

1410
1952

THE LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
AT PHILADELPHIA

The ⁺ Seminarian

11

St. Andrew's Day
1952

THE LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AT PHILADELPHIA

The ⁺ Seminarian

Volume XIV

St. Andrew's Day

Number 1

Published by

The Student Body

of

The Lutheran Theological Seminary

THE BOARD OF STUDENT PUBLICATIONS

John C. Bellingham — Editor

COMMITTEE

Robert Reisch

Jack Schersch

Kenneth Shirk

Paul Bosch

Published three times the school year. Subscription price—
fifty cents per issue, or one dollar and twenty-five cents (\$1.25)
for the school year. Address subscriptions to **THE SEMINARIAN**,
7301 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Penna.

IN THIS ISSUE

Ecumenical Encounter:

1. Theological Self-examination William Lazareth 3
2. Unity at Willingen David Hoh 6
3. Mission to the Masses Stanley Knull 9

Editorial

One of the most important subjects appearing on the contemporary scene is this subject of ecumenicity. We are all aware of the various programs on our own campus of the ALS and ISM. In the last few months we have heard a great deal about the ecumenical movement because of the participation of members of our faculty and student body in the meetings held at Hannover and Lund this summer. Our participation in the program of the World Council of Churches, the NCCCUSA, and the National Lutheran Council make it necessary for us to be as fully informed as possible on this whole field. We as a student body were fortunate in having representatives at Lund, Hannover and the missionary conference at Willingen and it is to them that we can turn for information on this subject.

Before we are able to realize to what extent we are being influenced by the ecumenical movement, not merely what it can do for us but mainly what we are doing for it, where our position should be in this program, we must take a close look at ourselves

—our ideas, our functions and our program. The first article in this issue deals with this problem.

The remaining portion of this issue will deal with two areas in interdenominational effort in an attempt to show just what is being done; what the work in these two areas has meant for those concerned; what it can mean to us.

We are not attempting to answer all questions or say the final word in this area. Our purpose in this issue is to create interest through these articles in the subject of ecumenics. This is a problem that will occur many times in our lives—not only on the national and international but also on the local scene.

The final article gives us an insight into a program which although interdenominational in character is not sponsored by a definite interdenominational agency. It brings to a conclusion our discussion of ecumenicity on the local scene thereby covering these three areas: the theological application on a world scale in the mission field, and in the area of a local project.

Contributors to this Issue

Mr. William Lazareth is a graduate of Princeton University and a member of the Senior Class. He was one of the youth delegates of the ULCA at both the meeting at Hannover and the meeting at Lund this summer. Mr. David Hoh is a graduate of Muhlenberg College and a member of the Senior Class. He also attended the meetings at Hannover and Lund. In addition to these meetings he also attended the Mission conference at Willingen. Mr. Stanley Knull is a graduate of Wagner College and a member of the Senior Class. He spent his summer working for the East Harlem Protestant Parish.

Ecumenical Encounter: Theological Self-Examination

There was once a time when the description "ecumenical Lutheran" was as self-contradictory as "confessional Lutheran" was redundant. The united witness of the Hannover Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation and the Lund "Faith and Order" Conference of the World Council of Churches proved conclusively that this day is past.

Never was a confessionally-sponsored convention so ecumenical in its tone; never was an ecumenically-sponsored conference so confessional in its roots. Bishop Nygren's keynote motto at Hannover, "Forward to Luther," was substantially in agreement, both in spirit and intention, with Father Florovsky's credo at Lund, "I have no confessional loyalty. My loyalty is wholly to the *Una Sancta*." Both gatherings were at their best when they were most catholic, and yet, most evangelical.

While we have come to recognize the confessional-ecumenical antithesis as a false and dangerous dichotomy, one is nevertheless aware of the remaining vestiges of the "self-discovery" phase of ecumenical experience. The mutual discovery of one another as Churches has taken place. Then, through this initial encounter, comes the desire to know and represent one's own Church and confession better. Aggressive self-assertions become the mode of edification, instead of communication, and a Council of Churches is regarded as the means through which the non-Lutherans have the opportunity to discover that the Lutherans were right after all.

In the main, however, the con-

fessional positions are now presented clearly and without polemical apology by their representatives. Also, one is humbled by the presence of a new phenomenon which can only be attributed to the presence and guidance of the Holy Spirit: the note of mutual repentance coupled with an openness to receive, as well as to give, with one another. Having taken seriously the Amsterdam pledge that "We intend to stay together," the common thinking and praying of men of God in all denominations has become "ecumenically-conditioned."

The Lutheran World Federation is committed in its Constitution "to foster Lutheran participation in ecumenical movements." We believe in Christian unity and yet we are fearful of what a truly existential belief would entail. .demand. .cost. We neither want really to plumb the abyss of unbelief nor to be overtaken by the stark glory of the Lamb of God.

Consequently, theological thinking within the ecumenical movement has now reached a definite impasse. We have just about reached the limits of a clear formulation of comparative doctrines and ecclesiologies of the constituent members. We recognize both far-reaching agreement and the depths of our differences. We know where we are, but not where we are going to be led. .together. Personal sacrifice and mutual self-giving are the marks of all true discipleship in His Name. It remains for each of our Churches to submit itself to rigorous self-examination in order to ascertain God's will for our Church in our

day. Only in coming closer to Him, can we come closer to each other. Where do we stand in this light, particularly in relation to our witness in society?

I. Contemporary Challenge of Our Culture

The Lutheran Church in America has come of age. The tides of European emigration have ceased and American Lutherans are rapidly overcoming their traditional provincialism rooted in former national and linguistic differences.

This gradual acclimatization has more recently been accompanied by the necessity of meeting contemporary challenges and needs both at home and abroad. Our post-war overseas relief and reconstruction programs are predicated upon the demand of cooperation to meet a common need.

In this same period, we have taken bold steps in participation and fellowship in the ecumenical movement, its research and activities. We are aiming at the total activation and mobilization of our laity through the programs of the Stewardship committees, Lutheran Laymen's League, and Boards of Social Missions. We are pledging our active support to Christian Higher Education and the institutions of our Church. We are facing the problems inherent in ministering to people—often of mixed racial backgrounds, in the big city milieu of modern life.

In short, within a matter of decades, we have been challenged by other denominations in particular, and by our total citizenry in general, to make an ecumenical and social impact upon our culture as a whole, if we are to continue to justify our corporate existence and unique identity. With rare exception, we have been so

overjoyed at the opportunity of repudiating our "exclusivistic and quietistic" reputation that we have scarcely taken the time to choose which weapons would be most effective for the battle; and more painfully, whether or not these weapons are at our disposal in the Lutheran theological armory.

II. Current Needs

Any Lutheran who takes seriously the common European indictment that the quality of "Americanism" permeates the roots of all of our denominational life in America, cannot escape the necessity of some adequate theological and ecclesiological self-examination in the light of our newly-assumed ecumenical and social responsibilities. To date, this critical self-examination has not yet systematically been attempted. An American Lutheran social ethics is still unwritten.

During the entire "Social Gospel" era, the Lutheran Churches held themselves aloof from a frontal encounter with the society, presumably on theological grounds. Now the theological tenor of the times has radically changed, and newly—"neo-Orthodoxized" activists look to us for the theological and Churchly foundations for a more evangelical approach to society.

What have we offered to date? To be perfectly honest, our record is relatively good, but despite, not because of, its orientation. Much of our Stewardship and Laymen's materials smack more of enlightened self-interest, paternalistic duty, and legalistic moralism than the intrinsic social implications of the Christian Gospel. Most of our Social Missions material and approaches are singularly impervious to the doctrine of the Church;

its sociological and psychological insights, notwithstanding. The recent dilemma surrounding the formulation of a doctrine of the ministry in our Church is indicative of the disturbing situation which has grown out of non-Churchly, non-theological—however well-meaning, approaches to the rapidly changing society in which we find ourselves.

Furthermore, at this juncture, European Lutheran theological and ecclesiastical patterns have increasingly little to offer to us which is relevant to our situation. The state-church structures of both Scandinavia and Germany are crumbling at their very cores. Conscientious Lutheran clergymen everywhere are grappling with the fundamental problems in communicating and witnessing to their laity in society.

To date, their theologians have been able to offer few solutions. Indeed, only one major Lutheran "Ethics" has appeared since the war. (It might be added, parenthetically, that the registrations for the "Stewardship and Evangelism" sessions at Hannover more than doubled those of any other theme. European participants, however, found their inability to translate these concepts grammatically, almost as embarrassing as the American inability to justify them theologically; i.e., in traditional Lutheran categories.)

Yet, in the face of this central challenge to the very heart of Lutheranism, we do not have one Lutheran graduate student in the field of Christian Social Ethics in the whole country. We continue to assume new tasks and to enter

new fields with little theological or ecclesiological guidance, while simultaneously translating European theological tomes which have little, if anything, to say to our American congregational, institutional, and socio-political patterns of community life.

Our greatest international Lutheran need at this time—and therein lies also our most promising area for future ecumenical contributions, is the training of a new generation of European and American theologians and pastors, who, on the basis of exchange, inter-communication and common research projects, could assist one another in cogently stating what unique contributions our Lutheran insights and emphases might make toward the Christian witness to modern society. The Europeans must be led from the sterility of the theological to the life-infused practical. We, on the other hand, must be guided from the superficiality of the practical to the depths of the theological.

Each man would then be required to translate and integrate these common findings in his own unique social structures. The newly-formed Lutheran World Federation "Department of Theology," in correlation with the Study Department of the World Council of Churches, might prove itself an excellent channel for such a program. To become and remain both evangelical and effective, should be our dominating motivation in meeting contemporary man in and through his community and his language. In serving others, we will be serving Him who alone can fulfill our common prayer, "that they may be One."

—William H. Lazareth

Unity at Willingen

In 1949, with the fall of Chiang Kai Shek, the rule of China was taken over by the Chinese Communist Party. Everyone has recognized this as an event of major importance—for Americans and Europeans as well as for Asians. But most of us have not yet felt directly and personally the sharp impact which that event is destined to make on our lives in the years immediately ahead. Its full significance has not yet struck home.

I had the privilege this summer of sitting in on a two-weeks international conference of men and women whose lives were immediately and bluntly changed by the events in China as soon as they occurred. These were the leaders in the foreign missionary work of those Churches which have been part of the ecumenical movement. Most of them were the executive heads of their foreign mission boards or missionary societies, the "Secretaries of State" of the Churches. Some were former China missionaries. All were men and women for whom the primary significance of the rise of the Communist regime in China was the cutting off of the Western missionary work there. For them China was a symbol not of political defeat but of defeat of the extension of the Kingdom of God. It is impossible to exaggerate the strength of the bond between these men and women and the work of the Church in China. The forced closing of that work has made them anxiously search the purposes and the power of God.

The meeting this summer—of the International Missionary Council at Willingen, Germany—was part of this search. To be

sure, the meeting was not something unique or brand new; it was one in a series of IMC meetings going back to the Edinburgh Conference in 1910, through which the missionary agencies have been learning to work together and to trust one another in certain respects for the working out of missionary strategy. The Willingen Conference probably cannot be understood apart from that forty years of experience in mutual counsel. It is significant that these missionary leaders turned to each other across denominational lines rather than to their fellow-Churchmen for help in their efforts to understand "what the Spirit is saying to the Churches about their missionary task."

Nonetheless the unity at Willingen found its depth less in the history of the IMC than in the fact that the missionary agencies represented there are facing a common challenge. The set-back in China is only the sharpest example of it. In many areas of the world Communism, nationalism, secularism, anti-Westernism, and even newly-militant Hinduism and Buddhism are slamming doors shut in the face of missionary work. "We face a world in which other faiths of revolutionary power confront us in the full tide of victory, faiths which have won swift and sweeping triumphs, and which present to the Christian missionary movement a challenge more searching than any it has faced since the rise of Islam." There is no dividing up a challenge like that and parceling it out to the separate Churches. It is a situation which challenges all the Churches, and the Churches have recognized the need to face it together.

Confronted with this challenge, Willingen was ready to examine critically both the message and the strategy which have characterized the modern missionary enterprise. The result was, on the one hand, recognition that the missionary task of the Church is much larger than the traditional foreign missionary movement. "Unless the Church in every part of its life hears and responds to God's call to be a missionary community, no amount of improvement or multiplication of organizations will enable it to fulfill its mission." On the other hand, the result was also the adoption of a group of recommendations which look toward, as one man said, "the end of the missionary movement as we have known it." Willingen was not afraid of the future. The catch phrase of the conference was "initiative and mobility." The issue was simply—how do we start off again from here? The call of God to a fresh advance was never in doubt. "Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward."

The reports of the conference deserve study. They make important points and raise stimulating questions regarding the theology of a missionary faith. And they suggest some of the changes in the pattern of missionary activity with which the Churches propose to overcome the contemporary obstacles in the way of its mission. Our concern here, however, is not so much with the question of what the missionary leaders at Willingen said, as with the fact that they said it together. For Willingen, among other things, was one enormous piece in the jig-saw puzzle of ecumenical sharing in which there is gradually appearing a new picture of what the Christian Church should be. Christian unity was not the cen-

tral concern of the Willingen conference, but it was an essential concern which found a place in the discussion of almost every other topic which came up.

The unity which was sought was not a unity for the sake of collective strength. In difficult situations it is natural for timid men to draw close to each other for mutual protection. But these were not timid men. There was at Willingen virtually none of the sort of defensive ecumenism to which we are sometimes asked to subscribe—according to which the extra effectiveness and power to be gained by cooperation are urged as the last chance the Church has for survival.

Nor was there that kind of ecumenism which is a frantic hunt for an elusive or lost authority, as if the Churches, lacking real authority by themselves, could together construct a more adequate authority for the proclamation of the Gospel in the midst of the secular world. Willingen was not even a search for unity as a Biblical or theological ideal. Rather it was a call to an active unity, unity according to the demands of mission. The conference brought together working men for the purpose of talking shop—men with on-going responsibility for the administration of projects in which the Church is facing the world. It brought together such men for mutual testing of the adequacy of their message and of their strategy for proclaiming that message. These men came relying for strength and authority not on their ability to cooperate but on the victorious power of Jesus Christ; but they came together in humility before the task of proclaiming Christ's victory effectively for the ears of modern man.

The problems of missionary unity were tackled in two ways. On the one hand, cooperative projects were suggested: the establishment of regional centers—especially in Asia, the Near East, and Africa—for study and research on questions related to the work of the Christian mission; cooperative schemes for the training and guidance of Christian laymen who go out across the world in business, industry, and government; publication of an ecumenical missionary prayer handbook to stimulate and inform a discipline of common intercession for the work of all the Churches; the sending of international, inter-racial, and interdenominational missionary teams to areas of special opportunity. This last was put forward only very tentatively, because enormous problems are involved. But something of this sort may be necessary to make clear the Christian message of reconciliation in some parts of the world.

Willingen also spoke to the general problem of Church unity. The delegates from the younger mission field Churches, in a session by themselves, included this forceful statement among a group of recommendations:

We believe that unity of the churches is an essential condition of effective witness and advance. In the lands of the younger churches divided witness is a crippling handicap . . . While unity may be desirable in the lands of the older churches, it is imperative in those of the younger churches.

At another place the conference reports suggest: "Perhaps it is not realized in the older churches how grievously their witness is discredited by the divisions which

they have transferred to other parts of the world." Again—"We can no longer be content to accept our divisions as normal."

All this does not solve the problems which the call to unity uncovers. Indeed the conference added another large set of problems by pointing out that we cannot be content to write off the separatist churches, the fundamentalist groups, which in many areas are witnessing to the Lordship of Christ with more fervor and effectiveness than we. There is something wrong in the fact that we regularly regard their success as simply a problem.

Willingen was indeed unable to lead the Churches into any scheme of union. That certainly was not its job. But it did make clear the nature of the ecumenical challenge. In the lands which are called mission fields, within the context of Christian outreach, the call to unity is not simply a call for charity among Christians, nor for our living up to our theological principles. Rather it is a recognition of the stark fact that mankind will not, can not serve a divided Christ. Division in the Church distorts the witness, frustrates the mission. Is there any self-righteous escape from this dilemma?

This, it seems to me, exposes the real dimensions of ecumenism. The Church must be one for the sake of its mission. Unwavering conviction is of course the central thing; conviction cannot be sacrificed. But Christian conviction means mission, and it is in the attempt to fulfill the mission, that Churchmen learn that conviction also demands humility in the encounter with other Churchmen. "As the Father has
(Continued on page 12)

Mission to the Masses

The Seminarian is not alone in its interest in the East Harlem Protestant Parish. The story of this interdenominational, interracial work in one of New York City's worst slum areas has unobtrusively won its way to the desks of editors of periodical literature throughout our country. Even radio and television, ever alert to keep their listeners interested, by bringing them the extraordinary, has nodded to the unique aspects of the parish. David Hoh said that the Parish was a topic of conversation at Lund this past summer.

The men and women whose lives are bound to this work, ministers and people who call this their church are alternately puzzled, disturbed, and grateful in response to all of the publicity. On the same day members will lament the fact that they are in the limelight, and call a newspaper to cover an activity the Parish is planning, because they think this will be news of interest to the people of New York City. A faithful member of one of the churches told me this summer that she gets a strange feeling when her friends in other parts of the city tell her that they hear so much about her church, and that it's always in the "best" magazines. She wonders a little what all the fuss is about. The Rev. Don Benedict, who with the Rev. G. W. Webber began the work now known as the East Harlem Protestant Parish in 1947, says that if this little work is noteworthy, it makes clear what a shockingly meager witness is actually being made by the church in the depressed areas of our land.

The major Protestant denominations

had long ago written off the resident of the urban slum in three ways: as organically Roman Catholic, as below the wave frequency of our proclamation, receptive only to Pentecostal or Holy Roller ministrations; or as an unsafe financial investment. The East Harlem Protestant Parish is giving six or more denominations a chance to prove the first two limitations unfounded and the third untenable with Christian stewardship.

As we focus on the interdenominational character of the East Harlem Protestant Parish it is well to bear most clearly in mind that the intent and purpose of Webber and Benedict in bringing the Gospel to East Harlem was not so much that they could there engage in an interdenominational ministry. Theirs was a mission to minister to the people of the neglected masses of our land which the church left to shift for themselves when the church went middle class. Many factors went into the development of the interdenominational (and interracial) ministry of the East Harlem Protestant Parish. It was not an end in itself. If I interpret the present feeling of the ministers about this correctly I should say that they feel the interdenominational ministry, while not an end, is surely the strongest and most effective approach, and hence very desirable for the East Harlem situation.

There are at present about fourteen members in the Group Ministry. These are ordained or lay men and women committed to the job they have set about to do together—that of preaching and teaching the Gospel in a way that

relates it to the specific needs of the people; to identify themselves with the community in such a way that they are in a new sense available to minister in all kinds of need. It is not fair for me to enumerate for them, reasons why they think the interdenominational approach is best in East Harlem. At the same time there were forces which went into making the Parish an interdenominational venture which were of such an imperative nature as to exclude all other considerations. I speak for example of the sheer weight of the financial burden, so great that no one denomination would tackle the job at the time, with the existing home mission goals and methods. The conglomeration of emotional type sects providing with communism in the area a type of escape and a Roman Catholic church, whose practices caused many to be indifferent to its ministrations or anti-clerical, seemed to demand a group ministry with the strength and vision, diversity of outlook, and approach able to cope with the most frustrating problems and have the stamina to stand where the old type one man ministry with a feeble backing of one denomination would not.

Five years experience of the East Harlem Protestant Parish bears out the fact that many of the premises upon which an interdenominational ministry was projected were correct. Amid demolition by the city housing authority of buildings in which their members live, reverses caused by interracial strife, the transiency of the population, the hostility of degenerate forces in the community, members and friends forsaking the church to be caught up again by the devils of degradation, amid dope, gambling, prostitution,

drunkenness, poverty, filth, disease, murder, hunger, cold, heat, rats, tenements, exorbitant rents, unemployment, garbage, fires, political exploitation, neglected children, marital strife, greed, hate, vagrancy, police brutality, lack of adequate hospital facilities, stealing, gang fights, to mention a few of the outward counter forces, the Parish stands. It has not retreated or compromised its intention to preach a gospel of the love of God revealed in Christ Jesus. It has been concerned with man's relation to God and to his fellow men in the environment which the above listing suggests. The ability of the ministers and their families to find ways of meeting these problems in a straightforward way is due in no small measure to the variety of experiences, methods, and approaches which they brought together from their different denominational traditions not to mention their increased capacity to obtain help from existing city agencies because of their united Protestant approach.

Taking a firm stand in the combat of institutionalized sin in the environment is an integral part of the work of the church pastors and people together, if the life and worship of the church is to be meaningful, the members of the East Harlem Protestant Parish feel. This doesn't mean that the ministers have become social workers. They want to represent the church at all times. For this reason the ordained men wear a clerical collar in nearly all their work. Then it will not be mistaken—this is the church at work. Preaching is not done in a vacuum, nor is the liturgy mere form. Life is too tough for that. There is no middle comfortable ground for Christianity to stand on in East Harlem. Religion must be

either an escape from reality or that which makes living in a real world possible.

One of the most significant features of life in the four churches of the East Harlem Protestant Parish is the development and use of a rich and meaningful liturgy. Here again the ministers have used the best in their traditions and even gone beyond in order to provide liturgical forms for their worship. It's part of their endeavor to achieve a new sense of community on the blocks in which their churches are situated. The worshipping community grows slowly here. People are not flocking to the doors of the churches on Sundays. But inside they are finding a group that does not want anything from them. A group that does not exploit the new member or rejoice in long meaningless membership rolls. A congregation that wants to be the community church and the church which is a community.

The workers maintain that one of the strengths of the interdenominational nature of the Parish, is the healthy criticism. I must confess that I wondered as I worked in the Parish this summer why there was not obvious serious, doctrinal disagreement. It seemed to me that either there was a conspiracy of silence on matters which the representing churches traditionally disputed or else there was agreement shared by the members of the churches ministering in the EHPP that was not true of the rest of their denominations. As a Lutheran I could foresee a certain amount of basic disagreement, say on the sacraments, which would make it difficult to go about building the church with those who did not share my views. Certain understandings which I would con-

sider to be important for members to hold regarding the experience of faith would not be stressed or would be caught in a different way by an associate minister which would be frustrating indeed. It is claimed by the Group Ministry previously mentioned that each ordained minister should abide by the tenets of his denomination and feel responsible to his denomination's home mission board. So far as I can ascertain the men don't at present conceive of themselves as perpetuating their denomination. It has even been mentioned as a possibility that the particular ministers might achieve so much unity of thought, doctrine and practice as to be a new denomination. This would in my opinion be an ecumenical tragedy. At the same time if a church should become an integral part of the East Harlem Protestant Parish and maintain significant doctrinal positions different from the other cooperating churches I fear that grave difficulties would be encountered. Lutherans have for these very reasons customarily avoided close interaction of denominational churches on the local congregation level. Robert S. Bilheimer in an article "Problems in Ecumenical Action" lists these and related difficulties under the title "institutional rigidity." Whether a denomination could do as good a job in a situation like the EHPP is a question I have tried to answer for myself. I think it could, if it approached the work with a group of men and could muster adequate home mission support. Probably the group which bears the most resemblance to the EHPP is the astounding Worker — Priest movement in France. See *Revolution in a City Parish* by Abbé Michonneau or *The Priest and the Proletariat* by

Robert Kothen. This is a vital endeavor of Roman Catholic priests to reach the worker and the poorest in the slums of France. These priests are every bit as far ahead of the rest of the Roman Church as some of the men in East Harlem were ahead of the mission boards of their denominations and non-participating denominations in America.

It is important that we note that there has been in this seminary over the last few years an interest shown by a number of students, in the necessity of a ministry to the working people which is different. A ministry which will identify itself in a new way to the needs of the workers. Articles in the September 52 issue of *American Missions Together*, a publication of the Division of American Missions of the National Lutheran Council, reflect a new willingness to stop the trend in the Lutheran Church away from the knotty problems of both rural and urban slums and an indica-

tion that it will turn to these responsibilities with all the vigor and more that has been characteristic of the approach of National Lutheran Council Churches to suburban areas.

Unity at Willingen

(Concluded from page 8)
sent me, even so send I you." We owe a loyalty larger than the loyalty to the ecclesiastical structure to which we belong.

When all things are shaken, when familiar landmarks are blotted out, when war and tumult engulf us, when all human pride and pretension are humbled, we proclaim anew the hidden reign of our crucified and ascended Lord. We summon all Christians to come forth from the securities which are no more secure and from boundaries of accepted duty too narrow for the Lord of all the earth, and to go forth with fresh assurance to the task of bringing all things into captivity to Him, and of preparing the whole earth for the day of His Coming.