

EARLY REACTIONS TO HOENECKE'S DOGMATIK
MIRRORED THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CHURCH BODIES

Paul M. Mose

May 28, 1991

Sr. Church History

Professor Fredrich

Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library
11831 W. Seminary Drive. 66W
Mequon, Wisconsin

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my thanks to Professor Wilbert Gawrisch, Professor Joel Fredrich, and Pastor Gary Baumler for the time which they gave me in conversations about this subject.

I also want to especially thank my fellow seminary student, Brett Brauer, for his help in translating some of my German sources. Without his help, I doubt that I would have been able to finish this paper in the time I was given. I will, however, take full responsibility for the German translations, including any mistakes included in them.

There are many different ways one could evaluate the life and work of Dr. Adolf Hoenecke. Over the course of years many different people have done exactly that. This paper will not seek to reveal all of the areas in which people responded to Dr. Hoenecke, but will focus on the area of his ~~magnus~~^{magnus} opus, his *Ev. Luth. Dogmatik*. To accomplish this purpose, it will include a brief biography of Dr. Hoenecke, a description of how his *Dogmatics* was published, and the reactions which numerous people and groups had to it.

Dr. Gustav Adolf Felix Theodor Hoenecke was born on February 2, 1835 in Brandenburg Germany, about fifty miles southwest of Berlin. (1) There he finished his elementary schooling and the Gymnasium. (2) Even though his motives for it were unclear, in 1856 he went to Halle in order to study theology. (3) It was here that he met August Tholuck, a professor who would influence Hoenecke's growth as a theologian. He completed his studies at Halle in 1859.

Beginning on January 1, 1860, he worked for two years as a private tutor for Mr. Major of Wattenwahl near Bern. (4) During this time Dr. Hoenecke continued his study of theology and dogmatics. As he learned more of the Reformed theology, he became uncomfortable with the Union agreement that Lutheran and Reformed pastors wouldn't practice polemics against one another. (5) This feeling and his uncertain financial situation were factors in his acceptance of the call of the High Consistory for volunteers to come to America to do work supported by the Berlin Mission Society. (6)

And so Dr. Hoenecke was ordained and, in the spring of 1863, he came to Wisconsin with the understanding that he would likely be the pastor of a congregation in La Crosse. (7) That position was filled by the time he arrived, so he preached for a time in Racine and eventually became pastor in Farmington during that same year. (8)

In 1864, Hoenecke was elected as secretary of the Wisconsin Synod. (9) This position was the first step to his being noticed by others in the synod. In 1865, he was appointed as associate editor of the *Evangelisch--Lutherisches Gemeindeblatt*. (10)

A major change occurred in 1866. Conditions at the seminary at Watertown convinced that year's synod convention to establish the position of inspector, about equivalent to a dean of students. The convention also elected Hoenecke to this position. In part because of this, Professor E. Moldehnke resigned his position as professor at the school and began plans to return to Germany. (11) As a result of Moldehnke's departure, Hoenecke not only became head of the Seminary, but also editor-in-chief of the *Gemeindeblatt*. (12) He held both of these positions until his death of pneumonia on January 3, 1908. (13)

At the time of Hoenecke's death, he had not yet completed making his *Dogmatics* ready for publication. This work was completed by his sons, Walter and Otto. The Missouri Synod's *Theological Quarterly* spoke of the process of getting his manuscript printed by quoting a publisher's

prospectus.

For years the members of the General Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, and other States had entertained the wish that Dr. A. Hoenecke, professor and director at the theological seminary at Wauwatosa, Wis., who died January the third, 1908, might publish his dogmatic lectures. Dr. Hoenecke acceded to this wish, which was voiced particularly by his many pupils. He was on the point of preparing his lectures for publication, in fact, he had for years been occupied with this arduous task, when the Lord summoned him from his labors before he had completed them. Lest the work thus begun remain uncompleted, and the oft-repeated wish of many persons in our circles unfulfilled, the sons of the deceased have undertaken to complete their father's work and publish it. A committee, consisting of Prof. A. Ernst of Watertown, Prof. J. Koehler of Wauwatosa, and Rev. C. Gausewitz of Milwaukee, was appointed to assist them. The publication was taken in hand by the Publishing House of the Synod. (14)

They planned to publish the work first in eighty page leaflets, beginning with Volume 2, followed by Volumes 3, 4, and finally Volume 1. The publisher's prospectus elaborates on this system.

The publication begins with dogmatics proper, with theology (in the strict sense). It is not necessary to state the reason why the publication does not begin with the Prolegomena. The reason is this: The author was engaged on a revision (Neubearbeitung) of the Prolegomena and on expanding the material of this chapter by an additional history of the Prolegomena, when God called him from his labor. However, he left extensive notes covering the uncompleted part of his work. These must now be worked out, and that only to give to the complete work that degree of perfection which the author had intended. That is the reason why the publication begins in the middle of the work. The notes, when fully elaborated, will be submitted to the editing committee for criticism, and will be marked 'uncompleted by the author' in the published edition of the work. The entire work will be concluded with an exhaustive index. The first number is now ready for mailing. It is presumed that one number of 80 pages will be issued every other month, and the entire work will

comprise about 20 numbers, and require three years for its completion. (15)

This time frame turned out to be too ambitious. The first leaflets were published in 1909. The last one was published in 1914, five years later.

Dr. Hoenecke was clear in what his approach to his Dogmatics would be. It would contain the teachings of the Old Lutherans, but would not always use the same forms which they used. "The submitted Dogmatics is and should be one of the old Lutheran church, above all else in its contents, generally speaking in its form." (16) His goal was to transmit those pure teachings to modern day students.

Our theological students should become entrusted with the dogmatics of the old Lutheran church. That could hardly happen better than through this, that they would be made at home in the old teaching systems, in which the spirit of the old, similarly written, Lutheran teachings held sway throughout centuries. (17)

Hoenecke realized that his variations on the old form would cause some people difficulties. Some people might want to abandon the old forms altogether. But Hoenecke wrote, "No expert of the history of dogmatics will deny that this system has already had a blessing which has not been valued highly enough, also for the preservation of the pure doctrine." (18) Hoenecke also realized that some people might fear that changing the old forms would somehow change their contents. To them he responded, "Old doctrinal substance and obsolete teaching form are not the same things. We savor the same good Word of God as our faithful old dogmaticians, yet our taste for dogmatic descriptions may easily be different than

theirs in many cases." (19) Hoenecke hoped that both viewpoints could see the value of his approach. "This may satisfy as an explanation, on one hand for those who find much too old in these lectures in their form, on the other hand for those who find much too new." (20)

Dr. Hoenecke's basic approach was to state carefully worded theses and antitheses, which he followed with discussions of those statements. In this way, he not only stated the correct teachings, but also refuted false teachings. This approach came from the way he had conducted the lectures at the seminary.

From its character as lectures for theological students, esp. under our conditions, it is explained that, where it is a question of opinion of various doctrinal appearances and doctrinal developments, etc., not only will a short opinion be given about it, but also extensive statements about the subject matter, which gives the justification to the opinion and at the same time a desirable clearness. (21)

Hoenecke's *Dogmatics* was received very favorably by members of the Wisconsin Synod. This would naturally be expected, for this work had been greatly desired by its members. The *Gemeindeblatt* confirmed this desire in Hoenecke's obituary.

For a long time already the Synod has had two wishes: that he publish his *Dogmatics* and call into being a theological periodical. The latter came about four years ago, and Dr. Hoenecke was the prominent writer. He worked on his *Dogmatics* for the purpose of publication for many years, but he was freed from this work through his difficult sickness. (22)

Professor J. Schaller, who was on the publication committee, expressed a favorable view of the work.

In the theological work of Dr. Hoenecke the vivid character is obviously evident. On the strength of his excellent, natural ability he had obtained a rich, precise, orderly and overall helpful presentation of material in the course of time; but everything was used entirely in service of the Gospel, which in this way distinguished him from others. With his public discourses, his sermons, and his lectures one always admired the clarity and the reliability of the description and the quick reply to possible objections, but could also always heartily rejoice how all of his comments were ruled by a clear knowledge of the truth of salvation and from a childlike subjection to the Word of Scripture as God's Word. Hoenecke was a Bible theologian and wanted to be nothing else; to him the sermon of the gracious forgiveness of sins through Christ stood in the center of the entire theology. In this spirit also he has handled the Lutheran Dogmatics; his description is throughout pervaded and illuminated by the Gospel. In addition his particular strength lay in the explanation with the multifaceted antitheses, whose errors and mistakes he exposes with skilful acuteness. (23)

Professor J. P. Koehler held Hoenecke's approach to dogmatics in high regard. He says that from him he learned

the right method of the dogmatician, which builds on careful exegesis of language and history to convey to the human mind no more and no less, and hence not otherwise either than Scripture does, the eternal divine truths which the Spirit has revealed unto faith. (24)

Koehler also notices the fact that Hoenecke was not bound to what the earlier dogmaticians had said, but what the Bible said.

He criticized the fathers of Lutheran theology more freely than did Walther. As Luther, without espousing nominalism, did not follow the prevailing realism of scholastic theology, so Hoenecke was not a disciple of the scholastic system which governed the dogmatics of the 17th century and employed a reasoning foreign to our simpler 19th century logic. The doctrinal writings which he himself published are evidence of that, e.g. the prolegomena of his dogmatics [sic]. (25)

Nevertheless, Professor August Pieper shows in his articles for the *Theologische Quartalschrift* that Hoenecke had deeply studied those Lutheran dogmaticians. When he was a student at Halle, Tholuck had encouraged him to study them.

He directed him to the study of Lutheran dogmatics, pointing especially to Calov and Quenstedt as men who in intellectual sharpness and their very deep sincerity in regard to Scripture far surpassed all the shining lights of the first and second rationalistic periods. (26)

This firm grounding in Lutheran doctrine, combined with his natural personality, resulted in many people appreciating his approach to ministry and teaching. Pieper describes him as

a calm and prudent man who exercised his influence quietly, bore the weaknesses of our older men, though yielding not even a particle of God's Word. Even when practicing polemics, he never offended against Christian courtesy--just read the *Gemeindeblatt* and *Der Lutheraner* of that period. He strengthened and guided his coworkers in the synod and gave his students a firm grounding in sound Lutheranism, and with great patience he eagerly pursued peace with all who loved divine Truth. (27)

Pieper repeatedly points to Hoenecke's precision as his strong point.

He had an uncommonly sharp mind, was precise in his definition of terms and concepts, and--he knew his subject from the ground up. In exegesis and in clear dogmatic exposition he simply was the unexcelled master in our circles. (28)

Hoenecke never laid claim to first-class theological greatness. But he was a very thorough theologian of a relatively old-fashioned cut. His training was on the high level of German scholarship. His most outstanding intellectual characteristic was an uncommon acumen and clarity. For that reason gifted students found him interesting, yes, gripping, and to the less gifted ones he proved to be persuasive and fruitful.

Thoroughly at home in Scripture, in Luther, and in Lutheran dogmatics, he showed himself combat-ready in any debate that became necessary for him. He was also sure of his ground and careful in his argumentation. Therefore, as a rule, he came out victorious. Hoenecke was no fire-breathing warrior who pressed recklessly forward and broke through the enemy lines so that others might follow. Rather, he was a quiet, peace-loving man in the synod, and after the spirit of genuine Lutheranism had overwhelmed his soul and had taken it captive, he was the trustworthy leader of our synod in the cause of the true, pure gospel. (29)

His theology, as you know, is stored up for our use in his many synodical essays, but principally in the great product of his pen, *Ev.-Luth. Dogmatik*. From this fount the pure gospel flows out to the future pastors of our synod even today and, we hope, for many years to come. (30)

Reactions in other Lutheran bodies to Hoenecke's *Dogmatics* were also generally favorable. Periodicals of the Missouri Synod greeted the beginning of the publication. "The title of this publication, together with the name of the author, are sufficient to arrest the attention and to arouse the interest of every Lutheran theologian." (31)

In the discussion of these theses it becomes apparent that the author is a scholar of extensive reading, that his reading has been critical, and that he has formulated a careful judgment of the force and tendency of the statements of ancient, medieval, and modern theologians. (32)

We readily confess to a keen sense of delight while perusing this initial number of the first genuine Lutheran *Dogmatik* published in America and emanating from an American theologian. It is, of course, impossible at this early date to essay even a tentative judgment of the work as a whole; but the contents of the first installment are promising in such a high degree as to cause one to look forward with eagerness to the forthcoming sequels, and to wish both the editors and the publisher Godspeed in their painstaking efforts. (33)

The Missouri Synod's *Lehre und Wehre* also spoke well of the work, not only in its material, but also in printing quality. "In a typographical respect one can judge the first leaflet as surpassing. A distinguished work, like this *Dogmatics*, deserves also a distinguished entrance." (34)

Missouri synod publications continued to praise the work as it was being printed. The *Theological Quarterly* called the second leaflet "a worthy sequel to the first." (35) They likewise continued to speak well of his general approach to dogmatics.

Dr. Hoenecke's work, about which we have already reported the first six booklets in "*Lehre und Wehre*," grounds itself on the Lutheran dogmaticians. Yet although Hoenecke bears these in mind at length, so has he not yet simply taken over their teachings, but rather he exercises on them a repeated and, in part, decisive criticism, although with every mildness and modesty. (36)

But all words from Missouri were not words of praise. A review in the *Lehre und Wehre* criticized Hoenecke's *Dogmatics* for not speaking enough about justification.

In the detailed discourse of justification we fail to see a thorough discussion of universal justification, which still is a basis for everything that one otherwise has to realize about justification, and therefore should not be laid aside with a few sentences. But understandably the presentation of Hoenecke here is also correct. (37)

But in general, Missouri synod reviewers stood firmly with Hoenecke's material, especially as it spoke against false teaching. Their comments on his presentation dealing with the Election Controversy show this.

Very detailed is the criticism regarding the treatment of the doctrine of the dogmaticians concerning election *intuitu fidei*, which the Ohio

synod has made as its Shibboleth. Understandably we make no rebuke of Hoenecke for such criticism. Rather we are of the opinion that Hoenecke sometimes still moves, formally and factually, rather too much in the paths of the dogmaticians than that he had distanced himself from them too far, for example in the treatment of the doctrine of the call, illumination, rebirth, conversion, and repentance. (38)

Hoenecke's *Dogmatics* was received with more reservations by members of the Ohio Synod, for the Election Controversy has driven a wedge between Ohio and Wisconsin. Ohio's approval of the work was more reserved.

He has at his disposal a significant dogmatic knowledge and skill. His explanations are as a rule plausible and instructive. One thing we miss, however, namely a somewhat extensive Scriptural proof. Too often only the *sedes doctrinae* of the respective Scriptural passages are cited, without so much as printing out one in full, or where necessary, explaining more exactly. (39)

The *Theologische Zeitblätter's* reviewer, Professor F. W. Stellhorn, was very thorough in his evaluations, sometimes even mentioning minor details.

The editing of the work for print on the part of the sons of the author is a very careful one. The printing is an exemplary one for a work with its many quotes in foreign languages. Only a couple of printing mistakes, which one easily corrects himself, are found by us; for example, on page 287 [of Volume 2], the page heading is premature. (40)

In several instances, Stellhorn remarks that Hoenecke's explanations are not as conclusive as Hoenecke presents them as being.

In the doctrine of the Trinity, Gen. 1:1-2 is also quoted as a place in which the "three persons become certainly enumerated." This has said too much; without the light of the New Testament no one would also find indicated in the expression, "God spoke" the second person of the Godhead. (41)

With the doctrine of the Fall of Man, the author takes pains on pages 385ff. to reply in assured antitheses to our dogmaticians the question why God has allowed the fall of man, and yet he still comes with it to no comprehensible and satisfying solution. (42)

Stellhorn also often remarks that Hoenecke should have included more material on the subject being discussed. For example, on the subject of what human nature inherits, he says that "the author should have stressed and emphasized more over against the Reformed objection." (43) Stellhorn also spends about two pages expanding on the subject of Christ's active and passive obedience, because here, too, Hoenecke didn't state things as he thought they should be said. (44)

Stellhorn reacts negatively to the times when Hoenecke speaks of older dogmaticians in less than favorable ways. One example is "Philip [Melanchthon], whom the author gladly appears to criticize." (45) At another place he remarks, "But we do not understand why it was necessary also here again to find fault with Philip." (46)

Stellhorn expressed his discomfort at criticizing those deceased theologians with the words, "But whoever condemns out of hand our fathers of doctrine, who have rested with the Lord for centuries, in such a disdainful and unjustified way, to him one must oppose energetically, if he has also already himself departed from this life." (47)

Stellhorn did indeed criticize Hoenecke's material, particularly in matters relating to the Election Controversy. An expanded quotation will relate some of his views.

This tenth part of the most complete and thorough work (which by the way is not very rapidly nearing its completion) of all those which have appeared on the dogmatic field in the Lutheran church of America, treats of vocation, illumination, regeneration, conversion and repentance. These are the very articles which, besides the one concerning predestination, are in controversy between the Synodical Conference and the Joint Synod of Ohio.

We are glad to be able to say that the standpoint of the author in these doctrines is not such an extreme one, not one which is so opposed to the Lutheran system of doctrine that for more than three hundred years has remained constant, as over against Calvinism with its absolute predestination, and its irresistible grace in conversion, as we, judging from the treatment of the doctrine of predestination, feared would be the case.

Here, too, the author is not a consistent co-religionist with Calvin. An absolute predestination i.e. one that pays absolutely no attention to the previous demeanor and line of conduct of man as over against converting and saving grace, necessarily includes and asks for an irresistible grace in conversion i.e. one which is not at all determined by the demeanor of man as over against it.

The author indisputably teaches an absolute predestination in the sense in which we have just given it, and which is commonly accepted, being disputed only by New Missouri and its co-religionists. He should, therefore, if he is at all a consistent thinker, teach an irresistible conversion. (48)

Here it is worth mentioning that Stellhorn does not feel that Hoenecke was being as "extreme" as he had expected. This might be because Hoenecke spoke against Ohio in a gentle way, as was his nature. This, in connection with the Missouri Synod's reputation for being harsh, might have led to the impression that Hoenecke wasn't being quite as objectionable.

Another item of importance is the sentence, "He should, therefore, if he is at all a consistent thinker, teach an

irresistible conversion." (49) Stellhorn seems to be approaching dogmatics with an understanding that it will all fit together logically. After all, in the Election Controversy the Ohio Synod was trying to make the doctrine of election rational. But Hoenecke surprises Stellhorn with his approach of saying what Scripture says, and nothing more. When speaking of election, Hoenecke is willing to write things which don't make logical sense to us, but which are definitely true because God has said they are.

Because what Hoenecke is saying doesn't make sense to him, Stellhorn criticizes him.

The author's attempt at showing how senseless it is to speak thereof, that one before complete conversion is able to abstain from a spiteful resistance proves at its best merely that he did not know what Lutherans so term. In general it touches us rather peculiarly when a man, whose work is so completely founded on that of our fathers and who, as often as he can, quotes them as witnesses of orthodoxy, then there, where they do not agree with him, represents them as men who speak thoughtlessly and senselessly and who cannot wake up to the fact that their speaking and teaching, as often as they bring it into exercise, has no sense and meaning. We think our old dogmaticians are quite equal to our New Missourians in logical thinking. (50)

The opinion of the final church body to be studied is less controversial. The Iowa Synod welcomed the publication of this work.

We greet this work with joy, for once it always has his peculiar charm, to have still to do with the result of the scholarly life's work of a man who has won importance in wide circles, and furthermore because it is the first thorough complete presentation of Lutheran Doctrine from the feather of a theologian of the Synodical Conference. (51)

A complete opinion can naturally first be delivered

after the publication of all the parts, but thus far it can now already be said that Hoenecke has thoroughly studied rich material, that he puts down his sentences clearly and sharply, and that one can hardly learn nothing from the book. (52)

The main criticism of the Iowa reviewer was that Hoenecke didn't seem to let the doctrinal teachings flow from the Scriptural proofs, perhaps because he referred to older dogmaticians at length and didn't always have the proof passages written out, as was referred to earlier.

Hoenecke's presentation, disregarding the fundamental error referred to earlier, namely a deficiency of the careful elicitation and acquirement of the truth from Scripture, lacks the quiet development of the positive doctrines too much. The author has his eyes fixed so much on the antitheses that he does not give himself the needed rest to bring his own opinion in completed form to the presentation from every angle. (53)

A method which develops more from Scriptures, developing instead of proceeding polemically, would be more fruitful. (54)

From reading these two sections, one might easily get the impression that the Iowa reviewer wished that Hoenecke had not refuted false teachings. But this is the only way that the true teaching can truly be revealed clearly.

The reactions to Hoenecke's work at the time of its publication follows the general relationship between the church bodies at that time. The Wisconsin and Missouri Synods were basically united, although Missouri wasn't afraid to voice its opinions where it thought things were lacking. The Ohio Synod recognized it as a scholarly work, but used it as an opportunity to restate their opinions that they were correct in the Election Controversy, and that theirs was the

historic Lutheran viewpoint. The Iowa Synod stated the desire to be strongly Scriptural, but was uncomfortable in too much strife. This feeling of not pointing out other people's errors is a foundation for the ecumenical movement which is around today, also in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, of which the Iowa Synod is now a part.

Since these initial reactions, many people have received benefit from Hoenecke's *Dogmatics*. Unfortunately, over the course of years that number has been decreasing. The number of seminary students fluent in German is now less than it was in Hoenecke's time. With recent curriculum changes in the language department of Northwestern College, it is hard to say whether that number will eventually increase or decrease.

Since the 1950's, seminary students have had access to the English translation of Pieper's *Dogmatics*. While this is useful, it doesn't do away with the value of Hoenecke's work. Each presents material in different depth and ways. For example, Pieper is more conversational, Hoenecke relies more on theses.

There have been English translations of Hoenecke in the Seminary Library for several years. These were done by several different people, and therefore are of different quality. It is also often difficult to find a specific reference in these translations, because the divisions are not always marked clearly.

It is therefore a delight to hear that Northwestern Publishing House has begun work on an English translation of

Hoenecke's *Dogmatics*. Will it be received with as much enthusiasm as the original in 1909? Only time will tell. But at least now another thoroughly Lutheran view of dogmatics will be readily available in the English. With it, Professor Schaller's words will be true. "Thus Dr. Hoenecke also sits for us on his professor's chair for the future. May also this printed work serve to that end that his memory remain among us in blessing." (55) And as Dr. Hoenecke himself wrote,

Solely relying on the Lord does the publication of these lectures begin. May He give completion to the undertaking and his gracious blessing to begin with, that by this means a constant, fruitful, dogmatic instruction may be imparted in our Seminary which is dear to us all. (56)

APPENDIX A

Translated from Hoenecke's *Dogmatics*, Vol. 1, pp. V & VI.

FOREWORD

By Dr. Hoenecke, who was about to publish his *Dogmatics*, written by himself.

The Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan and other states has desired the publication of the lectures on the dogmatics of the Lutheran church which were held in its Seminary, and so the appearance of these in print begins with these words. These few words already contain an explanation about the manner of the lectures being published, and these hardly still need a further explanation. It has already been said with these words that the submitted *Dogmatics* is and should be one of the old Lutheran church, above all else in its contents, generally speaking in its form. This latter work came about with much care. Our theological students should become entrusted with the dogmatics of the old Lutheran church. That could hardly happen better than through this, that they would be made at home in the old teaching systems, in which the spirit of the old, similarly written, Lutheran teachings held sway throughout centuries. No expert of the history of dogmatics will deny that this system has already had a blessing which has not been valued highly enough, also for the preservation of the pure doctrine. Gladly it is conceded that nothing of the old orthodox systems is a system in the strict sense. To advance such a position can also not occur to a dogmatician who is basing himself simply on Scriptures. With a systematic dogmatizing in the strict sense, which indeed would also want to consider itself Scriptural, sometimes the systematic theologian becomes trustworthy, and sometimes the testimony of Scripture must become stretched out on the Procrustean bed. And, the appeal to experience of many of will have its right here, it is deficient with a certain necessity ultimately in the clearness and sharp boundary of the dogmatic terms, as the simple form of the systematic representation of our elders delivers them with, as one often criticizes, a somewhat mechanical and ultimately tedious methodology. Yet that is the main thing above all else in lectures for theological students, and not interesting systems.

From its character as lectures for theological students, esp. under our conditions, it is explained that, where it is a question of opinion of various doctrinal appearances and doctrinal developments, etc., not only will a short opinion be given about it, but also extensive statements about the subject matter, which gives the justification to the opinion and at the same time a desirable clearness. This method obviously finds application particularly in the Prolegomena.

That yet, to identify it briefly, every consideration is taken to the demand of timeliness, not only in reference to doctrinal development, but also instructional manner, it

agrees very well with this that the lectures appearing with these words bear essentially the form of the old dogmatics. Old doctrinal substance and obsolete teaching form are not the same things. We savor the same good Word of God as our faithful old dogmaticians, yet our taste for dogmatic description may easily be different than theirs in many cases. This may satisfy as an explanation, on one hand for those who find much too old in these lectures in their form, on the other hand for those who find much too new.

Solely relying on the Lord does the publication of these lectures begin. May He give completion to the undertaking and his gracious blessing to begin with, that by this means a constant, fruitful, dogmatic instruction may be imparted in our Seminary which is dear to us all.

A. Hoenecke
Wauwatosa, WI

APPENDIX B

Translated from Hoenecke's *Dogmatics*, Vol. I, pp. VI & VII.

FOREWORD OF THE EDITOR

We gladly comply with the wish of the Synod, to prepare the lectures of our father for print, since the Lord took the work from his hands. The lectures essentially appear as they were put forward in the last revision. Where completions were necessary, as particularly in the history of the Prolegomena, this was completed by us for the sake of completeness according to the detailed notes left behind by our father and was examined in association with Prof. J. Schaller, Prof. J. Koehler, and Pastor C. Gausewitz. For their efforts we express our heart felt thanks. Finally, we mention that all the completions added by us will be identified in print by brackets -- [--].

Walther and Otto Hoenecke
Milwaukee, WI 1914

APPENDIX C

Translated from Hoenecke's *Dogmatics*, Vol. 1, pp. XII & XIII.

In the theological work of Dr. Hoenecke the vivid character is obviously evident. On the strength of his excellent, natural ability he had obtained a rich, precise, orderly and overall helpful presentation of material in the course of time; but everything was used entirely in service of the Gospel, which in this way distinguished him from others. With his public discourses, his sermons, and his lectures one always admired the clarity and the reliability of the description and the quick reply to possible objections, but could also always heartily rejoice how all of his comments were ruled by a clear knowledge of the truth of salvation and from a childlike subjection to the Word of Scripture as God's Word. Hoenecke was a Bible theologian and wanted to be nothing else; to him the sermon of the gracious forgiveness of sins through Christ stood in the center of the entire theology. In this spirit also he has handled the Lutheran Dogmatics; his description is throughout pervaded and illuminated by the Gospel. In addition his particular strength lay in the explanation with the multifaceted antitheses, whose errors and mistakes he exposes with skilful acuteness.

Unfortunately he was not permitted to lay the final, screening and polishing hand to this great work. Just shortly before his death he had decided to comply with the longing of his synod and make available to the entire church the fruit of his long standing work of study. His revision has not progressed far. Therefore in this work actually only a copy of the presentation will be offered, which he worked out for his lectures, which certainly he often augmented and revised in the course of years, but never had finished to his own satisfaction. If the pen had not been taken from his hand so early, then he would have arranged at length, for example, the exegetical proofs to his theses, as he was accustomed to give them with the lecture, in connection to the dictation to his students. Similarly one must expose many other weaknesses, which one perhaps wants to recognize in his presentations. On his sons, who made the manuscript ready for press with loving devotion and an inherent comprehension of the characteristics of their father, a very understandable reverence forced the fundamental rule, that only the unavoidable changes might be made in their father's manner of speaking and essential presentations.

Thus Dr. Hoenecke also sits for us on his professor's chair for the future. May also this printed work serve to that end that his memory remain among us in blessing.

J. Schaller
Wauwatosa, WI. Feb. 1, 1914

ENDNOTES

1 August Pieper, "The Significance of Dr. Adolf Hoenecke for the Wisconsin Synod and American Lutheranism," Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Vol. 87 (1990), p. 249.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid. p. 250.

4 Ibid. p. 253.

5 Ibid. p. 254.

6 Ibid. p. 256.

7 Ibid.

8 Ibid. p. 257.

9 August Pieper, "The Significance of Dr. Adolf Hoenecke for the Wisconsin Synod and American Lutheranism," Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Vol. 88 (1991), p. 27.

10 Ibid. p. 29.

11 Ibid.

12 Pieper, WLO, Vol. 87, p. 266.

13 John Philip Koehler, The History of the Wisconsin Synod (St. Cloud, MN: Sentinel Publ. Co., 1970), p. 213.

14 "Book Review," Theological Quarterly, Vol. XIII (1909), pp. 125- 126.

15 Ibid. p. 126.

16 Adolf Hoenecke, Ev.-Luth. Dogmatik, Volume I (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publ. House, 1909), p. V.

17 Ibid.

18 Ibid.

19 Ibid. p. VI.

20 Ibid.

21 Ibid.

22 Ev. Luth. Gemeinde-Blatt, Jan. 15, 1908, p. 18.

23 Hoenecke, p. XII.

- 24 Koehler, p. 214.
- 25 Ibid. p. 215.
- 26 Pieper, WLQ, Vol. 87, pp. 252-253.
- 27 Ibid. pp. 170-171.
- 28 Ibid. p. 263.
- 29 Pieper, WLQ, Vol, 88, pp. 143-144.
- 30 Ibid. p. 145.
- 31 Theological Quarterly, p. 125.
- 32 Ibid. p. 128.
- 33 Ibid.
- 34 "Literatur," Lehre und Wehre, Vol. 55 (1909), p. 120.
- 35 Theological Quarterly, p. 188.
- 36 "Literatur," Lehre und Wehre, Vol. 58 (1912), p. 121.
- 37 Ibid. p. 218.
- 38 Ibid. p. 121.
- 39 F. W. Stellhorn, "Literatur," Theologische Zeitblaetter, Vol. 29 (1910), p. 307.
- 40 Ibid. pp. 307-308.
- 41 Ibid. p. 308.
- 42 Ibid. p. 373.
- 43 F. W. Stellhorn, "Literatur," Theologische Zeitblaetter, Vol. 1 (1911), p. 334.
- 44 Ibid. pp. 334-336.
- 45 Stellhorn, Theologische Zeitblaetter, Vol. 29, p. 309.
- 46 Ibid. p. 373.
- 47 Ibid. p. 374.

48 F. W. Stellhorn, "Recent Publications," The Lutheran Church Review, Vol. 31 (1912), pp. 778-779. Trans. "V."

49 Ibid. p. 779.

50 Ibid. p. 783.

51 "Aus der theol. Arbeit des vergangenen Jahres," Kirchliche Zeitschrift, Vol. 34 (1910), p. 41.

52 Ibid.

53 "Aus der theol. Arbeit des vergangenen Jahres," Kirchliche Zeitschrift, Vol. 36 (1912), p. 27.

54 "Aus der theol. Arbeit des vergangenen Jahres," Kirchliche Zeitschrift, Vol. 38 (1914), p. 174.

55 Hoenecke, p. XIII.

56 Ibid. p. VI.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "Aus der theol. Arbeit des vergangenen Jahres." Kirchliche Zeitschrift, Vol. 34 (1910), pp. 41-42.
- "Aus der theol. Arbeit des vergangenen Jahres." Kirchliche Zeitschrift, Vol. 36 (1912), pp. 27-28.
- "Aus der theol. Arbeit des vergangenen Jahres." Kirchliche Zeitschrift, Vol. 38 (1914), pp. 173-174.
- "Book Review." Theological Quarterly, Vol XIII (1909), pp. 125-128, 188-190.
- Ev. Luth. Gemeinde-Blatt, Vol. 143, No. 2 (Jan 15, 1908), p. 18.
- Hoenecke, Adolf. Ev.-Luth. Dogmatik Vol. I. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publ. House, 1909.
- "Literatur." Lehre und Wehre, Vol. 55 (1909), p. 120.
- "Literatur." Lehre und Wehre, Vol. 56 (1910), pp. 220-221.
- "Literatur." Lehre und Wehre, Vol. 58 (1912), pp. 121, 218-219.
- Koehler, John Philipp. The History of the Wisconsin Synod. St. Cloud, MN: Sentinel Publ. Co., 1970.
- Pieper, August. "The Significance of Dr. Adolf Hoenecke for the Wisconsin Synod and American Lutheranism." Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Vol. 87 (1990), pp. 168-180, 249-267. Trans. Werner Franzmann.
- Pieper, August. "The Significance of Dr. Adolf Hoenecke for the Wisconsin Synod and American Lutheranism." Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Vol. 88 (1991), pp. 15-33, 124-145. Trans. Werner Franzmann.
- Stellhorn, F. W. "Literatur." Theologische Zeitblaetter, Vol. 29 (1910), pp. 306-309, 372-376.
- Stellhorn, F. W. "Literatur." Theologische Zeitblaetter, Vol. 1 (1911), pp. 333-337.
- Stellhorn, F. W. "Literatur." Theologische Zeitblaetter, Vol. 2 (1912), pp. 128-133, 235-239, 427-428.
- Stellhorn, F. W. "Literatur." Theologische Zeitblaetter, Vol. 3 (1913), pp. 44-45, 342-343.
- Stellhorn, F. W. "Recent Publications." The Lutheran Church Review, Vol. 31 (1912), pp. 778-783. Trans. "V."