

Kowalke, Erwin Ernest

An Evaluation of our Present Ministerial  
Training Course

EFR 895

AN EVALUATION OF OUR PRESENT MINISTERIAL TRAINING COURSE

\*\*\*\*\*

Erwin Ernest Kowalke

WELS 36th Biennial Convention  
Wisconsin Lutheran High School  
August 8-17, 1961

dictions lies in the nature and in the activity of his and our God: "But the God of all grace, who hath called us unto his eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered a while, make you perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle you" (verse 10). It is the God of all grace, our Creator, Preserver, Redeemer, and Sanctifier, who is also the Creator of all reality. Indeed, it often goes beyond our puny minds to see the great unity in diversity. Yet surely our failure in this regard is not sufficient warrant for us to seek ultimate truth elsewhere and to cease to do what Scripture itself so constantly does, cling to the simple facts and realities of heaven and earth, of God and man, of time and eternity, of matter and spirit. To follow any other course than that set by Scripture itself, by our Lord and His Apostle, is no longer to let God be God and to deny that He and He alone is the ultimate Creator of all reality.

"But these are mere allegations," we will hear; "Where is the certainty?" To this demand there is no other answer than the one given by Pastor Gausewitz in the essay already referred to. There he wrote (page 12):

"I cannot demonstrate the truth that the Bible is God's Word by the use of human arguments. Repentance (*metanoia*) is the only way that leads to the conviction that the Bible is the Word of God. Only he who through the doctrine of the Bible has come to faith in Jesus Christ will accept also that particular doctrine of the Bible that it is the Word of God. Here the remark of our Lord Jesus comes into its own: 'If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God.' A believer will say with Peter: 'We believe and are sure that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' And: 'Thou hast the words of eternal life.' Here the answer applies which Jesus gave Peter on a similar occasion: 'Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.' Likewise the words of Christ in His high-priestly prayer: 'I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world. . . . Now they have known that all things whatsoever thou hast given me are of thee. For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me.'

"All I can do about this truth, as well as about all Bible truths unto salvation, is to testify as the Bible itself testifies, adding: 'He that believeth not shall be damned.'"

If someone is going to insist that we must approach the fact of our certainty that the Bible is the Word of God from a point outside of this life, which the very God we are speaking of has created, then we are making the same impossible demand that that old Greek philosopher made as his condition for being able to move the whole world. "Give me," he cried, "a place to stand, a place to use a fulcrum, and then by virtue of the physical laws of the mechanics of the lever I'll be able to lift the world." Alas, he never got outside this world, neither has it yet fortunately been lifted, as the old Greek dreamt it could be. For our existence is one entirely *inside* the creation of our God, and it is from this position, letting God be God, that we view all things. Among them, and very prominently there, is the reality that the Eternal God has from time to time given His Holy Spirit to servants of His own choosing, endowing, directing, leading, and guiding them, so that the written words which they have left us out of their ministry in the Church of God and which have been collected for us in the books of the Bible, are the revelation of the heart and mind of our God Himself, His holy Word.

Frederic E. Blume

## AN EVALUATION OF OUR PRESENT MINISTERIAL TRAINING COURSE

This topic was suggested by the Conference of Presidents, who asked me to prepare an essay to be presented to the convention of the Synod which meets in Milwaukee in August. Two reasons were given for attaching importance to this subject at a time when the Synod is wrestling with more critical matters. The first reason was that one may expect that greater and more insistent demands will be heard that educational requirements be eased in order to produce more candidates for the ministry. The second reason was that an evaluation of our preparatory course might help the Synod to take proper action in regard to the proposal to establish a practical seminary, a proposal that is now in the hands of a committee. Both reasons are closely connected with the present shortage of ministers in our Synod.

An evaluation of our present training course for ministers ought to consider the history of the development of that course. If we are to form a right judgment of the course, we should know the circumstances in which it was instituted, how it was developed, and just why this course was chosen and no other possible course.

For the first 13 years after the Synod was founded, it had no training course of its own. The first pastors of the Wisconsin Synod, Muehlhaeuser, Weinmann, and Wrede, were trainees of the Langenberger Mission Society in Germany. Under the direction of that Society young men received two or three years of intensive training and were then sent either to Africa or to North America to do mission work. Other well-known members of our Synod who were products of the Langenberger Society were John Bading, Philip Koehler, G. Reim, and Gausewitz. This was in early years the chief source of ministers in our Synod. From the Pilger Mission School near Basel in Switzerland there came 16 ministers who served in the Minnesota Synod, among them being Kuhn, Frey, and C. J. Albrecht. Jacob Conrad is an example of still another source of ministers. He was the first of a considerable number of men who received the only kind of training that the Wisconsin Synod was prepared to give. He had had some formal schooling, and when he offered himself as a candidate for the ministry, he was assigned to the care of Pastor Wrede who was to coach him in the fundamentals of theology. After a short period of such instruction he was licensed to preach under the supervision of experienced pastors. After two years of such supervised ministerial work, he and a few other men who received similar training were ordained and assigned to congregations. A third source of pastors during the first 15 years of the Synod was the Gettysburg Seminary of the Pennsylvania Synod, where Henry Sieker, later a very active member of the Synod, received his training. But the German Mission Societies, especially the Langenberger Society, were by far the most fruitful and most reliable sources of ministers for our Synod.

During the first 15 years the most pressing problem the infant Synod had to face was always the shortage of pastors. We bewail the shortage of pastors in our day, but our problems in that regard are puny compared with those of the founders of the Synod. At the Synod meetings from 1859 to 1863 almost the only subject of discussion and the object of most of the resolutions had to do with the supply of pastors. During the 1860 convention the pastors had five separate meetings attended by pastors only, in which they interviewed applicants for the ministry, heard trial sermons, conducted examinations, arranged for further instruction, and licensed those who were found ready to deliver an acceptable sermon. Some of the resolutions passed in the conventions from 1859 to 1862 show the complete dependence of the Synod on help from the outside in the matter of supplying the congregations with pastors and teachers. In one such resolution the Synod of 1859 voted thanks to the Langenberger Society and also to the Berlin Society for supplying pastors, and in the same resolution solicited further help from

them. The Pennsylvania Synod also received an official vote of thanks. The Pennsylvania Synod had been surprisingly generous in sending men and money. In 1860 this synod offered to send either a man to serve in Wisconsin as traveling missionary, or if a man could not be sent, then to contribute \$500 annually for mission work in Wisconsin. In return for the help that the German societies were sending they expected and received official reports on the work that their men were doing and on the disposition of the money that was being sent. We were dependent on these societies even for the books that our pastors required. We were not affiliated with any society or organization in Germany, but we were certainly dependent on them.

From the very beginning the Synod realized that if it were to survive and grow, it must create the means of educating young men as pastors and teachers. Each year it became more obvious that the Synod could not have healthy growth or even exist if it continued to depend on outside sources for its pastors. This is not said in disparagement of the men or of the societies from which they came. Some extremely able and excellent missionaries came from those societies, such as Bading, Koehler, Gausewitz, Kuhn, and Albrecht; or Pastor J. Heyer, the founder of the Minnesota Synod, who was a gift of the Pennsylvania Synod. These men possessed exactly the gifts and the spirit that were needed in a country that was still largely wilderness and that had nothing to offer them but the opportunity for hard work and self-sacrifice. Men with university training in Germany, with the notable exception of Hoenecke, had trouble accommodating themselves to these primitive circumstances. A few of those men who were privately tutored by pastors in the field turned out well, but this was the most unsatisfactory source of pastors that the Synod was making use of. Among the immigrants there were many people who had been misfits at home and who saw in the ministry or in teaching in this country an opportunity to make a living if they could get a position without too much trouble. It was to persons of this kind that President Bading referred in his report to the Synod in 1863 when he spoke of "dishonest fellows who wore a mask of hypocrisy and piety and tried to slip into the ministry and become pastors in our congregations." There were instances where such men were successful in slipping into the ministry, and too late the Synod discovered what their record had been in Germany. There are records of several pastors who created a scandal by their dishonesty or by excessive drinking and had to be expelled from the Synod.

Another reason why Germany was an unsatisfactory source of pastors was that so many applicants came from United Church circles in Germany and were never able wholly to shake off their indifferentism toward doctrine. Even a man like Fachtmann turned out to be at heart a unionist. He was eminently fitted by nature for mission work in a wild country. He was a tireless traveler, was a lover of nature, and must have had a winning personality. He traveled, mostly on foot, from Milwaukee to Fond du Lac, Menasha, Hortonville, on to La Crosse, Rochester and St. Paul, founding congregations and gathering scattered Lutherans into groups that later became congregations. He succeeded Father Heyer as head of the Minnesota Synod, but in the end became an agitator for unionistic practice, and when disciplined by the Synod, proved to be both untruthful and doctrinally confused. He was expelled from the Synod by unanimous vote in 1870, an inglorious end for a man who had done some really valuable work.

Many similar examples can be cited of failure or of scandal or confusion caused by the necessity of admitting to the ministry people who had been insufficiently trained. One young man who had had a brief preparation for ministerial work declared when he began his ministry that it was his intention to be neutral in his presentation of doctrine and would wait and see what preference might develop in the congregation, whether Lutheran, or Reformed, or Methodist; as for him, he was not particular and didn't think it made much difference. Another declared to the Synod that he was leaving to take

over an Episcopal congregation because he had long admired the unity that existed in Episcopalian and Catholic congregations; they didn't wrangle about doctrine. In New Holstein, near Manitowoc, the chairman of the board of trustees of the Lutheran congregation was a Catholic who was active in building Lutheran churches in the neighborhood because he believed that religion was good for the country. There was one pastor who regularly administered communion in two of his congregations according to the Lutheran liturgy, and in a third congregation according to the Reformed style. He also used whichever catechism the people preferred. He finally, reluctantly, changed his practice. It is not surprising that the Synod acquired a reputation of being unionistically inclined and had to defend itself, especially against Missouri against the charge of unionism. The president of the Synod in his 1859 report referred to a published article in a Lutheran periodical that called our Synod's pastors mere gangsters who take God's word into their mouths but hate instruction. Since the Synod was accepting men and money from United Church quarters in Germany and from eastern synods in this country, it was naturally thought to be of one heart and mind with those synods. The German societies began to wonder, too, why our Synod did not affiliate with the liberal General Synod.

The leaders in our Synod were faithful Lutherans and wanted sincerely to develop a genuine Lutheran synod in this country; and the dependence on Germany and the East was becoming increasingly embarrassing. Confessional clarity and anti-unionistic sentiment were not so far developed that they prevented the Synod from sending President Bading to Germany to collect money for a training school; but the sentiment was present in sufficient strength to enable the Synod to make a clean confessional statement a little later, even though it did mean the forfeiture of a considerable part of the money that had been pledged in Germany. At every annual meeting the Synod struggled with the problem of shortage of pastors and repeatedly the establishment of a school of their own was mentioned; and by 1859 the strengthening of the confessional stand and the clear need of a well-trained pastorate, especially the latter reason, made the Synod receptive to any plan that might lead to possession of a reliable source of pastors.

For a time, in 1859, it appeared that a solution of the Synod's problem had presented itself. There were in Illinois at that time three synods that were affiliated with the General Synod. Under the leadership of a Professor Reynolds, who had been president of Capitol University in Columbus, Ohio, and who was a conservative Lutheran, these synods were planning a seminary to be located in Springfield, Illinois, under the name of Illinois University. This was to be a joint seminary serving the English-speaking congregations in Illinois, the Swedes and Norwegian groups in Illinois and Iowa, and the Germans in Wisconsin. The plan advanced to the point where our Synod decided to submit it to all our congregations for their opinion and vote; but language difficulties, inability to agree on professors, and conflicting confessional positions caused the Wisconsin Synod pastors to withdraw from the scheme. The Illinois groups went ahead with the plan and erected buildings, but finally liquidated the institution and sold the buildings to the Missouri Synod for its new practical Concordia Seminary. It should be mentioned that the school in spite of its name, Illinois University, never had any connection with the State University of Illinois.

Three years after this false start in cooperation with the synods in Illinois our Synod decided to found its own training school for pastors, and after considerable animated debate over the relative merits of small towns and large cities as locations of a theological school, Watertown was chosen by a vote of 45 for Watertown and 19 for Milwaukee. In introducing the project President Bading had said, "We dare not and cannot depend on Germany. If we wait until we are rich before founding such a school, nothing will ever come of it. Let us call out to those across the sea: We are making a start. I am sure they will help us." The decision was now

made and action followed immediately. President Bading was commissioned to go to Germany to collect money there for a seminary building. Both the Langenberger Society and the Gustav Adolf Society had previously held out promises of help if we decided to build our own school. Pastor Moldehnke, who was at that time the itinerant missionary of the Synod, was at once selected as theological professor. After a move to reconsider the vote to start in Watertown had been voted down, it was decided on June 3, 1863, that Moldehnke should move to Watertown and start the seminary immediately, together with a college, with whatever students might present themselves. A piece of land was to be acquired and a building erected, while the money was to be sought in Germany, in the East of this country, from the city of Watertown, and among the congregations that made up the Synod. It is not quite certain in what year the seminary was started, whether in the same year in which the decision was reached, or in September of the year following, in 1864. Instruction was begun in a rented house which served as living quarters for Professor Moldehnke and his family, as a home for the two students, and as classroom. Before the year was out one of the two students had to be dropped because of bad conduct, and the seminary continued with one professor and one student.

This picture of our training school, one professor and one student in a rented house, accurately reflects the financial condition of our little Synod in 1864. Land was purchased and a substantial building erected at a cost of about \$10,000 within a year after the school was started. Our Synod could not possibly have started on such a scale without the generous contributions of the Christians in the old country and the \$2,000 contribution of the city of Watertown. The synodical report of 1864 lists an item of \$23.08 collected for the seminary in that year. In 1866 there remained a debt of only \$1400 on the property, but even that small amount seems to have been too heavy a burden for the Synod.

The Synod now had a building and a professor and was accepting candidates for theological study as well as applicants for pretheological college studies and students who sought only a general high-school education in that division of the school that was called the academy. Professor Moldehnke, and later Professor Hoenecke, both capable of giving instruction in theological branches, were found in our own midst. But to find a capable English professor to take over the college and academy work was a different matter. On the recommendation of Professor Moldehnke, Adam Martin of Hartwick Seminary in New York was called to preside over the college department and the academy. President Martin attacked his assignment with enthusiasm. Since the institution was to be theological seminary, college, academy, and teacher-training school all in one, it seemed logical for him to advertise the school in the newspaper as Wisconsin University and declare it to be ready to prepare students for any career and to grant any degrees that colleges generally were empowered to confer upon their graduates.

The name Wisconsin University that President Martin used in his first newspaper advertisements was not official, but it did express the ambitious program that was in the president's mind and perhaps in the minds of other members of the Synod. It is possible that these men were sincere in their ambition to make this a university "second to none in the land," as one of the advertisements declared. This was the land of unlimited opportunity, and other universities had grown great from small beginnings; so why shouldn't this one? The name Northwestern University, which became official, still expressed the same fond hope that the school might some day really grow to be a university. Not until 1909 did it finally settle down to Northwestern College.

It wasn't only the name of the school that expressed confusion, unrealistic thinking, erratic policies and fantastic promises. Consider the course of studies outlined for seminary students in the first years. The schedule for Monday included dogmatics, church history, exegesis, German, geometry,

and Latin in the morning; New Testament Greek, symbolical books, Hebrew, English, general history, and geography in the afternoon. That was one day's schedule. The day's work began at 7:30 A.M. and continued till 5:30 or 6:00 with an hour's intermission. This went on for five days a week. On Friday evening the academic week closed with a formal disputation on some historical or ethical subject. Saturday was set aside for labor in the house or in the garden. There was no summer vacation at first, although Professor Moldehnke did say that he believed the students should have a vacation so that they might do private reading, meditate on the previous year's work, or travel, if possible. Professor Moldehnke was the sole professor, who while mastering this schedule also served as pastor of St. Mark's during Bading's absence in Europe on the collecting tour. He also went off on collecting tours for the school both in neighboring congregations and in the East, all of which leads one to believe that the schedule merely listed the subjects that might be pursued in a seminary, and that it was not a list of things done and things to do.

In his 1866 report to the Synod the president reported that the institution had not come into existence by way of quiet development, but rather by a sudden violent thrust, and for that reason would require more than the usual amount of love and patience on the part of the Synod and of patience and blessing from Heaven if it was to achieve its goal. That was a wise and understanding remark. So far as the seminary part of the institution was concerned the goal was clear, although the schedule was unrealistic. But the College was starting off in a direction that did not and could not serve the purpose of training pastors and teachers for our German-speaking congregations. For one thing the medium of instruction was English, while the students who wished to become ministers understood little English and were to use only German in the ministry among people who had but recently immigrated from Germany. President Martin's purpose was to build a college on the order of all the other colleges that were springing up in the land. His scholarship plan, his curriculum, his advertising all pointed in that direction. Moreover he was in sympathy with the liberalists in confessional matters and when he saw that the trend in the Synod was toward confessional firmness, he resigned. Martin had come from Hamilton College in New York; his successor was likewise a graduate of a liberal college. He was Lewis Thompson, a graduate of Beloit, a fine personality and a gentlemanly scholar, but with little understanding of the needs of the German Lutheran immigrants whose needs he was to supply. Martin and Thompson both devoted themselves to building an institution after the model of an American college, and our German immigrants could not have been less interested in giving up their few dollars for another American college.

As a result, the College had a long list of students with English and Irish names who were getting a high-school education in the Synod's academy. But the school was getting very meager support from the Synod, either in terms of money or in terms of students enrolled for service in the Church. The ministerial course was so poorly supplied with students in the lower grades that negotiations were carried on for several years with persons in Germany with a view to establishing a proseminary of our Synod on German soil. This was not just a notion that a few people had; it was a serious proposal. There was much correspondence back and forth, possible locations had been selected, assurance given that a suitable building could be secured, and promises given of support from individuals and societies in Germany. For a time it looked as though the school were ready to start. People who were mainly interested in our ministerial course in Watertown were convinced that the Germans in our congregations would never give up their sons for the long course of study needed for the ministry. They saw no hope elsewhere than in young people in Germany, who would get their preparatory schooling in the homeland and then come over here for their seminary studies. Our people, they said, were too much interested in getting ahead financially to give up their sons for the ministry. The plan fortunately fell through,

possibly because our negotiators laid down the condition that the school should be conducted on sound Lutheran principles. If that plan had gone through, it would have delayed the development of our school into an efficient preparatory school for the ministry in this land for another generation.

This abortive proseminary was only one of several faltering moves that were made during the early years, all of which had their cause in the need for pastors and in the desperate financial situation of the College. When Concordia College was founded in Milwaukee, there was a halfhearted suggestion that we make common cause with Missouri in building up that institution and abandon the Watertown project. That suggestion received no serious support. The people were not giving their school very enthusiastic support, but still they were not ready to surrender and declare it a failure. The sale of scholarships that entitled the holder to free tuition was another unfortunate scheme, because it was designed to attract only students who had no intention of preparing for the ministry and committed the school to a curriculum that would fulfill the contract made with the holders of scholarships. Another money-making scheme was the founding of a ladies seminary, which operated for two years in a separate house rented for the purpose. It was thought that there would be so many girls enrolling that the tuition they paid would be sufficient to pay the salaries of two professors who could render some service to the men's college at the same time.

In 1870 an agreement with Missouri went into effect whereby our seminary students should be trained in St. Louis, while Missouri Synod boys received their preparatory training in Watertown. Under the terms of the agreement the Missouri Synod sent Professor Stelhorn to serve on the Watertown faculty, and our Synod was to send a professor to the seminary in St. Louis. Professor Hoenecke was called to go to St. Louis but he declined. The next man to be called was the Reverend Ernst of Hannover, Germany, the father of our Professor Ernst, but he was forced to return to Germany immediately after arriving here because of a serious ailment of the eyes. Then Dr. F. W. Notz was called. He accepted, but Dr. Walther agreed that he would serve both synods better if he joined the faculty in Watertown, which he did. Then Professor Brohm was called, but when he was told that he should go to the new seminary in Springfield instead of St. Louis, he declined. Then, in 1874, the agreement was canceled. Now Professor Schmidt of the Ohio Synod had a new scheme. His proposal was that all the synods of the Synodical Conference join in the establishment and operation of a single seminary. When that plan also fell through, our Synod decided to reopen its own seminary in Milwaukee. That was done in 1878, eight years after the agreement had been made to send our seminary students to St. Louis.

Three more minor decisions had yet to be made before the school finally settled down to the form and the purpose that characterized it for the greater time of its existence. In 1904 the Synod and the College Board very seriously and at great length considered dropping the academic division of the school, that is, the commercial department in particular. The decision to retain it was not reached with very noticeable enthusiasm, but the department has been retained to this day.

As late as 1907 a group of Milwaukee doctors renewed a proposal that they had made once before. They planned to establish a medical school and asked our Board to authorize its operation under our charter as a branch of Northwestern University. It was decided by a committee that such a school would not be a wholesome adjunct to our institution. About the same time the Board recommended to the Synod that it change the name of Northwestern University to Northwestern College. When the change was made, that put an end to all ideas of making the school into a university that might include medical school, law school, and other departments. In the 1920's an attempt was made to widen the scope of the school by adding a separate modern classical department that might attract to our own college young men and women who were attending such colleges as Lawrence and

Beloit. Professor August Pieper fought valiantly against the proposal, but the vote of the Synod went against him. Then came the depression and nothing more was ever heard of the modern classical department. From that time on, the school was content to devote its chief energy to the preparation of men for the ministry.

The change of name to Northwestern College, the refusal to include a medical school in its operations, the resistance to addition of a modern classical course, the opposition to the commercial department, and the consistent objection to include a girls' dormitory in the campus setup are all explained by the wish to avoid including any activities that would distract from the main purpose of serving the Synod as its training school for pastors. No measure that was ever tried and no policy that was ever followed proved to be a remedy for the chronic shortage that we still suffer from. There was only one period when we had an oversupply of candidates for the ministry, and no one who was involved in that period wants to repeat the experience. Of the class that graduated from the Seminary in 1938, only one member had received a call by the end of August. He received no salary except his board and room, and it was made a matter of conscience that he accept the call, although he had to borrow money to buy presentable clothes. The other members of the class finally received calls, but it was a bitter experience. It is, in a way, a blessing that we have not found a way to end the shortage and produce a surplus. Many ways have been tried and found wanting. In the first years of the operation of the school, young men who offered themselves for the ministry had board, room, and tuition furnished by the Synod, and in some cases even books and clothing were provided. For a short time the Synod tried the experiment of charging nothing at the Seminary for board and room, but free schooling did not attract men to the ministry. We have never charged tuition to those who were preparing for the ministry, and we have always kept our costs low. The only colleges that I know of that have costs lower than ours are schools that maintain farms and workshops and require part-time work of the student in lieu of cash payment for board, room, and tuition. I have never yet come across a school that publishes a catalog that has total costs lower than ours. The Synod has always had the policy of coming to the aid of students for the ministry who could not possibly finance their schooling themselves. At one time the charge for board and room was set at \$80 a year, \$50 for those who studied for the ministry. That low cost did not attract students either, but it may have helped to hold those already in the school. It is not high cost of schooling that is the cause of the shortage of pastors.

Periodically the Synod has passed resolutions or appointed committees to search for reasons for the shortage and to recommend a remedy. President Bading, in one of his frequent pleas for students and money said, "Some people think it is enough if a preacher is able to read German." Those people are still with us and are still making similar suggestions for relieving the shortage. There are many people who see no reason for such a long course in preparation for the ministry and who believe that it is enough if a boy has what is termed an inner call, can read the English Bible well, and has a gift of tongue.

In the early years there was quite general agreement that a chief cause of the shortage was the apathy of the congregations and of many pastors. In 1868 the president of the school complained bitterly about the apathy and cold indifference to the College. Some pastors, he wrote, were openly hostile. Students were making use of the institution free of all cost and then dropping out without offering any compensation for the instruction and the food that they had received. In 1869 the Board reported that if they could have foreseen the trouble, the discouragement, and the heartache that the school had caused, they doubted that they would have had the courage and the faith ever to start the project. Frequent dropouts, apathy in the congregations, lack of entering students were found as the causes of the ultimate shortage and they saw no way out of the trouble.

Because of the general apathy and the lack of money the school touched bottom in 1869, and in 1870 the College Board had this to say in its report to the Synod: "In its present plight our institution is like a ship at sea that has sprung a leak and that is being kept afloat only with the greatest difficulty. We fear that our poor ship will very soon go to the bottom. We fear, too, that the necessary help will not be granted, and if granted, will come too late; for many pastors and congregations in the Synod have up to the present time shown little interest in the existence and survival of the school. We must admit we have become discouraged and can no longer be heartened by pious promises and resolutions of the Synod."

It was at the time when the fortunes of the school were at the lowest ebb that help came from an unexpected source. Professor Meumann and Professor Ernst had been added to the faculty and both of these men believed firmly that the only hope for the school lay in setting a new course. It was through the influence of these two men that the language used in the school and the curriculum were changed. Today's students would hear with utter disbelief that their school was once saved by changing the language commonly used in the classroom from English to German and by introducing the course based on Latin and Greek that still characterizes the curriculum. The attitude of the congregations did not change at once, but from the time that that change was made there is noticeable a confidence that the school really intended to serve the congregations as a training school for pastors and teachers. Presidents Martin and Thompson looked to the Standard American college as their model, and the congregations and pastors could not see a close connection between that model and the pulpits in their churches. Little by little the preparatory department became less an academy and general high school and more a preparatory school for the ministry.

The problem of frequent dropouts is another that has always plagued the school and the Synod. In 1912 there had been 19 dropouts out of a total of 165 students, well over 10 per cent. A shocked committee reported to the Synod: "We deplore the decrease in number of students in the past year at Northwestern College and we recommend to the Synod that it seek out the cause." That committee was unable to decide whether the cause lay in the spirit of the times or in the administration of the school and rather helplessly recommended that the College Board be more diligent in its supervision of the school. Five years later the situation had not greatly changed; the spirit of the times was still in action. "We deplore the indifference, the superficiality, the pleasure-seeking spirit, and the lack of interest in studies." That sounds as though this committee had laid its finger on the cause of dropouts, but in the next sentence it says: "However, we rejoice that a majority of the students are industrious and are making progress." The problem still was not solved.

When it is asked why there are so many dropouts, the question is often accompanied by the suggestion that the situation is growing worse and that it was not so before. Statistics are always dull and often misleading, but actual facts and figures are often the only possible answer to certain questions. Why are there so many dropouts? Why is our production of pastors not keeping pace with the growth of the Synod? I have assembled a few figures and have condensed them into a list that is brief and, I believe, still accurate. I have compiled three lists. First, of graduates from Northwestern, how many entered the ministry? Second, of college freshmen, how many went on to the ministry? Third, of original ninth-grade boys at Northwestern, how many after 11 years entered the ministry? The figures cover five decades, and out of each decade I chose at random those years whose last digit was 2, and 4, and 5.

The sum of the college graduates in the years 1912, 1914, and 1915 was 44; 35 entered the ministry. In 1922, '24 and '25 there were 36 graduates and 29 became ministers. In those three years in the 1930 decade, the decade of the depression, of 52 graduates only 30 entered the ministry. In the corresponding three years of the 1940's, 70 out of 73 graduates entered the

ministry; and in the 1950 decade, 88 of 91 graduates entered the ministry. The production has risen gradually. In six of the 11 years between 1945 and 1955 we produced a total of 158 ministers. In the corresponding six years from 1915 to 1925 we produced 64 ministers, a difference of 147%. So there has been progress.

A simpler and clearer example of the progress that has been made is found in figures taken from later years. In 1899 there were 57 classical students in the college department; 37 of these entered the ministry, or 65% of the total. In 1903 there were 54 classical students in the college department; 33 of these entered the ministry, or 61% of the total. In 1957 there were 110 students in the classical department of the college; of these, 88 entered the ministry, or exactly 80%. That is a considerable improvement over against 61% and 65% in the earlier years. If it be thought that the line loss in the preparatory department is unduly great today, what shall we say of the loss in 1899 when we had a total of 83 in the preparatory department, of whom 23 became ministers, a loss of almost 75%. In 1903 there were 99 in the preparatory department, of whom 37 eventually entered the ministry, a loss of 60%. So, if the question is asked why we are losing so many more students than formerly, the answer is: We aren't; we are losing fewer.

How many college freshmen eventually entered the ministry? Again I took the years ending in 2, 4, and 5 in each of the five decades beginning with 1910. In 15 years out of the total 50 years there were 404 freshmen, of whom 264 became ministers, that is 65%. For the ninth graders I could use only the first four decades, because those of the 1950 decade are not yet finished with their course. In 12 years out of a total of 40 there were 378 ninth-grade boys, of whom 112 became ministers, that is 29½%.

If ministers are to come out of Mequon seven or 11 years from now, then we have to have freshmen and ninth graders entering now, and if we can go by figures of past performance, we should have at least three ninth graders for every minister expected. Just about 30% of original ninth graders hold out for the 11 years required; of the college freshmen, about 65% complete the course. Enrollment and dropouts are to some extent affected by economic conditions and by war. In 1924, a boom year following World War I, we had a total of 312 students in all departments, the first time we had ever reached the 300 mark. Then a gradual decline began which reached bottom in the depression year of 1933, when we had an enrollment of 198, a decline of 114 students in 10 years. In 1934 we had a ninth-grade class of just 10 students, and three of those had no intention of preparing for the ministry. War also has its effect on enrollment. When our country entered the war in 1917, we had only 193 students. As soon as the war was over, the enrollment quickly climbed to 266.

It is a strange fact that new buildings at a school may cause an increase in enrollment. When new buildings are going up at a school, every congregation in the Synod is kept aware of what is going on, parents begin thinking and talking about our schools, and it occurs to them to make use of the schools that they are being asked to pay for. In 1905, when a dormitory was being built at Northwestern, enrollment went up from 209 to 288 in the course of three years. Between 1950 and 1956, while the rebuilding process was going on, enrollment increased from 305 to 374, and the increase has been continuing since then. The decision that parents and their sons make when a boy enrolls to prepare for the ministry has its base in the desire to preach the Gospel as the Lord commanded, but the extra push that is sometimes needed may come from such external things as the advertising that a school gets during a building program.

It is hard to discover and to classify the reasons for dropouts. What will happen to the boys in this year's ninth grade between now and 1972 when we should like to see them ready for the ministry? We may expect that two-thirds of them will have dropped out by that time. One common reason that

boys give for dropping out of the course is that they have lost interest. That, however, doesn't tell us much. We ought to know why a boy loses interest if we are to prevent losses for that reason. It may be that too much force was used in starting him on the course in the first place. Perhaps he never had been personally interested in the ministry as a career. Perhaps he expected a quick and easy course and lost interest when he found that a great deal of hard study was required. A boy of 14 who has just been confirmed has gone through a moving spiritual experience at the most impressionable period in his life and he is likely to take a sentimental view of the ministry and the preparation for it at such a time. Certainly he cannot imagine at that age what the ministry is like. When the emotional glow connected with confirmation and going off to school has lost its brightness and the humdrum of lessons goes on day after day, he may find that he is losing interest. Besides this, just a year or two after entering school he also enters that rationalizing and calculating age of 16 to 18, and he will wonder why he ever decided to enter a profession that has so little glamor connected with it. That is a critical time. The boy may not know what he wants, but he seems sure that he does not want to study for the ministry. He loses interest, and that may mean that he neglects his work and more or less deliberately courts failure. Or he may tell us in all sincerity that he has discovered that he was not cut out for the ministry — whatever that may mean. Who was cut out for the ministry? Moses and Isaiah didn't think they were.

An important cause of dropouts is poor grades. Whether the poor grades are caused by inability or neglect makes little difference. The result is the same, loss of interest, discontent, discouragement, withdrawal.

There are always an appreciable number of boys who enter the ninth grade with a neutral attitude. They intend to give it a trial, see how they like it. Usually that is a poor way to start, especially if the parents tell the boy that he can come home if he doesn't like it. A slight case of homesickness may be enough to cause such a boy to give up. There are always a few boys who know early in life what they want to be or do and who have an understanding with their parents that they will take the course in preparation for the ministry but will not go all the way through if at the end of high school or even college years they still want to follow their early ambition. One of my best students this year knows that he wants to be a lawyer, an ambition that is hard to understand, but it would be wrong to force him into the ministry.

An important group of dropouts is made up of those who discontinue or are advised to discontinue because of very poor grades and of clearly demonstrated inability or unwillingness to do acceptable work. If a boy is obviously a shirker and unreliable and in spite of repeated admonition does not improve, the decision to advise him to discontinue is easy to make. But when a boy is of good character, sincerely wants to enter the ministry, but is not at all endowed with the necessary gifts, then the decision is very hard to make. Good character and willingness are, however, not sufficient qualifications for the ministry. Luther even added good health and a good voice as requisites. Nor is it always charitable toward a boy to let him go on to the ministry. I can recall vividly three cases where the advice was given both by our faculty and by the Seminary faculty to discontinue, but the boys insisted on going through. One of them lasted less than a year in the ministry, the other two held on a little longer but soon gave up after a brief and unhappy time in the ministry. Such cases are tragic, and if they can be prevented by dropping the boy when his unfitness becomes evident in school, then the charitable thing is to advise him to drop out and pursue some other useful Christian career where he might be better able to serve the Lord and His Church.

A group that is as yet not very large may continue to become more numerous if we can trust the signs. Although this group is small, the loss is the more serious because the group is made up of older boys who are

close to graduation. I refer to those who quit as undergraduates in order to get married. They become deeply involved in their high-school years and decide that the course ahead is too long; and so they drop out and get married.

Sickness and accidents take their toll. I can recall without going back to the records 17 losses by sickness, drowning, or automobile accidents. It wasn't until 1900 that we had a graduating class with that many men in it. Automobile casualties are bound to grow; they already have taken the place of drowning as a cause of death among students.

The controversy in the Synod is at present another reason for dropouts.

Those of us who attended Northwestern College can recall classmates who dropped out in the middle of the course. In some cases we know why they quit; in other cases they simply did not show up again when school opened in fall. What could have been done to save them for the ministry? The ministry does not have much to offer in the way of prestige or glamor. Young boys are very practical-minded as a rule, and one cannot make them see the real glory that is in the ministry; that is something that isn't visible to the naked eye. They are apt to think that when we speak of the blessings of the ministry we are just being pious or are trying to coax them into a harness that they don't want to put on. Once a boy has made up his mind to quit, not much can be done by arguing with him. Couldn't something have been done before he made up his mind? Can't we somehow preserve that interest with which he starts the course? Many sincere people believe that we could prevent many of the dropouts and increase the supply of pastors if we made the course easier, dropped certain subjects that are now required, or shortened the period of preparation. Because that means of solving our problem has been urged on the Synod, the call has come to take a long hard look at our course, to see whether we really want it and need it; an evaluation of our course of studies has been called for.

Before going over to the evaluation proper of our present course I should like to make one more reference to the past history of our ministerial course. In 1911, just 50 years ago, President Ernst read the doctrinal essay at the meeting of the Joint Synod in Mankato. The subject of the essay and the essayist had been suggested by the Synod. The subject was an evaluation of the ministerial course at our College. The Proceedings of that meeting do not contain the entire essay but give an adequate synopsis and list the seven theses verbatim. The essay was given in German. Following is a translation of the seven theses:

1. The office of the ministry is the highest office in the church and is the most blessed of all offices.
2. Because of the great importance of this office its bearers must be especially apt and capable.
3. To achieve this aptitude it is in the present-day circumstances necessary that those who aspire to this office be thoroughly prepared and educated for it.
4. Certain natural and spiritual gifts are a prerequisite for this education.
5. Where these gifts are present they must be painstakingly fostered and cultivated to bring them to full development. This cultivation is partly general in its nature, as imparted on the college level, and partly particular, as presented in the professional school, the theological seminary.
6. Exceptions to the preparation of a full college course are not to be made except in unusual cases, where outstanding natural gifts and special Christian maturity might compensate for the schooling and education that are lacking.
7. The Seminary should always have as its goal the development of self-reliant men, who are fully conscious of their high calling, capable of building a congregation on the right foundation, able to recognize all false trends and harmful influences and ready to oppose them and with God's help overcome them.

It is interesting to note that one reason given for assigning this essay was "that objection was being raised that in our institutions we are giving too much time to the languages and sciences and as a result are depriving the Word of God of time for study." Four years after this essay was read in Mankato, Professor Ernst reported that "the question of overburdening the students was again brought up and discussed with all seriousness without coming to a certain decision. I think one ought to proceed carefully here. Our young people are not very industrious, and they are especially interested in disposing of the work in the foreign languages with the least possible effort, or giving them up entirely."

If it is thought that the nature and content of our curriculum is a direct or contributing cause of dropouts, then we should start our examination at the high-school course, since it is in the early high-school years that dropouts are the most frequent. The subjects taught in our high-school course were chosen out of four areas of study — first, religion and history; second, languages; third, mathematics and science; and fourth, music. The first-year class, the ninth grade, receives instruction in religion-history, Latin, English, and algebra, five class periods a week in each subject, plus five supervised study periods, one period a week in music, and one period for one semester in becoming acquainted with the library. So the class has 21 or 22 periods a week in four major subjects.

The tenth grade, the second year in high school, has religion-history, a continuation of Latin, English, plane geometry, and a fifth subject, biology, and one period a week in music. This class has 27 class periods a week and four periods of supervised study.

The eleventh grade, third-year high school, has religion-history, Latin, English, chemistry, and beginners' German. German here takes the place of mathematics. This class also has one period of music and four supervised study periods a week. It has 27 class periods each week.

The twelfth grade, fourth-year high school, has the same subjects as the third-year class, except that physics takes the place of chemistry. This class has no supervised study periods. It has 26 class periods a week.

To sum up, religion, history, and English are carried through in each of the four years; there are two years of mathematics, three of science; two years of German; four years of Latin; one period of music a week through the four years. The week is divided into 33 periods of 50 minutes each. The first-year pupils have 27 scheduled periods including supervised study, so that they have six periods available for gym, for rehearsals, or for recreation of their choice. The transition from grade school to the high-school level has been made as gentle as possible for them.

Basically, this course is the one that has been followed ever since 1869, when, under pressure from Professor Ernst, the course preparing for the ministry was modeled after that of the German Gymnasium instead of the American academy. Its roots, however, go back still farther, to the Reformation, and in particular to Luther, who expected the pastor to be acquainted with the liberal arts, with the chronicles and histories and especially with "Holy Scriptures in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, German, and in whatever other languages it may be available."

On the value of the languages for the propagation of the Gospel I quote at length from Luther's appeal to the Councilmen of all Cities in Germany that they Establish and Maintain Christian Schools. These passages have been quoted a thousand times, but frequent quotation has not dulled their edge or taken anything from their soundness.

"But, you say again, granted that we must have schools, what is the use of teaching Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and the other liberal arts? We can still teach the Bible and God's word in German, which is sufficient for our salvation. I reply: Alas! I know well that we Germans must always remain brutes and stupid beasts, as neighboring nations call us and as we richly deserve to be called. But I wonder why we never ask: What is the use of silks, wine, spices, and strange foreign wares, when we have in Germany not only wine,

grain, wool, flax, wood and stone enough for our needs, but also the very best and choicest of them for our honor and ornament."

"In proportion, then, as we prize the Gospel, let us guard the languages For not in vain did God have His Scriptures set down in these two languages alone — the Old Testament in Hebrew, the New in Greek. These languages, therefore, that God did not despise but chose above all others for His Word, we too ought to honor above all others."

"And let us be sure of this: we shall not long preserve the Gospel without the languages. The languages are the sheath in which the sword of the Spirit is contained; they are the casket in which we carry this jewel; they are the vessel in which we hold this wine; they are the larder in which this food is stored. . . . If through our neglect we let the languages go (which may God forbid!) we shall not only lose the Gospel, but come at last to the point where we shall be unable either to speak or write a correct Latin or German. As proof and warning of this, let us take the wretched and woeful example of the universities and monasteries, in which men were not only unlearned in the Gospel, but corrupted the languages so that the miserable folk were fairly turned into beasts, unable to write a correct German or Latin and well-nigh losing their natural reason to boot."

"But, you say, many of the fathers were saved and even became teachers without languages. That is true. But how do you account for the fact that they so frequently erred in the Scriptures? . . . Now when men defend the faith with such uncertain arguments and mistaken prooftexts, are not Christians put to shame and made a laughingstock in the eyes of opponents who know the language? . . . Even St. Augustine is obliged to confess, as he does in his *De Doctrina Christiana*, that a Christian teacher who is to expound the Scriptures must know, in addition to Latin, also Greek and Hebrew; otherwise it is impossible not to stumble constantly; nay, there is room enough for labor and toil even when one is well versed in the languages.

"There is a great difference, therefore, between a simple preacher of the faith and an expositor of Scripture, or as St. Paul puts it, a prophet. A simple preacher, to be sure, is in possession of so many clear passages and texts from translation that he can know and teach Christ, lead a holy life and preach to others. But to interpret Scripture, to treat it independently, and to dispute with those who cite it incorrectly, to that he is unequal; that cannot be done without languages. Yet there must always be such prophets in the Church who are able to treat and expound the Scriptures and also to dispute; a saintly life and correct doctrine are not enough. Hence languages are absolutely necessary in the Church, just as prophets or expositors are necessary, although not every Christian or preacher need be such a prophet as St. Paul says in I Corinthians XII and Ephesians IV.

". . . Hence it was also a stupid undertaking to attempt to learn the meaning of Scripture by reading the expositions of the fathers and their numerous books and glosses. Instead of this, men should have given themselves to the study of languages. . . . How glad would the dear fathers have been if they had had our opportunity of learning the languages and coming thus equipped to the Holy Scriptures! What toil and labor it cost them barely to gather up the crumbs, while we may have the whole loaf with but half their labor, indeed, with scarce any labor at all. Oh, how their diligence puts our indolence to shame; nay, how strictly God will judge our lack of diligence and gratitude!"

Since 1900 a number of changes have progressively been made in the course to adapt it to changing conditions and to the capabilities of the entering students, without, however, changing the fundamental character of the course, or cheapening it, or reducing its content.

As late as 1900, boys were still being admitted at Easter, presumably just after confirmation, in the hope of preparing them somewhat better in the following two months for admission to the Sexta class. Since that was an



unworkable scheme, a subfreshman class on the seventh- or eighth-grade level, called the Septima, was added in 1902 to make it possible for boys with a very meager preparation to continue with high-school work after one year in this low-level class. In 1916 this so-called Septima class was dropped and in its place the beginners' class was divided into A and B sections, according to the ability of the students. At the same time the faculty ruled that henceforth no student should have more than 30 periods a week. Up to that time some had had as many as 36 periods. That meant, of course, that teachers too had had that number of teaching periods. For a time Professor Ernst was teaching 40 periods a week.

In 1919, several years after the name had been changed from University to College, the course became an eight-year course — four years of high school and four years of college. Previously, the fourth year, called the Tertia, had to be reckoned as the first year of college. The division between high school and college had up to that time been a little vague. It had not been wholly clear whether we had three years of high school and four of college, or four years of high school and three of college. Tertia, Secunda, Unter Prima, and Ober Prima comprised the college. The Ober Secunda of the German Gymnasium was missing in our system. Today the division between high school and college is clear, and each has four years.

In 1919 we were forced to introduce what were called the parallel classes. Many entering students were no longer bilingual. They knew no German. So, two sections of each class were run side by side; in one section the medium of instruction in all subjects was English; in the other section the medium in German and Latin classes continued to be German. It was not until 1938 that English became the sole medium of instruction in all classes of the high school and most classes of the college.

Till 1946, first-year students were required to begin two new languages in their first year, German and Latin. But by this time German was as much a foreign language as Latin, so that it seemed advisable to postpone the start in one of the two languages until the second year. That arrangement continued until 1958 when beginning German was postponed still another year until the third year of high school, so that now there is always an interval of two years between the beginning of one foreign language and the start of another. Latin is begun in the first year and continued through the second year of college; German is begun in the third year of high school and continued through the senior year of college; Greek is begun in the first year of college and carried through the senior year; Hebrew is a two-year course beginning in the junior year of college.

Through these changes the course has not been made appreciably shorter or easier, except in the first year of high school, where both the number of subjects and the number of class periods have been reduced. Although there is no longer any Greek in the high school, German has taken its place as a foreign language; and German is not any easier to learn than Greek, particularly since we do expect the student to be able to speak a little German at the end of his course. The course in mathematics has been somewhat cut back, but the science courses have been extended, since we now have the necessary laboratories and apparatus for adequate courses in biology, chemistry and physics on the high-school level. Except for a science survey course in physics in the sophomore year of college, all science instruction is given in the high school. Although Latin is discontinued at the end of the sophomore year in college, we still attempt to cover the same ground in six years that formerly was covered in seven or eight years. The present-day student may have less time to cover this ground than his counterpart of 30 years ago, but he has the advantage of learning his Latin through the medium of the English, a language that he understands well and that is much closer to the Latin than the German was. Another advantage that the present-day student has is that in most cases he comes better prepared than he used to be, since our parochial schools have been greatly improved over the one- and two-room schools of an earlier day.

Another change that has gradually taken place without attracting attention outside of the faculty and the student body, has to do with the length of the school year. For example, in 1904 the school year opened August 30, closed for Christmas on December 20, closed in June on the 20th. Forty years later we were opening a little later, September 3, closing for Christmas on December 19, and for the year on June 11. The calendar for 1960/61 announces the opening for September 7, closing for Christmas on December 15, for commencement on June 8. In that period there has been a reduction of 10 per cent in the number of teaching days in the year. That came about through a kind of nibbling process. The opening date in August was bad because of the growing importance of Labor Day and the heavy automobile traffic at that time. When Christmas mail became a deluge, students who had jobs with the post office had to report for work by December 15 to hold their jobs; for their sakes we closed earlier in December. In June we used to close about the 20th. But the pea canning season began about the 12th; so we closed earlier in June. Thanksgiving Day comes on Thursday; that suggested a long weekend, since most boys could get home by automobile and didn't care to make the trip back for just a day and a half. The College Board at one time set 220 teaching days as the minimum length of the school year. We are now down to 202. This reduction of almost 10 per cent may have made it necessary to increase the pressure in order to get the year's work done.

A number of questions are being rather persistently asked about our course in the preparatory department. Is this course too difficult for our students? Do we try to teach too many subjects? Is this the kind of course we want for our ministry? Can't we get along without one or the other subject? Now that we are establishing area high schools, could they not take over the work now being done in the preparatory department?

Is the course too difficult? It is admittedly not an easy one, but that does not mean it is too difficult for the boy who is moderately well gifted and genuinely interested in preparing for the ministry. Because of the foreign language requirements it is more difficult than the course chosen by most public high-school students, but is it not commonly admitted that that course is too easy and that these students do not come near to accomplishing what their contemporaries do in England, Germany, and Russia? It has happened that an overzealous professor has made greater demands in his subjects than the students were able to fulfill because of the press of other work, and that will happen again. It also happens that work will accidentally pile up in certain weeks and swamp the student. If that happens, the situation will not be remedied by decreasing the number of periods or by dropping Latin or German from the schedule. Experience has shown that the average student who is at all willing and does not take on too great a load of outside activities, can manage the course as it now is. This is not saying that the course is perfect and must remain as it is; but it does mean that the course, in itself, is not too difficult.

If difficulty of the course of studies is given as a reason for a dropout, it is usually Latin that has to take the blame. Why should Latin have to take the blame? I think there is a reasonable explanation. When a student runs into difficulty and is approaching the failure mark, his excuse is usually that Latin is at fault, and that if he could drop Latin, he could pass in other branches. It is almost never the case that a boy is failing only in Latin. The grades in all branches are likely to be quite uniform. But who would blame English or history or biology for his low grades? Everybody is supposed to be able to pass those subjects. But Latin sounds hard; so Latin gets the blame and the boy drops Latin with the consent of his parents and at the same time drops out of the ministerial course. Thus Latin gets a reputation of being the villain in the piece.

Why retain Latin in the course? Rarely is there a student who learns to read Cicero and Horace with ease, and I suppose that a few years after leaving the Seminary most will have difficulty reading the official Latin text

of the Apology of the Augsburg Confession or of the Smalcald Articles. Even though a minister might go along for years without reading any Latin, it would be folly to take it out of the preparatory course of a Lutheran minister. There is no language so useful for teaching a student the principles of grammar, whether that grammar be English, Greek, or German. Latin is invaluable as a means of explaining the meaning of English words. Latin was once the learned language of all the countries in Europe, particularly in law, politics, and religion. In theology, more than in any other branch of learning, Latin is not just useful; it is much more than that. But a boy will ask: Couldn't a minister get along without Latin? Of course he could. He could conceivably also get along without German, without ancient history, without algebra and geometry, without biology, chemistry, and physics. There are Negro preachers in the South and Jehovah's Witness preachers in the North who get along without any of these things.

Still the question persists: Why so much Latin in our course when no one will ever have to speak or preach in that language? Isn't Latin dead? If the only practical reason for studying Latin is to enable the theological student to help himself through an occasional passage of theological Latin from the Reformation period, then he could acquire enough Latin in two or three years to make it possible to plow his way through such a passage with the aid of a dictionary.

Or, if the help that Latin gives to the understanding of the many English words derived from Latin, is another practical reason for studying the language, then again two or three years of Latin ought to be enough to achieve that purpose. So why spend six years at Latin? Why Virgil? Why Cicero and Horace?

Latin was the language of a very great and articulate people. It was the language of a people that at one time ruled the whole civilized world. It was the language of the emperor who gave forth the decree that all the world should be taxed. It was the language of a people that had a genius that has never since been equalled, for government, for organization, for civil law, for military strategy. There had never been a people quite like this one in the history of the world, and there perhaps never will be another one like it. Rome had its calling to fulfill in God's economy, and when the Christian Church became established, Rome's destiny was fulfilled. But Rome was important. The genius of that people, its philosophy, its way of thinking, is expressed in the Latin language. This was one of the three or four really great peoples of history who brought man's natural powers to the ultimate height of their development. The language and the history of Greece and of Rome demonstrate the limitations of the natural gifts of mankind and show how even the highest natural gifts end in failure.

It is granted that not many of our students gain enough facility in Latin to read the language with sufficient ease to be able to get from their reading a feeling for the Latin spirit and for the peculiar Latin cast of thought; but some do, and all do acquire some acquaintance through direct contact with a people that God chose to play a very important part in His plan to establish His Church in the world. The Romans were, without a doubt a people that are still worth knowing, a people formed by God for God's purpose with the world, as Daniel the Prophet foretold. Rome and its language cannot be brushed aside as unimportant or dead.

Do we attempt to teach too many different subjects? If we were specializing, if we were engaged in teaching experts, Fachleute, the answer would perhaps be yes. To produce experts in one field we should have to concentrate on that field. People interested in accreditation have also told us that we should drop one or more languages and spend more time on sciences. Do we want to do that, considering what we are training our boys for? If we are teaching too many different subjects which ones should be dropped? Do we really want to drop German and Latin from our course? Do we want to encourage a slow weakening of our course? Those who advocate doing something about the course of studies in order to produce more graduates

do not suggest cutting back mathematics or science, not in this scientific age; the attack is usually directed against those subjects in which the labor of preparation cannot easily be avoided, in which poor preparation is easily detected, and where exactness is required. It is not so easy to get by in Latin as it is in the English class. If we keep the present course intact, should we then adopt much softer policies of promotion, so that the weak and inept may graduate as well as the rest? We are not interested in producing specialists, but we do want to produce well-informed graduates who have learned how to do hard work even though it may be unpleasant. We are under no compulsion from outside agencies to shape our course according to their formula; accrediting agencies as yet have no say as to the course that we choose to follow; we are under no pressure from the government; we are still free. Should we abuse our freedom by making our course a snap course, by making mediocrity our standard? It would seem the wise course for us to give our future pastors as broad a base of knowledge as possible and provide them well with the tools for their work, whatever special direction their interest may take in later life.

When it is suggested that we drop or cut back this or that subject, we are forced to ask ourselves if we have the preparatory course that we really want for our ministers. The ministry, as we have conceived and practiced it in the Wisconsin Synod, is one of teaching and preaching. We want our pastors to be theologians, not social workers. We want them to preach Biblically, exegetically, with an authority of interpretation and application based in independent study of the Scriptures, in the original whenever necessary. We should not want a ministry that is dependent on what it copies from others, that is uncertain, wavering, unable to make up its mind because it lacks the ability to find out for itself what the Scriptures say. It is not possible to acquire that ability except through a knowledge of the original language of Scripture. We can't afford to slight the languages.

The experience of those Lutheran synods that have no secondary schools supported by the church is that they have been forced to begin language study in their colleges and to restrict it to a minimum. The consequence is that students enter their theological seminaries with a meager preparation in languages, often with no more than a knowledge of New Testament Greek. Wartburg College requires only one year of German, one year of Latin, two years of Greek for its pretheological course, but gives the student an opportunity to choose in his senior year in which of these languages he wishes to do further work. Luther College seems to have given up making rigid requirements. Its catalog says merely that the pretheological student should take as much Latin or Greek as it is possible for him to carry. No mention at all is made of German, nor does the college offer a course in Hebrew. The Concordia Colleges require for admission to the freshman year of the junior college two years of German and two years of Latin, and give the college student opportunity to add to his knowledge of German and Latin by taking additional work on the high-school level after he has entered college. According to reports, of all the Missouri Synod schools, Concordia in Milwaukee still has the highest requirements in languages, although it has cut back considerably below what it used to demand. Besides the requirement of two years of high-school German and two of high-school Latin, the Missouri Synod student must take one more year of college German with two years of Latin, or else one year of college Latin coupled with two years of German, also one year of Hebrew and three years of Greek for admission to the seminary in St. Louis.

From Dr. Lowell C. Green, of the American Lutheran Church, author of a book entitled "The Mature Luther," I have some information regarding language requirements in the synods of the new merger. The ALC has only one remaining junior college with academy, the one at Regina, Saskatchewan. It is not thought of as a pretheological school. The ELC does have a number of high schools, Bible schools, academies, or junior colleges, none of which offers special work for pretheological students. When Dr. Lowell attended

Wartburg College it was required that all pretheological students take two years of Greek and two years of German, and many majored in one or the other of these languages. Latin was not pushed at all. Dr. Green's impression is that there is a wholesome emphasis on classical studies under Qualley at Luther College in Decorah and also at Concordia College, Moorhead.

From a member of the Canada Synod which is affiliated with what in 1962 will become the "The Lutheran Church in America," I have the following information. This synod used to operate Waterloo College in Ontario, which was affiliated with the University of Western Ontario. For the purpose of expanding its program, particularly in science, the college reorganized as Waterloo Lutheran University, one unit of which is Waterloo Lutheran Seminary. The synod has no preparatory schools at all. Students who do not measure up to requirements in languages may enter the seminary and be graduated with a certificate, but not with a diploma. So a student may enter this seminary and eventually the ministry with no knowledge of foreign languages, but he will not possess a diploma. In effect, this synod conducts a practical seminary together with its regular seminary, in which languages are still required. My informant writes as follows: "My impression is that the academic requirements for candidates for the ministry have become much stiffer in recent years. In spite of the pressing need for more pastors, the standards are not being lowered, but are stubbornly maintained. The coming 'Lutheran Church in America' is determined to up the requirements still further." It is interesting that in spite of the low language requirements in this synod there was still a pressing need for candidates for the ministry, and instead of lowering the requirements the synod is determined to raise them.

The history of Waterloo College relates that the institution used to have facilities for pretheological education but "emphasis having been shifted to higher education, the preparatory courses were reduced and finally abandoned in 1929." That, I think, is the normal and inevitable course that the development of a pretheological school will take. Steady reduction of requirements in language, and finally abandonment, not only of the languages, but of the preparatory school itself. One can drop Latin by decision in one Synod meeting, but it would take years and years to restore it in all classes if that should ever be desired again.

One more quotation from a professor at a pretheological school: "How unhappy it makes me to say that the language requirement is so meager, I shall not attempt to say." And he adds: "I am glad to say that the time is drawing close so that I can retire." He sees that there is no hope of restoring in his lifetime what has once been dropped.

Except for the Lutheran Church and the Catholic Church, the church denominations do not attempt to train candidates for the ministry at a level below the theological seminary. They make use of colleges like Carroll, Beloit, Hamline, and so on. Some do not even have their own seminaries but depend on the divinity schools of the universities, such as Chicago, Yale, or Harvard, or on union seminaries such as the interdenominational Union Theological Seminary of New York. The catalog of Concordia Seminary in Springfield says that "its program is designed particularly to serve students who are the product of the American system of colleges and universities." The seminary announces as its policy to train men for the ministry who have already attained the level of the bachelor's degree. Although Concordia at Springfield stresses New Testament Greek and offers Hebrew as an elective in the seminary, it has adopted as its own the recommendation of the American Association of Theological Schools for the pretheological course. Three requirements are suggested: first, ability to communicate clearly and correctly, for which English composition and literature, philosophy, logic, and scientific method are recommended; second, a knowledge of the world in which the student lives, for which he should study religious literature, philosophy, psychology, social science, and natural science; and third, he should have done some

independent work in order to gain a sense of achievement. There is no mention of any language outside of English. If the tools are lacking for the study of the Scriptures and of theological literature in any language but English, then naturally the stress in the seminaries will be laid on social science, the techniques of the pastor's profession, psychology, works on dogmatics that are available in English, and study of the English Bible translations, which have now become so numerous that they must be confusing to one who is unable to check the translation with the sources.

It has been suggested that the shortage of pastors might be relieved if we made it possible for public high-school graduates to enter our freshman college year and take the pretheological course. For several years we have had such a course in operation and have made it possible for boys to complete our course in four, five, or at most six years, depending on their previous preparation. This course has attracted a fair number of gifted and willing students who are doing fine work in the upper classes. The course has not been in operation long enough for us to say whether we have just been fortunate to have attracted particularly high-class students to this course in its first years, or whether it will continue to enlist this type of student regularly. The likelihood is present that when a student has finished high school or perhaps a year or two of college, he will have decided in his own mind what he wants to prepare for and will attack his work with serious purpose. The faculty has just adopted a revision of our college course that will make it possible for such students to complete the college work in four years if they are well gifted and willing to work. The course will not be what is called a practical course but will approximate the course that is required of students who begin their studies in our preparatory department. If there are young men among us whose grades would qualify them for admission to the university and who have made up their minds to study for the ministry, they will be accepted as freshmen and given the opportunity to get the B.A. degree at the end of four years.

A change that was made this spring in the scheduled course for the college department will help to make it more readily possible to accept high-school graduates on the terms just mentioned. Without reducing the content of the course, the faculty has reduced the number of periods given per week in a number of branches so as to give the student more time for preparation and for independent work and at the same time to make the course somewhat more flexible. For example, in the junior and senior years religion, including Greek New Testament, Hebrew, and music will be required subjects. But some choice will be allowed in the fields of English, Latin, Greek, and history. For example, if a student lacks the required Latin, he may take one semester of Latin in the junior year and another semester in the senior year in place of classical Greek, although Latin is not a regular subject in the two upper years of the college. A student must take three years of classical Greek, three years of college German, and two years of college Latin, but outside of that requirement some choice is permitted. Instead of a fourth year of Greek he could take an extra year of German, of English, or of philosophy. This revised schedule will leave openings into which those students can be fitted who did not have our preparatory course in German and Latin. They will have a chance to make that up as college students.

The area high schools are another source upon which we might draw to increase the number of candidates for the ministry. There are now eight of these schools, seven in Wisconsin and one in Minnesota, with a total enrollment of 1,866 students who are members of the Wisconsin Synod. These schools are to be fostered, encouraged, and supported, but it is not likely that they will have the broad and steady support that they would need in order to support at each school the special instructors required to keep them in line with the Synod-supported preparatory schools. The pretheological course in German and Latin requires a somewhat different treatment from the two-year course in these languages commonly given in high schools. The

pretheological course will have to be treated in such a way that the student is prepared to continue Latin and German on the college level, while the usual high-school course in German and Latin treats these languages as subjects that terminate at the end of the high-school years. That is proper. It is hardly economically feasible for these schools to keep in operation a full four-year course parallel with the course in the synodical schools. A practical solution would seem to be the one adopted at the Lakeside High School in Lake Mills. That school will try to determine at the time of first enrollment which students might wish to prepare for the ministry. Those students will take the same course in the first two years that they would get at Northwestern. At the end of two years those who still retained the ministry as their goal would be required to transfer to Northwestern. That plan saves the cost of at least one full-time instructor. The area high schools should, however, take upon themselves the unpleasant duty of carefully screening the candidates for further study to avoid the disappointment and hard feeling that would follow dropouts that occurred after the boys had been sent away from home to attend Northwestern.

Would a practical seminary be an acceptable solution to our problem of supplying the pastors that we need? We did at one time have a practical department in operation at our Seminary. In 1888 Professor Hoenecke reported 30 students in attendance at the Seminary, eight in the classical department and 22 in the practical department. In 1889 the number was about the same. In 1889 there came a proposal to abolish the practical department. The synodical reports of the 1880's have little to say about the practical department at our Seminary, and it does not seem to have been very effective, because no objection was raised when it was proposed to abolish it, and it does not seem ever to have produced many ministers; at least we do not find in the list of ministers of the 1890's names of men who were products of that department. It is certain that the department existed, but I have not been able to discover the names of any pastors who were products of it.

Two committee reports, one dated 1911 and the other 1903, dispose of the question of a practical seminary. With the exception of a very few minor details these two reports are as applicable to our situation as they were to the situation of half a century ago. I shall read those two reports and submit them as my answer to the suggestion that is being made today that we establish a practical seminary.

The following is a free translation of a committee report to the Joint Synod in session in Mankato in August 1911. The report is signed by John Schaller, A. C. Haase, John Plocher, and A. F. Ernst.

In 1907 a motion to establish a practical seminary in Wauwatosa was discussed by the Synod in session in Bay City, Michigan, and was rejected, only four members voting in favor of the resolution. In 1909 the subject was revived at the Fort Atkinson meeting of the Synod, the argument for reconsideration being that at Bay City there had not been sufficient discussion of the matter before the vote was taken. The result was that a committee was appointed to consider the proposal. That committee presented the following as its opinion and recommendation:

Three main reasons have been advanced for the establishment of a practical seminary. The first reason was the existing shortage of pastors. But how can a practical seminary remedy that situation? Instead of starting a new seminary more boys should be recruited to prepare for service as pastors. The command of our Lord that we should pray for workers in His harvest does not nullify the requirement that pastors be apt teachers and therefore that command does not compel the Church to abandon a program of training that the Church in its wisdom has adopted as suited to the times.

The second reason given is that without a practical seminary we are losing many potential workers for the Church. That is not a sound and valid reason. Some of those potential workers are still young enough to go through the regular course. If those who are too far advanced in years to take the

regular course, have had a good education and are of proven Christian character, they could be accepted in our seminary to take part in the regular course there, except in a few subjects. If such older people lack a good previous education or are not of proven Christian character, they are not good prospects for the ministry. If such persons do not have a strong desire to become pastors, or do not have the energy to overcome the great difficulties of study by self-sacrifice and perseverance, then they are of little use to us.

The third main reason given is that the parents cannot afford the long years of study required in the regular course. Our answer is that a father who has a gifted son who desires to enter the ministry and serve his Lord in that way should not shun the cost. If parents are willing but not able to bear the cost of having a son prepare for the ministry, then the Synod should help him.

None of the reasons advanced for opening a practical seminary are sufficiently convincing to make it seem wise or necessary to carry out the proposal.

Moreover, there are strong reasons why we ought to hesitate to embark on the proposed program of education of our ministers. The time for a practical seminary is already past in our Lutheran Church in America. When hosts of immigrants were streaming into our country and there were very few pastors to serve them, there was need for such a seminary. The sects, especially the Methodists, were flooding the country with their missionaries and gathering up the immigrants. Among immigrants to Wisconsin there were cases where among a crowd of immigrants from Germany there were but four Lutheran pastors, but 80 Methodist missionaries. At that time steps were taken in Germany to send over mature young men who had had a good education in Germany and who had been carefully screened there, to take a short course here in preparation for the ministry. Our own congregations did not at that time have the resources to start such a seminary themselves, nor did they have among them the educated young men who could in a short time fit themselves to serve at all acceptably.

In our time we can no longer depend on immigrants for the growth of our congregations. Our congregations must expand from within and must do mission work among unchurched people. That work is much more difficult than gathering up immigrants who were already Lutherans and who themselves were eagerly searching for a Lutheran church home. Our congregations have already become Americanized. Besides, the congregations in Germany from which occasional immigrants still come over are much different from what they were 50 years ago, all of which makes the pastoral work much more difficult than it was when a practical seminary provided a training that was sufficient for the circumstances. Our congregations demand much more than they did formerly; they require, for example, that their pastor be able to preach in either German or English. That lays a heavier obligation on the training schools. Let us not forget either that in our congregations we are getting more and more members who are professional men, more and more people who have had advanced education.

We do not have within our own congregations the schools that can provide the advanced schooling that ought to be the basis of a training course in a practical seminary.

Therefore the Committee begs to present the following recommendations for adoption by the Synod:

1. That the proposal to establish a practical seminary be rejected.
2. Likewise to reject the proposal to establish a practical division at our Seminary in Wauwatosa.
3. To appoint a committee in each constituent synod of the Joint Synod which shall use every means in its power to win young people who are suited for preparation for the ministry.

4. To establish a fund in every District for the support of needy students.
5. Young students in our lower classes who drop out in order to take a short quick course into the ministry should be considered as having dropped out of the ranks of our students who are preparing for the ministry.
6. After 1912 our Seminary at Wauwatosa should require a B.A. degree or its equivalent for admission.
7. If the theological faculty should find gifted mature students of good character and of extended experience who wish to enter the ministry, it shall be permitted to admit them to the Seminary and after due instruction and examination recommend them for ordination into the ministry.
8. At regular meetings of the Synod the District committees appointed to recruit young men for preparation for the ministry should submit a detailed report on their work.

Signed by Professors John Schaller and A. F. Ernst and Pastors A. C. Haase and John Plocher. August 1911.

#### Seminary Faculty on Practical Seminary

In the Synodical Proceedings of 1903, on page 106, there is printed the Opinion of the Seminary faculty covering a proposal that the Synod establish a practical seminary as a solution of the problem of a shortage of pastors. The opinion is about as follows:

##### I

1. The theoretical seminary and the practical seminary would, we assume, have to be operated under one head, as one institution.
2. In some branches the two departments would have to be united into one class: History, Isagogics, Symbolics, Homiletics, and Pastoral Theology. Dogmatics and Exegesis would have to be taught separately, because in these branches a knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew is presupposed.
3. There would have to be at least one more faculty member called.
4. It would have to be a requirement that the practical students be on a par in maturity and in general education with the members of the theoretical department if they are to be treated as one class in the branches mentioned. If they do not have academic preparation with the exception of foreign languages of the same grade as the other students, then it would have to be required of them that they continue their undergraduate work in college until they have attained the maturity of college graduates.

##### II

1. In any case this practical seminary must not be looked upon as a temporary establishment to meet a short-lived emergency. If a practical seminary is called into being at all, it must be with the knowledge and intention that it is to be a permanent establishment.
2. It must also be realized that if two groups of such diverse preparation are to be formed into one student body, there is bound to be a great gap separating them; they cannot be fused into a unit. Lack of unity will appear in the body of students and also in the faculty.
3. The spread between the better students and the weaker ones is already bad enough. Introduction of such a diverse group as the practical students are bound to be, will make the spread even greater.
4. There is a dangerous trend already observable in theological training toward shallowness and lack of preciseness in doctrine, and one should beware of encouraging a trend of that kind.
5. In the age in which we are now living (1903) we need more than ever before to insist on sound and thorough education and indoctrination of our pastors.

6. In those five branches mentioned as the ones in which joint instruction might be possible, thorough preparation is as important as in any other branches.

7. We do not recommend sending such special students to our already existing preparatory schools since their presence would suggest to those taking the classical course that there is an easier way into the ministry.

8. If a practical seminary is established and if it is ever to amount to anything it should have its own separate preparatory school.

This report was adopted by the Synod.

The shortage of pastors is with us and will remain with us as long as we are financially able to start new missions, have assistant or associate pastors at our larger congregations, and continue to draw on the ministry for teachers in our high schools and colleges. What can and should be done to produce an adequate supply of pastors?

We should not let ourselves be pressured into any kind of crash program. Emergency programs, like emergency taxes, have a way of establishing themselves as fixtures that one can't ever get rid of.

We should never relax our efforts to recruit boys just after confirmation for entrance into our ninth grade at the existing synodical preparatory schools. We should try to influence boys at our area high schools to prepare for the ministry, and at those schools we should not try to introduce a complete preparatory course for the ministry but should be content with a sound course in the first two years. We should also try to recruit for the ministry gifted high-school graduates, or boys who have had a year or two of college, or who have just completed their military training and are looking about for a career. We are now better able than ever before to fit such advanced students into our system. We should continue the process of separating clearly between the two departments at Northwestern College. There is some justification in the complaint that eight years on one campus, under one faculty, is too long. Our buildings have been built for a resident student body of 400. We are approaching that figure and will soon have to remove the inefficient and wasteful 1875 dormitory and replace it with the first unit of a new dormitory. When we have 400 college students, we should build up a new and separate preparatory department, on a separate campus, but in or near Watertown. This is a long-range program and I think that if we promote it with energy, it will solve our problem.

We are doing a work that the Lord commanded us to do and upon which He has laid His blessing. We can depend on His help and should ask for it. We must also not forget to thank Him for what blessings we now have. It is one of God's blessings that we are free to lay plans for building His kingdom and free to carry them out without interference from city or state or federal governments. We are as yet under no pressure exerted by state laws as regards our teaching program. No circumstances and no agencies are forcing us to whittle down our courses or to shape them according to what outsiders think a college ought to teach. We are still perfectly free to shape our course according to the needs of the ministry of the Gospel of Christ. There is nothing in the condition of the nation, in the make-up of our congregations, or in the constitution of our student bodies that could make a radical change in our course of studies necessary or that would force us to weaken our course. Rather than weaken the preparation of our ministers for their holy calling, we should consider whether we are doing all that could be done to recruit more of our gifted boys who are being drawn into secular professions. Our costs should continue to be kept low, so as not to discourage people of slender means or force our graduates to enter the ministry saddled with a debt. We should continue to provide attractive living conditions for our students and should be ready always to help the needy. It would be a grave mistake deliberately to weaken the academic foundation on which the college and seminary work stands. Weakening the preparatory department weakens the college and thus weakens the seminary and eventually the ministry too.