



The Wartburg Project

Autumn Extra

2016

The Wartburg Project is a group of WELS and ELS pastors, professors, teachers, and laypeople who are working together to produce a new translation of the Bible called the *Evangelical Heritage Version™* or *EHV™*.

Because so much is happening this month in the project and in the world of Bible translation we are producing an extra report between our September and October Reports

Special Presentations

Luther Fest The Wartburg Project was among the many presenters at the Luther Fest at Shoreland Lutheran High School in Somers, WI on Saturday September 17. Our presentation, in addition to presenting a handout of basic information about the Wartburg Project and EHV, gave participants an opportunity to provide feedback on two of the issues that seem to generate many inquiries to the project: 1) the tension between formal and informal grammar and 2) the best approach to handling the sometimes blunt sexual language in the Bible.

The discussion also brought up another question that we have addressed before, but now, as the publication of our first edition is getting closer, it seems to be a good time to repeat the answer. One of the questions I was asked was: *Does the EHV want to be the official translation of WELS?*

The short answer I gave was “No!” One reason for this answer is my belief that it would not be a good idea for WELS to adopt one official translation even if it would be EHV. There are several reliable translations that can be useful. We hope that EHV will be part of this package and be useful for many people in many places.

WELS has not had one official translation in the past, and there is no reason to have one now. In matters of worship practice, we believe the principle Luther stated: Free, free, free it must be! We would discourage any proposal to have the EHV declared to be the official WELS translation, just as we would discourage the adoption of any other translation as the official WELS translation.

In saying this, we are, of course, only stating a personal opinion as a member of WELS about a traditional practice that it would be wise to maintain. The question at the seminar was addressed only to the issue of our feelings about the EHV’s relationship to WELS. It did not address any other church body or group that may be interested in the EHV.

If any church body or group, Lutheran or non-Lutheran, wants to adopt EHV as an official or recommended translation, they, of course, are free to do so. Here too the principle applies: Free, free, free it must be!

Concerning the EHV, the whole question of adoption would, of course, be premature. It is hard to imagine a reason why anyone would want to adopt any Bible translation, including EHV, without a sufficient period of study and careful evaluation. It is helpful to have a Bible tested in congregational use. It helps to have many people and pastors evaluating a translation, rather than one or two small groups. This would lead to greater thoroughness and confidence. EHV plans, God willing, to have the full text available for study in 2017.

Furthermore, the whole idea of one official translation or even one translation for exclusive-use may soon be obsolete, if it is not already. The time when people bring one Bible to class may be drawing to an end. Very likely, in the not too distant future, many (eventually even most) participants will come to class with several translations on their smart phones.

Those of us who were pastors in the 1970s have been through this experience of translation eclecticism once before. As KJV was losing its hold, all kinds of translations were contending to replace it. Many translations were being tried by our members. We let the process work itself out until one emerged as a favorite but not official translation. We are in very much the same situation today, and we have to be patient and let the process work.

As further food for thought on an era of transition between translations we recommend this interesting study of the careful, deliberate process which led to the use of NIV 84:
http://www.wlssays.net/bitstream/handle/123456789/2403/JeskeNIV_0.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Doesn't it make sense to refrain from attempts to urge people to quickly switch to some new translation? Doesn't it make sense to say: Free, free, free it should be?

Our FAQ 21 adds a few more thoughts on this topic.

(See the article about ESV's "permanent text" below as an example of ongoing developments in the world of Bible translations.)

Christ in Media Online Seminar Sorry you missed the discussion at Luther Fest? No problem. You still have a chance to participate in an expanded version of the discussion. The Wartburg Project has been invited to participate in *Gospel Outreach With Media*, an online seminar presented by the Christ in Media Institute. The ten discussion topics that make up the seminar are intended especially for college and high school students but are open also to others.

The EHV presentation *Between a Rock and A Hard Place* helps students understand the dilemma communicators face when they are addressing a diverse audience. It uses the tension between formal and informal grammar as an illustration of this problem. If a speaker says, "Who are you looking for?" some readers will say, "That is bad grammar." If the speaker says, "For whom are you looking?" some readers will say, "That sounds so stuffy. Who talks like that?" The communicator is between a rock and a hard place. Whichever option the communicator chooses some readers won't like it. How does the communicator deal with this dilemma? To join the discussion go to GOWM.org between October 10 and October 31.

Part II of *Between a Rock and a Hard Place* deals with the sensitive issue of the blunt sexual language in some passages of the Bible. The Bible is most often euphemistic when dealing with sexual language, but there are some passages that are surprisingly graphic. People are often

unaware of these because translations tend to hide them with euphemistic translations. How should we deal with these? This part of the discussion also presents the issue of the appropriate age for students to deal with this material. This is an important topic that young Christians (actually all Christians) must learn to deal with in a way that is both honest and tactful. Because of the sensitive nature of the topic, this module is not posted online, but must be requested by teachers or other adults from wpbrugj@gmail.com. This procedure gives teachers the opportunity to preview the material and decide what is appropriate for their setting. It allows for “teacher discretion” and helps them to avoid possible offense in their particular setting.

To see the full slate of discussions see the “snip” of the poster at the end of this report.

Elsewhere in the World of Translation A considerable amount of discussion and debate, some of it quite harsh, has been generated by the decision of the ESV to freeze the text of their translation at its present state. Here is a part of their statement.

Beginning in the summer of 2016, the text of the ESV Bible will remain unchanged in all future editions printed and published by Crossway—in much the same way that the King James Version (KJV) has remained unchanged ever since the final KJV text was established almost 250 years ago (in 1769). This decision was made unanimously by the Crossway Board of Directors and the ESV Translation Oversight Committee. All future Crossway editions of the ESV, therefore, will contain the Permanent Text of the ESV Bible—unchanged throughout the life of the copyright, in perpetuity. The creation of the ESV Permanent Text represents the culmination of more than seventeen years of comprehensive work by the Translation Oversight Committee, as authorized and initiated by the Crossway Board in 1998. (For additional information about the ESV Bible translation, read more about the) **translation philosophy**. The decision now to create the Permanent Text of the ESV was made with equally great care—so that people who love the ESV Bible can have full confidence in the ESV, knowing that it will continue to be published as is, without being changed, for the rest of their lives, and for generations to come.

The decision generated a lot of discussion, including outright ridicule, but people should note what the statement actually says. It does not state that they believe their translation has reached the state of perfection. It simply states that the publisher Crossway has decided they want to keep the text as it is. It leaves open the issue of some future updates under the ESV name or some other name. Some of the harsher critics might have done well to reread both Crossway’s statement and their printed reaction to it before hitting the *post* button. If Crossway feels their job is done, and that future updates will be the task of another group, free, free, free they must be to do as they please. The translators of ESV certainly understand that being on the receiving end of snap judgments goes with the territory of being a translator, so none of the backlash can surprise them very much.

So what will the practice of EHV be? We want to have a stable text which is not constantly being tinkered with. We will naturally immediately correct any typos or errors that turn up. We expect that after three to five years of accumulating suggestions based on congregational use, we will produce an edition somewhat analogous to NIV 1984, which came out six years after the publication of the whole Bible and served as the base translation for quite a few years.

While we want a stable text, we do not foresee a situation in which the Wartburg Project would declare a freeze of the translation. Perhaps someday, at some point, the Project will conclude that it will leave the task of the necessary, ongoing work of updating of Bible translations to others, but in the meanwhile our goal is to follow Luther's example of improvement, balanced by the desire to have a stable text. That is where our practice will differ from ESV (though in fairness it should be noted that they worked on revising their translation for 17 years before halting the process.)

Where will our process of revision differ from NIV? We do not plan unannounced rolling changes, except for correction of mistakes. The big difference is that we have promised that if we someday move on to a new edition of EHV, we will not deny users of EHV permission to continue to use the old version of EHV, as the publishers of NIV 84 did when they denied permission to continue to use NIV 84 in creating products. People who have produced works based on EHV are assured that they will be able to obtain permission to produce, modify, and market those works even after the project may no longer be printing that edition.

Six New FAQs Check out FAQ No. 18 *John the Baptist or John the Baptizer?* No. 19 *Chariots, Horsemen, and Cavalry During the Old Testament;* No. 20 *Does Jesus Use Bad Grammar?* No. 21. *Does EHV want to be the official WELS translation?* No. 22 *Why does the EHV use the term mammon?* No. 23. *How does the EHV deal with so called gender-inclusive language?*

While you are at it, review some of our previous FAQs.

FAQ List

- 1 Why does Jesus say, "Amen, Amen I say to you"?
2. Why does your translation use bad grammar with *who* and *whom*?
3. Why don't you capitalize the pronouns that refer to God?
4. Why does the account of the Wise Men say that they saw the star "in its rising" or "when it appeared"? Many translations say they saw the star "in the East."
5. Toilets, sewers, and latrines in Bible times
6. Are you going to make a red letter edition of the gospels?
7. Why do you capitalize the Devil? Isn't that honoring the devil?
8. Is the Wartburg Project sectarian? Will the Bible it produces be sectarian?
9. In some passages of the New Testament some translations have the term Messiah where your translation has Christ. Why the difference?
10. In the gospels I noticed that your translation sometimes has more words and occasionally even more verses than other recent translations of the New Testament. Why is that?
11. Is the Wartburg translation of the Bible a literal translation?
12. In Psalm 110:1 "The decree of the LORD to my lord," why is the second occurrence of lord not capitalized? It refers to Christ, the Son of God.
13. Is the Bible produced by the Wartburg Project going to be a study Bible?
14. Why do you use the terms "inn" and "manger" and "swaddling clothes" in Luke chapter 2? Aren't these terms outdated?
15. Why is your translation called *the Evangelical Heritage Version*?
16. Do archaeological materials and historical records sometimes help correct or improve Bible translations?
17. In using the Bible and books like Bible dictionaries I have noticed that the spelling of people's names and place names is very inconsistent. Is the EHV going to fix this and have a consistent system of spelling?

18. John the Baptizer or John the Baptist?
19. Chariots, Horsemen, and Cavalry During the Old Testament
20. Does Jesus use bad grammar?
21. Does EHV want to be the official WELS translation?
22. Why does EHV use the word *mammon*?
23. How does the EHV deal with so called gender-inclusive language?

We hope to reorganize the FAQs soon with a more topical arrangement and searchability.

Progress Report

We won't include a new chart with this special edition since we are now engaged in intense work on the same set of books, namely, Joshua through Esther, with a focus on the coordination of Samuel/Kings with Chronicles. A coordinated manuscript of these six books is in the hands of reviewers and readers. A lot of work on the coordination of these books has reinforced our preliminary conclusion that it should not be our goal to attempt a word-for-word syncing of parallel accounts in Chronicles with Samuel/Kings. The document which summarizes the rationale for this opinion, titled *To Sync or Not to Sync* is attached to the end of this report. Keep in mind that this is a study document to be used by the group that is doing reviews on Chronicles. It is not our final conclusion. Your input is welcome.

Special Proofreading

Joshua, Samuel, Kings, Ezra, and Nehemiah present some special nightmares for proof readers because of the extensive lists of place names, personal names, and numbers. It is very easy for names to be dropped from the list, and a study of the available manuscripts shows that this in fact happened often, as the scribe in one manuscript or another skipped a name. Our regular proof readers will of course be checking these lists, but because of the magnitude of the problem, some special checks would be wise. A good way to do this is for one proof reader to read the list aloud from another Bible translation while a second proof reader follows the list in the EHV, watching for any skips. If you are interested in helping with this kind of double check, email to wpbrugj@gmail.com.

Powerpoints??

We have been asked if we are planning to produce PowerPoint presentations of the lectionaries for use in congregations that like to display the lections on a screen. This has not been part of our plan, but we would be happy to cooperate with pastors and congregations that are producing such presentations for their own use, who would be willing to share the fruits of their labors with others. In the same way, we would be willing to work with anyone who wants to produce a metric version of EHV, to produce compositions based on EHV psalms, etc., etc.

Coming Attractions Another issue that also troubles many readers of the Bible is textual criticism. We have already addressed this briefly in FAQ 10, but we will address it in more depth in upcoming months. The EHV restores some passages which many recent translations have omitted from their translations, if those passages have early and widespread manuscript support.

We do not support the idea that “a plastic text” makes us uncertain about the reliability of our texts of Scripture. Properly practiced textual criticism demonstrates that we can have confidence that the texts of the Old and New Testament which we have delivered the inspired Word of God to us.

In a month or two when work on Samuel through Chronicles is nearing completion we will issue an expanded 4th edition of our rubrics for translation, so people will have an in-depth opportunity to evaluate our principles and our rationale for specific translation decisions.

Our regular reports will be updated in the October report.

The following is a study guide for the work of coordinating Kings and Chronicles:

To Sync or Not To Sync? That Is the Question

Synoptic books is the name for a set of books that offers two or more views of the same biblical event, often in very similar language. There are two main groups of synoptic books in the Bible:

- 1) The synoptic gospels, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, provide parallel views of many of the events in Jesus’ life. Some of these events are described in all three synoptic gospels.

Some events are described in only two or even in only one of these three gospels. Sometimes the wording of the parallel accounts is very similar. Sometimes the parallel accounts offer different information about the same event. (*Different*, of course, does not mean *contradictory*.)

(In the New Testament Ephesians and Colossians could be called synoptic epistles since they parallel each other quite closely in subject matter.)

- 2) In the Old Testament the historical accounts from 1 Samuel to 2 Chronicles provide a synoptic view of the history of the Israelite monarchy.

1 and 2 Samuel provide one view of the beginning of the Israelite monarchy during the reigns of Saul and David. The second half of 1 Chronicles provides a second view of the same history.

1 and 2 Kings provide one view of the rest of the history of the Israelite monarchy. A second view of the same history is provided by 2 Chronicles.

These two parallel accounts of the history of the Israelite monarchy select different material to include in their respective accounts. The books of 1 and 2 Samuel give a more complete account of David’s rule. 1 Chronicles does not report the more negative aspects of David’s rule, such as David and Bathsheba, David and Absalom, etc.

1 and 2 Kings focus on the way in which Israel’s unfaithfulness led to the downfall of both Judah and Israel. These books provide a lot of information about events in the northern kingdom of Israel. In contrast 2 Chronicles focuses on the history of Judah, with very little attention to the history of the northern kingdom of Israel. It focuses on the grace of God, which is displayed in his actions to preserve and restore the priesthood and the

monarchy, which would both be fulfilled in Christ. In addition 2 Chronicles provides much information about certain kings of Judah which is not presented in Kings.

The first part of 1 Chronicles parallels some of the genealogies from Genesis and other early books. Both Kings and Chronicles also have parallels to Isaiah and Jeremiah.

Some events that are reported in one of the two parallel views of the history of Israel are completely absent from the other account. Sometimes both versions of the history contain reports of the same event, but the accounts are quite different in the points they choose to report and in the language they use to report it. But there are some events that are described in both accounts by very similar words. The Hebrew is nearly (but not quite) identical in both accounts. It may be that the author of Chronicles had the text of Kings in front of him and was using it as his main resource or that both authors were using one of the other written sources for Israel's history that are named in Kings, such as the annals of the kings.

Syncing Chronicles to Kings

It is this third class of parallel passages that is our main concern here. When the Hebrew of a passage in Chronicles is a very close match with the Hebrew of a passage in Samuel or Kings, should we try to make the English of the translation in Chronicles a verbatim match with the English of the translation of Samuel or Kings?

The EHV already has a number of general rubrics that have a bearing on this issue.

1. Try to be consistent in the translation of technical terms.
2. Though "one Hebrew/Greek word = one English word" is not a viable standard for a translator to apply consistently, the translator should strive to be consistent rather than casual in his renderings of specific words and word groups.
3. When a person has two or more personal names, preserve distinctions like *Jehoiachin/ Jeconiah/ Coniah*. In general, keep the distinct names as they appear in the Hebrew text. Alternate names of important figures can be footnoted. If the main text has *Coniah*,^b the footnote would have: ^bAlso called *Jehoiachin*.
4. Harmonize minor spelling changes of familiar names and the different pre- and post-exilic spellings of the names of individuals like Hezekiah (*Hizkiyahu* and *Hizkiyah* both = *Hezekiah*).
5. A special problem case is *Joash/Jehoash* and *Joram/Jehoram* because there are kings with the same two names in each kingdom (see 2 Kings 12). As a general rule use whichever name the text has, with a footnote when necessary.
6. The various Hebrew spellings of *Nebuchadnezzar* can be harmonized to this one English spelling.

Like all of our rubrics, none of these rubrics can be practiced as rigid rules. Language and its nuances are simply too complex. Translation is more of an art than a science. We don't want a translation that sounds like it was made by a computer or people who talk like books.

Looking for the consistency behind our inconsistency we can say this: We try to balance a concern for what will be easiest for the reader (usually that would be uniformity and homogenizing of names) with a respect for the original author's preference for diversity of spelling, diversity of names, etc. The author's preference should receive the higher priority of the two concerns.

So What Should We Do?

A point in favor of trying to make the parallel translations as close in English as the original texts are in Hebrew is that this practice will alert the reader to the fact that the Chronicler might be using Samuel or

Kings as his source. This same effect could, of course, also be accomplished by headings that correlate the two passages or by a footnote that says: *In this account Chronicles follows the text of Kings very closely.* So the question we must ask is whether an effort to make the two parallel English translations identical in wording is useful to the reader and faithful to the intent of the authors.

Some of the points that make an attempt at a total sync questionable include the following:

- 1) When one compares the texts of Kings with their parallels in Chronicles, one sees that there are no passages of any length in which Chronicles gives a verbatim rendering of Kings. (There are a few that are fairly close.)
- 2) If Samuel was written in about 900 BC, shortly after the reign of David, and Chronicles was written in the 400s at the time of Ezra, the distance between the two accounts was as great as the distance between the original King James Version and the EHV, so we would expect some differences and updating in grammar, spelling, and vocabulary.
- 3) It does not seem that the author of Chronicles was concerned to produce a verbatim reproduction of a source. Even the closely parallel accounts are not exact reproductions. It seems that even when the ancient authors had a specific source in front of them, their idea of “quoting” something was different than ours. They were more “using a source” than “quoting.” Translators should be guided by the concerns of the authors, not with squeezing them into our preferences or conventions. Translators are not editors.
- 4) The Chronicler updates grammar, spelling, and vocabulary:
 - a. The Tetragrammaton *LORD* is sometimes changed to *God*.
 - b. The pre-exilic spelling of names like *Hizkiyahu* may be updated to *Hizkiyah*.
 - c. The pre-exilic spelling of David *dvd* may be updated to *dvyd*.
 - d. The account in Chronicles substitutes different names. *Araunah* in Samuel is *Ornan* in Chronicles. (We follow Luther’s example in preserving this distinction.)
 - e. The term *cohen*, usually translated *priest*, refers to a *government minister* in 2 Samuel 8:31. By the time of Chronicles this use of the term *cohen* was apparently no longer current. In 1 Chronicles 18: 17 these officials are called *chief advisors at the side of the king*.
- 5) There are many textual variants in the manuscripts, especially in texts like the lists of David’s elite warriors. This makes it more difficult to establish the original reading or spelling in every case. In some cases, these variants can be evaluated only by comparing the texts in the archaic Hebrew alphabet. Even within the Hebrew and Greek textual traditions there is not a consistency of readings.
- 6) In some cases there are three parallel versions, including one from Isaiah or Jeremiah, so a one-for-one sync is not possible.
- 7) The spelling in Kings may be the original and the spelling in Chronicles may be a new spelling, but apparently the writer of Chronicles did not want to use the original spelling.
- 8) The different scribes of the two parallel accounts do not always divide and punctuate the two parallel texts the same way in both accounts. Different additions and omissions to the text mean that identical words do not have the exact same context in both versions.
- 9) There are no really reliable sources to help do exact syncing. A book like Abba Ben David’s *Maqbilot ba Miqra (Parallels in Scripture)* makes side-by-side comparisons of parallel texts, in which spelling variants are marked in red letters, but it does not always mark omissions of words. Its Hebrew text does not seem to match BHS in all cases. English harmonies like Armstrong (*Samuel, Kings, Chronicles: A Harmony*, Randolph W. Armstrong, c. 2004, dolphin.org/harmony.pdf) in closely parallel passages produce one composite translation rather than two accurate parallel translations.
- 10) Simply importing one translation into the other book, even in cases of near quotation, would produce false harmonizations.

- 11) Trying to produce an exact sync, which also preserves all the differences between the parallel texts, is therefore very time-consuming and costly, and it would produce only a sync of one particular manuscript, not a sync of the Hebrew text as it appears in different manuscripts.
- 12) Are we syncing the readings in the main body of the Hebrew text or the preferred readings which are written in the margin (*kethiv* or *qere*)?
- 13) The most important consideration for us is that the author of Chronicles does not seem to be concerned to produce a sync with Samuel or Kings. On the contrary, he often was interested in preserving spellings and data different from those in the parallel account, even when the contrast is quite jarring.
- 14) It is important for a translator to preserve these distinctions which the author wanted to make. If the distinctions raise a translation issue, a translator's footnote is appropriate. Further explanation of the difference is the assignment of a study Bible.
- 15) Another important consideration is that an exact sync is not useful to readers. Will a pastor who is producing a Bible class on an event in David's life benefit more from reading two identical translations of the text or from reading two different translations of the text by two translators who worked independently? Even when the translations are being used to work with the Hebrew text, two views are more useful than one.
- 16) People who want to compare the texts of the two versions of the story are better served by parallels like Ben David or harmonies like Armstrong, than by flipping back and forth between two translations on different pages of a Bible.
- 17) The EHV base translations of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles were made by different translators who worked independently. Where two translators gave slightly different shadings to a translation of the same account, it does not seem like good stewardship to discard one of the translations or to relegate all the variations to footnotes. The reader will benefit more from seeing that there may be more than one good way to translate a phrase and that each rendering gives insight into the meaning of the text.

(In reality, the difficulties that stand in the way of syncing are more complicated than indicated in the above study, which gives only a sample of the issues.)

So Where Does That Leave Us?

Our rubric, based on our study so far, is: In synoptic passages such as the parallel accounts in Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, the translations will be coordinated for key terms and expressions, but the translations do not have to be made 100% identical, even when the Hebrew texts are almost exactly alike. Throughout the Old Testament, we do not insist that a given Hebrew phrase must always be translated exactly the same way, so our practice in regard to syncing is no different than our normal practice. (The authors of Kings and Chronicles give us a good precedent for variety since they sometimes spell the same name two different ways in the same paragraph. They also use data from different chronological systems without trying to sync them.)

The name, therefore, which best describes our process is not *syncing* but *coordinating*.

While the two translations have already been drawn closer together, the efforts of the independent translators may in some cases be preserved in the parallel translations to give readers two views of the passage. The two translations will be close enough to each other that it should be clear to the reader when the two Hebrew texts are very close to each other.

Since the goal of the Chronicler (who may have been Ezra) is to produce a second view of the events recorded in Samuel or Kings, it seems wise that his goal should be our goal also.

A lot of the work of coordination has already been done, but we will probably be working on this for another month or two. If you have any thoughts on the matter, submit them through our response form or to the editor's email wpbrugj@gmail.com.

In developing our rubrics we ask two basic questions:

- 1) What is true to the intent of the authors?
- 2) What best serves our readers?

Neither of these considerations favors trying to producing translations that are synced in all points.

The Moral of the Story

If you have made it to the end of this exhausting (but not exhaustive) study, though the details may be unimportant to you, the principle behind it is important. It illustrates the lengths the EHV goes to try to develop and practice rubrics of translation which will honor the intents of the authors and the needs of the readers.

Important Note: Differences between two accounts of the same event are not contradictions unless they are mutually exclusive. If I tell one friend, “I went to Washington last week,” and I tell another friend, “I went to New York last week,” there is no contradiction. Both were true. For our purposes here we will give just one example from Samuel/Chronicles. 2 Samuel 24 reports that David purchased Araunah’s threshing floor and oxen for fifty shekels of silver. 1 Chronicles 21 reports that David weighed out six hundred shekels of gold to Ornan for the site. Neither text offers any explanation for the difference, but it seems that Kings chooses to describe the purchase of the threshing floor to erect an altar to halt the plague and Chronicles chooses to report the purchase of the whole site to build the temple.

Join the discussion online!

Gospel Outreach M^with Media

Online Conference

Opens on **Monday, October 10, 2016**

Active online discussion until **Monday, October 31 (Reformation Day)**

Go to GOWM.org during those three weeks to participate

Me serán testigos

by Jorge Briones, Leon, Mexico

"Rock" v. "Hard Place":

Bible Translation Dilemmas

by John Brug, the Wartburg Bible Translation Project

#Social: Getting Started with a Church or

School Social Media Program

by Alexis Schneider and Jordan McMahon, social media team leaders, Apostles Lutheran Church, San Jose, California

Have You Heard About...?:

Christian Apologetics in Person and Online

by Allen Quist, ELS Doctrine Committee

Digital Christianity

By Martin Spriggs, WELS Chief Technology Officer and host of WELStech webcasts

Popular Music For Worship, In and Out of Church

by Petr Krakora, pastor in the Czech Evangelical Lutheran Church, and teacher at Martin Luther School in Pizen, Czech Republic

How Christian Was That Movie?

by Tom Kuster, Christ in Media Institute

Gaming for the Gospel

by Mae Tacke, Minnesota Valley Lutheran High School and online digital instructor

**Making Videos that Promote Your School
(and Your Lord)**

by Nick Bartels, a senior and a video-maker at Lakeside Lutheran High School, Lake Mills, WI

What Should I Do with My Holodeck?

Exploring Virtual Reality for Evangelism

by Brian Klebig, ELS pastor and doctoral student at Michigan State University, East Lansing

Sponsored by



at Bethany Lutheran College
