

The **LUTHERAN** **CLARION**



Lutheran Concerns Association
149 Glenview Drive, New Kensington, PA 15068-4921

January 2017
Volume 9, Issue 3

What do Dr. Kloha's Errors Foretell for the Future of the LCMS?

Dr. Kloha's errors seem to revolve around the narrow field of textual criticism, constructing the best text of the Bible. Those listening to the recent Chicago debate between Dr. Montgomery and Dr. Kloha might ask: "where's the beef?" How does this connect to the daily life of the Church, where forgiveness is to be preached. This was not a mere academic debate over theories and definitions. Being able to condemn sin, speak of doctrine with certainty, and forgive sins with all the authority of Christ are at stake.

In a confessional church all the doctrinal answers are given. We believe they are prerecorded and predetermined in the 1580 Book of Concord. But professional interpreters see the Bible, and therefore Christianity, through a critical lens. In the elevation of academic experts (and their necessary insight), the Bible, by default, is made unclear. Kloha admitted that he cannot talk about the Holy Spirit in explaining the origin of the Bible to his scholarly peers. Why? From the critical perspective of atheistic scholarship, nothing can be assumed, not even God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It must be asked: is a seminary professor who is an expert in his field also under God's Word? Not even the learned Dr. Montgomery is qualified to speak on textual criticism, according to Kloha. But if God's Word does not rule over *all* men, it is not an authority that be can trusted by anyone. Is the Bible and the doctrine derived from it for everyone or do only professors have the right to define and interpret it?

This is a dangerous attitude, since Jesus has given His truth to us only in Scripture. Kloha speaks like liberal theologians (when speaking to them), so he can accrue worldly "credibility" to defend Scripture. But in doing so, the use of Scripture radically changes. Kloha stated in the 2013 Oberursel presentation: "Past use of [1 Cor. 14:34-35] within the LCMS has been in the propositional style exegesis, where the text presents divinely-inspired propositional statements devoid of historical setting, context or pragmatics." This text authorizes only male pastors and speaking in the assembly. In Kloha's (academic) words, this Scripture verse needs to be contextualized by the trained scholar. The simple Christian is seemingly not qualified to understand and apply God's Word. Man and his learning replace God and His truth, when theology becomes a secular, academic endeavor.

Throughout history simple Christians have taken the Spirit's words in Scripture and directly applied them. But in this modern, critical stance, nothing is certain or settled

(even the text itself). Scholars are good at asking questions, but never arrive at any final, definite truth, since their method (including the throughgoing eclecticism of Kloha) elevates their own reasoning above God's words. But the Spirit's words are better than any interpreter. He alone gives the truth and imparts it to man. No priestly seminary mediator is needed to make God's words true or meaningful.

The issue is authority. Is the Bible for all Christians, even those without advanced degrees? Look to the apostles. The Spirit's power is not in worldly learning. Every baptized Christian is given the Spirit and can use God's Word. All pastors' and professors' public teaching must be judged, to see who may be a wolf in sheep's clothing. We should not blindly trust any man, who is not the Lord Jesus Christ. Kloha's academic writings are at odds with the orthodox portrayal of himself to laymen. "As surely as God is faithful, our word to you has not been Yes and No" (2 Cor. 1:18).

The end result of godless approaches to Scripture will be the loss of confidence in Christ. Loss of confidence in His Scripture causes dependence on the methods, feelings, and pragmatics of man. What "works" replaces "thus saith the Lord." All doctrine, and therefore Christ Himself, will become merely ideas to reflect on, but not truths revealed by the Creator to which one should submit. Subtle doctrinal erosions will culminate in the loss of Christ who died for sin.

Scholarly experts can appear orthodox, but do not have the conviction to speak against the world's and the academy's idolatry. Scientific doubt is never certain. This is the opposite of the Christ's Spirit, who is no skeptic. We believe in Christ's teaching with boldness, because He gives us the doctrine which brings His mercy. If pastors and church authorities cannot speak under the authority of Scripture, nothing will be secure, from the law to the Gospel. Lord protect us from this. Amen.

Rev. Phillip Hale

Associate Pastor, Zion Lutheran, Omaha, NE

"The end result of godless approaches to Scripture will be the loss of confidence in Christ."

In this Issue of the **Lutheran Clarion**

What do Dr. Kloha's Errors Foretell for...LCMS?.....	1
Great Debate on the Bible.....	2
Dr. JW Montgomery—Textual and Literary.....	2
Presenters at the 2017 LCA Conference.....	5
Registration for 2017 LCA Conference.....	7

Great Debate on the Bible

On Saturday, October 15, 2016, more than 100 LCMS clergy and laity gathered at Concordia University Chicago to hear John Warwick Montgomery and Jeffrey Kloha, Provost at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, discuss the topic “Textual and Literary Judgments on the Biblical Text—What Happens to the Lutheran Commitment to Scriptural Inerrancy?”

In 2013, Kloha delivered a lecture on changes in methodology and text in the standard edition of the Greek New Testament, Nestle-Aland (NA). I quote the revised version published in *Listening to the Word of God: Exegetical Approaches* (Göttingen, 2016) 169-205. Kloha predicted “constantly changing” editions of NA “for at least the next 25 years.” (178) He wondered whether these changes would affect “the way that we affirm the authority of the text in light of these ongoing revisions.” (169) The laity will eventually notice because the changes “will slowly but inevitably be incorporated in the translations” they read. “Changes in translation do raise issues about the nature of the biblical text and its authority.” (169-70) Lutherans should be concerned because “The reality of the unstable text and the significance this has for the authority of Scripture has, according to [Robert] Preus, been insufficiently and unsatisfactorily resolved by the classic Lutheran dogmatians.” (170-1) Moreover, “given that the Nestle-Aland text will now also have an online version, the text can be changed ‘on the fly’ at any time.” (174)

Kloha spoke differently in Chicago. “My practice is consistent with the textual criticism of the past 150 years,” he stated. “My theology is consistent with Pieper and Chemnitz.” When asked how a text changed “on the fly” by a committee vote was consistent with the doctrine of Scripture’s clarity, Kloha quoted Chemnitz arguing that obscure passages in the Bible do not darken clear passages and muttered impatiently, “It’s not that hard.” Of course, Chemnitz did not know of or discuss a text that could be changed “on the fly” by a self-selected committee.

Montgomery argued that Kloha’s methodology of “Thoroughgoing Eclecticism” was vitiated by subjectivism. When Kloha objected that Luther omitted the Three Heavenly Witnesses in 1 John 5:7-8 from his translation for internal reasons, Montgomery correctly noted that Luther mentioned their absence from Greek manuscripts before discussing other considerations. Kloha devoted considerable time to defending the position of 1 Corinthians 14:34-35, which is found after v. 40 in “several manuscripts, chiefly Western” (Metzger, *Textual Commentary*). This variation led scholars to omit the verses as a non-Pauline addition. Kloha has argued for replacing Mary with Elizabeth as speaker of the *Magnificat* (Luke 1:46), although Elizabeth’s name is found in only “three Old Latin manu-

“The discussion triumphantly affirmed Missouri’s commitment to the Bible.”

scripts...and three patristic writers.” (Metzger) The textual situations seem similar, so explaining why Kloha treats the passages differently would be helpful.

The discussion triumphantly affirmed Missouri’s commitment to the Bible. The questions raised, however, are too important and complex to be resolved in one day. A series of similar events would usefully supplement the LCMS Presidential task force charged with investigating and reporting on the status of Nestle-Aland. [See Dr. Kopff’s article, “Keeping an Eye on the Nestle-Aland Committee,” in the November 2016 issue of the *Clarion* at <http://lutheranclarion.org>.]

E. Christian Kopff

University Lutheran Chapel, Boulder, CO
Rocky Mountain District Lay Delegate to 2016 Convention

Below is Part 1 of Dr. John Warwick Montgomery’s opening statement at the debate on October 15, 2016, at Concordia University Chicago.

Textual and Literary Judgments on the Biblical Text—What Happens to the Lutheran Commitment to Scriptural Inerrancy?¹

Our subject is textual (or lower) criticism and its impact on the formal principle (Holy Scripture) of Lutheran—and all biblical—theology. We are especially concerned with the views of Dr. Jeffrey Kloha of the Concordia Seminary, St. Louis.

Some preliminaries. First, I have never met Dr. Kloha and therefore what I have written and published elsewhere on this topic—and what I shall be presenting today—must not be considered any kind of personal vendetta. I am much impressed by Dr. Kloha’s linguistic knowledge and the laborious analyses of textual minutiae in his doctoral thesis. *Our problem is with the philosophy of textual criticism he espouses and its implications for the doctrine of scriptural inerrancy.*

Secondly, Dr. Kloha has repeatedly said that I “do not understand him”² and that, because my scholarly specialties are not in the area of textual criticism, I have no business critiquing him. I have pointed out that, with a classics major at Cornell University, a master’s degree in New Testament, years of teaching Greek at graduate level, three earned doctorates, and two published translations of previously untranslated Latin works of the 17th century, I am entirely capable of raising issues as to his position; and, far more important, that these issues do not relate to the technicalities of textual criticism but to the *underlying philosophy of textual criticism espoused*. It has been common for atheists such as Richard Dawkins to argue that only someone with his/the unbeliever’s scientific specialty (in Dawkins’ case, evolutionary biology) has a right to criticize the secular position. This is, of course, errant nonsense, since the problems arise, not from the science *per*

Thank You Balance-Concord, Inc.

Balance-Concord, Inc., has been a most faithful contributor to *The Lutheran Clarion* in honor of the sainted **Rev. Raymond Mueller** and the sainted **Rev. Edgar Rehwaldt**, both of whom faithfully served the Synod and Balance-Concord, Inc., for many years.

The *Clarion* is most appreciative of such continued support from Balance-Concord, Inc., as well as the wonderful support of our readers. These contributions make it possible to bring you substantive articles by respected and qualified authors on issues affecting YOUR Synod. Please continue your support. It is both appreciated and needed.

se but from the *philosophy of science* being presented. A generation ago, Dr. Gordon Clark, a distinguished philosophy professor, wrote a little book on textual criticism. In it, he defended his authorship against the charge that he himself was not a textual critic:

Although the present writer is not a textual critic, he will be bold enough to make some small claim to acquaintance with logic. . . . If someone argues, "All insects are quadrupeds, and all quadrupeds are edible, therefore all edibles are insects," the writer can with some degree of assurance declare the syllogism invalid, even though he may not know whether or not a bumble bee is an insect. . . . Similarly, if a textual critic asserts that manuscript *B* has the correct reading for Luke 5:33, and that therefore *B* has the correct reading for Jude 22, we must suggest a course in logic for the critic, even though we might think that *B* was discovered in 1624 and represents the Byzantine text.³

"There is a serious logical problem inherent in the philosophy of thoroughgoing eclecticism. If...one determines a reading by what best fits the internal content of the work as a whole, how did one discover the proper readings constituting that work as a whole?"

Thirdly, this is not a call for an *auto da fé*. It up to Dr. Kloha's academic and theological superiors to deal with the consequences of his views. I am sure that he is a Christian believer who wishes to identify himself with The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. The question is: *How realistic is it that someone with his biblical orientation teach future pastors of that church body?*

Philosophies of Textual Criticism
Let us begin with the most esoteric aspect of the issue—textual criticism *per se*. Here are two standard dictionary definitions of the field: "the study of a literary work that aims to establish the original text"; "the technique of restoring texts as nearly as possible to their original form."

The field is by no means limited to theological materials—classical studies and Shakespearean scholarship are

equally concerned to arrive at the best representations of what authors originally wrote.

The problem is that we do not have—in the case of all ancient and most modern literature—the "autographs" of the authors (their original, hand-written texts). It is therefore necessary to compare copies, together with quotations of the work from other writers, so as to arrive as closely as possible to the authorial originals.

In the case of the Bible, this task is made particularly difficult by the sheer number of copies, as well as numerous citations in sermons, in liturgies, and in the writings of early churchmen. The books now in our New Testament were (rightly) considered of such eternal consequence that they were copied, recopied, and quoted again and again from apostolic times to the invention of printing from movable type in the West (the 15th century). So how should the textual critic proceed?

There are several theories of textual criticism in the biblical field. These differ particularly in the value they place on *internal, literary criteria* for determining the choice of a reading. We shall focus on the theory espoused by Dr. Kloha, following his doctoral mentor J. Keith Elliott, one of the chief advocates of the approach termed *thoroughgoing eclecticism*.⁴ Here is Professor Elliott's statement of that philosophy—in contrast with the classic approaches:

The majority of textual critics grudgingly apply principles of intrinsic probability to text-critical problems only when their preferred external evidence is unhelpful or ambiguous. Thoroughgoing eclecticism, by contrast, operates the other way round, that is to say the initial questions asked when variants need to be resolved are: Which reading is in accord with our author's style or language or theology? and Why and how did the alternative readings occur?⁵

A follower of Professor Elliott, Charles Landon, in his *A Text-Critical Study of the Epistle of Jude* (one of the very few attempts to apply thoroughgoing eclecticism to an entire New Testament book), says in his definition of the eclectic method that the methodology relies "mainly on internal evidence to choose the best reading whenever the MSS divide, [and] places minimal reliance on external evidence."⁶

In practice, this means that, though the thoroughgoing eclectic uses external text evidence (how could he avoid doing so?), the factors that most influence his conclusions

The Lutheran Clarion—Please Help!

We sure could use your help with publishing the *Clarion* on a bi-monthly basis as we strive to present and uphold the truth of God's Holy Word.

If you would like to help with the cost of publishing a solid, confessional Lutheran periodical, there's an enclosed envelope so you can mail your check to Lutheran Concerns Association, 149 Glenview Drive, New Kensington PA 15068 -4921. Do it now. **Thank you!!**



Be Sure to Register!**LCA Conference: January 16, 2017**

Don't forget to register for the 2017 LCA conference at Don Hall's in Fort Wayne, Indiana, on January 16, 2017. The lineup of speakers include:

- Rev. Dr. Daniel L. Gard
- Rev. Paul R. Harris
- Mr. Mark Stern, Esq.
- Rev. Heath R. Curtis
- Dr. Adam S. Francisco
- President Matthew Harrison

A special treat will be brief lunchtime presentations by Concordia Historical Institute Executive Director Rev. Daniel N. Harmelink and Chaplain Craig G. Muehler, Capt., USN (Ret.), director of the Synod's Ministry to the Armed Forces.



Use the registration form on page seven of this issue.

are the internal, literary character and context of the work for which he is trying to establish the best reading of a given passage. Thus the following factors loom large in the eclectic's decision-making:

A variant's conformity to the author's style . . . vocabulary [and use of rhetoric]

A variant's conformity to the author's theology or ideology⁷

Thoroughgoing eclectics have tried to deflect the charge of literary subjectivism that such a philosophy inevitably entails, but without great success. Here is a recent evaluation of that methodology:

While thoroughgoing eclectics insist on the objectivity of their criteria, issues of style, language, use, theology, and other internal considerations are rarely as formally based as they propose or as clear-cut as they need to be. A wholesale diminishing of external evidence ends up placing the entirety of the decision upon the shoulders of the critic, without due consideration of the objective controls provided by external considerations. This represents the primary reason why most NT textual critics have rejected thoroughgoing eclecticism.⁸

The same point is made in a review of Elliott's book, *Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles* (2010):

The claim that thoroughgoing eclecticism is "by no means subjective" (19)—indicating that decisions are not made on a whim but on the basis of clearly established criteria—overlooks the fact that the very selection of any criteria is a subjective enterprise.⁹

Another critic of thoroughgoing eclecticism writes:

What Elliott fails to address, however, is the assumptions upon which a preference for internal criteria depend; for example, in his attention to the variant in Mark 1:4 . . . Elliott accepts "the probability of Markan consistency"; indeed, his entire argument depends in part on the assumption that the author is—or would be—consistent in his usage.¹⁰

The use of stylistic considerations for the determination of text authorship and origins has quite rightly been rejected in other academic fields. Thus, in computer investiga-

tions of texts:

A collection of newspaper articles and an autobiographical account all by the same author may differ considerably in their measurable style. Clearly, then, stylistic analyses are fallible and cannot provide positive identification of a text's authorship or literary heritage.¹¹

Parallels with the "higher criticism" should be evident: (1) reliance on subjective, internal, literary considerations in evaluating texts, and (2) the non-acceptance of such approaches outside the narrow confines of a (generally liberal) theological community. It is especially noteworthy that thoroughgoing eclecticism has never been accepted or employed in the textual criticism of Shakespeare; there, one relies objectively on a best text (e.g. the First Folio). As one writer has put it: "All modern Shakespeare critics are historical/documentary critics."¹²

There is also a serious logical problem inherent in the philosophy of thoroughgoing eclecticism. If, in the final analysis, one determines a reading by what best fits the internal content of the work as a whole, *how did one discover the proper readings constituting that work as a whole?* One needs to have a solid text in order to judge what variant reading best fits it—so one can hardly claim that literary "fit" is the fundamental factor for deciding which given variant is to be chosen. This is of course why the standard critical editions of the Greek New Testament (Nestle-Aland *et al.*) have generally used Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, the Corpus Paulinum, and the earliest major papyri as their starting points.¹³

Dr. John Warwick Montgomery

Professor Emeritus of Law and Humanities, University of Bedfordshire, England

A future issue of the *Clarion* will continue Dr. Montgomery's opening statement. He will next discuss Dr. Kloha's approach to the Biblical texts.

- 1 Professor Emeritus of Law and Humanities, University of Bedfordshire, England; Ph.D. (Chicago), D.Théol. (Strasbourg, France), LL.D. (Cardiff, Wales, U.K.). Member of the California, D.C., Virginia, Washington State and U.S. Supreme Court bars; Barrister-at-Law, England and Wales; Avocat à la Cour, Paris. Websites: www.jwm.christendom.co.uk; www.apologeticsacademy.eu This essay was presented, in debate with Dr. Kloha, at Concordia University Chicago on 15 October 2016.
- 2 In this I am by no means alone. Dr. Kloha said the same thing of Dr. Alvin Schmidt after Dr. Schmidt published a critique of Kloha's position in the 9/1 *Lutheran Clarion* (Sept. 2016): <http://lutheranclarion.org/images/NewsletterSep2016.pdf> Do Dr Kloha's critics not understand him—or do they understand him all too well?

For those who think that I don't know anything about textual criticism and have misrepresented Kloha, here is the evaluation of Dr Paul D. Wegner, director of the PhD/ThM Program at Gateway Seminary, Ontario, CA, and author of the standard text, *A Student's Guide to Textual Criticism of the Bible* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2006): "You are very correct in your critique of Kloha's thorough-going eclecticism view. At the end of the day you have no objective criteria to evaluate the text. At least with manuscripts you have something that actually exists and not just your assumptions about

which reading is favored by internal evidence. . . . Because there is so little evidence on how an author can say things and if they can ever say something new or unique causes a serious problem for the thorough-going eclectic view. You have hit the nail on the head for the problem; is the text a revelatory construction or merely a literary one? If it is revelatory, then we must start with original or as close to original sources as possible" (personal communication, 20 August 2016).

- 3 Gordon H. Clark, *Logical Criticisms of Textual Criticism* (Jefferson, MD: Trinity Foundation, n.d.), pp.10-11.
- 4 We do not commit ourselves to a particular theory; our object here is, rather, to show the great dangers for the doctrine of scriptural inerrancy attendant on the theory espoused by Dr. Kloha, following J. Keith Elliott. A far less subjective approach is that of the "single text model"—the model generally chosen being Codex Sinaiticus: "[A]ncient editors would have had access to much earlier and better manuscripts than modern editors and therefore would have probably been in a better position to make text-critical decisions" (Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, *Fundamentals of New Testament Textual Criticism* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015], p. 95). The latest efforts to arrive at the *Ausgangstext*/source text of the NT on a more solid, objective foundation is the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method (CBGM). Tommy Wasserman's paper on the subject (57/2 *Novum Testamentum* 206-218 [2015]) and his lecture at the 2014 annual meeting of the Society for Biblical Literature (San Diego, CA) apply the method, *inter alia*, to NT material (I John, Jude) for which we have an apparatus by way of the Editio Critica Maior project at the University of Münster; the result is a substantial critique of Bart Ehrman's claim to "orthodox corruption" of NT texts (textual changes due to Christological controversies)—*cf.* below, our note 16.
- 5 J. K. Elliott, *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles* ("Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*" 137; Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 41-42. See also Elliott, "Thoroughgoing Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism," in: Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research* (2d ed.; Leiden: Brill, 2014), pp. 745-79.
- 6 Charles Landon, *A Text-Critical Study of the Epistle of Jude* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), p. 25.
- 7 *Ibid.*, p. 26. Landon approves these criteria—to be found in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993), pp. 163-64. The square brackets are Landon's—who wishes the "rhetorical" style of the author (in his case, Jude's) to be taken into account when evaluating the choice of variant readings to be accepted.
- 8 Porter and Pitts, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-94. Not so incidentally, a milder position, "reasoned eclectic," falls under the same axe: "The same criticisms are applicable to reasoned eclectic as are lodged above against thoroughgoing eclectic. There are not clear criteria regarding the balance between external and internal criteria" (*ibid.*, p. 95). Fascinatingly, Elliott himself provides a commendatory recommendation of the Porter and Pitts book.

To prevent misunderstanding, we are not saying that internal criteria must *never* be employed by the textual critic. As in the "construction" (interpretation/exegesis) of legal documents, internal factors can be taken into account in the limiting case where the text as arrived at objectively makes no sense. This so-called "golden rule" in the construction of legal documents states that "the grammatical and ordinary sense of the words may be modified, so as to avoid . . . ab-

surdity and inconsistency *but no farther* (*Grey v Pearson* [1857], 6 HL Cas 61, Parke B; our italics). *Cf.* Montgomery, *Law and Gospel* [2d ed.; Edmonton, Alberta: Canadian Institute for Law, Theology and Public Policy, 1994], chap. 12, pp. 23-26).

- 9 Juan Hernandez, Jr. (Bethel University): www.academia.edu/6858603/Textual_Criticism_on_the_Basis_of_Thoroughgoing_Principles [accessed 15 September 2016].
- 10 Kim Haines-Eitzen (Cornell University), Review of *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism*, ed. David Alan Black, *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism*, 2003.
- 11 Daniel I. Greenstein, *A Historian's Guide to Computing* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).
- 12 Cf. Peter Alexander (ed.), *Studies in Shakespeare: British Academy Lectures* (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 128-30. There, bibliographer Ronald B. McKerrow notes Dr Samuel Johnson's reliance on the First Folio and his evaluation of Edward Capell's editorial approach to the Shakespeare texts as "gabble." Capell had "the idea that if an editor likes a reading, that reading is (a) good, and (b) attributable to Shakespeare." This uncomfortably reminds us of how Dr. Kloha handles the sacred text (*infra*).
- 13 See above, our note 4. Michael W. Holmes concedes that "the effort to identify the earliest text form to which we have access will always have a certain logical and diachronic priority, inasmuch as it provides a point of reference from which to assess and evaluate later changes and developments in the transmission of the text. As Epp has observed, 'we need a baseline'" (M.W. Holmes, "From 'Initial Text' to 'Original Text'," in Ehrman and Holmes, *op. cit.* [in our note 4 *supra*], p. 643). In his discussion of Codex Sinaiticus, David C. Parker notes that "Myshrall's analysis of approximately three thousand corrections in the Gospels revealed that the vast majority of them are minor—orthographical or just changing word breaks across a line. Only a tiny number are textually significant" (D. C. Parker, "The Majuscule Manuscripts of the New Testament," in Ehrman and Holmes, *op. cit.*, p. 58. And Barbara Aland, after noting the careful transmission of the earliest major papyri (P⁴⁵, P⁴⁶, etc.), states: "If we do not see radical changes in the transmission of a text later on, it follows that we should not see them earlier on either, before the initial text. And thus we should be able to trust the initial text as being fairly close to the original text" (B. Aland, "New Testament Textual Research, Its Methods and Its Goals," in: Stanley E. Porter and Mark J. Boda, *Translating the New Testament: Text, Translation, Theology* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009], p. 24).

Presenters at the 2016 LCA Conference

- **Rev. Paul R. Harris** - *Stand Here Fathers; 'Quit You Like Men' (1 Cor. 16:13) [Order of Creation, Role of Men in Three Estates]*

Rev. Harris was born New York, raised in Michigan, and schooled in the Southwest. He graduated from New Mexico Military Institute and Southwest Texas State University. He was commissioned in 1978 as an officer in the Army Reserve. He attended Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, Indiana, graduating in 1983. Rev. Harris has served parishes in North Zulch, Texas, Detroit, Michigan, Harvey, Louisiana, and Austin, Texas. From 1983-1995

he served as a chaplain in the Army Reserve. He is the author of *Why is Feminism so Hard to Resist?* (1997) and *Me and My Arrows* (2000). *Logia* has published three of his articles and now published two out of three of his letters.

• **Rev. Matthew Harrison**

The Rev. Dr. Matthew C. Harrison has served as president of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod since 2010. Before becoming president, Rev. Harrison served for nine years as the executive director of LCMS World Relief and Human Care. A native of Sioux City, Iowa, Rev. Harrison holds a bachelor's degree in religious studies from Morningside College in Sioux City, Iowa; and M.Div. and STM degrees from Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, Indiana. He has pursued additional graduate study at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, MO, and has received honorary doctorates from Concordia University Ann Arbor, Michigan, and Concordia, Fort Wayne.

• **Rev. Heath R. Curtis** - *Natural Law and Women in Combat*

Rev. Heath R. Curtis is pastor of Trinity and Zion Lutheran Churches in Worden and Carpenter, IL. He also serves the Synod as Coordinator for Stewardship. In his spare time Rev. Curtis is an assistant editor for Gerhard's *Theological Commonplaces* and a Latin instructor for Wittenberg Academy, an online Lutheran school, and Morthland College in West Frankfort, IL.

• **Mark O. Stern, Esq.** - *My People are Destroyed for Lack of Knowledge: The Vital Need for Christian Higher Education*

Mark O. Stern is a partner with Burke, Warren, MacKay & Serritella, P.C., Chicago, Illinois, where he has concentrated in corporate law and finance since 2000. He has also assisted with the firm's active religious organizations practice. Mr. Stern graduated from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign with a B.A. in History in 1993, and received his J.D. from the University of Chicago Law School in 1996. He is admitted to the bar in Illinois. Mr. Stern is Chairman of the Board of Regents of Concordia University Chicago, River Forest. While practicing in Springfield, he was outside counsel to the LCMS Central Illinois District.

• **Rev. Dr. Daniel Lee Gard** - *LCMS Higher Education in the 21st Century*

The Rev. Dr. Daniel Lee Gard serves as the eleventh president of Concordia University Chicago. He previously served as Professor of Exegetical Theology and Dean of the Military Chaplaincy Programs at Concordia Theological Seminary in Fort Wayne, IN, where he had taught since 1989. Dr. Gard also served as Rear Admiral (Lower Half) in the position of Deputy Chief of Chaplains for Reserve Matters in the U.S. Navy. He retired from the Navy Reserve on October 1, 2016, after over 28 years of service. Rev. Gard was awarded his B.A. in history from Carthage College, Kenosha, WI, and his Master of Divinity from Concordia Theological Seminary. He earned both

his M.A. in Hebrew Bible and Ph.D. in Hebrew Bible/Judaica with minors in New Testament and Liturgics from the University of Notre Dame. Ordained by The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod in 1984, Rev. Gard was pastor of St. Paul Lutheran Church in Mishawaka, IN. He has held several administrative positions at the Seminary including Dean of the Graduate School; he is an accomplished author and speaker.

• **Dr. Adam Francisco** - *The Challenge of Islam*

Dr. Adam S. Francisco (DPhil, Oxford University) is currently Professor of History and Chair of the History and Political Thought Department at Concordia University in Irvine, California. He has previously served on the faculties of Concordia Theological Seminary and Concordia College New York and was the Albin Salton Fellow at the Warburg Institute of the University of London. His publications include the books *Martin Luther and Islam* and *Making the Case for Christianity* as well as a variety of journal articles and chapters in other books.

Want to Read the *Clarion* Online?

If you would rather receive a digital version of *The Clarion* in your electronic mailbox, please send your email address to Ginny Valleau at gzolson2000@yahoo.com. We will remove your name from the hard copy mail list and add it to the email list.



**Please Support LCMS Missionary
Rev. Dr. Daniel Jastram in Northern Asia**



Rev. Daniel Jastram, who was Secretary-Treasurer for the Lutheran Concerns Association for many years, is serving the church as a missionary to northern Asia.

He and his wife, Dr. Joan Jastram, are stationed in Tokyo where Rev. Jastram serves as strategic mission planner for Japan, Korea, China, Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan, Vietnam, Thailand and the Philippines. He coordinates theological education opportunities and supervises and evaluates theological educators throughout northern Asia. When needed, Rev. Jastram teaches courses at Japan Lutheran Theological Seminary, Tokyo.

Dr. Jastram was born in Shibata, Japan, and his childhood congregation was Shibata Lutheran Church. He is the son of the Rev. Robert Jastram and Phyllis (nee Matthies), who accepted a call to serve in Japan as a missionary in 1953, and remained there for 23 years. Dr. Jastram has now returned to Japan to serve as a second-generation missionary.

The LCA encourages you to support Dr. Jastram's work for the Lord; write a check payable to:

LCMS (memo line: Jastram Asia Support) and mail to:
The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod
P.O. Box 66861
St. Louis MO 63166-6861

Thank you!

Some of the above information was extracted from www.lcms.org.

LUTHERAN CONCERNS ASSOCIATION ANNUAL CONFERENCE

Monday, January 16, 2017

LCA Conference Presentations

...[T]hy Word is truth. [John 17:17]

All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness... [2 Timothy 3:16-17]

[T]he Word of the Lord endures forever. [1 Peter 1:25]

6:40 a.m. - Registration Opens
7:00 a.m. to 7:45 a.m. - Bible Study led by Rev. Jerome Panzgrau
8:00 a.m. to 8:10 a.m. - Rev. Dr. William Weinrich
8:10 a.m. to 8:20 a.m. - Welcome and Greetings from the LCA (Mr. Walter Dissen, Esq.) and the LCMS Indiana District
8:20 a.m. to 8:50 a.m. - Guest Speaker - Rev. Paul Harris, "Stand Here Fathers; 'Quit You Like Men' (1 Cor. 16:13)" [Order of Creation, Role of Men in Three Estates]
8:50 a.m. to 9:20 a.m. - Questions and Answers
9:20 a.m. to 9:35 a.m. - Break
9:35 a.m. to 10:05 a.m. - Guest Speaker - President Matthew Harrison
10:05 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. - Questions and Answers
10:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. - Guest Speaker - Rev. Heath R. Curtis, "Natural Law and Women in Combat"
11:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. - Questions and Answers
11:30 a.m. to 12:00 noon - Guest Speaker - Mr. Mark O. Stern, Esq., "My People are Destroyed for Lack of Knowledge: The Vital Need for Christian Higher Education"
12:00 noon - 12:10 p.m. - Questions and Answers
12:20 p.m. to 1:20 p.m. - Lunch Served in the Meeting Room
1:20 p.m. to 2:10 p.m. - Guest Speaker - President Daniel Gard, "LCMS Higher Education in the 21st Century"
2:10 p.m. to 3:10 p.m. - Guest Speaker - Dr. Adam Francisco, "The Challenge of Islam"
3:10 p.m. to 3:45 p.m. - Questions and Answers
3:45 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. - Panel Discussion with All Presenters
5:00 p.m. to 5:10 p.m. - Closing Remarks and Closing Prayer
5:30 p.m. - LCA Annual Business Meeting (Paid Members Only)

The conference will be held at Don Hall's Guest House. The rates are **\$89.00** + taxes for a standard room or **\$99.00** + taxes for a king room; rates include two breakfast vouchers/day. When making your reservation, mention that you are attending **THE LUTHERAN CONCERNS ASSOCIATION ANNUAL CONFERENCE, CODE: GROUP 115**. To be guaranteed a room, reservations must be made by December 15, 2016. There is free airport shuttle service from the airport to Don Hall's. At the time of check-in, breakfast and dinner coupons (free breakfast and free dinner) will be given for each room (maximum two of each per room). A free lunch will be served in the meeting room (if registration is postmarked by 12/16/2016). You must make your own Guest House reservation.



REGISTRATION FORM

LCA Annual Conference · January 16, 2017

Don Hall's Guest House · 1313 West Washington Center Road · Fort Wayne, IN 46825

260-489-2524 · 800-348-1999 · www.donhallsguesthouse.com

Annual LCA Membership: \$35.00

I will attend the meeting:

Name _____

Address _____

Phone Number _____

Email Address _____

LCMS District _____

Lunch Preference: Swiss Steak Chicken [If you have special dietary needs, please indicate on your registration form.]

Annual membership fee (\$35) enclosed _____.

Paid LCA member conference registration fee: \$60 if postmarked by 12/16/2016; \$65 if postmarked thereafter. Enclosed _____.

Non-member conference registration fee: \$70 if postmarked by 12/16/2016; \$75 if postmarked thereafter. Enclosed _____.

Half day (AM or PM) registration fee is 50% less of above fee. If lunch is desired, add \$10; must be postmarked by 12/16/2016. Enclosed _____.

Seminary students and personnel will have the registration fee waived, but to receive **lunch for \$10**, registration must be postmarked by 12/16/2016.

I will pay at the door _____.

A free lunch will be served to early registrants who pay the applicable registration fee by 12/16/2016, or at the door.

Make check payable to **LUTHERAN CONCERNS ASSOCIATION**. Please detach this registration form and send to Lutheran Concerns Association · 149 Glenview Drive · New Kensington, PA 15068-4921

The Lutheran Clarion

The official publication of the Lutheran Concerns Association, a non-profit 501(c)(3) organization.
Circulation: 6,000



Published regularly to support issues and causes in The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod which build faithfulness to true Confessional Lutheranism and to be a clear voice of Christian concern against actions and causes which conflict with faithfulness to the One True Faith. LCA consents to readers reproducing articles provided the entire article, plus footnotes, is included in the reproduction and full attribution given.

The address for all matters pertaining to the LCA is:
149 Glenview Drive
New Kensington, PA 15068-4921
Editorial Board: Mr. Walter Dissen (Chairman)
Rev. Jerome Panzigrau

Mrs. Ginny Valleau: Layout, Printing & Mailing
Faithful Lutherans who are members of LCMS congregations are invited to submit articles of approximately 500 words for consideration. Inquiries are welcome. Manuscripts will be edited. Views and judgments expressed in articles are the author's own and do not necessarily represent those of LCA. Please email articles to Mr. Walter Dissen (wdissen@aol.com; 757-436-2049).

The Board of Directors for the LCA:
Mr. Walter Dissen (President)
Mr. Scott L. Diekmann (Vice-President)
Rev. Jerome Panzigrau (Secretary-Treasurer)

Rev. Dr. Kristian Kincaid Mr. Leon L. Rausch
Rev. Dr. Martin Noland Mr. Donald Zehnder
Rev. Andrew Preus
Rev. David Ramirez

<http://www.lutheranclarion.org>

Lutheran Concerns Association
January 2017



Lutheran Concerns Association
149 Glenview Drive
New Kensington, PA 15068-4921