. Boström taught a Hegelianism without dialectic and without Hegel's interest in history, and his strong subjectivism doubtless influenced Horn in the direction of Personalism. For Horn there are "not any other substances than personalities". And when the mind is confronted by a conondrum, it must seek comfort in subjective faith, "inner vision (ANSIEN)." This to his mind constituted a "reasonable limitation" of the Hegelian method.¹⁰ Horn seems to limit the Hegelian dialectic to the phenomenal world. In his doctrine of the Church, Horn made little use of the dialectic method, and significantly denies any dogmatic significance to the historical method. Yet if he has not completely succumbed to the Hegelian system, he also rejected Kierkegaard's "Either...Or". The solution for him appeared to lie in a "Both...And" approach. How far he succeeded in realizing a reconciliation remains, however, very questionable.

9 IK, 1898, 5R, XXIII, pp. 121ff.

10 TTLKN, NR I, pl 459.

Among the two dozen articles Horn contributed to theological journals, two are of direct concern for our subject: "Indre Grunde for eller mod en Statskirke (Internal Grounds for or against a State Church, 1864)", and "Om det Kirkelige Embedet (On the Ministry, 1863)". The latter was intended but never actually submitted for the Th.D. degree.

Horn approaches the doctrine of the Church from the subjective or personal side. For him the Church is pre-eminently the Communion of Saints. The grammatical main clause in Article VII of the Augsburg Confession (a "true" and "adequate" definition of the Church) exactly expresses its theological emphasis. The Church is identical with the MENIGHED; Although the words are not absolutely synonymous, they signify one and the same thing, seen from different angles.¹¹ Only the believers are members of the Church. This is the teaching of Scripture, but it is also reflected in the succeeding article, in which the hypocrites are described as ADMIXTI.

As the Church is a community of believers, so its work is "a work of faith", "a confession of faith", as described in the relative clause of Article VII. The Church's confession includes: (positively) the administration of Word and Sacrament and works of love, and (negatively) Church discipline.

Horn then proceeds to define the State. His concept of

¹¹ Indre Grund..., p. 215.

the State is thoroughly modern and associational: It is "a union of people for mutual protection and common preservation of their personalities and pertinent rights..." Its character and limits are different from those of the Church.¹²

Horn also reveals a great confidence in human nature. He admits that the content of the image of God (original righteousness) was lost in the Fall, but its form (personality) remains. Man has the will, intellect, and emotions, the necessary equipment for the spiritual life. It is the task of the State to preserve the personality.

Thus, says Horn, Church and State can never be identical. The State is to protect the religions within its borders, and the true religion will "develop its activity peacefully". The State needs religion in order to "maintain its idea", but from its own standpoint, the particular religion with which it is concerned is a matter of history or even of chance.¹³ Christianity happens to be the dominant religion at the moment. Mutual recognition and assistance between Church and State is good. But the Church must decline all help which is inconsistent with its own inner nature. Horn is opposed to the compulsion of the existing State Church

12 It is, however, worthy of note that in the 1890's Horn was still attempting to combine this associational concept with the concept of the Christian State. He maintained that the State must rest upon Christian principles if it is to preserve morality. A State is Christian if the majority of its subjects is "positively influenced by Christianity. Horn was as opposed as Monrad to the "confessionless" State. LK, NR, V, pp. 145ff.

13 Indre Grund..., p. 256.

in Infant Baptism, Confirmation, Marriage, and Burial.¹⁴

In this connection, he discusses the question of whether the practice of the indiscriminate Baptism of infants should continue or whether only children of confessing Christians should be admitted to this Sacrament. He finds that Infant Baptism is the "common root" of the State Church system, but that State and Church grow out from it "more or less separately". Every opponent of the State Church must sooner or later put the axe to this root. But Horn defends the retention of indiscriminate Baptism, and accepts this confusion of State and Church. He admits that State and Church hold conflicting views of human nature. The State assumes that man still possesses the IMAGO DEI, the Church that he has lost it. But while this is a problem for adults, this is not the case with infants, for the infant has no actual (GJØRLIG) sin. A trace of "the profound unity of existence, the unity of heaven and earth, the visible and the invisible", lost in the fall, is to be found in the soul of the infant. Here we may note the influence of his monistic metaphysics.¹⁵

If the infant is Baptized, he has EO IPSO faith.¹⁶

Horn states that his treatise on the Ministry grew out of the contemporary debate over this doctrine. His own position is definitely Low-Church. Taking Article V of the Augsburg Confession as his starting point, Horn emphasizes

14 Ibid., p. 259.

15 Ibid., pp. 276-77.

16. Ibid., p. 275.

the functional character of the Ministry. It is "a service", not a STAND either within or distinct from the Church. The article simply states that "in order to achieve faith, men could not do without an administration of the means of grace which are able to work faith".¹⁷ If we say that the Ministry is older than the Church or that it creates it or is above or apart from it, we create a dualism between the Ministry and the administration of the means of grace on the one hand, and the Communion of Saints on the other, and end in a Roman Catholic standpoint. Apparently with the relationship between Christ and the Apostles in mind, Horn admits that "originally" there existed a causal relationship between the activity of the Ministry and its result, faith, but this causal relationship was inevitably superseded by a relationship of mutual interaction.¹⁸ The Ministry works faith, but faith in turn carries out a Ministry through its confession and preaching. Article V presents the work of the Ministry as directed toward the believers from without; Article VII describes it as proceeding from the believers themselves. Horn regards this not as a contradiction, but as the expression of a relationship of mutual interaction. Although Horn does not make the point himself, we might perhaps infer that this relationship represents the synthesis of the two antithetic elements, the Communion of Saints and the office

17 "Om det Kirkelige Embedet", p. 390.

18 Ibid., pp. 390-91.

of the Ministry.

Horn next turns to the Biblical evidence. He finds the Ministry established by Christ (Matt. 28:19 and elsewhere), but holds that it was not given exclusively to the Apostles, but to all believers. This conclusion is confirmed by the practice of the Early Church, with its lay evangelists. On the other hand, when congregations were established, special officials, Bishops or Presbyters (the two are identical) were installed. He concludes that the office of the Ministry belongs "in principle" to the whole believing Church, but that the historical circumstances inevitably led to an arrangement whereby the Ministry was gradually placed in the hands of certain individuals,¹⁹ "for the sake of order".²⁰ The Ministry acts on behalf of the entire congregation and is authorized by it.²¹ Horn meets the objection that there never existed any "formless" Church and that the Apostles themselves chose and installed the Presbyters and regarded them as their successors. This is historically true, but has no dogmatic significance. He maintains the uniqueness of the Apostolate, and denies any "dogmatically necessary succession". Historically, the Presbyters certainly succeeded the Apostles, but "they had dogmatically quite a different position, and are thus an outgrowth of the congregation itself". With them, "all essential difference between teacher and

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 408.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 412.

²¹ Ibid., p. 417.

disciple is abolished".²²

Turning to the essentially dogmatic part of his treatise, Horn emphasizes the importance of the right starting point in ecclesiology. He agrees with the German Professor C.A. Harless that, in line with the Augsburg Confession, the true starting point should not be the Church or the Ministry, but Christ, the Holy Spirit, and the means of grace. This seems inconsistent with Horn's basic theological approach. Both Horn and Harless were *ERFAHRUNG*-theologians, and in effect their "objective" approach to the doctrine of the Church was nullified by their fundamental subjectivism. Horn begins with the Atonement in Christ. In his discussion of the *HEILSGESCHICHTE*, he makes the following points: 1) Since Christ has made the full and complete sacrifice, the Christian Ministry is essentially different from the Levitical Priesthood; 2) The Word of Atonement is complete and perfect in the New Testament; 3) Consequently, all Christian believers are prophets and priests, in "full possession" and with "full right of disposition" over redemption.²³ Horn thus proceeds to deduce the office of the Ministry from the Universal Priesthood. On the foreign mission field, the missionaries act on behalf of the entire Church; And at home, the congregation, through the Ministry "extends to itself the means of grace to growth and strengthening in faith". Only one sacrifice remains for us to offer--thanksgiving;

²² Ibid., p. 415.

²³ Ibid., p. 425.

And it is under this head that our entire worship, even our preaching, is subsumed. Horn admits that the Universal Priesthood and the office of the Ministry are not identical, but regards the latter as simply one aspect of the former, "one among many ways in which the Universal Priesthood is exercised..."²⁴ Horn quotes the Apology and Luther's letter to Prague in support of his case. The trouble with opposing views (such as those of L he and Kliefoth) is that they confuse the historical with the dogmatic. Horn concludes: "The Christian congregation has by virtue of its faith, the right and duty to confess, to express its thanks for redemption, and among the forms and ways in which it expresses its thanksgiving is the MINISTERIUM ECCLESIASTICUM, which thus becomes one aspect in the exercise of the common Universal Priesthood."²⁵

Horn's standpoint also extends to his teaching on the Power of the Keys. This "not only completely covers the office of the Ministry...it expands upon and accentuates it". Thus, the Ministry includes not only the positive POTESTAS ORDINIS (preaching of the Gospel and administration of the Sacraments), but also the negative POTESTAS JURISDICTIONIS (Discipline). Both aspects belong PRINCIPALITER to the whole Church. The clergy act as plenipotentiaries of the Church. They derive their authority from God, but not directly. The Church is a "middle man", CAUSA MINUS

²⁴ Ibid., p. 432.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 436.

PRINCIPALIS.²⁶

Horn now considers the significance of the historical form which the Ministry has taken. Again he distinguishes between the historical and the dogmatic, in a passage which reveals the philosophical basis for his theology. "The purely dogmatic is essentially timeless, and breaks in to a greater or lesser degree when there is a break in the historical connection..."²⁷ There are some laws which are absolute, resting on God's own commandment. But the historical succession, while it is "probably unbroken" and "must be respected", does not possess this guarantee but is merely the "static, historical covering for a dynamic inner reality". What rests simply upon history cannot be regarded as unchangeable, as the case of Augustine's two men in a boat or of emergency Baptism in general shows.²⁸

This essential distinction is decisive for Horn's view of Church polity, ordination, and the limits of the Church. He regards the function of the Ministry as having been ordained JURE DIVINO, while Church Order ("KIRCHREGIMENT"), the particular form which the Church has taken, exists JURE HUMANO. Nevertheless, he is extremely reluctant to break with historical tradition. His reasoning here takes faith as its starting point. Because the faith of all is not equally strong, special "servants" were necessary. Naturally, those

26 Ibid., p. 447.

27 Ibid., pp. 447-48.

28 Ibid., p. 448.

with special Charismata became the teachers. "The nature and essence of faith has fostered and made necessary the whole order." Even though Church Order merely exists JURE HUMANO, Horn nevertheless concedes that the historical order is not entirely a human affair, but "has an element of divine justification in it".²⁹ His motive here is clearly to avoid Separatism. Since the weak faith of the masses prevented their choosing their own clergy, God "anticipate" their need and chose the Apostles, who in turn chose the Presbyters. Dogmatically, the Ministry proceeds from the "inner need" of the Church, but historically, it is derived from the Apostles.

As regards the limits of the Church, the Church consists of believers alone. But this pure Church, although dogmatically correct, cannot be historically realized. The Visible Church cannot be a pure reflection of the Invisible. We are forced to acknowledge all Baptized persons not openly apostate as members of the Church although in fact many are not true members. "The historical form, though not IDEALITER adequate, is for the present necessary, because of the imperfection of the believers..."³⁰ It is so closely bound up with the Church that it cannot be abolished without fatal consequences. Article VIII of the Augsburg Confession, which asserts the validity of the means of grace independent of the pastor's own faith, indicates the lengths to

²⁹ Ibid., p. 494.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 498.

which the Lutheran Church is willing to go in respecting the existing order.

Horn was among the first to discuss the delicate issue of Article XIV and its relation to lay activity. He claims that this Article was intended to ensure that clergy were chosen, not how they were chosen, and that they were chosen on the basis of historical continuity. He pointed out that this is not an absolute rule: The Article reads not *NEC* *POTEST*, but *NEMO DEBEAT*. Horn attempted to define the terms *PUBLICE* and *RITE VOCATUS* as they are used in the Article. Public activity he defined as all activity which "takes the initiative". Private activity was undertaken at the request of others, and occurs within one's own circle. *PUBLICE* includes all the activity described in Article V. Thus Horn was a champion of lay-preaching, but he also upheld the need for proper examination and the call of the Church.³¹ He regarded the outer call as important, though the rule was not "absolutely binding". The Church can authorize unordained men (inner missionaries) to carry out public activity in certain places for a limited length of time. They would then be *RITE VOCATUS*, although their call would not be independent of the clerical office, and they could not work in a parish without the consent of the vicar.

Horn denied that ordination was a Sacrament or that it conferred a *CHARACTER INDELIBILIS*. "The pastor is not a

31 Cf. his article on lay-preaching in *LK*, VII, 1866, pp. 241ff.

pastor except when he is carrying out his official duties." Dogmatically, ordination is "an authorization from the congregation to an individual to administer the means of grace. It is, therefore, the congregation which ordains."³² Historically, the congregation bows to the tradition that one ordained person ordains another. Ordination gives the pastor sole authority in all public activity within his parish; All other religious workers are rightly called only when they are placed under him. In the case of a false teacher, the congregation is to apply for a new pastor; If the Church authorities refuse, the historical bond is broken. Lay-preaching may be defensible, but only after the individual has sought ecclesiastical authorization---and been refused.

Horn discusses the question of Church polity. He asserts that the form of the Church must develop out of the Church's life, but that this is so profound a source that no one form of polity is universally binding. He suggests, however, that the whole Church and not only the clergy, ought to govern the Church. The governing authority should be as representative as possible, and should include both local (parish councils) and national (Crown, Storting, Synod) organs. He viewed the parish council as the representative of the parish over against the pastor. It should have no part in pastoral care. Church discipline should be exercised by pastor and congregation, the pastor alone in the first

³² "Om det Kirkelige Embedet", p. 511.

stage (admonition) where the primary interest is salvation of the one under discipline, the pastor in conjunction with the congregation in eventual later stages (minor and major ban) where the chief interest is preservation of the Body.

Finally, Horn summed up his findings. All "false supports" for the Ministry must fall. Dogmatically, the Ministry belongs to all Christians. Historically, however, God has established the special Ministry for the Church. The Church need only consent. The clergy receive their authority from the Church, and therefore cannot be hierarchical. On the other hand, they are not responsible to individual Christians or groups, but only to the entire Church, and have full authority over all "public" activity. So far as the congregation is concerned, all have an "ideal" right to the Ministry, but "although all things are permissible, all things are not expedient". Faith freely relinquishes its right for the good of the Church.

The surprising thing about Horn's ecclesiological position is that it is far more Low-Church than one would expect from a theologian with his Idealist pre-suppositions. Horn was a critical thinker with a fierce independence. His case is evidence that Idealism need not necessarily lead to High Churchmanship or Erastianism. Hegelianism almost inevitably tends in that direction; But Horn was not a true Hegelian. He approaches Christian doctrine from the subjective, empirical standpoint. He is thus delivered from the errors of Monrad. His approach is virtually identical with

that of Gisle Johnson, and he shares Johnson's views on most ecclesiological questions: The basic essence of the Church, the distinction between the Two Realms, Infant Baptism, the functional character of the Ministry, the deduction of the Ministry from the Universal Priesthood, ordination, and Church polity. There is, however, one significant difference: Surprisingly, Horn makes almost no effort to apply the dialectical method to the doctrine of the Church. Consequently, while he shares the undeniable strengths of Johnson's teaching, he is even more vulnerable to the criticism which we directed against Johnson. His definition of the nature of the Church, for example, is completely subjective; He virtually ignores the institutional aspect. At only one point is his standpoint more true to the Lutheran tradition, his reluctance to draw limits to the Church. Horn was by no means a Pietist.

A further weakness of Horn's standpoint is his denial of any dogmatic significance to the historical. To regard Dogmatics as "timeless" isto ignore the historical character of the Biblical Revelation, and either to render Dogmatics absolute or to place it at the arbitrary mercy of the dogmaticians. Moreover, this standpoint is hardly in accord with Horn's Phenomenalism, and is an indication of his ultimate failure to combine an Idealist metaphysic with an empiricist epistemology.

(VIII) Jens Jonas Jansen (1844-1912)

J.J. Jansen never held high office in the Church of Norway, but he was Nevertheless one of the most influential figures of his day. He was in poor health for most of his life and occupied a series of parochial charges. These two facts serve to explain why he did not produce more than one scholarly work, though he published a number of more popular volumes. He is best known for the creation of a new homiletical idiom; He introduced the "modern" sermon, fresh, natural, and conversational. Jansen's slogan was "Live every word before you preach it!" But hand in hand with this homiletical revolution went a deep interest in the problem of faith and reason and his concern for the apologetic task. Jansen himself passed through a serious period of doubt following Georg Brandes' lectures in 1876, and he devoted his life to helping the weak and the doubt-ridden.

Jansen was critical both of Pietism and Orthodoxy on the one hand, and of radical Liberalism on the other.¹ He described Orthodoxy as "a mad farm dog that keeps people from approaching God". Theologically, he must be classed with Fredrik Petersen. Like Petersen, he was early and strongly influenced by Kierkegaard, and reacted against the free speculation of Hegelianism. Yet he could criticize Kierkegaard for his alleged intellectualism and aestheticism and for the absence of any social dimension in his thinking.²

1 The first lecture he attended of Johnson was also the last.
 2 J. Jansen Oplevet og Taenkt (his fascinating memoirs) p.97.

like Petersen again, he stressed the historical Revelation of Christianity and its Biblical norm.

But Jansen was also convinced that there was no essential conflict between faith and reason. If there is any conflict, it is between faith in God and belief that there is no God.³ This dilemma he attempted to solve psychologically. He believed "that the religious rests upon a special ability or function in our soul", some kind of religious organ in us.⁴ For this conclusion he claimed the support of Kant, Schleiermacher, and especially Kierkegaard.

Jansen described himself as a Broad-Churchman, but judged by his work, he appears as a moderate High-Churchman. The ecclesiological problem was one of his chief theological concerns, and his "Det Kirkelige Embedet i den Apostoliske Tid" (The Office of the Ministry in the Apostolic Age), which appeared in 1877-78, was his only scholarly work. This treatise was roundly assailed by the Low-Churchman Jakob Sverdrup, who wrote that the High-Church position here "appears as nakedly as we have ever seen it in the Church of Norway".⁵ At the same time, it elicited a letter from Dr. Krogh-Tønning expressing surprise that the Low-Church party should attack Jansen's paper; He thought that they ought rather to cite it in support of their case!⁶

The Article reveals an author of considerable scholarly

3 J. Jansen, Kristendom og Videnskab, Chra., 1883, p. 5.

4 J. Jansen, Oplevet og Taenkt, p. 91.

5 J. Sverdrup, Laegmandsvirksomheden og Art. XIV, p. 40n.

6 Oplevet og Taenkt, p. 129.

acumen. He says that the work arose out of the contemporary controversy between High- and Low-Churchmen throughout the Protestant world. All parties are agreed that the principles of Church Order should be taken from the New Testament, but they are not in agreement as to the lengths to which they should go in detail. Consequently, he proposes to go to the New Testament to discover the "main lines" which are always valid in the Church. We must bow, he says, to what is historically true in Scripture, and he expressly rejects the distinction between the historical and the dogmatic made by Dr. Horn.⁷ We must find and follow the true Via Media of history. Jansen finds that the New Testament actually militates against both extremes of Churchmanship.

The dissertation was divided into two parts: 1) An historical study of the origin and nature of the Ministry in general; And 2) An historical study of the beginnings and functions of the Presbyterate and Diaconate and the way in which these offices were filled in the Apostolic Age.

Jansen first raises the question of the relation between the office under the Old Covenant and under the New. He finds that the Ministry does not represent a continuation of the Levitical Priesthood, but that there is an "analogy" between them. The Levitical Priesthood is a "prototype" (FORBILLEDE) of the work of Christ, of the Universal Priesthood, and of the Ministry as well, in the sense that according

⁷ "Det Kirkelige Embedet i den Apostoliske Tid", TTILKN, V, p. 468.

to God's ordinance, the office was to be given to certain persons in the New as well as in the Old.⁸

The Ministry is closely bound up with the Church's nature. It was Christ's purpose to found an organized community, the Church. The Church is His Body, a Body which must be nourished; This is achieved through certain definite means, which in turn demand someone to administer them. Jansen thus begins in true Lutheran fashion with the function of the administration of the means of grace. Moreover, an organized community demands order, and this in turn implies someone who has authority or government.⁹ Christ did not leave it to the community itself to choose an authority, but in fact Himself organized the Church in the Apostolate. The Apostolate was to serve the community as an authority and to exercise leadership in the administration of the means of grace.¹⁰ The Apostolate was an office in the strictest sense, ordained as the life-work of certain definite persons. It is true that others preached in the Apostolic Age, but they were subject to the Apostles. The Apostolic Age was not "a golden age of ecclesiastical anarchy". The Apostolate involved both ordinary and extraordinary elements. The extraordinary element was their infallibility in doctrine, which gave them unconditional authority. In this they were unique. The post-Apostolic Ministry continues the ordinary function of

⁸ Ibid., p. 468.

⁹ Ibid., p. 470.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 472.

the Apostles, the administration of the means of grace. It has only a "conditional" authority, and is always subordinate to the Apostolic Word.¹¹ This, says Jansen, is the essential difference between Protestant and Roman Catholic views.

Yet the ordinary office is ordained by Christ in the Apostles, and they understood Him to mean that they should arrange for the continuation of this office. In so many words, they describe the office of the Ministry as divinely instituted (Eph. 4:11, I. Cor 12:28). Jansen is not afraid to use the term STAND of the clergy or to speak of a "continuity" (though not in the Roman sense of succession). He understands the Low-Church fear of hierarchy, but holds that there is no real danger unless one begins to talk of a continuation of the specific office of the Apostolate and attempts to make the Ministry a SACERDOTIUM. The opposite view, which deduces the Ministry from the Universal Priesthood, also tends to turn it into a priesthood. Moreover, Jansen points out the fact that the Low-Church view is rooted in the modern doctrine of human rights, an idea foreign to the Early Church.¹²

Turning from the origin of the Apostolate to that of the Presbyterate, Jansen attempts to show that the Presbyterate is identical with the "ordinary" governing and teaching office included in the Apostolate and placed in the Church by the Apostles.¹³ Jansen confines himself to a discussion

11 Ibid., pp. 480, 487.

12 Ibid., pp. 490, 499.

13 Ibid., pp. 505f.

of the origin of the Presbyterate and the Diaconate because these are the two offices we know for certain existed in the New Testament. The Episcopal office is "not without traces" there, and a genuine Lutheran Church order will always consist of "one or another nuance" of the episcopal order. But investigation of its origin would mean working mostly with sources outside the New Testament. Besides, the Presbyterate is identical with the present clerical office. Jansen rejects all sacerdotal overtones in connection with the office. He admits the existence of a Universal Priesthood, but distinguishes sharply between this and the Ministry. For him, the decisive question is "Is there a Universal Presbyterate?".¹⁴ The answer, obviously, is no.

Jansen finds that the presbyterate was both a governing and a teaching and preaching office from the beginning. There were not two kinds of Presbyters, as many Calvinists believed. Their ruling function was originally primary, but was gradually subordinated to teaching. This represented a development in the situation, but no radical alteration in the office. The "outward, historical" origin of the Presbyterate represents a legacy from the Jewish synagogue, whose Ministry had the same double function. But in its "content and essential nature", it was a new office created by Christ through the Apostles.¹⁵ The Presbyterate and the Episcopate were originally identical, the term EPISCOPUS arising in

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 506n.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 528.

Gentile Christian Churches where the Jewish "elder" title was foreign.¹⁶

Jansen comes to similar conclusions about the Diaconate. It too had a Jewish prototype and underwent a development in the New Testament Church. Between Acts 6 and I. Tim. 3, the function of administration of the means of grace was added to the Deacons' original charitable function, and they became assistant pastors to the Presbyters. Two factors contributed to the changes: The disappearance of the communion of goods, and the rise of the Presbyterate as the chief office, which made it necessary to subordinate the Diaconate to the Presbyterate. But the development was entirely natural; It was inherent in the fact that the clerical office is one. Thus, each branch must participate in its functions.¹⁷ Jansen deplored the hierarchical development of the post-Apostolic Church, which made of the Diaconate a mediator between clergy and laity. Unfortunately, he says, the gulf is still there in the Lutheran Church, because it possesses no Diaconate. He sees in the Inner Mission a plea for such an office and a "surrogate" for it. If the Inner Mission were under the leadership of a Diaconate, it would not bear so many "fruits of doubtful value for the whole Church". This was the view of the High-Church party in the 1870's (Heuch, *Luthersk Ugeskrift*) and even of a man like Gustav Jensen.

16 This view was widely canvassed at the time. Cf. J. B. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, 8th Edn., 1885, pp. 95f.

17 "Det Kirkelige Embedet...", p 87.

Finally, Jansen turns to the question of how these offices were filled in the New Testament Church. With regard to the appointment of Matthias to fill the place of Judas, Jansen finds that this act had both "ordinary" and "extraordinary" aspects. The Church (including the Apostles) nominated two candidates who possessed the qualifications for the Apostolate, and the Lord made the final choice (by lot). Deacons were elected by the congregation, whereas Presbyters were probably nominated by the Apostles and appointed by them after hearing the opinion of the congregation.

In conclusion, Jansen finds that there is little normative Church order set out in detail in the New Testament, and many ADIAPHORA. There are, however, basic lines and principles which are normative for all times. He summarizes his findings on pp. 122-127. It is Christ's will that there be an office of the Ministry in the Church, filled by "definite persons to the (relative) exclusion of others".¹⁸ The authority of these men is not unconditional or infallible, but nonetheless real. The office is not produced by the Church as "primary incumbent", but instituted by Christ Himself, simultaneous with His founding of the Church. "In and with the Apostolate", Christ instituted the Ministry, for the administration of the means of grace and the government of the Church. The Apostles were conscious of their "extraordinary" status, but left behind them the Presbyterate

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 122.

and the Diaconate to carry on their "ordinary" functions. They also recognized, however, the right of the congregations to be heard and to cooperate with the Ministry.¹⁹ Christ organized the Church through the Ministry. He gave the means of grace both "directly" to the Ministry and "indirectly" to the Church as a whole. So far from being a contradiction, this merely represents two aspects of the same truth. The means of grace are not given to the Church as "an undifferentiated complex of believers". Rather, the Church possesses a definite order for their administration, in the office of the Ministry. Every Christian can say: The Word and the Sacraments are given to me, as a member of the Church. But they are to be administered according to God's order through the Ministry. On the other hand, the means of grace are not given to the Ministry for "arbitrary disposition" or "independent possession", but for "service in the congregation". They are not associated with any "special, esoteric powers" on the part of the clergyman, but are given to the clergy in order "to fulfil an order which God wills in the Church, not independent of the Church, but in organic connection and cooperation with it".²⁰ God has also given the governing office to the Ministry, not as "sovereign", but as a "stewardship". The Ministry possesses only a relative authority, since in actual fact it is always subject to the judgement of God's Word. Should it

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 123.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 124.

deviate from the Word, the Ministry has no claim to divine institution. Every individual pastor is subject to "the organic ecclesiastical totality" of clergy and laity together, the "synod". The Word is indispensable, but the existing Ministry may, indeed under certain circumstances must be replaced . It enjoys no special priestly power beyond that common to all Christians. Still, Jansen issued the warning that the rejection of the existing Ministry was an "extraordinarily grave" matter, and that any Church which attempted to eliminate the Ministry in principle was acting contrary to God's order and Christ's institution.

(IX) Gustav Jensen (1845-1922)

Gustav Jensen, Dean of Kristiania, has been compared to W. A. Wexels, and played somewhat the same part for his generation as Wexels had for an earlier one. Influenced early in life by the best both of Haugeanism and Grundtvigianism, Jensen was a conservative theologian who was respected by all parties without being a member of any. As Principal of the Practical Seminary for 14 years, he was "PASTOR PASTORUM for a large part of the nation's clergy".¹ He was the liturgical expert of the Church of Norway, published several works on the subject, and revised its Liturgy in 1886 almost single-handed. He exercised leadership in many areas of practical Church-life, not least as author of numerous books and articles and as co-editor of *Luthersk*

 1 L. Koren "Gustav Jensen", in NBL, VI, Oslo, 1934.

Kirketidende and (together with Fredrik Petersen) of Kristelige Blade.

As a practical theologian, it must not be expected that he should have thought out his philosophical presuppositions with any degree of thoroughness. There are some indications that he continued to think in terms of the common Idealism of the previous generation. Thus, in writing of the three stages in Christianity, the Jacobean, the Pauline, and the Johannine, he identified Roman Catholic Christianity with James, Evangelical Christianity with Paul, although in neither case is the parallel complete. The third and higher Johannine stage still lies in the future. It is not difficult to find here an expression of the Hegelian triad. There are no traces of any particular indebtedness to Kierkegaard.

Among Norwegian theologians, he must be classed with Fredrik Petersen, conservative but open-minded, although his general theological position is somewhat to the right of both Petersen and J. J. Jensen.

There are really two poles in his approach to the doctrine of the Church. At times, he appears as a special kind of latter-day Grundtvigian. Jensen was a staunch Folk-Churchman who gradually developed into a supporter of the so-called "Free Folk-Church". This idea, which was prominent for a time in the bitter conflict within the Church which marked the first quarter of the present century, had its roots in the Grundtvigian movement. Again, like Grundtvig, Jensen had a profound appreciation of the Sacraments, emphasized the Baptismal Covenant, and urged the clergy to

preach it.

Jensen was no ecclesiological Pietist, and criticized the revivalist clergy for their failure to see the possibilities for nurture in the Folk-Church and for their Pietistic conception of the Eucharist. The Lord's Supper was instituted not to form cliques, but to create congregations. But he was a firm supporter of the Inner Mission and lay activity, at first on the basis of Gisle Johnson's "emergency principle", later on the pure basis of the Universal Priesthood.²

We may therefore conclude that Jensen moved with the times from a fundamentally Grundtvigian position towards a more Low-Church position in his attitude both towards the State Church and lay activity. Yet in his doctrine of the Ministry, Jensen had always been a moderate Low-Churchman.

Jensen never published a complete Pastoral Theology, but we have both his own lecture notes³ as well as notes taken by his students⁴ together with several occasional articles which give a clear picture of his standpoint.

Jensen's ecclesiology can be summarized in a single sentence as follows, using his favourite terms: The Church is an organism, and the Ministry is a service. He strongly criticized both the High-Church and the Low-Church positions. The former thinks of the Church in terms of ruler and subject,

2 C. F. Wisløff, TTK, 1958, pp. 63ff.

3 Selections edited by K. Rygnestad, in TTK, 1958, pp. 39-47.

4 Ms. no. 958, Håndskriftsamling, University Library, Oslo (1895-96).

and renders the congregation passive and voiceless. The latter derives from an "unorganic" concept of the Church as "a contractual association" of equal individuals (LIGEGODE ENERE). But the Church is neither of these things. Rather, it is an organism, in which the whole body serves the members and the members serve one another and the entire body.⁵

Where Petersen had rejected the terminology of the Visible and Invisible Church, Jensen attempted to use the contrast. He sees the weakness of the terms: The temptation to separate the two and to overemphasize one side or the other. There are not two Churches, one real and one nominal, but one. The Invisible Church represents the "ideal" and the Visible the more or less perfect "reality"; Jensen thus returns to the old Idealist solution.

The essence of the Church is the Communion of Saints. As the heart of God's Kingdom, it is not of this world. It is invisible in the sense that only the Lord knows His own. Yet it is made visible through the means of grace, which always call into being a tangible community. This is a real or true Church, for where the means of grace are rightly administered, they are always efficacious. But the source of Church-life is the Communion of Saints. Thus Jensen can say that the Invisible Church is the subject of the activity studied in Practical Theology, the Visible Church its object.⁶-----

⁵ K. Rygnestad, ed., op. cit., p. 40.

⁶ Ms. no. 958.

This is very closely linked with Jensen's view of the Ministry, which is basically Johnsonian. The organ of this activity, the Ministry of Word and Sacrament, proceeds from the Communion of Saints. "The holy service...springs from the Universal Priesthood", with "an inner necessity".⁷

Jensen emphasizes the fact that the function of the administration of the means of grace is given in principle to the believing Church, not to any clerical STAND regarded as prior to and superior to the laity. Christ clearly instituted the function of administering Word and Sacrament but He gave no order to form a clerical estate. The Apostolate was unique. The Apostolic Age worked on a purely Charismatic principle. Later, functions were concentrated in a particular office and were transferred to it by the Church.

In Jensen's view, the Ministry is a service, both to the Lord and to the Church. He reviewed the various clerical titles: The word "priest" (πρεσβύτερος) reminds us of the need for maturity; "Pastor" points to Christ as the exemplary good Shepherd; "Geistlig" has lost its good connotation in Norwegian and has taken on a cold, official tone. He prefers above all the English "minister". This he combined with "pastor" to call the Ministry a "HYRDE-TJENESTE" (shepherd-service). He points out that this term is Biblical and that it expresses the fact that the pastor

⁷ Ibid., p. 10.

serves both the individual and the collective.

On the other hand, Jensen emphasized the fact that the Ministry is not identical with the Universal Priesthood. The Universal Priesthood must be exercised "within one's own circle". The Ministry cannot be left to chance, but must be given to the individual by the Church. Its significance lies in its constant, permanent character, its concern for the whole Church. Moreover, Jensen emphasized the authority of the Ministry. It is an official, not a personal authority. But it is given to him not by a group nor by the local congregation, but by the entire Church, to whom Christ Himself first gave the "service". The pastor is therefore not responsible to the individual parishioner or to a group, but to the Holy Catholic Church. On this basis, he has a right to demand obedience.

Thus, while Jensen rejects the idea that the Ministry is given to a special STAND, he also rejects the idea that it is given to all believers as individuals. It is given to the entire believing Church as an organism.

Jensen insists upon the necessity of both an inner and an outer call. Since he deduces the Ministry not from but through the Universal Priesthood, the inner call is naturally essential.⁸ (Jensen does not say how he proposes to avoid Donatism.) But only when the outer call is present can a

⁸ Ibid., p. 13. "Only through a personal faith-relation to God is one fit for the service...only the believer has the personal call."

minister be described as RITE VOCATUS and thus entitled to teach PUBLICE ("on behalf of the community and on its responsibility"). Ordination "completes" the call, and represents the transference of the office on the part of the whole Church. The laying on of hands is first a symbol of intercession for the ordinand, and then of his initiation into the clergy.⁹

But proper pastoral care demands the work of many others besides the ordained clergy, at least in Norway. Gustav Jensen was an exponent of the Inner Mission on the basis of the Universal Priesthood. The Charismata must be utilized. In 1895, Jensen favoured the establishment of a Diaconate. Here he may have been influenced by the theories of his friend Jansen about the New Testament development of the office. He advanced several arguments for its introduction. It had historical precedent in the monastic orders; They too were independent of the local congregation and under control of the Church. Lay preaching is "a good thing", especially where the clergy lack the ability to preach in the language of the people. Jensen still held to the emergency principle, however, and looked forward to the day when lay preaching would be transferred from the associations to Church control.¹⁰

In 1900, Jensen was no longer restrained by the emergency principle. The Inner Mission is an aspect of

⁹ Ibid., pp. 19f.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 99.

the Church's normal existence, and arises from an "inner necessity". If it is not derived from the "organized" Church, its source is nevertheless the "essential" Church, the believing congregation.¹¹ It represents "progress" in the realization of the Evangelical concept of the Church. Jensen no longer speaks of a Diaconate; Instead, he calls for "the closest possible cooperation" between the free organizations and the clergy.¹²

Jensen shared the unbounded faith of his generation in progress and evolution. He could look forward to the day when heathenism would disappear. Like Gisle Johnson, he regarded the Inner Mission as the expanding nucleus of the Church. As early as 1877, during the second Free-Church crisis (See Chapter on Separatism), Jensen was convinced that a free Church would evolve spontaneously from the State Church, through its communicant membership.¹³ He drew the analogy of a child's growth to maturity. In a period of "authority", the State Church is the best form, and represents God's will for that period. But when "freedom" comes, the desire for self-determination will necessarily bring about the Free Church. It is the "ideal" form of the Church.¹⁴ Yet Jensen believed that this evolutionary process should not be forced either by withdrawal from the

11 NTT, 1900, I, p. 96

12 Ibid., p. 91.

13 LU, 1877, I, pp. 297ff.

14 Ibid., pp. 299f.

Establishment or by the Johnsonian reform movement, which aimed at the organization of the State Church parishes into free congregations. In 1898 we find him defending the Folk-Church.¹⁵ Jensen had inherited from Grundtvigianism the idea that the "Folk" had a special significance in the Divine economy. Like the Grundtvigians, Jensen interpreted the command in Matt. 28:19 (Norwegian translation: Go, and make all nations--FOLKESLAG--to be disciples) in terms of the creation of Christian nations and Folk-Churches.¹⁶ Jensen acknowledged its weaknesses (excessive subservience to the State and lack of Church discipline); It would at best always be "disturbingly imperfect". Yet he saw in it the expression of God's love for all. It is a way to reach the entire nation, to permeate the life of the nation with Christian truths, and to awaken the sleeping to conscious faith. The many nominal Christians are "the holy working material" for the growth of the "believing Church". God's Spirit has visited them in Baptism, and the Father continues to draw them. Despite all the weakness and evil which existed within it, the Folk-Church was still "a form of the Holy Catholic Church".

In 1900, Jensen reaffirmed the Lutheran position that no one form of polity is necessary for all times. Some form, firmly based upon the ordained Ministry, is indeed necessary, and there is a particular form which is the best for each

15 En Folkekirkes Betydning og Opgaver, Krs., 1898.

16 Ibid., p. 4n.

particular time, in the light of the nature of the Church.¹⁷

But in 1913, Jensen advocated the Free Folk-Church,¹⁸ and while there may appear to be vacillation in Jensen's views on polity over the years, it is more apparent than real. There is a clear line from 1877 to 1913, in which he displayed a persistent attempt to combine an attitude of freedom on the one hand with a sense of historical continuity and of God's purpose for the Folk on the other. Indeed, it is possible that the Free Folk-Church may represent the synthesis of these two antithetic elements.

(X) Knud Krogh-Tønning (1842-1911)

If Fredrik Petersen was suspicious of systems, Dr. Knud Krogh-Tønning had no such scruples. He came to create the most extensive dogmatic system of any 19th Century Norwegian theologian. He is therefore a figure of considerable importance for our subject. Although his doctrinal development gradually isolated him, he exerted no small degree of influence on the Church of Norway during the last quarter of the Century.

Krogh-Tønning has left us an excellent biographical source in his Memoirs,¹ even though these are somewhat coloured by his conversion to Roman Catholicism. He was reared in Pietism (G. A. Lammers was his childhood pastor

17 NTT, 1900, I, p. 88.

18 Morgenbladet, 1913, no. 21.

1 En Konvertits Erindringer, København, 1906.

and a friend of the family), and retained a decidedly ascetic bent throughout life. Theologically, he started his career as a strictly Orthodox Johnsonian, but with a speculative, Romantic tendency and a strong High-Church inclination. In the latter, he was influenced both by the German Neo-Lutherans (Kliefoth, Vilmar, and L  he) and the English Tractarians.²

He was one of the most learned Norwegian theologians of his day, and wrote voluminously. In 1870, he published his Troeslaere; It was destined to pass through several editions before being superseded by his massive Dogmatik in five volumes (1885-94). From 1880-97, he was also engaged in a translation of the Fathers, of which 19 volumes appeared. In 1883, Krogh-Tonning became one of the first to take the degree of Th.D. in the Norwegian University, with a work entitled The Apologetic of the Ancient Church against Greco-Roman Heathenism. As lecturer in the Practical Seminary, he also exercised his privilege of offering lectures in Systematic Theology. He held several pastorates, finally serving as vicar of the venerable Gamle Aker Church in Christiania.

Over the years, Krogh-Tonning developed an increasingly strong attraction to the Roman Catholic Church. He is the Newman of Norway. There was, however, one significant difference: When Krogh-Tonning became a convert to the Roman Catholic Church, there was no "Aker Movement". His conversion was a completely isolated phenomenon.

² Ibid., pp. 68, 75.

This development can be traced through the various editions of Troeslaere and in the Dogmatik. We shall note the philosophical basis of his work later. He was deeply concerned with the problems of authority and the unity of the Church, but underlying these problems there are still deeper issues. It can also be traced through his occasional and polemical writings, and is of course prominent in the Memoirs, which are a kind of Apologia pro Vita Sua. Krogh-Tønning acknowledges that "it was ecclesiological questions" which led him to Rome.³ For a quarter of a century, he was a zealous spokesman for the High-Church position, but disappointment followed disappointment until at last he saw no alternative but to change his allegiance. He writes that as early as the 1870's, "my attention was...steadily directed toward the necessity of strengthening the concept of the Church and the significance of the Sacraments for the life of the individual and the Church..."⁴ Krogh-Tønning was convinced that the Erastianism of the Church of Norway represented a "scandalous intrusion" on the part of the State. In 1880, convinced that the Lutheran Church had suffered a great loss when it abolished the Sacrament of Penance and ceased to demand private confession, he published Kirkelige Vidnesbyrd om Absolution. He had already become involved in controversy with his old friend, the Low-Churchman Jakob Sverdrup, over some points in the 1879 edition of Troeslaere.

³ Ibid., p. 236.

⁴ Ibid., p. 67.

But when Sverdrup as Minister for Church Affairs separated obligatory confession from the Holy Communion in the Royal Resolution of 1888, Krogh-Tønning was scandalized. In 1881, he published a 400-page tome on the Ministry (Det Kirkelige Embedet og Dets Funktioner). About this time, he introduced fasting in his home, the use of the Ave Maria, and prayers for the dead. He came to regard the Roman Catholic Breviary as the finest of all devotional books.⁵ Meanwhile, his preaching fell upon deaf ears; The congregation rejected all "catholic" ideas.⁶ He took cures in Roman Catholic Germany and read the most recent Catholic literature, including Newman. In 1892, he wrote Kirken og Reformationen, in which he asserted the primacy of Church over Scripture, and re-wrote Article VII of the Augsburg Confession to read: "Where the Church is, there is the right administration of the means of grace". He further maintained the necessity of the Apostolic Succession as an objective guarantee for right administration, although he did not insist that it be episcopal. In his estimation, the Church of Norway had retained a Presbyteral succession. He also believed in the infallibility of the Church or the priesthood. Kirken og Reformationen marked a definitive break with the Lutheran tradition. He had now given up the Sola Scriptura. He next abandoned the Sola Gratia, Sola Fide. In 1894 came Die Gnadenlehre und die stille Reformation, in which he maintained that Rome was

⁵ Ibid., p. 100.

⁶ Ibid., p. 101.

not semi-Pelagian and that there was no longer any real difference between the Roman Catholic and Evangelical doctrines of grace. Krogh-Tønning's mood in 1896 is illustrated by the title Den Kirkelige Opløsningsproces (The Disintegration of the Church), which appeared that year. All he could see in the Lutheran Church was disintegration. In 1900, he resigned his charge and shortly afterwards, in Denmark, was received into the Roman Catholic Church.

We shall examine briefly Krogh-Tønning's philosophical presuppositions and his dogmatic prolegomena (FUNDAMENTALLÆRE), before proceeding to consider his ecclesiology.

Krogh-Tønning was a philosophical and speculative theologian, a rare phenomenon in Norway. His Fundamentallaere is a work in the philosophy of religion; Interestingly enough, it appeared in the same year as Monrad's Religion, Religioner, og Christendommen, and is vastly superior to it from the standpoint of the theologian.

Throughout Krogh-Tønning's presentation there is evidence of a strong Hegelian influence. It is unfortunate that Koppang ignored Krogh-Tønning in his study of Hegelianism in Norway, for, apart from Monrad, he was probably the most Hegelian theologian Norway produced. He admits "formal" Hegelian influence in his Memoirs⁷ and his Dogmatik abounds in dialectic triads. Even more important, however, was another influence: The shadow of Schleiermacher rests heavily upon Krogh-Tønning's philosophy of religion and

⁷ Ibid., p. 44.

dogmatic method. Like Gisle Johnson, Krogh-Tønning confessionalized Schleiermacher. But whereas Johnson largely ignored his philosophical presuppositions, Krogh-Tønning laid a solid philosophical foundation for his dogmatic structure. After the manner of Schleiermacher, he combined an Idealist metaphysic with an empirical epistemology.

His *Dogmatik* begins with a consideration of the basis upon which his system rests: The Idea of religion. This Idea is (A PRIORI) "potentially present" in the natural human consciousness. The consciousness has "certain notions (FORESTILLINGER) of the constitutive elements of the Idea".⁸ The Idea of religion is "a necessary postulate of the ordinary human consciousness".⁹ The content of the Idea is fellowship with God. The immediate consciousness prevents fulfilment of the Idea. The only form of "the religious" in which the Idea can be realized or assume "validity" is Christianity.¹⁰ The combination of the two main philosophical influences on his work could not be more clearly illustrated.

Krogh-Tønning divides his prolegomena into three sections: 1) The essence of religion; 2) Its objective condition, Divine Revelation; And 3) its subjective condition, faith. "It proceeds empirically out from the actual existence of these ideas in the ordinary human consciousness."¹¹

8 K. Krogh-Tønning, Den Christelige Dogmatik, I, p. 1.

9 Ibid., pp. 3, 6.

10 Ibid., p. 1.

11 Ibid., p. 2.

The natural consciousness, reflecting upon the Idea of religion, will either end in one philosophical ditch or the other, either in absolute Monism or the individual's complete dependence upon God, or in absolute Dualism or the individual's complete independence from God. In both cases, the terms must be understood to be restricted to the I-Thou relationship. Christianity offers the synthesis in this dialectic. As the religion of the God-man and of Atonement, it represents the ethical and metaphysical union of the opposing elements in the universe. The opposition between God and the world is not metaphysical ("original and essential"), says Krogh-Tonning, but ethical, in sin. This is conquered by Christ, who "represents and realizes" fellowship between God and man, and through man, between God and the world. "Still, Christianity as a historical reality does not yet fully correspond to its Idea. In its historical existence, the Christian consciousness must continually work to unite dialectically the opposites which lie in the Idea of religion."¹² Krogh-Tonning acknowledges the fact that he follows Schleiermacher in finding the "answer" in the Christian consciousness. But he claims that there is a further dialectic which needs to be considered, between the great world religions and Christianity itself, and here even Hegelianism ended in the extreme of Monism. No one has yet attempted to show the dialectical opposition of the non-Christian religions which find their synthesis in Christianity--though

¹² Ibid., p. 8.

even here they remain in a vestigial form.¹³

Krogh-Tonning continually tries to avoid both Monism and Dualism, though his thought reveals clear traces of his Monist tendencies.

In Church history, as in heathendom, the Christian consciousness vacillates between the subjective (Dualism) and the objective (Monism). The Early Church knew Christianity only in simple "Thesis" form. A development was necessary, in which unity was lost in opposites (Antithesis), but it will be recovered later in a higher, conceptual "synthesis".¹⁴ "All deeper, conceptual appropriation, if it is not to be mechanical and spiritless, must be dialectic."¹⁵ Krogh-Tonning criticizes Roman Catholicism for being too objective and Monistic, and the Reformed Churches for being too subjective and Dualistic. Lutheranism is the proper VIA MEDIA. Thus, he applies the dialectic triad to the divisions of Christendom. But he carefully avoids using the terms dialectic or thesis-antithesis-synthesis in this connection, no doubt because he cannot regard Lutheranism as an absolute synthesis in the same way as Christianity is the synthesis of the world religions.

The key to Krogh-Tonning's conversion to Catholicism lies in this reasoning, and his conversion is in turn the best evidence of his own Hegelianism. Krogh-Tonning criticized both Hegelianism and Roman Catholicism for being too

¹³ Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 1f.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 76.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 77.

Monistic. He tried to do what Hegelianism had failed to do, and fell into the same trap. His own Monism led him directly to Rome. It also led to his obsession with the authority and the unity of the Church. In an age of Biblical criticism, which (on Krogh-Tonning's intellectualist conception of Revelation) undermined the Sola Scriptura, and in a period of sectarianism and Erastianism, Rome afforded what appeared to be the only safe refuge.¹⁶

Krogh-Tonning makes a distinction between general and special Revelation (the latter is partly historical, partly verbal), in which God reveals His nature and His relation to the world. Revelation corresponds precisely to what natural man seeks and needs. Special Revelation is a mystery, a miracle, but its inaccessibility to reason does not mean that it is in conflict with reason. It conflicts only with fallen reason. The content of Revelation is not "absolutely inaccessible" to reason.¹⁷ Krogh-Tonning stresses the fact that the intellect is only one aspect of our personal relation to God, which also includes will and emotions. But it is clear that he is most concerned with the intellect.

In his discussion of faith, Krogh-Tonning acknowledges his debt to Schleiermacher. It is his theology which will have lasting significance for our understanding of the genesis

16 Cf. Den Kirkelige Oplo'sningsproces, 1896, p. 30: "There is in point of fact no longer any larger Church body which positively and confessionally maintains the entire unabridged Christian faith except the Catholic Church."

17 Dogmatik, I., p. 104. Krogh-Tonning again rejects both Monism and Dualism, which in his opinion both preclude the possibility of a Revelation.

of faith. Schleiermacher has made Christian faith, as an inner experience, independent of learned investigation and criticism.¹⁸ Krogh-Tonning stands well within the Lutheran tradition when he describes faith as a work of God, but the terms which he employs are derived from Schleiermacher. Faith is "a receptive relationship" which expresses our "passive dependence" upon God, but it is also an active "free self-decision in relation to the impression received".¹⁹ In his emphasis upon the freedom of the will, Krogh-Tonning stands far closer to Erasmus than to Luther.

His devotion to Schleiermacher also determines his dogmatic method. Like Gisle Johnson, Krogh-Tonning deduced his dogmatic system from the regenerate consciousness. Revelation passes from Scripture through the Church to the individual, but dogmatics proceeds from the individual consciousness counterchecked both by the confession of the Church and by Scripture.²⁰ As in the case of Johnson, Krogh-Tonning's great respect for the Orthodox tradition normally lead him to Orthodox conclusions.

Krogh-Tonning's Dogmatik has three divisions: I) Man's original fellowship with God; II) Man's loss of fellowship with God; and III) Reestablishment of man's fellowship with God. It is indicative of his speculative interests that he could devote his entire second volume to Division I. In each division, there are three parts,

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 230, 232.

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 156ff.

²⁰ Ibid., pp. 239f. This was the same method used in Troeslaere (Cf. 1st Edn., p. 2).

(a further Hegelian touch): God, Man, and Fellowship.

These divisions are maintained in all three parts, except that the order of God and Man is reversed in Division II.

After this unusually lengthy introduction, we can now turn to Krogh-Tonning's ecclesiology.

He treats of the doctrine of the Church in Division III, Part I, "The Holy Spirit's relation to Salvation", before his discussion of redemption.

The Holy Spirit does not normally work directly, but rather works through "an outward visible institution". "This is none other than Christ's one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, the Communion of Saints, in which the means of grace instituted by Christ are administered to the salvation of men through the Apostolic office provided by Him for that purpose. For this activity, the office must be considered to be in the possession of the special guidance and support of the Spirit through all ages.

"Without the Church as an institution, posited, unchangeably determined, and guided by the Spirit, exalted in its Divine objectivity above all human arbitrariness, there would be no fully reliable, infallible mediation of salvation.

"To this extent the concept of the Church is a necessary postulate of faith in God's redemptive will."²¹

In this lengthy summary quotation, Krogh-Tonning presents the chief features of his ecclesiology: The emphasis

²¹ Dogmatik, IV-2, p. 2.

upon the institutional Church and the Divine institution of the office of the Ministry, characteristic of High-Churchmen everywhere. Krogh-Tonning indeed regards the Church both as an outward, visible institution and as the Communion of Saints, but it is clear from the summary statement that he places by far the greater emphasis upon the first description. He was still writing as a Lutheran theologian and pastor. But in reality, he had already reached a Roman Catholic standpoint in several respects, notably the tendency to render the Church and the Ministry infallible and to subject even the means of grace to them. The "fundamental feature" of a concept of the Church is its character of "Divine institution", which occupies "a mediatorial position" between God and the soul of the individual.²²

The Church is also the "Communion of Christians", united in an organism by the life of the Spirit. Krogh-Tonning rejects all associationalism; The Church is a product of God's will and activity. He also rejects the dualism between the Visible and Invisible Church. The Church, like man, has an invisible soul (Christ's Spirit and life), but there is no such thing as an Invisible Church. The limits of the Church are assuredly known only to God. But the Church is a visible, organized community, and expresses itself through visible organs.²⁴ The Church is a Kingdom of God, but it is not

22 Ibid., p. 3.

23 This terminology of Christ's Spirit as the soul of the Church is typical of Idealist theology.

24 Ibid., p. 4.

identical with the broader concept of the Kingdom. Krogh-Tonning refuses to call the Church a MENIGHED, for this denotes only the "MENIG" (lay) members of the Church.²⁵

The Church of Norway usually stops when it has named these two sides to the Church, but there is a third "essential and indispensable element". This is the Apostolate, the Apostolic office. It is true that the Church is where the means of grace are rightly administered. But it is a "necessary reciprocal" that the right administration of the means of grace occurs where the Church is. The Church is prior to Scripture, for it defined the Canon. Therefore, the Church cannot be built upon Scripture ("a book cannot... provide the basis for a community"). Such a view would encourage subjectivity and individualism. The only objective guarantee for the right administration comes when this administration rests "in the proper hands...in the hands of those who through all ages have been and are the legitimate bearers of the Apostolic office".²⁶ The Apostles arranged for the continuation of their office (not in its "extraordinary prerogatives", but in its "ordinary Church-office") through ordination. The office can only be continued through a transfer from person to person in ordination, whereby the office "supplants itself". Krogh-Tonning refuses to recognize as legitimate a ministerial office produced by the congregation (MENIGHED), or any Church body which acknow-

²⁵ Ibid., p. 5. This interpretation of the word is unique to Krogh-Tonning, and shows his Roman Catholic tendencies.

²⁶ Ibid., pp. 8f.

ledges such a procedure. He will not regard its acts as a true administration of the means of grace.²⁷ For Krogh-Tonning, an Apostolic Ministry ordained by Christ and preserved in unbroken succession is of the ESSE of the Church.

The "Apostolic Succession" must be maintained if we are to preserve any objective, firm and secure position for the Church.²⁸ Episcopal succession is not, however, necessary. It is the ORDO and not the GRADUS which must be maintained. A Presbyteral succession is equally valid. The Lutheran Church has preserved a Presbyteral succession, and therefore possesses a valid Ministry.

Krogh-Tonning next discusses the attributes of the Church. The Church is a Communion of Saints "because, as a redemptive institution, it is a community in which the means of grace are active unto sanctification".²⁹ The Church is Apostolic, because it possesses and is based upon the Apostolic office. The Church is One and Catholic. It is "permeated by the one life of Christ's Spirit", and is His mystical Body. But this inner unity "is conditioned by" the outward: "Common means of grace administered by a common Apostolic office, a common ecumenical confession".³⁰ The Church has room for individual peculiarities and a varied order (for example, a female diaconate), but these must not be independent of the Apostolic office. On the strength of the Church's Catholicity, the Church militant and the Church

27 Ibid., p. 9.

28 Ibid., p. 10.

29 Ibid., p. 12.

30 Ibid., p. 13.

triumphant are one. The saints who have passed on work and pray for the Church militant, and rejoice over a sinner's repentance. Its members on earth pray for their departed loved ones. Krogh-Tonning strongly criticizes Luther's substitution of the word "Christian" for "Catholic" in the Creed. The Church must be "identical with itself" through all ages. There is room for a doctrinal evolution on the basis of old tradition, but not for a revolution. To speak of "new dogmas" is a contradiction in terms. The holiness, unity, and catholicity of the Church mutually condition one another.

In order to "realize its essence as a redemptive institution", the Church requires a "representation", a CLERUS, as distinct from the MENIGHED or laity. The word MENIGHED is not a proper translation of *ἐκκλησία*, which includes both clergy and laity. The clergy represents the authority of the collective whole over the individual, but also the Divine authority as the "teaching Church" over against the community. "The Apostolic office is not the servant of the congregation, but the servant of God in the congregation."³¹

Krogh-Tonning attempted to make room for the freedom of individuals and individual congregations through parish councils, diocesan synods and national synods. But he emphasized the fact that the clergy must play the decisive role in the definition of doctrine. This is an ecclesiastical principle inherent in the concept of the Church. The -----
³¹ Ibid., p. 17.

highest authority resides in the ecumenical council.

Because the Church is under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, it is infallible in all decisions regarding faith and morals which are necessary for salvation. The Church and only the Church is "the fulness of Christ".³² Krogh-Tonning proceeds to deliver a sharp attack on the principle of Sola Scriptura. Christ left no Scriptures and did not command the Apostles to write any. Instead, He left the "teaching Church". For many centuries, the Bible was in the hands of a few literates. It was not the Bible in the hands of everyman, but the Bible in the hands of the Church, in the form of the Church's preaching, which enabled it to progress. It was a "fateful illusion" to base the theology of the Church upon the "one-sided Scriptural principle". It has led to schism, heresy, and error. Biblical criticism has shaken the foundations of the principle. The Church needs "a living authority" to uphold the written norm. The infallible teaching Church is the unshakeable foundation.

Moreover, the Church must be governed by the teaching office. It realizes its Idea as a community through the same organ with which it realizes its Idea as a redemptive institution.³³ Otherwise, its form would be incongruous with its essence.

Krogh-Tonning attempted to reconcile his views with the Lutheran Confessions. He found support for his institutional emphasis in Luther's Large Catechism and in the Apology.

³² Ibid., pp. 19f.

³³ Ibid., p. 27.

He also found in the Confessions a desire to preserve the Church's tradition in doctrine, order and worship. But the Confessions do not develop the doctrine of the Apostolicity of the Church, and they do not designate a final doctrinal authority. Their norm is Scripture, but they give us no objective guarantee that this norm will be followed. Krogh-Tonning believes that this "LACUNE" can be filled without conflict with the Confessions by the concept of the infallible teaching office in Apostolic Succession.³⁴ The documents of the Reformation show a tendency to assert the authority of the clergy, but this principle has not yet been carried through in the Lutheran Church. The stumbling-block has been the Sola Scriptura. Lacking a doctrinal authority, the Lutheran Church lapsed into arbitrariness and subjectivity. This led in turn to schism and secularization. In desperation, the Church threw itself into the arms of the State. In his view, many at the present day seek a solution in the "Presbyterian-democratic" Church polity. But this can only lead to further schism, and will put the Church at the complete mercy of changing opinion.

Krogh-Tonning next proceeds to compare the Lutheran and the Roman Catholic ecclesiologies. He examines and rejects a long list of popular conceptions of the difference between them. The difference is not to be found in the usual antitheses, Visible and Invisible, external and spiritual, institutional and personal, mediatorial and non-mediatorial,

³⁴ Ibid., pp. 34, 61.

authoritarian and free, nor even in the contrast noted by Schleiermacher that Rome makes the individual's relationship to God dependent upon his relationship to the Church, while the contrary position is adopted by the Lutheran Church. The real difference lies in the independence of the Roman Catholic Church, an independence as definite as any of the means of grace, most clearly expressed in its doctrine of the Church's infallibility, guaranteed by the episcopacy in Apostolic Succession. In Protestantism, the Church has no independence. Since all objective authority is lacking, it is possible for the individual to be right and the Church to be wrong. Krogh-Tonning proposes that the Lutheran Church should remedy this situation by adopting the doctrine of an infallible teaching office. This office must not, however, be restricted to the episcopacy, "still less" to a primate.³⁵ He does not demand the abolition of the State Church, but insists that the State must give up its supremacy over the Church. The regent would have to transfer his "so-called Summepiscopate" to an ecclesiastically ordained, ruling prelate.

Krogh-Tonning emphasized the fact that Christ Himself founded the Church. He built it upon the Apostle Peter. Peter "undoubtedly" received a "primacy". But the Church is also founded upon the other Apostles. They too received the power of the Keys. At Pentecost, the Holy Spirit created first the ECCLESIA DOCCENS and then, through it, the ECCLESIA

35 Ibid., p. 61.

AUDIENS. The Holy Spirit operates in the same manner through all ages.³⁶

Krogh-Tonning develops his doctrine of the Ministry in a separate section. At the risk of being repetitious, we shall examine this section briefly.

Krogh-Tonning's summary paragraph on the Ministry reads as follows:

"The MINISTERIUM ECCLESIASTICUM is the organ instituted by Christ whereby He founds His Church and mediates its life-functions in Word and Sacrament. The Church is originally called into existence through the Ministry. It is upheld and governed thereby through the ages. For the independence of the Ministry and thereby of the Church, it was necessary that the office originate in His positive institution and not from the congregation or any human arrangement.

"In order that the independence of the Ministry might be ensured and maintained, the call had to proceed from the Lord to the first incumbents, the Apostles, from these to others and so on through the ages from person to person. Only thus can the Church continually realize its essential Apostolicity or its status as an Apostolic redemptive institution in objective recognition for all times.

"The call is completed through ordination, by which not only the right but also the power to carry out the functions which the Lord attached to the office is transferred from person to person. The functions are the administration of the means of grace, and government."³⁷

Krogh-Tonning was most insistent on the need for an outer call as well as an inner call. The native Charismata may serve as a guide to the Church. The Church cannot test the heart, but it must examine what it can examine. The right to call belongs to the "teaching Church". The office is self-perpetuating, through a succession from person to person. The call is "completed" only through ordination,

³⁶ Ibid., pp. 66f.

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 71f.

Administered by one who is himself ordained. Ordination confers not only the right but also the power to administer (POTESTAS MINISTERII) the means of grace. Krogh-Tonning cites the ordination formula of the Church of Norway: "I therefore transmit to you...the holy office of the Ministry, with power and authority to preach God's Word...to administer the precious Sacraments...to bind...and loose..."³⁸ Ordination thus confers a "divine institutional competence", both POTESTAS ORDINIS and POTESTAS JURISDICTIONIS, and an "objective Charisma", a CHARACTER INDELIBILIS.³⁹ He points out that the Norwegian Church recognizes the latter in practice. It accepts the ministerial acts of a pastor emeritus, and does not require re-ordination after resignation or suspension. Ordination should, as a rule, be performed by a Bishop. Krogh-Tonning would not, however, exclude the possibility of ordination by another pastor "in a pressing emergency". The original office was one, the three-fold Ministry an early but successively developed order. Krogh-Tonning called for its reestablishment in Norway, since "it seems to enjoy Divine sanction", but does not go so far as to regard it as absolutely necessary.

The call of the Church, says Krogh-Tonning, is always VOCATIO DIVINA. The only difference between our call and that of the Apostles is that the one was immediate and the other is mediate. Although the pastor does not receive the "inspirational infallibility" of the Apostles, he nevertheless

³⁸ Ibid., p. 77.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 77.

receives the Apostolic office.

In an excursus on the Universal Priesthood (pp. 82ff), Krogh-Tonning accepts the doctrine, but categorically denies its relevance to the Ministry of Word and Sacraments. The Universal Priesthood concerns the individual's self-sacrifice in prayer and obedience. The fact that the laity carried out a Ministry in the Early Church is irrelevant, for we cannot deduce rules for the present from the special Charismata of the Apostolic Age.

Krogh-Tonning struggles with the problem of the Papacy. He has accepted an infallible teaching office, but rejects the corollary of its concentration in one man. He accepts the Papacy "as an Idea", but not the historic Roman Papacy. He raises the question whether God does not want a primate with extensive administrative power, for the sake of unity, or whether the "primacy" entrusted to Peter belonged only to the Apostolic Age, and the Church should now be governed by the Bishops without a primate.⁴⁰ He leaves the question open.

His Roman Catholic sympathies also come to light in his teaching on Baptism. He seems to hold an ontological concept of grace. In Baptism, God plants a "power", a "drive", a "sprout" (SPIRE), which "together with the conscience always prompts him to grasp eternal life in personal appropriation".⁴¹ Baptism confers a CHARACTER INDELIBILIS.

40 Ibid., pp. 109f.

41 Ibid., p. 228.

Krogh-Tonning speaks of a "necessary receptivity", but finds the infant heart particularly well suited for this purpose. He stresses the fact that the child does not have faith prior to Baptism, but receives it in Baptism. His emphasis is upon the activity of God and upon the covenant character of Baptism. His emphasis upon the sacramental character of Confirmation⁴² is a perfectly logical deduction from his premises, but it is unique among 19th century Norwegian theologians. His contemporaries thought of it almost exclusively in sacrificial terms.

Krogh-Tonning's Dogmatik is an example of the extremes to which Norwegian theology could go in attempting to solve the ecclesiological problem. It is impossible not to sympathize with him; Nevertheless, he quite clearly overstepped the bounds of Lutheran theology. It is a strange experience to read his criticism of Rome in his FUNDAMENTALLAERE, for it is precisely this criticism which must in retrospect be levelled against him.⁴³ He criticizes Roman Catholicism for being Monistic and authoritarian, for failing to allow for individual freedom, for making the Church absolute and infallible, and for a monistic concept of Revelation (NOVA LEX). It is perhaps significant that he does not criticize Rome for having an intellectualistic conception of Revelation.

⁴² Ibid., pp. 234f. In Lutheran theology, two aspects of Ritual are distinguished. The first or "sacramental" describes the manward activity of God; The second or "sacrificial" represents the devotion of man toward God (In Confirmation, the renewal of the Baptismal vow). There is a parallel in Anglican pastor theology between "confirming" and "being confirmed".

⁴³ Dogmatik, I, pp. 149f.

This was a blind spot for Krogh-Tonning as for most of his contemporaries. He can praise the "Christological interest" of the Lutheran Church, but even here it is significant that Christ is called the "living and personal principle of the Revelation of truth".⁴⁴ It was his failure to break loose from the intellectualist, propositional concept of Revelation which compelled him to seek for an objective authority and guarantee for his propositional truth in an age when old "truths" were crumbling on every side. This was the common problem of his generation. Whereas others found the solution in a break with historic Christianity, Krogh-Tonning found it in the infallible teaching office of the Roman Catholic Church.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 153.

BIBLIOGRAPHY---PART I

- J.K. Berle "E.F.B. Horn" in Norsk Biografisk Lexicon, VI.
- A. Brandrud, "Theologien i det norske universitet, 1811-1911", NTT, XII.
- G. Fasting, "Jens Jonas Jansen:Hvad han laerte", NTT, 1914, XV, pp. 193-218.
- A. Grimelund, Forelaesninger over Practisk Theologie i kort Sammendrag, Christiania, 1856.
- S.B. Hersleb, Lecture Notes, unpublished; Ms. no. 5, taken by H.J. Knudsen, and Ms. no. 256, taken by an anonymous student, Handskriftsamling, University Library, Oslo.
- M. Hertzberg, "Stiftsprovst Gustav Jensen" in Norvegia Sacra, 1923, pp. 242-269.
- E.F.B. Horn, "Grunde for eller mod en Statskirke", in TTLKN, VII, pp. 213-280.
- E.F.B. Horn, "Om det Kirkelige Embedet", in TTLKN, VI, pp. 388-448, 486-525.
- C. Ihlen, "Knud Krogh-Tonning" in NBL, VIII, pp. 50-52.
- C. Ihlen, "Fredrik Petersen", in NBL, XI, pp. 37-42.
- J.J. Jansen "Det Kirkelige Embedet i den Apostoliske Tid", TTLKN, V, pp. 463-529, VI, pp. 74-127.
- J.J. Jansen, Kristendom og Videnskab, Kristiania, 1883.
- J.J. Jansen, Oplevet og Taenkt, 6th Edn., Oslo, 1928.
- G. Jensen, En Folkekirkes Betydning og Opgave, Kristiania, 1898.
- G. Jensen, Indledning i Prestetjeneste, 5th Edn., Oslo, 1933.
- G. Jensen, "Nogle Spørgsmaal fra nutidens praktiske Theologi", NTT, I, 1900, pp. 84ff.
- G. Jensen, Lecture Notes, unpublished, taken by Chr. Erichsen; Ms. no 958, Handskriftsamling, University Library, Oslo.
- G. Jensen, "Om Statskirke og Frikirke", Luthersk Ugeskrift, I, pp. 297ff.
- G. Johnson, Grundrids af den Systematiske Theologi, Chra., 1879-1881, 2nd Edn., 1885.
- G. Johnson, "Hvad er Kirken", Luthersk Kirketidende, I, 1863, pp. 1-11, 33-38, 65-74, 401-412.
- G. Johnson, Lecture Notes, unpublished; Ms. no. 927, taken by J.N. Brun, 1860, Handskriftsamling, University Library, Oslo., pp. 173-175, 237-254.
- G. Johnson, Nogle Ord om Barnedaaben, Christiania, 1857.
- G. Johnson, "Om Gjenfødelse og om Kirken", LK, II, 1864, pp. 81-94.
- J. Kaurin, Nogle Ord til den norske Kirke, Christiania, 1846.
- O. Koppang, Hegelianismen i Norge, Oslo, 1943.
- S. Kierkegaard, Journals, ed. A. Dru, London, 1940.
- S. Kierkegaard, Training in Christianity, London, 1941.

L. Koren, "Gustav Jensen", in NBI, VI.

K. Krogh-Tønning, Afskedsprediken i Gamle Akers Kirke, Kristiania, 1900.

K. Krogh-Tønning, Den Christelige Dogmatik, I-IV, Christiania, 1885-94.

K. Krogh-Tønning, En Konvertits Erindringer, København, 1906.

K. Krogh-Tønning, Den Kirkelige Opølsningsproces, Kristiania, 1896.

K. Krogh-Tønning, Kirken og Reformationen, Christiania, 1892.

K. Krogh-Tønning, Om det Kirkelige Embedet og dets Funktioner, Christiania, 1881.

K. Krogh-Tønning, Den Kristelige Troeslaere i Grundtraek, Kristiania, 3rd Edn., 1879.

E. Molland, "Gisle Johnson" in NTU, II.

M. J. Monrad, Religion, Religioner, og Christendommen: Bidrag til Religionsphilosophie, København, 1885.

H. Ording, Dogmatisk Metode, Oslo, 1939, pp. 59-91.

G. Ousland "Fra Kirke- til Foreningskirkesyn" in TTK, Oslo, 1951, pp. 69-82.

G. Ousland, En Kirkehøvding: Professor Gisle Johnson som Teolog og Kirkemann, Oslo, 1950.

F. Petersen, Lecture Notes, unpublished; Ms. no. 709, taken by Iyder Brun, Manuskriptsamling, University Library, Oslo.

K. Rygnestad, "Gustav Jensen's Forelesninger ved det praktisk-teologiske seminar", in TTK, 1. hefte, 1959, pp. 39-47.

L. Selmer, Professor Fredrik Petersen og hans Samtid, Oslo, 1948.

S. J. Stenersen, "Bemærkninger i anledning af S.T. Hr. Catechet Wexels' Afhandling 'ere vi ved Daaben indlemmede i den Aegte Christelige Kirke'" in Tidsskrift for Kirke-Kronike og Christelige Theologie, I, Chra., 1834.

S. J. Stenersen, Forsøg til en Laerebog i Religionen til brug for de laerde skolars høiere Classer, Chra., 1827.

C. F. Wisløff, "Det geistlige embede og det almindelige prestedømme i norsk pastoralteologi from W. Wexels til Gustav Jensen", in TTK, 1958, pp. 49-62.

PART II

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH
IN NORWEGIAN CHURCH-LIFE
DURING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

GRUNDTVIGIANISM

(a) Nicolai Fredrik Severin Grundtvig (1783-1872)

N. F. S. Grundtvig was surely one of the most remarkable figures in 19th century Scandinavia. His long life was rich in dramatic events. He experienced deep disgrace and received the highest honours. Throughout his life, he was dogged by mental illness; He was successfully sued for libel and was placed under official censorship for over a decade; He was even barred for a time from the pulpit in Denmark; But he lived also to see himself vindicated and given the title of Bishop, and he was hailed as the "greatest in the North" by no less a personage than Björnson. Poet, scholar, Churchman, patriot, statesman, educator, he was a striking example of the "ten-talent" man.

Grundtvig's undeniable genius lay in the realm of the "prophetic and intuitive".¹ His cast of mind was not so much sharply analytical or massively systematic as visionary and poetic.

These characteristics are illustrated by his theological work. He has been rightly described as "an irregular theologian", and never fully worked out his views in systematic form. He was rather a creative visionary and a bold leader. Nor did he lack theologically brilliant disciples to work out the theological position that came to be known as Grundtvigianism.

1. A. Skrondal, Grundtvig og Norge, p. 2.

Grundtvig made his first appearance on the theological scene as the defender of Biblical Orthodoxy against Speculative Rationalism. In this respect at least, he might be described as a 19th century Scandinavian Karl Barth. In his famous Reply of the Church (1825), he demanded that the Rationalist Professor H. N. Clausen either retract some of his theological views or resign. Clausen did neither; Instead, he sued Grundtvig for libel and won his case.

Even before the Clausen case, Grundtvig, like many contemporary Protestant theologians, had been grappling with the problem of authority. As "the Bible's lone defender", he had come to realize the inadequacy of an appeal to Scripture alone. His Rationalist opponents were either critical of Scripture or at least interpreted its text in a different manner. Grundtvig already had a profound conception of the Church as the creation of the Holy Spirit and as the Body of Christ, and was particularly anxious about its future. In his old age, (1863) he recalled his early starting point as follows:

"I had fallen into profound concern over the desperate situation into which Christ's Church and especially its children and unschooled members had fallen; The scribes stubbornly maintained that, not only were the origin, canon, authenticity, and right interpretation of Holy Scripture very doubtful, but the basic doctrines of the Trinity, Christ's Divinity, and the Atonement...were not to be found in the Bible...It was clear that if Scripture was the Christian Church's rule of faith, unbelief now... would have a much stronger and more valid witness than faith...There must be, in the Church, a much stronger and more valid witness to the true, original, Christian faith than the letter of Scripture could ever be for women and children and all the unschooled."2

2 N. Grundtvig, Kirke-Spejl, US, X, p. 353.

"Writing, reading, and thinking, under constant prayer", he made his "matchless discovery", that the true witness to Apostolic Christianity was to be found in the Church, in the Apostles' Creed in conjunction with Baptism.³ This thesis constitutes the heart of the "Churchly View", and, although Grundtvig's views on many questions changed and developed during his long life, he never altered this basic concept.

Grundtvig's conception of Christian truth was objective. He expressly rejects the two opposite subjectivisms of Rationalism and emotionalism. "When a man takes his own spiritual need as his starting point, he obviously starts with the most profound but also the most mysterious element in man." When Christianity is regarded as "something indefinite, which can only be apprehended through inner experience, the consequences are invariably unfortunate."⁴ The emotions and the reason are equally poor criteria. He also rejects the Biblical starting point. He does not deny that the Bible teaches the same faith as the Creed, but "I will not deduce the Christian faith from the Bible, but take it where I find it clearly and definitely expressed: in the Church..."⁵ The Church, and consequently true Christianity is to be found, not in an exegetical, but in an historical approach.

Church history is a human witness, which is not the goal in

³ He was much impressed by Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. III,4, which notes that Scripture can be abused by heretics, but not the Rule of Faith received in Baptism. He might also have cited Tertullian, de Praescriptione Haereticorum to the same effect.

⁴ US, IV, pp. 505f. (1826-7).

⁵ US, IV, p. 644.

itself, but it points toward the goal.⁶ Grundtvig himself traveled this road in making his "matchless discovery". Hence the Grundtvigian position is sometimes called the "Historical-Churchly" view. Grundtvig distinguished sharply between the historical question: What is true, genuine Christianity?, and the religious question which presses upon the conscience: Is Christianity true? (In 1826, he wrote a treatise in two parts, "on the true Christianity", and "On the truth of Christianity".) It is a mistake to attempt to answer the historical question solely or primarily on the basis of Scripture. Nor can we assume that Luther or any other teacher is right. "We shall enquire of the Church what is the foundation the Apostles have laid on Christ's behalf, and laid not in a book, but in the Church itself as a gathering of Christian people."⁷ The Church antedates Scripture and created Scripture, not vice versa. "There has, for 1800 years, been a Christian Church on earth, recognizable by its solemn confession of faith and the Baptism with which it is associated..."⁸ "The Church is not sanctified by Scripture, but Scripture by the Church; The confession of faith is the living Word of the Church, Scripture merely a dead Word; Therefore, it is obviously not Scripture which can and shall defend the Church, but the Church which is to

⁶ US, IV, pp. 511ff, 521.

⁷ US, IX, p. 331 (1868).

⁸ US, VIII, p. 376.

defend Scripture."⁹ Grundtvig was obsessed by the spoken word. He regarded it as the true vehicle of the creative Word of God, an echo of the Word of original creation, and the expression of the image of God in mankind. The written Word, on the other hand, was useful within its limitations, but "dead". The Bible was useful as an "edifying book". It possesses a special authority, since it is the oldest record of Church history extant. It has a place, but only a secondary place in the ORDO SALUTIS. The Bible is not superfluous; It is as necessary for spiritual growth as a school is for the mental development of a child. But Grundtvig did not regard Scripture as a means of grace with regenerative power. Similarly the Word as preached, while still being the vehicle of the Holy Spirit, only has a preparatory function, calling the hearer to Baptism and the Lord's Supper. In Grundtvig's view, like Scripture, it has no regenerative power. The true life-giving Word by which the Spirit creates the believing Church is to be found rather in the Baptismal Covenant (the renunciation of the devil and the confession of faith), the Words of institution in the Lord's Supper, and the Lord's Prayer. As he put it in one of his hymns: "Only at the Font and at the Table do we hear God's Word to us...". These Grundtvig called "the Word from the Lord's own mouth", an expression which initially did not refer to their historical origins,

9 H. Begtrup, N.F.S. Grundtvig's Danske Kristendom, I, p. 61.

but to the fact that in and through them the Risen Lord was present and active. Later, the phrase was linked with an unfortunate theory that Jesus had actually given these Words in the exact form possessed by the Grundtvigians during the forty days between His Resurrection and Ascension. Grundtvig's "basic idea" is "that it is with the Word from the Lord's own mouth, through Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper that the Christian Faith lives or dies and the true Christian Church stands or falls."¹⁰ The Holy Spirit constitutes the Church through the Sacraments and, in the first instance, through Baptism. The Church is "a Baptismal fellowship of voluntary confessors of the faith".¹¹ All those who wish to be Christians must be baptized into the Name of the Triune God, and "the Church demands of all those who desire Baptism a solemn confession of their faith and a declaration of war against the devil..."¹² The conditions for salvation are Baptism and faith, which are "indissolubly" bound up together; "We cannot impose any other conditions..¹³ Baptism is "the only reception" into the Church; It is "a washing of regeneration", in which the Holy Spirit grants us "forgiveness of sins, heavenly inheritance, and the hope of eternal life".¹⁴ If Christianity stood on any other basis than that of Baptism with its confession of faith, it would have died out long before it came to Denmark.

¹⁰ Forhandlinger paa det første skandinaviske Kirkemøde i Kjøbenhavn, Kjøbenhavn, 1857, pp. 6f.

¹¹ US, VIII, p. 389.

¹² US, IV, p. 536.

¹³ Ibid., p. 537.

¹⁴ US, IX, p. 331.

God makes a covenant with man in Baptism, and it is within this covenant relationship that he is to grow and develop throughout life. The means of nurture within the Baptismal covenant, Grundtvig finds in the Commandments considered as a guide for life (the "third use of the Law" mentioned in the Confessions), common worship, the Ministry of the Word and the Eucharist, the Lord's Prayer, and Holy Scripture. Thus, for Grundtvig Baptism possessed a saving efficacy, and, although he admitted the possibility of falling away from the Baptismal covenant and of being brought back to it by the Holy Spirit, this was not a point upon which he laid any emphasis.

Grundtvig held steadfastly to Infant Baptism. Adult Baptism might possibly evoke "a stronger life and a clearer consciousness"; Therefore, parents ought to be free to decide whether to have their children baptized as infants or to postpone their Baptism. Grundtvig "hates" compulsory Baptism, and wishes that "never again should anyone be baptized who did not have the heart to believe". But he advises against waiting: "I believe that the most suitable age for Baptism is before a child knows the difference between left and right."¹⁵ Infant Baptism is only permissible where the parents "as far as we know, are believing Christians themselves and will do their best to ensure that the child remains in Christ..." But Grundtvig expresses a preference for Infant Baptism, "for the simple reason that

15 US, VIII, p. 433.

all birth, spiritual as well as physical, must be easier when one is small..."¹⁶ We "come just as unconsciously into the Kingdom of Heaven as we came to this world..."¹⁷ It is true that infants have no "conscious faith". They are conscious of nothing; But at least they have life. "In reality, faith in the truth is nothing but an open heart for truth",¹⁸ and this is exactly the position of the infant, even though it is unconscious. The objection that Infant Baptism lacks obligations as conditions for salvation amounts to a confusion of the Gospel with the Law. Baptism is "not a command that we are to keep in order to be saved, but an offer to save us..."¹⁹

A corollary of Grundtvig's high conception of Baptism was his anthropology, which was much more optimistic than that of his opponents. He rejected the concept of total depravity, and found it "self-contradictory" and "most annoying" when theologians assert both creation in the image of God and its complete "erasure" in the Fall, so that "not a bit remains of inherent glory and the created God-man relationship". This reduces "the whole history of Revelation and the whole work of redemption to a series of impossibilities", which cannot be overcome by "a dead and powerless Scriptural Word that what is impossible for man is possible for God". The difference between natural and regenerate human life is "as wide as the heavens", but it is "the same

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 434.

¹⁷ US, VIII, p. 416.

¹⁸ US, VIII, p. 434.

¹⁹ US, IX, p. 346.

human life"; It is "of the same species".²⁰ Christ and the thief on the cross shared a common humanity. If it were not so, then Christ was not a true man, and no human being could either will to become or become a child of God. The image of God has not been lost, or there could be no possibility of fellowship, no point of contact. The unconscious child is not guilty of actual sin. "Since all sin is rebellion, springing from egotism, the infant is rightly called innocent until egotism awakens."²¹

Thus, Grundtvig's ecclesiology, as well as his entire theology, is strongly concentrated and simplified. Everything hinges upon Baptism and the Baptismal covenant.

The Church has but one Mark, by which it is to be distinguished from the world: "Our spoken Word," the Apostles' Creed in conjunction with Baptism.²²

Grundtvig is reluctant to draw limits to the Church; At any rate, they must include all who are baptized and who believe, and he gives the benefit of the doubt to the questionable case. "Those with whom we really have a communion on Baptism, we must not exclude from the Christian Church, unless we can show that they have broken their Baptismal covenant and do not repent of it."²³ On the other hand, there are situations which preclude full fellowship with others. We are not to Communicate with them if they deny the Words of Institution

²⁰ US, IX, p. 430.

²¹ US, VIII, p. 434.

²² US, IV, p. 552.

²³ US, V, p. 344.

or reject the Lord's Prayer, the Benediction, the Lord's day, Scripture, or the Holy Ministry--until they become "more enlightened". There is a distinction between the two Sacraments which corresponds to a similar distinction between the two phrases in the Creed, "the holy, catholic Church" and "the Communion of Saints". Baptism, which together with faith belong to the "basic concept" of the Church, corresponds to the former. The Eucharist, which is an element of the "fully developed" concept of the Church, corresponds to the latter. Grundtvig discusses this distinction in connection with the articles on the Church in the Augsburg Confession (with which he believes himself to be in complete agreement). All those who share in Baptism and faith are included within the unity of the Church. Lutherans do not unChurch those who have a different interpretation of the Eucharist, although as the Marburg conversations prove, this necessarily excludes "heart-felt fellowship". Unity is retained through the proclamation of a common Gospel (which Grundtvig identified with the possession of a common faith as expressed in the Apostles' Creed), and this remains, even if "the entire doctrinal system", preaching, and the interpretation of Scripture are different. These belong not to the "foundation", but to the "superstructure".²⁴ Grundtvig is concerned to vindicate the position of the Lutheran Church within the holy, catholic Church. He and his movement did not possess a strong Lutheran self-consciousness; They were

24 US, VIII, pp. 389f.

more ecumenical than any contemporary Scandinavian party. But they were also concerned not to unchurch themselves. Grundtvig was scandalized at Luther's substitution of the word "Christian" for "Catholic" in the Creed. In adopting this alteration, Lutherans "excluded themselves from the holy, catholic Church". Moreover, Grundtvig was impatient with Lutheran reluctance to confess faith in the Church for fear of Roman Catholic tendencies. "If we cannot honestly confess faith in the Church as the temple of the Holy Spirit, we will always be stumbling and will imagine that it is the Church which needs worldly props. If we are afraid of the catholicity of the Church, we must forego any sense of fellowship with the Apostles and, through them, with the Lord..."²⁵

Behind this concern for the historically correct form of the Creed, as opposed to the variants then in use in the Churches of Denmark and Norway, lay a more profound consideration. If the Creed were the absolute authority, the "Word from the Lord's own mouth", then it was of the utmost importance that it be recited in its original form. Grundtvig believed that the original form had been handed down from generation to generation in the Church from the time of the Apostles. "The witness of the Church in Baptism--- about Baptism in itself, its conditions, and its fruits... must be taken and believed as the witness of Christ Himself

and His Apostles, transmitted from mouth to mouth and from generation to generation...as a Word of His own mouth which must never depart from the mouth of His Church, and from which His Spirit will never depart..."²⁶

He regarded it as at least questionable whether Baptism was valid if variations in its form took place. If Baptism was instituted by Christ Himself, it follows that He told the Apostles the conditions for Baptism. Thus, the Creed must be "A Word from the Lord's own mouth". And unless the Creed be taken and believed "as a whole and in part" as such, the indissoluble connection between Baptism and the Word of faith which alone makes it Christian Baptism, is lost.²⁷ The Baptismal covenant is a Word of the Lord's own mouth, and "only when we believe so will we taste the blessing of the Gospel in its fulness".²⁸ Grundtvig's line of reasoning here is a good illustration of the kind of A PRIORI argumentation which characterized the Churchly View.

Grundtvig's Christianity was objective and Sacramental; It was also collective. He is opposed to all individualism. The Church is primary. The Holy Spirit "is not sent to any individual, but to the whole Church, and does not give forgiveness of sins and eternal life to the individual, but only to one and all in the Church...which He creates.."29

²⁶ US, IX, p. 333.

²⁷ Quoted in Begtrup, op. cit., II, pp. 154f.

²⁸ US, VIII, p. 421.

²⁹ US, IX, p. 374.

Grundtvig deplored the spiritualizing tendencies current within the Lutheranism of the day. For Lutherans, the Church has become "a mere Idea...which has no corresponding reality on earth, but hangs in the indefinite, without any specific Marks..."³⁰ It is true that the Church must be "invisible" to "the eyes of dust", it cannot be recognized by its "crosses or Church-towers, its Bishops' caps or monks' cowls, its ceremonies or festivals, or by any book". But it must not be "intangible" (USANDESLIGT). It is "recognizable for the ear of dust by its clear, public, spoken Word, whereby its members confess their faith and hope".³¹ That is to say that the Church is not to be identified with any particular denomination (these are "imperfect attempts to realize the invisible idea in the visible sphere"), nor can its limits be drawn; But it is a concrete reality in history, and recognizable as such. The "undeniable fact" is that "there has been a Christian Church on earth for 1800 years, recognizable under all its names and forms by its solemn confession of faith and the Baptism which corresponds to this Confession".³²

There was no essential change in Grundtvig's basic ecclesiology from the time of his "matchless discovery". But his opinions changed in two important respects: The relationship between Church and State, and the concept of the Ministry.

³⁰ US, VIII, p. 376.

³¹ Ibid., p. 378.

³² US, VIII, p. 376.

Grundtvig was originally a supporter of the absolute monarchy and of the State Church. He regarded the State Church as identical with the Church of Jesus Christ in Denmark. After the Clausen case, however, and particularly after his three visits to England (1829-31), he drew a sharp distinction between the two. When the attempt to purge the Church of Denmark of the Rationalists failed, a group of his friends made (in 1831) an unsuccessful effort to create a free congregation of "Old Believers", with Grundtvig as pastor.³³ If the Rationalists would not leave the Church, then the "Old Believers would have to "divorce" themselves from them. The British Act of Toleration (1828-29), however, presented Grundtvig with another alternative, and from 1834 (when he wrote Den Danske Statskirken upartisk betragtede) onwards, he was a tireless spokesman for a spacious State Church, a "free" State Church, and a "free congregation (MENIGHED)".³⁴ The Establishment is to be retained as a useful educational vehicle, but it is simply a "State institution (STATSINDRETNING)", which the Government

³³ The term "Old Believers" seems to be drawn from the schism with the same name from the Russian Orthodox Church in 1667. The projected secession of the Grundtvigians would necessarily have been within the State Church, since religious freedom in Denmark was not guaranteed until the new Constitution of 1849 and the consequent replacement of the State Church by the "Folk-Church".

³⁴ Cf. P. Lindhardt, Dans! Teologisk Tidsskrift, XII, p. 151 : "It is no accident that he now has the same view of the value of the State Church and its relation to Christianity and society as the English debate so obviously displayed..."

had the right to alter at will.³⁵ The Church (MINISHED) is the "heavenly guest" within the State Church's walls. Both Rationalist and Old Believer could remain in the State Church if each party had its own Ritual and the parochial bond (which bound the laity to a single Church and clergyman) were loosed. Grundtvig has completely given up the concept of the State Church as a Christian Church, and with it the idea of a Christian State. He and his followers became the chief spokesmen for all manner of ecclesiastical reform: The relaxation of the parochial bond, elective congregations, liturgical freedom, the abolition of compulsory Baptism, Confirmation, Church marriage, and participation in the Holy Communion---"The Spirit can only work in freedom!" Despite the opposition of men like Bishop Mynster in Denmark, the Grundtvigians were able to realize the greater part of their programme.

Grundtvig originally held a high conception of the Ministry. In a letter to the Haugean Amund Helland in Bergen (1826), he upholds ordination and a form of Apostolic Succession, and describes Hauge's call as "self-assumed". "Christ has instituted a teaching office in His Church... which we must not minimize, the unbroken transmission of which He will ensure from His first Apostles to His last servants on earth; And only those to whom the office is thus rightly transmitted receive (when they have faith) that special wisdom, power, and anointing which belongs to the

ability rightly to divide the Word of Truth."³⁶ Clearly, Grundtvig regarded the Church's ordination as transmitting a Charisma, although in another letter he denied that any ordaining minister since the Apostles has had the power to transmit gifts. In the same year, he wrote that "without ordination with the laying on of hands, there is no Christian teaching office, and where the episcopal ordination is not transmitted without interruption, there are, in the Church's true understanding of the term, no Bishops..."³⁷ The Danish Bishops are not true Bishops; This situation could and should be remedied, since God has preserved the true episcopal ordination in the Church of England. Though the Church of England did not particularly honour its name at the time, it was "an orthodox Church with real (not self-made) Bishops," he wrote in 1830. The Lutheran Church erred in failing to retain the Apostolic Succession. "I know from experience that it carries a different weight when a Bishop, and not one of us, pronounces the blessing in the Name of the Lord."³⁸ At the same time, Grundtvig refuses to unchurch or to charge with heresy those who do not share his point of view. He will not assert that Christianity stands or falls with the concept of the Ministry. Nor are the clergy to be placed in a special class; Grundtvigianism was not hierarchical.

³⁶ Quoted in Kolsrud, NTT, XXXI, p. 240.

³⁷ US, IV, p. 611.

³⁸ US, V, p. 353. Grundtvig's followers urged Bishop Mynster's successor, H. L. Martensen, to seek ordination in Sweden, in order that the Apostolic Succession might be reestablished in Denmark. Cf. C. Kolsrud, op. cit., p. 241.

In the past, says Grundtvig, Bishops and priests "had the Church to themselves, or rather they were the Church". In reality, the Church "embraces both pastor and people, a spiritual concept, the Christian Communion of Saints, which is created in Baptism of those who believe what we all confess..."³⁹

It was in 1839 that Grundtvig first began to express doubts about the Apostolic Succession. "He has noted that the Oxford Movement in England strove to use it to build a hierarchy on the power of the Bishop, and he is naturally anxious to avoid a repetition of this in Denmark."⁴⁰ The following year, he rejected any significance of the Apostolic Succession.⁴¹ The Anglicans base their authority upon the same Scripture text as Rome (Matt. 16:18), and "without the secular arm together with the Thirty-Nine Articles, they would have shown long ago that they are a long way from agreement in the interpretation of Scripture or Apostolic doctrine". They can scarcely claim to uphold what has been taught and believed SEMPER, UBIQUE, ET AD OMNIBUS in the Church, and they cannot unchurch the Church of Denmark unless they can "prove that we have altered faith and Baptism...".

By 1862, Grundtvig still regarded ordination as an Apostolic tradition, but held that the only true ordination existing in the Church since the time of the Apostles has been "ordination to preach the Gospel freely...and to

³⁹ US, IV, p. 548.

⁴⁰ H. Begtrup, op. cit., II, p. 27.

⁴¹ US, VIII, pp. 372, 379.

administer Baptism and the Lord's Supper...It is only the Holy Spirit's means of grace which can give the Lord and the Church good...servants."⁴² "To my great amazement", Grundtvig has "discovered that the so-called Apostolic Succession or episcopal ordination in unbroken succession from the Apostles is the emptiest of all imaginings, since such ordinations did not exist in the Early Church. Even Peter Lombard finds that, while Bishops have the sole right to confirm and ordain, the office has no higher degree of ordination (ORDO), but only a rank and office (DIGNITAS and OFFICIUM), for there never have been higher degrees of ordination than that enjoyed by Deacons (preachers) and Presbyters (priests)."⁴³ About the same time, Grundtvig wrote that "an inherited Apostolic consecration" to which the Holy Spirit has bound the teaching gift, is a "papistic assertion" which "already for the sake of the Spirit's own freedom...must be rejected".⁴⁴

42 US, IX, pp. 403f.

43 Ibid., p. 403.

44 US,X, p. 179.

(b) The Rise of Norwegian Grundtvigianism.
W. A. Wexels (1797-1866)

The history of Grundtvigianism in Norway may be described briefly as follows: It gradually gathered strength from the time of the founding of the University until the 1850's. It then came under heavy attack from several quarters, and gradually declined until the division in its ranks and its disintegration as an ecclesiastical party by 1886.

At the outset, Grundtvig's anti-Rationalist crusade won him many supporters in Norway. In addition to Hersleb and Stenersen, he carried on a correspondence with a number of the leading Norwegian clergy (including the famous Johan Nordal Brun, Bishop of Bergen), as well as with several Haugean laymen.¹ His writings were widely read. His "matchless discovery" cost him the support of the theological faculty in Christiania, but he retained the friendship of Pastor Wilhelm Andreas Wexels, the man who was to become the leading spirit in the Grundtvigian movement in Norway.

Wexels was one of the noblest figures in the history of the Church of Norway. He had been a student of Hersleb and Stenersen, and was spiritually awakened by the lectures of the latter. For forty-seven years, he served as pastor in the same parish, the Cathedral Church of Our Saviour in Christiania, and he never rose higher than second pastor (RESIDERENDE KAPELLAN). Several times he received the majority of votes for the office of Bishop, but always declined

¹ A. Skrondal, Grundtvig og Noreg, p. 53.

the position. Nevertheless, he was the leading figure in Norwegian Church-life for many years, until about 1850. He was not a first-rate scholar, although he wrote prolifically. Irenic and positive, he yet possessed the courage of his convictions. Thorvald Klaveness called him "the spiritual centre" of the Hersleb-Stenersen clergy, their "ideal representative", not because of his great gifts but because of his Christian personality.² Through his devotional writings and hymns he won the hearts of the laity, until in the heat of theological controversy, they turned against him. He was a prominent member of several important ecclesiastical commissions, and was the first lecturer in practical theology at the University when the theological professors were relieved of this duty in 1849. He was for a time a close friend of the Moravian superintendent N. J. Holm, although the relationship cooled in later years; Wexels grew more critical of the Moravians as he became more Grundtvigian. Tolerant toward dissenters, Wexels was on the other hand both politically and ecclesiastically conservative. He must be regarded as the most influential representative of High-Churchmanship during his lifetime.

Wexels himself has stated that, so far as his conception of Christianity was concerned, he owed "more than he could say" to Grundtvig, "the great witness in the North".³

Inspired by Grundtvig's example in the Clausen case, the

² Quoted in J. B. Halvorsen, Norsk Forfatter-Lexicon, VI, p. 578.

³ Ibid., p. 576.

youthful curate ventured in 1828 to attack the Rationalism of the venerable Professor Niels Treschow, "learning's Nestor" in Norway. The brief conflict which followed "marks a turning point in Norwegian Church-life".⁴ Wexels and his friends continued to develop in a more confessional and Grundtvigian direction. In 1834, Wexels started the first theological periodical in Norway, Tids-skrift for Kirke-Kronike og Christelige Theologie, which ran for five years. Here for the first time he appears as a spokesman for the Churchly View. The very first article was entitled "Are we in Baptism made members of the true Christian Church?". Wexels states the problem: "When we are challenged to defend our true Christian community on the basis of Scripture, we do not shun this criterion. But...our opponents issue this challenge in order to make fools of us. For they immediately render Scripture useless for proof, by questioning the authenticity of passages and by employing such rules for exegesis as to make the real meaning of the Scriptures uncertain..." He counters with the Grundtvigian solution: "Therefore, we will not undertake any defence from Scripture...but keep to the historical witness for the genuineness of our Christianity..." The historical witness is to be found in the Church, and its content is embodied in the Apostles' Creed as it is confessed in Baptism. "We become Christians when we are baptized into the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost in the words of the Apostles' Creed, to which we pledge ourselves in Baptism."

4 A. Skrondal, op. cit., p. 66.

The Church is therefore built on this confession..."⁵ Wexels' understanding of the relation of the Creed to Scripture is significant. The Creed is not found verbatim in Scripture, but there is Scriptural evidence for every one of its articles. Wexels is reluctant to jettison the principle of Sola Scriptura, and apparently does so only because the Rationalists have abused it. He was never able like Grundtvig to label Scripture as a "dead" word. He does not place Scripture in opposition to the Creed; On the contrary, they agree. Yet the Creed becomes the basic key to Scripture, its interpretative principle.

Wexels also raises a problem which was destined to lead to a lengthy discussion in the Norwegian Church, and eventually to a famous legal case: The wording of the Third Article of the Creed. Luther's substitution of "Christian" for "Catholic" had been adopted in the Norwegian Altar Book (1688) and was prescribed by the Baptismal Ordinance of 1783. A number of other variants from the historically correct text had also come into use in various places, such as "I believe that there exists a holy, Christian Church", "which is the Communion of Saints", or "...the Communion of holy persons". In some parishes, the word "Catholic" (AL-MINDELIG, literally "common, universal") was used instead of "Christian".⁶ Wexels, as well as Grundtvig, regarded the wording of the Creed as of crucial importance for Baptism into the true Christian faith. Those baptized with

⁵ Tids-skrift for Kirke Kronike...I, 1834, p. 15.

⁶ A. Skrondal, op. cit., p. 133.

another wording are baptized into another faith, and are "not really members of the Church...". Their Baptism is not invalid, but "neither is it the same as our Baptismal covenant; Nor are they in every respect members of our Church".⁷ Presumably they need to be re-baptized. Wexels made a plea for the restoration of the word "Catholic" (ALMINDELIG) in the clause, and for the exclusive use of "I believe in one holy, catholic Church". He admits that we cannot believe in the Church in the same sense as we believe in the Persons of the Trinity, but this remains the correct wording. Moreover, he objects to the practice of regarding the phrase "The Communion of Saints" as a mere parenthesis or an explanatory gloss on "one holy, catholic Church".⁸

This article of Wexels evoked a sharp attack from Professor Stenersen, who particularly deplored Wexels' emphasis upon Tradition at the expense of Scripture and his suggestion of re-baptism.⁹ In reply, Wexels denied any contempt for Scripture, but upheld "the historical and Churchly witness". He insists that Baptism is "that source whence Christian life springs", and the Baptismal covenant must therefore be re-emphasized. To alter the wording of the Creed is to "play the Pope" and to establish a different Baptismal covenant, thus abrogating the true Baptismal covenant. Anyone who enters into this spurious covenant

⁷ TKK, I, p. 24.

⁸ Ibid., pp. 15ff.

⁹ Cf. pp. 103ff. above.

thereby removes himself "more or less" from the Catholic Church and deprives himself of its blessing.¹⁰ Wexels is careful to guard against an EX OPERE OPERATO Sacramentalism by insisting upon faith as well as Baptism. He admits that his suggestion of re-Baptism was an error, for "it is not the verbal statement...of the Creed but its living appropriation which in conjunction with Baptism makes a person a Christian". Anyone baptized into the Name of the Trinity is a Christian "as soon as he appropriates the Apostolic confession whereby Baptism can first begin its work". This would not be true of a Rationalist confession. Still, Wexels can conceive of cases in which an altered Creed would make re-Baptism necessary.¹¹

Wexels never abandoned this basic Grundtvigian position, "The Churchly View" as it was later called. His conviction grew stronger with the years. We shall examine some of his major writings on the subject.

The Churchly View occupies a prominent place in his Commentary on Ephesians and Colossians (1848). Commenting on Eph. 4:4ff., he declares that the Apostles' Creed is the Church's "foundation, the rule and norm for Christian interpretation of the prophetic and Apostolic Scriptures". The Church is built upon Baptism and the Creed. The Apostles' Creed is the original Apostolic confession. He does not, however, subscribe to the theory that the Creed was given

¹⁰ TKK, I, pp. 458f. For Wexels' views on Baptism, see further "Daaben frelser os", Kirkelig Folkeblad, II, pp. 145ff.

¹¹ Ibid.

to the Apostles by Jesus Himself. Belief that the Creed is Apostolic does not imply acceptance of the "improbable legend" that each clause came from one of the Apostles.¹² Even without this, it is "worthy to be regarded as the expression of that unity in the faith which the Lord and Spirit would have confessed by all the little ones who are to inherit God's Kingdom and be reborn to eternal life in Baptism".¹³ An alternative theory that Jesus dictated the Creed to the Apostles was an even more improbable legend. At this time, Wexels seems to have avoided the Achilles heel of the Churchly View.

Another interesting feature of his Commentary is his rejection of the distinction between the Visible and the Invisible Church. Like Luther and Grundtvig, Wexels emphasizes the tangibility of the Church. Indeed, he seems to go further, and to identify the empirical Church with the catholic Church: "The Visible Church is the revelation of the Invisible Church, and one cannot truly belong to the

12 The "improbable legend" that each of the Twelve proposed a clause is found (with the contribution of each Apostle identified) in the pseudo-Augustinian sermon De Symbolo, and in the writings of Priminus. But the belief that the Apostles drafted this summary of their future preaching, with the hint that each composed a clause, is found in the Commentarius in Symbolum Apostolorum, which probably dates from the beginning of the fifth century and was already old when he wrote. Its first literary appearances are perhaps a decade earlier than the work of Rufinus. See J.N.D. Kelly, Rufinus' Commentary on the Apostles' Creed, Ancient Christian Writers, Vol. XX, pp. 100f.

13 W. Wexels, Apostolen Paulus' breve til menighederne i Ephesus og Kolossae, Christiania, 1848, p. 72.

one without belonging to the other, one cannot be a Christian without being born of water and the Spirit, or continue a Christian without being nourished by the Word and the Lord's Supper."¹⁴

In 1849, Wexels was invited to deliver a lecture to the Christiania Theological Society on the subject "The Churchly View".¹⁵ He begins by defining the term "view"(ANSKUELSE) as it is used here as something intuitive, even Gnostic; It is not an "opinion", but "an inner vision, as a certain picture appears to the eye of the spirit in a definite form and draws the inner man to itself". The Churchly View forms "the basis for all my endeavour as a servant of the Word". It is the only "consistently Churchly" view. It breathes the spirit of Luther, and can be accepted by all faithful Lutherans. The lecture is an impassioned apology for the historical-Churchly as opposed to the Scriptural principle, and for the Baptismal covenant. It reveals a Wexels who is more thoroughly Grundtvigian than ever. He rejects in turn the various Orthodox attempts to maintain the Scriptural principle: By means of the principle of the internal testimony of the Spirit, the "analogy of faith", and the "new popery" of the Confessions. The Apostles' Creed is the one objective Rule of Faith, independent of Scripture, which can serve as a NORMA NORMANS for Scripture and which can ensure for us membership in the Apostolic Church. No longer does

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 70.

¹⁵ Printed in Theologisk Tidsskrift for den norske Kirke, 1849, pp. 521-549.

he regard the Divine origin of the Creed as an improbable legend. It is "a Word from the Lord's own mouth". He who gave the Apostles their witness must also have given them their Creed, which they have passed on to the Church. If the original Creed had ever been lost, no man could re-create it, and the Church would have died. But in fact the Church lives on, a historical reality whose existence has continued without interruption since the days of the Apostles. Therefore, its Creed must also be in existence and in evidence. The very fact that no Creed can be shown to be earlier establishes the originality of the Apostles' Creed. It was "transmitted from mouth to mouth for centuries", and this serves to explain why it is not found in Scripture or in the Fathers. Both Jerome and Ambrose advised against committing the Creed to writing, because it would be remembered better if it were transmitted orally.¹⁶

The best source-book for Wexels' theology is, however, his Lectures on Pastoral Theology, published in 1853. This book has been called the "PROGRAMSKRIFT" of Norwegian Grundtvigianism,¹⁷ and it is true that the Churchly View forms the underlying basis of the book. There is, however, another influence which is extremely prominent in this, the most

¹⁶ References to a discipline of secrecy with regard to the text of the Creed are fairly frequent in fourth century Fathers, e.g. Ambrose, de Cain et Abel, I, ix, 37 (C.S.E.L., I, p. 370); Rufinus, Comm. Symb. Apost. 2 (P.L., XXI, 338); And Jerome, c. Joann. Hieros. 28 (P.L., XXIII, 396). None of them, however, supports the reason for the custom given by Wexels.

¹⁷ A. Skrondal, Grundtvig og Noreg, p. 147.

High-Church of Wexels' writings, particularly in his discussion of the Ministry, the so-called Neo-Lutheranism. This party, which was particularly prominent in Germany at the time, included such men as Vilmar, Kliefoth, and particularly the Bavarian pastor Wilhelm Löhe. It especially emphasized the divine origin of the Church and the authority of the Ministry. It is evident that Wexels is strongly under the influence of this group; He quotes Löhe frequently. Indeed, it may be said that, while Wexels' doctrine of the Church is Grundtvigian, his doctrine of the Ministry is Neo-Lutheran.¹⁸

Wexels regards the doctrine of the Church as fundamental to a doctrine of the Ministry. He concedes a great deal to natural theology; The longing for fellowship with God is "the most essential characteristic of human nature". The distinction which he draws between the Kingdom of nature and the Christian Church, both of which belong to God, recalls Luther's doctrine of the Two Realms. Wexels finds no necessary conflict between them. At the same time, he makes the rather Hegelian prediction that the kingdom of nature is destined to become one with the Church in a final "highest development", in which all opposition between them will be abolished.¹⁹

The Church is not "a philosophy, an Idea..or anything subjective", but "the most objective reality" upon earth.

18 A. Brandrud, NTT, XII, p. 224. Cf. Prof. O. Kolsrud's opposition to the dissertation of A. Skrondal, in NTT, XXXI, p. 242.

19 W. Wexels, Foredrag over Pastoraltheologien, pp. 2-3.

As such, it belongs to history. Its origin is divine, and it is a "supernatural" reality, yet at the same time it is a "human" reality. The Church is thus a "double" reality. It is, on the one hand, "God's State, a theocracy, a hierarchy in the...highest, deepest, and truest sense". It is "a divine institution", "an organism through which an eternally happy family is created and preserved". It is "an organic unity based upon the means of grace...which the Lord uses to create and sustain his congregation..." On the other hand, the Church is "the people of God", "a community", "the congregation in and through which the means of grace are active..."²⁰ By this distinction between the Church as a Divine institution and as the people of God, Wexels maintains the dialectic of Article VII of the Augsburg Confession. But he clearly emphasizes and takes as his starting point the objective aspect, the means of grace, the activity of God directed toward man. He distinguishes between the "body" and the "spirit" both of the means of grace and the congregation; The former is visible, the latter invisible. As a people in faith, the congregation is invisible, but as a community confessing its faith and using the means of grace, it is visible. Thus here, although he has rejected the dualism between two Churches, he introduces the distinction in the form of a double aspect or character of the one Church. Wexels emphasizes the need for the body. The Holy Spirit "cannot be in the

20 Ibid., p. 4.

congregation without the body"; He cannot be active without the means of grace and the empirical Church.

To assist in the extension of the Kingdom of God is the vocation of every Christian, but especially of the pastor, whose work is connected with an office in the Church, a STAND. God's State demands its "officials", its "hierarchy", the means of grace their administrators. The Ministry is necessary: "It is through this office that the entire activity of the Church proceeds; Take away the Ministry, and the activity of the Church will either stop or dissolve into... arbitrary, anarchical confusion".²¹ When Christ founded the Church, He also founded the Ministry. All Christians are indeed commanded to confess Christ before men, but He chose certain persons for special training, and gave them greater authority. In the period between His resurrection and His ascension, a period "of the greatest possible importance both for the founding of the Church and of the Ministry", He "no doubt" gave them complete instructions regarding their work.²² They were conscious of having received an office, as is shown by their election of Matthias in Judas' place. After Pentecost, the Holy Spirit made it clear that He too chose to work through the Ministry. "If we fail to acknowledge the significance of the Ministry, we fail to understand the purposes and activity of the Holy Spirit."²³

²¹ Ibid., p. 10. There follows a lengthy quotation from L  he, in which he stresses the necessity of the Ministry, although he concedes that the Ministry was created for the sake of the means of grace and not the reverse.

²² Ibid., p. 13.

²³ Ibid., p. 16.

The office to which the Apostles were called was not intended for them only, but also for all who later receive "mediate" calls. "It is clear that the Lord instituted and the Spirit sealed a class (STAND) of teachers and stewards, which through a chain of persons was to continue...throughout all ages..."²⁴ This is not to say that the Ministry is any sort of caste, either above or apart from the congregation. The Ministry is "of the congregation, born of it by the call and ordination, just as the congregation itself is born through Baptism...". The Ministry "belongs to the congregation, lives in it, and vice versa, in unity..."²⁵ Wexels does not deny that the Lord can call witnesses outside the clerical STAND, "prophets" or "whatever an emergency might justify". But the divine institution of the clerical office is beyond dispute. Recognition of the clerical office goes hand in hand with a recognition of the significance of the means of grace. The Enthusiasts' rejection of the Ministry is in harmony with their neglect of the Sacraments and the outward Word. The whole Enthusiastic view of a spiritual inner Church, as opposed to the outward and the Sacramental "rests on a confusion of the Church with the fruits of the Church..."²⁶ Only through the means of grace is the "Apostolic genuineness" of the Church to be recognized. When the Enthusiasts substitute certain spiritual exercises for the Sacraments, this only goes to

²⁴ Ibid., pp. 17f.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 18.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 19.

prove the universal need for some means of grace.

Wexels objects strenuously to the democratizing tendency in the Church; This can "destroy the theocracy and transform God's order into an order of the congregation", and thus not only destroy the significance of the Ministry but also "break down the nature and principle of the Church". The idea that the office of the Ministry derives its "origin, authority, essence, and nature" from the congregation is "completely in conflict with the concept of the Church... and the needs of God's State". Wexels quotes with approval the judgement of L  he that it would be much more correct to say that the congregation derives from the Ministry. Christ Himself first exercised the office of the Ministry, then passed it on to the first members of His Church, "so that the congregation should be transplanted through it and grow, and so that [the office] itself should be transmitted as a permanent organ through which the congregation should receive life and nurture".²⁷ It is true that the minister is a representative of the congregation and that he officiates on its behalf. But his office does not have its "root" in the congregation. He is not a mere servant of the congregation. He is in duty bound to follow the Lord's instructions, and to avoid despotism, but it is of "extraordinary importance" that he be conscious of the divine origin of his office. It is also a "subjective necessity" for the congregation to see in their pastor a servant of Christ and a

²⁷ Ibid., p. 20.

messenger of God. He must be able to say: "I have my authority from the Lord; I act on His behalf and in His Name. If you reject me, you reject Him." The congregation is not well served when it is served by one to whom it has itself given authority.

Wexels next discusses the Universal Priesthood of believers²⁸, a subject which he developed further in a lecture before the Christiania Ministerial Association in 1858.²⁹ For the sake of convenience, we shall incorporate the content of the lecture here. Wexels begins with the Old Testament priesthood. In addition to the Levitical priesthood, there existed under the Old Covenant a priesthood of all believers. Both of these have their counterparts under the New Covenant, the one fulfilled and sustained in the High Priesthood of Christ, the other corresponding to the Christian priesthood of all believers. Apart from these two, the priesthood of the One and the priesthood of everyone, there is no priesthood under the New Covenant. Christian ministers are prophets, and should not be called "priests". Although the two have often been confused (even by Luther), the Universal Priesthood is entirely different from the teaching and preaching office. Such passages as I. Peter 2:5-9 and Rev. 5:10, which can be used as SEDES DOCTRINAE for the Universal Priesthood, do not refer to the preaching office, but to the obligation of the Christian to offer

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 21-23.

²⁹ W. Wexels, Om det bibelske Begreb af det almindelige Praestedømme, Chra., 1858.

prayer, thanks, and himself to God. It is true that all Christians have the right and duty to witness, but this does not include teaching and preaching, "to which belong a special call from God, mediate or immediate".³⁰ St. Paul expressly forbids all to prophesy (I. Cor. 14:23-35, I. Tim. 2:12). Women possess the Universal Priesthood, but not the office of the Ministry. Wexels regards lay-preaching as a threat to Church Order. Obviously under the influence of Luther, he advises the people to remain in their respective callings and exercise their priesthood there, for "it is not the work that makes a priest, but a priest that does the work".

Wexels insists upon the necessity of both an inner and an outer call to the Ministry.³¹ Possession of the office does not necessarily mean that the incumbent has a true vocation. Indeed, it sometimes happens that the office is abused by those who are called by men but not by God, although God can use even these men. But a divine office demands a divine call. While this is both "subjective" and "objective", the latter is the call in the truest sense. The objective call comes from God as well as the subjective, even when it occurs "mediately" and is largely dependent upon human agencies. Wexels maintains that even the immediate calls to the Apostles and Prophets occurred through some outward sign, "something seen or heard". Historically, the mediate

³⁰ Ibid., p. 24.

³¹ W. Wexels, Foredrag over Pastoraltheologien, pp. 28-33.

call was first introduced through the Apostles, was later issued through the whole clergy or through the congregations, and now comes through the State Church Order.

Wexels holds a high view of ordination. It is something more than a mere ceremony, and a necessary concomitant to the call. "Only through such a sealing is the call a true ecclesiastical authorization to administer the office." It corresponds to the laying on of hands practiced by the Apostles.³² In ordination, the candidate receives the office, and "enters the Lord's STAND, in the chain of successors to the Apostles".³³ Through ordination, the office is "transmitted through all ages, and gains its Apostolic truth for the incumbent". The RITE VOCATUS of Article XIV of the Augsburg Confession thus includes "either ordination or the qualifications to receive it".³⁴ Ordination is a "purely ecclesiastical" act; It can only be conferred by the Church, not as the State Church, but as the Church of Jesus Christ. Through ordination, the candidate "is marked with a priestly character...which cannot be ecclesiastically erased except by another ecclesiastical act corresponding to ordination and exercised with the same authority..."³⁵ That it can only be administered by persons who are themselves ordained is not only "natural", but it is "an Apostolic-Churchly ordinance, grounded in the very origin and significance of

32 Ibid., p. 40.

33 Ibid., p. 36.

34 Ibid., p. 36n.

35 Ibid., pp. 44f.

the office".³⁶ The Lutheran Confessions "seem to" present a true concept of ordination, although they are not as clear as they might be. Wexels deplores the way Lutheran theologians have "wavered" on the doctrine of ordination. Lately, they have displayed a "panicky...and disgraceful fear" of Roman error. He raises the question whether true episcopacy has not disappeared where the SUCCESIO APOSTOLICA has been broken, and whether the "special authority" of the "special office of a Bishop" is not the authority to ordain. He wonders whether in the loss of SUCCESSIO APOSTOLICA "a departure from the original has not occurred, a mistake been made, a good thing lost, which cannot be wholly without consequence..." He declines to go into these questions further. He is certain, however, that Protestant ordination "administered through ordained persons and in accordance with Apostolic practice in that Church which is founded on the Apostolic Baptism and Faith" is valid, and that Church bodies which no longer possess the SUCCESSIO APOSTOLICA are not necessarily to be deemed heretical.³⁷

Ordination carries with it a special anointing. "The Holy Spirit is present in ordination in a special way and bestows His grace and anointing..."³⁸ Christ received the Spirit when He was about to enter upon the office, although He had the Spirit from birth. Likewise the Christian minister; He is born a priest in Baptism, and anointed

³⁶ Ibid., p. 36.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 38n.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 45.

with the Spirit in ordination. The "driving power" behind the life of the Christian should be the fact that he is anointed in Baptism. The driving power behind the life of a minister should be the fact that he is anointed in ordination. This is not a "human-personal" but an "office-personal" anointing, and is present and active whenever he performs ministerial acts as commanded by the Lord.

No one is a minister "according to Apostolic order" without ordination. A layman may, in emergency, perform ministerial functions: He can administer Baptism, preach, and in extreme emergency even give Absolution and administer the Lord's Supper. It is permissible for "several families" to come together for "private devotions". Itinerant preaching, however, is dangerous. It can easily become "both objectively and subjectively objectionable", and represents an intrusion upon the divinely-sanctioned Church order.³⁹

(c) The Catechism Controversy and
The Alienation of the Laity. Olaus Nielsen (1810-88)

Grundtvigianism gathered strength until well into the 1850's. This was largely due to the activity of Wexels, but there were other factors as well. It had a spokesman on the Theological Faculty in the person of Professor Kaurin; And its openness in the cultural sphere appealed to the Hersleb-Stenersen clergy. Grundtvig's one and only

³⁹ Ibid., p. 49.

visit to Christiania in 1851 took on the character of a triumphal entry. It appeared to many as though the Grundtvigians might be the leading party in the Church of Norway for some time to come.

During the 1840's, however, two events occurred which were eventually to prove catastrophic for the Churchly View. Both were a part of the strong confessional reaction which, aided by the milder Lutheran Orthodoxy of Hersleb and Stenersen, swept into Norway at this time. The first event was the so-called "Catechism Controversy" which broke out in 1843; It was to cost Grundtvigianism the support of the "awakened laity". The second was the election to the Theological Faculty of Carl Paul Caspari in 1847 and Gisle Johnson in 1849. This development turned the Theological Faculty against the Churchly View, and later led to the defection of Professor Kaurin.

Prior to 1843, various editions of Pontoppidan's Catechism Sandhed til Gudfrygtighed were in general use.¹ In 1839, a committee consisting of Professors Kaurin and Keyser and Pastor Wexels was commissioned to revise the Catechism. In 1843, the use of their revision was authorized by Royal Resolution.² The use of older versions was permitted for a limited period of five years.

1 The edition used in the present study is Sandhed til Gudfrygtighed, ...udi en...forklaring over Dr. Martin Luthers liden Catechismo...Christiansand, 1817--cited as Sandhed.

2 Udtog af Dr. Erich Pontoppidans Forklaring, omarbeidet af en dertil naadigst nedsat commission, Christiania, 1845---cited as Udtog.

The Revised Catechism evoked a storm of protest from a section of the laity. In part it represented a protest against the bureaucratic manner in which the book was authorized, an expression of the rising opposition to the official class. But doctrinal matters were also at stake.

Theologically, the controversy may be described as a conflict between 18th century Pietism and 19th century Grundtvigianism. Two of the major conflicts, one over the question of the adiaphora and the other over Christ's descent into Hell (where the Revised Catechism left the door open for the Grundtvigian belief in the possibility of conversion after death) are not directly relevant to our purposes. The texts are, however, set out in an Appendix. (Appendix I).

The statements about the Church are, however, of direct importance to our subject, and must be discussed in greater detail. The difference is already apparent in the text of the Apostles' Creed as given in the two documents. Here Sandhed gives a paraphrase of the authentic text which replaces belief in the Church by a mere statement of its existence, glosses "Catholic" by the addition of "Christian" and plainly equates the Communion of Saints with the Church. Pietist influence could not be more strongly displayed. What, however, Udtog understood by the restored text is clear from two additional articles. The first explains what is meant by belief in the Church and is more restrained in tone than might have been expected. The second glosses "The Communion of Saints" in a thoroughly Grundtvigian manner. The accent falls upon the corporate

and a noteworthy point is its inclusion both of the living and the dead within the fellowship of the Body of Christ.

In the definition of the Church, Sandhed approaches the Church from the subjective point of view, as a community of regenerate persons. Udtog, on the other hand, defines it in more objective terms as a confessing community marked out by Baptism and the profession of the Christian Faith. Its tendency to draw only broad limits to the Church was the principal rock of offense to its opponents. While Sandhed restricts the marks of the Church to "the pure preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments", Udtog asks "Which is the Christian Faith?", and replies in terms reminiscent of the Baptismal Formula and the Apostles' Creed. A functional definition of the Church is replaced by the Grundtvigian approach to the Church through the Creed. A new question included in Udtog expounds the holiness of the Church in terms of the Baptismal Covenant and the operation of the Holy Spirit through the means of grace. It is possible to infer that any similar article in Sandhed would have spoken of a community of holy persons understood in the sense of the regenerate.

Sandhed emphasizes the distinction between the Visible and Invisible Church, admitting the existence both of hypocrites and true Christians in the undifferentiated mass of the Visible Church. The membership of the Invisible Church is hidden amid the great mass of hypocrites who cannot always be discerned. Apparently then to Sandhed, they can

sometimes be detected. The corresponding article in Udtog restricts itself to the Visible Church, admits the existence therein both of hypocrites and true members. Where, however, Sandhed merely speaks of the true Christians as those who in faith do God's will, Udtog defines them as "those who keep their Baptismal Covenant".

The clergy generally accepted the Revised Catechism (Udtog).³ The laity, led by a few turbulent spirits, did not. For several years, they submitted a steady stream of protests to the Storting and to Wexels. Fresh from their triumphs in the repeal of the Conventicle Act and the founding of the Norwegian Missionary Society in 1842, the "awakened laity" threw their weight against the "Wexels book", as it was sometimes erroneously designated.

Drammen appears to have been the first centre of opposition. Among the attacks on Udtog which emanated from there was an anonymous pamphlet published by a teacher, Kristofer Bratten. Among his objections was the question on the nature of the Church. He charged that Udtog was "in error" because it made a person a member of the Church "by mere Baptism and Christian confession, whether or not he is holy".⁴ Here speaks the authentic voice of aroused Pietism.

After 1848, however, the leader of the opposition was a remarkable layman from Fredrikshald, Olaus Nielsen.

3 A. Skrondal, op. cit., p. 114.

4 K. Bratten, Nogle Bemaerkninger..., p. 8.

His life story is strange and romantic. He was reared in poverty and was burdened with financial problems for the greater part of his life. He was completely self-taught, experienced a sudden conversion at the age of 24, and thereafter "viewed everything through Pietistic spectacles". (Skron-dal). "Like most self-taught men, he had an unlimited self-confidence and a naive certainty that his own opinions corresponded exactly to objective Christian truth as revealed in Scripture...Gifted, energetic, and aggressive, but one-sided, stubborn and fanatical,...he eventually became isolated and lost the position of leadership which his abilities and the circumstances had given him."⁵ Thwarted temporarily as a lay-preacher, Nielsen turned to writing, and published his own material. For ten years (1848-57), he edited and published Kirkelig Tidende (Church Times), the first Church paper in Norway edited for the laity.⁶ At one time, it had a circulation of 2000, a large figure for that time. In his self-assumed role as the defender of Orthodoxy, he issued re-prints of the oldest editions of Luther's Catechism he could find, as well as a Bible from the time of Pontoppidan, "examined and corrected by O. Nielsen". Undoubtedly his life-work was much coloured by class hatred. But Nielsen is worth studying, for in many respects he was "a typical

⁵ L. Selmer, "Olaus Nielsen", in NBL, X, pp. 66f.

⁶ Nielsen explains his use of the adjective "kirkelig". He says that there are many periodicals which give "historical reports" about the Visible Church, but none so far as he knows which treats of the affairs of the Invisible Church. His paper was intended to fill this need. Kirkelig Tidende, 1849-50, p. 19.

representative of the lay viewpoint of his day" (Skrondal). His Churchmanship "bore the mark of the conventicle, which he sought to organize as a Church" (Selmer). He was one of the earliest spokesmen for Church reform; He urged the introduction of parish councils, in order to protect the congregations from "false teachers". While Nielsen vigorously defended his own freedom of conscience, he displayed an unwavering intolerance toward the opinions of others. As time went on, he grew increasingly sectarian. In 1849, he discussed in print the possibility of withdrawal from the State Church; In 1855, he asserted the right of the laity to celebrate the Eucharist; And the following year, he supported Pastor Lammers' attack on Infant Baptism, and followed him out of the State Church.

From the year 1846, Nielsen regarded it as his life mission to eradicate the Churchly View. He directed his attack first against Wexels (both personally and theologically), then against the clergy as a whole, and finally against the entire institution of the Church. Wexels in his turn, in unusually violent language, placed Nielsen in the same class as Marcus Thrane, the leader of the budding labour movement; Both men were "wild, destructive spirits, the one attacking the State, the other the Church".⁷

As early as 1842, Nielsen had published a small pamphlet on the doctrine of the Church.⁸ He was particularly

7 A. Skrondal, op. cit., p. 121.

8 O. Nielsen, Kort Udsigt over Kirken, Fredrikshald, 1842.

concerned to establish the right and duty of the laity to preach. With this purpose in mind, he shortly thereafter inaugurated a "proper work", on which he laboured for the next three years. At the time, publication proved impossible owing to lack of funds, but shortly afterwards, the author was encouraged by Bratten to publish it as a counter-blast to the Revised Catechism.⁹ In revised form, it appeared in 1847 under the title Kirken eller hellige Menneskers-Samfund fremstillede i Betragtninger over den tredje Artikel, etc. (The Church, or the community of holy persons, presented in studies on the Third Article, etc.). This amazing book is a "proper work" of no fewer than 511 pages; It is the chief source for our purpose. A verbose, repetitious, confused, and sometimes contradictory book, it is nevertheless a fantastic accomplishment for a man like Nielsen. It reveals at the same time an author of great native intelligence and energy, and a man handicapped in his judgements by lack of education and therefore doubly dangerous. It represents Biblicism and Pietism in extreme form. It is a morass of proof-texts, and the sharp distinction between the world and the Communion of Saints is repeatedly emphasized. Anti-clericalism is also very much in evidence.

⁹ Kirkelig Tidende, 1858, pp. 19f. Nielsen explains that he had originally been moved to write by the activity of the noted jurist C. W. Hjelm. Hjelm, whose position has been described as "ultra-State-Church", was the author of a bill (1840) to limit freedom of religion together with a scurrilous attack on the lay movement. (See further the chapters on Inner Mission and Reform.) The copies both of the book Kirken... and of KT now in the University Library in Oslo were formerly in the library of Gisle Johnson.

The book is a discussion of the entire Third Article of the Creed, as it appears in Luther's Catechism. Nielsen's version of the Article reads: "I believe...that there exists a holy, Christian Church, which is a communion of holy persons..."

He defines the Church as "the congregation of God, God's own people, God's believing assembly", "those who repent and believe". It is a little flock, a holy seed. Indeed, the community of holy persons is called (by the world) sectarian, separatist, Enthusiastic, and is persecuted, because the world knows not God.¹⁰ Nielsen naturally draws a sharp distinction between the Visible and the Invisible Church. The Visible Church, which includes "all who are called to the Kingdom of God", is not the true Church, for "everything visible is subject to vanity, change, and destruction, but the invisible is everlasting".¹¹ The true Church is invisible, since its faith and its communion with Christ are invisible, it is concerned with invisible things, and it consists of invisible essences (The Holy Trinity, Angels, "united spirits"). It is "spiritual". The lengths to which Nielsen could go in spiritualizing the Church are well illustrated by his statement that, as Christ the Head is invisible, so is His Body.¹² He attacks the Revised Catechism's definition of the Church as "all baptized persons". This Church is composed of

¹⁰ O. Nielsen, Kirken..., pp. 153, 160. Cf. also KT, 1851-2, pp. 1-25.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 153.

¹² Ibid., p. 156.

"people who are incapable of faith or good works, their understanding darkened..." When CARNIS MINISTERIUM...is called "the Church", the Church becomes a Jewish school, ...always subject to the taste of the people and the demands of the day...a mere folk-Church, which stands under the lordship of the clergy or the people...the fleshly Church will deny the existence of the spiritual Church and will deny the SPIRITUS MINISTERIUM..."¹³ Like most Haugeans, Nielsen was continually on his guard against a false security in Baptism. He does not deny Baptismal regeneration; Children are "grafted into " Christ in Baptism. But he emphasizes the need for repentance and faith, for the many who break their Baptismal covenant, who have "put on" Christ in Baptism but have since put Him off again by sin and unbelief, and who consequently are not members of the invisible Church. Baptism "is really intended for those who confess their sins and repent, for only these profit thereby..."¹⁴ Parents should take steps to ensure that their children remain in Christ. Thus Nielsen does not at this time reject Infant Baptism, but he has a pessimistic view of its lasting efficacy, together with a deep dissatisfaction with contemporary Baptismal practice.

Nielsen was not, however, content to leave the Church

13 Ibid., pp. 371-372n. This is the earliest use I have found of the term "folk-Church". In opposition to the Grundtvigians, the "awakened laity" naturally used the term in a derogatory sense.

14 Ibid., p. 227.

completely invisible. In his view, the Church is made visible through 1) Christian conversation, 2) the fruits of faith (love, joy, peace, and the like), 3) devotions in the home, and 4) public worship, in the Church and "elsewhere". The conventicle is essential to a "true visible communion". Where there are no conventicles, "there is no right Visible Church-communion, no matter how many Churches and Church-goers". "The visibility of such a communion depends primarily upon the conventicles".¹⁵

Despite the all-too-obvious subjectivism of Nielsen's approach to and concept of the Church, he is nevertheless aware that the means which God uses to gather the Church are the objective means of grace, the Word and the Sacraments. The marks of the Church are the pure preaching of the Word and the right use of the Sacraments, although these are ascribed to the "true Visible Church", by which he apparently means the Church made visible in the sense explained above. For this conclusion, he found support in three facts: 1) The Scriptural description of the true Church, 2) The fact that the Church is gathered by the means of grace, and 3) The fact that the true believers separate themselves from the false members(!).

One rather confusing section in Nielsen's book is his treatment of the "causes" (aarsag) of the Church. The first cause (VIRKENDE AARSAG) is the Holy Trinity. The efficient cause (BEVAEGENDE AARSAG) is three-fold:

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 163.

1) human need, 2) the grace of God, and 3) the sacrifice of Christ. Again, he speaks of the "cause" of the Church as being 1) the praise of God, and 2) the repentance and salvation of mankind. In this case, the word is used in the sense of a final cause to denote the *raison d'être* or purpose of the Church.¹⁶

In chapter X, "On the difference between the Church established and founded by the Lord and the Church caused by the world and established by human concepts", Nielsen develops his argument against the Revised Catechism. The former is his "holy Christian Church", the latter the "holy catholic Church" of the Catechism.

As we have noted, he rejects the definition of the Church proposed by the Catechism. "All Church parties... all heretics, Enthusiasts, false teachers, blasphemers, liars, murderers, villains, sinners, and unrighteous men, if only they be baptized and for the sake of show attend public worship," are members of this new "Christian Church"¹⁷

Nielsen denies the assertion of the Catechism that the holiness of the Church is due to the means of grace and the Holy Spirit. "The means of grace are secure enough in themselves, but can this Church build anything defensible on them?...How many of all these baptized persons actually serve God?...only a few..."¹⁸ Nielsen has previously defined

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 154.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 375.

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 376f. Cf. P. 379: "The means of grace can save no one unless he allows them to awaken and convert him."

the holiness of the Church in eight points: The Church is holy because of the holiness of 1) its founder, 2) the means whereby it is built, 3) the believers, 4) God's hands, which use the believers as instruments, 5) the hearts of the believers, 6) its doctrine, 7) its persecution, and 8) its everlasting character. Where any of these is missing, there is no holy Church.¹⁹

On the catholicity of the Church, the Revised Catechism had stated that it was the Church's destiny "to include all men". Nielsen holds that it is the Church's destiny to preach the Gospel to all men, but not to include all men, because all do not, unfortunately, believe the Gospel.²⁰ He refuses to call the Church "catholic", or ALMINDELIG. For this he seems to give two reasons. He identifies the term with the Roman Catholic Church and her errors. The Church of the Pope is the only "ALMINDELIG" Church (pp. 373, 378n.), and it is a false Church (p. 374). The true Church, on the other hand, is too small a group to be called ALMINDELIG (p. 361). After all, Christ's Person and doctrine were UALMINDELIG ("uncommon"). Here Nielsen is obviously playing upon an ambiguity in the meaning of the word. To the objection that Pontoppidan uses the term, he merely replies that he may be excused for this error (p. 378n.).

Nielsen refused to confess to any faith in the Church. The "falseness" of the Revised Catechism's Church is shown by its demand to be believed in, especially when it is such

19 Ibid., p. 135.

20 Ibid., p. 372.

a mixed body. To believe in the Church must mean either that "the smaller group [the Communion of Saints] is to believe in the larger [the confessing community of baptized persons] , or that we are to believe in the clergy...because the Church's doctrine is given to them...an 'infallible' teaching estate, who understand religion better than others".²¹ Nielsen misinterprets the Revised Catechism's qualitative distinction between Church and Communion of Saints as a quantitative distinction, and regards this as still another evidence of the falseness of its Church. "They will not recognize the Communion of Saints as the Church, for they would condemn it as sectarian, but they would have themselves and the world designated as the Church".²²

Naturally, Nielsen's concept of the Ministry stresses the Universal Priesthood, the charismatic principle, and the inner call. All Christians are priests, and it is the duty of all to spread the Gospel, "through the Spirit, grace and power active within us". Some have the power and the charisma to preach. Others are to witness by Godly life and conversation "within their own circle". The inner call is as legitimate, though less apparent, as the pastor's call. It cannot be called illegitimate, for it is God's call, and His call must be regarded as legitimate, although it may not be as "regular" as we might wish. Study,

21 Ibid., p. 362.

22 Ibid., p. 362.

examination, and ordination, (although Nielsen does not reject or regard these things as unprofitable), are not the way to the clerical office, but "repentance and faith". The outer call is worthless without the inner call.²³ The ordained Ministry is not "unnecessary or superfluous... God forbid!" "There are some pastors who speak in Christ", although most "counterfeit God's Word..." But the clergyman who denies the right of lay-preaching "offends against the true priesthood, and bears the name of pastor in vain".²⁴ Nielsen strongly defends conventicles: "To forbid conventicles is the same as to forbid the clergy to preach the Gospel; For, since the conventicle is an inevitable fruit of the preaching of the Gospel, the Gospel must be suppressed lest it create conventicles".²⁵

Such was the position of Olaus Nielsen. If he can be regarded as typical of the awakened laity in 1847, he was not in his later years. By 1877, when he wrote Nogle Ord om Sekter og Kirken (Some words on Sects and the Church), he had moved still further in a Spiritualist direction in his doctrine of the Church, and become an advocate of ecclesiastical anarchy. In this work, he purported to show from Scripture and from Church history that both the sects and the Churches are "false". Sects have a way of turning into Churches, and all organized Churches are "Babylon, the whore", and represent something "mysterious" and "foreign"

²³ Ibid., pp. 317f.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 369n.

²⁵ Ibid., pp. 300f.

which has interposed itself between Christ and the congregation. The Christian should seek God directly, and avoid all Churches and sects.

Wexels attempted to defend himself and his views in his Open Declaration (AABEN ERKLAERING, 1845) and A Peaceful Word... (Et Fredens Ord..., 1852). The former is not relevant here, as it is concerned exclusively with the question of Christ's descent into Hell. The latter is a defence of the historically correct form of the Third Article. Wexels claims that, since the appropriation of the Creed is a condition of membership in the Church, its wording is of vital importance; After all, the words carry the meaning. He presents a lengthy apology for the word "catholic" (ALMINDELIG) from the Confessions and the Lutheran dogmaticians. Moreover, this is in fact the meaning which Luther attached to the term "Christian", although he was guilty of a "misunderstanding" when he employed the word GEMEINDE instead of GEMEINSCHAFT in his translation of "the Communion of Saints" into German. Wexels can quote Arndt, Spener, and Francke in support of the correct text and the drawing of a distinction between "the holy catholic Church" and "the Communion of Saints".

Et Fredens Ord is also a plea for the freedom to use the correct form. The situation at the time was somewhat confused. In 1850, the Ministry for Church Affairs had

published an official edition of the Symbolical Books approved by the Theological Faculty in which the Creed appeared in the correct form.²⁶ A large meeting of clergy at Lillehammer the same year, in which Gisle Johnson himself participated, unanimously approved the new translation and called for its introduction into the Baptismal Ritual. For some inexplicable reason, however, no Royal Resolution to this effect was forthcoming. The form authorized by the Baptismal Ordinance of 1783 remained the only legally acceptable form.

Wexels pleads for "the greatest possible freedom and the least possible compulsion within the boundaries of the State Church". Since the State Church has long permitted the use of various forms, it ought to continue to do so. He asserts that any pastor who utilizes the correct form is "well within his rights", but if he were to be denied the freedom to use it, he would have no recourse but to resign. In point of fact, many had already begun to use the correct form. But the conditional reference to resignation was destined in time to prove prophetic.

Wexels received surprisingly little support from others. One of the two men who sought to defend him, however, was Professor Kaurin. In reply to Bratten, he published a little book entitled Some Words to the Norwegian Church..., in which he assumed the major responsibility for the Revised Catechism. This work leaves no doubt of Kaurin's

²⁶ The committee which prepared the new translation and edition consisted of Pastor Fangen, Prof. Kaurin, and -- Wexels.

Grundtvigianism. The Church is "the Christian congregation, the historical Christian Church, which was founded by the Holy Spirit through the Word and Baptism on the first Pentecost... and which has remained and evolved by means of the transmitted means of grace...throughout 1800 years...".²⁷

Kaurin attempts to defend the Revised Catechism by drawing a distinction between the subjects discussed by Sandhed and Udtog. Sandhed identified the Church with the Communion of Saints, and is therefore talking about the Invisible Church. Udtog is talking about the "historic, Christian Church", i.e. the Visible Church, although he says that the terms Visible and Invisible Church are not used in Udtog because they are not Scriptural and "do not serve to clarify the concepts". Pontoppidan's identification of these two statements in the Creed is erroneous, for three reasons:

1) Ἐκκλησία is not the same as κοινωνία, for the latter is never used by the New Testament or the Fathers in the sense of "assembly"; 2) Such an appository gloss would be superfluous; And 3) Scripture includes hypocrites and false members in the holy catholic Church. As evidence, he cites such parables as the Wheat and the Tares, the Drag-net, and the Wedding of the King's Son.²⁸ Moreover, the Apology to the Augsburg Confession includes the hypocrites as members according to the "outward marks", "the Word, Confession of faith, and the Sacraments". Kaurin regards Christian Baptism

27 J. Kaurin, Nogle Ord til den norske Kirke..., p. 24.

28 Ibid., pp. 22f.

and confession of the Christian Faith as the conditions the Church demands for reception into membership. He points out however, that the Revised Catechism guards against the view that Baptism and confession guarantee salvation. In question 415, the question is asked: "Are all saved who are baptized and who confess the Christian faith?", and the answer is given: "No. Only the Church's true members are saved." And the following question clearly distinguishes between "two kinds" of members in the empirical Church, hypocrites and true Christians.

We have examined only a part of the literature in the Catechism Controversy, in order to present the issues and the principal positions. The result of the controversy was a victory for the awakened laity. The Revised version, which by the best estimate had been introduced into most of the town Churches and about a third of the rural Churches, was not recalled. But in 1852, the Government rescinded its order to withdraw the older versions. Molland says that the Government yielded at this point because it feared a Free-Church movement and even a possible revolution; 1848 was still fresh in the memory of everyone. Although the controversy abated after 1852, it was only with the publication of H. U. Sverdrup's revision of Pontoppidan in 1864, a revision more to the liking of the laity, that the matter was finally closed.

(d) Grundtvigianism in Ascendancy.
 Fredrik A. Wexelsen (1818-96) and
 Johannes W. C. Dietrichson (1815-83)

Grundtvigianism continued, however, to gain supporters. About this time, the party assumed the spiritual leadership of the Church of Denmark, although it never embraced a majority of the Church people. The important "All-Scandinavian Church Meetings" held in Copenhagen (1857), Lund (1859), and Christiania (1861) were inaugurated on the initiative of the Grundtvigians and dominated by them, except for the delegates from Sweden, where Grundtvigianism has never possessed any significant following. Grundtvigian circles sprang up here and there in Norway. In 1857, the party began publication of Kirkeligt Folkeblad, under the able editorship of Pastor Fredrik A. Wexelsen and O.A.T. Krogness. This excellent paper was to serve as the Grundtvigian organ in Norway for fourteen years. Moreover, the movement underwent a significant change in character about this time. In addition to its function as a religious and ecclesiastical party, it gradually broadened to include a movement for popular education and culture as well. It provided a haven for men of varying shades of liberal opinion. The change in the general situation in the Church brought the Grundtvigians face to face with new opponents. Rationalism was vanquished; From this time forward, its adversaries were revived Orthodoxy and Pietism and the forces of political and cultural reaction.

As representative of Norwegian Grundtvigianism at this period, we propose to discuss the ecclesiology of Fredrik A. Wexelsen and J. W. C. Dietrichson.

F. A. Wexelsen , the brilliant and gifted vicar of Baklandet Church in Trondhjem, was a nephew of Wexels, and shared his uncle's nobility of character and dedication to the pastoral task. Even his opponents praised him, and Skron-dal asserts that in different circumstances, he would certainly have risen to the office of Bishop. Apart from Wexels, he was the foremost spokesman for the Churchly View in Norway.

The very first article in Kirkeligt Folkeblad came from his pen, and was entitled, significantly enough, "The Christian Church".¹ It was followed later the same year by another, entitled "For Further Explanation".² Although he shows signs of original thinking, Wexelsen does not diverge from Grundtvig or Wexels in any essential point. His fundamental approach and starting point is thoroughly objective; He begins with the means of grace. The presence of Christ is indissolubly linked with the means of grace. Whereever He is, there is the Church. "The true Church is present wherever people gather about the means of grace which He has given them...wherever God speaks to us and deals with us...as Father, Saviour, and Sanctifier."³ Wexelsen defends the Grundtvigians against the charge that they "overvalue" the

1 "Den Kristne Kirke", KF, I, pp. 6-26, 33-45.

2 "Til Naermere Forklaring", KF, I, pp. 209ff., 225ff.

3 KF, I, p. 9.

means of grace. This, in his view, would be impossible. He defines the means of grace as the Word and the two Sacraments, but it is evident from the context that he does not mean to identify the Word with Scripture. He can also define the means of grace simply as "the Sacraments".⁴ The Word is primarily the Grundtvigian "living Word" which comes to man through the Sacraments. Wexelsen says that the encounter between God and man "does not occur secretly, but in a visible, sensible divine act, namely in Baptism into the Name of the Triune God".⁵ Baptism is the "entrance", the "gate" to the Church, and the "basic concept" of the Church, upon which it rests and which distinguishes it from every other community.⁶ To Baptism is indissolubly connected the "Covenant", which God makes with those who wish to be received into His fellowship. Thus, faith also belongs to the "basic concept" of the Church; Those who renounce the devil and confess the Faith constitute, together with God, the Church. God continues and perfects His work in them through the Word and the Lord's Supper. For baptized believers, the preached Word is an "explanation" and a "quickening" of the Baptismal gift of grace, and an admonition to an ever-increasing appropriation of the gift. For the unbaptized and the unbeliever, it is a call to repentance and an invitation to Christ.

Wexelsen emphasizes, however, the essential dialectic

4 KF, I, pp. 215, 227.

5 KF, I, p. 11.

6 KF, I, p. 12.

of the Lutheran doctrine of the Church. In using the term "Church", he explains, "we are thinking partly of the means of grace, through which Christ dwells in those who believe, partly of the community of persons who are regenerated and sanctified by the means of grace. It has been and still is the source of much misunderstanding, suspicion, and needless strife that many, when they hear the word "Church", only have the latter sense in mind. The Church belongs not only to the Christian people (the saints), but also to their King and Lord, Who through the means of grace dwells among them."⁷ The Church is "a State", "God's Kingdom on earth", and this belongs both to people and King. Without the community of believers, there are no means of grace in living use, there is no Christ in action on earth; But neither is there any congregation without the means of grace.⁸

Wexelsen is not averse to using the terms Visible and Invisible Church, but he repeatedly stresses the fact that these do not represent two Churches, but merely two aspects of the one Church. Like Wexels, he describes the Church as possessing both a Body and a Soul. This distinction is not identical with the distinction between the Church as the bearer of the means of grace and as the community of believers, but rather with its Visible and Invisible aspects in either case. The Church as institution possesses both a body and a soul, and is both visible and invisible. Likewise the Church as the community of believers; Its faith

⁷ KF, I, p. 14.

⁸ Ibid., p. 15.

is invisible, but its persons are visible, and it is "recognizable" (KJENDELIG) by "its Baptism and confession, its life, and its conflict with the world". Wexelsen takes exception to the assertion that we are saved only as members of the Invisible Church and not as members of the Visible Church. This is merely to confuse the issue, and would lead to an underevaluation of the importance of membership in the Visible Church. On the contrary, this is necessary, for we are not saved without the means of grace, we do not find Christ outside His institutions, and rightly understood, there is no salvation outside the Church.⁹ Yet we must use these institutions aright, and appropriate life and the Spirit through the means of grace. Wexelsen admits that the Church has her "dead" members, but he cannot accept the identification of the Visible Church with the confessing community and the identification of the Invisible Church with the believing community. Nor can he accept the identification of the phrase "the Communion of Saints" with the Invisible Church. He struggles manfully to avoid a dualism at this point. The Church on earth must put up with false Christians, and reckon all who "voluntarily confess the Christian Faith" as members, unless their lives obviously give the lie to their profession. It is a "mixed assembly of genuine and false members". Not all those who have been baptized are members of the Church; Some "reject the Faith...", although they

⁹ Ibid., p. 22.

may be members of the State Church. It is necessary to distinguish between "Christendom" and "God's congregation". Nevertheless, Wexelsen asserts that "all who accept and appropriate the...Baptismal covenant are members...when they are rightly baptized with the Church's Baptism...God has offered us salvation on these terms, and we must neither add nor subtract anything from them".¹⁰

Like Wexels, Wexelsen insists upon describing the Church as "catholic" (ALMINDELIG), because "it is her destiny to embrace all men". No one has any right whatever to alter the Baptismal covenant by changing the wording of the Creed. Luther was wrong to substitute "Christian" for "catholic", though he interpreted it in this sense. We must confess faith in the "catholic" Church, lest we give Rome reason to call us apostate. Wexelsen can unChurch some denominations because they reject Baptism and the complete confession of faith. Despite doctrinal disagreement, he accepts the Roman Catholic and Reformed branches. Rome's great error is her exclusive claim to the title of "Church".

For Wexelsen, then, Baptism and faith are the "basic concept" (GRUNDBEGREB) of the Church. He speaks next of its "fulness" (INDBEGREB), that which is necessary for the "birth, maintenance, and growth" of Christian life. To this belong: 1) the Sacraments, 2) The Gospel, or the preaching of the Word, 3) the Ministry, 4) people who believe the

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 36.

Word and make use of the Sacraments, and 5) Holy Scripture, which is the Church's "text-book" (LAEREBOG) regarding the Kingdom of God, whence it "derives Apostolic enlightenment and is made wise unto salvation".¹¹

Since the Church is "the institution of grace" (NAADES-FORANSTALTNING), given by the Lord Himself for our salvation, we ought to confess faith in it. Indeed, this is required of us in Baptism. It is not enough to believe that the Church exists, any more than it is enough to believe that God exists. The Church is "a work of God", God's redemptive power resides in the means of grace alone, we find God only in them, and consequently we must believe in the Church. If we do not believe in what God has instituted, we must believe in what men have wrought. We must not replace the Church by our own works, nor regard our own interpretation of Scripture as the ground of faith.

In "For Further Explanation", Wexelsen adopts a thorough-going Grundtvigian position on the relationship of Scripture to the Church. The Church is prior to Scripture, which must be interpreted in accordance with the Rule of Faith, the Creed. Scripture is not itself a means of regeneration, but merely points to the Sacraments. He also answers the charge that the Grundtvigians put the Church in the place of Christ, in such a way as to indicate that he virtually regards the Church as (to use an Anglo-Catholic phrase) "the extension of the Incarnation". Wexelsen admits

¹¹ Ibid., p. 40.

that the Grundtvigians put the Church in Christ's place, but asserts that this is only what He Himself has done.

"He has put His congregation with the holy means of grace in His place, as surely as the Holy Spirit is His Regent on earth and the revelation of this Spirit occurs through the Church's means of grace".¹² Therefore, the Church is called the Body of Christ and the Fulness of Christ.

Everyone must either put the Church in Christ's place or something else; Rome puts the Pope in Christ's place, the Enthusiasts, the inner light, the Rationalists, reason, others again their own interpretation of Scripture.

Another typical Grundtvigian was Pastor J. W. C. Dietrichson, vicar at Nerstrand and later at Østre Moland. He was the first ordained clergyman of the Church of Norway to work among the emigrants to America, organized several congregations and laid the foundation for what came to be known as The Norwegian Synod there. He delivered a lecture at the second Scandinavian Church Meeting in Lund (1859) entitled "The teaching of the Church on Baptism, the Church, and the Ministry". Although he rejected the Grundtvigian label, his views reflect the party line.¹³ He says that Baptism together with its Covenant (interpreted in terms of the Creed) constitutes "the means whereby man is received into the circle of disciples..."¹⁴ It is the sole means of

¹² KF, I, p. 227.

¹³ Grundtvigian theologians generally preferred to call themselves "the Churchly" (de Kirkelige), regarding "Grundtvigian" as undesirable because it was a "party" name.

¹⁴ Förhandlingar vid det andra Skandinaviska Kyrkomöte, p. 124.

regeneration. A person may fall from the Covenant, but this does not mean that eternal life is "dead" within him. So long as he has not committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, he can be "converted" through "the call of grace in God's Word", but this is not a regeneration. Baptism brings the Church with its blessings to the individual. Only through the Church can Heaven's blessings come to us; Outside the Church there is no salvation. Therefore it is necessary to believe in the Church. The Baptismal Covenant demands it. Dietrichson departs from the Grundtvigian position only in his rather unclear attempt to define the relation of the Church to the Communion of Saints. He tries to develop this according to an analogy of the Church as a Kingdom. The Communion of Saints is "the fellowship of all true, obedient citizens".¹⁵ The Church is a more extensive concept, including all those who have been granted citizenship in Baptism. The result is an un-Grundtvigian quantitative distinction which in practice amounts to the distinction between the Visible and Invisible Church, although he does not use these terms. In his doctrine of the Ministry, Dietrichson follows Wexels. It belongs "of necessity" to the Kingdom of Heaven, for the proper administration of the Sacraments and the right preaching of the Word (the fact that Dietrichson listed the Sacraments before the Word is significant). It has been "transmitted from the Lord through the Apostles in the holy catholic Church".¹⁶

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 131f.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 133.

Dietrichson draws a sharp distinction between the Universal Priesthood, which "every Christian anointed and consecrated in Baptism" possesses, and the office of the Ministry, which only those who are called, examined, and consecrated by the Lord can claim. It is solely the function of the latter to baptize and teach. He quotes the ordination formula of the Churches of Denmark and Norway: The clergy have "power and authority, as the rightful servants of God and Jesus Christ, to preach God's Word publicly and privately in the Church, to administer the holy Sacraments according to Christ's own institution, to bind the sins of the stiff-necked and to loose the sins of the penitent, and everything else which belongs to his holy calling according to God's Word and the order of the Church". No one may take this vocation upon himself. Only he who is ordained by the Church has the "full measure" of Divine authority. Rightly understood, ordination conveys a charisma, whence the pastor constantly draws new power for his work. As for the call, only the Lord knows who has the inner call. Consequently, we must regard everyone who has the call of the Church as being called by the Lord.

In the early 1850's, Grundtvigianism was strong in the Church of Norway. Two widely separated examples may suffice to bear this out. In 1851, the Drammen Theological Society met to discuss the question of the relationship between Church and State. Ten theses were presented for discussion. There

was considerable criticism of the Revised Catechism; As we have said, Drammen was the early centre of opposition. But there is no evidence of any dissension on the first thesis, which defined the doctrine of the Church. It was almost completely Grundtvigian in character: "The holy, catholic Church...is the gathering of all who through the means of grace...are united into a congregation...which declares its renunciation of God's enemy the devil...and confesses faith in the Triune God...according to the Apostolic articles of faith".¹⁷

The same year, in Wisconsin, U.S.A., the Synod of the Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Church was formed. Article II of its Constitution read as follows: "The Church's doctrine is that which is revealed through God's holy Word in our Baptismal Covenant and in the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments..." Article III stated that the Church recognized as clergy only those who were "rightly examined, regularly called, and ecclesiastically ordained".¹⁸

17 "Forhandler i Drammens Theologiske Forening", Theologisk Tidsskrift, III, p. -535. The one non-Grundtvigian element in the thesis was its acceptance of Scripture as a means of grace.

18 "Den Norsk-Evangelisk-Lutherske Kirke i Amerika", TT, III, p. 511. The Constitution was, however, purged of all Grundtvigian leaven two years later, after the arrival of several Johnsonian pastors.

(e) The Campaign against Grundtvigianism:
Gisle Johnson and Carl Paul Caspari (1814-92)

Grundtvigianism had, however, powerful opponents. The "awakened laity" had been alienated by the Catechism Controversy. The election of Johnson and Caspari to the Theological Faculty in the late 1840's heralded a powerful confessional-Orthodox reaction. Wexels saw the storm coming as early as 1847. He wrote that "the clouds are forming more and more against the Churchly View..."; The make-up of the Theological Faculty means that the opponents of the View will be superior in learning; And "that faith in the Church which is the real foundation of the Churchly View, is foreign to most people, indeed it is regarded as a Roman Catholic monstrosity".¹ When in the 1850's the laity and the Faculty formed an anti-Grundtvigian alliance, the stage for the conflict was set.

The connecting link between these two factions was the person of Gisle Johnson. As the leader of the great revival of the 1850's, he won the hearts of the Christian laity. His ultra-confessional standpoint inevitably clashed with the growing strength of Grundtvigianism. Johnson's first appearance as an anti-Grundtvigian took place at a pastoral conference in Fredrikshald in 1851, where he

¹ In a letter to Ludvig Helveg, the Danish Grundtvigian. Wexels had actively supported Helveg's candidacy for the position to which Caspari was appointed. Quoted in A. Skrondal, op. cit., p. 110.

championed essentially the same position as Olaus Nielsen. Historians are agreed that, while this was Nielsen's shining hour, it was also the hour in which leadership of the lay movement passed from him to Johnson. Johnson's programme for the next twenty years was two-fold: To awaken the sleeping to spiritual life, and to defend Lutheran Orthodoxy against Grundtvigian "error" as well as the rising tide of Separatism. The organization under his leadership of The Christiania Association for Inner Mission (1855) and the inauguration of Norsk Kirketidende by one of his disciples (1856) were not primarily directed against Grundtvigianism, but they came to be employed to this end. It was not, however, until 1857 that the storm really broke. In that year, Johnson published his Nogle Ord om Barnedaaben (Some Words on Infant Baptism), a defense of Infant Baptism directed principally against sectarian propaganda, but also aimed at the adherents of the Churchly View. He attacked "those who speak about the Church and faith in the Church " in an "offensive" manner; They have brought the word "Church" into such "disrepute" that people "avoid it like the plague" and "cannot hear it without being suspicious and fearful of papistic leaven".²

The same year, at the annual meeting of Christiania Inner Mission, Johnson spoke darkly of the Church's enemies "within and without". When challenged to elucidate, he did so in the famous "Declaration" in NK in which he named

2 G. Johnson, Nogle Ord om Barnedaaben, p. 7.

Grundtvigianism as one of the internal enemies of the Church, those who "outwardly remain in its bosom", indeed even "eat its bread," but use their position within it to "undermine its walls".³ He does not unChurch "all" its adherents, but accuses them of trying to build "a new, Danish, Grundtvigian, national (FOLKELIG), catholic (AL-MINDELIG) Church" on the "blasted ruins" of the Lutheran Church.

The differences between the Grundtvigians and the Orthodox-Pietists were indeed profound. Molland has said that they represented two completely different attitudes to life. We cannot pursue in detail all aspects of the struggle, but we shall attempt to state the major issues and to examine those which are particularly relevant to our subject.

There was, in the first place, a difference over the question of authority in matters of doctrine. The Orthodox regarded it as essential to uphold the authority of Scripture. While the Norwegian Grundtvigians were careful not to follow Grundtvig in speaking of Scripture as a "dead" Word, their basic authority was the Creed of the historical Church (i.e. Tradition). In his Declaration, Johnson accused the Grundtvigians of inability "rightly to divide the Word". A common accusation was that the Grundtvigian position led to Rome, and there is some evidence that the Roman Catholic Church hopefully took the same view.

3 NK, II, 1857, p. 241.

There was a profound difference in anthropology. Johnson wrote in 1863 that the "basic error" of the Grundtvigian theology was its "Pelagian view of...human nature, its lack of appreciation of the full depth of human sinful depravity".⁴ Johnson regarded natural man as "a child of the devil". The Grundtvigians replied that if everything human had become demonic with the Fall, then Christ could not have become incarnate or men regenerated except by a new creation. There would be no "point of contact" between God and man.⁵ At this point, the Grundtvigian-Orthodox struggle recalls many similar controversies in the history of the Church.

The two parties held different views of Baptism. The Grundtvigians regarded Baptism as the one and only means of regeneration. Johnson and his followers, while not denying Baptismal regeneration, restricted it to those who are "receptive", and held that it could also occur by means of a conversion experience through the Word of Scripture. Moreover, they asserted that even the "unconsciously regenerated" infant must come to a "conscious regeneration". (Cf. the exposition of Johnson's doctrine of Baptism, Part I, pp. 132ff above.) This evoked the Grundtvigian charge that Johnson taught a "double regeneration". In this dispute, Johnson's chief antagonist

⁴ LK, I, 1863, p. 319.

⁵ F. Wexelsen, "Erø alle mennesker i deres naturlige tilstand djevelen s Børn", KF, II, pp. 353ff. Wexelsen goes so far in this article as to assert that a child must be capable of faith in Christ prior to Baptismal regeneration, p. 358.

was Pastor Carl Wille of Fredrikshald. Wille drew an analogy between physical and spiritual life; Birth cannot occur more than once in either case, and it must be an unconscious event. Conversion is merely a return to Baptism. He denies the existence of "two kinds of regeneration", one conscious and one unconscious. Moreover, there is no evidence either in Luther or the Confessions for more than a single regeneration. The Grundtvigian emphasis upon the Baptismal Covenant is commendable, but it is difficult to see how Wille and the others could avoid an EX OPERE OPERATO conception of the Sacrament.

This had implications for the doctrine of the Church, particularly for the limits of the Church. The Johnsonians continually charged their opponents with teaching that the Church is composed of "the sum total of all baptized person",⁶ and for failing to draw the line between believers and unbelievers. Johnson himself opened the first issue of *Luthersk Kirketidende* with a series of articles entitled "Hvad er Kirken?" (What is the Church?); He stated that the best foreword for a new Church paper in our times must necessarily be a presentation of its concept of the Church.⁷ The articles were in fact a lucid presentation of the Orthodox Lutheran doctrine of the Church as seen through the eyes of a 19th century ERFÄHRUNGS-theologian. The Grundtvigians in turn attacked Johnson for his failure (in their judgement) to take seriously the catholicity of

6 Cf., e.g., LK, II, p. 392.

7 LK, I, p. 2.

the Church, of writing as though the Church had originated with the Reformation, and of inconsistency with regard to other Church bodies, whom Johnson alternately seemed to accept and reject. The Grundtvigians were much less fond of the "Lutheran" label; The Danish theologian Vilhelm Birkedal wrote (against Johnson) that he recognized no "Lutheran" Church, but only one, catholic Church. Norwegian Grundtvigians were generally more cautious, and regarded themselves as fully in agreement with the Confessions of the Church of Norway. When, however, Johnson and Caspari in 1861 published the Formula of Concord, with its strong emphasis upon the Sola Scriptura, the Grundtvigians protested that the two professors were seeking to introduce authorities foreign to the Norwegian Church.

Johnson made a point of warning his students against the Grundtvigian emphasis upon faith in the Church. While he conceded that it was permissible to confess faith in the Church if this were interpreted to mean "faith in God as active in the Church through the means of grace", he considered the practice dangerous, because it could lead to a "Catholic overvaluation of the Church" and a tendency to place the Church on the same level with God.⁸

The basic question was, however, a historical one. Since the Grundtvigians based their entire Churchly View on the theory that the Creed was "a Word from the Lord's own mouth" which had been transmitted in unaltered form

8 G. Johnson, Lecture Notes, taken by Brun, pp. 246f.

throughout the history of the Church, it had in the final analysis to stand or fall with this theory.⁹

The man whose task it became to refute the theory was Professor Carl Paul Caspari. We have devoted little attention to him in this dissertation, for his field of study lay in the Old Testament, and he neither produced any work on the doctrine of the Church nor played any significant part in practical Church-life. He was, however, the most outstanding scholar in the Norwegian Church during the 19th century. If, unfortunately, his involvement in the Grundtvigian conflict led him away from his proper field, it made him a pioneer in the modern study of the Creeds.¹⁰ For over a decade, Caspari scoured the libraries of Europe for information on the history of the Apostles' Creed and of the Words of Institution in the Eucharist. The results of his studies were published in the form of immensely learned articles (totalling some 1600-1700 pages) in the new Theologisk Tidsskrift for den evangelisk-luthersk Kirke i Norge, founded in 1858 by Johnson and himself. His conclusions constituted a thorough refutation of the historical claims of Grundtvigianism. He completely cut the ground from under the Churchly View.

9 The Norwegian Grundtvigians were, however, extremely cautious about the use of the phrase "a Word from the Lord's own mouth". It is rare in the Norwegian literature.

10 On the work of Caspari in the Apostles' Creed, see the sympathetic notice of J. de Ghellinck, Patristique et Moyen Age, T.I, pp. 39-45. He notes the religious spirit which pervades Caspari's scholarly work, but makes no reference to the polemical motive which inspired it.

Caspari's principal work was "Historical-critical Studies in the Baptismal Confession of the Church".¹¹

His conclusions were as follows: Both the Eastern and Western Churches treated the text of the Creed with great freedom; Certain parts of it were not contained in the original text; In Baptism, the text was often abridged or expanded in the Medieval Western Church; Therefore, he could not regard the belief that "the Creed is a Word from the Lord's mouth or from the Apostles which has existed unchanged...to this day...as anything but superstition...a self-made belief, an Enthusiasm, a SCHWÄRMEREI".¹²

His studies of the Words of Institution in the Eucharist yielded the same result: These have taken different forms at different periods, and indeed various forms are now in use; The form at present in use in the Churches of Denmark and Norway was deliberately taken from Scripture by Luther and Bishop Palladius; If the Lord ever dictated a definite form, we do not know what it was; Among all these variations, Scripture is the only safe source. Consequently, Caspari's SUMMA SUMMARUM was as follows: "The view of Grundtvig and his friends regarding the Dano-Norwegian form of the Words of Institution is in complete conflict with history and is therefore untrue, and thus the whole Grundtvigian theory of the 'living Word' collapses, since all these 'living Words' constitute a system, an interrelated

¹¹ TTLKN, I-III, VII, IX, and NR, II.

¹² TTLKN, IV, p. 542..

whole, and thus stand or fall with one another."¹³

Although the conflict continued to rage, in the press, in the parishes, and in the University classroom (where the professors of theology zealously strove to root out all Grundtvigian leaven among the students), Caspari's monumental studies proved to be the decisive defeat of the Churchly View in Norway.

(f) The Collapse of the Grundtvigian Party

Meanwhile, the Orthodox had gained still another ally: the Ministry for Church Affairs, under the firm hand of Bishop Hans Riddervold. Time after time during this period, the Ministry denied Grundtvigian clergy the promotions they deserved. Moreover, it held to the letter of the law in the matter of the Third Article. As early as 1853, the Ministry issued a warning to the clergy that the new edition of the Symbolical Books gave no authorization for the use of the correct form in the ministerial acts. In 1858, the Theological Faculty ruled that the idea of one exclusive form for the Creed is foreign not only to the Lutheran Church but to the Church as a whole. A decade later, the Ministry began receiving complaints about Grundtvigian pastors who used the correct but technically illegal form. Matters came to a head in 1869, when the vicar of Hemne, Johan Ernst Gunnerus, was actually placed on trial, convicted, -----
¹³ TTLKN, X, p. 289.

and fined for his failure to use the form of 1783. He was acquitted on appeal, but his position in the parish was untenable. He had no recourse but to resign his office, and he was followed the same year (1872) by Pastor J. W. C. Dietrichson, who had become involved in a similar case. In both cases, the situation was the same: A layman demanded that the pastor use the form of 1783 in baptizing his child; The pastor refused, the layman complained to the Ministry, and the Ministry declined to transfer the pastor to another parish.¹

The Gunnerus case virtually outlawed the Churchly View in Norway. The year 1872 was critical for the party in yet another way: It was the year in which Grundtvig died. The leaderless Grundtvigians faced a stiffened Orthodoxy in the 1870's. Young Grundtvigians no longer ventured to enter the Ministry, but chose instead to enter the teaching profession. At the same time, there was a growing radicalism in Norwegian cultural life, as illustrated by the visit of Georg Brandes in 1876. Many radicals had been attracted to Grundtvigianism by its liberal spirit, but had never entered into its religious side. Some of these now renounced historical Christianity, and the Grundtvigian party which had once been called the road to Rome was branded as the road to infidelity. The most prominent example of this tendency was Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson, who had been regarded by many

¹ The historically correct form of the Creed was adopted without incident in the Høymesse Liturgy of 1887 and the Altar Book of 1889. These were largely the result of Gustav Jensen's work.

as the future leader of the party. His religious crisis and subsequent rejection of traditional Christianity (1876) "was more than any other single event the thing which led the 'View' into spiritual ruin".² The schism which had long threatened the party became a bitter reality at the so-called "spiritual freedom" meeting at Sagatun Fokk-High School in 1886. From that time, the Grundtvigian party disintegrated as an ecclesiastical force in Norway.

(g) The Grundtvigian Doctrine of the Church:
Loss and Gain.

We shall now attempt to evaluate the Grundtvigian concept of the Church. It is a difficult task. Skrondal says that neither Grundtvig nor his followers formulated any consistent ecclesiology free from contradictory elements.¹ Aulén holds that the Grundtvigian ecclesiology fails to strike a balance, and vacillates between Roman Catholic and sectarian poles.² Certainly there was something Romantic and intuitive if not downright poetic about the Churchly View. It included many commendable features. Its emphasis upon Baptismal regeneration and upon the Baptismal Covenant and Christian nurture constituted a much-needed counter-balance to the revivalism of the age. Its accent upon the collective counteracted the strongly individualistic trend of the day. Above all, the Churchly View represented a

2 A. Skrondal, Grundtvigianismen i Noreg, p. 149.

1 A. Skrondal, Grundtvig og Noreg, p. 139.

2 G. Aulén, Till Belysning om den lutherska Kyrkoideen, p. 151. The present evaluation owes much to Aulén's penetrating criticism.

largely successful attempt to avoid the subjective approach and to build upon the objective means of grace. Thus, Grundtvigianism was able in great measure to conquer one of the two great obstacles to a resolution of the ecclesiological problem, although as Aulén points out, the subjective element still remained in the confession of the Creed.

On the other hand, there were certain serious weaknesses in the Churchly View. There is no doubt that its overemphasis upon the Sacraments at the expense of the Word, and its basically traditionalist concept of authority were more Roman Catholic than Lutheran. Its view of Scripture was particularly faulty, and represents a fatal departure from the principle of Sola Scriptura. There was in the Grundtvigian idea of the "living Word" the germ of the modern view of Scripture, but it was not sufficiently developed.³ It reflected the authentic personalism of the Lutheran doctrine of grace and the existential character of the relationship between God and man which figures so prominently in the writings of Luther himself. Here, it seems, was an attempt to break loose from the intellectualistic concept of revelation. Grundtvig had caught a vision of something vitally important. That Norwegian Grundtvigians also saw it is borne out by a little book which is one of the most interesting in the Norwegian Grundtvigian literature, Rural Dean Fredrik Ingier's Om den Kirkelige Anskuelse, written in reply to Caspari. Ingier puts his finger on

³ Cf. A. Fridrichsen, in En Bok om Bibeln, Lund, 1948, p. 69.

the fundamental weakness of the Orthodox theologians: their intellectualism. He says that the Churchly View does not rest upon the Creed as a written set of propositions about the Christian doctrine, but as a living confession in Baptism. Consequently, Caspari's "proofs" are irrelevant. Unfortunately, however, Ingier's own rejection of the TESTIMONIUM INTERNUM SPIRITUS SANCTI inevitably separates the Spirit from the outward Word of Scripture. The conclusion appears inescapable that Grundtvigianism was on the verge of a great discovery, a return to Luther's own concept of revelation, but that it was never completely successful. Despite Ingier's arguments, the Churchly View committed the error of binding God's Revelation, His Living Word, to the propositions of the Creed. Even more fatal was the fact that the authenticity and validity of the Creed were made dependent upon a supposedly unbroken historical transmission in precisely the same form. It was therefore open to the same historical criticism as the Apostolic Succession, and was a great deal easier to disprove. Therefore, despite all its emphasis upon the Living Word, the Churchly View ultimately reduced Revelation to something intellectualistic and nomistic. It failed to conquer the second obstacle to a deeper understanding of the doctrine of the Church.

It is interesting to compare the Churchly View with the Anglican Tractarian movement. Although the two were

contemporaneous, and although Grundtvig visited England several times, there seems to have been no direct historical connection. The Churchly View (1825) actually antedates the Oxford Movement. Bishop Aulén has undertaken to compare the two, and it would be difficult to improve upon his conclusions.⁴ He finds several points of similarity: Both are intimately associated with Romanticism and nationalism; Both represent attempts to find an objective, Divine point of departure for the doctrine of the Church; Both emphasize the Sacraments as the only means of salvation. On the other hand, there are significant differences: The two movements grew out of different circumstances, the Tractarian movement being (among other things) a reaction against sectarianism, the Grundtvigian against Rationalism; They had different views of Sacramental grace, the one Catholic, the other Lutheran. In a word, they arose out of different traditions. Grundtvigianism cannot be explained apart from the Lutheran tradition, while the Tractarian movement is only explicable in terms of Anglican history and tradition.

⁴ G. Aulén, *op. cit.*, pp. 149ff.

Grundtvigianism--Bibliography

- E. Allen, Bishop Grundtvig: A Prophet of the North, London, Jas. Clarke and Co., 1949.
- H. Begtrup, N.F.S. Grundtvig's Danske Kristendom, København., vol's. I-II.
- E. Borup, "Grundtvig", in NTU, I, pp. 1122-1129.
- A. Brandrud, "Teologien i det norske Universitet, 1811-1911", NTT, XII, pp. 201ff.
- A. Brandrud, "Hersleb og Stenersen i deres forhold til Grundtvig", NTT, XXII, pp. 135ff, XXIII, pp. 82ff, XXVII, pp. 69ff, XXIX, pp. 147ff.
- K. Bratten, Nogle Bemaerkninger om Pontoppidan's Forklaring, Udtoget og isaer den Omarbejdede, etc., Drammen, 1845.
- C. P. Caspari, "Har den hellige Augustin havt ordene 'Sanctorum Communione' og 'catholicam' i sin Daabsbekjendelse? Med saerligt hensyn til Biskop Kierkegaard's 'eldre Smaaskrifter'...", TTLKN, IV, pp. 263-352, 529-644.
- C. P. Caspari, "Historisk-kritisk Studier over den kirkelige Daabsbekjendelse", TTLKN, I-III, VII, IX, and NR, II.
- C. P. Caspari, "Nadverdens Indstiftelsesords Gudstjenestlige Historie fra det femte aarhundrede af indtil vore dage. Med saerligt Hensyn til Grundtvig's og hans venners Anskuelser om disse ords form i Kirken og denne Forms Oprindelse", TTLKN, X, pp. 84-306.
- Förhandlingar vid det andra Skandinaviska Kyrkomötet in Lund, af. H. B. Hammar, Christianstad, 1860.
- Forhandlingerne paa det første skandinaviske Kirkemöte i Kjöbenhavn, Udg. af Fr. Hammerick, Kjöbenhavn, 1857.
- Forhandlingerne paa det tredje skandinaviske eller nordiske Kirkemöde i Christiania, ved W. Wexels, Christiania, 1862.
- N.F.S. Grundtvig, Udvalgte Skrifter, I-X, ed. H. Begtrup, København, 1904-09--cited as US.
- F. Ingier, Om den Kirkelige Anskuelse, Christiania, 1861.
- J. M. P. Kaurin, Nogle Ord til den norske Kirke i anledning af et i Drammen udkommet Skrift betitlet Artikel, etc..., Christiania, 1846.
- Kirkelig Folkeblad, 1857-1870--cited as KF.
- Kirkelig Tidende, et Maanedskrift til Christelige Laerdommes og Sandheders Udbredelse og Forsvar, 1848-57--cited as KT.
- O. Kolrud, "Grundtvig og Noreg: Inlegg ved A. Skrondal's Disputas for Doktorgraden i Teologi", NTT, XXXI, pp. 216-142.
- P. Lindhardt, "Borgerlig Indretning--Himmelsk Gaest", Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift, XII, pp. 129-151.
- E. Molland, Church Life in Norway, 1800-1950, Minneapolis, 1956.
- Norsk Kirketidende, 1856-62--cited as NK.

- O. Nielsen, Kirken, eller hellige Menneskers Samfund fremstillede i Betragtninger over den tredje Artikel, etc., Fredrikshald, 1847.
- O. Nielsen, Nogle Ord om Sekter og Kirken, Fredrikshald, 1877.
- G. Ousland, En Kirkehøveding: Prof. Gisle Johnson som Teolog og Kirkemann, Oslo, 1950.
- E. Pontoppidan, Sandhed til Gudfrygtighed, ...udi en.. Forklaring over Dr. Martin Luthers liden Catechismo, Christiansand, 1817--cited as Sandhed.
- F. Schröder, "Grundtvigianismen" in NTU, I, pp. 1130ff.
- L. Selmer, "Olaus Nielsen", in NBL, X.
- A. Skrondal, Grundtvig og Noreg: Kyrkje og Skule, 1812-72, Bergen, 1929.
- A. Skrondal, Grundtvigianismen i Noreg i Kyrkje og Skule, 1872-90, Bergen, 1936.
- A. Tannaes, Bidrag til Sandhedens Forsvar i Anledning af et i Drammen udkommet Skrift, under Titel "Nogle Bemaerkninger om Pontoppidans Forklaring...", Christiania, 1846.
- D. Thrapp, "W. A. Wexels (1797-1866), Livs- og Tidsbillede" in Forhandlinger i Videnskabs-Selskabet i Christiania, Christiania, 1906.
- Udtog af Dr. E. Pontoppidan's Forklaring Omarbejdet af en dertil naadigst nedsat Commission, Christiania, 1845--cited as Udtog.
- W. Wexels, "Ere vi ved Daab indlemmede i den aegte Christelige Kirke?", TKK, I.
- W. Wexels, Et Fredens Ord om den tredie Troesartikels Lydelse, Christiania, 1852.
- W. Wexels, Foredrag over Pastoraltheologien, Christiania, 1853.
- W. Wexels, Forklaring over det nye Testamentes Skrifter, I-IV, Christiania, 1837-54.
- W. Wexels, "Den Kirkelige Anskuelse", TT, II.
- W. Wexels, Om det Bibelske Begreb af det almindelige Praestedomme, Christiania, 1858.
- C. Wille, Indlaeg i Dagens kirkelige Strid, Christiania, 1864.

THE
INNER MISSION
MOVEMENT

The 19th century represented the dawn of a new era in the Norwegian Church. It was heralded by the introduction of Revivalism, which in turn led to the establishment of organized Inner Mission and Foreign Mission movements.¹

There were three major revivals in 19th century Norway, one at the beginning of the century, one at mid-century, and one toward the close of the century, as well as several smaller ones. The first, the Haugean, was natively inspired and exclusively lay in character. It was sober in piety and orthodox in doctrine, but it introduced lay preaching and Pietistic ECCLESIOIAE, both of which were to be sources of tension and conflict in the Church throughout most of the century. The second, the Johnsonian, was both Pietistic and staunchly confessional. It united the new generation of clergy and the "awakened laity", and led to an organized Inner Mission enterprise. The third, inspired in part by Anglo-Saxon Christianity, was more radical and critical of the Church, as well as less confessional.

The theology which informed all three of them was characterized by the subjective approach and an intellectualist conception of Revelation. Although no solution of

1 The term "Inner Mission" originated in 1848 with the work of Pastor Johann Wichern in Germany, and is widely used in Continental Lutheran circles. It has seemed best in this thesis to translate it directly into English. The closest English approximation is "Home Missions" (a term current in Evangelical Anglican circles), though "Inner Mission" is a more comprehensive term, including evangelism, charitable endeavours, educational institutions, and the like.

the ecclesiological problem emerged from the revivals or their resultant missionary movements, it will be of importance for the subject of this thesis to examine the impact of the movement on the ecclesiological question, and the serious tensions which it created. This chapter will also be concerned with the successful struggle for legal recognition of the lay movement initiated by Hauge, the union of clergy and laity resulting from the breakdown of theological and class differences in the Johnsonian revival, and the establishment of organized Inner Mission work to counteract advancing secularization. In the course of this study, we shall be concerned to trace the serious conflicts culminating in the 1870's over the attempt to gain ecclesiastical and confessional recognition of lay-preaching, the efforts to unite the Inner Mission movement into a single national organization which were crowned with only partial success, and the foundation of more radically Low-Church organizations as a result of the revival at the close of the century.

(a) The Haugean Revival

The appearance of the lay-preacher Hans Nilsen Hauge (1771-1824) created an epoch in the Norwegian Church. Molland has described him as "the personality who has left the deepest and most lasting impression" on its later history.¹

Hauge was nurtured on the writings of Luther, Johan Arndt, and the Pietists. At the age of 25, he underwent an ecstatic assurance experience similar to that of John Wesley, which he interpreted as a call to preach revival. For the next eight years, he travelled incessantly throughout the land, conversing with individuals and preaching, and organizing small conventicles.² A stream of devotional literature poured from his pen. Almost from the beginning, he came into conflict with the authorities both of the Church and the State, because of his infringements of the Conventicle Act. He was arrested on eleven different occasions, and was finally imprisoned for the better part of seven years, while his case was pending. He thus became the martyr of the Norwegian Church. In the end, he was fined 1000 RIKSDOLLARS, but he had won a moral victory.

1 E. Molland, "H. N. Hauge" in NTU, I, p. 1222. Cf. I. Welle, Kirkens Historie, 1st. Edn., II, p. 274.

2 The term "conventicle", which is not widely used in English theological circles, is used here to cover any meeting for devotional purposes outside the regular services of the established Church.

Hauge possessed a remarkable Christian maturity, wisdom, and balance. Theologically, he sought to be strictly Orthodox. At the same time, he was a true son of Pietism. From these two sources, he, like most of his contemporaries, inherited the intellectualist conception of Revelation and the subjective approach to Christian doctrine. For this reason, he was not always faithful to the theology of Luther. There is in particular a legalism about Hauge's theology which is more Pietistic than Lutheran. This extended also to the ethical realm; The Haugeans were Norway's Puritans. Following Pontoppidan, they adopted a strict position on the question of the Adiaphora.

It is hardly to be expected that Hauge should have worked out a developed ecclesiology. He was unschooled and self-taught, and not even the theologians of his day gave much thought to the subject. Moreover, he was primarily a preacher of revival. Bishop Bang, in his definitive work on Hauge³, does not handle Hauge's concept of the Church, although he discusses thoroughly Hauge's theology on other points. The best source we possess is Hauge's Testament to His Friends, dated March 7, 1821.⁴ A careful examination of this document will give us the necessary clues to his standpoint.

Hauge's ecclesiology combined the Pietism of the

³ A. Chr. Bang, Hans Nilsen Hauge og Hans Samtid, Christiania, 1888.

⁴ Hans Nilsen Hauge's Skrifter, ed. H. Ording, Vol. VIII. A bibliography of the most important Hauge literature is found in Vol. VII, pp. 293ff.

conventicle with staunch fidelity to the State Church which had abused him. In his affirmations of loyalty to the Establishment, Hauge recalls the expressed intentions of John Wesley. He warns his followers against the danger of schism, and reminds them that nothing is so important as unity. He reaffirms the confessional loyalty of the Haugeans: "We have remained faithful to the evangelical religion according to the true Augsburg Confession, or the religion of the State". The charge that they constitute a sect is "absolutely without foundation". "We have never had any organized Church discipline, never kept membership lists...never had any symbols or ceremonies..." He told his followers: "It is my last will that you hereafter as heretofore unanimously hold to the religion of our State, that you receive from the official teachers everything that belongs to their office, that you attend worship, receive the Sacraments, receive the blessing of the Church in marriage and Church committal in burial, and everything else which pertains to good order."

This was a clear recognition of the institutional element in the Church.⁵ It is true that Hauge does not use the term "Church" of the Establishment, but repeatedly refers to "the religion of the State". This may be significant of his theological interest, but since the same terminology is used in the Constitution of 1814, it may

⁵ Haugeans generally followed his advice. They were faithful Church-goers, and received the Sacrament regularly twice a year, according to Norwegian custom.

simply reflect current usage. Hauge uses the term "the Christian Church" only once in the Testament, to denote the Church catholic.⁶

On the other hand, Hauge emphasized the personal element, the congregation of saints, which he appears to have identified with the conventicle. Earlier, he had been quite naturally critical of the inability of the State Church to meet the spiritual needs of the nation. In his "enthusiastic period" (1800-02), he could call his followers "the Church", and appoint economic and spiritual "superintendents" according to the pattern of the New Testament.⁷ The Haugean ECCLESIOIAE had their "elders"; In the Testament, Hauge speaks of the "congregation" (MENIGHED), meaning the conventicle. Even as he denies the charge of sectarianism, he writes: "If we are to be called a sect, we ought to be called the virtuous sect, the truly godly sect". He advises his followers to retain the office of elder. Its incumbents are to be chosen for their faith, love, righteousness, experience in spiritual things, and wisdom. They are authorized to supervise both doctrine and life in the conventicle. Nome has pointed out that Haugeanism introduced a Presbyterian order based on the charismatic principle. A similar institution existed (since 1629) in the State Church, the

6 The extreme Low-Churchman Oscar Handeland says that Hauge did not consider the State Church a Church "in the Biblical sense". Cf. Vårsløysing, I, p. 95.

7 E. Molland, "Kristen Tro og Økonomisk Aktivitet hos H. N. Hauge", NTT, 4th hefte, 1958.

8 J. Nome, Demringstid i Norge.

office of "lay assistant", but without any emphasis upon the charismatic principle. Despite the lack of "organized" Church Discipline, Hauge spoke of an "informal"(UFORMERKET) discipline; Erring Haugeans were shunned by the others. This, he said, should continue (according to Matt. 18:11), but the miscreant should be allowed to hear God's Word if he is penitent. Lay-preachers were subject to strict examination and supervision. They had first to prove that they had been "truly converted(OMVENDT)" and to show "the worthy fruits of repentance". In the Testament, the elders are instructed to ensure that the lay-preacher "daily examines himself and realizes the depths of his own sins and weaknesses". He must have passed through trial and temptation, be well grounded in and have a clear understanding of God's Word. Only two or three at a time are to be authorized by the elders to preach.⁹

Despite the emphasis on the conventicle, Hauge recognized the fact that the Church is more than a conventicle. He did not demand a specific conversion experience, but recognized the validity of the Baptismal covenant. The revival was consciously based upon the Christian nurture which the people had received in the State Church. Hauge also counselled tolerance toward Christians who do not agree completely with his followers. Moreover, the conventicles were not intended to be defensive in character, but were rather to act as salt. Each Haugean was made

⁹ H.N. Hauges Skrifter, VIII, p. 248.

aware of his responsibility to "gather men into God's congregation". However, not all were to preach; Only those who possessed the preaching charisma and the inner call were to exercise this function.¹⁰ Lay-preaching was regarded not as a substitute for but as a supplement to the preaching of the clergy. Haugeans could carry their offensive so far as to exercise "brotherly discipline" upon members of the clergy. But where they were served by an evangelical pastor, they usually rallied around him.

Hauge's ecclesiology thus preserves a measure of the Lutheran dialectic between the personal and the institutional elements. At the same time, it must be admitted that the emphasis is clearly on the personal aspect. The Haugeans were primarily conventicle Christians. The ambiguous character of Haugean ecclesiology, reinforced by the fact that Hauge himself wrote so little on the subject, however, made it possible later on for men of widely different standpoints to claim him in support of their case. From Bishop Heuch on the one hand to the founders of the Lutheran Free Church on the other, men of all shades of opinion appealed to the authority of Hauge.¹¹

¹⁰ Hauge wrote: "We know from God's Word that not all have received the same number of talents, and to travel about on such a mission is not the calling of everyone; For each ought to feel a special compulsion in that direction". Quoted in A. Bang, op. cit., p. 117.

¹¹ It is only recently that followers of Inner Mission have criticized Hauge directly. Cf. Fr. Wisløff, Den Haugianske Linje, Oslo, 1949, p. 51, where it is stated that Hauge's Churchmanship has been abandoned, because it was "too much bound to the old clerical standpoint".

Although the avowed Haugeans probably numbered no more than a few hundreds, the example of Hauge inspired a number of lay-preachers, and the moral and spiritual influence of the movement was far out of proportion to its size. Eventually, the "friends" (as they were called) came also to exert considerable influence in the realm of politics and business.¹²

Hauge and his followers were of basic significance for the later Inner Mission movement and for the ecclesiological situation in the Norwegian Church, in three important respects. In the first place, they introduced revivalism into the Church of Norway. There had previously been brief, local revivals, but Haugeanism introduced revivalism as a permanent feature of Norwegian Church-life. Secondly, they introduced lay-preaching, again on a permanent basis and on a nation-wide scale. Finally, as a result of the Haugean movement, the institution of living conventicles became an important factor in the life of the country as a whole. The previous unity of the Church of Norway was, for better or for worse, shattered. Haugeanism inserted the wedge that came eventually to divide the "Church people" and the "Christian people". At the same time, the conservative Churchmanship of the Haugeans was a powerful factor in

¹² Hauge's followers were known by a variety of names: The friends, the readers, the men of prayer, the teachers, the holy ones. They were not called Haugeans even at the time of their leader's death. I. Welle, op. cit., p. 273.

retaining the vast majority of conventicle Christians within the State Church.

(b) The Repeal of the Conventicle Act

The period 1800-1845 was characterized by a movement for religious freedom, in which the Haugeans and the liberal politicians made common cause. The first result of their efforts was the repeal of the hated Conventicle Act in 1842.

The Conventicle Act of 1741 had the double object of legalizing conventicles while at the same time controlling them. It permitted gatherings of "a very few" persons, under strict clerical supervision. It did not require the presence of the local vicar at all meetings, but it did require that he be notified on each occasion. Moreover, it required the strict segregation of the sexes, and prohibited all eating or drinking at such meetings. The time of meeting was restricted to the hours of daylight. Most important of all, the Act expressly forbade lay-preaching, permitting reading and conversation only.¹ Clearly, the law was intended to confirm the authority of the clergy and the uniqueness of their office.

After the Hauge case, the law fell into general disuse, although it was invoked in one case in 1828 and another in 1832.² It was generally forgotten except by the Haugeans.

¹ The full text of the Act is printed in Indstilling fra den under 12te Febr. 1841 anordnede Kommission til at afgive Betaenkning og Forslag til Lov om Graendserne for Religionsfriheden, Kra., 1842, Bilag 1, pp. 100ff.

² A. Seierstad, Kyrkjelegt Reformarbeid i Norig i Nittande Hundreåret, pp. 208ff., 216ff.

They launched a concerted campaign in the Storting for its repeal. The leader of the campaign was the astute Haugean Ole Gabriel Ueland (1799-1870), a political democrat with definitely conservative religious views.³ A bill for repeal was passed in 1836 and again in 1839, but failed to get Royal sanction. The Ministry for Church Affairs was controlled by men who were strongly anti-Haugean.⁴ In 1839, the Minister, knowing that if the Storting again passed the bill (as was likely), it would automatically become law under Paragraph 79 of the Constitution, requested the noted jurist Claus Winther Hjelm (1797-1871) to draft a bill on the subject of religious freedom, to cover both the status of the conventicles and the question of Dissenters. Hjelm had been engaged for the past twelve years in drafting a code of civil law, and was well qualified. He was also anti-Haugean.

Hjelm's proposal, together with the reasoning which lay behind it, was published in 1840.⁵ He interpreted the Constitution in a thoroughly Erastian manner. He identified the Church and the State; The Church was defined as "the soul of the body politic". The King was the head of the

³ Ueland was the leader of the farm bloc in the Storting for a generation. He was elected to every Storting from 1833 to 1869, and his motto was "The nation has two key-stones: religion and the Constitution".

⁴ A. Seierstad, op. cit., p. 271.

⁵ Betaenkning til Lov om Graendserne for Religionsfriheden og navnlig om Separatister og gudelige Forsamlinger, Chra., 1840. Five hundred copies were distributed, and the text appeared also in the daily press. We shall discuss the dissenter provisions of Hjelm's law in a later chapter.

Church; "Staff and sceptre" are both in his hands. According to Paragraph 16 of the Constitution, he orders all meetings and assemblies on matters of religion (Hjelm laid special emphasis upon the word "all"). The religion of the State is to be the "only public (OFFENTLIG⁶) religion" in "the broadest sense of the term". From a practical point of view, there is nothing worse than religious differences; They "dissolve all the bonds of humanity". His proposal was no less stringent than the Act of 1741; Indeed, in some respects it was even more harsh. The intent of Hjelm was not only to forbid the activities of dissenters, but also to restrict conventicles within the State Church as much as possible. The local pastor must not only be notified, but his permission must also be obtained. Lay-preaching was to be prohibited. Eating and drinking at such meetings were to be permitted only when absolutely necessary. The number of outsiders present was not to exceed the number in the family. Itinerant preaching was prohibited. Everyone was in duty bound to report violations of the Act, and infringements were to be punishable by fines and imprisonment.⁷ Hjelm's "Reasoning" was actually one long diatribe against the Haugeans, the Quakers, and the Moravians. Included in it were various libellous insinuations against the Haugean "Enthusiasts", whom he

6 This word, which will figure prominently in the debate on lay-preaching, can mean either "public" or "official" in the Norwegian language.

7 Betaenkning, Paragraphs 13-29.

regarded as Separatists, because they had broken with the existing order.⁸ Hjelm admitted that Hauge himself was "the most respectable and enlightened" of the lay-preachers, and that his doctrine was "harmless"; But he asserted that the movement as a whole had given rise to "gross crimes".

The proposal created a great furore. It was attacked in the liberal press by Henrik Wergeland and others. The Ministry for Church Affairs solicited the opinions of the clergy and the civil officials and of the newly-formed local community councils.⁹ It then referred the matter to a Royal Commission consisting of Pastor Wexels, Professor Dietrichson, and the jurist S. Sørenssen. The task of working through the opinions on the dissenter question was assigned to Dietrichson, while Wexels was charged with an analysis of the opinions on conventicles.

Opinion proved to be sharply divided on all aspects of the problem. Nevertheless, there was a clear trend against the reactionary position of Hjelm. Of the clergy, 162 favoured full religious freedom; While 180 wanted at least some restrictions, only 81 favoured Hjelm's proposal without modification.¹⁰ Of the 365 community councils, 182 rejected Hjelm's law out of hand, and only 94 approved it without alteration. The theological faculty and the Bishops favoured some modification but not total repeal of

⁸ Ibid., pp. 20, 57-58, et.al.

⁹ This was the first time they had been asked to give an opinion on any issue.

¹⁰ A. Seierstad, op. cit., p. 293.

the Conventicle Act.

The most effective opposition to Hjelm was offered by vicar (later Bishop) J. L. Arup (1793-1874), whose official opinion, published in the press, was also the opening salvo in the movement for a new Church polity.¹¹ His position was liberal but not radical. Arup conceded that Hjelm's law would bring peace in the Church, but claimed that it was life, not peace, which was needed. He asserted the "independence" of the Church from the State, and disavowed coercion in the life of the Church. The State, he said, should only intervene in religious matters when doctrine or practice is immoral or dangerous to the State. He concluded by saying that Hjelm's law was contrary to the rightful claims both of Church and State; contrary to public opinion; contrary to the spirit of Christianity and of Protestantism; contrary to the Constitution; And contrary to the prevailing legislative trend. Moreover, it was incapable of enforcement.¹²

The Royal Commission published its opinion, together with a legislative counter-proposal, in 1842.¹³ This document was largely the work of Wexels, and it breathes the mild spirit of the man. It is balanced, fair and

¹¹ *Morgenbladet*, 1840, no's. 300, 301, 302, 307, 308, and 311. It was said that Arup's activity in this case "elevated him to the Bishop's chair".

¹² *Ibid.*, no. 311. Another of Hjelm's opponents was Rural Dean P. P. Aabel, who stated that Hjelm's law was popularly known as "the law for religious compulsion". *Morgenbladet*, no. 50, Tilleg, 1842.

¹³ Indstilling...

objective. On the one hand, it expresses the prevailing clerical concept of the Church and the Ministry; On the other hand, it would grant considerable freedom to conventicles.

Wexels began by calling attention to three factors which served to complicate the issue: 1) The confusion in the relationship between Church and State; 2) The lack of an independent Church polity and Church discipline; And 3) the lack of any religious freedom for dissenters. What was needed was a reform in which the State, the Church, and the individual each received its due, and in which Church and State could cooperate without confusion.¹⁴

Wexels expounded thoroughly the opposing points of view before presenting his own position and proposal. His own sharp distinction between the Ministry and the Universal Priesthood are naturally prominent. In view of Article XIV of the Augsburg Confession, the Commission has "reservations" with regard to the call claimed by the lay-preachers. Those who possess only an immediate (inner) call cannot be regarded as RITE VOCATUS. Itinerant lay-preaching represents an invasion of another's calling, and has no claim to legality. Wexels drew the conclusion that the deduction of the right to administer the Holy Communion from the Universal Priesthood follows as logically from these premises as the establishment of the right to preach.¹⁵

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 44f.

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 80-82.

On the other hand, Wexels endorsed the principle of religious liberty. The congregation has a "Christian and natural right" to gather for edification outside of the official worship.¹⁶ He opposed civil compulsion in religion. It was contrary to the basic character of the Lutheran Church. Family devotions were "wholesome" and should be encouraged. And since it is impossible to draw a line between family devotions and other conventicles, both should be equally free, regardless of the number in attendance.¹⁷ But the real problem arose in connection with the itinerant preachers. Although their activity was "abnormal" and contrary to law, Wexels advised toleration "as far and as long as they can be tolerated..." It is "not absolutely certain" that they are acting in violation of Article XIV. This article was written in opposition to the practice of the Anabaptists, who rejected the Ministry altogether. The Haugeans were not guilty of this error. The word "OFFENTLIG" could also be interpreted to mean "official", as well as "public". Haugean lay-preachers do not covet the office of the Ministry.¹⁸ Indeed, the conditions within the Church could be such that the State Church ought "gladly" to tolerate them. Moreover, toleration would yield better practical results. Their punishment would be regarded as persecution for the sake of Christ, and would be interpreted as a form of martyrdom. Responsible Haugean elders would

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 73.

¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 64-66.

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 85f.

have greater success in controlling them than legal proceedings. Finally, a policy of toleration would offer a better chance for the Church to "enlighten, win, and bring into a more correct path " the itinerant preachers.

Wexels' legislative proposal is, in contrast to Hjelm's, a Church law. Here, "it is the Church which demands order and norm in her free life".¹⁹ It reflects the dialectic between the institutional and the personal. Paragraph II would permit "Lutheran-Christian" conventicles, to be attended by "as many as might desire", so long as they are orderly and open to the pastor, and so long as they are not held during the hour of Sunday worship. Paragraphs V and VI dealt with the delicate matter of itinerant preachers. Those who are not "lawfully called" ought not "as a rule" to teach publicly. Still less ought they to neglect their ordinary vocations in favour of preaching. The clergy were to remind the people of the proper significance of the Universal Priesthood, according to which each Christian shall serve God and offer himself a sacrifice within his own STAND. Should, however, any "Lutheran" feel the inner call to preach, he is not forbidden to do so. He is required, however, to report to the pastor before each meeting and to inform him of its time and place. He is also required to present a certificate from his parish pastor as to his moral character. Women and unconfirmed persons were forbidden to preach. Violations

A. Seierstad, op. cit., p. 309.

of the law were punishable by a fine which was to be used for charitable purposes.

Wexels' proposal was adopted by the Government, and presented to the Storting as a Royal Proposition, but it proved to be unacceptable both to the Haugeans and the liberals. The Haugeans countered with a bill for the unconditional repeal of the Conventicle Act. The Royal Proposition was killed in committee, and the Storting voted unanimously for the Haugean bill. Since the bill had now been passed three times, it automatically became law without Royal sanction. By this action, lay-preaching in effect won legal recognition in the eyes of the State. As the Haugeans put it, "the Word" had been "liberated".

(c) The Johnsonian Revival and
The Foundation of the Inner Mission.

The Johnsonian revival of the 1850's set off a chain reaction which lasted for fully a generation. The revival "changed the lives of huge segments of the Norwegian people" during the ensuing decades.¹ A new theology, Orthodoxy rejuvenated, reigned; Its message was carried by a new generation of clergy, confessional, puritanical, and revivalistic.

One of the most immediate effects was the inauguration of the Inner Mission movement. This enterprise, in part an outgrowth of the revolutions of 1848, represented a

1 E. Molland, Church Life in Norway, 1800-1950, p. 39.

recognition that the Church faced a new emergency, in which secularization was far advanced and social and economic conditions demanded immediate attention. It also constituted a renewal of the Pietist heritage, along with a certain influence from Enlightenment humanitarianism. Still, it would scarcely have arisen except against the background of revivalism. This is particularly evident in Scandinavia, where from the very beginning the emphasis was placed on preaching and evangelism rather than upon social action as in Germany.² An attempt was indeed made by Pastor Honoratius Halling to organize a Christian labour movement in competition with the corresponding secular movement led by Marcus Thrane at mid-century. But social and economic conditions in Norway were widely different from those in Germany. Norway was still largely rural, and industrialization had barely begun. It was only later that the Norwegian Inner Mission movement concerned itself with social problems.

The first local society for Inner Mission was founded at Skien in 1853, under the leadership of the brilliant but unstable vicar Gustav Adolph Lammers. Lammers was a powerful preacher of repentance, a close friend of Gisle Johnson, and an advocate of conventicles. The first building to

² It is also interesting to compare the titles of the organizations in the three Scandinavian countries: Denmark's Kirkelig Forening for Indre Mission, Sweden's Evangeliska Fosterlandsstiftelse, and Norway's Lutherstiftelsen. In Denmark, Inner Mission was in fact more "Churchly", in Sweden more "Evangelical", and in Norway more confessional.

bear the name "Prayer-house" (BEDEHUS) was built under his auspices the same year.³ The by-laws of the Skien society stated its purpose as follows: "To awaken and nourish a true Christian life in the midst of our Church, in which many presumably need influencing in this regard". It was to work by example, admonition, and the distribution of Scriptures and other Christian literature. There was no mention of preaching.⁴

The revival came to Christiania as a result of a series of Bible studies given by Gisle Johnson in 1854. At that time, the capital city had 30,000 inhabitants and only one parish Church, with three pastors.⁵ In the autumn of the same year, the first steps were taken to establish an inner Mission society in the city. Johnson was the first chairman of the board, which also included Prof. Caspari and Pastors Halling, Grimelund and Hald, as well as nine laymen. In December, the Society's statutes were drafted and sent to the Christiania clergy for comment. This document was significant in that it charted the course which the Inner Mission movement was to follow in the future.⁶ Paragraph I established the confessional character of the Society;

3 The "Prayer-house" movement grew out of the fact that laymen were not permitted to speak in the parish Churches before 1888. The first building with this purpose (though not called by this name) was in use in West Norway about 1840. They were thus the equivalents of the British "Chapels" except that they were not separatistic and were largely built by and for laymen.

4 NK, I, 1856, p. 43.

5 Two more Churches stood just outside the city limits, and a second Church was about to be erected in the city.

6 Printed in NK, I, pp. 120f.

Its membership was to consist of "evangelical Lutheran Christians", and one of its principal aims was to combat Separatism. The task of the Society was stated as follows: To work for the extension of God's Kingdom among the inhabitants of Christiania, "who are indeed outwardly reckoned as members of the evangelical Lutheran Church, but who must nevertheless be regarded as actually being totally foreign to it". A qualifying clause, "while the Church is unable with the forces at hand to provide the necessary pastoral care", gave expression to the "emergency principle" or "principle of need" which was destined to play an important part in the future history of the movement. Paragraph II laid down the means through which Inner Mission would work: It would seek to "bring the Word to the individual" through the distribution of Scriptures and other literature, through Bible studies, and through "awakening, enlightening and edifying talks". Paragraph VII outlined the Society's relationship to the clerical office: It pledged "unified cooperation" with the clergy, hoped that the clergy would "participate", and offered to "open the way for them to supervise its activity" and to make such guarantees for its "Churchliness" as the clergy might demand. Paragraph V gave expression to the Charismatic principle: The men chosen to work in the Society were not only to be Lutheran Christians "in the conviction of their hearts", but were also to possess the "necessary peculiar gifts" for their work.

The reply of the Christiania clergy was, as might be expected from men schooled in the Hersleb-Stenersen-Wexels tradition, polite but cool.⁷ They proposed several changes in the statutes, particularly concentrating upon Paragraph VII. They suggested that this whole paragraph be deleted, on the grounds that it was superfluous and easily misunderstood. They expressed perplexity as to the form which the "unified cooperation" would take. They assumed that this meant "a certain outward cooperation", since spiritual cooperation was too obvious to require mention. They would welcome support from any quarter, but declined to enrol in Inner Mission, on the grounds that as clergy they were already pledged to "preach the Word publicly and privately" (a quotation from the ordination vow). Such a course would not only be superfluous, but would also cast some doubt upon the sincerity and adequacy of their ordination vows. They made it plain that they regarded Inner Mission as an entirely voluntary and "private" enterprise. They reminded the committee of the great responsibility which they were assuming, and warned them of the dangers of sectarianism, Enthusiasm, and itinerant preaching. They particularly cautioned the Society against giving its servants cause to regard themselves as "called" to carry out a mission for which they had no call from God. The clergy were obviously afraid that Inner Mission would give lay-preaching some stamp of ecclesiastical recognition. They also suggested

⁷ Also printed in NK, I, pp. 121-124.

the deletion of all reference to "evangelical-Lutheran Christians" and to the inability of the Church to cope with the existing need. This amounted to a proposal to omit any reference to the "emergency principle". They reminded the committee that it is not given to men to draw limits to the Church. Finally, the clergy urged the Society to work with "as little ostentation" as possible.

The committee adopted some of the clergy proposals in the final draft.⁸ Paragraph VII was shortened and in its final form read that the Society would give the clergy "such support as the situation demands". The clergy were to have opportunity to supervise. In Paragraph I, the committee partially adopted the suggested redraft, but included the emergency principle. The Society was to be composed of "members of the Lutheran Church" and was to work "where spiritual ignorance and moral depravity seem to demand a more extended pastoral care than the Church under its existing organization is able to provide". Paragraph V remained essentially unchanged, with its reference to the charismatic principle and its "conviction of the heart".

The first attack upon Inner Mission was delivered by the doughty High-Churchman O. T. Krohg, vicar of Vestnes, and appeared in the daily press.⁹ In his view, Inner Mission

8 NK, I, pp. 51f.

9 Morgenbladet, 1855, no's. 45 and 85.

was not something new, but had existed since 33 A.D. It is the administration of the means of grace through the ordained Ministry, "the office of grace". Article XIV of the Augsburg Confession placed public preaching in the hands of those who have received the gift of the Holy Spirit in ordination. He warned the sponsors of the movement that confusion and schism would result if Inner Mission were not integrated into the Church Order. He compared the relationship of the pastor to his parish to the marriage relationship. When outsiders force their way into the parish, the pastor is in the position of an outraged husband. The office of the Ministry is a divine institution, given by God and not by the congregation. The Apostolic office has come down to us "in unbroken succession". The Universal Priesthood and the clerical office are two "quite different" things. Only ordained clergy can perform ordination, not because of the person, but because of the office. Krohg's concept of the Ministry was thoroughly Wexelian. He referred to Wexels' Pastoraltheologi as "a book that is in the hands of almost all of the clergy and some laymen", and asserted that "practically all" of the clergy shared his view. This was an exaggeration at the time, and would be even less true in the years to come.¹⁰

¹⁰ A majority of the clergy did share Krohg's view, but it was already being seriously challenged. Cf. the debate on the Ministry which took place at the Skien pastoral conference in June, 1854, TT, VI, pp. 125ff. The conference finally passed a resolution to appeal to the Ministry for Church Affairs for more pastors, a common demand at the time.

Several clergymen were already involved in the Inner Mission, and there was considerable clergy support by 1860.

Krohg proposed the ordination of a number of additional men to do Inner Mission work "organized by the Bishops and under the supervision of the parish pastors". In other words, Krohg was proposing the establishment of a Diaconate. He was not opposed to inner mission work, but was vitally concerned to keep it under the control of the clergy and within the established order. This seemed to be the only way to ensure confessional fidelity, and it remained the official High-Church policy as long as the party existed.¹¹

Inner Mission was defended against Krohg by "D" in the same paper.¹² "D" agreed that Inner Mission was inherent in the nature of the Church, but put forward a concept of the Church which differed sharply from Krohg's clericalism. The Church, he said, possessed a "dualistic" character. On the one hand, it was a divine institution, with a corresponding emphasis on the Sacramental; This was its "immediate" character. On the other hand, it possessed a "mediate" character, in which the stress is placed upon

¹¹ Krohg's final word on the subject was an article which appeared in 1883 entitled: "Proposal for appointment of Deacons by the Bishops, and their activity under clerical control", *Morgenbladet*, 1883, no. 63.

¹² *Morgenbladet*, 1855, no. 63. Among the other achievements which "D" claimed for Inner Mission was the maintenance of Britains social peace in 1848. By "Inner Mission" he probably meant the long-range effects of the Methodist and Evangelical Revivals. I suggest that "D" should be identified with Paul J. Dybdahl, pastor at Røken. Cf. LK, IX, pp. 33ff. He was known to have published some anonymous articles: See article on Dybdahl in *Halvorsen, Forfatter-Lexicon*.

the believers themselves. There is a further dualism in the Ministry; On the one hand, it has a priestly, Sacramental function, and on the other hand, a preaching function. There is in addition a dualism in the preaching office itself. While God has attached a divine promise to the preaching of the Word as such, the ability of individual preachers depends upon the possession in varying degrees of a charisma. Ordination gives him not the ability, but only the permission to preach, because he seems to possess the ability. It is impossible to draw limits to the inner call. Inner Mission is based upon the Universal Priesthood and the charismatic principle. Since the congregation has neglected its duty to carry out the Universal Priesthood, it has lost the legal right. Inner Mission seeks to restore both. Thus, on the basis of the Universal Priesthood, and the charismatic principle, "D" sought to establish the right of the Church in its "mediate" aspect to carry out evangelistic work, by means which are parallel and (if necessary) supplementary to the clerical office. Indeed, the clergy should not only guard against the abuse of the preaching office, but also ensure that each person who possesses the necessary charisma uses his right and fulfils his duty. Each part of the Body of the Church must function.

Meanwhile, the Inner Mission movement spread. Local societies sprang up in Sarpsborg (1855), Trondhjem (1859), Drammen (1860), Bergen (1863), and Bodø in North Norway (1864). The idea of a nation-wide organization was broached

as early as 1856, but some years were to pass before any such action was begun. Charitable institutions were also established, as well as special Christian work among youth, emigrants, military personnel, and the like.

The most thorough discussion up to this date of the whole question of Inner Mission and lay-preaching was held at a rump session following a missionary meeting in Drammen in 1860.¹³ Gisle Johnson delivered the opening lecture on the subject of Inner Mission, and a lively debate followed. Here were represented most of the clerical and lay points of view, except for the most radical on either side.

Johnson first established the need for Inner Mission. The situation, he said, was indeed better than it had been fifty years previously, but still only a beginning had been made. Inner Mission was "the action of the Church to conquer the heathenism which remains in our midst". (He defined the Church as the community of believers.) The only means at the disposal of the Church are the means of grace, in emergency as well as in normal times. These belong to the entire congregation, and are equally powerful in the hands of any believer. But God is a God of order, and this is indicated by the way in which He has distributed the Charismata.¹⁴ From this fact there arises a variety of vocations, including a vocation to the office of the Ministry. Still, all Christians have a right and a duty to participate

¹³ Printed under the title Forhandlinger ved det kirkelige Møde i Drammen, 11-13 Juli 1860, (ed. Th. Bernhoft).

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 8.

in the work of the Church, so long as they do not disturb the public (OFFENTLIG) administration of the means of grace. There are too few clergy in Norway, and many fall short of the ideal. Consequently, lay forces must be pressed into service. God has blessed Norway more richly than any other Lutheran land in the matter of "great gifts" for lay-preaching. But Johnson also emphasized the fact that only in an emergency is the use of this talent "ecclesiastically justified".¹⁵ If Inner Mission is to serve the Church, it must not only be firmly grounded in the Lutheran Confession, it must also "respect" and "support" the clergy. The ideal situation is where the pastor himself leads the local Society. On the other hand, if he rejects the Inner Mission, the laity are to proceed without him, both in preaching and in the organization of their society. Johnson assumes that the Inner Mission is to operate strictly within the limits of its own local parish. He was afraid of any "actual organization" on a larger scale.

In the discussion which followed, Johnson elaborated certain points. He stressed the importance of Article XIV; Anyone who refuses to recognize it "thereby declares that he wants nothing to do with the Lutheran Church."¹⁶ He also emphasized the importance both of the inner and

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 17.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 39. This statement is a classic illustration of Johnson's intellectualist conception of Revelation, whereby rejection of any one proposition in the system inevitably leads to a charge of heresy, if not to virtual exclusion from the Church.

the outer call. In Norway, only he who is called by the Ministry for Church Affairs is RITE VOCATUS and authorized to preach "OFFENTLIG". Johnson admitted that it was hard to draw the line between "OFFENTLIG" and private activity; This was the crucial point. He chose to define "OFFENTLIG" as "where I invite the general public to hear me". Only where the Word is being proclaimed either insufficiently or not at all has the individual or the Inner Mission society (an organization which is no more official than the individual) the right to break the rule. The Inner Mission is therefore "a temporary emergency measure, which we believe to be necessary until an ordering of lay activity by the Church can make it superfluous".¹⁷ At the same time, although the Inner Mission cannot issue a call to a lay-preacher, its organization of lay-preaching in "set forms" would be a great boon. The encouragement and support of Inner Mission would not be without significance for the lay-preacher.¹⁸

The conference was in general agreement on several points: There was indeed a variety of charismata in the Church, more lay activity was desirable, and the gulf between clergy and laity should be bridged. But there were various emphases and shades of opinion on other aspects of

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 45.

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 79f.

the problem. The laymen felt keenly the lack of an outer call, but in spite of pangs of conscience, they repeatedly asserted their right to preach, on the basis of their inner call and the desperate need.¹⁹ Some, including Cand. Theol. Anton Johnson (Gisle Johnson's brother), regarded a request from the pastor or the local laity as an outer call. One layman pointed out the fact that it was possible for a clergyman to possess the outer call but no inner call.²⁰ Vicar Andreas Hauge, son of the great lay leader, agreed essentially with Gisle Johnson, but thought that Johnson overemphasized the emergency principle "as though an 'as a rule' could be inserted into" Article XIV. Hauge preferred to find justification for lay-preaching in a broad interpretation of "OFFENTLIG". He could conceive of as many as 1000 people in a "private" meeting. Only if the preacher claims official authority, "if he comes to speak to the congregation", is his activity "OFFENTLIG".²¹ While Hauge favoured lay-preaching on this basis, he repeatedly emphasized the fact that Inner Mission had no authority to send out lay-preachers, and also that Inner Mission must confine its activity to the local parish.

Many of the other clergy expressed reservations. Pastor Th. Dop. spoke of the large number of itinerant preachers who work without any authority in law or in

19 Cf. the statements of, e.g. Styrk Eielsen, p. 27., Chr. Svanholm, p. 64, Hveding, p. 28.

20 Ibid., p. 28.

21 Ibid., p. 66.

Scripture. Pastor Gloersen reminded the gathering that the clergy were under oath to uphold Article XIV. He stated that he would gladly receive lay-preachers if he could conscientiously do so. Pastor Brochmann suggested the establishment of an institute to train lay workers, and the creation of a Diaconate. Pastor D. A. Aabel accused the Christiania Inner Mission of failure to keep to its proper task of visiting the neglected, and of holding public meetings and Bible studies in "collision" with the clergy. He was answered by Pastor Julius Bruun and several others. The leading critic at the meeting was vicar Sven Brun. He rejected the emergency principle out of hand. The need of the Church is permanent, but this must not be turned into an excuse for work undertaken outside the rule of law and order. The Church's need was never greater than in the Reformation Era, yet it was the Reformers who composed Article XIV! The office of the Ministry was instituted by the Lord Himself, and the congregation must entrust the administration of the means of grace wholly to it. Brun did not deny the existence of a variety of gifts in the congregation, but he argued that the possession of a gift does not entitle anyone to seize the office. The inner call by itself is not enough. Indeed, the call is not given in the Charismata, nor in the desire to preach, nor is it guaranteed by the "results". There are really not two calls, but one, and it is a simultaneous "go" within and a "come" from the congregation. Lay activity within one's

own circle is proper, but it is not permissible to leave home and vocation to become an itinerant preacher. Brun was obviously concerned to restrain lay-preaching. He flatly rejects the charismatic principle, and interprets the emergency principle as a recognition that lay-preaching in fact possessed no "objective rights". He opposed the conferrence of a legal status upon lay-preaching. While admitting the contention of Gisle Johnson that the order of salvation must take precedence over Church Order, he nevertheless insisted that it was best achieved by means of the order of the Church. He also admitted the need for Inner Mission, but held that it must be ordered under the clergy. The Church, he said, would welcome a voluntary Diaconate, provided it was exercised under proper control.²²

(d) The Change of Direction in the Inner Mission Movement, and the Establishment of Lutherstiftelsen.

The meeting at Drammen led to no concrete action or resolution, but provides a good indication of the points of view prevalent among interested Churchmen at the time. Amid the varying opinions and emphases, the personality and standpoint of Gisle Johnson looms as the most powerful influence, attempting to unite clergy and laity, confession-alism and lay-preaching, the Church and Inner Mission, the institutional and the charismatic principles. Johnson had gone into a leaderless vacuum, had adopted the revival

22 Ibid., pp. 29-36, 56-63.

method, and had struck a chord deep within a people reared on Pontoppidan. For the next thirty years, he was to continue to hold the Inner Mission movement in tension, tenaciously clinging to the emergency principle, but gradually being forced toward the left, toward a more Low-Church position. This was in keeping with the general political trend, and foreign and non-Lutheran influences in the Church, first from Sweden, and later from the Anglo-Saxon world, were also to play a part.¹

The first such influence was the revival movement known as Neo-Evangelicalism or Rosenianism, after the great Swedish lay leader, Carl Olof Rosenius (1816-1868). This movement entered Norway through Rosenius' books and his magazine Pietisten (begun in 1842), and through Olaus Nielsen's Kirkelig Tidende. But it was not until the 1860's that it became a power in Norway, through the work of a number of Norwegian lay-preachers, notably P. G. Sand, Jakob Traasdahl, Andreas Lavik, and later Thormod Rettedahl. The hyper-evangelicalism of the new revival ("Come as you are!") led to a sharp conflict with the more legalistic old Haugeans. Rosenianism was Pietistic, subjectivistic, and individualistic. Its anti-clericalism and even contempt

¹ O. Handeland, Vardøysing, I, pp. 42f. This popular, one-sided work is nonetheless an excellent source of insight into the views of the radical wing of the lay movement. Handeland is critical of the emergency principle, describing it as a "back door" for lay-preaching, which tended to reduce lay-preachers to the status of "ecclesiastical cot-tars". Moreover, he is critical of the alleged tendency of the Johnsonians to interpret Scripture according to the Confessions. Cf. pp. 43ff.

for the State Church (an attitude not shared by Rosenius himself) led to considerable conflict with the clergy. Rosenianism was strongest in West Norway, especially in the Bergen area. Here there were continual local revivals, "with a smell of sulphur".²

West Norway possessed a long tradition of independence from Oslo and the East. Bergen had been the only city in which Hauge could work freely. When "The Society for Inner Mission in Bergen and Surrounding Area" was organized (by laymen alone) in 1863, it was on the basis of free lay-preaching. The emergency principle was rejected. The standpoint of the Society called forth a protest from the local clergy: "Inner Mission intends to hold Bible studies, public lectures, etc.--an activity which we regard as obviously belonging to what our Confession calls 'public teaching'...and we greatly fear that our evangelical-Lutheran Church cannot truly be edified through an activity which quite expressly conflicts with a part of the Church's own Confession." The clergy also noted that the Society planned to work not only within the individual parish, but also throughout the diocese. This they regarded as an "intrusion" which will not be beneficial to "The Church as a whole". "Church disorder", they said, "can hardly build up the Church of God."³

The Rosenian movement, then, tended to accentuate

² Ibid., p. 17.

³ Quoted in B. Eide, et.al., Det Vestlandske Indremisjonsforbund Gjennom 50 Aar, pp. 59, 61.

revivalist and anti-clerical tendencies and the suspicion of the State Church already prevalent in West Norway. Nor was its influence confined to West Norway, although it was strongest there.

Gisle Johnson had staunchly opposed any attempt to organize the Inner Mission movement beyond the local level, on the grounds that it might appear to be "a Church within the Church". The Drammen meeting had displayed general unanimity on this point. But pressure for further organization steadily increased, and Johnson, "after the most earnest consideration", consented in 1866 to participate and eventually to lead in the organization of "Den Norske Lutherstiftelsen" (The Norwegian Luther Foundation).

In December of 1866, the organizing committee sent a copy of the proposed by-laws for the Foundation to 1200 pastors and laymen. The organization, patterned after the Swedish "Evangeliska Fosterlandsstiftelse", was to consist of a Board of twelve men living in or near Christiania. They were to examine, select, and send out the Foundation's "Bible messengers" or colporteurs.⁴ The Bible messengers were to be examined on their "knowledge of Christianity and ecclesiastical standpoint", and were to go where the Board directed. Their credentials were to be valid for periods of six months at a time. Their task was "to converse with individuals, read to them, and hold devotional

⁴ G. Johnson, "Den Norske Lutherstiftelse", LK, VIII, 1867, pp. 273ff. Rules for the activity of the Bible messengers were printed on P. 278n.

meetings in homes, where requested to do so", and they were to seek out especially "the poor, the ignorant, the sick, and the needy". The Foundation was to have a "contact man" in each parish, and the messenger was to call on him first. "As soon as possible", he was also to contact the parish vicar, and receive from him "help and guidance".⁵

The most delicate question was, of course, the question of lay-preaching. The committee expressed the opinion that "there are emergencies which justify public preaching of God's Word even by those not regularly called by the Church...". In their view, the Lord had "richly blessed lay-preaching in our land...". Although a "private circle" such as the Board of Lutherstiftelsen could not authorize anyone to preach, everyone who is truly compelled by the Spirit to witness already has this right, in an emergency. Therefore, the committee proposed that the question of lay-preaching be left "a free matter".⁶ The rules for Bible messengers contained the statement that they were not "sent out" for the purpose of public preaching, but that they were not "forbidden" to preach, provided they possessed the necessary "gift and ability" and their "proper" work was not neglected.⁷ Thus Lutherstiftelsen represented a concession to lay-preaching as well as to the demand for a broader Inner Mission organization.

Reaction was not long in coming. The editor of

5 Ibid., p. 278n.

6 Ibid., p. 277.

7 Ibid., p. 278n.

Morgenbladet launched a sustained attack on the scheme, calling it "a complete new apparatus for governing our Church in an anti-confessional spirit". He was seconded by Professor M. J. Monrad, who wrote a weighty series of articles in the same paper. Monrad criticized the way in which the committee had operated as "underhanded". He too regarded the enterprise as "OFFENTLIG", and saw in it the elements of an ECCLESIA JUXTA ECCLESIAM. He protested strongly against its associational character; It is not permissible to "play State or Church" through an association. Moreover, Monrad issued the warning that Lutherstiftelsen would not be a means toward greater freedom, but would inevitably become hierarchical and centralized.⁸

As might be expected, O.T. Krohg took the field against the Foundation.⁹ He maintained that the purpose of Lutherstiftelsen was already being fulfilled through another organization, "the holy Christian Church". He saw in the Foundation a parallel organization; The members of the Board corresponded to the twelve Apostles, the Bible messengers to the clergy. He predicted that Lutherstiftelsen would be like the Rata tree of New Zealand, which chokes all other plant life within its reach. The Bible messengers would bring schism and disorder. He reminded his readers that they

⁸ Morgenbladet, 1867, no's. 116, 142, 144, 148B, 158B. The anti-confessional charge seems a strange one to direct at Gisle Johnson; The editor was evidently referring to Article XIV.

⁹ Morgenbladet, 1867, no. 66.

had all entered into a covenant with God in Baptism, and where this covenant was alive, Lutherstiftelsen was superfluous. In a later article, Krohg repeated his proposal for a re-organization of the Church "as a Body", with a strong single head and parish councils and a synod. This re-organized Church could then begin to organize its lay forces properly.¹⁰

The most serious opposition to Lutherstiftelsen came, however, from another source. In April of 1867, fourteen of the seventeen clergy in Christiania, including Bishop Arup, issued a public protest in Morgenbladet.¹¹

The clergy of Christiania admitted that there was a "need" in the Church of Norway, but they denied that it was extraordinary. Need may arise from a particular situation in the Church, such as the inadequacy of a given Church order to meet the requirements of the age, or it may simply be the expression of the constant situation of the Church in this world. The clergy believed that the chief problem existing in the Church was the shortage of clergy. In other words, they rejected the emergency principle as inapplicable to the existing situation.

Their principal objection to Lutherstiftelsen, however, was its "OFFENTLIG" character. Its "error" consists in its attempt to "constitute itself as an institution independent of the clergy". The by-laws of the Foundation contain

¹⁰ Morgenbladet, 1867, no. 255.

¹¹ Morgenbladet, 1867, no. 123A.

"unChurchliness", and conflict with the Church order. The activity of the Bible messengers "can by no means be called private". The Board of Lutherstiftelsen would, in calling them, be establishing itself as "a Church government number two". The local contact men are extra "superintendents" for the local congregation. Inner Mission is justified only if it confines itself to the local congregation and remains subordinate to the clergy. Lay activity must be "organically integrated into the entire Body of the Church". The more extensive and influential an extraordinary enterprise is, the more liable it is to offend against the established order. "A corporation of twelve" is more dangerous than an individual. It matters not that many applaud the undertaking, nor that the clergy themselves support it, for neither "many" nor the clergy (and still less a minority) is authorized to speak for the Church. Moreover, the establishment of Lutherstiftelsen is in conflict with the Augsburg Confession; "Never has Article XIV so obviously been thrust aside". "Hardly any enterprise" was less suited to bear the name of Luther. They made the further charge that Lutherstiftelsen was a blind for other designs, "a sign which says one thing but whose reality will be quite different". Its protagonists know that lay-preaching will result, and they seek to organize the Inner Mission on a nation-wide scale. The clergy expected "no real help" from this venture, but rather "schism and confusion". They therefore felt unable to

participate in its leadership, decisions, or institutions, or to "share the responsibility of the clerical office with men whom the Church has not called" .

The committee was stung by this rebuke, which they hastened to say was unique among all the correspondence they had received on the matter. They replied in the same newspaper, repeating the same arguments as before.¹² The need was extraordinary: The large, scattered, and multiple parishes, the long distances to Church, the geographical difficulties, poverty, and the shortage of clergy, all made unique demands upon the Norwegian Church.¹³ "Mormons and other sectarians" were active. The quality of pastoral care was not always what it should be. In this day of visitation, the Church of Norway must utilize the lay forces at its disposal. This step cannot be postponed indefinitely, and the experience of Lutherstiftelsen would prove a valuable guide for future "official" action. The committee again stressed the "private" character of the Foundation. The position taken by the clergy that it was "OFFENTLIG" was "completely untenable". The committee pointed to the parallel situation in the field of foreign missions. They thought it "improbable" that a Foundation which was sworn to fidelity to the Confessions would be

"unChurchly" or "separatistic". They hoped that their

¹² Morgenbladet, 1867, no. 135. Also printed in LK, VIII, 1867, pp. 332ff.

¹³ Maanedstidende for den Indre Mission, 1868, p. 7 pointed out the fact that the ratio of clergy to laity was twice as low in Norway (1 to 3272) as in Denmark (1 to 1553).

"contact man" would be the local pastor in as many cases as possible. They pointed out the fact that one of the purposes of Lutherstiftelsen was to give aid to needy theological students. They again disclaimed any scheme to form a national Inner Mission organization. Finally, the committee denied that Lutherstiftelsen was in conflict with Article XIV (it was private) or with the existing Church order (it gave no authorization to lay-preachers).

The project was discussed further at a meeting held after the 1867 general convention of the Norwegian Missionary Society at Christiansand.¹⁴ Here, various standpoints were represented. The High-Churchmen were represented by F. W. Bugge, later to become successively professor and Bishop. Bugge was an opponent of lay-preaching, and he was not convinced of the applicability of the emergency principle. Not all "need" could be remedied by public preaching. Those who attended the meetings of lay-preachers were those who wished to hear God's Word, not those who needed it most. The relationship between Lutherstiftelsen and "OFFENTLIG" activity needed greater clarification; Otherwise, the loyalty of the clergy to their ordination promise would make it impossible for them to participate in its work. The activity of the Ministry and that of the congregation must form an organic unity under clerical

¹⁴ LK, IX, 1867, pp. 102ff, 131ff., 171ff., 216ff. This was the convention at which the famous Øvrum proposal for application of the charismatic principle on the mission field was made. Cf. the chapter on Foreign Missions.

leadership.

Others proposed that Lutherstiftelsen should go further, and authorize lay-preaching on the basis of the charismatic principle.¹⁵ Pastor Chr. Dons, the general secretary of NMS, envisaged the organization of Lutherstiftelsen on the same lines as the foreign missionary society, with local societies organically united, and a general convention as the governing body. He also suggested that the local society might be regarded as an unofficial parish council, the first step toward a synodical polity for the Church. He proposed that the Foundation authorize lay-preachers, when they are "called" by a local society with the pastor as chairman. They would thus be serving as "representatives" of the congregation, the lay-preachers would be "regularly called", and the requirements of Article XIV would thus be satisfied. The pastor would participate "officially", for he was the pastor of the "Church" as well as of the "State Church". At present, too much responsibility rested upon the lay-preacher. In the Lutheran Church, it is the congregation which is the bearer of the means of grace. They should share in the responsibility for calling lay-preachers.

Gisle Johnson opposed Dons' proposal. He rejected the idea of a national Inner Mission based on local societies, on the grounds that it might appear to be "a Church within the Church".¹⁶ Moreover, a local Inner Mission

¹⁵ Cf. the remarks of the laymen Tønnesen and Hektoen, p. 173.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 105.

society cannot act as the congregation, nor would it be recognized as such by the Ministry for Church Affairs.

Johnson also clarified several other points. He stressed the fact that messengers would not be sent without consulting the local pastor, although he admitted that cases might arise in which a messenger would be sent where no local society existed and the pastor rejected the offer. This would in itself be a sign of the greatest need. He regarded local Inner Mission societies as temporary agencies, until the local parishes secured governing organs. After their establishment, they would be the proper agencies to decide whether to call in a Bible messenger. Johnson also further clarified his understanding of the word "OFFENTLIG" in Article XIV. The Reformers, he said, used the word (The Latin PUBLICE) to mean "on behalf of the congregation" or "in the name of the congregation", or "with the authority of the congregation as the proper bearer of the means of grace". Johnson admitted that the word could also mean "publicly" or the opposite of "secretly", and that the two meanings were closely connected. All activity of the ordained clergyman is "OFFENTLIG". On the other hand, no activity of the layman is "OFFENTLIG" unless he assumes the authority of the congregation. The question, then, with regard to lay-preaching is not how many are present, but "the manner in which he appears". If asked by a group of people (not pretending to be the congregation) to speak, the lay-preacher is not carrying out an "OFFENTLIG"

activity. But the activity of an itinerant preacher, with the express intention of gathering people to hear him preach, would be correctly described as "OFFENTLIG".¹⁷

The views of Anton Johnson were frank and outspoken. He was doubtful whether Lutherstiftelsen could avoid organizing itself as a national Inner Mission society. Indeed, he thought it should deliberately do so. The work of the Bible messengers will be "OFFENTLIG", and we may as well admit it. Lutherstiftelsen had no authority to call pastors, but it should not hesitate to send lay-preachers where the need and the necessary charismata were present. These words were both frank and prophetic.

The Meeting at Christiansand was entirely unofficial, but it served once again to bring out the various views.

The Grundtvigian party adopted a line of its own on the subject of lay activity. This was expounded in two articles by Cand.Theol. Ole Arvesen in Kirkelig Folkeblad.¹⁸ The Grundtvigians were naturally opposed to Lutherstiftelsen, which Arvesen accused of being "based from beginning to end on a falsehood". He interpreted the emergency principle to mean "need makes the illegal legal". The attempt of the lay movement to retain both lay-preaching and Article XIV was "self-contradictory". Lutherstiftelsen represented either "confused thinking" or "cowardice", and was not beneficial either for the Church or for the laity.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 218.

¹⁸ Kirkelig Folkeblad, NR V, 1867, pp. 81ff., 161ff.

Arvesen claimed that two things make a man a Christian: Baptism and Faith. Two things make a man a pastor: The call and ordination. He thought theological study highly overrated. Although he disclaimed anti-intellectualism, he proposed new legislation to make it easier for gifted laymen to secure ordination. When the lay-preacher possesses the necessary attributes, he has the inner call; It only remains for the Church to issue the outer call. This would be in harmony with the Confessions, and would provide a mediating influence in the class struggle. Arvesen's proposal is fully in keeping with the basic position of Grundtvigianism: A demand for greater freedom from the State, a "popular" emphasis in contrast to the prevailing notion of a "classical" education, and at the same time a concern for Church order. Moreover, the Grundtvigians feared the growing power of the Johnsonians. Arvesen warned lay-preachers of the danger of examination by Lutherstiftelsen; The Grundtvigians had experienced Orthodox examinations in the University!

There may have been those who sought to ignore the lay movement completely and to concede it no rights, but there could not have been many. Opinion among both clergy and laity, was divided into three groups: To the left stood those (mostly laymen) who wanted complete freedom for lay-preaching. To the right stood those (mostly clergy) who sought some way of integrating lay activity into the Church order under the clerical office. In the middle were the

Johnsonians, with their emergency principle. Lutherstiftelsen was their child, and after the not inconsiderable travail which we have sketched here, it came into the world in 1868. The original scheme was essentially unchanged. One concession to protest was made; The idea of local contact men was abandoned. For the time being, nothing replaced it; Gisle Johnson refused to make Lutherstiftelsen an organization of local societies. The same year, Maanedstidende for Den Indre Mission" (The Inner Mission Monthly) appeared; It ran for nine years. In addition, the Johnsonians founded still another organ, the weekly newspaper Faedrelandet, edited by the Johnsonian theologians Thv. Klaveness and Peder Haerem.¹⁹ The editors dreamed of turning the paper into a Christian daily, but the plan never materialized. However, it championed the Johnsonian causes (Lutherstiftelsen, and reform) for the next five years.

(e) The Development of a National Inner Mission.

Lutherstiftelsen was a compromise arrangement. As such, it was unsatisfactory to large segments of the Norwegian Church in the long run. To the High-Churchman, it represented a legitimization of irregularity. To the lay-preacher, the emergency principle was ludicrously

¹⁹ A. Skrondal, Grundtvigianismen i Norge, p. 111 calls Faedrelandet "a spokesman for Løhe's concept of the Church". This is a most incomprehensible error, for it was as faithful to the Johnsonian party line as it could well be.

inadequate, for it was not a full recognition of the charismatic principle. It meant, as Sven Brun had said, that lay-preaching had no objective rights. It raised but failed to answer many questions: When is the need so great as to justify lay-preaching? Who shall make the decision? (In practice, it usually fell to the Bible messenger himself.) Where can the line be drawn between private devotions and public preaching? As a result, Lutherstiftelsen came under increasing pressure to alter its character, and gradually, it yielded to the pressure. In his characteristically colourful fashion, Handeland has described Lutherstiftelsen's policy as an attempt to sit on two chairs at once. The new generation pulled the chairs (representing High-Church and Low-Church parties respectively) apart.¹ In the end, the emergency principle fell, and Lutherstiftelsen was reorganized as a national Inner Mission society based upon the charismatic principle. We proceed now to sketch this development and the final great debate over lay-preaching in the 1870's.

The first change in Lutherstiftelsen occurred already in 1871, when the Foundation reorganized as an organization of local societies with a general convention as the highest governing body, exactly like NMS. Handeland says that this was an era of new forms in the Inner Mission movement.

¹ O. Handeland, Vårloysing, I, pl. 67. In another place, he calls Lutherstiftelsen "a bomb which blasted a great hole in the wall of the Church", p. 45.

In many places, the old Haugean elders ruled the local societies up to 1870, but as they died, they were replaced by local boards.² In the annual report of 1870, mention was made of increasing pressure on the part of the supporters of Lutherstiftelsen for the creation of societies. The Board stated that it "had nothing against" the formation of local societies.³ In the following year, a change was announced in the by-laws, which would give "those who support the cause a part in its direction" and prevent the "isolation" of the Board.⁴ The Foundation, it was claimed, could not thrive in the long run without this. The amended by-laws opened the way for "any Churchly society" which joined the Foundation and supported it to be represented at the general convention, which would be held triennially.

Thus Lutherstiftelsen conquered its fear of appearing to be a Church within the Church, and took the first step toward a more permanent and compact organization. Whether in protest or not, Gisle Johnson resigned as chairman of the Board for the next five years.⁵

Two further changes in the by-laws were unanimously adopted by the general convention of 1876.⁶ These provide a clear picture of the attitude taken toward lay-preaching in the Inner Mission movement at the time. The first

2 Ibid., pp. 45ff.

3 MTIM, III, pp. 18f. Financial difficulties may have played a part in this decision. Lutherstiftelsen showed a deficit of 300 SPECIEDOLLARS for the year 1869 (Cf. MTIM, IV, p. 21).

4 MTIM, IV, pp. 39ff.

5 G. Ousland, En Kirkehøvdning, p. 222.

6 Minutes printed in MTIM, IX, Bilag.

change was the insertion of the qualifying phrase "as a rule" in Article VI, which now read as follows: "Bible messengers shall, as a rule, be sent to parishes from which a request for assistance has been received by the Board".⁷ The second was even more significant. Pastor Thorvald Klaveness, one of the most zealous champions of lay-preaching and the charismatic principle, proposed the following amendment to Article VIII: "The Foundation permits its Bible messengers to preach God's Word in public (OFFENTLIG) gatherings, when they feel an inner call to do so and when experienced Christian friends and the local situation encourage them..."⁸ Klaveness had originally proposed this change at an Inner Mission meeting held in the previous year at Drammen.⁹ It had elicited a lively debate; Gisle Johnson and others opposed the change, but in vain. Johnson seems not to have been present at the convention of 1876, and sentiment was all on the side of Klaveness. The convention unanimously passed his resolution, but to make it less offensive, the word "OFFENTLIG" was replaced by the phrase "in larger gatherings".¹⁰

Lay-preaching thus advanced one more step on the road to full recognition. Lutherstiftelsen was not yet sending out preachers, but it had recognized the charismatic principle, and it now "permitted" lay-preaching.

⁷ Ibid., p. 19.

⁸ Ibid., p. 20.

⁹ MTIM, VIII, p. 170.

¹⁰ MTIM, IX, BILAG, p. 28.

The Foundation had other functions as well. It published and disseminated Christian literature; In 1875, it published a total of 376,500 copies, of which 244,633 were actually distributed during the year. But assistance to needy theological students never assumed any real importance, and even the sale of books eventually dried up to the merest trickle.¹¹ It was the work of the Bible messengers which was regarded as of supreme importance from the start, and their chief occupation came increasingly to be regarded as public preaching. Their expenses were reimbursed by the Foundation, but since it did not wish to encourage them to leave their ordinary vocations, it was not called a salary, but "a contribution enabling those who feel the inner call...to follow that call..."¹² Lutherstiftelsen grew; From the original fifty local societies, it grew to 140 in ten years. Beginning in 1868 with five Bible messengers, it had 77 in 1876.¹³ It received support not only from within the borders of Norway, but also from Britain, particularly from Scotland. Secretary Peder Haerem made a tour of Britain in 1870, speaking for the Norwegian Inner Mission. The result was a substantial contribution, totalling more than 15% of its total income for that year. This support continued for forty years.¹⁴

¹¹ E. Sverdrup, Fra Norges Kristenliv, p. 170.

¹² Ibid., p. 176. The quotation is from the annual report for 1876.

¹³ MTIM, IX, p. 10.

¹⁴ MTIM, IV, p. 38; E. Sverdrup, op. cit., pp. 134f.

Still, all was not as it might have been with Lutherstiftelsen. A considerable part of the Inner Mission movement remained outside it, in Trondhjem, in the Skien area, and particularly in West Norway. The Bergen Society never did join Lutherstiftelsen, but became instead the nucleus of an eventual competitor. We must bear in mind how isolated the two parts of the country were by the mountains. "In those days, it was farther from West Norway to East Norway than it is to England or even America today."¹⁵ Jealousy between the two halves of the country may well have had its part to play, combined with differences in political allegiance. But there were also differences in religious emphasis. In East Norway, the most important factors were those of Hauge and Gisle Johnson, in the West new leaders arose who combined revivalist religion with radical politics. A book which moulded the thought of the Inner Mission supporters in the West was J. A. Merle D'Aubigné's work on the Scottish Church, which appeared in Norwegian translation in 1873 under the title Two Kings and Two Kingdoms (To Konger og To Kongeriger). It was widely read, and served to strengthen alike the Biblicism and the radicalism of West Norway.

By 1870, East Norway lost the initiative in the Inner Mission movement to the West. Fresh revivals swept through the West, and the movement for the construction of "Prayer-houses" reached its climax.¹⁶ The new leaders were men of

¹⁵ B. Eide, et.al., op. cit., p. 72.

¹⁶ O. Handeland, Vårsløysing, I, pp. 45ff.

a very different temper from Hauge and Gisle Johnson. As examples we shall select two. One of them was the powerful revival preacher Lars Oftedal. He ranged throughout the area around Stavanger, preaching revival; The Church attempted to domesticate him by giving him a parish in the city. Here, he erected a huge Prayer-house and orphanage, published a devotional magazine ("Bibelbudet"--The Bible Messenger"), continued his itinerant activity, and became a power in the Storting, until he was finally ruined by personal scandal in 1890. Another even more powerful figure was Vicar Jakob Sverdrup (1845-99), a member of one of Norway's most gifted and influential families. His uncle, Johan Sverdrup, was Norway's first great party politician, the founder of the Liberal Party and prime minister of the first Parliamentary government in the 1880's. Jakob Sverdrup had been principal of a folk-high school in Sogndal, and was later vicar of Korskirken in Bergen. Together with the schoolman Ole Irgens, he was the leader of the Bergen Reform party (See the chapter on Reform), and he served both in the Storting and in his uncle's and later governments. He was Minister for Church Affairs from 1885 to 1889 and from 1895 to 1898, and at the time of his death was Bishop of Bergen. Few Churchmen or even politicians have been subjected to the kind of bitter criticism ("démagogue", "the yellow intriguer") which the Conservative press poured out upon him. As a young man, he had been gripped by Cavour's principle,

"A free Church in a free State", and he never abandoned it as long as he lived. We shall examine his concept of the Church and review his work as a champion of reform in Church polity in a later chapter. Here, we shall concern ourselves only with his views on the Ministry and lay-preaching.

Sverdrup was an advocate of the charismatic principle and consequently of free lay-preaching. At the convention of 1876, he moved to instruct the Board to present to the following convention a proposal for new by-laws, by which Lutherstiftelsen would actually send out lay-preachers for that purpose.¹⁷ The motion was in fact carried with only three dissentient votes, but the Board unanimously refused to recommend any such change, on the grounds that, 1) it was superfluous in view of the Klaveness amendment, and 2) any outer call to the lay-preacher should come from the local congregation and not from Lutherstiftelsen.¹⁸ Thus the proposal was abortive. The influence of Gisle Johnson is probably to be suspected here. Sverdrup had argued that this was the only way to unite the Inner Mission movement. In this he was undoubtedly correct; It was precisely Lutherstiftelsen's reluctance to send out lay-preachers which was the major factor preventing unity. In some cases, notably in the case of the Bergen Society, fear of domination by the clergy was also an important consideration. In 1878, Sverdrup called for a union of

17 MTIM, IX, Bilag, p. 27.

18 LK, 4R, III, 1878, pp. 217f.

all Inner Mission activity with headquarters in Bergen, but there was little interest for such a scheme in West Norway. There was greater interest in the East, though not of course for Bergen as its centre. Easterners feared the radical Low-Churchmanship of the Westerners.

(f) The Final Conflict over Lay-Preaching
Johan Christian Heuch (1838-1904) and Jak. Sverdrup

Meanwhile, Gisle Johnson had begun to shed his responsibilities; As Handeland says, his day was past. He relinquished his Chair of Systematic Theology in 1875. In the same year, he turned over the editorship of *Luthersk Kirke-tidende* to two of his disciples, Pastors J. C. Heuch and F. W. Bugge. By this action, the stage was set for the final battle over lay-preaching.

Heuch was the leading personality of the two. This remarkable figure, who would eventually become the most outspoken if not the leading apologist of the Norwegian Church, was then pastor at the Deaconess Institute in Christiania and Rector of the Practical Theological Seminary. He was a thoroughly confessional Johnsonian who had been led in a High-Church direction by a period of study in Germany. He later expressed his gratitude to Theodosius Harnack of Erlangen; "He was the first to open my eyes to the significance of the fact that the Church, as surely as it is the Communion of Saints, is also the institution created by the Lord for the regular administration of the

means of grace...This truth has ever since marked my view toward many phenomena in the life of the Church."¹

It was no accident that Heuch's chief apologetic work came to be titled Against the Stream. Much of his mature life was spent in fighting the current. In an age of individualism, he was obsessed by a sense of the collective. In a time of onrushing democracy, he emphasized authority in Church and State and the responsibility of the individual toward the group. In the flood of secularism and liberal theology, he stood for Biblical "Churchly" Christianity. In the movement for Church reform, he first favoured limited reforms (though only on the basis of strict confessional controls), but later took the position that reform was "overemphasized", and tried to focus attention on the means of grace instead.

Heuch viewed the Low-Church development of Lutherstiftelsen with alarm, and immediately began to attack it in Lutherstiftelsen's own paper. (It had taken over control of LK in the previous year.) He criticized the "bitter anti-clerical spirit" of many laymen in the Inner Mission movement. They have no appreciation for the rights of the office. But their chief error is that they "fail to grasp the truth that the means of grace are powerful in themselves". They are "Donatistic"², anti-confessional, and self-willed; "rebellious against the Church order", possessed

¹ J. Tandberg, Biskop Heuch's Liv og Virke, p. 11.

² LK, 3R, I, 1875, p. 356.

of an attitude of "loveless judgement" and of "a suspicious opposition to all higher education generally...and theology in particular".³ He cited Hauge's Testament against both the Separatists and those who advocated "too-hasty changes in the basic structure of Church order".⁴

The result of the position adopted by Heuch and Bugge on reform and lay-preaching was two-fold. In the first place, they were relieved of the editorship after a year and a half, and founded their own paper, Luthersk Ugeskrift. Jakob Sverdrup wrote that their position must have surprised Gisle Johnson, but this is hardly likely. Johnson knew both men well. It is more probable that, with his genius for balance, he deliberately chose them in order to counter-act Lutherstiftelsen's tendency toward the left. But the Foundation could not tolerate their views, and they were replaced by Pastors Thorvald Klaveness and Gunvald Blom. In the second place, Jakob Sverdrup, together with Cand. Theol. Ole Vollan, founded Ny Luthersk Kirketidende, a radical Low-Church paper, in 1877.

In the lengthy debate which followed, the principal figures were Heuch and Sverdrup, representing High- and Low-Church concepts of the Ministry respectively. The new editors of LK were largely silent, attempting to maintain the mediating Johnsonian position.

Heuch's basic view of the Ministry was revealed in

³ LK, 3R, II, 1876, p. 32.

⁴ LK, 3R, I, 1875, p. 88.

his lectures in the Practical Seminary and in various articles in *Luthersk Ugeskrift*.⁵ He maintained that the Ministry was a "direct institution" of Christ.⁶ But Heuch does not attempt to deduce the Ministry from the Apostolate and a succession, as Wexels had done. His is a Lutheran, "functional" concept of the Ministry. Christ instituted the Ministry when He gave the means of grace. "Through the means of grace, the Lord upholds and governs the Church; Therefore, He has given that office, through...which He Himself administers the means of grace in its midst."

"The authority of the Ministry rests entirely upon the fact that it rightly administers the means of grace".⁷

The Ministry is rooted in the fact that the Church is a living organism of interrelated members, the Body of Christ. As a collective Body, the Church has a different task from that of the individual, the task of ensuring that the whole Church is nurtured and strengthened. It can only do this through the Ministry. Consequently, while there is a mutual interrelationship between the individual member and the Body, and a "parallelism" between the Universal Priesthood and the Ministry, the two are not identical. The Ministry is given neither to the individual member of the Church, nor to a self-perpetuating STAND, but to the Church as a whole, because the means of grace are given to it

5 J.C. Heuch, Lecture Notes, taken by H. Raabe, Ms. no. 915, Håndskriftsamling, University Library, Oslo; And LU, I, pp. 361ff.

6 Lecture Notes, p. 8.

7 LU, I, pp. 366f.

alone. The congregation does not give the Ministry its authority; That comes from the means of grace. The congregation cannot add any power to them, nor can it use them as it pleases. The moment it rejects the means of grace administered according to Christ's will, it ceases to be a Christian congregation. This constitutes the most striking proof that the congregation is not the source of the authority of the Ministry, but rather is dependent upon it.

Since the Ministry is God's gift to the whole Church, no individual may usurp it; Hence, Article XIV. The "rightly called" pastor thus possesses certain rights over the individual members, but the congregation has in turn certain rights over him. Any individual who rejects the pastor's Ministry offends against the Church which called him. The congregation has the right to supervise the work of a pastor, and to remove him, in the same manner as it called him, when he is untrue to his charge. Thus, the Ministry derives its authority from the Lord's means of grace, but it receives it through the call of the Church. This does not mean that the Ministry is finally subordinate to the congregation. The pastor is called to do the work of Christ, not of the congregation. Thus (in a sense) the Ministry as a whole stands above both congregation and the individual pastor, and neither can use it in an arbitrary fashion.

Heuch's chief contribution in the debate was a series of eight articles in *Luthersk Ugeskrift* entitled "Den

Offentlige Laegmandsvirksomhed og Nødvendigheden af dens kirkelige Organization" (Public lay activity and the necessity of its ecclesiastical organization). These articles, published in 1878, represent an expansion of the teaching which he had given in the Seminary, and a thorough refutation of the other contemporary positions.

Heuch began by acknowledging that, from the prophet Amos to Hans Nilsen Hauge, God had called prophets without an outer call, when the Church was failing in its task. But he drew a sharp distinction between Hauge and the lay-preachers of his own day. The latter, who were unique to Norway, lacked the evidencies of an inner call which Hauge displayed, such as special gifts and martyrdom. Heuch was not completely opposed to lay activity. Such a position was in conflict with the Confessions, and would widen the gulf between clergy and laity and open the door for the sects. Instead, he proposed that lay-preachers be "called by the Church's legitimate organs, after proper examination by the Church, to work within a definite area, under the same supervision as the other servants of the Church".⁸ In his view, the greatest danger lay not in the fact that lay-preachers were not trained theologians, but that they were "self-called" and "without ecclesiastical supervision and responsibility". In other words, Heuch, like Krohg, Bugge, and the Grundtvigians, was proposing

⁸ J.C. Heuch, "Den Offentlige Laegmandsvirksomheden...", LU; Published in book form under the same title, p. 14.

the establishment of a Diaconate.

He then proceeded to a critique of the other views and a theological justification of his own. He first rejected the view that lay-preaching is fully justified on the basis of the Universal Priesthood. Heuch drew a sharp distinction between the Universal Priesthood and the office of the Ministry. Only those called and authorized by God may administer the means of grace. Even those who deduce the Ministry from the Universal Priesthood admit that it is the possession of the community and therefore cannot be usurped by an individual, but must be conferred by the community. Heuch distinguished between the official Ministry of Word and Sacraments and the individual witness, in these words:

"Whereas the official administration of the means of grace is a special life-work confided to the individual by the community for the edification of the whole congregation, the witness of the individual Christian is a fruit of his faith, which in a life-work quite different from the Ministry of the means of grace, appears wherever the situation enables him to help his neighbour by his witness."⁹

This distinction is in danger of being obscured. Whereas the clergy are rightly examined and called, the lay-preachers are either not called at all or called by those who have no right to do so. He quoted a significant statement by Ole Irgens, one of Sverdrup's supporters: "Since Inner missionaries preach the Word in the congregation, they are in the

⁹ Ibid., pp. 18f.

Ministry, yet outside it, and consequently against it."

Heuch next discussed Article XIV. Its meaning is clear enough; The difficulty arises in attempting to reconcile it with lay-preaching. Many believe that lay-preaching is Scriptural, and Heuch admits that Scripture must take precedence over the Confessions. On the other hand, he is contemptuous of attempts to "rewrite" the Article or to ignore its clear meaning. He asks whether such an attempt to redraft the first Article would be regarded as tolerable. It can be rejected as being in conflict with Scripture, but not rewritten. Heuch refuses to interpret the RITE VOCATUS as a reference to the inner call. This would lead to mere subjectivism. Everyone would decide for himself whether he is called. Interpreted from this point of view, the Article would simply mean that no one was to be forced to preach against his will! The Church acknowledges the fact that God issues both mediate and immediate calls, but the latter must be verified "in an unusual manner", with "signs and wonders". Heuch further rejects the favourite Sverdrupian doctrine of the right of the local congregation to call, and its duty to utilize the charismata. This right it has never possessed in the Lutheran Church, and certainly not in the year 1530.

As regards the crucial question of how to interpret the word "OFFENTLIG", Heuch took a firm and clear stand. "Any preaching which does not proceed with inner necessity

from the life situation and the contacts which the individual Christian has in his life-work, but is directed toward the congregation as such", whether singly or in groups, is "OFFENTLIG".¹⁰ Whenever anyone abandons his regular vocation or subordinates it to preaching, his activity becomes "OFFENTLIG". No other distinction between public and private can be drawn. Heuch was particularly "astonished" at the view of Lars Oftedal, who restricted the description "OFFENTLIG" to preaching which took place within a Church building. He dismissed the wording of Lutherstiftelsen's by-laws as "sophistry". He mentioned one supporter of lay-preaching who interpreted Article XIV to mean that no one should force himself into the clerical office, for instance by halting the preacher in the midst of his sermon and taking his place in the pulpit. Heuch was sympathetic with the advocates of the emergency principle, but he called upon those who desired free lay-preaching either to admit that public lay-preaching was contrary to Article XIV, or to repudiate the Confession and then "consider the question of how we can remain members of the Lutheran Church..."

The High-Church champion then proceeded to discuss the relation of Article XIV to Scripture. He prefaced his remarks with a reminder that we often experience how "the Church has seen more deeply into Scripture than we can,"

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 45.

and that the basic fault of the Norwegian Church was its lack of a sense of the Church and of a confessional consciousness.

There is no contradiction, says Heuch, between Scripture and Article XIV. Scripture does not give to every Christian the right to preach, and Article XIV does not deny him the right to witness, but only the right to preach publicly, "To the congregation". Passages concerning witness and the Universal Priesthood are inadmissible as support for lay-preaching. On the contrary, they show that not everyone who shares in the Universal Priesthood has the additional right to carry out the functions of the Ministry. Women, for example, are bidden to keep silent in Church (I Cor. 14:34), but they are not thereby excluded from the Universal Priesthood. The New Testament priesthood is a sacrificial service, "an offering to God of the whole life..." Scripture uses other titles for the clerical office: Apostle, prophet, teacher, evangelist, pastor. Not all are Apostles, prophets, or teachers (I Cor. 12:29). The Ministry cannot be deduced from the Universal Priesthood, nor can the right to administer the means of grace be deduced from the charismata. In the first place, the possession of a gift does not convey the right to use it. Moreover, the term "Charismata" denotes extraordinary gifts, which are no more in evidence among lay-preachers than among the clergy. The "normal fruits of faith" do not require a public Ministry for their exercise. In that

case, all Christians would have not only the right but also the duty to preach (to utilize the gifts), a position which not even the most zealous supporters of lay-preaching are willing to adopt.

Heuch did not attack the emergency principle in itself, but he stated four objections to the way in which it was being applied. In the first place, its supporters "misunderstand and exaggerate" the need. Lay-preachers do not go and are not sent where they are really needed. They do not pay the slightest attention to the local situation, for the simple reason that they confuse the need for more preaching with the need for more listening. The latter is most common and is not unique to Norway, but the former is the only need which justifies lay-preaching. Heuch challenged the lay-movement, if it wished to be consistent, to "break the stave over" its own activity where this was superfluous. Secondly, Inner Mission should have made every effort to gain ecclesiastical legitimation as a part of the existing Church order, before violating the Church's Confession. This, in Heuch's submission, it has made absolutely no attempt to do. Thirdly, in its zeal for the individual, Inner Mission "forgets the rights of the community, and that, in the final analysis, all individuals must suffer when the organic life of the community is disturbed". Here Heuch displays his deep concern for the Church as a whole. Article XIV can only be properly understood in the light of the concept of the Church as an

organism in which each member has its distinctive functions. Inner Mission "so exclusively regards the purpose of the Church as the salvation of individual souls" that it fails to see that the individual is inevitably affected by the varying fortunes of the community as a whole. Consequently, although Inner Mission saves many souls, the Church must oppose it, because "the community as a whole has been injured, and is exposed to dangers which will increase, the more permanent and extreme forms this un-Churchly activity, this unorganic growth on the Body of the Church, assumes".¹¹ Thus, in the last resort, the emergency activity of Inner Mission will in fact replace one kind of emergency by another.

Heuch further discussed the various dangers involved in lay-preaching, both for the lay-preacher himself and for the Church, and made concrete suggestions in order to meet the situation.

For the lay-preacher, a "self-assumed" Ministry is a sore temptation to his pride. "Nothing is more dangerous" for the spiritual life than concentration on the spiritual gifts which an individual believes himself to possess, or upon the results of his own preaching.¹² Other temptations were bound to arise: the martyr complex, the abandonment of lay vocations for the sake of the prestige attaching to preaching, and the tendency for new converts to preach,

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 95, 98.

¹² Ibid., p. 101.

now that the old Haugean elders no longer controlled the laity. "No one has less claim to being called" than a new convert.

The lay movement creates several dangers for the Church. The Church exercises no doctrinal control over lay-preachers; Their preaching is "not infrequently" unsound. Pastoral care is made more difficult. Since the critical faculties of the laity are but little developed, and the people adopt an attitude of trust toward all preachers, there is danger of emotionalism and sectarianism. Heuch further accused Inner Mission of creating a "Church within the Church" and of "trying to gather and separate as a visible community the true believers from the nominal mass."¹³ On the criterion of "a scheme for the Christian life", they are confident of their ability to distinguish the saints. This ECCLESIOLA inevitably stands in opposition to the Church. Furthermore, it has a tendency to turn inward instead of outward, and to abandon its duty of acting as salt. The Church is thus threatened by divisions, parties, a censorious attitude, soul-tyranny, formalism, and a tendency to set the conventicle meeting above the worship of the Church. Though there is little "outward separatism", there is "inner separatism", and the former may follow. Finally, because of the cleft

¹³ Ibid. p. 132. Its adherents "often confuse the conventicle with the Church and regard only those who belong to their circle as God's children".(p. 179)

between a clergy pledged to a definite Church order and lay-preachers propelled by an inner call, the ECCLESIOLA is easily induced to follow the lay-preacher at the expense of the pastor.

Heuch deplored the assumption of Lutherstiftelsen that the order of salvation must take precedence over Church order. For him, Church order was the best means by which to carry out the ORDO SALUTIS. "Only where it is retained can the undisturbed sound edification of the community take place." The Church order was instituted by God, and is based on the organic character of the congregation. Advocates of the emergency principle would replace the authority of the Church by the authority of Lutherstiftelsen, and Heuch asks the question: Is the cure worse than the disease?. Inner Mission in Norway was different both in purpose and in function from Inner Mission in Germany. Lay-preaching was its chief function. Preachers are called by those who have no right to do so. The presence of clergy on Inner Mission boards does not make the call legitimate, but merely lends to it "a false Churchliness". The permanent organization of Inner Mission increases the danger of Separatism.¹⁴ Lutherstiftelsen embodies "the strongest concentration of all the dangers inherent in lay activity. Its main work is nothing less than a usurpation of one of the most important functions of Church government, the

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 165f. "Inner Mission societies are inherently nothing but the breeding ground for all kinds of unclear and unChurchly tendencies."

providing of teachers for the congregations."¹⁵ The control of Lutherstiftelsen is in the hands of a democratic general convention, of whose "Churchliness" we have no guarantee. "It is impossible to remedy a disorder by organizing it."

What must the Church do? Heuch proposes that it either put a stop to lay activity (though without State intervention, and certainly not by means of a new Conventicle Act), or integrate it as an "organic function" in its own work. Much revival is due to lay activity, although the Church is not merely a mission field, but a field in which both wheat and tares grow side by side. Many lay-preachers would be a credit to the Ministry. Heuch admits that an increase in the number of clergy is not the answer to the current emergency. "God has given our Church a sign that it should receive lay-preaching into its service."¹⁶ The Church already has the means of integration in its office of lay assistant. The Church should simply expand the functions of this office to include preaching and pastoral care. This solution has the approval of the Bishops. The gifted layman would report to the Bishop, and after examination by him, be assigned to work under a pastor. This arrangement would remove all the dangers and retain all the blessings of lay activity, and meet the requirements of Article XIV. The problem was not lack of theological training, but the "arbitrary, self-

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 169.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 185.

assumed exercise of the Church's office". Under the proposed scheme, lay-preachers would be regularly called, the Church would exercise supervision over them, they would really "support" the clergy, and the "need" would truly be met. The "greatest blessing" would derive from this kind of lay activity, "for God is not a God of confusion, but a God of order".

The chief spokesman for the Low-Church position, Jakob Sverdrup, expounded his standpoint in the pages of *Ny Luthersk Kirketidende* and in two little books, What is the Church, What is the Office of the Ministry, And What is the Right to Call? (1878), and Lay Activity and Article XIV... (1879).

"The question of the origin and nature of the Ministry", said Sverdrup, "depends upon what we understand by 'the Church'".¹⁷ He rejected the definition of the Church which made of it "a divine institution (ANSTALT)". The Church was "a free and equal community...of believing brothers and sisters...all with the same rights before God and the same access to Him".¹⁸ There is no dualism of Church and Congregation. Sverdrup does not fall into the trap of sociological associationalism, however; The Church is the result of the activity of Christ, Who founded it, sent His Holy Spirit to lead it, and gave it His Word and Sacraments. But He did not leave behind Him any complex of ecclesiastical

¹⁷ J. Sverdrup, Hvad er Menigheden..., p. 2.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

institutions, but only the means of grace and "a living congregation". All necessary Church order is "a fruit of the inner development of the community itself, of the task ...which God has given it". The Ministry evolves "with inner necessity from the Christian idea of the congregation".¹⁹

Since the Christian idea of the congregation was for Sverdrup the Universal Priesthood, this was the source from which he deduced the office of the Ministry. All Christians are priests (I Pet. 2:5,9; Rev. 5:10). There is no special priestly STAND; Christ is our only mediator. The priestly mission of every believer is to offer himself as a living thank-offering (which Sverdrup distinguishes sharply from an atoning offering). This cannot be done without it also being a testimony for men, according to the spiritual gift and the occasion God gives us. However, as an organism, the Body of Christ, the Christian community must "appear in the world...with definite marks of life". These are the means of grace, whose administration cannot be left to chance. The priestly mission thus has two aspects: the individual witness, and the witness of the community. "The Universal Priesthood has one of its most beautiful tasks in the public use of the means of grace."²⁰ This task is the "common property" of the Christian community. It is the "true Church" which owns, and is responsible for

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 3.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 6.

the means of grace, but since this function cannot be carried out except through a "visible" Church, they must actually be administered by "the Communion of Saints in visible form", with which are mingled many hypocrites. This is a necessary consequence of the Church's lot on earth.

The special office of the Ministry is a creation of the congregation. It is not "an immediate institution of God, an order introduced by God's immediate command, a divine organ of authority above and apart from the congregation", but "whatever it has, it has of and through the congregation".²¹ It may be said to have "originated according to God's Will", as necessary for the administration of the means of grace, but not to have been "immediately instituted" by God. The Ministry is the "mouth" of the congregation. This represents no devaluation of the Ministry, nor does it place the clergy at the mercy of the congregation. The content of the means of grace remains the same. As the servant of the congregation, the pastor is also the servant of Christ and "a messenger in His place". Sverdrup seems to ignore the potential tension here.²² It is the concept of the Ministry as a priestly caste which reduces the Church to the status of a legal institution, and robs it of its free, evangelical character.

Not every Christian can preach and administer the

²¹ Ibid., p. 8.

²² Cf. NLK, I, p. 243: "All ecclesiastical authority is rooted in the congregation, but the congregation derives its authority from God."

Sacraments. Christians are free and equal, but different; Not all have the gift for the Ministry. Furthermore, no individual has the right to assume the office; He must receive it from the community. The outer call is necessary, if he is to work "on behalf of the congregation". The congregation bases its call on the charismatic principle.²³

Sverdrup claimed Scriptural authority for this view. The New Testament Church is different from the Old Testament "folk". There is no direct word of institution in the New Testament for the Ministry as a divine order. "The silence of Scripture here is decisive." The Apostles' position of leadership was based upon the charismata, not upon an office.²⁴ They did not claim the exclusive right to administer the means of grace. True, they alone possessed the right to "proclaim the Word infallibly", but "in this they had no successors". The Ministry is not a continuation of the Apostolate, but arose as the Apostles permitted the congregations to establish offices and to elect men to fill them. We know that this was the origin of the Diaconate, and we "have every right to assume" the same conclusion with regard to the Presbyterate, which Sverdrup identified with the Episcopate.

This view was also in harmony with Luther and the Confessions. Luther's concept of the Church as the Communion of Saints "excludes the idea of a Ministry

²³ NLK, I, P. 234.

²⁴ Cf. NLK, I, p. 248: "The gifts are first, the office second."

immediately instituted by God". The Schmalcaldic Articles gave the power of the Keys and the power to call and ordain to the whole Church, on the basis of the Universal Priesthood. Later, "bloodless ghosts" of the Roman Catholic concept of the priesthood entered the Lutheran Church, and the State Church system led to institutionalism and a cleft between clergy and laity.

Sverdrup next moved on to one of his favourite ideas and one of the distinctive features of his ecclesiology: The autonomy of the local congregation. The local congregation is the true possessor of the right to call pastors. It is the form in which the Church originally appeared, the form in which it most clearly appears today, indeed the only form in which it can exist.²⁵ Sverdrup interpreted Article XIV to mean that "every minister called by the congregation is RITE VOCATUS". This right can be delegated by the congregations, but in Norway it has been altogether lost. Yet it is only because of the silent concurrence of the congregation that the Norwegian clergy are regularly called. "No one who knows what State and Church are now believes that the clerical offices have their source in the power of the Crown."²⁶ He then went on to propose a new law whereby the local congregations would gain advisory power in the calling of their pastors.

Sverdrup defined ordination as "the act in which the

²⁵ J. Sverdrup, Hvad er Menigheden..., p. 12.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 14.

congregation invokes God's blessing upon him to whom it transfers its office". Ordination confers no "grace of office", no "personal ability". It is not "an act of transfer within an exclusive circle of officials", but, together with the call, it constitutes an "acknowledgement of the person's gift for administering the means of grace". If ordination did confer a personal quality, an indelible character, it would itself be a means of grace, indeed it would be the first and highest, which validated all the others. But this idea is foreign to the evangelical concept of the Church.²⁷

We now turn to Sverdrup's views on lay activity and Article XIV.²⁸ In his apology for lay activity on a broader scale, Sverdrup began by noting the general agreement that Hauge's work was justified. He next proceeded to deny Heuch's assertion that Hauge possessed extraordinary gifts. He did not heal, prophesy, or speak in tongues. He many have had greater gifts than the present generation of lay-preachers, but they were of the same kind. There was a "clear continuation" of his work in the lay movement. Sverdrup admitted that the historical situation had changed, but maintained that there was still a place for lay-preaching.

So much for history; Sverdrup's main argument was based on Scripture. The New Testament teaches the duty of all believers to witness for Christ. We are all priests. Scripture places no limitations upon our witness except

²⁷ NLK, I, pp. 235ff.

²⁸ J. Sverdrup, Laegmandsvirkksomheden og Augsburgske Confession 14de Artikel...

for the limit of the charismata, "a limit which shows how unlimited the freedom to witness is..."²⁹ This duty rests upon each individual as well as upon the collective community, and involves a verbal witness as well as a witness by one's life. The Apostolic Age was characterized by the most widespread lay activity.

Sverdrup next dealt with the various arguments against lay-preaching. In the first place, lay-preaching cannot be contrary to the concept of the Ministry because it is an "individual", not a community or a congregational matter. The lay-preacher does not try to force his way into the office. If lay-preaching does offend against Church order, then the order may be wrong, as has often been the case in the past. Christ gave us no "rules and commands for Church order..." Order is the servant of life, not life the servant of order. Wholesome lay activity actually lightens the burden of the clergy. There is no inner drive or need for lay administration of the Sacraments, nor is any special charisma required for this purpose. The clergy can supply the need in that respect. Lay-preachers are, in fact, examined. Besides, the inner call is the most essential, even for the clergy; And both clergy and lay-preacher must face the question of the inner call alone, in self-examination. Far from lay-preaching leading to sectarianism, it provides a defence against it. Finally, the "most decisive" argument against the critics of lay-preaching is represented

²⁹ Ibid., p. 29.

by the fruits which it has produced; In comparison, its conflict with Church order is a relatively minor thing.

Jakob Sverdrup sharply criticized the emergency principle. It was, in his estimation, unfair both to lay activity and Article XIV. He accused Luthersk Kirketidende of "cheap faithfulness to the Confession". The paper's standpoint rendered Article XIV unsuitable for the Church of Norway and probably for any church, and made of it "merely a modest rule for Church order under especially favourable conditions".³⁰ The principle "necessity breaks all rules" is of doubtful value when applied to one of the chief articles of faith. Furthermore, lay-preaching is justified on the basis of Scripture, and consequently deserves more recognition than the emergency principle affords.

Sverdrup's own interpretation of the Article is distinctive. He paraphrases it to mean that the Church is to have a definite office for the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments, and that those who hold it are to be called according to the custom and order of the Church, and that no one may assume this office without a true call.³¹ "OFFENTLIG" means "on behalf of the congregation", "officially". It does not mean "publicly". Sverdrup drew a parallel here with the civil arm. Article XIV contains no prohibition against lay-preaching, unless

³⁰ Ibid., p. 75.

³¹ Ibid., p. 78.

it attempts to replace the Ministry. Sverdrup deplored the statement, made at the previous diocesan synod in Bergen, that Article XIV should be "buried".³² "Such an idea should be far from all Lutheran Christians." The Article is, properly understood, a weapon against both clericalism and Enthusiasm. It is "the bulwark of the congregation's rights", since it speaks of the administration of the means of grace and the call of the congregation. The congregation also has the right and duty of exercising discipline in doctrine and order on lay-preaching. Lay-preaching should not compete with the Church, oppose it, or lead people away from it "as long as the Church's preaching is the revealed truth".³³

Sverdrup agreed with Heuch that the Church should create minor clerical offices for laymen, but opposed the attempt to force all preaching into the clerical framework. There was both order and freedom in the Spirit. Heuch's proposal was "as dead and impracticable as it could be", because 1) it would mean the end of lay-preaching, and 2) the congregation would have no voice in Heuch's "thoroughly clerical" Church order. Norway needed a congregational polity before the congregations could supervise lay-preaching. Meanwhile, supervision must be carried out "unofficially", on the local level by "parish assemblies" and on the national level by a nation-wide Inner Mission society.

³² Cf. NLK, II, p. 410.

³³ Laegmandsvirksomheden..., p. 85.

Heuch and Sverdrup carried on a running battle in their respective periodicals. Heuch found the basic error of his opponents in their insistence that "all ecclesiastical authority roots in the congregation".³⁴ They posit a false alternative: Either the clergy are slaves of the congregation, or the reverse is true. Both, said Heuch, are in fact subject to a higher Power. NLK fails to distinguish between the office and the caste (STAND); God could very well have instituted the former but not the latter. The authority of the Ministry cannot be deduced from the Universal Priesthood. The congregation cannot delegate its Christian responsibility to a representative; Here the Low-Churchmen are close to the Roman Catholic conception of the priesthood as representative of the congregation. He further argued that this attempt at deduction must inevitably lead to Donatism, for only a believer can act on behalf of the Universal Priesthood. Finally, the Ministry would not be necessary if it were only needed for the sake of order. Clerical tyranny has historically done so much harm that it would not have been retained "unless it had been seen from God's Word that the Lord...has given the Ministry..." Heuch also charged that NLK's standpoint was "the reasoning of political liberalism...transferred to the ecclesiastical sphere".³⁴

³⁴ Jakob Sverdrup's own phrase; Cf. Ibid., p. 243.

³⁵ Editorials in LU, I, 1877, pp. 330ff., 343ff., 361ff.

Ny Luthersk Kirketidende replied³⁶ that the Lord has given His means of grace to the congregation and has given it the right and duty to administer them. It is well suited to this task because of its "priestly character". To avoid confusion and because all do not possess the ability, the congregation transfers this duty to a representative chosen on the basis of his gifts. It is true that the duty of an individual Christian to witness cannot be transferred, but this is not the case with the "collective activity" of the congregation. Sverdrup admitted that he was a political liberal, but denied any connection between his politics and his concept of the Ministry. He shrewdly pointed out the similarity between Heuch's concept of the Ministry and "certain political doctrines", but dismissed such methods of controversy as "unfruitful". Sverdrup had difficulty with Heuch's charge of Donatism. "It is quite true", he wrote, "that the administration of the means of grace is so closely and indissolubly linked up with the Universal Priesthood that in truth it cannot without inner self-contradiction be carried out by anyone who does not share in this priesthood, this faith. When nominal Christians administer the means of grace, this is something which ought not to be, something not in accord with God's will." This is a result of the Church's predicament in this world. But even then it represents "a revelation of the Priesthood of all believers".³⁷ Sverdrup went on to point out that

³⁶ NLK, I, 1877, pp. 225ff, 241ff, 273ff.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 232.

the administration of Word and Sacrament is given, not to the Church in its "ideal", eschatological form, but to the Church "under the Cross", the Church "as it appears visibly on earth...wherever a little local congregation gathers in Jesus' Name".³⁸

Luthersk Kirketidende (Klaveness and Blom) was less actively engaged in this debate. It appeared as a spokesman for the Johnsonian emergency principle against both of the other parties.³⁹ Against Heuch, the paper admitted that lay-preaching was "OFFENTLIG", and that lay-preachers were not RITE VOCATUS and consequently in conflict with Church order, but insisted that in an emergency, Church order must give way. The situation demands that the charismata be utilized, and that the Church receive sufficient pastoral care. Time and again, the faults of the Church order are reviewed, and the editors of LK clearly hope for great things from the Reform Movement. In the meantime, lay-preaching is justified. LK denied Heuch's charge that lay-preachers regard the inner call as sufficient. On the contrary, they agree that an outer call is also necessary. But they have an outer call from experienced lay Christians. LK also denied the charge that lay activity leads to the formation of a Church within the Church. Mature lay-preachers know that "the Communion of Saints cannot be seen". But in the Church of Norway, where so

³⁸ Ibid., p. 250n.

³⁹ LK, 4R, III, pp. 133ff., 141ff., 169ff., 177ff., 186ff., 193ff. Also LK, 4R, V, 1879, pp. 36ff.

many despise the means of grace and are spiritually dead, Christians will inevitably constitute an ECCLESIOIA. The danger of schism and party spirit is not due to lay activity, but to the "sorrowful circumstances" of the Church. Likewise, the cleft between clergy and laity is due to the State Church system, as well as faults on the side of both laity and clergy, including "unwholesome High-Church theories of the Ministry". The Norwegian Inner Mission is different from the German because it is especially preaching and pastoral care which are needed by the Norwegian Church. Besides, lay-preaching antedates Inner Mission; Inner Mission has in fact developed from lay-preaching and not the reverse.

Democracy is the order of the day, said LK. In the Church, we have awakened to new appreciation of the fact that the Gospel challenges the whole Church to utilize the charismata and to exercise the Power of the Keys. But, because the Church is "unwilling" and its order is "unable" to integrate the laity, these must proceed by "free association", lest the new-found powers be lost or go astray. LK stressed the fact that Lutherstiftelsen desires the closest possible relationship with the clergy. It admitted that its general convention could become "unChurchly", but asserted that it was no more likely to do so than the State Church, governed as it is by a "Confessionless" Storting. LK opposed Heuch's scheme for a Diaconate, on the grounds that the State Church lacked the "flexibility" to absorb

lay activity without "choking" it to death.⁴⁰ The "stiffness and helplessness" of the Church is proved by the past failure of the Reform movement. Its legislative power is in the wrong hands. Heuch's plan would bring "formalism" into the lay movement, and would kill it. History shows that this is the fate of minor clerical orders.

The paper's polemic against Sverdrup was considerably more mild. Indeed, it may be said that LK has significantly altered its emergency principle, and has virtually adopted the position of NLK. This was illustrated by the Klavness proposal of 1876. LK cannot accept NLK's definition of "OFFENTLIG". It rightly pointed out that according to Sverdrup's interpretation, it would be impossible to violate Article XIV! LK also rejected NLK's identification of the conventicle with the congregation. Consequently, lay-preachers are not RITE VOCATUS, when called by the conventicle. On the other hand, LK has now become a zealous advocate of lay-preaching and Church reform. It finds lay-preaching Biblical. Not only those for whom preaching is a life-work, but others as well may be given the right to preach by the Church. Such was the Apostolic practice. Lay-preaching in the Church of Norway can only be defended on the basis of need, says LK, but it adds these significant words: "But understand us correctly; Not...the fact that men who do not possess the clerical office teach publicly; It is not this which must be

40 LK, 4R, III, 1878, p. 197.

defended on the basis of need, for it has a clear basis in God's Word and our Confession...but lay activity as it is practiced in our Church, that men teach publicly who have not the permission of the Church...By the word 'need', we mean not only that our Church does not preach the Word enough, but also that it is not so organized that it can issue the call to the laity, and so it neglects the charismata."⁴¹ In this way, LK removed the onus of irregularity from lay-preaching as such, preserved Article XIV inviolate, reconciled lay-preaching with Scripture and the Confession, and placed the entire blame for the situation on the existing polity of the State Church!

Another apology for lay-preaching came from Cand. Theol. Christopher Bruun, who was under the influence of Grundtvigianism but independent of all parties. He defended it on the simple basis of human equality. Jesus and His Apostles were laymen. The right of the laity to preach is "clear as day", and "if it had not been in conflict with the natural tendency of the clergy to place themselves above ordinary believers, no one would have thought to question it".⁴² He avoided mention of Article XIV. Bruun was already in 1881 the spokesman for a "Free Folk-Church". He proposed that the Storting and Government separate the Church from the State, and that the Church then organize itself synodically as a Folk-Church.⁴³

⁴¹ LK, 4R, V, 1879, p. 39.

⁴² C. Bruun, Kirkelige Foredrag, I, "Om Laegmandsvirksomheden", Krs., 1881, p. 18.

⁴³ NLK, 1881, pp. 305ff. Cf. C. Bruun, Fri Folkekirke, Krs., 1909.

(g) The Close of the Controversy
on Lay-Preaching.

The acute stage of the debate on lay-preaching lasted from 1877 until 1879. Dr. Krogh-Tønning was drawn into the controversy when sections of his Troeslaere were published in Luthersk Ugeskrift. Sverdrup attacked his "Catholic" tendencies, and asserted that "where this party leads can no longer be in doubt..."¹ He was to indulge in controversy with Krogh-Tønning for the rest of his life.² Meanwhile, Heuch was already engaged in a defence of the faith against Björnstjerne Björnson (1879). The issue of lay-preaching was by no means settled, but after 1879, it was virtually forgotten. In 1881, Ny Luthersk Kirketidende ceased publication. The editors gave as their reasons not only the lack of time and qualified help, but also that "the questions the paper has especially sought to discuss must be said to have been thoroughly debated, at least for the present".³ The attention of the Church was now turning toward other matters. Its greatest task during the next two decades was the defence of the faith against enemies without.

In this situation, the question of lay-preaching moved gradually and quietly toward a solution. Jakob

1 NLK, 1881, p. 407.

2 His final effort was entitled Shall the Lutheran Church Give Itself Up? (Skal Den Lutherske Kirke Opgive sig selv?), 1896.

3 NLK, 1881, p. 401.

Sverdrup made the greatest contribution to this end. As Minister for Church Affairs, he put through two Royal Resolutions which authorized laymen to speak in the Churches. According to the Resolution of 22 August 1888, laymen who were members of the State Church, who had good references, and who had the permission of the local vicar and his lay assistants, were authorized to speak from the Choir. The Resolution of 20 December 1897 gave them access to the pulpit as well.⁴

Meanwhile, there was increasing pressure within Lutherstiftelsen for formal renunciation of the emergency principle. Handeland says that, for all practical purposes, it was long since dead. Pastor Hartvig Halvorsen, who became the executive secretary of Lutherstiftelsen in 1884, and Cand. Theol. (later Professor) Sigurd Odland, who was elected to the Board in 1885, were both men of strong Low-Church convictions.⁵ Hand in hand with this development went an increasing pressure to unite the Inner Mission movement. Inner Mission experienced a resurgence in the last half of the 1880's, but many associations still declined to join Lutherstiftelsen, chiefly, it was said, because of the emergency principle. Gisle Johnson repeatedly threatened to resign as chairman of the Board if the

4 In 1913, lay-preachers were authorized to preach at Sunday morning worship.

5 In 1907, Halvorsen made an abortive attempt to found a political party ("The Norwegian Church Party") on the platform of separation of Church and State.

principle were dropped, but finally, in 1890, he capitulated. At the General Convention of 1891, the emergency principle was formally abandoned. Jakob Sverdrup's views on lay-preaching were as victorious as his views on Church reform were unsuccessful.

The way was now open for an attempt at amalgamation. In 1892, a national Inner Mission meeting was held at Stavanger, and a joint committee of three Easterners and three Westerners appointed to bring together the two factions. The committee made good progress, and leaders on both sides favoured union, but in the end, the movement was only partially successful. One major obstacle was disagreement as to the type of organization. The Westerners, led by Sverdrup, favoured a federation of autonomous local societies, with the Board to be a non-governing "working committee" (Congregationalism applied to the Inner Mission). In the East, there was a desire for a more central authority, with Lutherstiftelsen as a nucleus. Despite greater agreement than ever before on the relation between Inner Mission and the clerical office, "the old ghost...the fear that the brethren in the East would tend to be too friendly toward the clerical office" kept many Westerners from joining.⁶ Lutherstiftelsen was reorganized in 1893, along the lines preferred by the Eastern party, and its name was changed to Det norsk lutherske Indremissionsselskabet (The Norwegian Lutheran Inner Mission

6 E. Sverdrup, op. cit., p. 400.

Society). The greatest change in its by-laws occurred in Paragraph II, where preaching was made the first point in its programme.⁷

There were no doubt many factors which contributed to this movement for unity. Probably the strongest factor was the rapid secularization and the radicalism which descended so suddenly upon Norway in the 1880's. Among other things, this revived the idea of separation of Church and State. Pastor Christoffer Knudsen (later Minister for Church Affairs) stated at the General Convention of Lutherstiftelsen in 1891 that sooner or later, State and Church would be separated, and that there would then be need for "an organized free Lutheran enterprise" upon which to build the Church.⁸

The demands of the age also played a significant part in another development: The collapse of the High-Church party, the "most dramatic" such collapse in Norwegian Church History (Molland). Its leader, Heuch, turned his energies to the apologetic task. *Luthersk Ugeskrift* reacted mildly to Sverdrup's Resolution of 1888; The fact that the lay-preacher needed the consent of the local vicar and his assistants would, in its view, make him RITE VOCATUS, since the right to call would thus be transferred from the Church

⁷ The complete victory achieved by the charismatic principle is indicated by the fact that all the most recent histories of the lay movement written from within it deplore the emergency principle; Cf., in addition to E. Sverdrup, Handeland, and Eide, Tschudi, p. 100, and Brekke, p. 75.

⁸ O. Handeland, Værløysing, I, pp. 254f.

to the local clergy. When he was consecrated Bishop of Christiansand in 1889, he completed an ecclesiological metamorphosis. He immediately became friendly with the lay movement, and created a sensation by attending the prayer-house as a member of the congregation. Here he learned to know the lay movement first hand, and he was won over to it. Moreover, he found in it a strong ally against modern infidelity. He sacrificed his Churchmanship for the sake of his Christianity. In 1893, *Luthersk Ugeskrift* ceased publication, and was succeeded by a magazine of a wholly different character, Klaveness and Bruun's For Kirke og Kultur.

Inner Mission continued to grow in the 1890's, nurtured by the new revival. This was particularly true of West Norway, where lay-preaching was most thoroughly accepted and where the attempt of Indremissionsselskabet to incorporate the local societies had experienced its greatest failure. Here, Fundamentalism combined with a deep suspicion of the clergy and of modern theology. This suspicion was confirmed in the years after 1896, when three new professors (Michelet, Brandrud, and Lyder Brun), all of them liberals, were appointed to the University Faculty. Moreover, many Westerners believed that in Indremissionsselskabet, the Inner Mission movement had "surrendered itself into the hands of the theologians", to use a phrase of Handeland. As a result, the independent societies of West Norway, under the leadership of Jakob Traasdahl, Andreas Lavik, and Pastor O.K. Grimnes, banded together to form the

Vestlandske Indremisjonsforbund (1898), a federation of autonomous local societies. Lavik delivered its "platform speech" in Bergen. He raised the question: "Is it defensible to allow the lay movement to fall under the leadership of the clergy?" His answer was a decided "no". In the first place, the laity has no voice in the education or appointment of the clergy. "Rationalism", (especially Biblical Criticism) represented the greatest threat to the Church, at the end of the century as it had at the beginning. "Believing pastors" were to be supported and even elected to the local Inner Mission boards, but the Society was not to be placed under the clerical office, for believing pastors could be succeeded by "Rationalists". Moreover, this would lead to a fatal breach in the line of historical development, for Inner Mission as a movement originated with the laity, not with the clergy or the State Church. "The Christian laity are powerless enough in the State Church, without also sacrificing their own work."9

The by-laws of Vestlandske Indremisjonsforbundet pledged it to "God's Word and the Lutheran Confessions" (paragraph II) and "as far as possible" to an attitude of cooperation and support toward the incumbent of the clerical office (Paragraph V). It sought "good understanding" and "a brotherly spirit" with Indremissionsselskabet. More significant, however, was the provision in the "working

9 B. Eide, et. al., op. cit., pp. 77f.

plan" that the Board would "when the societies so desire", "seek out and call" lay-preachers.¹⁰

There is one more event which deserves mention, although it falls outside the period covered by this thesis. It was not directly and exclusively a part of the Inner Mission movement, but formed part of a division within the Norwegian Church as a whole: The foundation of the independent theological college, the MENIGHETSFAKULTET, in 1908. The connection is closest in the sphere of theology, and represents a direct line from Hauge and Gisle Johnson. MENIGHETSFAKULTET came into existence when the lone conservative on the University Faculty, Professor Odland, resigned in protest against liberal theology. MENIGHETSFAKULTET has derived much of its support from the "free organizations" of the Inner Mission movement. At least in the beginning, it followed the revivalist Churchmanship of the movement. In many respects, the foundation of MENIGHETSFAKULTET represents the logical conclusion of the 19th century, and set the pattern for the 20th century. There has been no development in organization since 1908. Molland writes: "With the establishment of MENIGHETSFAKULTET, an old tension within the Church had found institutional expression. The tension between Haugeans and clergy, between 'Scriptural theologians' and Grundtvigians, and between the spiritual trends represented by Heuch and Fredrik Petersen, had led to an institutional

10 Ibid., p. 112.

split which in time was to encompass other matters as well. And with it the framework for 20th century Norwegian Church life was drawn up."¹¹

The 20th century has seen various attempts to unify the factions, but without notable success.

¹¹ E. Molland, Church Life in Norway, 1800-1950, p. 92.

See also John Nome's somewhat partisan but very thorough study of the background to and establishment of MENIGHETSFAKULTET, Brytningstid: Menighetsfakultetet i Norsk Kirkeliv, Oslo, 1958. Nome is professor of systematic theology at MENIGHETSFAKULTET, and his book is unique in its attempt to place this phenomenon in its context in the history of ideas and theology. Nome regards MENIGHETSFAKULTET as an expression of the awakened sense of the Church ("MENIGHETSBEVISSTHET"), and draws direct lines to it from the revival and the missionary movements of the previous century. See, e.g., pp. 385ff.

Inner Mission--Bibliography

- Art. "Conventicle" in Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, vol. IV, pp. 102-104.
- B. Eide, S. Anker-Goli, and A. Ellingsgaard, Det Vestlandske Indremisjonsforbund Gjennom 50 Aar, Bergen, 1948.
- Forhandlinger ved det kirkelige Møde i Drammen den 11te-13de Juli 1860, ed. Th. Bernhoft, Christiania, 1860.
- O. Handeland, Værløysing, I, Bjørgvin, 1922.
- H.N. Hauge, Skrifter, ed. H. Ordning, Vol's. VII-VIII, Oslo, 1954.
- J.C. Heuch, Lecture Notes, unpublished, taken by H. Raabe, Ms. no. 915, Håndskriftsamling, University Library, Oslo.
- J.C. Heuch, Den Offentlige Laegmandsvirksomheden og Nødvendingheden af dens kirkelige Organisation, Kristiania, 1878.
- C.W. Hjelm, Betaenkning til Lov om Graendserne for Religionsfriheden og navnlig om Separatister og gudelige Forsamlinger, Christiania, 1840--cited as Betaenkning.
- Indstilling fra den under 12te Februar 1841 naadigst Anordnede Commission til at afgive Betaenkning og Forslag til Lov om Graendserne for Religionsfriheden og navnlig om gudelige Forsamlinger m.v., Christiania, 1842--cited as Indstilling.
- Art. "Inner Mission" in Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Vol. II, pp. 1089f.
- Luthersk Kirketidende, 1863-1899--cited as LK.
- Luthersk Ugeskrift, 1877-1893--cited as LU.^o
- Maanedstidende for den Indre Mission, 1868-1876--cited as MTIM.
- E. Molland, Church Life in Norway, 1800-1950, Minneapolis, 1956.
- E. Molland, "H. N. Hauge" in NTU, I, pp. 1222ff.
- Morgenbladet, 1855, 1867-68.
- D. Munkejord, ed. Den Kristne Arbeidsfront i Norge, Oslo, 1938.
- Norsk Kirketidende, 1856-1862--cited as NK.
- J. Nome, Demringstid i Norge, Stavanger, 1942.
- Ny Luthersk Kirketidende, 1877-1881--cited as NLK.
- G. Ousland, En Kirkehövding: Prof. Gisle Johnson som Teolog og Kirkemann, Oslo, 1950.
- A. Seierstad, Kyrkjelegt Reformarbeid i Norig i Nittande Hundreaaret, Bergen, 1923.
- A. Seierstad, "Det norsk lutherske Indremisjonsselskabet" in NTU, II, p. 1268.
- J. Shaw, Pulpit Under the Sky, Minneapolis, 1955.
- P-O. Sjögren, "C.O. Rosenius" in NTU, III, pp. 389-394.
- R. Slaatelid, "Ophaevelsen av Konventikelplakaten" in Norvegia Sacra, I, Kristiania, 1921, pp. 87-110.
- E. Sverdrup, Fra Norges Kristenliv: Det norsk lutherske Indremisjonsselskabet, 1868-1918, Kristiania, 1918.

Jakob L.R. Sverdrup, Hvad er Menigheden, Hvad er Prestembedet, og Hvad er Kallsretten?, Stavanger, 1878.

Jakob L.R. Sverdrup, Lægmandsvirksomheden og Augsburske Confession 14de Artikel fremstillede efter Gud's Ord, Stavanger, 1879--cited as Lægmandsvirksomheden.

J. Tandberg, Biskop Heuch's Liv og Virke, Kristiania, 1905.

S. Tschudi, Hundre År i Kamp mot Nød: Oslo Indre Misjon, 1855-1955, Oslo, 1955.

I. Welle, Kirkens Historie, II, 1st Edn., Oslo.

Fr. Wisløff, Den Haugianske Linje, Oslo, 1949.

THE
FOREIGN MISSION
MOVEMENT

The ecclesiological tensions of the Norwegian Church in the 19th century are reflected also in its Foreign Missions movement. The same forces leading both to deterioration and recovery were at work as in other parts of the life and thought of the Church.

(a) The Origins of the Foreign Missions Movement

The Foreign Missions movement in Norway began in the early years of the 18th century, with the foundation of three missions. The first was the mission in the Danish colony of Tranquebar in India (1705). Its significance for Norway was minor, although Denmark and Norway were then one kingdom, but it led to the establishment of the so-called MISSIONSCOLLEGIUM in Copenhagen, a kind of State office for missions. In 1716, the Norwegian mission to Lappland was founded by the Pietistic Pastor Thomas von Westen. This mission, however, did not extend beyond the confines of the nation, and, as the work was often carried on by the local parish clergy, there was no clear distinction between the mission and other Church activity. The real pioneer of the Norwegian missions movement was the courageous Hans Egede, who resigned his living in West Norway in order to found the Greenland mission in 1721. Egede must be regarded as a member of the Orthodox party, but he had also been influenced by Pietism.¹ He was able to combine the

¹ E. Danbolt, Misjonstankens Gjennombrud i Norge, I, p. 28.
Cf. I. Welle, Kirkens Historie, II, 1st Edn., p. 82.

institutional side of religion with a spontaneous approach, the appeal to the individual as well as to the nation.²

The influence of Pietism upon the missionary movement is sufficiently obvious. All three of these missions arose during the heyday of Pietism, and with regard to Tranquebar, there was a close connection between Copenhagen and Halle. The fortunes of the missionary movement tended to decline during the period of the Enlightenment. It experienced, however, an immense growth during the 19th century, due to a number of factors. In Norway, influences from abroad played an important part. The burgeoning missionary movement in Great Britain and Germany made itself progressively felt in Scandinavia.³ The Bible Society movement was of special significance. During the 1820's and 1830's, committees were formed to support various missionary societies in other countries, notably the Basel Society, which secured a few Norwegian recruits. At home, the foundation of the University ushered in a new theological climate and consequently a growing missionary concern on the part of the clergy. From the beginning of the organized movement, many of the clergy were active; In the opinion of Nome, account must be taken here not only of the religious motives, but also of clerical opposition to the rising spirit of democracy. They sought to counteract this development in the missionary movement through active participation.

² O. Myklebust, "Hans Egede i Norsk Kirkeliv", TTK, no. 3, 1958, pp. 158f.

³ Cf. E. Molland, Christendom, London, 1959, pp. 223-226.

The most powerful internal factors were, however, Pietism and revivalism, represented particularly by the Moravians and the Haugeans. Although there were only a few Moravians in Norway and they made little effort to expand, they nevertheless exercised an influence out of all proportion to their numbers. Their living interest in missions (amply illustrated in other parts of the world) was a strong stimulant to the Church of Norway. In the words of a modern authority on the history of missions in the Norwegian Church, they were "pioneers for an early Christian congregational fellowship within the milieu of the State Church", and here (as elsewhere) challenged the Church to "realize its own essence".⁴ The first missionary periodical, Reports on the Progress of the Gospel throughout the World (Efterretninger om Evangelii Fremgang i Alle Verdens-Dele) was edited by Bishop P. O. Bugge, who was strongly under Moravian influence. This paper lasted only a year, but it was succeeded by Norsk Missions-Blad, edited by the President of the Moravian Society in Christiania, N. J. Holm. For many years, this was the only Christian periodical in the country. The able and talented Holm was highly regarded by many of the clergy, and was particularly popular among the students in the Capital. The Haugeans were slow to participate in the Foreign Missions movement. They were conservative in Churchmanship and rather bound by their concept of vocation. It was not until the 1840's that they

4 J. Nome, Det norske Misjonsselskapets Historie, I, p.99.

threw their full weight into mission work. But once they committed themselves, they became a powerful factor in the movement.

(b) The Foundation of the Norwegian Missionary Society
-- Hans Paludan Smith Schreuder (d. 1882).

Local missionary societies sprang up here and there during the 1830's. These were modelled upon the pattern of the British and German societies which had begun to appear at the close of the 18th century.¹ Because the official Church lacked a sense of mission, individuals who felt a concern organized societies to act on behalf of the Church. This was in complete accord with the associational concept of the Church which predominated during the period of the Enlightenment. At the same time, they were not consciously separatist. They "represent a new concept of the Church, in virtue of the fact that the societies assume the authority to call and send out missionaries on behalf of the Church...This does not amount

¹ The first Anglican society with a specifically missionary aim, the Church Missionary Society, was formed in 1799, although the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge had been founded in 1701 and 1698 respectively. The former was mainly concerned with British people in the colonies, though its work extended to slaves in the West Indian plantations, and its adaptation to missionary work proper belongs to the 19th century. The latter (now primarily devoted to the task of Christian literature) sponsored some missionary work, particularly in India. Other British societies included the Baptist Missionary Society (1792), the Missionary (later London) Society (1795) and the Edinburgh and Glasgow Societies (1796). The Swiss and German Societies date from the 19th century: Basel (1822), Rhenish (1828), Berlin (1824), and the Bremen, Leipzig, and Gossner Societies (1836).

to a capitulation to the Free-Church view. The mission societies are not new congregations or Churches. They are working instruments for the Church in a freer relationship to the official Church government..." They constitute "expanded conventicles".² They were not avowedly anti-clerical, but in general they were due to the initiative of the laity rather than of the clergy.

The seeds of conflict were latent in the missionary movement from the beginning, and the attempt to unite the heterogeneous elements into a national organization met with serious difficulties. From the beginning there was tension between the Haugeans and the Moravians. The Moravians were neither "Churchly" nor confessional enough for the Haugeans.³ "In the Moravian society, it was the brethren themselves who constituted the Church...the clerical, High-Church concept of the Church and Ministry was completely foreign to them..."⁴ There was, moreover, the tension between clergy and laity, a part of the developing class struggle. "Much of the conflict within the missionary societies did not concern missions in the strict sense, but organization. It was based first and foremost on a different view of the rights of the lay movement."⁵

Nevertheless, the various elements, representing 65 local societies, united to form the Norwegian Missionary

²E. Danbolt, op. cit., p. 97.

³ Ibid., p. 163.

⁴ J. Nome, op. cit., p. 24.

⁵ E. Danbolt, op. cit., p. 99.

Society (Det Norske Misjonsselskapet) in 1842. Only two weeks before the foundation of the Society, the Conventicle Act had been repealed; This event seemed to herald a new era in the relations between clergy and laity. A clergyman was elected chairman of the first Board, and a theological candidate its first secretary. For the next twenty years, the influence of the clergy, in cooperation with the Haugeans, steadily grew, while Moravian influence declined. The period from 1842 to 1860 has been called "the period of the clerical regime".⁶

Seven months before the foundation of NMS, there occurred an event unprecedented in Norway. Cand. Theol. Hans Paludan Smith Schreuder published a small (24pp.) pamphlet entitled: Some Words to the Norwegian Church on Christian Duty with respect to the Salvation of our non-Christian Brethren (Nogle Ord til Norges Kirke om Christelig Pligt med Hensyn til Omsorg for ikke-Christne Medbrødres Salighed.). It was an appeal to the Church to assume its missionary obligation (supported with no fewer than 190 Bible references in the space of 19 pages), and an announcement of his own decision to go to South Africa as a missionary. A recommendation of the book signed by Professors Keyser and Kaurin and Pastor Wexels was appended⁷

Schreuder came from a family of the official class,

⁶ J. Nome, op. cit., p. 37.

⁷ For an interesting comparison of Schreuder's appeal with those of Erasmus, von Welz, Neander, and William Carey, see O. Myklebust, "Schreuder's Misjonsopprop i Kirke-historisk sikt", NTT, 1942, pp. 193-215.

including a long line of clergymen. He had graduated with highest honours from the University. His theology was Orthodox, with an emphasis on the objective values and a love for the historical tradition in Confession, liturgy, and Church order. He possessed a simple, Churchly piety. For several years, he had lived a frugal, even spartan existence, keeping his missionary aspirations to himself in order to be absolutely certain of his vocation. He was a man of tremendous physical and moral strength and endurance. He was to display great vision as a missionary, both strategically and practically, and ability in linguistics and diplomacy. On the other hand, his strength of will was often a trial to his co-workers, he was proud and demanding; His lively wit frequently degenerated into acrid sarcasm, and he was never able to overcome the social class-consciousness in which he had been brought up.

Kaurin, Keyser, and Wexels formed a committee to collect funds for Schreuder, and issued an appeal to the clergy for support. Schreuder sought ordination from the Church, and received it in 1843. NMS opened negotiations with Schreuder with the object of appointing him as their first missionary. But Schreuder had issued his appeal to the whole Church; In effect, he wished to "make the whole Church a missionary society", to "awaken the parishes to consciousness of their missionary responsibility".⁸ He

⁸ Ibid., p. 210. The distinctive difference between Schreuder's appeal and those of von Welz, Carey, and Neander is "the Church-centred motivation".

wrote to NMS that he did not regard the Society as having the nation-wide breadth necessary for its recognition as a centre of the missionary activity of the whole country. On the other hand, the official Church was unprepared for foreign mission work. There was no Church assembly, no representative organ for the whole Church independent of the Government Ministry. And NMS was moving in a Churchly and confessional direction, in accordance with the general development of missions in the 1840's.⁹ Paragraph V of its constitution stated that "the missionaries are to be ordained if possible by a Norwegian Bishop, or if this is impossible by another Evangelical-Lutheran Bishop". Paragraph IV bound the missionary training school to the Confessions of the Church of Norway. At length, NMS proposed to undertake to support Schreuder, if he in turn would be "faithful to the Society's instructions" and would "confer" with it regarding his activities. Schreuder agreed, and sailed in 1843 for Africa by way of London.

The first years of the mission were extremely difficult, and it was not until 1858 that the first Zulu was baptized. Supporters of the mission at home were generally patient, though some became dissatisfied with the lack of "results". In 1856, Schreuder replied to the critics with a characteristic Open Declaration, in which he made clear his refusal to send home "subjective reports, full of pious meditations and hopes..."; If missionary interest required this instead

⁹ Cf. the legitimization of the Church Missionary Society in 1841.

of reliance upon "the Word and the Sacraments, prayer, conversation, and the like", it was a "hot-house plant".¹⁰ The Board gave Schreuder strong support, even to the extent of recalling and cashiering two missionaries who had not fulfilled the vow of obedience which Schreuder demanded of them.

In the same year in which Schreuder sailed for Africa, the Society's training school opened in Stavanger. Schreuder and his clerical friends opposed it, but support for a separate institution from the University was strong among the Low-Church elements, especially the Moravians. Conflict over the matter continued throughout the 1840's, and became particularly acute when it was rumoured that the students were being exposed to "Moravian heresies". The students were examined and given a clean bill, but the conflict led to the temporary closing of the school in 1847.

The possibility of ordination for graduates of the school had been discussed from the beginning. The general convention of 1845 voted to seek ordination from the State Church. But the application was refused by the Ministry for Church Affairs. This was justified on several grounds. The Society had expressed the desire that its missionaries be regarded as "sent out by the Norwegian State Church".¹¹ The Theological Faculty favoured ordination, but not as pastors in the State Church, since missionaries were not

¹⁰ O. Myklebust, Det Norske Misjonsselskapets Historie: Sør Afrika, III, p. 36.

¹¹ J. Nome, op. cit., pp. 121ff.

directly associated with the State Church. Candidates should be ordained by a Bishop on behalf of the "Evangelical-Lutheran Church in Norway", as a purely ecclesiastical matter. Bishop Arup and others disagreed; It was in principle impossible to distinguish either between the State Church and the Lutheran Church in Norway or between the purely ecclesiastical authority of the Bishops and their authority within the State Church. This approximated too closely to the Roman Catholic conception of ordination as a Sacrament to be tolerable. Any ordained pastor could administer ordination. But the missionaries ought not to be ordained in the State Church. In addition, the standards of this "private school" and the qualifications of its graduates were regarded as doubtful. The first three graduates went to Africa without ordination, in 1849. Here they were ordained by Schreuder himself, although he was not enthusiastic about the idea, because he was "only a pastor" and not a Bishop. NMS again sought ordination for its graduates in 1857, but was refused on the ground that the application was made EN BLOC, without naming the candidates. In principle, this meant that the right of ordination could not be given to the school. In 1864, the application was renewed, this time including the names. By Royal Resolution of the same year, all Bishops were authorized to ordain such missionaries as they found suitable, though with the reservation that they would not be

allowed to perform ministerial functions in Norway.

While Schreuder and his fellow-missionaries struggled through the difficult 1850's in Africa, Norwegian Church-life was passing through a new phase. The Johnsonian Revival swept through the land, the Inner Mission movement began, the Grundtvigian conflict entered its crucial stage, and a democratic spirit made rapid progress. As Nome says, ecclesiastical ideals were under revision from about the year 1860. Undoubtedly the fact that Schreuder was in Africa while this development was taking place and thus unable to follow it step by step had an important part to play in the tension between him and his constituents at home during the years which followed. He was never really able to understand the Norwegian situation in this era of revolutionary change. On the other hand, none of those in responsible positions in NMS had ever been in South Africa; Consequently, they failed to understand the situation there.

A significant incident occurred in 1854, when the Grundtvigians in Fredrikshald, under the leadership of Pastor Carl Wille, disbanded the local mission society and declared (in the true Grundtvigian and Schreuderian spirit) the entire parish a missionary society. They sent representatives to the general convention of NMS in 1854 and again in 1856, although on both occasions the convention refused to admit them. After a long debate, the convention adopted the solution of Gisle Johnson; It would recognize the delegates from Fredrikshald "as soon as they declare that they

have formed a missionary society".¹²

(c) The Conflict between Schreuder
and the Board of NMS.

From the outset, there existed a certain tension between Schreuder and the Board at home. Each guarded his authority jealously; The Board was, moreover, responsible to the general convention. The fact that the constitution of the home Society was democratic, whereas authority in the field was autocratic was bound to lead to conflict. It is therefore all the more surprising that the Board proposed in 1864 that Schreuder should come home and accept ordination as a missionary Bishop. The idea originated with the missionaries in the field, but it was the Board which made the decision. Schreuder replied that he had never considered the possibility, and that he preferred not to comment until the "proper Church and State Church authorities" have spoken "definitively" on the matter.¹ In the end, however, he accepted, and was ordained a Bishop on July 8, 1866 in Bergen Cathedral, "with the same powers and authority as a Norwegian Bishop, subject to such qualifications as were made necessary by the constitution of NMS".²

Schreuder's authority reached a peak with his consecration to the episcopate, and he must have felt that

¹² J. Nome, op. cit., pp. 177f.

¹ O. Myklebust, Sør Afrika, p. 53.

² Ibid., p. 67.

he had achieved his heart's desire. His views were definitely High-Church. This fact is not made explicit in his original appeal, although it is significant that it was addressed to the Church, and that the term recurs frequently in the document. It is clear that his concept of the Church is more than that of a Pietist conventicle. His conception of the missionary vocation is objective rather than subjective. His appeal, for example, did not emphasize the spiritual needs of the natives, but preferred to lay the greater stress upon the obligation of the Church to administer the means of grace in all the world. This corresponds closely to his concept of the Church.

Schreuder himself, in a later work³, rejected the High-Church label. The term belongs to the Church of England, and is not applicable in the Norwegian Church. He prefers the Church of England, which he has observed at close hand for a generation, to any other non-Lutheran Church. The High-Church Anglicans hold a doctrine of the Eucharist which is "approximately" the same as the Lutheran. Therefore, to be High Church in the Anglican sense is to hold a Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Still, he denies being either High- or Low-Church, but simply "conservative Churchly", "bound by my Baptismal, confirmation, ordination and episcopal vows to uphold the doctrine of the Norwegian Lutheran Church, and to maintain its practice in cultus

³ H. Schreuder, Lidt til Regulering af Overformynderiueiret i den norske Mission, Chra., 1874.

and polity...so long as the Church does not undertake... a revision". He also rejects the accusations that he is "Papistic" or Grundtvigian. He denies that he has read much of Grundtvig, and recalls that he was not impressed with him when they met in London in 1843; Grundtvig seemed too closed-minded. This statement, however, is in flat contradiction to a letter written to Wexels at the time; He had felt a "magnetic attraction" to Grundtvig, as one to whom he was closely related "in Baptism and in Spirit, in Faith and doctrine".⁴ It is certain that Schreuder had been influenced by Grundtvig through his Norwegian followers, but the extent of this influence is difficult to determine. Schreuder never adopted the distinctive features of the Churchly View. He never regarded the Apostles' Creed as a NORMA NORMANS over against Scripture, nor emphasized it as constitutive of the Church. It is true that he had a high conception of the Sacraments, and it is possible that they tended to loom larger than the Word in his thinking. Still, it is difficult to discover anything contrary to the prevailing Orthodoxy in his position on these points. His conception of the Ministry and particularly of ordination represents the clearest testimony to his High-Church principles. In an ordination address in 1870, he said that the transference of the holy office of the Ministry occurs "only in the power of the Lord's institution, whence it has come to us through the Apostles..." and that "its

⁴ J. Nome, Demringstid i Norge, p. 365.

institution by the Lord contains the charisma and awakens it in every given case..."⁵ Schreuder did not regard the Ministry as arising out of the congregation on the basis of the Universal Priesthood, but as having been instituted by Christ apart from the Universal Priesthood, and as having been transferred through the Apostolic Succession. It was neither the inner nor the outer call which gave the office to the candidate, but ordination. Schreuder stressed the idea that a charisma is actually given in ordination.⁶ In a sermon preached shortly before his consecration to the episcopate, he said: "Those who are not ordained, who do not know the mysteries of the office, nor the greatness of its importance, might desire to preach publicly...but what good would it be...when the Spirit and grace of anointing are lacking..."⁷ He advised Dr. Borchgrevink in Madagascar (an ordained pastor and a physician) to regard his medical work as secondary to his pastoral work. Having once ordained Borchgrevink, he cannot release him from the work of his office, "for when I have once consecrated anyone to the holy office, it is as though a sacred (GEISTLIG) power has gone out from me..."⁸ It is clear that, in his doctrine of ordination, Schreuder departs to a significant degree from the Lutheran tradition.

5 Norsk Misjonstidende, 1872, quoted in J. Nome, Det norske Misjonsselskapets Historie, I, p. 263.

6 Aktstykker, p. 208.

7 Beretning, p. 37.

8 Letter, printed in Aktstykker, pp. 225-226n.

Schreuder always regarded the mission in South Africa as an extension of the Church of Norway. Consequently, he strove to maintain the order of the home Church, and particularly resented any attempt on the part of NMS, which he regarded as a "private society", to inaugurate changes in the Church order in the field.

Hardly had Schreuder returned to Africa with the complete authority of a Bishop⁹, when a new movement began to contest his authority. At the general convention of 1867, in harmony with the democratic tendencies than at work in the homeland, a certain Mr. Øvrum proposed the following revision in the instructions of the Society to its missionaries:

"For the proclamation of God's Word on the mission field, all the spiritual gifts which the Lord has given the congregations are to be utilized. These charismata are to be sought out, encouraged, proved, and acknowledged by the elders, who thereupon issue the call of the congregation to proclaim the Word without ordination. In case of doubt or disagreement, the opinion of the Bishop shall be decisive."¹⁰

The Board notified Schreuder of the proposal, together with the observation that there was "considerable sympathy" for it within NMS, indeed that "several" of the members of the Board thought it based on principles which were in harmony with Scripture and the Confessions. On the other hand, they felt that it was probably impracticable

⁹ The Board expressed it in these terms: "All authority to make decisions and to act in the field rests in the hands of the Bishop", O. Myklebust, Sör-Afrika, p. 68.

¹⁰ Aktstykker, p. 17.

in the field, since the lay missionaries already did some preaching and there was no sign that the natives possessed the necessary spiritual gifts. It might also open the way for independency. The Board thought it preferable that such a policy should come as the result of a "free, organic development" in the field rather than as a proposal thrust upon the mission by NMS. They urged Schreuder to give his opinion, and proposed that he should declare the idea "unnecessary" in the case of Zululand.¹¹ Schreuder replied, at first briefly, later at greater length.¹² He dutifully declared the proposal "unnecessary", and added that it "only looms large in the minds of those at home who harbour rather precarious unChurchly tendencies". Such manifestations of "the horrible spirit of the times" take all the joy out of missionary work, and subject the mission to "all the whirlwinds of experimentation, both by the learned and the ignorant". He attempted to interpret the key phrases of the proposal. Were the "spiritual gifts" to be interpreted as "extraordinary, Apostolic" gifts, or those mediated through Baptism and Christian nurture? According to Scripture, spiritual gifts are given, and cannot therefore be "sought out", unless indeed they have been neglected, an implication which Schreuder regards as an insult to himself and his fellow-missionaries. Are the possessors of these gifts Norwegians or Africans? If they are Africans, then they will need instruction by the "elders". But there are no

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 18-19.

¹² Ibid., pp. 41-44, 78-109.

"elders" among the natives who are capable of performing this duty; Such a "theological faculty" is as yet "an unfulfilled prophecy". How would such a body of elders be constituted? As the Bishop understands it, Øvrum's proposal would amount to the introduction of a Presbyterian Church order, and would render him helpless in the face of possible "heretical, dissenting, unChurchly tendencies". The proposal is the product of "egotism" and "a tactless mania for novelty", and should have been rejected by the Board outright.

In the end, the Øvrum proposal was killed by the district meetings of NMS. This attempt to introduce lay-preaching and the charismatic principle was not only "unnecessary" but also unrealistic. Apart from the fact that Schreuder was in principle opposed to lay-preaching and any form of non-Episcopal Church order, conditions in Zululand were not ripe for either. Øvrum's proposal was one example of the numerous attempts made during these years to read the Norwegian situation into the Zulu Church.

Another question which became acute about the same time was the status of the annual missionary conferences in the field. These conferences had never possessed any real jurisdiction, but with the introduction of the episcopate in the field, it had been expressly stated that their power was to be purely advisory. The missionaries themselves were generally though not universally satisfied with this, but the main opposition was in Norway.¹³ The

¹³ O. Myklebust, Sør-Afrika, p. 72.

Board attempted to quiet the opposition by reminding them that it was only on such conditions that the Bishop had agreed to take office, and that the present order was valid only in the case of Schreuder and could be re-examined when he was gone. However, pressure became so strong that in 1868, the Board found it necessary to write to Schreuder, requesting "a more definite and statutory" ordering of the Conference in order that it might form "an important link" in the missionary enterprise. They desired the conference to have an "official" character and the minutes of the meetings to be officially reported to the Board. Moreover, they claimed the right to poll the conference at any time.¹⁴ In the opinion of the Board, much of the sentiment in favour of the Øvrum proposal arose from "a fear of monarchic absolutism" in the mission field.

Schreuder was not opposed to conferences as such, but was afraid that they might acquire too much power. He ignored the Board's request for a statutory ordinance for three years. In 1871, the Board again returned to the charge. Schreuder replied that the Board had no right to demand or to force an organization upon the conference. He resented the "intrusion" and "high-handedness" of the Board. The conference is the missionaries' own affair; The Board had no more concern in the matter than the missionaries with the general convention back home. He regarded the original "formlessness" of its constitution

¹⁴ Aktstykker, pp. 36f.

as a vote of confidence in the missionaries as mature men with rights and responsibilities, and the Board's proposal as a reflection of dissatisfaction and lack of confidence. He warned the Board that it would have to change its attitude if he were to continue in his present position.¹⁵

No change was forthcoming, and on May 14, 1872, Schreuder resigned his position as superintendent of the Zulu mission. The chief reason which he gave was that, whereas in 1866 he had been given the authority of a Norwegian Bishop, the NMS now demanded that he become "an office manager for a majority rule" within the Society.¹⁶ Schreuder refused to abandon the Church order which had been established with his consecration to the episcopate, and which he termed an "analogy" to the order in the home Church. The outbreak of the Zulu war caused him to remain in office for another year. He even sent home a statutory ordinance for the conference. But the final break was inevitable; Schreuder left the service of NMS in July, 1873. The field was divided, and Schreuder's mission continued as "The Mission of the Norwegian Church by Schreuder". It was supported through a committee in Christiania until 1928, when Lutherans in America assumed full responsibility for the mission.

There were several factors which contributed to the conflict between Schreuder and the Society. Schreuder's

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 241-267.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 275.

personality undoubtedly contributed to the tension. But the conclusion seems inescapable that the one factor which underlay the entire conflict was a basic difference in the concepts of the Church and of the Ministry. The controversy reflects clearly the ecclesiological tensions then current in the Church of Norway. Schreuder's Wexelian position, despite certain questionable features, was at least consistent; In this respect, it contrasts favourably with the remarkable inconsistency, particularly in the matter of Church order, displayed by the home Society.¹⁷

(d) The Madagascar Question and Lars Dahle

The conference question was further complicated by the fact that, on the initiative of Schreuder, NMS had inaugurated a new mission on the island of Madagascar, in 1866. As missionary Bishop, Schreuder was responsible for the new mission as well, an impossible situation, not only because of the distances involved, but also because of differences in the local situation. The mission in Madagascar was from the beginning more independent and democratic. Schreuder, apparently without authorization from the Board, and even without prior notification, had appointed a kind of Dean for the island mission.¹ This, however, was

¹⁷ Schreuder traces the tortuous course of the policy pursued by the home Society in Lidt til Regulering...

¹ The Board heard of it incidentally, three years later. Aktstykker, p. 401.

not satisfactory to the missionaries in the field. In fact, this high-handed action seems to have caused the Board to renew its demand for a conference ordinance in 1871. Schreuder's biographer asserts that the dissatisfaction originated not from the Madagascar missionaries as a whole, but "from one specific source".²

This source was undoubtedly Lars Dahle, then newly-arrived in Madagascar, but destined to become the leading figure there for a decade and afterwards the powerful secretary of NMS for thirty-one years. He journeyed to Madagascar via South Africa, and was ordained there by Schreuder in 1870. In his memoirs, he recalls the conversation he had with Schreuder prior to the ordination, in which Schreuder expounded his concept of ordination. Dahle agreed with Schreuder that the office of the Ministry had been instituted by God, but when Schreuder maintained that it was transferred "by Apostolic Succession to the present day, without being influenced by the congregation", and that ordination by a Bishop in Apostolic Succession bestowed a special charisma, Dahle disagreed. He recalls that Schreuder "was as High-Church as I was Low-Church". Dahle insisted that it was the call, not ordination, which conferred the office. The Holy Spirit "draws and prepares for the work" through the inner call, but since both the means of grace and the Ministry are given to the Church,

2 A. Thunem, Biskop Hans Paludan Smith Schreuder, p. 240.

an outer call from the Church or someone authorized to act on its behalf (such as the Crown or the Board of NMS) is also necessary. Dahle was glad to be able to quote Johan Gerhard that "ordination is a declaration of and a testimony to the official and solemn call". In view of their disagreement, Dahle was afraid that Schreuder might refuse to ordain him; But Schreuder listened patiently to his younger colleague, and ordained him nonetheless.³ Once in Madagascar, Dahle became convinced that government by the conference (or what he termed "the abolition of absolutism") was a vital necessity for the mission. Unsolicited, he formulated a conference ordinance and sent it to the Board (1872). It was Dahle's Church order which in all essentials was finally adopted in all mission fields of the NMS.

Lars Dahle is one of the few associated with the Foreign Missions movement who have left us any kind of systematic treatise on the doctrine of the Church.⁴ He was a true Johnsonian. Like Johnson, he stresses the necessity of the objective means of grace, but approaches the concept of the Church from the subjective standpoint. "The Church is not primarily a redemptive ANSTALT, but a gathering of believing people. But to this gathering the Lord has indeed confided the means of grace, by which

³ L. Dahle, Tilbakeblik paa mit Liv, I, pp. 232f.

⁴ L. Dahle, Hvad er Kirken, og Hvad er Sand Kirkelighed?, Stavanger, 1903.

sinners are saved, and to that extent it is also a redemptive ANSTALT."⁵ The Church is the kingdom of God on earth. It is an "inward" kingdom, "which did not come in such a way that it could be pointed out, for it began within the believers...it had its profound basis in their communion with Him, which no man can see..."⁶ A certain Pietistic inclination is evident in Dahle's definition of ECCLESIA: "a gathering of those called together from the larger mass, i.e. a selection".⁷ He interprets Matt. 16:16 to mean that the Church is built upon Christ Himself, or possibly upon Peter's confession, but certainly not upon Peter himself (This is in effect a traditional Lutheran interpretation).

All who believe and are baptized, and therefore have been regenerated, are members of the Church. Therefore, the true Church is invisible. "We can indeed see the believers, but we cannot see whether they are believers, for we cannot see the faith which makes them believers."⁸ Dahle expressly rejects the "error" of the sectarians, displayed in their attempt to render the invisible Church visible; It is impossible to create a pure Church. On the other hand, in the authentic Pietist manner, Dahle maintains that we can see those who live unChristian lives, even though they may confess Christ. "These ought to be removed by Church discipline, and when this does not occur,

5 Ibid., p. 5.

6 Ibid., p. 6.

7 Ibid., p. 6n.

8 Ibid., p. 25.

or cannot occur in a State Church, we must acknowledge that things are not as they ought to be."⁹ This and many similar remarks in his treatise indicates the extent of Dahle's dissatisfaction with the system of the State Church.

The Church does, however, appear visibly, as a redemptive ANSTALT, through its confession. "The believing Church is invisible, but the confessing Church is visible." Thus Dahle inevitably reaches the conclusion that "...the Visible and Invisible Church are two different Churches. They constitute simply a larger and a smaller circle around the same mid-point, so that the smaller lies within the larger."¹⁰ Thus we have a dualism in the concept of the Church. The Visible Church has, however, some religious significance: It is the administrator of the means of grace. But it possesses this treasure because it includes the Invisible Church, the believers. In contrast to Rome, which knows no Invisible Church, and to the Reformed Churches, who know no Visible Church, the Lutheran Church posits the existence of both, and thus constitutes the true VIA MEDIA.

The Church is one, possessing an inner unity in the same God and the same means of grace. Outward unity is to be prayed for, but it is impossible in this world. Indeed, the various branches of Christendom (like the nations of

⁹ Ibid., p. 25.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 26. This represents a significant departure from Gisle Johnson's insistence that, although it has these two aspects, there is essentially only one Church.

the world) have their own special tasks.¹¹ The Church is Apostolic, not in the sense of a tactual Succession, but because of its foundation by the Apostles and the Church's faithfulness to the Apostolic Scriptures. Rather surprisingly, Dahle can speak of the infallibility of the Church, though only in the qualified sense that the whole Church can never depart from the basic redemptive truths.

The Ministry was instituted by the Lord, when He gave the means of grace. All are priests before God, but not everyone can act on behalf of the congregation; Not only would confusion result, but not everyone has the requisite gifts and abilities. The Church must therefore search out the gifts which God has placed in its midst, develop them and transfer the work of the Ministry to those whom it chooses, although the way these principles are carried out in the State Church "leaves much to be desired". Dahle appears to be Lutheran in his concept of the Ministry, retaining the tension between the divinely instituted office and the Universal Priesthood. But he tends to assign too great a role to the congregation instead of stressing the outer call as a call of God mediated through the Church. He must therefore be regarded as standing slightly left-of-centre in this respect.

Dahle also discusses the question: "What is true Churchliness?".¹² It is not synonymous either with being

¹¹ Dahle was a prominent delegate to the Missionary Conferences at London (1888) and Edinburgh (1910).

¹² Ibid., pp. 37ff.

a Church-goer, a Christian, a High-Churchman, or an opponent of lay activity, but in adopting (and living out) an attitude toward the Church which is in keeping with its nature as the Body of Christ. A true Churchman 1) makes use of the means of grace, 2) participates in the joys and sorrows of the Church and all its members, 3) recognizes the doctrinal tradition as being "of the highest importance", and 4) is faithful to his own Church body and its Confessions. He also respects the "healthy" development in the history of the Church. Even unhealthy development is not to be lightly regarded. For example, with regard to the connection between State and Church, an "operation" there could be more dangerous than the "illness". Finally, a Churchman directs all his religious activity (including Inner Mission, Foreign Mission and charity work) toward the service of the Church. "There is no doubt that foreign missions work is a matter for the Church and not for individuals or organizations."¹³ But in its present predicament, the Church is unable to carry out this task. Therefore, a society like NMS considers itself to be doing the Church's work, on its behalf. The Church, however, must bear its share of the blame for the rise of "unChurchly" organizations. "It is not easy either for the individual Christian or for the Christian organizations to enter into any organic relation to the Church, where the Church...has grown together with the State and ...so stiffened that it

¹³ Ibid., p. 52.

is ill-suited to relate itself to movements of Christian life...individual or collective,...receive them into its service, regulate and utilize their work in the best way for its own growth and welfare and for the carrying out of the task which the Lord has given to it."¹⁴

(e) Other Missionary Enterprises
Founded during the 19th century.

Two further missions founded during the 19th century virtually escaped the ecclesiological conflicts and experienced a harmonious development as moderate, "Churchly", clerical missions from the outset. Both owed much to the Johnsonian revival, and generally represented its point of view. These were the Norwegian Mission to Israel (Den norske Israelmisjon, 1844) and the Mission to Seamen (Den norske Sjømannsmisjon, 1864). The first initiative toward a Jewish mission came when a local society was formed, at the instigation of Lutheran-Moravians, in Stavanger in 1844. But when a national organization was founded in 1861, its Churchly character had been established. As a converted Jew, Professor Caspari was a natural choice as chairman of the Board, and served in this capacity until his death in 1892. The Mission to Israel supported the London Society and various German societies until 1891, when it sent out its first missionary to work among the Jews in Eastern

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 49.

Europe. It is typical that this first missionary was an ordained clergyman with several years' service in a parish behind him. The Mission to Seamen, begun on the initiative of Pastor J.C.H. Storjohann, has always been served by ordained clergymen.¹

A mission which began as a laymens' and an interdenominational enterprise and developed into a "Churchly" and Lutheran undertaking was the Santal Mission (Santalmisjon) in Northern India. Its co-founder (together with the Dane H. P. Børresen), Lars Skrefsrud, was such an outstanding personality and had such a romantic life-story that he became the most famous Norwegian missionary. He was converted in the State prison in Christiania, where he was serving a four-year sentence for larceny. Rejected by the NMS because of his past, he was trained (rather sketchily) and sent out by the Gossner Society of Berlin. Friction led Skrefsrud and Børresen to leave the Gossner mission and, together with the English Baptist E. C. Johnson, to found the "India Home Mission to the Santals". Under Baptist influence and support, Skrefsrud allowed himself to be re-baptized. He later asserted that he was "half forced" to do so, and renounced his re-baptism as "unnecessary" and "a mistake".² Johnson soon left the mission, and in 1877, it became a Scandinavian Lutheran undertaking. In the same year, Børresen was ordained by Bishop Martensen of

¹ The first missions were established at Leith, North Shields, and Antwerp.

² E. Döhl, Lars Skrefsrud, p. 33.

Copenhagen. Skrefsrud was by now also convinced that the mission must have (as he put it) "a regular Church order" and "a recognized ordination".³ In 1878, he wrote to Professor Rudin of Uppsala that he would "prefer to see foreign missions become more of a parochial (MENIGHED) matter than left to the missionary societies", and expressed the hope that the universities would assume the leadership of the movement.⁴ Of particular though enigmatic interest is his enquiry in the same letter whether the Apostolic Succession still existed in Sweden, and "what evidence is advanced for its existence" and the links in its transmission.⁵ It is difficult to deduce what lies behind this enquiry, but it is safe to assume that Skrefsrud was considering the possibility of his own ordination and that the matter had personal significance for him. The following year, he wrote to his former prison warden that he was being accused of being a Grundtvigian. He denied having any party affiliation, but expressed an admiration for Christopher Bruun, whom he regarded as "firmly grounded in Christianity". In 1881-2, Skrefsrud made a trip home to Norway. The Ministry for Church Affairs received two petitions for his ordination, one signed by twenty clergymen, the other from the Board of NMS. In 1882, he was ordained by the Bishop of Christiania. There was some

³ O. Myklebust, "Lars Skrefsrud" in NBL, XIV, p. 12.

⁴ "To Skrefsrud Brev" in Norsk Tidsskrift for Misjon, 1953, p. 116.

⁵ Ibid., pp. 116f.

dissatisfaction over this; "Many of the best supporters of Skrefsrud and the Santal Mission were not a little cool toward the State Church, and Skrefsrud was accused of letting the Church 'capture' him".⁶ Lay activity continued to play an important part in the work of the Santal Mission, both at home and in the field,⁷ but Skrefsrud led the Santal Church "from Apostolic simplicity to Churchly consolidation", and established the principle that its missionaries should be trained, ordained theologians.⁸

(f) The Formation of the China Missionary Association, and Ludvig Hope.

During the 1880's, the subject of missions to China was a matter of great concern throughout the Protestant world. There was at the time considerable direct Anglo-Saxon influence in Norwegian religious life, for example through Skrefsrud's visits to Britain and the revivalism of Moody and others. It was the foundation of the China Inland Mission by Hudson Taylor which first aroused the interest of Norwegians in China. Several Norwegians entered the service of this Society. China missions appealed particularly to those with Low-Church, revivalist, and weak confessional sympathies, and tended to accentuate them. There were Christians in Norway who regarded NMS with

6 E. Döhl, op. cit., p. 60.

7 B. Hall, Lars Skrefsrud, p. 81.

8 O. Myklebust, "Lars Skrefsrud" in NBL, XIV, p. 12.

coolness, on the grounds that it was too "Churchly" and clerical,¹ and who shared the standpoint expressed in the Øvrum proposal of 1867. They were mostly laymen, in the Haugean tradition, but "almost all were even more strongly influenced by the Rosenian movement, with its free, evangelical point of view. And they were much more free in their relation to the State Church and the clergy than NMS; Some were Free Church people on principle".² These were the constituents of the Norwegian Lutheran China Missionary Association (Norsk Luthersk Kinamisjonsforbundet, since 1949 Norsk Luthersk Misjonssambandet), which was founded in Bergen in 1891. It severed all connection with the China Inland Mission at the outset, because of Taylor's views on polygamy and his interdenominationalism, and bound itself to the Confessions of the Church of Norway. At the general convention of 1890, NMS had discussed the possibility of assuming responsibility for the Norwegians already working in China, but had decided not to do so. The leader of the opposition was the new general secretary, Lars Dahle, who argued that the Madagascar mission, which was both more fruitful and more inexpensive, demanded all the men and the means the Society could muster.

The China Association differed from NMS in one important respect. It was not purely a foreign missionary society, but an inner mission society as well, indeed the latter

¹ Det norsk lutherske Kinamisjonsforbundet Gjennom 50 Aar, I, p. 20.

² Ibid., p. 19.

activity was basic to the former. Its purpose was "to win souls for Jesus, then to organize societies for the cause".³ The Society always possessed more itinerant "emissaries" at home than missionaries in the field.⁴ Many of the leaders of the China Association were prominent Inner Mission workers in other societies. Indeed, the China Association at home was so similar to and so closely associated with the West Norway Inner Mission Society that the two were sometimes (erroneously) identified.

A "fairly peaceful" relationship existed between the China Association and NMS throughout the 1890's, though there was a "visible tension". NMS made an overture toward union in 1892, but the offer was politely declined, although the Association expressed the hope that "understanding" and "friendly cooperation" might prevail between the two groups.

It is significant that the question of the relation of the Association to the State Church, ordination, and ritual was ignored by those who founded the organization until "congregations had been established and practical questions arose..."⁵ The majority of its members "were not fond of many aspects of the State Church system...which they regarded as un-Biblical...Not a few were independent on principle, and some were members of the Lutheran Free Church".⁶

³ Ibid., p. 66.

⁴ In 1936, there were 197 salaried workers at home, and 106 missionaries in the field.

⁵ Ibid., p. 101.

⁶ Ibid., p. 101.

The first missionary, Johannes Brantzaeg, one of the very few theologians to be associated with the Association, and for nearly forty years the leader of its work at home, applied to the Ministry for Church Affairs for ordination, with the blessing of the Board. His application was rejected by the Bishops on the ground that so little was known about the Association that none of them ventured to give his blessing to it. Brandtzaeg went to China without ordination. At the time, none of the leaders of the China Association regarded ordination as necessary "either for religious or ecclesiastical reasons", although it seemed to them to offer certain "practical" advantages.⁷

Nevertheless, the question of ordination became the source of conflict within the Association for several years. The immediate occasion arose from the fact that two of the Association's missionaries had studied in the most "Churchly" Norwegian Lutheran synod in America. One, Nils Arnetvedt, was ordained there, with the permission of the Board. The other, J. Gotteberg, also requested permission to receive ordination, which was refused by the Board. Brandtzaeg was too kind-hearted to break the news to him, and held out the hope that he might be ordained in China. Meanwhile, without consulting the Board, Brandtzaeg applied to the Ministry for Church Affairs for the ordination of a third missionary, Ole Masoni. The request was approved by Jakob Sverdrup, then Minister for Church Affairs, but the

⁷ Ibid., p. 102.

Board vetoed the plan. "It was clear that the majority on the Board did not want its missionaries ordained, either by the Synod [in America] or by the Church of Norway."⁸ Arnetvedt and Gotteberg protested; The Board replied with a reminder that they were, after all, the Board. Arnetvedt denied the right of the Board to refuse ordination to any of its missionaries, if the Association were to be faithful to the Lutheran Confessions. He conceded that ordination was not commanded in Scripture, and was willing to do without it if it could not be secured; But if it was available, it was "egotistical to break with the existing order which God has commanded us to obey".⁹ Gotteberg replied in still stronger terms; He regarded ordination as necessary if the Association were to call itself Lutheran, and if the Board persisted in denying him ordination, he would consider himself released from its service.

The question of ordination was hotly debated at all the general conventions of the China Association from 1895 to 1899, and also in the field in China. Finally, in 1899, the convention agreed by 86 votes to 26 not to seek ordination from the State Church, but "to allow the Board, as representatives of the China Association, to consecrate (INNVIE)" the missionaries.¹⁰ Two years later, the outbreak of the Boxer Rebellion led to the return of the

8 Ibid., p. 112.

9 Ibid., p. 114.

10 Ibid., p. 132.

missionaries, and when they were not allowed to publicize their own minority view, Arnetvedt and Gotteberg left the service of the Association and joined the NMS, which decided in the same year to open a mission in China. Three members of the Board of the China Association, including the superintendent of the missionary training school, Pastor Leere, also resigned.

Leere was no High-Churchman, but he thought it un-Lutheran to restrict Church order to the minimum; The Lutheran approach was to retain all that is not contrary to Scripture. Ordination is not merely "an empty ceremony", but a "visible expression of the fact that the Church has called and installed the ordinand to administer the means of grace on its behalf".¹¹ Leere further protested against the tendency within the Association to deny to the State Church any semblance of the character of a Church; If this is the case, we must all leave the State Church. If we are to remain in it, we must work for its improvement. Furthermore, it is inconsistent to accept Baptism and Holy Communion from the Church and yet reject its ordination. If the China Association is to call itself "Norwegian Lutheran", it must have an express connection with outward Christendom. Our missionaries deserve to be regarded as missionaries for the whole Church. Finally, it would be a breach of good order to allow the Board to "consecrate" the missionaries.¹²

¹¹ Ibid., p. 138.

¹² Ibid., pp. 137-140.

Brandtzaeg also had "strong doubts" as to whether the convention was Lutheran on the question of ordination, but he voted against Church ordination. He feared a "Catholic" concept of ordination as a Sacrament, with the corollary that the rite can only be conferred by an ordained person. He also expressed the fear that ordination might lead to a cleavage between the clergy and the laity within the Association itself.¹³

The speakers who favoured consecration by the Board, notably N. Nilssen and Thormod Rettedahl, claimed that this was most consistent with Biblical and Apostolic practice. They did not regard the State Church as a Church in the Biblical sense. Its practice in admitting gross sinners to confirmation and Holy Communion was far too lax. Nor did they regard the State Church order as Apostolic; According to the order of the Early Church, it was not the State but the congregation through its elders which conferred ordination. Although the Board of the Association were not the elders of any congregation, they nevertheless corresponded most closely to the Biblical pattern in the present situation. The manner in which the State Church clergy and Bishops are called and installed is "basically false". Therefore, it seems strange to ask them to place their stamp of approval upon the missionaries. Moreover, these missionaries are not commissioned by the State Church, but by a few "friends of missions" within the State Church.

¹³ Ibid., pp. 122-127, 135-137, 144f.

They saw no reason to leave the State Church, simply because they could not accept its order. No State Church authority has demanded the right to ordain the Association's missionaries; The real question is whether the Association should request State Church ordination. In any case, they had no desire to introduce the Norwegian State Church into China; A Free Church, with as "Biblical" an order as possible should be established there. To consecrate their own missionaries was no more "unChurchly" than to call them in the first place, (with an obvious side-glance at the practice of NMS); It was simply more consistent, a more logical conclusion. Nor was it contrary to the Lutheran Confessions. The Augsburg Confession does not mention ordination; It occurs in the Apology, which is not recognized as binding on the Church of Norway. Finally, ordination was not necessary for a successful mission; Many unordained missionaries were already working in China, with just as much success as those who had received ordination.¹⁴

A further source of conflict was provided by the question of ritual in the mission field. The missionaries wished to follow the ritual of the Church of Norway, but the general convention decreed in 1895 that "such fixed forms as are found useful and necessary should be as few and simple as possible...and be in full accord with the spirit and practice of the New Testament. The Liturgy

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 134f., 140f.

in particular should be so ordered as to give room for the exercise of the spiritual gifts in the congregation..."

A protest from the missionaries that, according to the Association's constitution, such matters fell under their jurisdiction, went unheeded.¹⁵

The ecclesiological standpoint of the China Association is most clearly and thoroughly presented in the writings of the lay-preacher Ludvig Hope, the "Grand Old Man" of the Association. For this reason, although his works belong to the 20th century, we shall examine his doctrine of the Church here.¹⁶

Hope's approach to the doctrine of the Church is Biblicist; Again and again in his writings, he asks: What is Biblical?. He is concerned to define and order the Church in accordance with the ideal of the Apostolic Age. There is no room for tradition or development in his concept of the Church.

His starting point is subjective. The Church is defined as "the people of God...all who are born of God... only these, and not one more or one fewer".¹⁷ This "spiritual communion" exists "wherever there are regenerate people".¹⁸ But he is careful to guard against associationalism, and stresses the fact that the Church is solely the creation of God.

Thereafter, Hope allows others to speak for him. He cites three sources with whom he is in agreement: Prof.

15 Ibid., pp. 116-119, 152.

16 L. Hope, Skrifter i Samling, Vol. IX.

17 Ibid., p. 238.

18 Ibid., p. 240.

Sigurd Odland, Rudolph Sohm, and Martin Luther (a carefully selected series of passages from his anti-Roman polemic).¹⁹ Sohm and Odland maintain that the Apostolic Age knew no office of the Ministry or institutional order as we have it. It was purely a charismatic society, based on the principle that the charismata should be allowed to work freely. The teaching office arose out of the spiritual gift of teaching. Those who possessed it volunteered to the congregation, and were legitimized by their work. The call and consecration by the congregation was simply the public recognition that God had chosen these men for this task. The Ministry was not a statutory office with statutory rights, and is necessary neither for the existence of the Church nor for the administration of the Sacraments. Authority in the Church belongs not to the Ministry, but to the congregation. The Ministry as we know it was the result of a 2nd century development, and this development represents the beginning of the decline of the Church. In reliance upon Sohm, Odland, and (apparently) Luther, Hope draws a sharp distinction between what is commonly called the Church and the people of God. "That which we usually call the Church is the scaffold on which we stand to build the Church of Jesus Christ."²⁰ Throughout his writings, he distinguishes between the "life", "Spirit", and "Charismata" of the free organizations, and the

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 191-203.

²⁰ Ibid., pp. 17, 240.

"organization", "form", and "office" of the Church.

"Neither the State Church nor a Free Church nor a 'free organization' constitutes the congregation (MENIG-HETEN), but the congregation is in the organizations."²¹ The State Church lays the groundwork for Christian faith, particularly through its educational ministry, but it is unable to awaken much true Christian life. A Free Church, although its polity is "somewhat correct", is no better, and may even be worse. The "free organizations" (the missionary societies) resemble most closely the Early Church, and therefore represent the best hope for awakening and sustaining Christian life. They are "in the Church but not under the Church". "It is my most profound conviction that the instrument which God has especially used to lead people to Christ is lay activity, free Christian endeavour."²² The proof is in the fruits. But lay activity must beware of certain dangers. It must not allow itself to be "captured" by the Church and the clergy. It must not attempt to organize the State Church on the Biblical model; This would give a Biblical form, but an un-Biblical content, for it would "organize the Christians and the world together".²³ It must also beware of over-organization. Only in the larger cities should it have a permanent preacher, lest the organization become simply another Church. "God has not introduced lay activity among the

²¹ Ibid., p. 210.

²² Ibid., p. 63.

²³ Ibid., p. 35.

Norwegian people for the purpose of creating a new Church." Except for the few with special gifts, lay-preachers are not to preach full-time, but are to have another occupation, preferably farming, for part of the year.

Hope denied that the China Association was "unChurchly". It was not un-Biblical, nor was it un-Lutheran; How then could it be un-Churchly? He was the leader of the movement to allow the laity to celebrate the Holy Communion in conventicles. In his view, "Free Communion" was justified on the basis of Scripture, and in harmony with the principle of self-government on which the free organizations were based. Moreover, the practice of the State Church was wrong, in two respects: It failed to exercise Church discipline, and it emphasized the motif of forgiveness to such an extent that it virtually excluded the elements of Communion and joy in the Sacrament. Just as Hauge and his followers freed the Word from the monopoly of the clergy in the 19th century, so ought the Eucharist to be freed in the 20th century.

The ecclesiological development of the Church of Norway as a whole is clearly reflected in the Foreign Missions movement. At the time the NMS was founded, the prevailing doctrine of the Church displayed the Orthodox objective approach with an emphasis upon the Church as a redemptive institution. Schreuder, the first and only Norwegian missionary Bishop, was a somewhat extreme

exponent of this standpoint. But the movement was from the outset Pietist and associational, and of necessity developed outside the structure of the State Church. Despite the fact that the clergy at first controlled the Society, its membership was predominantly lay. Thus the standpoint of Schreuder was never typical of the movement as a whole. The praiseworthy but unrealistic attempts of Schreuder and the Grundtvigians to make missions the responsibility of the national Church were doomed to failure, because they ran counter both to the Pietism within the movement itself and the trend toward secularization in the life of the nation as a whole.

Although Gisle Johnson personally exercised little direct influence upon the movement, it was his theology which informed the movement after 1850. The Church came to be regarded primarily as a congregation of believers, and the Ministry was deduced from the Universal Priesthood on the basis of the charismatic principle. Schreuder's strictly episcopal Church order was replaced by a modified presbyterianism. Lars Dahle is a typical representative of this point of view.

The China Missionary Association and its Chief spokesman, Ludvig Hope, represent the final stage of the development and at the same time a divergence from the main stream. Here the Church is completely spiritualized. The Association's views on the Ministry and Church order represent the charismatic principle and ecclesiastical democracy in an extreme form. Indeed, it is questionable whether the China Association possesses an ordained Ministry in the accepted sense.

Bibliography--The Foreign Missions Movement

- Aktstykker til Belysning af Forholdet mellem Biskop Schreuder og det Norske Missionsselskabet fra Biskopens Ordinasjon indtil Generalforsamlingen 1873, utg. efter Foranstaltning af det Norske Missionsselskabets Hovedbestyrelse, Stavanger, 1876--cited as Aktstykker.
- Beretning om Misjonspraest Schreuders Ordinasjon til Biskop over den Norske Kirkes Misjonsmark...samt Praedikener og Foredrag af Biskop Schreuder, Stavanger, 1868--cited as Beretning.
- L. Dahle, Hvad er Kirken, og Hvad er Sand Kirkelighed?, Stavanger, 1903.
- L. Dahle, Tilbakeblik paa mit Liv, I, Stavanger, 1922.
- E. Danbolt, Misjonstankens Gjennombrud i Norge, I, Oslo, 1947.
- E. Döhl, Lars Skrefsrud, Oslo, 1944.
- B. Hall, Lars Skrefsrud, Kristiania, 1922.
- O. Handeland, et. al., Den Lille Jubileumsboka, Oslo, 1944.
- O. Handeland, Vårldøysing, I, Björgvin, 1922.
- O. Hodne, "To Skrefsrud Brev" in Norsk Tidsskrift for Misjon, 1953, pp. 114ff.
- I. Holsvik and M. Waaler, Festskrift i Anledning Santalmisjonens 50-Aars Jubileum, Kristiania, 1917.
- C. Ihlen, Den Norske Israelmisjons Historie i Hundre Aar, 1844-1944, Oslo, 1944.
- Den Norsk Lutherske Kinamisjonsforbund Gjennom 50 Aar, utg. av Hovedstyret, I, Oslo, 1941.
- J. Løth, Lars O. Skrefsrud, Oslo, 1938.
- O. Myklebust, "Hans Egede i Norsk Kirkeliv", TTK, 1958, No. 3.
- O. Myklebust, Det Norske Misjonsselskaps Historie: Sor-Afrika, III, Stavanger, 1949.
- O. Myklebust, "H.P.S. Schreuder" in NBL, XII, pp. 533-541.
- O. Myklebust, "Schreuders Misjonsopprop i Kirkehistorisk Sikt", NTT, 1942, pp. 193-215.
- O. Myklebust, "Lars Skrefsrud" in NBL, XIV.
- J. Nome, Demringstid i Norge, Stavanger, 1942.
- J. Nome, Det Norske Misjonsselskaps Historie, I, Stavanger, 1943.
- A. Olsen, "Lars Dahle" in NBL, III, pp. 243-245.
- I. Saeter, Skrefsrud, Oslo, 1940.
- H.P.S. Schreuder, Lidt til Regulering af Overformynderi-uveiret i den Norske Mission, Kristiania, 1874.
- H.P.S. Schreuder, Nogle Ord til Norges Kirke om Christelig Pligt med Hensyn til Omsorg for ikke-Christne Medbrødres Salighed, Christiania, 1842.
- A. Seierstad, "Norsk Luthersk Misjonssamband", NTU, pp. 1264-1267.
- D. Thrap, Biskop H.P.S. Schreuders Liv og Virksomhed, Christiania, 1877.
- A. Thunem, Biskop H.P.S. Schreuder, Oslo, 1944.

THE

REFORM MOVEMENT

(a) Introduction

Christianity was introduced into Norway largely by the power of the Medieval kings. The Reformation relied chiefly on the strength of Danish arms. Throughout its modern history, the besetting danger of the Church of Norway has been Erastianism. To this day, it has retained more of the characteristics of the classical State Church than any Church in Christendom.¹

In the 19th century, there arose in Norway a vast movement for ecclesiastical reform. The renewal of the Church's theology and revival of its life led here, as elsewhere in Europe, to a growing ecclesiastical self-consciousness, an increasing awareness that the Church was a unique entity. This conviction combined with the democratic political trend of the day to induce Churchmen to re-examine the relationship between Church and State, and to raise the demand for greater independence for the Church in her internal affairs. The Church was also driven to an investigation of the closely related problem of Church Discipline. Consideration of these two questions, although they were peripheral from a Lutheran point of view, led the Church into more central and profound matters, including the limits of the Church and indeed its very essence.

¹ Unlike the Danish Constitution, the Norwegian Constitution does not designate the Church as a "Folk" Church, i.e. a Church of the majority. It recognizes the Lutheran faith as "the official religion of the State".

Thus the Reform Movement stimulated the Norwegian Church to some of its most profound theological thought.

The Church of Norway was never without some organs independent of the State, but the trend in the post-Reformation era was definitely in the direction of a greater measure of State control. At the time of the Reformation, all clergy were elected; After the introduction of State Absolutism in 1660, both Bishops and parish clergy were appointed by the Crown. The college of Bishops did not meet between 1685 and 1877, and it was only in our own century that permanent arrangements for Bishops' meetings were made. There were no clergy synods between 1668 and 1873, and when they were resumed, it was on an "unofficial" basis. Indeed, after 1660, almost the only independence left to the Church was the right of the local parish to choose its own hymn book.

Norway's Medieval laws decreed that "every man in the King's realm shall be a Christian". This principle remained virtually unchallenged until the 19th century. Luther's doctrine of the Two Realms was ignored in favour of the theocratic systems introduced (no doubt under Calvinist influence) in the Age of Orthodoxy. Pious kings felt responsible for the spiritual welfare of their subjects. Even those who had personally little concern for religion recognized the need to preserve order and morality. One religion was to prevail; The limits of Church and State were to be identical.

For the realization of this ideal, compulsion was necessary. The result was a change in the character of Church discipline. It lost its spiritual character, and became confused with civil punishment. The discipline of the Church became an instrument of the State in upholding public morality, and the Church sought the aid of the civil arm in carrying out her discipline.

The rules for Church discipline were first laid down by the Ordinance of 1629. In theory, it prescribed discipline after the Biblical pattern. The so-called lay assistants (MEDHJELPERE) were introduced; These were the equivalents of the Calvinist ruling elders. The local vicar was to appoint two or more men to assist him in carrying out those aspects of discipline which were not covered by criminal law. The pastor and his assistants had authority to admonish and to place the unrepentant sinner under the minor ban. They could levy fines and demand that the penitent make public confession. It is significant that the laity had no active part in discipline; Even the lay-assistants were appointed by the clergy. In actual practice, the clergy frequently appealed to the civil arm. Imprisonment or a turn in the stocks were common disciplines. Finally, the major ban carried with it automatic exile.²

The Ritual (1685) and Norwegian Law (1687) of Christian V strengthened the tendency toward compulsion. Infant Baptism was, of course, mandatory. For the first time,

2 A. Seierstad, Kyrkjelegt Reformarbeid i Norig i Nittande Hundreåret, pp. 2-4.

private confession and absolution were made a necessary prerequisite for reception of the Holy Communion (Norske Lov 2-5-16).³ The clergy were given authority to refuse the Sacrament to certain classes of people: Those under the ban, heretics, the mentally incapacitated, children and the uninstructed, and gross sinners (Norske Lov 2-5-24). It was required of the clergy that they should deliver unrepentant sinners to the civil arm for punishment in the case of certain offences, such as the use of profanity (Norske Lov 2-9-27).

Pietism, despite (or perhaps precisely because of) its concern for the individual faith-relationship, served to increase the compulsion. Compulsory confirmation was introduced in 1736. All capable children were required to accept confirmation, and the clergy obliged to confirm them. Confirmation was made a prerequisite to the first Communion, and both confirmation and reception of the Holy Communion prerequisites for marriage. (No ordinance for civil marriage existed.) Pietism laid great stress upon worthy participation in the Sacrament, and the tendency was to make worthiness dependent upon the attitude taken towards the ADIAPHORA, as laid down by Pontippidan's Catechism. The clergy were regarded as personally responsible for the acceptance or rejection of communicants, though in practice, few communicants were rejected by the Pietist clergy. The communicants bowed to their demand for penance, even to the lengths

³ Norges Lover, 1682-1957, pp. lff.

of submitting themselves to public confession. To ease their consciences, the clergy sometimes utilized conditional absolution.⁴

The Enlightenment brought a new tolerance, although it was strongly opposed to any sort of "Enthusiasm". Church discipline and punishment declined, until by 1800 they were virtually extinct. Nevertheless, the old provisions were still legally binding. (The majority have not been repealed to this day.) Moreover, the Norwegian pastor was required to take a special clergy oath in addition to his ordination vows, in which he was pledged "diligently to exercise Church discipline" (DISCIPLINA ECCLESIASTICA DILIGENTER EXERCEATUR). In a Church thoroughly dominated by the State, in which mass confirmation, mass Communion, and Church marriage were virtually compulsory, it is easy to see how the oath could lead to great pangs of conscience for the earnest pastor. Strengthened by the revival, a demand for reform had to come.

Scattered attempts were made to revise the polity of the Norwegian Church in the period before 1840. The subject of Church discipline also came in for some tentative discussion. The repeal of the Conventicle Act (1842) and the passage of the Dissenter Act (1845) stimulated a more thorough debate on both questions. The Reform Movement

⁴ B. Gulbrandsen, Nattverd i Norsk Kirkeliv, pp. 80f., 86, 88. Spener is quoted as having said that "the Confessional is the torture chamber of every faithful pastor".

reached a climax in the period 1850-1873, when no fewer than four different parties emerged, each with its ecclesiological peculiarities and each with its own programme of reform. The movement suffered a decisive defeat in 1869. Interest waned thereafter, and when the movement was again thwarted in 1887, it completely collapsed, after registering only minor gains.

Because the Church was so completely subordinate to the State, all reform legislation had to pass through the Storting and the Government. The movement was thus caught up in the political struggle for power between Storting and Government. This proved to be a major factor in its failure. The Reform Movement became the victim of a vicious circle: The Church was prevented from gaining greater independence by her very dependence upon the State.

(b) The Constitution of 1814 and
The First Attempts at Reform.

The basic legal status of the Church of Norway was defined in the Constitution of 1814. The men who drafted this document were men of the Enlightenment, with a deep respect for the "natural rights" of man. The original draft of the Constitution included a passage guaranteeing full religious freedom to "all Christian communions". But in some inexplicable manner, the clause was deleted in the final draft, and no one seems to have missed it! Molland tries to explain this lapse on the ground that, while they

believed in religious freedom as a principle, the whole practice was foreign to them.

Paragraph II of the Constitution reads: "The Evangelical Lutheran religion shall remain the official religion of the State. Those inhabitants who confess to it are required to raise their children in the same." Paragraph IV provides that the King is to be a Lutheran and is to defend that faith. Paragraph XVI prescribes that "the King is to order all official Church services, all meetings and assemblies on matters of religion, and to ensure that the official teachers of religion follow the norms prescribed for them." Paragraph XXI gave the Crown the right to appoint all clergy, as well as military and civil officials. Paragraph XCII decreed that all State officials were to confess to the State religion.¹

From these provisions, it is clear that those who drew up the Constitution regarded the Norwegian State as a Christian State. This idea represents a radical departure from Luther's doctrine of the Two Realms. For him, the State was an order of creation and consequently subject to God, but to regard it as Christian would be to confuse the Two Realms. A ruler could be described as a Christian, but hardly a State. The statement of the Constitution reflects the theocratic thinking of Orthodoxy and Pietism. The State and the Church are here identified in a thoroughly Erastian manner.

¹ Norges Lover, 1682-1957, pp. 53-55.

Seierstad has summed up his estimate of the Constitutional provisions as follows: "The Church of Norway could, as regards its outward form...scarcely be called anything but a State function---alongside the judiciary, the military, and the like. The Church had neither political nor economic power...She had not, like her German sister Churches, been awakened to self-consciousness by contact with other Churches in the realm. There is no mention of the word 'Church' in the Constitution...only of the religion of the State. The Church is not regarded as a separate corporation, an independent organism; It is the State thinking and acting in an evangelical-Lutheran manner. The organs which the State uses to promote Christianity are precisely the same as it uses otherwise. The Storting and the King have the legislative power in the Church; The King and his officials have the executive power..., and the Supreme Court has the judicial power..."²

This is undoubtedly a correct evaluation of the situation. The Constitution was an expression of the reigning ecclesiology of the time--a traditional, clerical, Erastian conception of the Church, accepted without reflection. There was no significant difference from the days of the absolute monarchy. The State Church was not yet a "problem".

In the ensuing period, there were, however, efforts to achieve greater independence for the Church in her internal affairs, which went hand in hand with a developing self-

² A.Seierstad, Reformarbeid, p. 62.

consciousness. There was a vain attempt, led by the Bishops, to create a clergy collegium.³ An effort by the Bishops to tighten the rules for inspection and control of the clergy met with some success. A number of unofficial clergy meetings were held, again on the initiative of the Bishops. The matter of Church discipline came in for some discussion, though without concrete result. In 1818, the Ministry for Church Affairs circularized the clergy for their opinions on the subject. Their replies fell into three main groups. A small number wanted all of the old legislation enforced, on the ground that the authority of the clergy must be upheld. Some argued on the basis of the Enlightenment idea that the Church is an organization of voluntary members, and therefore should have the power to exclude unworthy members. A second group wanted all Church discipline and punishment transferred to the civil arm. The third group wanted the abolition of all discipline which savoured of force, although they reserved the right to withhold the Sacrament. It is significant that pastors in all groups generally regarded the clergy as possessors of the Power of the Keys. The clergy were responsible for taking the initiative in any disciplinary case, indeed at every stage except the final step of excommunication.⁴

³ Ibid., pp. 70ff.

⁴ It is indicative of a difference of approach to the problem that in 1876 Thorvald Klaveness could charge the laity with the first two steps, and introduce the pastor and the Church only at the final stage.

The first three decades after 1814 were, however, generally peaceful. It was not until the 1840's that the questions which concern us came in for serious debate.

(c) The Movement for Reform, 1840-1850.

It was the movement for religious liberty, culminating in the repeal of the Conventicle Act and the passage of the Dissenter Act, which provoked Churchmen into a discussion both of Church polity and Church discipline. They were afraid that, unless the Church could be reorganized to allow greater freedom, the new legislation would open the way for Enthusiasm and Separatism. Many of the clergy understood that the old order was changing, and regarded this as a sign of moral and spiritual decline. They sought a reorganization of the Church for purposes of Church discipline. The Royal Commission appointed to consider Hjelms' law to limit religious liberty recognized the need for a re-examination of the entire State-Church relationship, both from the standpoint of law and of theology. Church polity was discussed in the daily press. Theologisk Tidsskrift for den norske Kirke (which began publication in 1846) published a number of articles on polity from German and Scottish sources. A few clergymen were favourably impressed by the Scottish polity. There was as yet no sympathy for a separation of Church and State. On the contrary, all but the most radical held to the State Church

principle. Churchmen agitated rather for a new polity which would give the Church more control over her internal affairs. Among the chief spokesmen for a presbyterian-synodal polity were the influential pastor (later Bishop) J. L. Arup, and the Grundtvigian Rural Dean, P. P. Aabel (1795-1869). Both favoured a thorough re-organization of the Church, including a local parish council, a ruridecanal conference, diocesan and national synods. Both participated in the debate in the press precipitated by Hjelm's proposed law (1840). Arup and Hjelm carried on a running battle in *Morgenbladet* for the better part of two years. It was here that Arup first proposed a new Church polity. "It is a sad fact", he wrote, "that there is no nation in Christendom which so utterly lacks anything which could be called a Church polity." He went on to assert the independence of the Church; He did not regard it as a "State within the State" (to use Hjelm's parody of the Reformers standpoint), but rather as "a Church within the State", and "not merely a fraction of the State..." Arup's slogan was "the Church strong in the State".¹ He warned his readers against a complete separation of Church and State; The two are to work toward a common goal ("the development of humanity through time to eternity"). But the Church has its own authority, and much of its effectiveness depends upon its outward organization. Arup proposed that the Church of Norway be reorganized from top to bottom. It is interesting

¹ *Morgenbladet*, No. 300, Tillaeg, 1840.

to note that he ascribes to Mr. Gladstone's book The State in its Relations with the Church (1839) "a high place" among current literature. The book seems to have exercised considerable influence among the Norwegian clergy at the time.²

In 1846, Aabel wrote a lengthy article in Theologisk Tidsskrift, entitled "On the Christian Church as an Outward Society, its Organization and Relation to the State". He was one of the few to write against the designation "State Church" or "State religion". The State ought not to have any religion. As a typical Grundtvigian, he preferred to use the terms "National-" or "Folk-Church".³ He conceded that it was "customary" and even "necessary and helpful" for part of the Church authority to be combined with the State in the person of its head, but the Church must act independently and possess organs of its own for the administration of its internal affairs. In his capacity as head of the Church, the king should use these channels and not the ordinary civil authorities in his dealings with the Church. Aabel emphasized the divine origin of the Church;

2 It is also quoted at considerable length by Bishop Birkeland in Kirkelige Tilstande, pp. 10ff. Characteristically, however, it was read in a German translation.

3 So far as I have been able to determine, this was the earliest use of the term "Folk-Church" in Norwegian literature in any but a derogatory sense. Theologisk Tidsskrift, I, 1846, pp. 381-2n.

It derives its existence neither from the State nor from human voluntary association. Church polity was an "internal" matter (JUS IN SACRA), and should be ordered by the Church independently of the State. The form of polity "most in accord with the Church's nature and essence, the Apostolic prescription, the practice of the "early Church, and the evangelical view of the Reformers" was the presbyterian-synodal form.⁴ It was for Aabel the Biblical ideal, which guaranteed the most essential element in Church polity, "representation". He foresees that, unless the national Church gains the same freedom as the sects have been given in the Dissenter Act, the result will be "certain death" or multiple parties. Reorganization would assist the exercise of Church discipline.

Pastor (later Bishop) P. Hersleb Birkeland (1807-96) adopted a position similar to that of Arup. He too emphasized the common aim of Church and State, to work for "the ennoblement of man". But the two work with different means, and consequently the Church must have its own organs and institutions. Although Birkeland conceded to the Storting the legislative, and to the king-in-council the highest executive authority in the Church of Norway, he proposed that the Church introduce both parish councils and diocesan synods, with "deliberative" powers.

Another point of view was expressed by Pastor J r gen Hansen. He supported the proposal that the Ministry for

⁴ Ibid., p. 425.

Church Affairs should be administered by a Churchman, and advocated the introduction of a synod with executive as well as advisory powers. However, his standpoint was thoroughly episcopal. "The proper synod, in which the Church's power must be concentrated, is the diocesan synod under the leadership of the Bishop."⁵ The episcopate has been the keystone of the Church from its foundation. Unlike the State, the Church is not meant to be a democratic institution. In view of the fact that it is not a product of human voluntary action, its members do not possess the right to control it. Hansen shared the Wexelian concept of the Ministry, and was an avowed admirer of the Anglican system.

Pastor (later Bishop) J. J. Tandberg (1816-84) contributed an article to *Theologisk Tidsskrift* in which he discussed the power of the Church on the basis of Article XXVIII of the Augsburg Confession. The Church possesses certain independent powers: The preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments, and the Power of the Keys (Church discipline). Here the Crown has no authority, and the king cannot therefore be a *SUMMUS EPISCOPUS*. Like Hansen, Tandberg adopted a fundamentally episcopal approach to the problem of Church organization. Concretely, he proposed local boards of elders, and ruridecanal and diocesan synods, the last two to be strictly clerical.

The cause of Church reform was championed among the

 5 J. Hansen, Vore Kirkelige Spørgsmaal, p. 55.

"awakened laity" by the indefatigable Olaus Nielsen, in his Kirkelig Tidende. For several years from its foundation in 1848, Nielsen returned again and again to a congenial theme: The Church is at the mercy of the State; The laity have a right to a voice in Church government. But his protest against the domination of the Church by the State is combined with other factors which went to form a veritable crusade--anti-clericalism, the class struggle, and above all his battle against the Revised Catechism. His pietistic tendencies are revealed in his demands for stricter Church discipline, and for the right of the congregation to a voice in the selection of their pastor, as a safeguard against the appointment of "unbelieving" clergy. It is clear that Nielsen's campaign was not merely dominated by democratic motives. He showed considerable sympathy for the extreme Low-Church group established in the Middle West of America by the Haugean lay-preacher Elling Eielsen. Specifically, Nielsen advocated the introduction of what might be called the "purely presbyterian" system. He strongly favoured the establishment of local parish councils according to the polity of the Church of the Prussian Union, for which, in his opinion, the "enlightened" laity were already prepared (an unmistakable reference to the Haugean system of elders).⁶ This was the "most Biblical" form of Church polity. On the other hand, Nielsen was opposed to further organization;

6 KT, III, pp. 142, 150.

He feared that a synod would mean clerical domination. His interest in Church polity seems to have waned in the 1850's, and his attention was increasingly absorbed by the problem of Church discipline. He was no doubt bitterly disappointed that neither of these campaigns led to any change.

Prominent in the minds of the reformers was the problem of the gap which existed between clergy and laity, and the place of the laity in an eventual new polity. This was a perennial issue in the history of the Reform Movement.

The reigning concept of the Ministry was the one laid down by Wexels in his Pastoraltheologien. The office of lay assistant had fallen into disuse, because it was difficult to find qualified men, and because it was difficult to find men willing to serve. The lay assistants were in any case commonly regarded as the pastor's spies and accordingly avoided. Some reformers wished to revive and expand this institution into a parish council. Birkeland, for example, regarded the lay assistants as corresponding to the elders of the Apostolic Church. Others wished to introduce parish councils independent of the lay assistants. Others again wanted both lay assistants and parish councils.

The idea of lay participation in Church government was revolutionary, and gave rise to several questions. Should the council members be elected by the laity or appointed by the clergy? There was as yet no thought of allowing the laity to take part in the election of clergy

to councils or synods. Should laymen participate in rural deanery, diocesan and national synods, and if so, to what extent? Arup first proposed equal clergy and lay representation, but later advocated a clerical majority. Aabel wanted more laymen than clergy. Others would reserve the synods for the clergy, or for clergy and lay representatives appointed by the clergy. It was pointed out that the laity already had their forum, in the Storting. One of the features of the Scottish system which appealed to the Norwegian clergy was the non-elective, self-perpetuating character of the ruling elders. They could thus be regarded as a kind of minor clergy.

Despite widespread interest in reform, powerful voices were raised in support of the status quo. A thorough-going Erastian point of view was espoused by the noted jurists U. A. Motzfeldt and C. W. Hjelm, and the philosopher M. J. Monrad. In 1841, Hjelm described the Church as the "soul" of the body politic, and maintained that Church and State were indissolubly united in any concept of the Christian State. The same legislative, judicial, and executive authorities should prevail in both. It is impossible to distinguish between external and internal Church affairs. An independent Church polity is an absurdity, and a synodal Church would be a dangerous State within the State.⁷ In his Kirkerett of 1844, Motzfeldt expresses essentially the

⁷ Morgenbladet, 1841, No. 8.

same standpoint. It is in the best interests of religion that the identity of State and Church be maintained. He decries the efforts of some clergymen to "place themselves and their presentation of doctrine above the State and its laws".⁸ The king is the head of the Church; Just as he receives his secular power from the sovereign people, so he receives his ecclesiastical power from the Church. Ordination is not above royal appointment, but parallel to it. And when the Church calls and installs clergy, it is not acting in any way distinct from the State.⁹

In an anonymous article in *Morgenbladet* in 1845, Monrad interpreted the relationship between Church and State in a thoroughly Hegelian manner. He applied the dialectic triad to the question. The thesis is the "juridical" view (that the Church is an instrument of the State); The antithesis is the "theological" view (that the Church is divine and hence above the State); The Reformation brought a synthesis, in which State and Church are fused together in the Christian State. The State is the visible Church, a divine institution for the promotion of moral and religious welfare. In the inevitable development of history, there is no possibility of retreat, and consequently there can be no separation of Church and State. "What God has joined together, led not man put asunder..."¹⁰

8 U. Motzfeldt, *Kirkerett*, p. IV.

9 Ibid., p. VI.

10 *Morgenbladet*, 1845, No's. 87, 88.

This first effort at reform, largely inspired and directed by the clergy, led to few concrete results. In addition to the opposition of powerful factions, there was an almost complete lack of interest on the part of the laity. It achieved two minor victories, but neither had any practical outcome. In 1848, for the first time since independence, a Churchman and not a jurist was appointed as Minister for Church Affairs. Ironically, however, the government nominee, Bishop Hans Riddervold (1795-1876), who held office for 24 years, came to bear more responsibility than any other single person for the failure of the Reform Movement. In 1845, Bishop von der Lippe petitioned the Ministry to authorize permanent, biennial ruridecanal meetings; And two years later, Bishop Arup publicly proposed a constitutive national synod, with some lay representatives, to work out the details of Church polity. The Ministry approved the former, on an unofficial basis, but the Storting refused to appropriate funds for them, for two reasons, on the ground that they excluded the laity, and were not part of a more extensive Church polity. On the other hand, the Storting authorized the calling of an advisory synod, but this was rejected by the Ministry. These efforts thus stranded on the horns of the political rivalry between Government and Storting which played such an important part in Norwegian history during the last half of the 19th century. This was not the last occasion on

which this occurred.¹¹

Despite this first defeat, the Reform Movement gathered strength throughout the tempestuous 1850's. Reform was the principal theme of the many meetings of clergy and laymen held in this decade. The reformers closed their ranks, and, in response to the growing demand of Churchmen, the Government in 1859 appointed a Royal Commission to study a whole series of Church matters. The reformers waited patiently for the next decade, only to be bitterly disappointed when the Storting failed to enact any of the legislation proposed by the Commission. In the 1870's, the Church turned to the expedient of unofficial national synods, but it became increasingly apparent that there was a division in the ranks between the so-called "Eastern" and "Bergen" parties. Meanwhile, the High-Church party launched a short-lived but effective campaign of opposition. Hope temporarily revived in the middle 1880's, but the reform proposals again suffered a crushing defeat in the Storting. Despite tremendous effort and sometimes high hope, the Reform Movement of the 19th century ended in dismal failure.

Hand in hand with the question of reform went the related problem of Church discipline. We shall see in the next chapter how this problem led to the establishment of

¹¹ O. Handeland says that both the Haugean leader Ueland and the Chairman of the Committee on Church Affairs in the Storting (Pastor H. U. Sverdrup) feared a clerical regime if the proposal for ruridecanal meetings were passed. To Linor i Norsk Kyrkjepolitik, p. 17.

Free Churches in 1856 and 1877, and how it was an important factor in the growth of the other dissenting bodies. For at least three decades after 1850, there were repeated but unsuccessful demands for legal reform. We now turn to a more detailed examination of the events in the last half of the century.

(d) The Reform Movement, 1850-1859.
Gisle Johnson. The Grundtvigians.

The Reform Movement entered a new phase in the 1850's, when Gisle Johnson descended from his lectern and assumed leadership of the movement. Just as he united the clergy and the laity in the revival, in the Inner Mission movement, and in a theological front against Grundtvigianism, so he gathered together most of the strands of the Reform Movement into a cohesive party with a definite programme. Yet the subjectivism of his whole approach inevitably led to difficulties within the movement.

The implicit principle underlying the Johnsonian programme of reform was the Lutheran doctrine of the Two Realms. Johnson emphasized, however, the distinction between the Realms. He repeatedly cited Article XXVIII of the Augsburg Confession as the basis of his programme. The Church is definitely distinct from the State. It has a higher purpose than the State; Its task is not the preservation of public morality, but the salvation of souls, although morality will incidentally be strengthened thereby.

Johnson deplored the existing "thoroughly Caesaropapistic" situation, and regarded it as contrary to the Confession. He called attention to the fact that, although the Storting passed all legislation for the Church, the Church had no guarantee regarding the relation of the legislators to the Church. After the passage of the Dissenter Act, they were not even required to be members of the State Church. Therefore, the Church needed its own "representation", a voice of its own. This would involve a new Church polity. Johnson rejected the "overvaluation" of polity which made it a part of the essence of the Church. There is no divinely-ordained form of Church polity which is necessarily right for all times. The Church is constituted by the means of grace, not by its form. On the other hand, Scripture contains some hints on the kind of polity needed by the Church in order to realize its mission. Polity is not a matter of complete indifference, but rather is either a help or a hindrance to the Church in any given situation.¹

Johnson saw a further reason for Church reorganization in the need for a renewal of Church discipline. Pastoral care in the Church of Norway was generally insufficient. Parishes were too large, and the clergy were burdened with too much secular work. Johnson sought to bring about an organic relationship between clergy and laity, and to mobilize the laity for the work of the Church. His aim was to

¹ "Praestemøde i Christiania", NK, 1857, pp. 49-52. Cf. LK, NR IX, pp. 290f.

unite the charismatic principle with an ordained Ministry. Johnson was particularly concerned over the decline of Church discipline. He did not favour the revival of the old system in its entirety. In accordance with his basic principle, he renounced all forms of civil compulsion in the Church. The State cannot properly force anyone into or out of the Church. Hence, the persistent Johnsonian opposition to compulsory confirmation, compulsory Church marriage, and Paragraph XCII of the Constitution, which demanded membership in the State Church for all State officials. His party advocated compulsory catechetical instruction, but considered that the rite of confirmation should be voluntary. It was also to continue to be a condition for participation in the Lord's Supper. Like Luther, Johnson did not regard marriage as a Christian relationship in itself, but as an order of creation. He distinguished between "actual" and "true" marriages, and advocated civil marriage with eventual Church blessing for the Christian couple. Church discipline was a matter for the Church alone, and its only weapons were spiritual ones. What the State could not do, the Church had not only the right but also the duty to do. It had to preserve its own holiness. Johnson was aware of the fact that this was a serious and essential consideration, involving the very essence of the Church. He stated in 1856 that "Church discipline should properly be exercised within the Church. It has nothing to do with those outside, and thus presupposes a determination of

those who belong to the Church."² Sooner or later, the baptized person must "personally appropriate" Baptismal grace and make a confession of faith. In other words, Johnson held that the Invisible Church must be made visible. This was the point at which Church discipline ought to begin, at the first Communion, when the individual entered the mature membership of the Church. Here the Church must demand a confession of faith. "Faith's essential visible mark is confession."³ The Johnsonian party was especially concerned to preserve the "purity" of the Lord's Supper, and to exclude the "unworthy". On the other hand, the Church must accept the individual's confession when he makes it.

Johnson conceded the fact that the Church exists wherever the Word is purely preached and the Sacraments rightly administered, but he questioned whether the Word can be purely preached where there is no Church discipline. In harmony with Luther and the Confessions, he regarded the Power of the Keys as an aspect of the ministry of Word and Sacrament. It may be questioned, however, whether his nomistic emphasis is not very different from Luther's subordination of Law to Gospel. Johnson did not deny that the State Church was a Church, but he asserted that it was "in contradiction to itself". The dividing line between believer and unbeliever had been erased. In 1856, the

² Christiania Posten, 11 February 1856.

³ LK, NR IX, p. 294.

first Separatist crisis arose; In this situation, he stated that if Church discipline should prove to be impracticable in the State Church, then he would have to withdraw from it, because "where Church discipline is impossible, there is no longer any Church".⁴ On the other hand, he repeatedly warned his followers not to leave the Church while there remained any hope of improvement. Like Luther, he regarded Church discipline as a matter for clergy and laity together. The first step (admonition) was a matter for the pastor, but further stages were the responsibility of both in concert.

These principles were embodied in Johnson's proposal for a new polity. He wanted the Church organized "from within outward" and "from below upward". The first and basic step in reorganization is the introduction of parish councils. Diocesan and national synods were to follow, until the entire Church was organized.

Parish councils had long existed in Swedish and Dutch Lutheranism, and had recently been introduced into some German Churches. Johnson had high hopes that they would create a new sense of the Church in Norway. Their purpose was two-fold. In the first place, they were to represent the parish in its relations with the other elements in the Church government (the synods and the Ministry for Church Affairs). They were to act as the voice of the congregation in such matters as the election of pastors, the

⁴ Christiana Posten, 11 February 1856.

division of parishes, and administration of Church property. They were also to arrange the election of representatives to the synods. This might be described as their "outward and upward" purpose. Secondly, they were to assist the pastor in providing for the pastoral care of the parish and in the exercise of Church discipline. This was their "inward" function.

Johnson favoured the establishment of the new councils on the basis of the old office of lay assistant. The councils would thus preserve a measure of historical continuity. He criticized the older institution because in its existing form, it was purely clerical, and Church discipline was a matter for the whole congregation. Therefore, the councils should be elected by the congregation, with the pastor as EX OFFICIO chairman.

One of the distinctive features of the Johnsonian programme of reform was its insistence upon strict "Church guarantees" in the matter of suffrage. There is an obvious interrelation between these election rules and the desire for stricter Church discipline. In reality, Johnson wanted a Church which was governed by the ECCLESIOIAE. Nowhere is his Pietistic anxiety for the holiness of the Church and his desire to draw sharp limits more evident. Members were to "earn" the right to vote by presenting themselves before their pastor and swearing fidelity to the Word of God and the Lutheran Confessions. They must also be regular participants in the means of grace, i.e. they must be regular

Church-goers and must have participated in the Holy Communion within the past year. Men over the age of 25 who fulfilled these requirements were to be eligible to vote, and those over 30 were eligible for election. Women were excluded, on Pauline grounds.

Johnson further insisted that the introduction of parish councils should be voluntary, and not mandatory for the whole nation. The same suffrage rules were to apply for the parish meeting which was to decide for or against the introduction of the council. Johnson seems never to have laid down the minimum number of electors necessary for the introduction of the council system. It was his intention that the council system should grow spontaneously as the spiritual life of the parish developed, not that it should be imposed upon the parishes from above. Actually, he only wanted the opportunity for the congregation to introduce the council. In harmony with his conception of the Inner Mission, his ECCLESIOLOAE were to expand.

The Johnsonian programme of reform also included diocesan and a national synods, with representatives elected democratically, and equal numbers of clergy and lay delegates. Each estate was to elect its own representatives.

In order to implement the reform programme, the Johnsonian party advocated calling an advisory, once-for-all national synod. Johnson was realistic enough to acknowledge the fact that any legislation would have to come through the Storting.

During the 1850's, a flurry of petitions for Church reform was received by the Ministry for Church Affairs. In 1850, the Stavanger County Council (AMTFORMANDSKAB) petitioned the Government to draft a bill for a new synodal Church polity, which would give the Church its own legislative body and draw together the clergy and the laity, specifically through the introduction of parish councils. Two years later, a group of 48 clergy, 17 theological candidates, and 2 theological professors requested the Government to call an advisory synod. Gisle Johnson was influential in this meeting, and the petition included the essential points of his programme.⁵ Similar opinions were expressed by clergy meetings in Christiania and Moss (1853), Stavanger and Tromsø (1855), and laymen's meetings at Hamar (1856) and Sarpsborg (1857). Meanwhile, the state of the Church was under constant debate in the Storting. In 1857, no fewer than three separate private members' bills for the introduction of parish councils were submitted to the Storting. One of these came from the Haugean leader, O. G. Ueland, that tireless champion of democracy. He saw the parish council as something entirely distinct from the office of lay assistant; It was to be "a true representation for the congregation", elected by the people. All men of good reputation, 25 years or older, were to have the vote. The pastor was to be chairman, but the council was to exercise supervision over his work and to report

⁵ Theologisk Tidsskrift for den norske Kirke, V, pp. 144ff.

any lapses to the Bishop and the Government Ministry.⁶

The other two bills, both clerical in origin, were similar to the Ueland bill, but neither gave the council the right to supervise the pastor. The Committee on Church Affairs of the Storting recommended "Church guarantees" and voluntary instead of mandatory introduction of parish councils. In the legislature, opposition to the bills was strong. Opponents of the bills argued that 1) there was little popular demand for parish councils, 2) the matter had not been sufficiently discussed (Neither the Government, the clergy, nor the parishes had been heard), 3) it might arouse strife and bring back the old Church discipline, and 4) (against voluntary introduction) it would result in two types of polity within the same Church. As a result, all three bills were rejected. The tenacious Ueland submitted his bill again in 1859, but without success. He presented it for the third time in 1863; This time, it was passed by the Storting, but was refused Royal sanction.

The other party with a programme of reform in the 1850's were the Grundtvigians. In Denmark, they had been in the forefront of the liberal movement which led to the

⁶ O. Handeland, To Linor i Norsk Kyrkjepolitik, pp. 19-24. Handeland says that Ueland here departs from the Haugean line, and that this is the beginning of the "other line" in Norwegian Church politics. In his view, Ueland attempted "to re-cast the entire State Church according to the Haugean-Biblical mould...the 'congregation' is now the entire parish...", not, as in Hauge's view, the conventicle (p. 23).

new Constitution of 1849. In Norway, they were among the strongest supporters of reform. They were influenced by the same fundamental considerations as the Johnsonians. Following Grundtvig, they distinguished sharply between the Two Realms. The State Church was "a civil institution" in which the Church of Jesus Christ dwelt as a "heavenly guest". The Grundtvigian programme could be summed up in a single word: FREEDOM. In 1862, Fredrik Wexelsen wrote: "I believe we need nothing in our State Church but a little more freedom".⁷ They were inexorably opposed to any sort of compulsion; Consequently, they supported the Johnsonian effort to abolish compulsory Church marriage and confirmation. The Grundtvigians desired freedom to use the correct form of the Apostles' Creed in Baptism. They had stated that Baptism was not fully valid unless the correct formula was used. This standpoint led them to include in their programme two features which were unique: The demands that the parish bond be relaxed, and that they be granted freedom to found "elective congregations" (VALGMENIGHEDER).

According to the Norwegian Law of Christian V (1687), every person in the realm was bound to accept the pastoral care of his parish vicar and none other. The Grundtvigians demanded that this bond be loosed so that the layman could seek the ministrations of a pastor who used the correct form of the Creed. In Denmark, this freedom was granted in 1855. For similar reasons, they desired the freedom to

⁷ KF, VI, p. 281.

found elective congregations (granted in Denmark, 1868). Under this plan, ten or more families within a parish could establish their own congregation but nevertheless remain within the national Church. They possessed authority to call their own pastor, but were required to pay all expenses themselves.

In one important respect, the Grundtvigians differed radically from the Johnsonians. They were not at all concerned to draw limits to the Church, and consequently opposed the Johnsonian campaign for a greater exercise of Church discipline. They sought the abolition of the special clerical oath. They were early supporters of parish councils, but changed their position on this issue during the persecutions of the 1860's. They feared that parish councils would give more power to the anti-Grundtvigian "awakened laity". "What the Orthodox regarded as freedom, the 'Churchly' regarded as compulsion."⁸

In the face of repeated efforts to introduce reform, the Government adopted a do-nothing policy. Its standard reply was that the time was not ripe for any action. The all-powerful Minister for Church Affairs was Hans Ridder-vold, a former Bishop of Trondhjem and president of the Storting. He had been a liberal, but the Separatist crisis and the Grundtvigian controversy changed him into a decided conservative. During his long tenure of office,

8 A. Skrondal, Grundtvig og Noreg, pp. 186f.

his avowed aim was to ensure "that God's Word might dwell peaceably in the land". His biographer says that "he halted all attempts to re-organize the State Church".⁹ We need not ascribe to him any malicious motives, but the fact remains that Riddervold bears more responsibility for the failure of the Reform Movement than any other person.

(e) The Royal Commission of 1859

His answer to the Reform Movement in 1859 was the appointment of the famous nine-man Royal Commission to study the question of Church reform. The Commission comprised: Bishop Arup (chairman); Two jurists, C. Hansteen and U. A. Motzfeldt; Four clergymen, P. F. Bassøe, J. J. Tandberg, O. Berg, and H. O. Folkestad; And two farmers, N. C. Gjelstad and Chr. Svandøe.

They were given a Herculean task. They were charged with the study of the following matters: 1) confession and absolution in relation to Holy Communion, 2) compulsory confirmation, 3) the marriage laws, 4) the wording of the Apostles' Creed, 5) laws for the removal of clergymen, 6) the question of parish councils, and 7) possible amendments to the Dissenter Act. They were not specifically directed to discuss Paragraph XCII, the relaxation of the parish bond, or an eventual new Church polity, but they

⁹ H. Koht in NBL, XI, p. 441. Cf. Bishop Bang's even stronger accusations in Den Norske Kirkes Historie, pp. 464f. Bang says that Riddervold "never did today what he could put off until tomorrow".

were well within their authority in doing so. The hard-working Commission published a whole series of reports and legislative proposals over the ensuing ten years, culminating in its proposal for a new polity in 1868.

The concept of the Church expressed in the opinions of the majority is a Wexelian Lutheran High-Church position, with an emphasis upon the office of the Ministry. "The office is instituted by the Lord Himself..." It is "an integral part of the Church, and essential to its existence ...without the Ministry the Church is unthinkable..." A sharp distinction is drawn between the Universal Priesthood and the office of the Ministry. "The Church body does not produce the Ministry, but the Lord produces the Church by His Spirit through the office of the Ministry, its gifts and its activity." The office is constitutive of and prior to the congregation. It is "an independent divine institution..."¹ The Universal Priesthood, on the other hand, "is no institution...but a personal endowment...which has its basic significance in the relationship of the individual to God..."² Neither public preaching nor private pastoral care (SJELESORG) belong to the Universal Priesthood, but to the clerical office. This is illustrated by the Ordination Formula and by the Augsburg Confession, and confirmed in Norwegian law and practice.

As a consequence of this view, the majority proposed

¹ Motiverede Lovudkast, afgivne af den...nedsatte Commis-
sion, I, p. 5.

² Ibid., pp. 6-7.

the introduction of parish councils throughout the Church, but they advocated the retention of the lay assistants as well. The work of the latter was to be regarded as clerical, and they were to be appointed as before by the pastor. All confirmed males above the age of 25 and not excluded from Communion were to be eligible to vote in the election of the council. Its function was not clerical, but it was to represent the congregation, have a voice in Church discipline (in its second phase), and exercise supervision over the clergy. A minority consisting of Tandberg and Svandø held that the retention both of lay assistants and parish councils was neither necessary nor practical. They favoured the expansion of the office of lay assistant into parish councils. They conceded that the lay assistants were laymen, but thought that they ought nevertheless to be entrusted with both pastoral and disciplinary duties. As laymen, they were to be elected by the laity. They were not to be the personal assistants of the pastor, but the assistants of the office. To assign to them the duty of reporting on the pastor without the further obligation of assisting him would be to invite organized opposition. Svandø also favoured the voluntary introduction of the councils.

The Commission recommended the retention of confession and absolution before participation in the Sacrament. Only one man voted for separating confession from the Sacrament. The Commission proposed that confirmation instruction continue to be mandatory, but that both pastor and candidate

should be free to refuse confirmation. It also recommended that the parish bond be relaxed here, so that the child might request instruction from a pastor other than his vicar. This was the sole relaxation of the parish bond advocated by the Commission.

For our purpose, the most significant aspect of the work of the Commission was the theological presuppositions and legislative proposal for a new Church polity. Here the Commission begins by defining the Church in a dialectically Lutheran manner. It is "an assembly of the true believers, i.e. a spiritual society, indefinable in any outward way, the limits of which only He who sees the heart knows, but whose existence is an object of faith for Christians..." Yet it is also a society "necessarily appearing outwardly" in the means of grace, "the only means whereby the Church is established, upheld, and transplanted". The administration of the means of grace cannot be "left to chance"; Consequently, the Church needs an outward organization.³ This "outward society" continues to be a true Church, no matter how many hypocrites may be mixed with it, "as long as the Gospel is rightly preached and the Sacraments rightly administered", for, when this is done, there will always be believers.⁴ Some of its functions, such as the authority of the Ministry to preach the Gospel, administer the Sacraments, and exercise the Power of the Keys, are ordered

³ Ibid., VI, p. 22.

⁴ Ibid., p. 24.

JURE DIVINO. Others, like Church polity, are ordered

JURE HUMANO. It is necessary, but secondary. In contrast to the Ministry, which is "a direct divine institution", the organization of the Church is "a practical necessity of the moment", subject to the "free decision of the Community".⁵ The function of Polity is to facilitate the Ministry. Legislation must concern itself with the outward society, for the Communion of Saints is an indefinable spiritual society which cannot be organized outwardly.

The Commission discussed the whole question of the relationship between Church and State. It rejected, on the one hand, separation, and on the other hand, both the Church-State theocracy and the existing "Caesaropapistic" system in Norway. Separation would not represent progress, but rather "a disturbing of relations which are deeply rooted in our society".⁶ But the Commission deplored the present state of the Norwegian Church. It recognized the need for a connection between Church and State, but "comingling" must be avoided. The Church's legislative power was "entirely...in the hands of the State authorities". The authority of the Bishops was described as "rather limited". It is possible for the Ministry for Church Affairs to be placed in the hands of a man without interest or insight into Church affairs. The high civil courts are also the final ecclesiastical courts. The parishes have no voice. "And finally, the highest governing authority is

⁵ Ibid., p. 25.

⁶ Ibid., p. 52.

in the hands of the head of State, under whose jurisdiction are placed even such matters as involve the Church's essence, without any guarantee that sufficient weight has been given to the opinions requested from the Church officials."⁷

The Constitution, drafted in an age which was "little Churchly, not to say un-Churchly", requires further clarification. The representatives in the Storting, elected as they are "for political and material" reasons, are not suited to decide Church matters. The Commission obviously viewed the situation as critical. It pointed out that a future combination of anti-Christian forces and indifference might well threaten the life of the Church. The question had even been raised whether the Storting had the authority to alter the Church's Confessions.

The Commission was of the opinion that Article XVI of the Constitution gave too much power to the Crown. The Crown was empowered to order all ritual and to authorize altar books, hymn books, and school textbooks. These things reflect the "basic standpoint" of the Church. There must be guarantees that the Church is not "led away from the foundation upon which it rests", especially since "anti-confessional tendencies are abroad" and "the age of infidelity draws near".⁸

The Commission submitted a concrete proposal for a national synod, which was actually to be an ecclesiastical

⁷ Ibid., p. 30.

⁸ Ibid., pp. 43f.

legislature with an authority parallel to that of the Storting in the secular affairs of the country. After approval by the synod, proposals were to go directly to the Crown for sanction. The range of topics with which it could deal was wide and was to embrace worship and liturgy, Holy Days, Baptism, confirmation and catechetical instruction, the ecclesiastical courts, matters affecting the clergy in their relation to the parishes and the Church as a whole, the Church rate, Church administration, election to the synod, Church Discipline, and the marriage of Church members. The Storting would only be concerned with financial appropriations.⁹ The Commission offered the following amendment to Article XVI of the Constitution: "Authority to make general decisions regarding the affairs of the State Church (ecclesiastical legislation) shall reside in the Crown and the national synod."¹⁰ The Crown was to have an absolute power of veto, but it could not force through legislation which was rejected by the synod. The synod was to meet every fifth year. It was to be composed of the six Bishops, two of the theological professors, fourteen clergymen, and twenty-two laymen, i.e. equal clergy and lay representation. The Commission saw in the demand for clergy majority an ecclesiology which identified the Church with the clergy, and in the demand for lay majority an ecclesiology which unChurched the clergy. So far as the

⁹ Ibid., pp. 169f.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 178.

synod was concerned, "both are, regardless of office, only members of the Church",¹¹ although it was admitted that the clergy possessed "special ability" for Church government. All males above the age of 25 entitled to receive the Holy Communion were to be eligible to vote, thus omitting the Johnsonian guarantees. It saw no need for a once-for-all synod to pass on its proposals; They were suitable for immediate and direct action by Storting and Crown. The final decision was not to be made by the State, however, but by the Church. The Commission regarded the creation of a national synod as the first step in reforming the Church. It advocated, in other words, organization from the top downwards.

The thorough and far-reaching proposals of the Commission met with a mixed reception.

Gisle Johnson was not entirely satisfied. In two articles in *Luthersk Kirketidende*, he set forth his major objections.¹² In the first place, the new polity should have taken as its starting point not the outward community as a whole, but the "living congregation" within the parish. He desired stricter guarantees. Secondly, he favoured voluntary, not mandatory introduction of parish councils. Thirdly, he disliked the fact that the Commission would give the councils authority to supervise the clergy. The clergy are not servants of the local congre-

¹¹ Ibid., p. 55.

¹² LK, XII, 1869, pp. 1ff. and 81ff.

gation only, but of the entire Church. The authority to discipline the clergy should remain with the Ministry for Church Affairs. Every layman has the right to report on the pastor; To make the council responsible for this would be to deprive the rest of the laity of their rights.

Fourthly, Johnson opposed the distinction between the council and the lay assistants. In harmony with his deduction of the office of the Ministry from the Universal Priesthood, he saw no qualitative difference between the clerical office and the office of the parish council. Finally, and quite realistically, he feared that the Commission's demand for an ecclesiastical legislature would never pass the Storting. He knew that the legislators would never relinquish so much of their power.

Bishop Riddervold reacted in typical fashion. He indicated that he did not believe the matter of Church polity had as yet been sufficiently discussed. He therefore proposed to call a preliminary advisory synod. He added that this synod naturally would have no legal authority, but that its moral authority would be such that it could scarcely be ignored (a thinly veiled threat to the Storting). He asked the Storting for 7500 SPECIEDOLMARS to finance the project. Gisle Johnson and his followers took hope.

Their hope was vain. The Storting replied to Riddervold's threat by guarding their prerogatives the more jealously. The leader of the opposition was Johan

Sverdrup himself, the most powerful man in the legislature. Religiously, he was indifferent, but politically he was a rabid democrat. His great political cause was the abolition of the Royal absolute veto and the concentration of all political power in the Storting ("All power in this hall!"). With this principle clearly in mind, he sharply criticized the proposed synod as hierarchical and clerical, and asserted that the Storting was both more willing and more able to represent the people in Church government than the synod. He was not opposed to reform, but it must be carried out in a democratic manner; It must begin from the bottom up, with the parish councils.¹³ The Government's proposal was defeated by a large majority. Two months later, a bill for parish councils, without "guarantees", was passed by the Storting, but failed to get Royal sanction. Again, the reform movement was the victim of the rivalry between Government and Storting.

(f) Dissension Within the Reform Movement.
Jakob Sverdrup and the Bergen Party.

This was in reality the death-blow to any large-scale scheme of reform. The private initiative of the 1840's and 1850's had given way to an approach through the official Commission. It had waited upon the Government and Storting, but this approach had led to no result. The reformers were thrown back upon private initiative once again. In an

¹³ LK, XII, pp. 179ff.

attempt to enlist public support and in the hope that its efforts might lead to an official reorganization, they turned to the expedient of an unofficial, "voluntary" organization, consisting of parish councils, diocesan synods, and a national synod. The first of a series of unofficial national synods met in Christiania in 1873. There were over 500 in attendance, including 150 of the clergy. Strangely enough, the synod did not discuss Church polity, but confined itself to a discussion of confirmation, marriage, and Paragraph XCII, on which it took a traditional reform position. As a matter of fact, interest in the Reform Movement declined after the synod of 1873. There seemed little hope of concrete results, and there was a natural fatigue after the years of activity.

The reluctance of the synod to discuss polity is not difficult to understand. It became increasingly apparent during the 1870's that a serious cleavage existed within the ranks of the reformers, between the so-called "Eastern" and "Bergen" parties. The former, still under Gisle Johnson's leadership, maintained the Johnsonian position. The latter, led by Pastor Jakob Sverdrup, differed materially, particularly on the vital matter of conditions for suffrage. The programme of the Bergen Party was summed up in two phrases: "Complete freedom of religion", and "Complete self-government for the parishes". The Party favoured allowing all who were not excluded from the Sacrament to vote. They

were willing to make fidelity to the Confessions a precondition to election to the council. They regarded further restrictions, however, as useless and impracticable. Hypocrites can never be excluded by mere legal restrictions. We have seen how the rivalry between East and West played an important part in the history of the Inner Mission movement; The cleavage in the Reform Movement was to prove no less fateful.

In 1869-70, Jakob Sverdrup, together with his brother Georg and Cand. Theol. Georg Schielderup, published a series of "Churchly Tracts" (Kirkelig Traktater). Jakob Sverdrup himself contributed one on the parish council. Here he set forth the essential Johnsonian demand, but with some distinctive elements. The basic reasoning was the same: The Church (or "congregation", as he preferred to call it) is in the hands of the State, and lacks a voice. Article XXVIII separates the powers of the Church and the State. The inner life and the polity of the Church are inextricably bound together. In the Church of Norway as it now is, reorganization is not "a matter of indifference" but "an undeniable demand". This reorganization must begin from the bottom, with the parish council. Its introduction will lead to the revival of Church life and of a sense of the Church. But Sverdrup also presented two points which were to become part of the distinctive Bergen programme: 1) Besides assisting the pastor in private pastoral care and

in Church discipline, the parish councils were also to supervise (KONTROLLERE) his work; And 2) the congregations were to have a voice, through the parish councils, in the selection of their pastors. There was no mention of the lay assistants. Nor did Sverdrup take up the question of suffrage. Nevertheless, the Bergen Party was already allied with the Liberals in the Storting on this point. This is shown by the fact that the bill of 1869, introduced by the zealous Bergen reformer Ole Irgens, contained no provision for "guarantees".¹

One event which served to make the Bergen Party more radical was the publication in 1873 of Vicar C. M. Eckhoff's translation of J. H. Merle D'Aubigné's book, Two Kings and Two Kingdoms. This book came to exert great influence upon the members of the Party, and upon leaders of the allied Inner Mission movement in West Norway. Its sharp distinction between the authority of the Church and the State was sufficiently similar to the doctrine of the Two Realms and Article XXVIII of the Augsburg Confession so that the differences between the two views were obscured. The result was increased distaste for the State Church and sympathy for separation. Many Westerners, like Ole Irgens, were admittedly Free-Church at heart, but did not consider that the time was ripe for radical change. Another result was a more Biblicistic approach to Church polity. A Calvinistic impulse to realize divinely-ordained political ideals

¹ Stortingsforhandlinger, 1868-69, Document No. 57.

entered the party. The book created considerable furor in the Church press, where opponents were quick to point out the fact that this was a foreign influence.

In 1877, Jakob Sverdrup and Ole Vollan founded Ny Luthersk Kirketidende, as "an organ for the reform... movement which the Church-life of the past 30 years has produced", and as a counter-blast to the High-Church propaganda of Heuch and Bugge. In the pages of this paper and in his What is the Church? (1878), Sverdrup presented his associational, Low-Church ecclesiology, and set forth the platform of the Bergen Party.

He defined the Church as "the community of those who in free personal appropriation receive salvation in Christ, i.e. the community of free choice..."² (His starting point, then, was clearly subjective.) He rejected the definition of the Church as a divine institution (ANSTALT). To the charge that he had reduced the Church to a mere human association, something "not from above", he replied with the question: "Are not the believers themselves from above?"³ Sverdrup thus overemphasized the personal side of the nature of the Church. He attempted to retain a theocentric approach by individualizing it. He maintained that God "creates" the individual believer and "mediates the Church's existence" through the means of grace.⁴

² NLK, I, p. 88.

³ J. Sverdrup, Hvad er Menigheden...?, p. 3.

⁴ Ibid., p. 4.

The Church and the means of grace cannot be separated; Indeed, the administration of the means of grace is "an inner necessity for its life". It will be recalled that Sverdrup deduced his concept of the Ministry from the Universal Priesthood and the charismatic principle. The function of the Ministry is the witness of the Universal Priesthood. On this basis, it is only natural that Sverdrup should believe "in principle" in the "complete autonomy of the congregations".⁵ The local congregation is "the form in which the Communion of Saints most clearly appears in this world"; The Church first entered the world as a local congregation, and only in the form of local congregations can it live its life".⁶ It is the seat of all ecclesiastical authority. The authority of the Church body is delegated to it by the local congregation. The insistence on the right of the congregation at least to have a voice in the calling of its own pastor was a logical consequence of Sverdrup's position. Further, since the clergy are called by the congregation, they do not occupy any privileged position in the government of the Church. There was, he said, no inherent reason why the Lutheran Church could not be governed entirely by laymen. This would neither be "unchurchly" nor un-Lutheran". Sverdrup was careful to point out that polity, unlike the administration of the means of grace, is not prescribed

⁵ NLK, I, p. 2.

⁶ Hvad er Menigheden...?, p. 12.

by divine command. It rests rather on the need of the congregation for an ordered community life. But the Church needs an organization which is in harmony with its essence, God's Word, and the Confessions.⁷ In Norway, this organization must begin with the parish council.

Sverdrup adopted a "wait and see" attitude toward the question of separation. He thought it understandable that Christians would withdraw from a State Church in which the parishes had no voice, in which compulsion prevailed and in which the charismata were not utilized. Still, he believed that the State Church could be reformed. He admitted the possibility that reform would eventually result in a Free Church, but preferred to leave this question open and to let the future decide. He could write of the "liberation" of the Church and of "a free Church", but was opposed to immediate withdrawal. Instead, he emphasized the need for immediate reform. Sverdrup was evidently less influenced by D'Aubigné's book than some of his associates.⁸

Otherwise, the Bergen Party platform included the familiar Johnsonian planks: the abolition of all religious compulsion, the amendment of Paragraph XCII, the abolition of compulsory confirmation, and the introduction of civil marriage.

As will be apparent from their standpoint on suffrage, the Bergen Party were strangely cool toward Church discipline.

⁷ NLK, I, pp. 13f, 129ff.

⁸ NLK, I, pp. 97ff., IV, pp. 307f.

The view of the Party was summed up by Sverdrup in 1881: "[We] believe that when we have achieved full freedom of religion and freedom in the Church, the treasures of the Church will seldom be sought by those who ought to be under discipline. We therefore attach little importance to this problem."⁹ The Party favoured the separation of confession and absolution from the Holy Communion. But the pages of *Ny Luthersk Kirketidende* are otherwise silent about the matter of discipline. In point of fact, the problem was not so acute in 1870 as it had been in 1850, when the Johnsonians began their movement; Johnsonian preaching and advancing secularization had already removed many from communicant membership.

The question of suffrage was kept as quiet as possible. The synod of 1873 did not discuss it. *Ny Luthersk Kirketidende*, though it agitated constantly for reform, never mentioned the delicate problem. But it was there, and came to the fore once more in the mid-1880's.

In 1878, Jakob Sverdrup entered the Storting, and immediately opened a campaign for the Bergen Programme with a bill "For the Participation of the Parishes in the Filling of Clerical Offices". He proposed a call committee of 12-24 members, elected for the occasion. All members of the parish not excluded from Holy Communion were to be eligible to vote. The committee were to select three

⁹ NLK, IV, 1881, p. 310.

candidates and recommend them to the Crown. They were to have advisory power only.¹⁰ The Storting recognized the right of parishes in this regard, but shelved the bill until the opinions of the clergy and the parishes themselves could be heard. The Ministry for Church Affairs solicited the opinions of the Bishops, and found that they were (with one exception) opposed to the bill and even to any approach to the parishes on the subject. The Government concurred. Sverdrup re-submitted his bill the following year, but it was again shelved by the Storting, and so nothing came of the proposal.

(g) The High-Church Party and Reform.

Meanwhile, another development hindered the work of reform: The shift of Pastor J. C. Heuch to the right, and the emergence of a High-Church Party with him as its spokesman.

The High-Church tradition, of which Pastor Wexels (d. 1866) was the foremost representative, had never died out. We have seen how some of the reformers of the 1840's were High-Churchmen. Around mid-century, there was an effort to introduce the Apostolic Succession into the Church of Norway. Professor P. A. Munch reported that in 1848, when three Bishops were to be elected, "one of the theological professors" (not further identified) wrote an opinion in which

¹⁰ NLK, II, 1878, P. 70.

he proposed ordination by a foreign Bishop in Apostolic Succession. Munch added, however, that the opinion "caused the utmost amazement" and "was even stigmatized as almost amounting to heresy".¹ As we have seen, the Royal Commission of 1859 expressed a High-Church conception of Church and Ministry, along Wexelian lines.² A majority of the older clergy held similar views, and consequently were cool toward the Reform Movement. Bishop J. N. Skaar and Dean M. B. Landstad adopted this standpoint. Among the multitudinous subjects which he discussed in *Morgenbladet*, Pastor O. T. Krohg also wrote about the Reform Movement. He favoured the introduction of parish councils (he offered a concrete proposal in 1873), but was fearful of the "Calvinistic" leaven in the movement. He desired confessional guarantees, but was opposed to the Johnsonian programme because he feared control by a Pietistic minority. He blamed the failure of the synod of 1869 upon the tyranny of the Orthodox-Pietists. Krohg's concept of polity was fundamentally episcopalian. In 1853, he published an article entitled "No true Lutheran Church without the Episcopate", in which he called the Church of England "most like the Lutheran" and "ECCLESIA LUTHERIZANS".³

1 O. Kolsrud, *NTT*, XXXI, 1930, pp. 241f. Munch's statement is part of a report on Norwegian Church-life which his Scottish friend G.J.R. Gordon asked him to write. It was printed in the *London Morning Chronicle*. Kolsrud says that there is reason to believe that the idea of reclaiming the Apostolic Succession was again raised in 1852.

2 These men did not insist upon "guarantees": While they were Orthodox, they did not share Johnson's Pietism.

3 *Morgenbladet*, 1853, No. 172.

He favoured an increased power for the Bishops and the introduction of the office of Archbishop, as a counter-balance to the increased power the laity would gain in the parish councils. He would have denied the laity any part in Church government above the parish level.⁴ Pastor (later Bishop) Folkestad, of the Commission of 1859, had proposed the same thing in 1857.⁵

It was not, however, until Heuch and Bugge assumed the editorship of *Luthersk Kirketidende* in 1875 that the High-Churchman got a leader who spoke with authority.

Heuch was a Johnsonian theologian. His chief concern was to preserve the Church of Norway as "a Lutheran, confessional Church", and in a "Churchly" form. Yet he differed from Gisle Johnson in two important respects. His higher concept of the Ministry led him to take a different attitude on the question of lay-preaching, while his objective emphasis on the means of grace resulted in a different approach to Church reform.

Heuch's first article on the Reform Movement (the first polemic article from his pen) appeared in 1871. It was entitled "Rather No Laws on Parish Meetings, Parish Councils, and Synods, than UnChurchly Ones!".⁶ It was a powerful rejection of democracy in the Church, and of the principle that the civil community should make ecclesiastical decisions, and a demand for strict confessional

4 *Morgenbladet*, 1869, No. 46; 1873, No. 341B.

5 *Morgenbladet*, 1857, No's. 81 (*Tillaeg*) and 100.

6 LK, NR, V, 1871, pp. 385ff.

guarantees. Heuch was fearful that the Church would come under the domination of "the great idol of the age--HERR OMNES". He asserted that it was more dangerous to have Church matters decided by an "unchurchly" organ expressly elected for the purpose than that they should be decided by an "unchurchly" assembly which dealt only incidentally with them (in this case, the Storting). A similar synod in Germany had recently purged the Catechism of "the basic truths of the Gospel". Therefore, rather no laws than "unchurchly" ones.

When Heuch and Bugge assumed the editorship of LK, a sharp conflict ensued over the relationship between Church and State. Heuch denounced D'Aubigné's book as "unusually crass" Reformed propaganda.⁷ He correctly noted the principal issue: D'Aubigné asserted that the system of the State Church involves a denial of the Lordship of Christ. This is contrary to the Lutheran Confessions. The Lutheran Church recognizes only two marks of the Church, the Word and the Sacraments, while the Scottish Reformed Church adds a further two: Church discipline and a particular Church polity. The translator (Pastor Eckhoff) replied, and Heuch again replied to him. In reality, the conflict was between the Eastern and the Bergen parties. The Bergen Party accused Heuch and Bugge of being reactionary and of holding a position contrary to "the basic principles of the Lutheran Reformation". Heuch replied that there were only two

⁷ LK, 3R, I, 1875, pp. 261ff.

basic principles of the Lutheran Reformation, Justification by Faith and Sola Scriptura, and that they had not departed from either. On the other hand, the views of the Bergen Party were more in keeping with the Scottish than the Lutheran Church, particularly in the refusal of the Party to recognize Church polity as an ADIAPHORON.⁸

After their removal as editors of LK (1877), Heuch and Bugge carried on the campaign in their new *Luthersk Ugeskrift*. Here another High-Churchman, Pastor M. J. Faerden, also attacked D'Aubigné's book in a lecture on "Free Church and State Church".⁹

The High-Church position was clearly set forth in Heuch's first editorial in *Luthersk Ugeskrift*.¹⁰ The Party favoured some specific reforms: The amendment of Paragraph XCII, and the abolition of compulsory confirmation and Church marriage. Apart from this, he thought that the whole question of reform had been "overemphasized". The welfare of the Church was not primarily dependent upon its form, its polity, but upon the pure means of grace. He thanked God that these had been preserved in the Church of Norway. He could not agree to the proposed introduction of parish councils, because this would deliver the Church into the hands of the "unchurchly masses". Meanwhile, there are other "more important tasks". He called for unity among Churchmen in the battle against the "common foe".

8 LK, 3R, II, pp. 9ff., 24ff.

9 LU, I, pp. 49ff.

10 LU, I, pp. 10ff.

The common foe was the new secularism, Positivism, and radicalism. There is no doubt that Heuch's position on reform was strongly influenced by the greater threat. He was already preparing for the great apologetic task which was to occupy his later years. Within a year, he would be engaged in controversy with Georg Brandes and with Björnson. Simultaneously, he would be engaged on another front, against the Separatists and the advocates of lay-preaching.

The High-Church attitude on Church discipline was set forth in 1875 by Dean J. J. Tandberg in a lecture before the Theological Society. The lecture was promptly printed in LK and endorsed by Heuch and Bugge.¹¹ Church discipline, said Tandberg, was a "fundamental question" for the Church of Norway. Indeed, the whole reform movement can be interpreted primarily as an attempt to restore it. His lecture was a presentation of the possibilities for discipline under existing laws. These, in his view, were "so good" and had "proceeded from such a spirit of Christian understanding" that a more serious attempt to apply them was no more than they deserved.¹² In other words, the laws, the forms, the institutions were all there; The trouble is that they are simply not being used. Heuch agreed. The High-Churchmen were no less zealous for the cause of discipline than the Johnsonians. They did not deny the need for a "more democratic" procedure, but

¹¹ LK, 3R, I, pp. 33ff., pp. 46ff.

¹² Ibid., p. 33.

"the first thing that should be done is...the renewal of Church discipline as it can and should be practised under existing law".¹³

The Grundtvigian Party fared no better with its programme of reform. Opposed by the other parties, it made repeated but unsuccessful efforts to gain more freedom. Three times (in 1865, 1868, and 1871), the Grundtvigian lawyer Halvor Bentsen submitted to the Storting his bill for the abolition of the parish bond, and each time the measure was defeated. The bond was indeed loosed by a law passed in 1876, but in a manner unacceptable to the Grundtvigians. The clergy were given the right to perform ministerial acts for persons living outside their parish. The Grundtvigians called this a "half-relaxation". They retaliated by joining with the Liberal Party to block the calling of the synod in 1869, and by voting against the bill for parish councils in the same session. In 1879, L.M. Bentzen introduced a bill for elective congregations. He pointed out that it would reduce Separatism, and would provide a field for experiments in Church polity. The bill never got out of committee, but was rejected on the ground that it would lead to disunity. A similar bill was also rejected in 1886. *Luthersk Ugeskrift* wrote that this would be to "place some of the Church's members outside the control of the Church body and yet allow them to enjoy its advantages".¹⁴

¹³ Ibid., p. 47.

¹⁴ The idea of elective congregations was revived by the Orthodox-Pietists in the 6th unofficial synod of 1906, as an escape from "unbelieving" clergy.

(h) The Appeal of 1883 and the Synods
of 1885 and 1887.

In the years before 1885, the question of Church reform was shelved in the face of more ominous issues. The great political conflict of the century, the struggle between Government and Storting, moved toward a climax. In this critical situation, a group of Churchmen, led by Gisle Johnson and including all of the Bishops, many of the clergy, and a large number of civic leaders (456 in all), adopted the device of direct intervention. In 1883, they issued the famous appeal "To the Friends of Christianity in Our Land", in which "political radicalism" (the Liberal Party) was branded as the most dangerous enemy of Christianity. In effect, the appeal identified the Church and the Christian Faith with the Conservative Party.

While no doubt most "free-thinkers" supported the Liberal Party, it was not true that all Liberals were non-Christians. Moreover, the appeal constituted a radical departure from Lutheran principles. In retrospect, we are driven to ask how it was possible for men of such strong confessional views to take this fateful step. Many probably proceeded on the assumption of the Christian State, an idea which was anything but Lutheran. When, in an era of rapid secularization, they recognized the possibility that the Storting and the Government might be controlled by non-Christians, they rallied to the support of their ideal in the only way open to them.

This was true of a man like Bishop Heuch, who was an ardent advocate of the idea of the Christian State.¹ The case of Gisle Johnson is more complex. He knew his Luther too well to subscribe to the theocratic ideal, and he was opposed to Absolutism. On the other hand, he too could speak of the Christian State. Moreover, he was a staunch conservative who regarded the idea of popular sovereignty as fundamentally anti-Christian. In this situation, he emphasized the words of St. Paul in Rom. 13: "The powers that be are ordained of God..." Johnson could not recognize the Storting as an organ of *ἐξουσία*. This he identified with the monarchy, or one particular form of government, and saw the role of the Storting as merely to represent the people to the *ἐξουσία*. In line with the attitude of Luther towards the Peasants' Revolt, Johnson considered the claim of the Storting to power over the Constitution as an act of rebellion which would mean insecurity for the authority of the State. While the action of the Storting certainly disturbed the delicate balance of power within the State, Johnson was wrong in his assumption that the idea of popular sovereignty is inherently anti-Christian. He ignored the fact that the social and political structure had changed radically since the days of St. Paul or even of Luther.

1 Cf. Heuch's statement in LU, VII, p. 242: "The Norwegian State is, according to its Constitution, not a religionless, but a Christian State with an 'official' religion, which has its definite ecclesiastical confession." For evidence that Johnson accepted the concept of the Christian State, see G. Ousland, En Kirkehövding, p. 68.

This may serve to explain the surprising fact that this man who so consistently emphasized the distinction between the Two Realms in the question of Reform now came to emphasize the close relation between them. Quite apart from the rightness or wrongness of his views, the practical consequences of the appeal for the Church were disastrous. The Church was indelibly branded as reactionary.²

In the event, the Storting was victorious in its campaign. In 1884, the members of the Government were impeached, tried, and removed, and the Parliamentary system introduced, with Johan Sverdrup's Liberal Party in control. The Storting had established its claim to supreme authority. Many Churchmen now thought that the Church was completely at the mercy of the Storting. In *Luthersk Ugeskrift*, Heuch called it "the day of Bedlam", in which "the lowest class in society is made absolute and the rest of the nation enslaved under the brutal majority of the vulgar class". The second unofficial synod was hastily called. It met in October, 1885, and proposed a complete new polity for the Church along Johnsonian lines, with the important reservation that the national synod was to have purely advisory authority. It called for even stricter suffrage "guarantees" (the voter must have participated regularly in the Sacrament for three years past). Heuch and many other High-Churchmen now changed their position radically. So long as they had been reasonably certain that the

² The views of Johnson are set forth in detail in G. Ousland, *op. cit.*, pp. 302ff.

the State would preserve the freedom of the means of grace, they had opposed reform. They had now lost all confidence in the State, and gave their full support to the synod proposal.

The synod requested the new government to present its plan to the Storting. The Government refused, (the synod plan was finally submitted as a private member's bill), and instead submitted a bill for parish councils and parish meetings. Jakob Sverdrup had been given a seat in the Government; It was he who stood behind the Government bill. He now made his strongest attempt to introduce reform. His bill included a provision to give the parishes a voice in the selection of a pastor. It also left Church discipline and pastoral care in the hands of the pastor and the lay assistants. The parish councils were to deal only with the externals of religion. They were to be mandatory everywhere, and no suffrage "guarantees" were stipulated. Simultaneously, the Storting had before it bills for the relaxation of the parish bond, for the extended use of Church buildings, for private Holy Communion, and for mandatory civil marriage. In this situation, a petition signed by the members of the Theological Faculty, all of the Bishops, and 538 of the nation's 653 pastors was sent to the Crown. It asked that an official national synod be called before any decision was taken on the new legislation. The voice of the Church, it said, ought first to be heard. The Government declined to comply with the request. The Storting, however, found it necessary to postpone debate on the pending bills until 1887. A new unofficial synod (the third) was hastily

summoned in February, 1887. This synod developed into a tug-of-war between Sverdrup on the one hand, and Johnson and Heuch on the other. Heuch had already made known his views in a series of articles in *Luthersk Ugeskrift*, undoubtedly one of the most bitter attacks ever published in a Norwegian Church paper.³ He thundered against the "arithmetical principle", and predicted that Sverdrup's law would mean disintegration of the Church, because it would strip the clerical office of "every right and significance". Nor did he spare the persons of the law's promoters. The synod meeting proceeded in a calmer spirit, but the bitter disagreement could not be concealed. In the end, the synod followed the Johnsonian line as it had in 1885. It rejected the Government bill (46-22), and voted for strict guarantees. It also emphasized the spiritual task of the parish councils. It endorsed the plan to give the parishes a limited voice in the selection of pastors, but only through the parish councils, not in parish assemblies, as Sverdrup had proposed.

A majority in the Committee on Church Affairs in the Storting opposed both the Government and the synod proposals, on the grounds that the principle of the majority rule was not applicable to the Church. Furthermore, there was no general public sympathy for Church reorganization. A minority supported the synod's proposal, but opposed the Government plan on the ground that organization on the level of the parish alone would lead to "independency".

3 LU, XVIII, 1885, pp. 214ff., et.al.

The debate in the Storting lasted for eight days. The synod bill was defeated, 64-21. Despite the whole-hearted support and the ringing oratory of the Prime Minister, the Government bill suffered an unprecedented 84-1 defeat. Surprisingly, the Government did not fall (a fact hardly in keeping with the Parliamentary system). Indeed, although the opposition press and even some Liberal papers clamoured for his resignation, even Jakob Sverdrup remained in office. Still, the Sverdrup Government never fully recovered from this defeat, and it eventually fell in 1889. From that time, neither Government nor Church leaders ventured to champion a scheme for Church reform.

The Reform Movement of the 19th century was finished. As secularization progressed and large segments of the people unchurched themselves, the cause lost its urgency. The parties disintegrated. Of the High-Churchmen, Heuch was made a Bishop in 1889 and turned to the apologetic task, Krogh-Tønning moved ever nearer to Rome, and Faerden became a liberal. Luthersk Ugeskrift ceased publication in 1893. Gisle Johnson died in 1894; By that time, a new theology and a new situation in Church-life was developing. The Grundtvigian Party splintered in the later 1880's. The Bergen Party never had the support of the majority of the Church, and had failed to realize its aims by means of its alliance with Liberal politics. The only concrete results of the Reform Movement were an amendment to Paragraph XCII, a slight change in the marriage laws,

and Jakob Sverdrup's Royal Resolution to allow Holy Communion without confession and absolution in "exceptional" cases. Confirmation and Church marriage were made voluntary in our own century. The Church of Norway did not introduce parish councils until 1920 (without "guarantees"). It is still waiting for a national synod. Unofficial synods continued to meet in the 20th century, and the theological tension which led to the establishment of MENIGHETSFAKULTET in 1908 also occasioned a new effort at reform, this time with the object of the separation of Church and State. The committee appointed to study the relationship between Church and State by the 5th unofficial synod brought in a recommendation (the date, 1908, is significant) for immediate separation. Nothing, however, came of the proposal. Today the movement in favour of separation is weaker than at any time during the past 100 years.

(1) Conclusions

In the Lutheran Church, a proper doctrine of the relationship between Church and State rests upon the delicately balanced dialectic of the doctrine of the Two Realms. Lutheranism is entirely flexible with regard to Church polity. No one form of polity can be said to be essential to the existence of the Church. The Church is constituted by the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments. Any particular form is, as Molland says, desirable or undesirable "depending upon the extent to which it furthers, serves, makes possible, allows,

makes difficult, hinders, or prohibits these functions".¹

Yet the principal cause of the problem of the State Church in 19th century Norway was theological. It arose from a failure to uphold the doctrine of the Two Realms. Lutheranism was continually at fault during the three centuries following the Reformation in failing to maintain the distinction between the Realms. At times, this error manifested itself in theocratic tendencies, but the dangers of Erastianism were in the outcome far more potent. Molland regards the relaxation of the bond between Church and State in the 19th century as a blessing, because it restored to the Church its proper role, that of a servant. This is undoubtedly true. But Molland tends to minimize the danger of Erastianism. The Norwegian Church was under the control of the State. Her polity was not such as could best enable her to carry out her essential functions. This is borne out by the history of the Inner Mission and Foreign Missions movements, both of which were forced into other channels by the inelasticity of the Church. The movement for reform was therefore entirely justified, indeed necessary. On the other hand, it was doomed to failure by the fact that the Church was in subjection. Since the doctrine of the Two Realms was not a living doctrine, the people as a whole manifested no desire for reform, and the movement found itself at the mercy of the political situation. It was powerless in the face of a reactionary

1 E. Molland, Statskirke og Jesu Kristi Kirke, pp. 79f.

Minister for Church Affairs in a time of Government supremacy, or of a Storting jealous of its powers in a time of advancing democracy. It could not avoid falling victim to the struggle for power between the two.

But the movement was also doomed to failure by the inability of the theologians to reassert the doctrine of the Two Realms, and by dissension between the various parties. The dissension may have been inevitable precisely because of the flexible attitude of Lutherans toward polity. But it is evident that not even the theologians understood the doctrine of the Two Realms. The High-Church Party, no doubt under Hegelian influence, were opposed to all but minor reforms. They failed to distinguish between the Realms, and held to the idea of the Christian State. For men like Bishop Heuch, polity was an ADIAPHORON. In actual fact, it is not a matter of sheer indifference. There is normally a specific type of polity which is particularly suited to each situation. The other three parties emphasized rather the distinction between the Realms. The Grundtvigians and the Bergen Party tended to separate them completely. The programme of the Bergen Party was actually intended to gain as much advantage as possible for the Church through legislation and then to — separate Church and State. It thus exhibited both theocratic and Separatist tendencies. Its ideal was undoubtedly the Scottish Church. The ecclesiology of the Bergen reformers was subjective, associational, individualistic, nominalistic, and anti-clerical. The alliance with the Liberal Party in

the Storting was bound to collapse. It was said of Jakob Sverdrup that he was too radical for the conservatives and too conservative for the radicals. Still, he achieved more practical results than any other reformer. By his Royal Resolutions, he "got the Church of Norway moving" when it was "stuck fast" (Thorvald Klaveness). The standpoint of Gisle Johnson was more moderate and more Lutheran than any of the others. Without using the term, he propounded something similar to the doctrine of the Two Realms, although his emphasis was definitely upon the distinction between them. He rightly recognized that polity is neither an ADIAPHORON nor a matter to be determined legalistically. Yet the fundamentally Pietist approach of Johnson reflected itself in his attitude to Church polity. His starting point was the regenerate individual, and this inevitably led to his obsession with Church discipline and concern to draw limits to the Church. His insistence upon "guarantees" split the advocates of reform at a time when a united front might have achieved success. It is inevitably hard for those who adopt such a standpoint to take with full seriousness the doctrine of the Two Realms. He proposed to govern the "outward Christendom" (Luther's phrase) of the Kingdom on the Left by the ECCLESIOLOGIAE of the Kingdom on the Right. If the judgments pronounced by the Johnsonians upon the Grundtvigians are any indication, this could have led to some unfortunate attempts to "purify" the Church, just as his insistence upon a particular form of spirituality virtually led to the self-

excommunication of a large section of the population. At any rate, it was a tactical error, for the Storting could not endorse this plan. Finally, Johnson erred grievously, as we have seen, in issuing the celebrated appeal of 1883, again because he failed to maintain the doctrine of the Two Realms. If superficially the movement for reform seemed to founder upon the rocks of the changing political situation, there is a deeper reason still, the absence of an agreed theological foundation based on sound Lutheran principles for the practical proposals put forward by its advocates.

Bibliography--The Reform Movement

- P. Aabel, "Om den Christne Kirke som udvortes bestaaende Samfund, dens Forhold til Staten og ydre Organisation", Theologisk Tidsskrift for den norske Kirke, I, pp. 361-536.
- J. Arup, Til Christiania Stifts Geistlighed, Christiania, 1847.
- H. Birkeland, Kirkelige Tilstande, deres Indflydelse paa og Krav til den Christelige Stat, Bergen, 1845.
- Den Constitutionelle, 1847.
- Forhandlinger i det Kirkeligelandsmøde, October 1885, Christiania, 1886.
- Forhandlinger i det Kirkelige Landsmøde, 1887, Kristiania, 1887.
- B. Gulbrandsen, Nattverd i Norsk Kirkeliv, Oslo, 1948
- O. Handeland, To Linor i Norsk Kyrkjepolitikk, Bjørgvin, 1923.
- J. Hansen, Vor Kirkelige Spørgsmaal og deres Løsning, Christiania, 1847.
- C.W. Hjelm, Betaenking, op. cit., Christiania, 1840.
- Indstilling til Lov om Graendserne for Religionsfriheden, Christiania, 1842.
- Kirkekommissionen af 1908, Indstillinger, I-VIII, Kristiania, 1908.
- Kirkelig Tidende, 1848-1857.
- Luthersk Kirketidende
- Luthersk Ugeskrift
- E. Molland, Statskirke og Jesu Kristi Kirke, Oslo, 1954.
- Morgenbladet
- U. Motzfeldt, Den Norske Kirkerett, tilligemed den Øvrige Geistligheden isaer vedkommende Lovgivning, Christiania, 1844--cited as Kirkerett.
- Norges Lover, 1682-1957, utg. av det Juridiske Fakultet, Oslo, 1958.
- Ny Luthersk Kirketidende
- G. Ousland, En Kirkehøvding, op. cit., Oslo, 1950.
- A. Seierstad, Kyrkjelegt Reformarbeid i Norig i Nittande Hundreaaret, Bergen, 1925.
- A. Seierstad, "Norsk Kyrkjeordning i Eldre Tid" Arbök for den Norske Kirke, 1955, Oslo, 1954, pp. 91-102.
- A. Skrondal, Grundtvig og Noreg, Bergen, 1929, pp. 177-187.
- R. Slaatelid, "Ørdsiftet i 1840 Aarene om en Norsk Kirkeforfatning", in Norvegia Sacra, 1922, Kristiania, 1922.
- J. Sverdrup, Hvad er Menigheden, Hvad er Praesteembedet, og Hvad er Kallsretten?, Stavanger, 1878.
- J. Sverdrup, Kirkelige Traktater, V. Om Menighedsraad, Bergen and Kristiania, 1870.

SEPARATISM

(a) Introduction

As the 19th century dawned, the Church of Norway was a pure State Church. The limits of Church and State were identical. Apart from certain free cities where aliens of non-Lutheran faith could live (provided they disseminated no propaganda), there was no legal provision for Dissenters. In the past, all Dissent had been promptly stopped, usually by the banishment of its leaders.¹ We have seen how a clause guaranteeing full religious freedom was inadvertently omitted from the final draft of the Constitution of 1814 because it had no practical significance at the time. It was not long, however, before religious freedom became a real issue. The carelessness of 1814 was remedied by the Dissenter Act of 1845. In the course of the 19th century, the ties between Church and State were gradually relaxed. Various minority groups separated themselves from the national Church, partly because of conditions within the State Church, partly because of the missionary activities of foreign denominations. By the end of the century, most of the major branches of Christendom were represented in Norway. The Dissenters were never very numerous (even today, they comprise less than 5% of the population), but their importance in Norwegian Church life is out of all proportion to their numbers.

¹ A. Seierstad, Kyrkjelegt Reformarbeid i Norig i Nittande Hundreaaret, p. 19.

It will be shown in this chapter that the doctrine of the Church was the most significant factor in the establishment of Dissenter bodies. Apart from the Roman Catholic Church, all Dissenter groups were the products of revival. We have seen how revival within the State Church led to the establishment of the Foreign and Inner Mission movements. Confessional as these movements were, they still represented what may be called "first degree separatism". Although their supporters remained within the national Church, their spiritual home was in the missionary society, in the Pietist manner. In the course of the century, the confessional character of the revival was gradually weakened, thus opening the way for the establishment of independent separatist movements. These in turn tended still further to weaken confessionalism. Their creation was due partly to internal conditions and partly to foreign (especially Anglo-American) influence. The relative importance of these two factors varied in different instances. Bloch-Hoell is of the opinion that foreign influence was the more decisive. It is true that foreign influence grew as the century progressed, strengthened by the tremendous expansion of the Norwegian merchant fleet and (less directly) by the large-scale emigration to America.² This foreign influence came neither

² The seamen and some of the emigrants returned. Both carried on an extensive correspondence with relatives at home. Less than one-third of the emigrants remained within the Lutheran Church in America. A considerable proportion, therefore, were exposed to other religious influences, and these in turn affected their relatives in the homeland.

from Anglican nor strict Calvinist circles, but primarily from the left-wing of Protestantism. Social class distinctions became important at this point, for the seamen and the emigrants belonged largely to the lower social and economic classes.

Apart from the Roman Catholics, the Dissenting bodies in 19th century Norway generally exhibited certain common characteristics. They shared the same revivalist, associational ecclesiology; They regarded the Church as a sociological entity, a voluntary society formed by individual Christians. They displayed a tendency toward the creation of a "pure" Church, an effort to re-create the Biblical congregation. They attempted to draw sharp limits, often on the basis of the ADIAPHORA, with a resultant emphasis upon strict Church discipline, ethical Puritanism, and accusations against other Church bodies. They often displayed a negative attitude toward the Sacraments, especially Infant Baptism. Further, they emphasized the autonomy of the local congregation and its right to call its own pastor. We have seen traces of these characteristics even in the State Church. In times of crisis, they led inevitably to separatism.

The most frequent occasion for the manifestation of separatist tendencies was the question of Church discipline, or the attempt to define the limits of the Church against the background of a State Church in which discipline was not being, perhaps could not be, practised. We have seen

how the Johnsonian reform party attempted to revive Church discipline through parish councils elected on the basis of Church "guarantees". In this chapter, we shall see how various individual clergymen, spurred into action by their tender consciences, tried to enforce discipline under the existing laws, and how, failing, they separated from the national Church.

The problem presented itself in its most acute form in connection with the Holy Communion, for unfortunately discipline had become closely identified with the Eucharist. Virtually every form of discipline had disappeared except the minor ban, exclusion from the Sacrament. According to Lutheran theology, the Lord's Supper is a means of grace, but in 19th century Norway, it was often regarded more as a means of discipline. The shift in emphasis occurred gradually. Luther retained private confession ("for the sake of absolution") as a voluntary preparation for reception of the Sacrament. He allowed, however, the use of a general confession instead. The Augsburg Confession retained private confession, but insisted that it was of human right only. The Norwegian Kirkeordinans of 1537, however, made private confession obligatory, although the clergy could exempt the "upright".³ The Ritual of 1685 made private confession obligatory for reception of the Sacrament. These regulations display a tendency to look

³ A. Holter, "Skriftestol og Nattverdbord" in Korsets Ord og Troens Tale, p. 239.

upon confession as a means of excluding the unworthy from participation in the Sacrament. The Ritual of 1685 knows no confession apart from the Lord's Supper. Meanwhile, contrary to law, the practise of general (collective) confession replaced private confession. Individual absolution (with the laying on of hands) was retained, but the confession of sins was made EN MASSE. In the pure State Church of Norway (especially after 1660), every good citizen received the Sacrament at least once a year; Exclusion meant loss of some civil rights. The norm of civil law became the norm of Church discipline. Thus, both of the Keys were misused. "Never has a Lutheran Church so totally confused Law and Gospel as when absolution was actually pronounced on the basis of civil righteousness."⁴ By the 19th century, Church discipline had all but disappeared in the Church of Norway, and the Norwegian people continued to communicate EN MASSE.

Such was the background to the problem which Skrondal regards as the focal point of the struggles of the Norwegian Church between 1850 and 1900.⁵ In his thorough study of the history of the Eucharist in Norway, Gulbrandsen has pointed out that the Norwegian people, after 900 years of "mass Communion" all but excommunicated themselves in the second half of the 19th century. Various factors contributed to this development, but the "chief cause" was the opposition to mass Communion on the part of the Johnsonian clergy.⁶

⁴ Ibid., p. 243.

⁵ A. Skrondal, in NTT, L, 1949, p. 53.

⁶ B. Gulbrandsen, Nattverd i Norsk Kirkeliv, p. 197.

They regarded it as the expression of a nominal Christianity. Gisle Johnson is quoted to the effect that it was a good sign when few received the Sacrament. He "deliberately aimed at a Eucharistic ECCLESIOLOGIA IN ECCLESIA".⁷ His generation of clergy were unable to exercise through the confessional the discipline which they were sworn to uphold in the clergy oath. They therefore sought to keep the unworthy from the Lord's Table by repeated warnings from the pulpit against unworthy participation. Like the "awakened laity", they were scandalized by the prevalence of tares among the wheat. With regard to the Eucharist, their chief concern was to protect its holiness. In time, as Skrondal has pointed out, the Lord's Supper again became primarily a means of grace instead of a medium of discipline.⁸ But not before the vast majority of Norwegians had been persuaded to excommunicate themselves, and not before the Church of Norway had suffered schism. The demand for Church discipline split the Reform Movement, and was one of the main causes of its failure. The same demand was also the chief factor in the separatist movements of Lammers and the Lutheran Free Church. Although it was not directly responsible for the introduction of foreign Dissenting bodies, it was dissatisfaction with the "worldliness" of the national Church which enabled them to gain a foothold in Norway. Finally, as we shall see, it was the same consideration which led to the "first degree

7 Ibid., p. 211.

8 A. Skrondal, in NTT, L, 1949, p. 53.

separatism" of the 1890's, including the peculiar movement for "free Communion".

(b) The Passage of the Dissenter Act

The principal cause of the Dissenter Act of 1845 was not so much pressure from existing Dissenters as the combination of Protestant principle and Enlightenment liberalism.

The generation of 1814 was a transition generation, in which the liberal moralism of Locke and Kant overlapped and clashed with the older Supranaturalism of Leibniz and Wolff. Adherents of the latter, with its intellectualist conception of religious truth, were bound to be sceptical of religious freedom. A religious faith was either true or false, and men were obliged to believe what was true. The University of Copenhagen was dominated by this philosophy until the last years of the 18th century. Professors Hjelm, Hersleb, and Treschow were all fundamentally Supranaturalists. Hjelm was the most consistent in his opposition to freedom, whereas the others were more eclectic in their views. On the other hand, those influenced by Kant and Locke regarded religious freedom as an inalienable human right. This standpoint was entirely in keeping with the ecclesiology of the Enlightenment, which made of the true, invisible Church a Platonic State and the visible Church a mere sociological entity. As a transcendental Idea, the true Church could not be identified with any

particular visible body like the Church of Norway. The various historical forms of religion were regarded merely as means for inculcating universal ethical principles. Each had a rightful claim to membership in the true Church and therefore to freedom of worship. The attitude expressed in the American and French Constitutions was adopted by the Norwegians. This standpoint definitely gained strength in the 1830's and 1840's, aided by the entrance of Romanticism, with its respect for the individual.¹

It was the existence of two small Quaker societies, one in Christiania and one in Stavanger, which made the question of religious freedom a living issue in Norway. Introduced by a group of 19 former prisoners of war returning from Britain in 1814, Quakerism became a problem as early as 1816, when a Quaker couple chose to solemnize their marriage in the Quaker manner. The marriage was not legally valid, but the couple refused any other ceremony; They finally emigrated to England. For the next thirty years, the existence of the Quakers in Norway raised a whole series of problems: marriage and burial without the services of a clergyman, refusal to have children baptized, and refusal to take the oath or perform military service. English Quakers, such as William Allen and George Richardson, continually urged the Norwegian authorities, including King Karl Johan XIV, to be tolerant of their co-religionists. Because of the assistance which Quakers had rendered to

1 A. Seierstad, op. cit., pp. 264, 293ff.

persecuted Prussian Lutherans, their appeal did not go unheeded. Although the Norwegian Quakers were extremely few in numbers, their presence in the country created a very thorny problem both for the Church and the State. In 1817, a Royal Commission was appointed to study the problem. It drafted a bill which would have given Quakers religious freedom in certain cities and exempted them from State Church Baptism, confirmation, marriage, and burial, and from taking oaths and military service. The bill, presented as a government proposition the following year, failed by three votes to pass. Further legal efforts also proved fruitless until the 1840's.

Professor Hjelm's proposal of 1840 dealt with the whole problem of religious freedom. His aim was to retain the STATUS QUO. Paragraph I absolutely prohibited the practice of any non-Lutheran religion "in any public manner (OFFENTLIGHED) whatsoever", on pain of fine or imprisonment. Paragraph III forbade proselytizing of Lutherans, on pain of fine or imprisonment. Paragraph V prescribed banishment for foreigners who violated these provisions. Paragraph VII prescribed banishment for a second offence on the part of Norwegian subjects. Paragraph XI prescribed Lutheran instruction for "apostates", as long as there was a possibility of repentance. Paragraph XII required the apostate to raise his children in the religion of the State.²

2 C.W. Hjelm, Betaenkning, op.cit., pp. 73-76.

The recommendations of the Commission of 1841 (worked out by Professor Dietrichson) were in essential agreement with the bill of 1818. This proposal was, however, shelved by the Government.

Thus far, proposed legislation had been aimed primarily at solving the Quaker problem. In 1842, the Crown granted a dispensation for the creation of an Anglican congregation for the English workers at the copper smelter at Alta. In 1843, a similar dispensation was granted to Roman Catholics in Christiania. With these developments, in mind, the Government appointed a new Commission in 1843, to draft a law to cover all Dissenting bodies. Members of this commission were : Pastor Wexels, Pastor A.N.H. Stenersen, an avowed liberal, and the jurist U. A. Motzfeldt. It was essentially their proposal which finally became law in 1845, under the title of "Law Concerning those who Confess to the Christian Religion but are not Members of the State Church".³

The all-important first Paragraph of the new law provided that "Dissenters, or those who confess to the Christian religion but are not members of the State Church, are to have freedom to practice their religion publicly within the limits of law and decency, and to establish congregations under the leadership of their own pastors or presidents". Paragraph II required Dissenting clergy to present their credentials to the civil authorities and to

³ Full text printed in K. Rygnestad, Dissentarspursmålet i Noreg frå 1845 til 1891, pp. 13-16.

submit a list of members annually. Paragraph III released Dissenters from all obligations to the State Church except the tithe. Paragraph IV forbade worship behind closed doors. Paragraph VI decreed that marriages involving Dissenters should be registered with a Notary Public. Paragraphs VIII and IX gave Dissenting parents the right to decide whether or not their children were to be raised in the State Church, even in cases where one parent belonged to the State Church. There was no prohibition of proselytizing except where threats or trickery were employed (Paragraph XVII). The minimum age for withdrawal from the State Church was fixed at nineteen, and those withdrawing were required to notify their parish pastor in person.

Churchmen generally favoured the Dissenter Act, but it was thought by some that it came too soon and was too far-reaching. Jørgen Hansen wrote that the abolition of the Conventicle Act had come "like an elephant in a flower bed"; This opinion was even more widely held about the Dissenter Act.

So far, nothing of any real significance for the doctrine of the Church had been involved in the discussions which led to the Dissenter Act. It was merely a question of the rights of small minorities (largely though not entirely consisting of foreigners) to exist legally within the realm. The Dissenter Act was not the result of ecclesiological controversy. On the other hand, passage of the Act opened the way for a serious discussion of the doctrine

of the Church.

(c) Gustav Adolph Lammers (1802-1878) and
The Separatist Congregation at Skien.

There was no immediate Dissenting movement following the passage of the Act. The Government indeed bowed to the lay movement in the Catechism controversy largely because it feared a large-scale exodus from the national Church. Yet ten years were to pass before any new form of Dissent arose. And the reason for its emergence then was: Revival. Gustav Adolph Lammers, vicar of Skien, had launched a local revival even before that of his younger friend, Gisle Johnson. Lammers had been raised in a Rationalist home and possessed considerable artistic talent (in later life, he supported himself as a painter). His undoubted gifts were unfortunately combined with an unstable personality. Converted under Moravian influence, he came to Skien in 1849 as a powerful revival preacher, with a strongly Pietistic attitude to life. The influence of Kierkegaard is plain in the sphere of ideas and even in his phraseology. The literary historian Henrik Jaeger considers the Lammers was the model for Ibsen's famous "Brand"; This is highly probable, since Ibsen's mother and sister belonged to Lammers' congregation. Lammers built the first "prayer-house", and started the first Inner Mission society.

The ecclesiological problem loomed large for Lammers. Bishop Christen Brun says that Lammers' doctrine of the

Church "formed the basis of his position as a whole, and determined his attitude on the questions that led to his break with the Church order".¹ His root problem, the limits of the Church and the exercise of Church discipline, was not peculiar to himself. It was, as we have seen, common to the new generation of clergy trained by Gisle Johnson. They faced it particularly in two ministerial acts: confirmation, and confession and absolution prior to Holy Communion. Confirmation was performed EN MASSE; It was prescribed by law for all non-Dissenting Norwegians. Confession and absolution were bound to Holy Communion not only by the Lutheran Confessions but also by Norwegian law.² In the 1850's, mass Communion was still the common practice. It was customary to utilize a collective form of confession, but absolution was administered individually, with the laying on of hands. The discrepancy between law and practice was obvious.

Lammers continued to read Kierkegaard, and to struggle with this problem. Then, in 1855, contrary to law, he announced that the new class of confirmands would not be immediately admitted to the Holy Communion. As Gulbrandsen says, "the minor ban had stricken an entire parish".³ Lammers wrote to the Ministry for Church Affairs through Bishop Arup, stating his objections to the present absolution practice. He would, he said, in future demand private

1 C. Brun, Den Lammerske Bevaegelse, p. 29.

2 Norske Lov 2-5-10.

3 B. Gulbrandsen, op. cit., p. 217.

confession of all participants in the Holy Communion, unless there was "some other way out". He proposed that the Ministry authorize him to administer the Sacrament without confession and absolution. He further proposed that the existing formula of absolution should be replaced by a precatory absolution addressed collectively to all the penitents.

Lammers' request was refused, whereupon he asked to be relieved from all celebration of the Holy Communion, and requested a curate to carry out this function. This request was granted.⁴

In February, 1856, Lammers took part in a pastoral conference in Christiania, where Church discipline was the chief topic of discussion. Also present were Professor Johnson, Pastor Wexels, Professor Monrad, Pastor Grimelund, Cand. Theol. Eilert Sundt, and others. Thus the report of this meeting gives a clear picture of the various views on Church discipline current at the time.⁵ The principal question under discussion was "Whether and to what extent Church discipline can be exercised under the existing circumstances". The introductory lecture was delivered by Pastor N. C. Hald, who reviewed the Biblical and historical material. He traced the reason for the collapse of Church discipline back to the establishment of the State Church in the 4th century. But some discipline is still possible

⁴ Correspondence printed in Ibid., pp. 218-220. Cf. Lammers' Afskedsandragende, p. 6.

⁵ "Praestemøde i Christiania", Christiania Posten, 11 Feb. 1856; NK, I, 1856, pp. 53ff., 65ff., 84ff., 100ff.

under the existing system; The clergy and their lay assistants can at least utilize admonition and the minor ban to discipline the gross sinners. This would "satisfy the rightful demands of the zealous" and "preserve the Church and its holiness from the worst scandals".⁶ In this general position, Hald was supported by most of the participants, among others Grimelund, Wexels, and Sundt. Wexels admitted that the State Church could not be identified with the Church of Jesus Christ, that indeed the majority of its members were probably not Christians. But the State Church had developed under God's permissive providence, and thus by this fact, God had admitted many unsuitable persons to participation in holy Things. The pastor could, however, reach and discipline the individual, and he should be satisfied with that. Grimelund also admitted that the State Church had not yet awakened to life, but he was optimistic about the future. New life was appearing, and compulsion was decreasing. He issued a warning against the danger of separatism. Discipline can and must be applied to the gross sinners, beginning in the Holy Communion. Eilert Sundt counselled moderation as "the basic principle for a State Church", especially in view of the divergent opinions regarding the criteria for disciplinary action. He was supported by Monrad, who presented a unique point of view. Scripture and the Church, he said, are both objective authorities, but Scripture is changeless whereas the Church

6 NK, I, p. 72.

is always subject to change. What must now be done was to reconcile law and "the consciousness of the Christian community". Church discipline must not simply follow the letter of the law, but "unconditionally follow opinion". It will be led by "the divine nucleus" to follow the Church's authority. He drew an analogy to the State, although he maintained the Church's distinctive character. He thought no good could come of separatism; God could not cure anything through poison. The individual can make his contribution to ecclesiastical opinion, but must remember that he is only one individual, and ought to bow before the authority of the Church. Neither the individual pastor nor the individual congregation constituted the Church, and it was the Church as a whole which must order Church discipline. Because it is composed of many elements, it is less apt to err. He emphasized the fact that he was speaking of the Visible Church. The Invisible Church was indeed its "proper essence and purpose", but if the Church were something which arose in the subjective consciousness, it would be something intangible and temporary. We must maintain that the Church exists, despite its weaknesses. Monrad warned against attempting to reestablish a bygone age. Everything was in process of developing toward perfection (a Hegelian notion). We are progressing toward greater freedom and from externalism toward an existence where "hidden inwardness" (this was the same term used by Bishop Mynster in Denmark) is most important. Penance and

punishment are things of the past. That which has significance today is the power of the Word.⁷

Pastor Lammers was obviously in an extremely defensive frame of mind. His speeches were impassioned, his questions blunt and embarrassing. He was clearly convinced that discipline could not be exercised in the State Church, that the magnitude of the task made it impossible. With pathos, he asks: Should we attempt Church discipline when many pastors ought themselves to be disciplined, and when the majority of the Church "definitely rejects" her message? How can the pastor begin, when he harbours the fear that he will soon have to abandon the whole attempt? A failure of this kind would only add to the confusion. The Church was in a process of "disintegration". Could it be regenerated? Lammers flung out Kierkegaard's charge that the State Church was "triumphant" and "not in harmony with the militant Church in our midst". How far can a pastor go to satisfy his own conscience and the demands of the true believers? Can he expect the support of the Church and its highest governing authority?

Lammers was not satisfied with a discipline of the gross sinners. This was not "a true Church discipline". He reminded the brethren of the clergy oath and cited Norwegian law on discipline. If even a beginning was made to enforce these provisions, he would (speaking for himself) have to ban the entire parish. If he did not, he would

⁷ Ibid., pp. 92, 100ff.

have to admit that he could not exercise discipline and hence that he could not rightly administer the Sacraments.⁸ Lammers admitted the impossibility of creating a pure Church, but insisted that the admonition of I Cor. 5 not to have fellowship with unbelievers was a valid Christian thought. He demanded to know: "Where is the limit? Who properly belong to the Lord's Church?"⁹

He asserted that there was a "chaos" of attitudes in the Church and among the clergy. He had chosen Pontoppidan's Catechism, "an authorized text-book of the Church" as his guide, but many Church members were refusing to acknowledge as sinful some of the things which the Catechism condemns.¹⁰ In the Christian sense, there were no ADIAPHORA. In this, he was opposed by several, particularly by Sundt, who pressed Lammers so hard that the chairman had to divert the discussion. Most of those present claimed that the ADIAPHORA did not constitute any safe criterion for distinguishing Christian from non-Christian. Neither Scripture nor the Church had spoken definitively on the matter. Lammers agreed that externals were no guarantee for a Christian life, but asserted that a Christian spirit would inevitably show itself in externals. He admitted that "DE OCCULTIS NON JUDICAT ECCLESIA", but, he said, many Church members publicly admit that they reject Pontoppidan at this point, and yet we do not discipline them for it. He regarded a

8 Ibid., pp. 85f.

9 Ibid., p. 76.

10 Cf. Appendix I, (1).

criterion dating from the Pietist period of the Church as the criterion of real Christianity.

In view of the situation, Lammers wondered whether it might not be best to resign in protest against the present Church polity. He spoke of a "not insignificant schism", evidently expecting many of the clergy to support such an action. He thought it would not be in vain, for theological candidates were already hesitating to accept holy orders.

Lammers' sole support at the conference, as he himself stated, was Gisle Johnson, in a number of contributions to the discussion.

He began by reminding the gathering that the proper objects of Church discipline were the Church's own mature members. For proper Church discipline, "the Church must first know who are 'in', and that the Church has its definite limits".¹¹ Discipline must begin at the entrance to adult membership (confirmation). Nevertheless, many on the periphery also must come under discipline; Johnson likened them to the catechumens of the Early Church.

In determining the criteria for discipline, the objective Word of God must be the only norm. There will inevitably be a certain subjective arbitrariness in discipline, but this must be reduced to a minimum. The proper safeguard was to place the power of Church discipline in the hands of its rightful possessors, the congregation. While it was "undeniable" that the collapse of discipline could

¹¹ NK, I, p. 86.

be traced back to the establishment of the State Church, it was not impossible to practice discipline under it; Otherwise, the State Church would have ceased to be a Church. For discipline is necessary. Without it, the pure preaching of the Word and the right administration of the Sacraments is impossible, although it is not a mark of the Church as the Reformed Church maintains. The Sacraments are objectively valid when administered according to Christ's institution, but if this condition is to be fully realized, they must be administered to those for whom the Lord intended them.

Johnson asserted that the question of whether discipline could be exercised in the State Church could only be answered on the basis of future experience. The attempt must certainly be made. The fact that, as he believed, God had permitted the State Church, did not mean that the system was in every detail according to His will. He warmly defended the Protestant right to separate from a Church in which the means of grace are not being properly administered. He himself was not willing to endorse the present system "at any price". Separation from a community which has ceased to be a Church is not only a right but a duty, and represents not a schism, but "a return to the true Church". He criticized Monrad's point of view as "Catholicizing".

Proper Church discipline requires a "living" pastor, a "living" congregation, and a "congregation-consciousness".

The only way to exercise discipline is for the "Church within the Church" to act as God's Church. The others must be regarded as catechumens. In the absence of such an ECCLESIOLA, we must be satisfied with something less. But if Church discipline by this means were eventually to prove impracticable, then he would have no choice but to withdraw from the State Church.

Lammers also raised the question of the relationship between confession and absolution and Holy Communion. Pastor Brun replied that he did not always require confession. Lammers reminded him that it was prescribed both by the Confessions and by law. Pastor Hald objected that it was very difficult to require confession in new and large parishes. Johnson stated that it was actually not permissible to waive confession in this manner, but admitted that circumstances might make the ideal impossible to attain. Pastor Steensrud was of the opinion that no necessary connection existed between confession and the Lord's Supper, but that absolution implied a previous confession. Discipline must begin with the practice of absolution. The Norwegian clergy had neglected the binding Key. He agreed with Lammers' description of the state of the Church, but was optimistic about the future. Hald contrasted his own position with that of Lammers by saying that, whereas Lammers would refuse absolution and the Sacrament to all whom he did not know to be Christians, he would accept all

whom he did not know to be non-Christians. Johnson again sought to mediate and to defend Lammers. The question was not whether complete certainty could be attained in matters of Church discipline, but whether the Church could justifiably admit all Baptized and confirmed persons to the Altar without further examination.

The Christiania conference settled nothing. We have treated it at considerable length because it gives good insight into the problem of Church discipline and into the various attitudes to the question in the 1850's. Lammers had heard nothing to alter his ideas. One month later, he resigned his charge and in July of the same year, founded a small Free congregation in Skien.

In his letter of resignation to the King, Lammers stated that "the entire constitution (SAMMENSAETNING) and polity of our Church, the administration of the Sacraments therein, and the various ministerial acts as they must be performed seem to me to be self-contradictory and irreconcilable with truth and God's Word..."¹²

Of his farewell speech to his parish it has been said that "never has the Church of Norway been so violently attacked from one of its own pulpits".¹³ It is a heart-rending document which reveals not only the anguish and pathos but also the emotional instability of the man. He began by protesting against the compulsion of the State

¹² G. Lammers, Afskedsandragende, pp. 5-6.

¹³ H. Jaeger, Henrik Ibsen, quoted in C. Brun, op. cit., p. 197.

Church, which "seeks to evoke by force what can only voluntarily be truth unto salvation". This "tyranny" created hypocrisy.¹⁴ He then plunged into the matter of the lack of discipline, especially in the practice of absolution. In view of the clergy oath, he could not do what the State Church demanded of him (it was "sinful") and ignore "what I knew or had to assume about the true condition of my parishioners".¹⁵

Lammers proposed a Biblicistic basis for the Church. It should be "ordered also in the externals according to God's Word", not according to "false and man-made presuppositions".¹⁶ He denied that he was seeking to found a pure Church (a sheer impossibility), nor did he regard it as necessary to leave the State Church in order to be saved. The State Church was for him "a Babel, in which the true Israelite can still find his Saviour...but in which I cannot remain".¹⁷ It was not the holy catholic Church, the Communion of Saints "as the Lord desires and his Word shows it should be revealed". True, the Church is invisible, but the Lord also has a kingdom "in which He reveals Himself visibly on earth...gathered and upheld by the Word and the Sacraments, and consisting of those who...confess His Name and voluntarily join together around the means of grace...". The State Church is "anything but that". The Sacraments are not for all, but only for those who "repent" (or are

14 G. Lammers, Afskedsandragende, p. 10.

15 Ibid., p. 13.

16 Ibid., pp. 14f.

17 Ibid., p. 16.

converted--"OMVENDE SIG"); They can awaken people, but should be "withheld from them until their conversion, so far as men can determine and test it, shall have occurred".¹⁸

Lammers' revivalist ecclesiology also, as is so frequently the case, led him first to reject the practice and later the theology of Infant Baptism. In his farewell speech, he still acknowledged Baptism as a washing of regeneration, but only "on condition of faith". Infant Baptism should only be practiced where the parents are Christians and where there is reasonable hope of the children being brought up as Christians. Parents should be free to have their children baptized, to have them dedicated, or to do neither. The Children can decide when they reach the age of discretion whether to let themselves be sealed in Baptism, so that as God's Word and our Confession teach, this Sacrament can be a washing of regeneration in the Holy Spirit for them. Infant Baptism has no basis in Scripture, and is even contrary to Christ's command. It "coincides with the Church's degeneration, and I cannot but regard it as a permanent principal cause of the same".¹⁹

Lammers favoured catechetical instruction for all, but confirmation only for the "Christians". Throughout his writings, the Kierkegaardian influence is evident (even the timing of his resignation, the year after the Attack on Christendom, can hardly be coincidental), but nowhere is

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 17f.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 20.

it clearer than in his famous words from the farewell speech: "Rather unbaptized and unconfirmed children! Rather honest heathens than to be influenced by civil relationships and to use the State Church to nurture a generation of liars and hypocrites! Rather renunciation of everything pure and good in the world than to continue to participate in this horrible game!".²⁰

Lammers developed his ideas further in his Apology for the Free Church, published later in the same year. Here he denied that the State Church was a Christian Church, although he would not condemn all its members. The Free Church is "a true Church of the Lord". The fact that a community contains some Christians does not make it Christian. It is not necessarily true that the Church exists wherever the Word and Sacraments are; A home is not Christian because there is a Bible on the table, but only where there is a "living confession".²¹ The Church is pre-eminently the Communion of Saints. "Union with the Lord and with one another in the Spirit is the principal thing, and where this appears visibly as a community...there is the Lord's congregation." Lammers would render the Invisible Church visible: "We do not believe that the Church [for him, the little flock] shall be invisible for the sake of the great mass..." He protested against the concept of the Church which makes of it the creation of the means of grace,

²⁰ Ibid., p. 19.

²¹ G. Lammers, Forsvar, pp. 12-13.

"as though the means of grace were the principal factor which constitutes the Church and the living members secondary", for in that case, the Church could be a true Church when the majority of its members were spiritually dead, so long as it preserved the means of grace.²² He warns against faith in the Church "instead of in the Lord".

In his view, reform was impossible in the State Church, because "a State Church is unthinkable except on condition that all reform cease".²³ The true concept of the Church and the right administration of the means of grace are "most intimately connected". Only where a Church is a Communion of Saints "as a whole, generally" is there any guarantee that the Sacraments will be administered rightly, i.e. to the right people.²⁴ From the standpoint of the true concept of the Church, the Lammers sect rejected Infant Baptism as "a wrong administration", "completely invalid", "meaningless". Indeed, half the book is devoted to a polemic against Infant Baptism. It does not rest upon any command of Christ, was not practiced by the Apostles, and in fact lacks any basis in Scripture whatever. Adults were to be baptized upon request. This was not regarded as re-Baptism, since Infant Baptism was not a true Baptism. The Lammers sect regarded no Sacrament as necessary to salvation, but did require regeneration by the Spirit through the Word.

²² Ibid., pp. 13-14.

²³ Ibid., p. 19.

²⁴ Ibid., pp. 21-22.

Lammers published the Constitution of his Free Church the same year. The voluntarism of the enterprise is emphasized in the very first Paragraph: "The congregation is formed of persons who earnestly seek the salvation of their souls, know no other righteousness and salvation than Jesus Christ and Him crucified, and desire to obey His Gospel²⁵ in faith, hope, and love". Paragraph II pledges loyalty to the Augsburg Confession, except for Articles IX and XXV. Baptism is made voluntary, as well as private confession and absolution, which are separated from the Holy Communion. Paragraph III emphasizes the Universal Priesthood, but authorizes a Ministry "for the sake of order and decency". Government is placed in the hands of up to five elected elders. Paragraph V provided for Church discipline and "eventual excommunication" by the congregation. Paragraph XI authorized the congregation to ordain the first elder, who together with the "president" (FORSTANDER) was to ordain the others. Only confessing Christians were to be received into membership.

Lammers' action was sharply criticized in the daily press (especially Morgenbladet). The Church press also found it necessary to oppose him. His old friends were saddened; The editor of Norsk Kirketidende, Th. Bernhoft, published a series of articles against Lammers' Confession, but avoided

²⁵ This decidedly un-Lutheran phrase may betray something of Lammers' confusion of Law and Gospel, Grundtraek, p. 1.

making any attack upon Lammers personally.²⁶ Lammers' friends, wrote Bernhoft, have not forsaken him, but he has forsaken them, not so much by separating from the State Church as by his protest against the Lutheran doctrine of Baptism. His former colleagues prayed for his return. But the magazine continued to accept articles from his pen.

The Grundtvigian Fredrik Ingier issued a rejoinder to Lammers' farewell speech.²⁷ Ingier found Lammers' ecclesiology "unclear" and "self-contradictory", but one thing seemed certain: Lammers identified the holy catholic Church with "a voluntary society of holy persons".²⁸ Against this subjective and voluntarist approach, Ingier adopted an objective standpoint which defended the means of grace. "As long as we have the means of grace, we have the Church." He accused Lammers of inability to find the Church in the State Church because he was unable to find his Lord in the Word and Sacraments.²⁹ Clarity in ecclesiology can only be achieved on the basis of clarity regarding the means of grace. The Church is God's "institution of grace" (NAADESANSTALT). It is not upheld by human endeavour, but by the Holy Spirit working through the means of grace. Its holiness depends not upon the holiness of its members but upon God's activity in the Church. "I cannot conclude that I find no Christian Church on earth because I find no true Christians, but I must conclude that because the Church of Jesus Christ cannot be destroyed, because we have

²⁶ NK, I, pp. 329ff.

²⁷ F. Ingier, Nogle Ord i Anledning af Presten Lammers' Afskedsord, Christiania, 1856.

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 5, 13.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 8.

the Word and Sacraments, there must be Christians no matter how many dead members...there seem to be."³⁰ The State Church is not an unmitigated evil, but "a relative good", "God's government". Its abolition would mean "anarchy and revolution"

Writing editorially in *Kirkelig Folkeblad*, Fredrik Wexelsen also raised the question "How long shall we remain in the State Church?" He answered in the words of the Danish Grundtvigian Vilhelm Birkedal: "As long as we can find in the Folk-Church (though not necessarily in our own parish Church)...nurture for life and soul through the pure Word and Sacraments, we should not flee from the community of our Fathers and our Folk and seek the Rock without; For as long as this is the case, the Rock is within..." To this, editor Wexelsen added the question: "Might it not be that those who leave the State Church are in danger also of leaving the very Church itself..?"³¹

Meanwhile, a parallel Free Church movement was under way in North Norway, in Tromsø and Balsfjord, under the leadership of a lay-preacher named Johan Bomsta. Congregations were formed at both places in 1856. Here, as elsewhere, the movement followed on the heels of revival. The schoolmaster H. Blom gave a first-hand account in 1859.³² The movement was nurtured by Reformed literature, Nielsen's *Kirkelig Tidende*, and Kierkegaard's Attack on Christendom, which was "read with passion" by many of the most exalted and

³⁰ Ibid., pp. 11-12.

³¹ KF, I, 1857, p. 47.

³² TTLKN, II, 1859, pp. 444-457.

least mature" and served "to kill the last bit of love for the old Church". Luther's statements about the Roman Church (here merely called "the Church") were understood to mean the State Church! Of the revival, Blom wrote that "its essence is subjective sincerity, subjective to the extent that each of Christianity's objective means is pushed into the background, and above all the Visible Church. This is the main point. But from this developed a weakening of faith in Baptism as a means of regeneration, and in the Lord's Supper...and an anguished fear of offending the Institutor by participating in it together with the children of the world". He added that the revivalists had faith in the Word only when it was proclaimed by "a 'living' mouth", i.e. a regenerate person.³³

These Dissenters contacted Lammers, and adopted his Constitution. Lammers and Bomsta exchanged pulpits for a year (1857-8), and Lammers began to publish a monthly Free Church paper, "Reports to and from the Free Apostolic Christian Congregations" (1859-60). This little (16pp.) magazine shows that Lammers was conscious of belonging to a world-wide movement. Despite the fact that none of his fellow-pastors had followed him, he had high hopes. Its pages were filled with enthusiastic reports in 1859, but by May of 1860, there were more than hints of trouble. There was talk of exaggerations, abuses, immorality, exclusions, confusion. Finally, Lammers issued an ultimatum: Either hold to the Constitution

³³ Ibid., p. 446. Blom's statement is in large measure applicable to the entire revival of the 1850's.

or he would have to resign.³⁴ In November, 1860, the catastrophe occurred: Twenty incorrigibles in Skien separated as an Anabaptist congregation. A month later, Lammers concluded the publication of the Reports with an "open Confession from the editor to Skien's Free Apostolic Christian Congregation and its elders".³⁵

It was a sadder but wiser Lammers who tendered his resignation in this document. He now saw that there was "much that is impure" about the Free Church, much "one-sidedness, self-confidence, egotism, superficiality, works-righteousness". He agreed with Wexels that there was much greater probability that the separatists would fall prey to "false spirituality" than that they would be able to establish a "living congregation". The Free Church, while it was true to the letter of Scripture, could not claim to be the "only correct concept of the Church" on the basis of the spirit of Scripture.³⁶ Formation of a Free Church is justifiable only on the basis of "a special call from God". Lammers admitted that in trying to separate the Christian congregation from the decadent Church, he had forgotten that it might thereby be separated from "the Lord's holy catholic Church on earth and God's children in it". With Luther, he now recognized that Enthusiasm might well destroy the Gospel itself.

Lammers bowed to Gisle Johnson's view on Infant Baptism, and confessed to the Augsburg Confession in its entirety.³⁷

³⁴ Meddelelser, II, pp. 78ff.

³⁵ Ibid., December, 1860.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 183.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 188.

"I no longer dare", he wrote, "to assert that infants are not to be baptized, or that Baptism in its proper nature and true essence can be better administered than in Infant Baptism." He attributed his inability to see the truth about Baptism and the Church to the fact that he had approached both questions "from the subjective side".³⁸

Probably the greatest single factor in preventing the spread of separatism and in counteracting Baptist propaganda was the publication in 1857 of Gisle Johnson's Some Words on Infant Baptism.³⁹ One Norwegian Church Historian has called this book "a word at the right time from the right quarter", and has pointed out that it served to consolidate the laity on the side of confessionalism against both Grundtvigianism and separatism.⁴⁰ Johnson regarded the current separatist movement not as "a cleansing of Enthusiasts", but as "a great misfortune for our Church, one of the heaviest blows and most serious penalties the Lord has visited upon us for our sins". It was also a misfortune for the separatists. He could conceivably separate himself, under certain circumstances, but not so long as the Church remained "a true evangelical Lutheran Church, with pure Word and Sacraments".⁴¹

38 Ibid., p. 189.

39 Cf. pp. 132ff above.

40 A. Skrondal, Grundtvig og Noreg, p. 192.

41 G. Johnson, Nogle Ord om Barnedaaben, p. 5n.

(d) Nils Poulsen (1815-1894) and the Separatist Congregation at Eker.

One of the sharpest critics of the State Church was the lay-preacher Nils Poulsen. He founded a Free congregation at Eker in 1858.

His A Look at the Church, published anonymously while he was still a member of the national Church (1858) is as crass and bitter an attack as was written in the 1850's. Taking his starting point in a statement by Heinrich Müller (1631-75) that the Established Church has four idols : The Baptismal font, the Altar, the pulpit, and the confessional, he proceeded to examine "our age's confused concept of the Church; The obligation to accept evil and godless pastors; Compulsory Baptism, confirmation, and confession and absolution", in the light of the practice of the Apostolic Church as revealed in Scripture.¹ He saw the introduction of the State Church under Constantine as the great catastrophe which subjugated the Church to the State and which paved the way for all manner of compulsion, heresy, gross evil, and human ordinances. He raised the question whether the Church's polity was so contrary to Scripture as to render the Church a "synagogue of Satan" and to make separation necessary for any Christian.

The Apostolic Church was militant (Cf. Kierkegaard), the Bride and Body of Christ, a pure virgin, a holy priesthood, the communion of true believers. Its marks were

¹ N. Poulsen, Et Blik paa Kirken, p. 15.

poverty of spirit, obedience to and peace with God, and concern for the salvation of others. The existing Church of Norway defined itself as the congregation of those who were baptized, confessed the Christian Faith, and used the means of grace. It seeks to "unite Christ's Church with the kingdom of Satan", persecutes true Christians, authorizes false doctrine ("the infamous Catechism"), and exercises no discipline. The Early Church elected her clergy, on the basis of the call and anointing of the Holy Spirit; They were persecuted, self-denying, industrious, frugal, and held to the prophetic Word. The 19th century clergy are appointed by the State, are often godless, ambitious and demanding, persecuting instead of persecuted, and interpret Scripture on the basis of "symbols, Confessions, formulas, decretals, rituals, etc.". Poulsen denied that the means of grace are efficacious even when administered by evil and godless men; This was contrary to Scripture, God's holiness and righteousness, and the Church's own ordinances. He advocated an increase in lay-preaching, and denounced the clerical monopoly of preaching as "a Protestant papacy".

Although Baptism in the Name of the Triune God was commanded by the Lord, the Sacrament has been surrounded by the Church with human additions like the questions about renunciation and faith. Poulsen was opposed to Infant Baptism. An infant cannot have faith, nor can anyone else answer for it. Furthermore, he has no actual sin, and so needs no forgiveness, but belongs to the Lord without Baptism. Unless it is to be

regarded as an OPUS OPERATUM, faith and confession must precede Baptism.² Compulsory confirmation, on pain of the loss of civil and ecclesiastical rights, and immediate reception of the Sacrament constituted "one of the most horrible comedies in the world". The confession of the newly-confirmed should at least be tested for a time before they were admitted to the Communion Table.

Otherwise, the Church has made the original Sacramental practice impossible, by "exercising un-Christian compulsion but no Church discipline". "People go to Communion in the State Church almost like cows to the brook to drink."³ Although no one loses his own salvation by participating together with unbelievers, it was no more than right to strive to maintain the purity of the Lord's Table.

Poulsen now turned his attention to confession and absolution. The confessional was unknown to the Early Church. There was, however, a strict Church discipline, administered by the whole congregation. Since that time, the Church has fallen progressively into error, first by restricting the Power of the Keys to the clergy, then by joining confession to the Sacraments, and finally by making it compulsory, with the consequence that it has now become a blasphemous act.⁴ Poulsen finds this intolerable, but neither will he relinquish his right to the Sacrament. Consequently, the State Church

² Ibid., p. 36. In 1877, Poulsen wrote a little book entitled Is the Unbaptized Child in a State of Condemnation, and is it first in Baptism that it becomes a Child of God? His answer was, of course, no.

³ Ibid., pp. 42f.

⁴ Ibid., p. 58.

has forced him to leave its ranks, although he emphasizes the fact that it is from the State Church, and not from the Church as such that he is withdrawing. Poulsen's book was not without pathos, as the following quotation will illustrate:

"The living God desires free sacrifices, voluntary children, who worship Him in spirit and in truth; But the State Church, in which reigns the principle of compulsion, the murder-knife of truth, spirituality, and sincerity, brings forth instead compulsion, hypocrisy, nominal Christians...open ungodliness, fleshly license....The Church calls everyone 'these children of God'...'Good Christians'...and absolves one and all with full assurance...in--O cruel blasphemy!--the Name of the Holy Trinity! ".⁵

Poulsen's book evoked an immediate response from Pastor Th. Dop., Withdrawal from the State Church (Om Udtraedelse af Statskirken, 1858). Dop did not deny the faults of the State Church, but he pointed out that even the Apostolic Church was not perfect. The State Church should not be compared with "a perfection which has never existed on earth".⁶ Although Establishment has often meant that the true Church was compelled to take the form of an ECCLESIOLA, this development is nevertheless according to the will of God. Through the State Church, He has "bound the arm of the world", so that the State no longer persecuted the Church, but came to tolerate the proclamation of Law and Gospel. The State Church has historically exercised great influence for good. No one could tell how long God would continue to will a State Church, but Dop was confident that He still desired it, as "salt" for the world. Dop pointed

⁵ Ibid., pp. 24f.

⁶ Th. Dop., Om Udtraedelse af Statskirken, pp. 7-8.

out that the Reformers did not leave the Roman Church, but were expelled from it. He challenged potential separatists to ask themselves whether they were being true to their calling to witness in the State Church, or whether their proposed course of action might not constitute a violation of God's order.

Dop rejected Poulsen's Biblicism. It is not true, he said, that everything not expressly commanded in Scripture is sinful.⁷ Moreover, he accused Poulsen of failing to distinguish between the use and the abuse of a practice.

Dop defined the Church as "the congregation of all who stand in a spiritual connection with their Master and Lord, who are members of His Body..."⁸ It is essentially invisible, but it is also visible "in so far as it consists of people who have united to confess their faith, hear the Word, and receive the Sacrament publicly". However, since we cannot know its limits, we must define the Visible Church as being those who are baptized into and confess the Christian faith and who use the means of grace.⁹ Dop denied that the State Church taught salvation by Church membership, and preferred to emphasize the fact that Church members have a greater responsibility than the heathen. Poulsen's accusations against the clergy would have been true fifty years earlier, but now they were "a great lie". Dop re-asserted the efficacy of the means of grace independent of the faith of the

7 Ibid., p. 11.

8 Ibid., p. 17.

9 Ibid., p. 18.

administrator. Poulsen's Donatism was a temptation to "first degree separatism", which he defined as the neglect of the public worship "ordered by men according to God's will".¹⁰

Dop used Johnson's argument in defending Infant Baptism. Original and possible actual sin made Baptism necessary. The child can receive grace because he does not oppose it, and he can have "an unconscious longing-faith".¹¹ The provision for the compulsory Baptism of infants was a grievance which had been exaggerated; No believing parent ought to regard this as a burden. He admitted that compulsory confirmation and immediate Communion were wrong, or at least that the confirmands were too young (minimum age: 14), but he defended compulsory instruction. Poulsen's criticism of the lack of Church discipline was justified, especially in the matter of "mass absolution" without confession. He expressed the hope that the Royal Commission on Reform would separate absolution from Holy Communion. The Power of the Keys should be used by clergy and congregation together to keep unworthy guests from the Altar. The participants should "at least be worthy according to human judgement".¹² Yet mass absolution does not prevent the individual Christian from receiving what is rightfully his. The real question is not whether the State Church has faults, but whether these faults hinder or prevent the salvation of the individual.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 32.

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 33ff.

¹² Ibid., p. 45.

Since the Church has the pure Word and Sacraments, and allows freedom to worship, its faults do not prevent salvation. Furthermore, the State Church would soon be reformed.¹³ Dop accused the separatists of the sin of pride and lack of respect for the truth. No one knew where the Free Church would end. His book certainly was not lacking in pungency and even in spleen. He repeatedly charged his opponent with untruthfulness.

Poulsen replied with Factual Information on the Occasion of Catechet Dop's Book (1859). He in turn accused Dop of ignoring the dark sides of the State Church. He could not lull all consciences to sleep with his pleas of "it doesn't matter" and "it's not necessary". This book contained little fresh material apart from a more detailed exposition of his concept of the Ministry. Poulsen admitted that an evil pastor could not deprive Word and Sacraments of their "inner power", but insisted that their "effect" (VIRKSOMHED) in life was "more or less weakened, if not lost".¹⁴ He maintained that the Ministry should be based on the charismatic principle and the Universal Priesthood.¹⁵ A clergyman receives his authority from the call. Ordination presupposes the call, and is an invocation of God's blessing on the work he has been given in the call. Its effect depends upon the content of the prayer and the spiritual condition of the ordinand.¹⁶

In 1861, Poulsen published his Free Church Confession.¹⁷

¹³ Ibid., p. 50

¹⁴ N. Poulsen, Faktiske Oplysninger, p. 29.

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 31-33.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 42.

¹⁷ Omrids af en Frimenigheds Toresbekjendelse.

It was thoroughly Orthodox. Baptism is described not only as an "earnest" but also as "an active cause" of regeneration. Scripture has decreed that all who would receive forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit must be baptized. The one point at which Poulsen departs from orthodox Lutheranism is in making Infant Baptism optional. on the ground that Scripture says nothing about the "time" of Baptism. Still, Infant Baptism was held to be "the most correct". The questions addressed to the infant should be postponed until confirmation and "reception into the congregation".¹⁸ Church discipline was to be carried out "in precise agreement with Matt. 18 and I Cor. 5". The congregation acknowledged the Universal Priesthood, but forbade anyone to assume the public office "unless appointed by God". A probationary period was to follow, to see whether the preacher was "blameless", after which the congregation would transfer to him "their common right".¹⁹ Secular authority was considered good and necessary, and worthy of obedience. There is no authority except of God. From this provision, however, the State Church clergy were expressly excluded, on the question-begging ground that this form of authority was unknown at the time when Romans 13 was written.²⁰

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 8-9.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 15.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 16n.

(f) The Rise of Other Dissenting Bodies in Norway

The Skien, Eker, and North Norway congregations were separatists in the true sense of the Word: They broke away from the State Church from within its ranks. Meanwhile, other Dissenting denominations were active, and here the impulse came from abroad.

The Roman Catholic Church, hindered by the deep-seated Norwegian prejudice against Catholicism, displayed little missionary zeal, confining its activity largely to the foreign element in the population. The Methodists and Baptists met with a more favourable response. Here we need only note that the principal reason for their success was their emphasis upon the idea of a gathered Church. The doctrines of the Church and Baptism were prominent subjects in the early "discussions" and clashes between Methodists and Lutherans.¹ Dissatisfaction with the State Church, particularly with its practice of absolution, was the factor which induced many to join these Dissenting bodies.² True to their tradition, the Baptists stressed a Biblicist approach to ecclesiology which made the New Testament Church the norm for all time, the doctrine of the Universal Priesthood and the charismatic principle, the separation of Church and State, and a congregationalist polity. These were clearly expressed in the "Confession of Faith" adopted by the first Baptist congregation in 1860.³

1 J. Thorkildsen, Den Norske Metodistkirkens Historie, p. 74.

2 C. Eltzholtz, Livsbilleder af Pastor O. P. Petersen, pp. 162ff.

3 Printed in full in P. Stiansen, History of the Baptists in Norway, pp. 82ff.

Scripture is recognized as "the one perfect rule for our Christian faith and practice". The Church is defined as "a union of believing and baptized Christians, who have covenanted to strive to keep all that Christ has commanded, to maintain public worship, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit to choose from among themselves shepherds or overseers and deacons, to administer Baptism and the Lord's Supper, to practice Christian Church discipline...". The Confession asserts that "every such congregation is an independent entity, free in its relation to other Christian churches and acknowledging Christ only as its Head".

The revivalist ecclesiology of these Dissenters appealed to a minority of Norwegian Christians. The leaven of the Dissenters also permeated the Inner Mission movement to a significant degree; Here there was much "first degree separatism" (to use Dop's convenient phrase). Nevertheless, the separatist movement never assumed the proportions feared by many Churchmen in the 1850's. In fact, there were not more than 7000 Dissenters of all kinds in Norway in 1875. The reasons are not difficult to discover. In addition to the schism within the Lammers movement itself, the Dissenters had to contend with sharp opposition from the side of the State Church. Moreover, large-scale attempts were made within the national Church to remedy its faults. The person of Gisle Johnson looms large in this connection. Under his leadership, the Church closed ranks, theologically and

practically. It was a major tragedy that the Reform Movement failed to achieve inner unity or even to produce any significant results. But the existence of a Royal Commission at work on the question of reform in the 1860's was a most effective counter to separatism. Furthermore, the Reform Movement did gradually achieve some results. Meanwhile, the Inner Mission movement, under strong confessional leadership, managed to retain most of the revival within the national Church.

(g) The Establishment of the Lutheran Free Church

The failure of the Reform Movement in 1869 brought deep disappointment and renewed criticism of the State Church in many quarters. It also fostered renewed agitation for separation and led to the foundation of the largest Dissenting body of the 19th century, the Lutheran Free Church.

The chief cause of this schism lay in the unsolved problems of the period, such as disciplinary legislation and the clerical oath. Some Churchmen considered that the legislation which governed the Church was contrary to the Law of Christ; And it was evident that disciplinary practice (especially with regard to the Holy Communion) did not correspond to the legislation. In the words of Gulbrandsen, "this was for decades the most burning issue in our Church".¹ Gisle John-son favoured some revision, but thought that much of the

¹ B. Gulbrandsen, op. cit., p. 258.

ideal demand should be retained, as a stimulus for reform of the Church.² This point of view was not appreciated by some of the clergy; After all, it was they who had to apply the rules as best they could. They were sometimes subjected to all manner of indignity and unpleasantness, including lawsuits and even threats to life and limb, when they ventured to withhold the Sacrament from "unworthy" guests.³ There were repeated requests to the Ministry for Church Affairs for permission to administer the Sacrament without previous absolution, but the Ministry repeatedly denied such requests. The Commission of 1859 opposed the separation of absolution and Holy Communion. Some pastors practiced "conditional" absolution; Vicar Skavland in Trondhjem combined this expedient with "the laying on of two finger-tips"(!)⁴ Others made a conscientious attempt to fulfil the legal requirements to the limit.

One such man was Pastor Andreas Høyer. He was so critical of the State Church and its practice and so zealous in discipline that his Bishop found it necessary to silence him by assigning him to a post as prison chaplain.⁵

Another was Johan Storm Munch (1827-1908), vicar of Horten. He was a mild but manly person with an extremely tender conscience, who passed through a conversion experience after several years in the Ministry. He introduced strict discipline and demanded private confession as prescribed by

² Ibid., pp. 215f.

³ Ibid., pp. 238ff. gives several examples.

⁴ Ibid., p. 251.

⁵ Ibid., pp. 247-51. Cf. his famous sermon for the 23rd Sunday after Trinity, in Kirkelige Vidnesbyrd, Molde, 1872.

law for all communicants. When he failed to get the support of his Bishop and the Ministry for Church Affairs, he resigned his office in 1875. In the same year, he set forth his ecclesiological views in a little book entitled My Relationship to the State Church and its Office.

Munch took two statements of Christ as his starting point: "My kingdom is not of this world", and "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's". It is evident that he has read and digested D'Aubigne's Two Kings and Two Kingdoms. He draws a sharp distinction between the Church and the world and between Church and State. The Communion of Saints is "an invisible community", but it has "visible appearance". The community that gathers about Word and Sacraments must have "an independent form of existence", can be joined to the State but must not be absorbed by or confused with it so that it becomes "the ecclesiastical department of the State, the protector of enforced Christianity". Munch admitted that a pure Church was impossible, but the situation must not arise in which there were "just a little wheat here and there among the tares".⁶ The State Church was originally permitted "for the hardness of their hearts". It is not the correct form, for it makes the full deployment of the charismata impossible. The system was defensible under the absolute monarchy, but the advent of constitutional democracy made things "quite different". The State Church has now become absorbed into the world;

6 J. Munch, Mit Forhold til Statskirken og dens Embede, p. 6.

Because the people were politically capable, they were also given ecclesiastical control.⁷ The result is that all good citizens are regarded as good Christians, and "spiritual self-government" is denied to the individual. Munch also attacked the compulsion of the State Church. It forced the world into hypocrisy, the Christians into silence, and the clergy into acquiescence. Mass compulsory Christianity had "ruined the congregational relationship" and made the free organizations necessary.⁸ In his parish, he had found "two congregations", Inner Mission and the Church, those who supported lay activity and revival, and those who opposed both. Under these conditions, it was impossible to enforce Church discipline.⁹ He had tried, and had failed to gain the support either of the majority in his parish or his superiors. The Ministry for Church Affairs and his Bishop had told him that many of the old regulations were obsolete. His failure had released him from his oath, but at the same time, it had made it necessary for him to resign. Munch proposed the introduction of elective congregations as in Denmark, as the only way to prevent the "bursting" of the State Church. He probably placed considerable hope in this possibility, for he took no action to withdraw from the State Church. Indeed, it is questionable whether he ever did leave it. When the Bishop advised the clergy not to open their pulpits to him, Munch regarded himself as

⁷ Ibid., p. 11.

⁸ Munch reported that whereas Aberdeen had 50 churches for 90,000 people, Christiania had only 8 for the same number.

⁹ Ibid., p. 40.

expelled. But he did not accept a call to the Free Church, and in 1879, he was formally reinstated as a member of the State Church. Nevertheless, he played an important role in the establishment of the Lutheran Free Church.

Munch's book involved him in a lengthy controversy with Heuch in Luthersk Kirketidende. Heuch shared Munch's chagrin over the compulsion, lack of discipline, and Erastianism of the State Church. However, he could not agree that the State Church system was the cause of all the difficulty. Much of it is due to the Church's situation in this world. Munch's "great error" is his failure to recognize this. "What really offends him," wrote Heuch, "is the difference between the Visible Church and its Idea as the Communion of Saints". He was unwilling to abandon the idea of a pure Church.¹⁰

Paul Peter Wettergreen (1835-1889), vicar of Risør, came simultaneously but independently to the same conclusion as Munch, and resigned his office. Wettergreen had been caught up in the Lammers revival as a schoolboy in Skien, and had served for nine years under Schreuder in Zululand. It was said that he was more like Gisle Johnson than any of his other disciples, but he lacked the stability of his tutor (he eventually became an Anabaptist). His views on the Church are contained in a booklet published in 1877, Letter to My Friends on the Occasion of my Withdrawal from the State Church. The arguments are identical with those used

¹⁰ LK, 3R,I, 1875, p. 176.

by Munch, but matters had progressed further by 1877, and Wettergreen was sharper in his criticism on some points. He laid greater stress on the responsibility of the Christian for the visible form of the God's Kingdom (He identified the Church with God's Kingdom¹¹). He was Biblicist in his approach; The Apostolic congregations are "examples for all time".¹² He was more insistent on the possibility of distinguishing between Christian and non-Christian, although he also admitted that some hypocrites would inevitably be included. "If it were entirely impossible to distinguish the false members from the true, all believers would necessarily have to be invisible; But invisible Christians are unknown in the Bible. There the believers are both visible and known."¹³ Wettergreen attacked the law and practice of the State Church with regard to confession and absolution as unScriptural and un-Lutheran. He disapproved of compulsion. Where it obtains, there can be "no congregation in the Biblical sense". On the other hand, where revivalism prevails, both believers and non-believers know who are the Christians.¹⁴ Wettergreen pronounced the Reform Movement a failure, and asserted that, since the "congregation" had been deprived of a voice, the State Church could not be reformed.

Others who left the State Church gave similar reasons

¹¹ This constituted a misinterpretation of the doctrine of the Two Realms. They are correctly distinguished, but God's control of the Kingdom on the Left is not sufficiently emphasized.

¹² P. Wettergreen, Brev til Mine Venner, p. 9.

¹³ Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 14f..

for their action. The lay-preacher Herman Hundere, who became a Free Church pastor (Moss-Horten), withdrew because he "could not receive the Lord's means of grace in the way prescribed in His Holy Word..." To the question whether the Eucharist was rightly administered in the State Church, he replied "yes and no". The State Church possessed the true doctrine of the institution and significance of the Sacrament but its practice was wrong, since the "openly godless" participated.¹⁵ His colleague, Aslak Findreng, listed the following reasons: 1) The control of the Church by the State, contrary to Article XXVIII of the Augsburg Confession; 2) The lack of Church discipline; And 3) the practice of the State Church with regard to Baptism, confirmation, and absolution.¹⁶

The Lutheran Free Church was, however, the product of broader and deeper factors than the conditions which prevailed in the 1870's. The official history of the Free Church quite rightly traces its roots in the 19th century back to Hauge. His revival contained "ecclesiastical dynamite". It introduced a whole series of questions which sooner or later had to be fully discussed: The Universal Priesthood and the charismatic principle, and the discipline, government, and authority of the Church.¹⁷ The Hauge revival was a "necessary pre-condition" for the Free Church, not least in introducing the rudiments of a presbyterian polity. The Moravians, too,

¹⁵ Den norsk evangelisk-luthersk Frikirke Gjennom 75 Aar, p. 99.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 100.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 15. It is significant that the history of the Free Church is here traced back to the Apostolic Church.

had a Free Church tendency. The Johnsonian revival, the Lammers movement, and the Inner Mission all contributed to the rise of the Free Church. The Reform Movement also possessed considerable significance; Indeed, "the Free Church is a consequence and a fruit of the Reform Movement".¹⁸ It was largely from the Rosenianism of the revivals in South Norway that the Free Church derived its spiritual character.¹⁹ Finally, two books must be mentioned: D'Aubigné's celebrated work, and a book by the Danish (former-Grundtvigian) A. G. Rudelbach entitled The Origin and Principle of Evangelical Church Polity.

The first step towards the establishment of the Lutheran Free Church was taken in September, 1875, when the "Fri, Kirkelig Forening" (N.B. with comma: "Free, Churchly Association") was organized at Arendal.²⁰ Its members came to the conclusion that the Eucharist was not being rightly administered in the State Church. The following year, Munch and Wettergreen attended the general assembly of the Scottish Free Church in order to study the presbyterian polity in action. Upon their return, they met with a large number of interested persons, including Nils Poulsen and several lay-preachers, at Havstad. Here three questions were discussed: 1) What are the consequences of the union of Church and State? (Conclusion:

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 41.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 28.

²⁰ The organization of this group was in part inspired by the tension existing between the unfortunate Pastor J. W. C. Dietrichson and his parish at Østre Moland, near Arendal.

The Church was "enslaved"); 2) Can the State Church be reformed? (Conclusion, after long discussion: No); And 3) Which form of polity agrees best with God's Word? (Conclusion: The presbyterian). A committee was appointed to draft a constitution for a Free Church and to request permission from the government to found "elective congregations" as in Denmark.²¹

The result was a document entitled Explanation for the Free Church (Redegjørelse for Arendals og Omegns Frikirkelig Forening)²², published in 1877.²³ Besides outlining a presbyterian polity for the Lutheran Free Church, it contained a review of recent events and the reasons which lay behind the Free Church action.

Mention was made of the following points: The peculiar local situation (the Dietrichson case) which gave "a clearer vision of the Church's need"; The conviction, inspired by certain "tracts" written by State Church theologians, that Scripture contained a definite teaching on Church order; Disappointment over the failure of the Reform Movement; The Munch case and the attitude of the Ministry for Church Affairs toward it.

The Redegjørelse leans heavily upon Munch's reasoning. It begins with the same two proof-texts, and frequently uses his own terminology. It also quotes extensively from D'Aubigné

²¹ "Frikirkelige Møde paa Arendalskanten," LK, 4R, I, 1877, pp. 100-102.

²² Here the comma of the original title is significantly deleted.

²³ Redegjørelse is printed in full in Den norsk evangelisk-luthersk Frikirke Gjennom 75 Aar, pp. 47-84.

and incorporates shorter citations from Höyer, Klaveness, Rudelbach, and Pastor (later Bishop) N. Laache. Its authors disclaimed the name of separatist, on the ground that "we are not separating from the Lutheran Church, but as a Lutheran congregation from State domination..."²⁴ The document denied the State Church any basis in Scripture. Against the argument that the State Church had developed as a form under the will of God, it disputed the "infallibility" of historical development. History can lead to some "strange results", as in the case of the Roman Church. (This was no doubt a salutary reaction against the latent Hegelianism of many State Church theologians). The State Church principle conflicts with Christ's royal office in the Church, and with the nature of the congregation as an association of free individuals. This is supported by a lengthy quotation from D'Aubigné. Luther stressed the distinction between the Two Realms, and advocated a synodal polity with episcopal supervision, but had been forced by historical circumstances to turn to the princes "not in their capacity of secular authorities but as Christian men", and ask them to act as emergency Bishops. The Church had not carried out Luther's plans.

The authors of Redegjøre refused to make withdrawal from the State Church a condition for salvation (it was not a "Babel"). However, they themselves felt compelled to withdraw, because to remain would be to continue to participate in a sin, and because "only in a Free Church can we serve

²⁴ Ibid., p. 59.

God in a congregation organized according to His Word".²⁵ They are confident that the Free Church is the Church of the future; God has often begun a great work in a small way. If they did not act now, "the slaves will resign themselves to their chains". They regarded the fact that they had a "rightly called and ordained" pastor (Wettergreen) as a sign from the Lord to separate.

The "presbyterian order"(pp. 78-84) of the Free Church began with a definition of the congregation which was associational and congregationalist. It is "a gathering...of believing Christians in a definite location, in which God's Word is preached in accordance with the evangelical Lutheran Confession". It was conceded that the inclusion of "those whose hypocrisy and evil is not obvious or evident for men" could not be avoided.²⁶

It is significant that no mention was made of the Sacraments in the definition. Under the next Paragraph, "Confession", the Free Church subscribed to all the Confessions of the Church of Norway, but the omission of any reference to the Sacraments in the first Paragraph indicates a preference for conversion over nurture Christianity?²⁷ One reservation was made with regard to the "disputed" Article VIII of the Augsburg Confession: "... The Sacraments are indeed valid irrespective of the administrator's condition of soul; But if it is the teaching of the Confession that an evil person is useful

²⁵ Ibid., p. 74.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 78.

²⁷ Today, the Free Church emphasizes conversion at the expense of the Sacraments.

for the interpretation of Scripture in the congregation, we must deny this, in deference to the clear testimony of the Word, Ps. 50:16, I. Tim. 3:16, Titus 1:6-9."²⁸

A complete constitution followed. Paragraph I asserted the Lordship of Christ both over the Visible and the Invisible Church, and excluded the civil arm from Church authority. Paragraph II laid down the charismatic principle. Paragraphs III to VIII outlined a complete presbyterian polity, with a three-fold Ministry including Ruling and Teaching Elders and Deacons. Sections II and III dealt with "the duty of the congregation toward its children" and "ritual". Here, several innovations were made. Infant Baptism was of course retained, but the sign of the Cross and the questions addressed to the Godparents were dropped (III-3). Confirmation was restricted to catechization, intercessory prayer, and a blessing (II-2). Confirmands were not admitted to the Sacrament until they had made a confession before the congregational council (I-6). The connection between confession and absolution and Holy Communion was abolished.²⁹ Church discipline was placed in the hands of the pastor and the ruling elders, but the power of excommunication was reserved for the whole congregation (I-5).

The first Free Church congregations were founded in 1877 at Moss, Arendal, Risør, and Halden. Wettergreen accepted the call to Arendal, where he remained until he left the

²⁸ Ibid., p. 78

²⁹ Ibid., pp. 78f.

Free Church in 1888. Munch was not a presbyterian, but retained his episcopalian sympathies. He really preferred "elective congregations" within the State Church, and did not regard himself as a Dissenter, since he shared the doctrinal conviction of the State Church.

The Free Church experienced a steady but slow growth. If it was "the Church of the future" in 1877, that future has not yet arrived. When the first presbyterium was formed in 1878, its membership totalled 392 communicants. At the time the synod was formed in 1892, the figure was 3902. In 1950, the Free Church had 6981 communicant members.³⁰

Reactions to the establishment of the Lutheran Free Church were varied. Ny Luthersk Kirketidende showed considerable sympathy for the enterprise. It was certainly right to take the principles of Church order from Scripture, even though it was unnecessary to imitate every detail. The paper sent its good wishes to the Free Church, and regarded its formation as a "warning" and a "judgement" upon the State Church to hasten the work of reform.³¹

Luthersk Kirketidende was less sympathetic, thought the move unjustified, and predicted disappointment. It pitied the elders who would have to carry out discipline, for they could not judge the heart. The paper reminded its readers that the State Church still possessed the pure means of grace and "essential freedom". But it was not without guilt, and badly in need of reform and discipline. If action were not taken quickly,

³⁰ Ibid., pp. 115, 129.

³¹ NLK, I, 1877, pp. 263-266.

the Free Church movement might prove to be "the beginning of the end" for the State Church.³²

Luthersk Ugeskrift was sharply critical. In a series of articles, it branded the Lutheran Free Church as a "Reformed", "Methodistic", and "Donatist" sect, with a subjective approach and an obsession for defining the limits of the Church.³³ It differs from the Lutheran tradition principally in the "marks of the Visible Church". The Lutheran Free Church wished to make visible the invisible and to anticipate "the glory of the Kingdom" now. The vain desire to draw limits leads to "externalism", the attempt to find the marks of the believer, and hence to false security, Phariseeism, censoriousness, the illusion that one is "through with the world". This attitude prevents the Church from realizing its apologetic task in the midst of the nation. The theology of the new Church could be accused of "externalizing" Christ's Kingdom. Since the Kingdom exists wherever the means of grace are found, the "Kingdom not of this world" can also flourish within the State Church. The Free Church had misapplied the words of Christ when it interpreted them as a denial of the State Church. The paper did not deny either the need for a Church polity or its significance for the progress of the Kingdom, but merely the view that the essence of the Church was dependent upon its polity.³⁴ The real rock of offense for the Lutheran Free Church was not the system of a State

³² LK, 4R, II, 1878, pp. 33-37.

³³ LU, II, 1878, pp. 45ff., 62ff., 78ff.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 82.

Church, but the whole conception of a Visible Church. "It seeks to present something which is not of this world in worldly forms, so that one can point at it and grasp it in one's hands."³⁵

The formation of the Lutheran Free Church re-opened the question of the relation of confession to the Sacrament. In 1877, a petition for permission to administer the Lord's Supper without absolution, signed by 103 pastors (representing 11% of the clergy), was sent to the Ministry for Church Affairs. The Ministry referred the matter to the Theological Faculty; They advised against the proposal, but favoured the substitution of a collective absolution for the existing individual absolution.³⁶ A poll of the Church taken by the Bishops revealed very little desire for any change. Only one Bishop favoured it. Under these circumstances, nothing was done until Jakob Sverdrup's Royal Resolution of 1886.

(h) The Later History of Separatism. The Movement for "Free Communion".

It was precisely during these years that "modern infidelity", as Heuch called it, entered the Norwegian scene. Several of the leading authors attacked the Church and clergy. The radical agrarian leader Søren Jaabaek, with his Farmers' Societies and his influential periodical Folketidende, had long directed his fire at the same targets. His conflict

³⁵ Ibid., p. 83.

³⁶ LU, I, 1877, pp. 229ff.

with the Church reached a climax in 1876 when despite Church discipline and legal defeat, he was re-elected to the Storting for the twelfth consecutive term.¹ For its own reasons, this movement opposed the State Church and its compulsion. The "free-thinker" sought not only the abolition of the State Church, but the abolition of historical Christianity as a whole.

During the 1880's, while the great battle for the faith was raging, new revival movements entered Norway. The result was more Separatism, but because the revival had a non-confessional character, it usually led to "first-degree" separatism. Its adherents remained nominally within the national Church, although they regarded one or another of the independent associations as their true spiritual home.

The new movements of the 1880's were the so-called "Free Mission" (FRIMISJON), a precursor of the Mission Covenant (MISJONSFORBUNDET), The Salvation Army, and the independent "Three-leafed Clover" revival. These went hand-in-hand with the interdenominational tendency prevalent at the time, and were introduced into Norway from the Anglo-Saxon world and from Sweden, where separatist tendencies were strong.

The Free Mission entered Norway from Sweden. It had no institutional or dogmatic bonds. Its ethos was revivalist, pietistic, and charismatic. It was critical of the "Sacrament-

¹ The entire Jaabaek affair revolved about the question of whether Church Discipline was in any sense practicable in Norway. Cf. NTT, XXXIX, 1938, pp. 166ff.

alism" and "ritualism" of the State Church, and had a certain connection with the remnants of the Lammers movement. In 1883, the Swedish-American revivalist Fredrik Fransson, who had worked with Moody, introduced Moody's method (including the "after-meeting") into Christiania. The following year, the movement was organized as The Norwegian Mission Covenant, with the purpose of "uniting the Christian missionary societies and congregations to common action for God's Kingdom..."² In the "Statutes" later adopted, it was stated that the Bible was the "only rule for faith, life, and doctrine" accepted by the association. Creeds and confessions were therefore excluded (though the Apostles' Creed was adopted as a rule of faith in 1920). There was to be "complete freedom of conscience" with regard to such questions as withdrawal from the State Church and the use of Baptism and Holy Communion.³

The Salvation Army, also revivalist, pietistic, non-Sacramental, and non-confessional, began its activity in Christiania in 1887.

The remarkable trio known as the "Three-leafed Clover", Otto Treider, Hans Guldberg, and Johannes Jørgenson, led a similar non-confessional lay revival beginning in the late 1880's. They too were strongly influenced from Sweden. Some idea of the magnitude of their revival can be gained from the fact that it built the famous Calmeyer Street Mission House in Christiania (1890), then the largest house of worship in

2 D. Braendeland, Det Norske Misjonsforbund Gjennom 50 Aar, p. 20.

3 Ibid., p. 22.

Scandinavia, seating 5000 people. This revival strongly emphasized the Universal Priesthood and the charismatic principle, with a considerable flavour of anti-clericalism. It was relatively short-lived, but is chiefly remembered for introducing the unique form of first-degree separatism known as "Free Communion" societies, lay conventicles in which the Lord's Supper was celebrated privately.

The Grundtvigian layman Viggo Ullmann was the first to be prosecuted for celebrating the Holy Communion in his home without the services of an ordained pastor. In 1887, he was placed on trial and convicted, but the sentence was reversed by the Supreme Court on the feeble ground that he had "acted in good faith", i.e. without intending to violate the law.⁴

Ullmann's case was an isolated one. In Sweden, however, Free Communion societies had existed since before mid-century, when Olaus Nielsen had advocated their introduction into Norway. But it was Otto Treider who really inaugurated the Free Communion movement, in the 1880's. Soon there were small groups of this type in several places in East Norway. The ecclesiastical authorities wisely refrained from legal action, but several clergymen launched a campaign against the practice. The article of Gustav Jensen in *Luthersk Kirketidende* was typical: "The Free Communion societies spring from a spirit that has no appreciation of what the Christian Church is and what Christian congregations are...For this spirit, the

⁴ B. Gulbrandsen, op. cit., p. 330.

circle of friends is the main thing..." This movement would make of the Sacrament not a symbol of the unity of the whole Church, but a "party symbol". It displayed a spirit of schism, which seeks "its own" rather than the good of others.⁵ The following year (1890), the Ministry for Church Affairs, upon request from the Drammen clergy, issued a circular to all pastors, in which it reviewed the situation and outlined a course of action.⁶ The advocates of Free Communion stubbornly refused to withdraw from the State Church, and denied having violated any law. They explained that they were merely attempting to follow God's Word and the example of the first Christians. Nevertheless, their actions are in conflict with the Lutheran Confessions and with existing law. The Government Ministry regarded the movement as separatist in character, and accused its adherents of failing to appreciate the significance of the Christian community, the common worship, and the office of the Ministry.⁷ Its actions were clearly actionable. However, the Ministry thought it would be "very regrettable and unfortunate" if legal steps were taken. It urged the clergy to try to persuade the adherents of the movement to return to the Altar of the Church.

In their defence, the Free Communion party rehearsed the old arguments from the controversy over absolution. The Lord's Supper, they said, was intended for the believers.

5 LK, 5R, V, 1889, p. 49.

6 Printed in full in LK, 5 R, VII, 1890, pp. 24-32.

7 Ibid., p. 27.

The practice of the State Church is un-Biblical; Godless clergy pronounce absolution to unworthy guests. In Free Communion, the believers were merely appropriating what was rightfully theirs.⁸

The movement in support of Free Communion declined as the effect of the revival dwindled in the 1890's. As a matter of fact, it never attracted more than a tiny handful of the thousands who were touched by the revival. Only forty people participated in Christiania in 1891.⁹ The Inner Mission disassociated itself from the movement, and it certainly led to no increase in the number of communicants in the country as a whole. This continued to decline during the decade. Indeed, because of its criticism of the State Church, the Free Communion movement actually contributed to the trend. The practice, however, revived strongly among the fjords of West Norway after 1906, when the so-called Westland Brotherhood (led by Ludvig Hope) launched a campaign which removed all legal restrictions upon Free Communion in 1913.

(1) Conclusion

The Separatist movement of the 19th century arose primarily out of the ecclesiological problem. It represents the extreme expression of a point of view which was common to a large section of the Norwegian Church in the period: The associational, revivalist idea of the Church, combined

⁸ B. Gulbrandsen, op. cit., pp. 336f.

⁹ Ibid., p. 338.

with a Pietistic ethos. By Lammers' own admission, its basic error lay in its thoroughly subjective approach to Christian truth. Moreover, the movement emphasized to the exclusion of everything else the Universal Priesthood and the charismatic principle with regard to the Ministry. It was more concerned with conversion than with Christian nurture within the Baptismal Covenant. It strongly asserted the distinction between the Two Realms, and the independence of the Church from the State. It regarded Church discipline as an essential part of the life of the Church. All of this was to some extent characteristic of the Johnsonian Orthodox-Pietist standpoint. But the separatists lacked Johnson's balance, and were more radical. They ignored historical tradition and adopted a thoroughly Biblicist approach to doctrine and order. They tended to assume the secularization of the Kingdom on the Left, and to deny that the State Church was a Christian Church. They carried their conversionist emphasis to its logical conclusion, and attacked Infant Baptism. Their Biblicism led them to insist upon a particular form of Church polity, congregationalism in the case of Lammers and presbyterianism in the case of the Lutheran Free Church. In the opinion of Bloch-Hoell, the question of confession and absolution was merely the "occasion" for the latter schism; The real reason was a desire to realize an idea of the Church and the Ministry different from that of the State Church.

The Separatist movement was neither numerically nor

theologically significant. It boasted no first-rate theologians, and indeed most of the Dissenter clergy possessed little theological training. It made no important contribution to a renewal of the Lutheran doctrine of the Church, for it was motivated by presuppositions which were not fundamentally Lutheran. The movement is interesting chiefly because its standpoint represents an extreme position. It was of value primarily as a stimulus to the thought and life of the national Church.

Bibliography---Separatism

- E. Bernhardt and A. Hardy, ed., Metodistkirken i Norge: 100 Aar, Oslo, 1956.
- N. Bloch-Hoell, Pinsebevegelsen, Oslo, 1956.
- H. Blom "Bidrag til den Tromsøiske Vaekkelses historie", TTLKN, VI, pp. 444-457.
- D. Braendeland, Det Norske Misjonsforbund Gjennom 50 Aar, Oslo, 1934.
- C. Brun, "Den Lammerske Beveagelse", NTT, V, 1904.
- Th. Dop, Om Udtraedelse af Statskirken, Drammen, 1858.
- C. Eltzholtz, Livsbilleder af Pastor O. P. Petersen, Chicago, 1903.
- B. Gulbrandsen, Nattverd i Norsk Kirkeliv, Oslo, 1948.
- M. Hansen, Dagbraekning i Femti-aarene, Kristiania, 1900.
- C. Hjelm, Betaenkning, op. cit., Christiania, 1840.
- F. Ingier, Nogle Ord i Anledning af Praesten Lammers' Afskedsord, Christiania, 1856.
- G. Johnson, Nogle Ord om Barnedaaben, Christiania, 1857.
- Kirkelig Folkeblad
- Kirkelig Tidende
- G. Lammers, Afskedandragende og Afskedsord ved nedlaeggelsen af Embedet, Skien, 1856--cited as Afskedsandragende.
- G. Lammers, Forsvar for den frie apostoliske Christelige Menighed, Skien, 1856--cited as Forsvar.
- G. Lammers, Grundtraek af en fri apostolisk Christelig Menighedsforfatning (vedtagen af endeel af Statskirken Udtraadte Personer), Skien, 1856--cited as Grundtraek.
- G. Lammers, ed. Meddelelser til og fra de frie apostoliske Christelige Menigheder, I-II, 1859-60--cited as Meddelelser.
- Luthersk Kirketidende
- Luthersk Ugeskrift
- J. Munch, Mit Forhold til Statskirken og dens Embede, Horten, 1875.
- Norsk Kirketidende
- Ny Luthersk Kirketidende
- N. Poulsen, Et Blik paa Kirken og de Kirkelige Forholde i den forbigangne og naervaerende Tid, Drammen, 1858--cited as Et Blik paa Kirken.
- N. Poulsen, Faktiske Oplysninger i Anledning af Kateket Dops Skrift om "Udtraedelse af Statskirken", Hougund, 1859--cited as Faktiske Oplysninger.
- N. Poulsen, Omrids af en Frimenigheds Troesbekjendelse, Hougund, 1861.
- K. Rygnestad, Dissentarspursmaalet i Noreg fra 1845 til 1891: Lovgjeving og Administrativ Praksis, Oslo, 1955.
- A. Seierstad, Kyrkjelegt Reformarbeid i Norig i Nittande Hundreaaret, Bergen, 1923.
- A. Seierstad, "Den Norsk Luthersk Frikirke", in NTU, II, pp. 1267f.
- A. Skrondal, "Kristendom og Fritenking i Norsk Aandsliv, 1876-1894" in Norvegia Sacra, 1940, Oslo, 1950, pp. 1-139.

- A. Skrondal, "Litt um den gamle Bondeopposisjonen og Kyrkja", NTT, XXXIX, pp. 166ff.
- R. Solberg, O. Modalsli, and A. Holm, Den Norske Evangelisk Lutherske Frikirke Gjennom 75 Aar, Oslo, 1952.
- P. Stiansen, History of the Baptists in Norway, Chicago, 1933.
- S. Svendsen, Den Lammerske Vekkelse i Skien, Oslo, 1949.
- H. Tandberg, Femti Aars Korstog for Gud og Norge, Oslo, 1937.
- J. Thorkildsen, Den Norske Methodistkirkens Historie, Oslo, 1926.
- P. Wettergreen, Brev til mine Venner i Anledning af min Udtredelse af Statskirken, Risør, 1877--cited as Brev til mine venner.

CONCLUSION

In this section of the thesis, it will be our task to restate in summary form the ecclesiological issues in the Norwegian Church in the 19th century, to examine critically the dogmatic presuppositions of the various positions, and to suggest an approach which might have proved more fruitful for the discussion of the subject.

We have seen that 19th century Norwegian theology failed to produce any renewal of the Lutheran doctrine of the Church. Moreover, we have indicated as the root cause of this failure the nomistic-intellectualist conception of revelation, a point which cannot be emphasized too strongly. This error, a part of the Hellenistic leaven which entered the Christian Church early in its history, was corrected by the Reformers of the 16th century, but re-entered the theology of the Lutheran Church in the Age of Orthodoxy. As a result, it became impossible to maintain the proper dialectic balance between the "objective" and "subjective" aspects of the Christian religion. Such a conception of revelation renders a dialectic standpoint impossible. On these premises, the objective and subjective elements must either be synthesized or left in diametrical opposition to one another. If one side is right, the other side must be wrong, and the charge of heresy must inevitably be raised. Thus, instead of maintaining the dialectic, each side tends to absolutize its own position, and what is intended to be one element in the dialectic becomes a system in

its own right. Thus, the objective and subjective poles of the dialectic issue in doctrines which (in one form or another) may be described as "Objectivism" or "Subjectivism".¹ In general, Objectivism tends to substitute for faith in God Himself faith in another objective entity, which man can possess and over which he disposes. Moreover, it fails to recognize God's self-revelation as a command which places the hearer under obligation to obedience. Subjectivism, on the other hand, fails to take seriously the saving revelation of the sovereign God, and instead regards religious experience and ethical endeavour as supremely important. The effect is substantially heightened when Objectivism is informed by an Idealist philosophy and Subjectivism is linked with Empiricism.

This was the basic PROBLEMSTELLUNG of the Norwegian Church in the 19th century. It had inherited from Orthodoxy an intellectualist conception of revelation and an Objectivist tendency. But it had also inherited from Pietism and the Enlightenment a strong Subjectivist tendency. It was informed by a fundamentally Idealist philosophical tradition. But it attempted to combine this with an Empiricist epistemology, with the result that Subjectivism was in fact increasingly predominant throughout the century.

Some attempts were made to synthesize the objective and subjective aspects. From the objective side, Monrad tried to

¹ We are much indebted to theologians like Emil Brunner and Reidar Hauge for calling attention to the dangers of these two "isms". Cf. E. Brunner, The Divine-Human Encounter, 1944, and R. Hauge, Gudsåpenbaring og Troslydighet, Oslo, 1952.

do so in the best Hegelian manner. But Idealistic Monism is manifestly false, and impossible to reconcile with the dualism implicit in the Biblical faith. For all its emphasis upon the objective, it cannot do justice to the transcendent character of God. Despite its emphasis upon history, it fails to comprehend the condition of historical revelation. Its immanentist synthesis is foreign to the true Christian dialectic. From the subjective side, Gisle Johnson attempted to harmonize the subjective experience with the objective doctrine of the Confessions. Thus, in him the streams of Orthodoxy and Pietism merged. But his epistemological bridge was as artificial as Monrad's, and was doomed to collapse. Indeed, it might be argued that by this device, Johnson in effect abandoned the Empirical method. He strove mightily to achieve a balance between the two poles, but his intellectualist conception of revelation precluded any conscious and determined dialectic approach.

In general, however, the tendency in the Norwegian Church was not so much toward a synthesis as toward a dualism of Objectivism and Subjectivism. It is true that the Lutheran dialectic was in large measure preserved in Norway, but only at the cost of a serious inner division. The unity of the Church was shattered in the 19th century, and there is to this day little evidence that it is being recovered.

The Norwegian Church was, then, divided into two camps. We shall proceed to outline how this division affected the doctrine of the Church.

On the one side were the Objectivists. To their credit, they emphasized the theocentric approach of Divine revelation and the fact that the Church is the product of Divine activity, not of human endeavour. But, on the basis of the intellectualist conception of revelation, they tended to "objectivize" the Church, the means of grace, and the Ministry, and to make of them DINGE-AN-SICH distinct from God and the human members. Revelation was made synonymous with doctrine, and the Church and the Ministry were the Divine institutions by which it was dispensed. They employed the terms "redemptive institution" (FRELSESANSTALT) for the Church, and STAND for the Ministry. They drew a distinction between the two phrases in the Creed, "the holy, Christian Church", and "the Communion of Saints". The means of grace were generally regarded as the constitutive factors in the Church, but this was conceived in a somewhat mechanical manner which sometimes approximated to the Sacramentalism of the Roman Catholic Church. The Confessional qualification that the preaching of the Word was to be "pure" and the administration of the Sacraments "right" was interpreted in intellectualist terms. Orthodox doctrine fulfilled both qualifications. Time and again, (especially against Separatist tendencies), the Objectivists

asserted that the fact that the State Church "possessed" the pure means of grace was a sufficient guarantee of its character as a true Christian Church.

The Subjectivists approached the Church from the "personal" side, emphasized its character as the Communion of Saints, and therefore, like Luther, identified the two phrases in the Creed. They were reluctant to call the Church an institution; Jakob Sverdrup, for example, rejected this designation categorically. Although the Subjectivists attempted to avoid the error of bald associationalism by asserting that the Church was the product of Divine activity, they displayed a definite associational tendency. They regarded the Church and all aspects of its life primarily from the standpoint of its individual members. They were no less the victims of the intellectualist conception of revelation than their opponents, but they were also moralistic and psychologizing in their approach. The Church and the Ministry were to be composed of the right people. They agreed that the means of grace should be administered in strict Orthodoxy, but they added the qualification that a right administration also meant administration to the right people. Thus, they were advocates of a strict Church discipline. Indeed, they tended in Calvinist fashion to elevate discipline to the position of a mark of the Church, alongside the two marks of traditional Lutheranism. Moreover, although the preaching of the Word and the administration

of the Sacraments were recognized as marks, they were not assigned their rightful place as constitutive factors in the Church.

The ecclesiological dualism of the Norwegian Church was illustrated by the use of the terms KIRKE and MENIGHED. Although several theologians correctly denied any theological difference, others drew a sharp distinction between them. The Subjectivists preferred the term MENIGHED, interpreting it to mean the Invisible Church or the conventicle, as opposed to the great mass of nominal Christians who in their view comprised the Visible Church. The Objectivists naturally preferred the word KIRKE, as signifying the institution. They were opposed to the congregational and Pietistic connotations of MENIGHED.

Both sides were strongly attracted to the Scriptural image of the Church as the Body of Christ, but interpreted it in different senses. For Dr. Krogh-Tonning, whose ecclesiological position represents an extreme and isolated Objectivism throughout, it meant the Mystical Body in the Roman Catholic sense. For Monrad, it signified an organism in which Christ was "the indwelling principle". For Wexelsen, it was virtually the extension of the Incarnation. For most Objectivists, however, it simply meant that the Church was an organism with a definite order. The Subjectivists, on the other hand, emphasized the privilege and responsibility of each individual member within the Body.

A few of those who adopted the objective approach flatly rejected the distinction between the Visible and the Invisible Church, but most theologians tried to employ it, although they were faced with considerable difficulties in the process. On the basis of the Idealist distinction between Idea and Reality, some Subjectivists posited a clear dualism, in which the Invisible Church was completely spiritualized, and the Visible Church denied any semblance of the character of a Church. The Objectivists placed the stress upon the Visible Church, the Subjectivists on the Invisible. In general, however, both sides agreed that the one Church is both Visible and Invisible. The analogy of body and soul was frequently used. It was common to regard the Church considered as a believing community as Invisible, but as visible in its character as a confessing community. Its faith and limits are invisible, but its marks are visible. The majority of Norwegian Churchmen were true to the Lutheran tradition at this point. This is one of the encouraging "meeting points" between the two sides, which might have provided a basis for the renewal of the dialectic view. Still, the dialectic of Visible and Invisible, while it contains an important truth about the Church, is difficult to maintain. There is a constant temptation either to attempt a synthesis, or to lapse into dualism. The effort on the part of Subjectivists to make visible the Invisible Church, a genuine Pietist idea, represents in fact an

attempt to establish a false synthesis. Far from contributing to a deeper understanding of the dialectic, it is a negation of its underlying truth that only the Lord knows who are His, and that the Church is hidden in the world. On the other hand, the Invisible Church may be spiritualized either by the adherents of Inner Mission, who adopt the device of "first degree separatism" in order to avoid the mass of nominal Christians, or by advocates of the Folk-Church, who stress the hiddenness of the true Church in order to escape Church discipline. In either case, the result is dualism.

The controversy which raged about the Creedal statement "I believe...in the holy, Christian Church" is closely related, and is in retrospect most significant. As Reidar Hauge has pointed out, faith in the Church cannot be separated from faith in Christ and faith in the Bible.² These three must indeed be carefully distinguished, but they cannot be separated. But this is precisely what occurred in 19th century Norway. The Objectivists demanded faith in the Church as an object apart from faith in Christ and in Scripture. Wexelsen freely admitted that the Grundtvigians "put the Church in Christ's place". The Subjectivists, who regarded the Church as essentially an association of people, naturally could not acknowledge it as an object of faith. Olaus Nielsen denied that a body as mixed as the Church could

2 R. Hauge, op.cit., p. 178.

possibly be the object of faith.

All parties accorded to the Church the attributes of Apostolicity, Catholicity, Unity, and Holiness. But there was wide divergence in the interpretation of these terms.

All agreed that the Apostolicity of the Church rested upon its fidelity to the Apostolic deposit, the Faith once delivered to the saints. But they differed widely on the question of its source and guarantee. If the Patristic idea of Apostolicity rested upon a three-fold appeal,³ the Norwegians of the 19th century tended to isolate the three guarantees. The Johnsonians appealed to Scripture, the Grundtvigians to the Apostolic Creed, and Krogh-Tonning to the Apostolic Succession. However, apart from Krogh-Tonning, on the one hand and the Lutheran Free Church on the other, the Norwegian Church was faithful to the Lutheran tradition in maintaining the complete flexibility of Church order.

Catholicity was generally interpreted in terms of universality. Any Church which "possessed" the Word and Sacraments was accepted as a part of the Church Catholic. The term "Catholic" was laden with Romanist connotations. The Grundtvigian attempt to restore the word to the Creed was opposed by all other parties. But there was also disagreement over the idea of universality. The Grundtvigians asserted that it was the destiny of the Church to embrace all men, an indication perhaps of their unqualified belief in

³ C. H. Turner, "Apostolic Succession" in H. B. Swete, ed., The Early History of the Church and the Ministry, London, 1921, p. 101.

progress, while their opponents preferred to limit universality to "all Christians". The Objectivists applied the category of Catholicity to the Visible Church, and described it as a unity-in-diversity. The Subjectivists applied it rather to the Invisible Church, thus reducing the attribute of Catholicity almost to the status of a truism.

A similar situation existed with regard to the associated attribute of Unity. Following the Augsburg Confession, the Objectivists asserted that Unity is a mark of the Visible Church as well as the Invisible Church, although this does not preclude the existence of local differences. Thus, they regarded outward unity as given within the framework of a kind of branch theory. The Subjectivists maintained that unity is a mark of the Invisible Church. Outward unity is not given, but is a goal toward which we must strive. It cannot, however, be perfectly realized in this world, and must therefore be relegated to the ESCHATON. Their position had the merit of taking seriously the divisive effect of sin and of opposing the Hegelian idea that outward unity would inevitably be realized by a process of historical evolution. Yet the Subjectivists spiritualized the attribute of unity as well as that of Catholicity. This was a corollary of their intellectualist conception of revelation, which made any significant degree of outward unity impossible.⁴ While the Augsburg Confession demanded agreement only in the

⁴ This is clearly illustrated by Johnson's statement that, while the Church ought to seek outward unity, it must never do so "at the expense of truth". Johnson's definition of "truth" included the entire Orthodox system.

preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments, 19th century Confessional Lutheranism extended this to cover the entire Orthodox system. How much outward unity is possible in this world is indeed an open question, but the problem is not to be avoided by a retreat into spiritualism.

There was sharp disagreement over the Holiness of the Church. The Objectivists regarded the Church as holy because it was the dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit and the home of the holy means of grace. The Subjectivists, while not denying this, insisted that the holiness of the Church was in some measure also dependent upon the holiness of its members. In order to protect this holiness, they were, as we have said, advocates of strict Church discipline, although they generally admitted that a completely "pure" Church was an impossibility.

The majority of those who employed the objective approach were thoroughly Lutheran in their reluctance to draw limits to the Church, although the denial in principle of the existence of limits (as Monrad did) is a gross error. But the obsession of the Subjectivists with this problem, while intelligible in the 19th century situation, is nonetheless a Pietist error. They were in fact Calvinists at this point. Despite his repeated denials, Gisle Johnson virtually elevated discipline to the status of a mark of the Church. This is to subvert the Lutheran idea of the primacy of the Gospel over the Law. There is indeed a need for discipline in the Church, but its primary purpose is to induce repentance in

the individual involved, and only secondarily to preserve the holiness of the Body. There was much of the spirit of Jonah among 19th century Norwegian Christians. Moreover, the Subjectivists erred in two further respects. In the first place, by making the ADIAPHORA a criterion for judgment, they not only denied the existence of such "indifferent things" altogether, but also accepted an 18th century norm as binding for all time. And secondly, they sought to apply discipline to hypocrites as well as gross sinners, a manifest impossibility, for by definition hypocrisy cannot be detected. If, as the Lutheran Church maintains, the Power of the Keys is an aspect of the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments, then in the final analysis, the Church can only proclaim Law and Gospel, accept the profession of the individual at face value, and leave the discipline of hypocrites to the Holy Spirit.

Both sides accepted the principle EXTRA ECCLESIAM NULLA SALUS, but differed in its application. The Subjectivists held that it referred only to the Invisible Church, while the Objectivists applied it to the Visible as well, on the ground that only there are the visible means of grace to be found. Gisle Johnson applied the principle to the Invisible Church made visible.

Inevitably, the Objectivists were supporters of "nurture" Christianity, with an emphasis upon the Sacrament of Baptism and the idea of the Baptismal Covenant. Their view of Baptism, however, bordered on the EX OPERE OPERATO, and their

inclusion of all baptized persons in the Church scandalized their opponents. Although with few exceptions they did not deny the efficacy of Infant Baptism or the idea of the Covenant, the Subjectivists nevertheless placed greater emphasis on conversion and the need for a conscious faith. They tended, perhaps unconsciously, to regard Baptism more as a single act than as a continuous covenant relationship.

There was a wide divergence as to the relative importance of Scripture and historical tradition for the doctrine and order of the Church. On the one extreme, Monrad posited a Hegelian and Krogh-Tonning a Roman Catholic historicism. On the other extreme, a small minority exhibited a tendency towards Biblicism, in which even the details of Church order were to be derived from isolated passages of Scripture. The majority, however, steered a middle course. They attempted to maintain the supremacy of Scripture, but differed over the place of tradition. The Objectivists were inclined to assign some dogmatic significance to tradition, but this was categorically denied by the Subjectivists.

The Church of Norway suffered from a similar dualism in its doctrine of the Ministry. There was universal agreement that an office of the Ministry was necessary to the life of the Church. However, departing from the functional view of Luther and the Confessions, Norwegian Churchmen tended to regard the Ministry either as an institution or as an office, the tenure of which was conditioned by the possession of Charismata. The issue was brought sharply into focus

by the influence of revivalism, which emphasized the doctrine of the Universal Priesthood, and introduced lay-preaching on a large scale.

Controversy over the Ministry took several forms. In the first place, there was the question whether the Ministry was instituted by Christ or was derived from the congregation, whether it originated "from above" or arose "from below". With few exceptions, theologians agreed that it was in some sense instituted by Christ. But this gave rise to a further question: Did Christ establish the Ministry in and through the Apostolate, so that it is in some way a continuation of the Apostolate, or was it merely instituted by implication when the Lord bestowed upon the Church the means of grace? The Objectivists, while recognizing the unique character of the Apostolate, regarded the office of the Ministry as a continuation of the "ordinary" aspect of this office. They did not hesitate to speak of a clerical STAND, which by Divine right exercises authority in the Church over the administration of the means of grace. This STAND has been perpetuated, if not by an episcopal succession, then at least by a presbyteral succession. The Power of the Keys rests in the hands of the clergy. The Subjectivists asserted the absolute uniqueness of the Apostolate, rejected the idea of a STAND, and consequently refused to speak in terms of an Apostolic Succession. The Ministry is an office (AMT) in the strict sense, founded by implication when the Lord gave the means of grace and the Charismata, and its incumbents are the

servants of the congregation for the administration of the means of grace. The Power of the Keys properly belongs to the whole congregation.

A further question was the relationship between the office of the Ministry and the Universal Priesthood. The Objectivists drew a sharp distinction between them, reminding their opponents that the Lutheran Ministry was not a priesthood. Except for a few extremists, they did not deny the relevance of the inner call or of the Charismata, but they emphasized the need for the outer call of the Church as well. If ordination is not a Sacrament, it at least confers the office. The Subjectivists, on the other hand, deduced the office of the Ministry, if not from, then at least through the Universal Priesthood. In theory, all members of the Universal Priesthood possess the right to administer the means of grace, but they transfer this right to the pastor in and through the call. While not rejecting the outer call, they laid special emphasis upon the inner call. According to their Charismatic principle, the outer call must follow the presence of the Charismata, and ordination merely ratifies this call. Their identification of the Ministry with the Universal Priesthood laid them open to the charge of Donatism.

On the doctrine of the Ministry as well as the doctrine of the Church, the trend was definitely toward the subjective side throughout the century. Radical Subjectivists, who regarded the congregation (or conventicle) as autonomous,

the Charismata as all-important, and the inner call as sufficient, gradually won ecclesiastical and legal recognition. This trend is illustrated in the controversy over lay-preaching. The Objectivists consistently opposed lay-preaching, on the ground that it was prohibited by Article XIV of the Augsburg Confession, and sought to render it legitimate by the creation of a Diaconate. From the safe distance of Africa, Bishop Schreuder could reject lay-preaching as useless because it lacked the anointing of ordination. Moderate Subjectivists like Gisle Johnson, although they agreed that the practice was irregular, denied that the Article prohibits lay-preaching categorically, and put forth the famous "emergency principle". Lay-preaching was considered justifiable in an emergency such as was alleged to exist in Norway. The radical Subjectivists, however, asserted the free right of laymen to preach wherever the gift is present, and it was in fact this extreme standpoint, the Charismatic principle carried to its logical conclusion, which triumphed in the controversy. Thus, the Church of Norway came to recognize the validity of an independent lay Ministry alongside its clerical Ministry.

The inability of 19th century Norwegian theology to maintain a dialectic approach is further illustrated by the fact that it lacked a proper eschatological perspective. It is no accident that only in our own century, with its rediscovery of the personal, dynamic conception of revelation and its renewed appreciation for the dialectic that this has been

in some measure achieved. Both Subjectivists and Objectivists, operating within an immanent framework, tended to identify the Kingdom of God with the Church. They were therefore a dimension short in their consideration of this important doctrine. Within this framework, each of the two poles contributed one aspect of the truth. The approach of the Objectivists was collectivist and static. They tended complacently to assume that the Kingdom had come in the Church, and consequently to overlook the need for evangelism and Church discipline. The danger here was that the Church would be swallowed up by the world. The Subjectivists were individualistic, and attempted to employ a dynamic approach. But their point of view involved the anthropocentric delusion that it was their task to bring in the Kingdom. This is amply illustrated by their revivalism and moralistic zeal for discipline. Although they exhibited a tendency to spiritualize the Church, they were seldom content to let the matter rest there, but sought rather to make visible the Invisible Church. Whereas the Objectivists sometimes sacrificed life to order, the Subjectivists were willing to abandon order in favour of life. But this PROBLEMSTELLUNG was wrong. As Regin Prenter says, the choice is not between order and Charismatic freedom, but between "an eschatological Church which lives in expectation of a coming Kingdom beyond this world, and a 'historical' Church which represents an attempt to realize the Kingdom of God in this world".⁵ Both sides

5 R. Prenter, Skabelse og Genløsning, København, 1955, p. 566.

failed to recognize the truth implied in Luther's final mark of the Church, that it must always be "under the Cross". Like the individual Christian, the Church is always IN VIA. Neither side fully appreciated the dialectic situation of the Church, in which the Kingdom has indeed come but has not yet been consummated. It is highly significant that Lammers (following Kierkegaard) could accuse the State Church of anticipating the ESCHATON, and that, twenty years later, Bishop Heuch could make the same charge against the Lutheran Free Church.

What was needed, then, in 19th century Norwegian theology was an entirely different conception of revelation which was theocentric in direction, which facilitated a dialectic approach to Christian doctrine in general and the doctrine of the Church in particular, and which would open out the eschatological perspective. This would in effect represent a purge of the leaven both of Orthodoxy and Pietism and a return to Luther and the Augsburg Confession.

In the act of revelation, God gives, not propositions about Himself, but Himself. Moreover, it is inherent in the very idea of revelation that the direction is from God to man. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that neither the Church nor the individual Christian has any life apart from the life of Christ, and that the Church is the result of God's self-revelation, not of human endeavour. But the Church is not only the result of God's activity; Its purpose

is to serve as an instrument for this activity. This is the aspect of the Church which is sometimes called the institutional. This word has, however, a too static connotation; It is too easily interpreted in terms of an autonomous DING-AN-SICH. It is therefore preferable to refer to this aspect as the functional aspect. Such a term is manifestly more true to the understanding of this aspect of the Church's nature which is expressed in Article VII of the Augsburg Confession. The Church comes into being and is sustained and extended by the action of the Holy Spirit in and through the function of the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments. These are the means of grace; But they must not be interpreted as DINGE-AN-SICH any more than the Church itself. They are valid only IN USU. The Word cannot be described as a deposit in a Book, nor can the Sacrament be reserved on the Altar. The Word and the Sacraments are means of grace only as and because the Holy Spirit acts through them. This, then, is one pole of the dialectic in the definition of the Church. It is a function, a means toward an end.

On the other hand, it is also the congregation of saints, the community of believers. As such, it is in one sense an end-in-itself, as well as a means. This personal aspect is neither the starting point of the Church nor the end, for it is neither an autonomous association nor a Christian "mutual admiration society". But there could obviously be no Church without the believers, for faith is

a personal relationship, and we are men, not robots.

There is therefore a profound dialectic in the nature of the Church. It is "a solidarity of persons" among whom and through whom a definite function takes place. The two poles are as inseparable as the chicken and the egg. Without the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments, there would be no community of believers, and without the believers there would be no preaching of the Word and administration of the Sacraments. The Church is both MINISTERIUM and COMMUNIO.

On the basis of the dialectic approach to the Church, it is possible to combine the best insights of both poles of the 19th century antithesis, without false synthesis and without dualism. The Church is the Body of Christ, sustained and ruled by its Divine-human Head, in which the believers serve as His members. It is at one and the same time both Visible and Invisible; Its faith, Spirit, and limits are hidden, but its means of grace and common confession are apparent to the senses. Outside this one Church there is no salvation; This principle applies not only to the Invisible but also to the Visible Church. Only where the Gospel is preached and the Sacraments administered does the Spirit work salvation. We are indeed grafted into Christ in Infant Baptism, but Baptismal grace must be appropriated in faith. But an understanding of the mystery of the Sacrament or an interpretation of Conversion cannot be reduced to an attempt to psychologize the concept of faith. We can only accept the

assertion that, as the Augsburg Confession puts it, "the Holy Spirit worketh faith where and when it pleaseth God". The Church is indeed the Kingdom of Grace on earth, but it is not yet the consummated Kingdom. In any case, it is not the product of human endeavour, but only of God's redemptive activity, although God certainly works through human agents. Moreover, we must be careful not to deny the Lordship of Christ also in the Kingdom of power, the Kingdom on the Left.

A similar dialectic approach must be applied to the Ministry. It is clear that the term "Ministry" can be understood in at least two ways, either as a corpus of persons (a STAND) or as a function, an activity. The 19th century Objectivists interpreted it in the former sense. This was in clear defiance of Luther, who rejected the idea of a STAND in favour of the designation AMT, or office. But even the word "office" has taken on foreign connotations which are out of keeping with its primary functional meaning. The Lutheran doctrine of the Ministry must avoid completely the idea of the STAND and define itself in strictly functional terms.

The Subjectivists of the last century were thoroughly Lutheran in describing the Ministry as a service, or to use Gustav Jensen's excellent phrase "a shepherd service". The Ministry is an activity of the Holy Spirit exercised through certain human instruments. The persons themselves, while necessary for obvious reasons, are of decidedly secondary importance. But, because of the application of the

Charismatic principle, the Subjectivists negated in large measure the idea of the Ministry as a function. They were if anything even more concerned than the Objectivists that the Ministry should be exercised by the right persons. It is entirely Biblical to assert that the Holy Spirit gives to those whom He calls a Charisma, but to identify this with certain subjective qualities is to focus too much attention upon the person. It is also to be remembered that the chief Charismata are faith and love. Moreover, God is a God of order. Because the function of the Ministry always involves a definite pattern of action, some form of order is required. It is a confessional principle of the Lutheran Church that no one is to assume the function of the administration of the means of grace without the outer call of the Church. To circumvent the Church in this regard is in fact to deny the very doctrine of the Universal Priesthood which the Subjectivists claimed to uphold. In retrospect, it seems that the chief reason behind the rejection of the Diaconate by the Subjectivists was human pride.

The functional approach to the Ministry combines the best insights of both poles of the dialectic. The Ministry is not a STAND apart from and superior to the congregation, but neither is it merely a service of the congregation. It is a service of the Word. As an activity of the Holy Spirit, its authority is self-evident, yet it is an authority only of the Word. There is a distinction between the Ministry and the Universal Priesthood. At the same time, the Universal

Priesthood is exercised by all members of the Church in their private lives, and in fact transfers a part of its function to the office of the Ministry. But it does not do so as an autonomous entity. It serves as the instrument of the Spirit in mediating the Divine call to the Ministry.

On the functional view, it is impossible to deny categorically the efficacy of lay-preaching; Nor can it be justified on the basis of an "emergency principle". It is the function and not the form which is all-important. The parallel existence of clerical and lay Ministries constitutes a remarkable illustration of the functional principle and the dialectic view. Yet this is a dialectic maintained by extremes and at the price of inner division. The insistence of the clergy on the idea of the STAND forced their opponents to extreme Charismatism. It ought to be possible to maintain a more moderate dialectic, in which one side sacrifices its false authority in favour of an emphasis upon function, and the other side relinquishes its false autonomy in favour of order.

The dialectic approach is the way to a sound, Lutheran doctrine of the Church and Ministry. It is also the way to achieve the unity which is at present the greatest need of the Norwegian Church.

APPENDIX I

(i) The Adiaphora

Question: How does one abuse the Sabbath?

Sandhed

By unnecessary physical labour, by sinful amusements like dancing, games, comedies, the frequenting of taverns, etc., which are always sinful in themselves and doubly so on the Sabbath.

Udtog

By neglecting or despising God's Word, or by being religious in the hope of earning some merit with God or in order to appear holy, or by undertaking or participating in such things as are sinful in themselves or tend to lead the mind away from God.

(ii) The Descent into Hell

Question: What did Jesus do, when he descended into Hell or the realm of the dead?

Sandhed

Shortly before his resurrection, Christ entered the place of the damned, triumphed over the power of Satan, and preached to the spirits.

Udtog

He revealed the victory which by His death He had won over the devil, and preached the Gospel to the spirits in prison.

(iii) The Church

Sandhed

(a) Wording of the Creed

I believe...in the existence of a holy, catholic, Christian Church, which is the Communion of Saints...

Udtog

I believe...in the holy, catholic Church, the Communion of Saints...

(b) The Church defined (Question 517)

...not a building of wood and stone, but the community of holy persons...

(Question 404)

The congregation of all who are baptized with Christian Baptism and confess the Christian Faith.

(c) Marks of the Church (Question 517)

The pure preaching of the Word and the use of the Sacraments according to Christ's institution.

Sandhed

Udtog

(d)

Question: Which is the
Christian Faith? (Question 406)

Faith in God the Father, the
Son, and the Holy Ghost accor-
ding to the Christian, Apostolic
articles of faith.

(e)

The Holiness of the Church
(Question 408)

The Church is called holy
because it is dedicated to
God in Baptism...and because
the Holy Ghost accomplishes
His work and sanctification
in it, through the holy means
of grace.

(f) Question: Are all saved
who live and die in the
Visible Church? (Q. 521)

No, not the Visible, but
only the invisible Church's
members will be saved.

(g) Question: What is the
difference between the
Visible and the Invisible
Church? (Q. 522)

There is only one Church,
but in the one outward,
visible mass are two dis-
tinct kinds of members,
the hypocrites and the
true Christians.

[Hypocrites] are those
who cry "Lord, Lord",
but do not the Father's
will.

[True Christians] are
those who in faith do
God's will.

[The difference] is not
always obvious to human
eyes. [Therefore the
Church is called invisible
because] its members are
hidden amid the great out-
ward mass of hypocrites.

(h)

Question: What is it to believe
in the holy catholic Church?
(Q. 414)

...that I am convinced that
this Church exists, and that I
...have fellowship with Christ
in it, through its means of
grace...

On earth [it includes] hypo-
crites and true Christians...

(Q. 417) [Hypocrites are]
those who confess Christ with
their mouths, but deny Him in
their hearts and works.

(Q. 418) The true Christians
are the real members of the
Church, who keep their Baptismal
Covenant and thus confess
Christ in their hearts, their
words and their deeds.

(i)

The Communion of Saints
separately discussed:

It is the union of the Saints
or the true Christians in one
Spirit, one faith, one hope,
into one Body whose Head is
Christ.

It is a living communion be-
tween God's holy ones here
and those who are at home
with the Lord...