

Seeking an Interpretive Discrimen in the Evangelical Covenant Church

C. JOHN WEBORG

The intent of this paper, voiced from the perspective of a theologian in the Covenant Church, is to focus on early Mission Friends in the context of their history, especially as to how theological formation was taking place. Their Lutheran worship, biblical and catechetical instruction, and engagement with Pietism and Revivalism both clarified and, at the same time, made the formation of an interpretive *discrimen* a complex process. A *discrimen*, borrowing from David Kelsey, is a “configuration of criteria that are in some way organically related,” whereas a norm “is assumed to be absolute or by its very nature to exclude the acceptance of other theological norms.”¹ The first part of this configuration of criteria lies in the Lutheran heritage of the Mission Friends.

THE MISSION FRIENDS LIVED WITH A LUTHERAN MENTALITY BUT NOT A LUTHERAN METHODOLOGY

By mentality I mean appeals to something like an ecclesiastical family identity, a body of writings used at various levels of authority to authorize, defend, explain, or exposit an idea or action, and to use words that nested in a specific tradition. The *Oxford Dictionary of Word Histories* dates the word “mentality” to the seventeenth century and notes its meaning as a “mental process.”² The Mission Friends were not biblicistic, despite Waldenström’s question “Where is it written?” While seeking to be biblical, they employed a range of sources for their thought processes, none more valuable than Luther. This mentality worked itself out in the following three ways.

POLEMICAL

When it became necessary to defend the conventicle in the face

of legal and ecclesiastical sanctions, Luther's words in a "true evangelical order" became a source of legitimation:

Christians should sign their names and meet alone in a house, somewhere to pray, to read, to baptize, to receive the sacrament, and do other Christian works. According to this order, those who do not lead Christian lives could be known, re-proved, corrected, cast out or ex-communicated, according to the rule of Christ (Matthew 18: 15-17). Here one could also solicit benevolent gifts to the poor, according to St. Paul's example (2 Corinthians 9). Here one could set out a brief and neat order for baptism and the sacrament and center everything on the Word, prayer and love.³

When the conventicles began to raise questions of ecclesiastical privileges over issues of liturgical practices, they would invoke Augsburg articles 7, 15, and 28, and article 3 of the Smalcald Articles.⁴ The Mission Synod found Luther's 1523 "Letter to the Bohemians" helpful regarding communion practices thought to be irregular.⁵

In 1910, polemics arose when decisions needed to be made regarding the Congregational question (i.e., relations with the Congregational Church that had had such a persistent interest in linking up with the Mission Friends and whose East Coast congregations often bore the name Congregational in their titles). More pressing was the question of how far relations should go with Chicago Theological Seminary as a place for Mission Friend theological education. One of the decisive voices in opposition was that of Axel Mellander, later dean of North Park Seminary. Two doctrines that separated the two traditions were the Reformed doctrine of predestination and the Reformed doctrines of the means of grace (i.e., sacramental theology). Mellander's Lutheran mentality showed when he said that more differences separated the Mission Friends from the Congregationalists than from Augustana.⁶

PEDAGOGICAL

Luther's Small Catechism went through four printings by Cov-

enant publications beginning in 1913, the last being in 1930. A commentary on the catechism was provided by a prominent pastor, O. W. Carlson, which in no way modifies Luther. Luther's explanation of the creed continues to be printed in current confirmation material and is included in *The Covenant Hymnal: A Worshipbook* (1996).

When the current hymnal was published, it intentionally included a credible representation of the Covenant's Swedish heritage and chorale tradition (how much is enough?). When the section on salvation was laid out, the committee set before itself the Lutheran *ordo salutis* (order of salvation) as represented by David Hollaz (1745). This was to recognize intentionally Luther's explanation of the creed: "By myself I cannot believe the gospel, but the Holy Spirit calls me by the gospel." Theologically, the initiative belongs to the Triune God. With this confessional Lutheran gospel tradition, the Covenant discerns the mediating role of Pietism in knowing the joy of living faith experienced in Jesus Christ. Sequencing the divine work of grace is a theological concern, even in song. The Covenant's hymnal commission attended to this Lutheran mentality and pietistic heritage.

IDENTITY

Lutheran lineage is demonstrated in our teaching document, *Covenant Affirmations*, where Luther and Spener are the only two sources cited. The term *Pietist* is beginning to return in the denomination's journalism. President Gary Walter underscores the marker, and the theological journal, *The Covenant Quarterly*, has published some of the papers of the Pietism Section of the American Society of Church History. The seminary offers course work in Pietism through the teaching and writing of Michelle Clifton-Soderstrom (theology and ethics), who has established contacts with Halle. Philip Anderson (church history) has for years offered courses in Luther and denominational history and has opened each class with a hymn as a way to sing the heritage—or should I say a way to permit the heritage to sing the singer? Such is a way to cultivate and sustain a mentality or, to paraphrase St. Gregory of Nazianzus, a way to give

the heritage wings.

By the term *methodology* I mean confessionalism. In an all too truncated version of the historical process, what the Mission Friends perceived happening in their experience of the Swedish State Church and Augustana was the shifting of faith from the believer to what was believed. The emphasis on the fiduciary trust of the justified sinner was moving toward assent to doctrinal formulations. The confessions, rather than the confessor, became the confession of faith. This, joined to the Waldenströmian atonement controversy, transformed the confessions even more from a proclamation of the gospel to a polemical instrument, since the confessions contain not only statements of faith but *damnamus* clauses (i.e., the provisions “we confess . . . we condemn . . .”). The very articles of the Augsburg Confession that the Mission Friends would cite that authorized latitude seemed also to carry a spirit they found increasingly absent.

When the Mission Friends used the term “formal” in regard to Augustana they were not referring exclusively to liturgical forms. In 1900, the Mission Friends themselves had appointed a committee on ritual that had carefully worked out a relation between form and freedom, word and sacrament.⁷ Formal, in relation to Augustana, also meant that the form of faith (confessionalism) had threatened faith. For the Mission Friends, the Galesburg Rule was a painful reminder and a fruit of confessional rigidity making fellowship in the gospel hardly tenable.

The faith of the confessor also, finally, made for a tense ecclesiological situation, in that a version of the so-called “believers’ church” became a tenet of Mission Friend ecclesiology. Yet the desire for a congregation of regenerate persons living a new life is not the same version as the Anabaptist. The Mission Friends kept infant baptism, confirmation, Holy Communion with the understanding of the real presence, the church year, and the lectionary. Pietism, which gave them birth, did not foster a prototypical morphology of conversion.

The congregation as such is the gospel’s most cogent witness. Lina Sandel’s question “Do you Live?”⁸ or the question “Are you Living yet in Jesus?” are questions considerably different than “When were you saved?” or “Are you saved?” The Mission Friend queries

were rooted in Rosenian piety. But a challenge was on the horizon in the person and work of D. L. Moody.

Philip Anderson has written that “it is certainly a misnomer generally to apply the word ‘revival’ to Scandinavian Lutheranism. In a state church context, the terms ‘awakening’ or ‘renewal’ are better suited, recognizing that the vital ministries of word and sacrament had never ceased, though many places seemed to slumber in their religious life.”⁹ The literature of the Mission Friends often seems to use the terms “awakening” and “revival” or “renewal” interchangeably. But can they be so used, and if so, by whom?

Lutheran pietistic conventicles were not revival meetings in any conventional use of the term: rife with techniques to produce converts, organized with strategic skill, and seeking conscious results. Spener spoke of “outcomes” (a modern word), especially repentance, renewal, and a return to one’s baptismal covenant. He also spoke of groups of people in the German population unmoved by the gospel because of the abysmal spiritual state of the congregation. A renewed congregation meant a public congregational life able to make various publics take notice of its gospel-wrought character. Pietists practiced a sociological apologetic for the gospel. It was this public witness dimension that stands behind the believers’ church tradition among the Mission Friends.

What took place in the conventicles—the spiritual process, if it can be called that—in fostering renewal, Spener called a *Verlassung*. No longer used in the German vocabulary, it refers to something being an occasion or instrumental in a process, *but not a cause*. Conventicles are awakenings, not revivals, not produced, not executed in any way.¹⁰

For the Mission Friends this history—of faith engendered by Word and Sacrament and made alive by the Holy Spirit—encountered a new factor in their interpretive discrimen. It was the dynamic and impressionable power field in the form of revivalism embodied in D. L. Moody, later in E. A. Skogsbergh, the so-called “Swedish Moody.” As Scott Erickson avers, “This inheritance was not expressed in buildings, but rather through a living culture in which conversion was the ‘one thing needful’ and living the Christian life was the objective.”¹¹ The “one thing needful,” as David Gustafson points out, for Moody

was instantaneous conversion, and he quotes Moody to the effect that there is no other kind.¹² Moreover, this could be done in mass meetings and made personal in after-meetings for those seeking conversion. Along with Moody there emerged a specified type of conversion: instantaneous, a contrast to the earlier Pietism. Gustafson also points out that while there was a Covenant connection with Moody, there were many preachers whose Rosenian Lutheran Pietism generated reluctance. Two of Gustafson's sentences are thought provoking. "Certainly, without Moody there would not have been the Free (what became the Evangelical Free Church). However, without Moody there would still have been a Mission Covenant in America, especially in the Rosenian Pietist tradition."¹³ Some of the complexities of that story follow.

The content of this complexity was also present in the more immediate context of the Rosenian Pietism of the Mission Friends. In part, the Augustana heritage, as will be shown, shared the same nuance where some of the same language and theological use prevailed. First, Rosenius:

In baptism He has made especially my person participant in all the merit of Christ. And in an eternal, imperturbable testament He has secured it for me. Even if I have gone away from my treasure and in sin and unbelief, the treasure still has not gone away. Still the covenant remains with God. Shall our unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid (Romans 3). Even if I have fallen the ark has not broken down. I still have my security in the same ark. The ark, baptism, testament and grace of God do not fall and waver because of my falling. But they stand forever.¹⁴

In *A Faithful Guide to Peace with God* Rosenius speaks of the withered branch on the vine still having access to life. "For even though the life-union with Christ has been lost, yet the sacramental union with him has not been lost. Only return to your Savior and to the covenant relationship of your baptism . . . what you have received in your baptism is enough."¹⁵ Similar parallels can be found in Spener. Where this becomes pertinent to both Augustana and the Covenant

Mission Friends, in my view, is the attempt to describe conversion. Is it an instantaneous event as in the Moody tradition or a return to one's baptismal covenant as in the Rosenian tradition?

I begin with Lars P. Esbjörn's pamphlet, "Greetings to The Swedish, Norwegian and Danish Emigrant." Very briefly, it appears as an evangelistic tract, warning that the emigrants' "churchianity," if I may use the term, in the country of origin will not save them from damnation. He then appeals to a possible carelessness regarding the words of Jesus, which, if not heeded, will keep them out of heaven. There follows a warning that anyone who knowingly breaks their baptismal compact cannot be saved without conversion. A passionate plea for the spiritual concern for one's children follows. As Esbjörn moves toward the conclusion he presents an apologetic for their need to be found where the Lutheran faith is confessed, especially where the new birth in baptism and the true Body and Blood of Christ are available.¹⁶ This cursory summary shows a use of the term *conversion* in a fashion incompatible with the Moody tradition, where conversion is the beginning of the Christian life, not its renewal.

Esbjörn is not without similarity among early Mission Friends, if I read some of them correctly. Carl Hanson taught theology at North Park from 1905 to 1911 and said:

Here I find another instance where the old Lutheran theology struck the right note in discriminating between conversion and regeneration. How often did I emphasize in North Park, many years ago, that complete regeneration is a gradual process which reaches its completion in the resurrection of the body and of course, I believed in infant baptism, by which the regenerating forces are brought into *historical* contact with the human being.¹⁷

Years later a veteran Covenant pastor, Herbert Palmquist, lecturing on "Covenant Perspectives" in 1954, said that "a baptized backslider should never be told that he needs to be born again. That was the same as being baptized again. But he should be told to arise, be converted, come home as the prodigal to the father to whom he belonged."¹⁸ Conversion in these instances is a return to baptism, is it not?

Theological and pastoral dynamics became more complex as matters move from personal situations to public settings. A brief excerpt from 1876 in Nebraska:

In the spiritual awakening, which began in 1876 and continued for a few years, certain acts took place which before had not been practiced among the Christians who were the children of the early revivals in our fatherland. Various strange means were used to stir up the feelings of the people, and to bring those who manifested any sorrow over their sins to the mourners' bench, with exultant prayers. . . . It was most trying for the pastors who before had preached the Word of God on the Field to remain as spectators only to something new with which they were not in accord. That they remained as spectators was caused mostly by the fact that the revivals seemed to be dependent on certain leaders. No one expected any results except from them.¹⁹

Lutheran Rosenian Pietism had engaged revivalism in the nascent life of the Mission Friends.

In Chicago, the same tension was palpable between J. M. Sanngren and E. A. Skogsbergh. As the story goes, once the Swedish Moody landed in Chicago from Sweden the cry was "Skogsbergh," "Skogsbergh." He represented more the Waldenström-Moody line of development; Sanngren represented more the Rosenian. The tensions described in Nebraska are repeated in Chicago. Relying on the Holy Spirit to work through the Word, Sanngren had never thought of giving an account of how many persons had been saved during his ministry. As he said, "I felt absolutely defeated because there was something in the tone of the question (he had been asked for an accounting of results) which in my soul sounded as if he had said, 'If you cannot show forth something like this, your ministry is of no worth, and we can now get the kind of workers whose labor is crowned with rich blessings.'" Sanngren acknowledged both disappointment and self-examination. But I am struck by his words, "we can *now* get the kind of workers whose labor is crowned with blessings."²⁰

That transition came in Skogsbergh. What was said in Nebraska

now is virtually repeated: “The revival (not awakening) was now dependent on certain leaders.” No one expected any results without them. Add to this the new dimension of counting converts. The late Eric Hawkinson, dean of North Park Seminary (1949-1961), commented, “People of a more inward and reflective piety were meeting people of a more objective and aggressive piety.”²¹

Hawkinson further reflected on this more “objective and aggressive piety” when he pointed out a Mission Friend reserve toward an overly aggressive pursuit of converts and numbers. Instead, he thought that the fellowship should be attractive enough to draw persons to the hearing of the gospel, and that this hospitality would commend itself in such a fashion as to enable people to reconsider their lives. Hawkinson identified the two types of piety by name: Rosenian and Reformed. Employing terms already used, he referred to the former as reflective and inward, the latter as more aggressive and objective, acquiring a more intellectual character and institutional drive. Not wanting to make distinction into an absolute separation, what he wanted to identify was a more aggressive type of preaching, evangelistic outreach, and institutional appropriation of the evangelistic ministry.²²

Once again a reference to Augustana calls for comparative reflection. In 1928-1929, *The Augustana Quarterly* published four articles in succession on four types of piety in the Augustana Synod: “The Churchly Evangelical Type,” “The Fundamentalist,” “Schartaism,” and “The Rosenian Type.” The churchly evangelical type article could have been written by any number of Mission Friends and is reminiscent of Esbjörn’s letter. The author, P. A. Mattson, shows quite clear knowledge of the language of Pietism (e.g., *ecclesiolae in ecclesia* [the small church within the big church], which, Mattson says, rightly understood is Augustana’s position via the concept of the invisible church of believing souls). The essay stresses a theology of awakening to new life in Christ.²³

The fundamentalist type is difficult to decipher. While there are the fundamentals that are confessed in the creeds, Emil Berquist argues that contact with the Reformed has caused Lutherans to imbibe some of their spirit. The Reformed, Berquist argues, are the great practicalists and, he avers, have much to teach Lutherans in

that area. At this point, the term *Reformed*, as the article progresses, becomes more identified with American Fundamentalism than any form of the Reformed confessional traditions. Berquist sees additional linkages to the fundamentalist opposition to modern scientific research and publication, especially William Bell Riley. Berquist even identifies Lutheran fundamentalism with “the good old Bible doctrine: the illumination of the Holy Spirit and being at *heart a mystic*.”²⁴

I digress briefly to recall Hawkinson’s use of the term “Reformed” as a contrast to Rosenian piety, the Reformed being more “aggressive and objective.” To Berquist, the Reformed were more practical. Something is being conveyed here beyond the Rosenian willingness to wait upon the Triune God through Word and Sacrament, whether in the intimacy of the conventicle with its song, prayer, reading, and brotherly/sisterly engagement (Are you living yet in Jesus?), or in public worship. Hawkinson and Berquist are taking note of issues of strategy, human agency, planning, and a gradual institutionalizing of the evangelistic ministry; thus those two streams of the one thing needful (new life in Christ) are present to/and with each other, namely, Lutheran Rosenian Pietism and American Revivalism and its later kin, Evangelicalism. But the issue of conversion will never reach a tidy definition.²⁵

In sum, first, for the Covenant Church to develop an interpretive discrimen, the Lutheran mentality of its ancestors directs us to the way they thought in company with the tradition that bore them. Article I of the Augsburg Confession begins with the confession of the Nicene Faith. The Preamble of the Covenant Constitution speaks of our adherence to the Apostles’ and Nicene Creeds. Another way of saying this is to think *with* the church before there is any thought to the contrary. There is a depth of meaning that both Augustana and the Covenant begin with a patristic rootage and say so. *Covenant Affirmations* affirms not only our Reformation and Evangelical heritages but also our Apostolic (i.e., scripture) and Catholic heritages.²⁶ It is here that Mission Friends have a gift that has not always been appreciated, namely, that with stress placed on the believer’s faith, sufficient stress has not fallen on the *faith believed* (i.e., the credal forms that have carried and sustained the believer). Karl Olsson criticized P. P. Waldenström for his anti-confessionalism, say-

ing that the consequent vulnerabilities are akin to a turtle without a shell.²⁷

Second, the discrimen needs to include a renewed commitment to the congregation as a sociological apologetic for the gospel.²⁸ This, I would argue, is Spenerian Pietism's conceptual contribution to what became in part the believers' church idea for the Mission Friends. While Spener did not advocate the idea of separation because of a fear of schism, his concern was congregational renewal, *not* individual spiritual renewal as an end in itself. The recent work of Dorteia Wendelbourg of Humboldt University, Berlin, makes this point.²⁹ The earlier work of Dale Brown demonstrates Spener's keen sense of the sociological implication of the gospel. In conventicles servants and masters sat at the same table. There was also prophetic opposition to changing the water between the baptism of the children of the peasants and nobility.³⁰ This congregation was a new work, powerful in its offense and attractiveness. But the sociology was the apologetic. An interpretive discrimen for Covenant people requires a theological sociology of baptism to match their mission-mindedness.

Finally, in relation to Covenant freedom—a cliché almost—a recovery of a Lutheran mentality would do well to link Luther's treatise on Christian Freedom³¹ and Article 7 of the Augsburg Confession on Justification. If "a Christian is a perfectly free lord of all subject to none" and "a perfectly dutiful servant of all subject to all," Covenant people need to exegete that proposition with great skill. With our work in compassion, mercy, and justice, to say nothing of the planting of a plethora of ethnic congregations, Luther becomes our teacher. But, I think, unless we are prepared for the radical gospel of justification by grace alone through faith alone we may not even want to start.

ENDNOTES

1. David Kelsey, *The Uses of Scripture in Recent Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 160. My first written exploration of the Lutheran dimension of Covenant identity appeared in Weborg, "Lutherans in Their Theology: Luther and the Evangelical Covenant Church," *Explore* (Spring 1986): 23-30, where some of these same themes are studied and sources explored.

2. Glynnis Chantrell, *The Oxford Dictionary of Word Histories* (Oxford Uni-

versity Press, 2002), 324.

3. Ulrich S. Leopold, ed., *Luther's Works: Liturgy and Hymns* 53 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965), 63f. Daniel R. Anderson, "Missional DNA of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America." This same citation appears in a current Lutheran work: Craig Van Gelder, ed., *The Missional Church and Denominations: Helping Congregations Develop a Missional Identity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2008), 194f., which seeks to relate Lutheran sources to contemporary missional adaptations.

4. All references to the Lutheran Confessions, whether by specific title or number, can be found in Theodore G. Tappert, tr. and ed., in collaboration with Jaroslav Pelikan, Robert H. Fischer, Arthur C. Prepkorn, *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959). See C. J. Nyvall, *Travel Memories From America*, trans. E. Gustav Johnson (Chicago: Covenant Press, 1959), 118.

5. See Philip J. Anderson, "The Läsare and Luther, or What Does Värmland Have to Do with Wittenberg?" *The Covenant Quarterly* (November, 1983): 41.

6. Axel Mellander, *Betankande Kongregationalist—Fragen* (Chicago: Trycket a Missionären Tryckeri, 1900), 23. Karl Olsson translated this document for me and gave me an extended interpretation.

7. "Guide to Christian Worship," published as an introduction to *A Book of Worship for Covenant Churches* (Chicago: Covenant Press, 1964), xiii-xxvi. The Swedish title was *Förslag till Kristlig gudstjänstordning* and the responsible group was Förbundets ritualkommittee.

8. See the hymn by this title in *The Song Goes On* (Chicago: Covenant Publications, 1990), 149. Dale Brown reports Erich Beyreuther's research in Francke's life and work, which turns up a similar way of inquiring about one's relationship with God in Christ: "We do not ask, 'Are you converted? When were you converted?' But we ask, 'What does Christ mean to you? What have you experienced personally with God? Is Christ necessary to you in your daily life? And it is, to be certain, very likely that one does not know at all the period of time.'" Francke himself did have a spiritual crisis. *Understanding Pietism*, (Grantham, PA: Brethren in Christ Historical Society, 1978), 78. August Tholuck of Halle (1799-1877), a participant in the German Awakening movement with demonstrated links to Pietism, had the practice, according to Karl Barth, of visiting the rooms of his students to ask, "Brother, how are things in your heart?" *Evangelical Theology: An Introduction*, trans. Grover Foley (New York, Chicago and San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart and Winston: 1963), 83. Alistar E. McGrath, *Iustia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification From 1500 to the Present Day* (Cambridge: University Press, paperback ed., 1993), 53, points out that Pietism is often charged with shifting the fulcrum of the *ordo salutis* from forensic justification to the regeneration of individuals, a process that had al-

ready begun in later Lutheran Orthodoxy. In his discussion McGrath at times conflates Methodist themes with Pietist themes, e.g., 52.

9. Philip J. Anderson, "The Lively Exchange of Religious Ideals between the United States and Sweden during the Nineteenth Century," in *American Religious Influences in Sweden*, ed. Scott Erickson (Svenska kyrkans forskningsråd, 1996), 34.

10. Philip Jakob Spener, *Pia Desideria*, hzgb. von Kurt Aland. *Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter and Co., 1955). My conversation with Professor Hans Mollenhauer of North Park College took place on 11 March 1983, regarding the term *Verlassung*. The English text of the *Pia Desideria*, trans. and with intro., Theodore Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964) can be found on 82.

11. Scott Erickson, "The Anatomy of Immigrant Hymnody: Faith Communicated in the Swedish Covenant Church," in Edith L. Blumhofer and Mark A. Noll, eds., *Singing the Lord's Song in a Strange Land: Hymnody in the History of North American Protestantism* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2004), 130.

12. David M. Gustafson, *D. L. Moody and Swedes: Shaping Evangelical Identity among Swedish Mission Friends 1867-1899* (Linköping, Sweden: Linköping University, 2008), 10.

13. *Ibid.*, 318.

14. C. O. Rosenius, *Day by Day with God: Daily Devotions* 6, trans. Maj-Len Hendriksson (Bombay: Gospel Literature Service, 1979), chap. 16, 44f.

15. C. O. Rosenius, *A Faithful Guide to Peace with God* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1923), 162f. The title page indicates that these are excerpts from the writings of Rosenius; the preface indicates the source as *Pietisten*. The one responsible for the reproduction was George Taylor Rygh, assisted by Bishop N. J. Laache.

16. John Norton, trans. and intro., "Immigrant Pastor Lars Paul Esbjörn's 1851 Recruiting Pamphlet: Greetings to the Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish Emigrant," *Swedish-American Historical Quarterly* (October 2009): 169-73.

17. Karl Olsson, "Sweetness and Light: Carl Hanson as Teacher," *Covenant Quarterly* (May, 1966): 16-17.

18. Cited in Glen Wiberg, "The Sacrament of Holy Baptism," *Covenant Quarterly* (August, 1964): 30, fn. 21.

19. J. O. Lonnquist, "Nebraska Conference" in *Covenant Memories: Golden Jubilee, Swedish Mission Covenant Church, 1885-1935* (Chicago: Covenant Book Concern, n.d.), 434.

20. Eric Hawkinson, *Images in Covenant Beginnings* (Chicago: Covenant Press, 1968), 152ff., italics mine.

21. *Ibid.*, 152.

22. Ibid., 41f.

23. P. A. Mattson, "Types of Piety in the Augustana Synod: The Churchly Evangelical Type," *Augustana Quarterly* (January 1929): 45-52.

24. C. Emil Berquist, "Types of Piety in the Augustana Synod: The Fundamentalist," *Augustana Quarterly* (January 1929): 125-34.

25. *Son of the People: The Autobiography of C. V. Bowman*, trans. Eric G. Hawkinson and ed. Lois Bowman Michaelson (Chicago: Covenant Publications, n.d.), illustrates the difficulty of pinpointing conversion: is it instantaneous, as Moody argued, or an extended work of grace, as in the case of Rosenian Pietism? Bowman reports that after coming to America, experiencing a job loss and loss of funds, he found another job. At his workbench he reports the words came with power: "The just shall live by faith" (Romans 1:17). He received courage and a spiritual fog was lifted, but he experienced a reticence in being able to confess his witness. Discouragement set in. The powerful words of Romans nevertheless did a work of grace, rooted no doubt in Luther's catechism that he learned in Sweden.

In 1885, under the preaching of F. M. Johnson, the Chicago congregation experienced a revival where Bowman experienced a renewal, near his seventeenth birthday, when he "made a decision about the relationship of his soul to the savior." He had become a new creation.

Query: Is the 1885 event his "conversion," or is the event at the work bench his conversion with the 1885 event its fruit? Or renewal? Note that the event at the work bench was an experience of the Word with power. Of course we need not answer this query, other than not to program God. Conversion is not necessarily dateable and subject to no pattern (116).

In volume 2 (bound in one volume in the English edition) Bowman makes an observation about revival meetings held in Minneapolis by Fay B. Mills. As for the count of 1,800 converts, Bowman cautions that the All-Seeing might not have discovered any such number. He avers that counting numbers is hazardous and such efforts should be left to the Lord (172).

26. *Covenant Affirmations* (Chicago: Covenant Publications, rev. ed. 2005), 1-6.

27. Karl A. Olsson, "The Covenant Constitution and Its History," *Narhex* (February 1983), 9.

28. I first developed this concept in detailed argumentation in Weborg, "Pietism: Theology in Service of Living Toward God," in *The Variety of American Evangelicalism*, ed. Donald W. Dayton and Robert K. Johnston (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1991), 161-83.

29. Dorthea Wendelbourg, "Luther on Monasticism," in *The Pastoral Luther: Essays on Martin Luther's Practical Theology*, ed. Timothy Wengert (Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans Company, 2009), 344f., fn. 65. A

very perceptive essay by A. G. Roeber shows that individualized piety was a problem in Lutheranism long before the advent of Pietism, and he cogently argues that the “state and conventional opposition of ‘pietism’ against ‘dead orthodoxy’ fundamentally misrepresents the deeper crisis surrounding popular piety’s relationship to both the pastoral office and public worship,” 143. See Roeber, “Official and Nonofficial Piety and Ritual in Early Lutheranism,” *Concordia Theological Monthly* (April 1999): 119-43.

30. Dale Brown, 42f.

31. Harold J. Grimm, ed., *Luther’s Works: Career of the Reformer* v. 31 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1957), 344.