

A REDACTION-CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE WISCONSIN LUTHERAN
SEMINARY DOGMATICS NOTES

BY
PETER S.A. METZGER

THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF DIVINITY

PROF. JOHN F. BRUG, ADVISOR
WISCONSIN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MEQUON, WISCONSIN
MARCH 2013

Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is to examine and evaluate the historical influences that have effected alterations and additions of content and diction in the Dogmatics notes of the Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary in the span of 70 years. Two editions of the Dogmatics notes have been analyzed – the edition with which J.P. Meyer began teaching in 1935, and the current edition, which was revised in 2005. In view of the mass amount of material contained in the Dogmatics notes, three specific headings have been isolated: *Christian Marriage and the Family*, *the Lord's Supper*, and *the Ministerial Office*. Within the first two headings the focus has been narrowed further to isolate Family Planning and Reproductive Technology, as well as the Moment of Presence. Each focal point is introduced, overviewed historically, analyzed according to the alterations in Dogmatics notes, and conclusions are drawn therefrom. This thesis concludes with an encouragement to continue to carefully craft further alterations to the Dogmatics notes in view of external influences while maintaining a faithful biblical foundation.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Problem 1
Purpose 3
Preliminary Observations 4
Procedure 5

CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY

Introduction 6
Historical Overview 6
 Family Planning 7
 Reproductive Technology 10
Dogmatics Notes Analysis 12
Conclusions 13

LORD’S SUPPER

Introduction 13
Historical Overview 14
Conclusions 16
Dogmatics Notes Analysis 16

MINISTERIAL OFFICE

Introduction 17
Historical Overview 18
Conclusions 22
Dogmatics Notes Analysis 23

CONCLUSION 23

BIBLIOGRAPHY 25

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Christian Marriage and the Family	27
Appendix B – Lord’s Supper	42
Appendix C – Theses on the Lord’s Supper by the Doctrine Committee of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod	44
Appendix D – Six-point statement added in May, 1989 to clarify thesis nine	46
Appendix E – Ministerial Office	47

Introduction

Problem

We live in a world of amazing flexibility and change. Within one's own lifespan, drastic and severe changes can be witnessed on a regular basis, not just in the mentality and habits of that individual person, but also in the wide world around him. Many of the aspects of the world in its present form would baffle and boggle the minds of those who walked the very same earth no more than 100 years ago. Because of the development of technology, for instance, the way in which people go about performing even the most mundane and regular subsistence activities in the year 2013 would look to be something out of a science fiction novel, a completely incomprehensible picture of the present to residents of the not-so-distant past. Because of the passage of time and the unceasing progression of history, the metaphysics of communities and the philosophies of cultures morph and grow and revert back to trends that are thousands of years old, in much the same, unpredictable way that a river changes its course every year depending on the precipitation and erosion of the past. In short, change is an essential part of the history of this world and the burden falls on the prudent to document, examine, and grow from the conclusions gleaned therefrom.

With eyes open to and aware of the changes that incessantly occur in the world around him, the astute observer will also recognize that there exist certain immutable realities. Authors, poets, and those who look to entertain with witty quips and quotations that could only have come from a mind the like of Benjamin Franklin would smartly assert that the only things that are certain in life are death and taxes. If one were to be so bold as to improve upon such a timeless axiom he might assert that, ironically, change itself proves to be one of the most prevalent, unchanging aspects of this life. Others, who are most certainly more bright and keen witted than this author, could likely compose a list of gargantuan proportions consisting of the unchanging realities of this world. However, for the sake of the focus of this paper forget the mindless inanities and idiosyncrasies of the world and its history and instead consider what contribution a Christian might make to such a list.

Certainly, in the context of words like immutability, the first thing that would likely jump to the fore of the mind of a Wisconsin Synod theologian is the essence of God. This of course would be drawn from the aforementioned theologian's training in systematic theology, i.e. his study of doctrine. This study could produce a number of immutable characteristics of God, but that might be an unnecessary particularization. Rather than enumerating each of the individual, immutable qualities of the essence of God, why not simply state that doctrine itself is unchanging? After all, there has been no progressive revelation; there has been no addition to the Christian canon for two millennia, nor is there expectation

for such, as is clear according to the words of John in his Revelation, “I warn everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book: If anyone adds anything to them, God will add to him the plagues described in this book” (22:18). Moses, Jesus, and the divinely inspired apostles and prophets, have long since left this world and discontinued the expansion of the edification and education of their pupils. What remains is simply the consistent and faithful exposition and explanation of the body of doctrine that has already been laid forth.

Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary details as one of its purposes and goals “to teach all the areas of the theological curriculum—biblical, systematic, historical, and practical theology—in a thorough and scholarly fashion, always in full harmony with the Holy Scriptures and in conscious agreement with the Confessions of the Lutheran Church.”¹ In this way WLS acknowledges the unchanging nature of Christian doctrine and esteems the work the historic church has done to preserve it as such. The Seminary continues with an appeal to Scripture itself as the basis for such a stated goal:

The Apostle Paul told the elders of the church in Ephesus, “I have not hesitated to proclaim to you the whole will of God” (Acts 20:27). What Paul had passed on to them, they were in turn to pass on to their flocks. Timothy was to do the same. Paul instructs him, “The things you have heard me say in the presence of many witnesses entrust to reliable men who will also be qualified to teach others” (2 Timothy 2:2). Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary sees this as its primary task also: to pass on intact to the next generation the whole body of truth as revealed in the Scriptures and set forth in the Lutheran Confessions.²

In light of such a professed purpose, how, then, can there be such a visible difference in terms of the material used to accomplish this goal? Over the course of the past 78 years the resources employed by Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary to teach systematic theology specifically have evidenced the change characteristic of the world in which we live. Even the most obtuse, clueless, and unobservant student, when sitting through syllabus day, can’t help but register the fact that the dogmatics professor just handed him a stack of roughly 1500 sheets of paper weighing upwards of 15 pounds. Needless to say, that is a lot of paper. How does it compare, however, to what a seminary student would have received 78 years ago? If a man were to place the WLS systematic theology notes from 1935 next to the current edition of those notes taught in the same class today, the current edition would stand approximately six times higher. Every student, whether diligent and zealous or negligent and lazy, would notice such a

¹ "Our Purpose and Objectives | Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary." Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary. <http://www.wls.wels.net/about-us/our-purpose-and-objectives> (accessed February 18, 2013).

² Ibid

disparity. Why the change? What is so different? What, if anything, is additional; why wasn't it included in the previous edition; and inversely, why is it included now?

Purpose

Precisely these questions are what breathed into this paper the breath of life. The study and exposition of Scripture defines the work of a pastor. If he is to be faithful in his work, it is imperative that he not thoughtlessly regurgitate the work of his forebears, and in effect to treat the work of the church fathers (or his seminary professors) as gospel, or pure gold, or the silver bullet that will be perfectly applicable in any and every situation. J. P. Koehler properly encourages diligent theological study and discourages an apathetic or indolent "inertia" with the following words:

The inertia of which I am speaking shows itself in a lack of readiness again and again to treat theological-scholarly matters or practical matters theoretically and fundamentally without preconceived notions. This is necessary if we are to watch and criticize ourselves. For in the course of time, circumstances change and our views also change. For example, words and expressions change their meaning. And if we do not again and again rethink in detail the most important theological matters and our way of presenting them, it can happen that all of this can become mere empty form without spirit or life. As we practice such self-criticism, we shall find that the divine truths which we draw out of Scripture indeed always remain the same, but that the manner in which we defend them, yes, even how we present them is not always totally correct. Here we can and must continue to learn.³

In its current form the Systematic Theology department at Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary is largely responsible for the education that Koehler encourages, and for entrusting the truths of Scripture to aspirant pastors. The fact that the graduates of the class of 2013 will not have graduated having studied the exact same dogmatics notes as the first pastoral candidates of the Wisconsin Synod has inspired an examination into the current dogmatics notes, ideally taking into consideration the pertinent historical perspectives, and making note of the expansion and contraction of a variety of doctrines as the time and context of pastoral ministry dictated.

Now, in order to properly and thoroughly accomplish such a goal, out of necessity one would be required to dedicate years to research, hundreds of hours to composition, and thousands of pages of finely tuned and in depth historical and doctrinal insight. The end result would be a document far greater than 6 times the size of the edition of the dogmatics notes currently in use at Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary. However, the scope of this paper is far too narrow to accomplish such a grandiose

³ Koehler, J.P. "The Importance of the Historical Disciplines," *The Wauwatosa Theology*, Vol. 3 (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House), p.434,435

ambition. Therefore, for the sake of brevity and clarity what follows is *A Redaction-Critical Study of the Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Dogmatics Notes*, which will take a brief look at the following doctrines, taking each as it occurs in the dogmatics notes and detailing the changes in diction, content, and form: Christian Marriage and the Family, the Lord's Supper, and the Ministerial Office. These doctrines, while by no means being a comprehensive list of all the changes that have been made to the WLS dogmatics notes, provide a representative sample set from which different scenarios may be portrayed and from which different conclusion may be made. After each doctrine has been presented a brief analysis will accompany it and seek to explain what impetus there may have been for the changes that have been made. Finally, in the vein of prudence and growth, it would only be fitting to make general observations concerning the nature of the study of unchanging doctrine and its ever-changing expression within the confines of contemporary, external influences.

Preliminary Observations

A brief note of preliminary observations would be warranted prior to the thorough redaction-critical analysis, for there are certain, non-doctrinal factors that play a large role in answering the questions posed above concerning what accounts for the differences in the various editions and what accounts for the most notable disparity, i.e. the comparative lengths of the documents.

Quite naturally the finer points of the format would be subject to change (font, font size, line spacing, margins, inclusion or exclusion of justified text, indentation lengths, etc...). These finer formatting points certainly contribute to the observable differences in the various editions, but they prove to be rather inconsequential in the grand scheme of things. One of the most influential factors when considering document length turns out to be the use of biblical quotations instead of biblical references. Simply taking into consideration the fact that a typical two-verse reference may include a hypothetical average of twenty words, and a typical page in the current edition may include upwards of ten biblical references, and the current edition contains 1422 pages, basic multiplication would demonstrate that the use of biblical quotation, as opposed to biblical reference, would provide 284,400 more words or approximately 500 additional pages.⁴ This factor alone, accounts for the majority of the 1176 page difference between the two documents.

⁴ Understand that these numbers are not meant to be authoritative fact, rather merely illustrative of a general trend. The fact of the matter is that there are many references that contain more than two verses and many points and sub-points within the outline of the Dogmatics notes that contain more than the average amount of references. Therefore the actual number of additional pages owed solely to the use of biblical quotation could be much higher than 500. This author did not deem it a priority, however, to spend the majority of his study in counting or calculating. Instead the emphasis is meant to focus on the content of what is found in each edition respectively.

However, there still remains much ground to be covered if the gap is to be accounted for. Another factor that contributes to the greatly increased length of the documents is the use of contemporary commentators, representing both orthodox Lutheran, as well as heterodox Catholic, Reformed, and Evangelical, and even some cultic opinions.⁵ Obviously, along this same vein would fall the quotations of church councils, synods, and papal decrees that have occurred within the span of the past 78 years.

Perhaps the most intriguing factor that accounts for the differing document lengths, and largely the basis for this paper, is the coverage of previously uncontroversial issues. In keeping with the theme of the introduction, the world, and the church especially, is forced to endure an endless barrage of change. Satan does not assault the church of God with one weapon and in one direction only. He makes full use of his entire arsenal and employs every tactic in his repertoire. Therefore, it comes as little surprise that with every passing year and after every fervent struggle or controversy new notes are added and old notes are revised and supplemented to respond more acutely to the attack of the devil on the foundation of the church, namely the Word of God. If in some way Satan can cause the Church to compromise its stance on or reliance in Holy Scripture, whether by the overt appeal to the desires of the sinful flesh or by the subtleties and guile of apparently godly intentions and words, he has won. For this reason, it is not only not surprising to see additional coverage of previously uncontroverted issues but it is also entirely necessary for the survival of the Christian church.

Procedure

As each of the following doctrines receive individual attention, it would only be fitting to explain the manner in which they are laid out. Each doctrine will receive two major foci: 1) a section dedicated to the empirical data that was collected, or, in other words, the bare comparison of the editions of the Dogmatics notes (which will appear in the appendices); and 2) a section dedicated to the inferences and historical influences that shaped the evolution of the doctrine's expression.

To assist in the comprehension of what follows, here are a few notes regarding the presentation of the empirical data in the appendices. In the interest of conserving space, the Biblical quotations have been reduced to Biblical references and formatting has been sized down. The text that is standard black denotes the information that is common to all editions of the Dogmatics notes. What is written in red ink, denotes information that is unique to the current edition; green ink, the information that is unique to J.P. Meyer's Dogmatics Notes; what is found in parentheses denotes the information found in J.P.

⁵ Especially notable contributors to this list would be theologians such as the Baptist, Wayne Grudem, a consistent use of the Catholic Catechism, references to Vatican II, and an acknowledgement of the Mormon cult.

Meyer's notes that have been roughly paraphrased in the current edition; both editions are cited to illustrate the change in diction.

Finally, the doctrinal sections are arranged in order of appearance in the current edition, not by order of importance or degree of difference. Each of the following doctrinal treatments will represent the various ways in which the dogmatics notes have changed and include many of the wide-spread reasons for such alteration. Noteworthy also would be the fact that the scope of this paper makes it impossible to provide a detailed discourse into every single, idiosyncratic issue within each doctrine. Rather each doctrine will have a narrowly defined focus.

Christian Marriage and the Family

Introduction

It doesn't take long to notice that one section of the Dogmatics Notes that is drastically different from one edition to the other is the section dedicated to Christian Marriage and the Family. J.P. Meyer's notes contain roughly one page of information, whereas the current version spends upwards of 30 pages to cover the same issue. Why such an expansion? There are many answers to that question, and a thorough analysis of each of them would exhaust both author and reader. For the purpose of this paper it is sufficient to say that included among the areas of expansion are the topics of the social influence of marriage, engagement, roles of man and woman, blessings of marriage, family planning, reproductive technologies, divorce, polygamy, homosexuality, extra-marital cohabitation, and lifelong bachelor(ette)hood. Of these topics there are many "hot button" issues that are increasingly relevant in today's society and each is worthy of individual attention in a thesis of its own. However, this thesis will take a look into the development of doctrinal expression concerning family planning and reproductive technologies in particular.

Historical Overview

In view of such a comprehensive list, these are appropriate issues with which to begin because they are characteristic of the changes that contemporary society has endured. On the one hand, the population of the world has increased by upwards of 125% in the past 50 years, growing from 3.04 billion people in 1960 to 6.89 billion people in 2010.⁶ With such a drastic increase in the world's

⁶ "World Developmental Indicators - Google Public Data Explorer." Google Search. https://www.google.com/publicdata/explore?ds=d5bncppjof8f9_&met_y=sp_pop_totl&tdim=true&dl=en&hl=en&q=population%20of%20the%20world#!ctype=l&strail=false&bcs=d&nslm=h&met_y=sp_pop_totl&scale_y=lin&in

population, many have begun to question the value or prudence of bringing more children into the world. Whereas there are countries, like China, who regulate the birth rate of their population through an act of the law, there are those who are free from such regulations (in countries like the United States) who nevertheless don't care to procreate for reasons of personal comfort or out of the pangs of a conscience-stricken heart; this sort feels guilt for increasing the so-called "burden" on the natural resources of the Earth⁷ by having children, whether that be enough children to keep the population of the earth growing (i.e. 2 or more), or any children at all. The responsibility for the Christian, therefore, is to determine whether or not family planning is a moral, God-pleasing action at all, and if so, when.

On the other hand, innovations in the realms of technology and medicine have introduced to the Christian church a myriad of adiaphora otherwise unknown to previous generations, specifically, in this context, in the field of reproductive technology. For those conscientious or paranoid potential parents about to engage in sexual activity who intend not to have children as a result of their coitus, there have been certain "natural"⁸ methods to avoid conception that have been available since the origin of sex itself⁹ (cf. Gen. 38:9). With the introductions of refined mechanical and chemical methods, the Christian must now consider not only the motivation behind family planning, but also the actual results of the methods employed. In other words, the Christian must now distinguish between two words, or concepts, that had previously been non-existent, or at the very least seldom used: abortifacient vs. contraceptive methods of birth control.

Family Planning

When it comes to determining the morality of the basic principle of family planning (i.e. whether a Christian in good conscience can intentionally defer the blessing of children while at the same time enjoy the blessing of sex), it is only natural for a Lutheran to compare and contrast the two most

d_y=false&rdim=region&ifdim=region&tdim=true&tstart=-311623200000&tend=1297836000000&hl=en_US&dl=en&ind=false (accessed February 18, 2013).

⁷ "The Message of the Georgia Guidestones." The Message of the Georgia Guidestones. <http://thegeorgiaguidestones.com/Message.htm> (accessed February 18, 2013).

⁸ In contradistinction to chemical or mechanical methods of birth control.

⁹ In his paper, *Are All Methods of Birth Control Acceptable For The Christian?*, Pastor Robert Otto includes four degrees of "natural family planning": the rhythm or calendar method, the basal body temperature method, the ovulation method, and the sympto-thermal method. All of these methods involve careful observation of the female reproductive system and menstrual cycle. While previous generations may not have had access to the same biological information that is available today, study and observation were available to them. Interestingly enough, Pastor Otto does not develop the "natural family planning" methods of abstinence, coitus interruptus or amplexus reservatus.

polarizing viewpoints. On the conservative right is the Romanizing assertion: “The primary purpose of marriage is the procreation and upbringing of offspring; a secondary purpose is that of mutual assistance and the prevention of sinful desires.”¹⁰ Pope Pius VI expresses Rome’s view on the matter a little more stringently: “Every act in marriage in which its natural power for the coming-into-being of new life is frustrated by the arbitrary action of man violates the Law of God and of nature. Those guilty of doing so, defile their conscience with grievous guilt.”¹¹ On the liberal left is the libertine echo of the “Free Love” movement of the mid-1900s, which merely gives voice to the vice of lust that has permeated mankind since the Fall, and which eagerly accepts all methods of birth control as a consequence-free license for licentiousness.¹²

Strictly speaking, family planning is an adiaphoron, neither commanded nor forbidden in the Bible. Therefore, to take the Romanizing view and to condemn family planners unequivocally is a papistic heresy not supported in Scripture. On the other hand, justifying the sinful act of extra-marital sexual relations on the basis of removing its earthly by-product is equally sinful and anti-Scriptural. For this reason a Christian and a Lutheran cannot accept either position and must turn to God’s Word for the biblical principles to guide his conclusions and actions on the matter of family planning.

At this point the reader would be well advised to remember that the aim of this paper is not to “exegize” Scripture and therefrom to provide a sound biblical confession regarding family planning or any other doctrine, for that matter. Rather, the aim of this paper is to examine and evaluate the historical influences on the development of doctrinal expression as it stands today.

Within WELS circles Hans Kirsten’s essay, “Birth Control as Ethical and Pastoral Problem,” from 1967 is a common starting point. Kirsten appropriately provides a biblical foil for the Roman Catholic doctrine concerning the primary purpose of marriage by directing the reader’s attention to the creation account and considering marriage, or the union of man and woman, as it was ordained by God in the perfection of Eden. He states that “at the creation of man, specifically also of woman, that is, at the establishing of marriage (Gen. 2), no mention whatsoever is made of offspring; companionship alone is spoken of. God ordained marriage, not in order to assure progeny, but in order to create a ‘help meet

¹⁰ CJC, can. 1013, par. 1

¹¹ *Casti conubii*, 1931

¹² Note that this is not a mentality or a movement that is limited to one decade or generation. For evidence, consider the Affordable Care Act of 2010 and its insistence on the provision of “preventative” care.

for' man."¹³ Then, in order to address the assertion that the commission to "be fruitful and multiply" from Genesis 1:28 is the primary purpose of marriage, Kirsten appeals to the chronological exposition of the creation account and says, "What is not to be overlooked is that the institution of marriage and God's reason for it actually precede the blessing pronounced upon it."¹⁴ In this way, Kirsten acknowledges the various purposes, gifts, and blessings of marriage and prioritizes them in a fundamentally scriptural way, while simultaneously pointing out that the blessings and purposes of marriage are in no way mutually exclusive. The opposite is true, in fact.

However, just because the blessings of marriage were designed to be mutually inclusive, that does not mean that there are no problems in the proper balancing of those blessings.

Normally, no choice needs to be made. But a dilemma does arise when the size of the growing family and the productive capacity of the parents create a problem, when the increasing size of the family becomes a burden, and when the all too rapid succession of births threatens to overtax the physical capabilities of the parents, especially those of the mother.¹⁵

To help guide husband and wife in proper decisions regarding family planning (as well as pastors in their marital counseling), Kirsten primarily appeals to two Bible passages. The first is from 1 Corinthians 7 in which the Apostle refers to marital relations as "not merely a means of procreation but an owed (and not merely tolerated) expression of marital companionship and affection."¹⁶ This passage is meant to demonstrate that abstinence is not always the best birth control method because when it is prolonged it hinders the primary purpose of the institution of marriage. Secondly, Kirsten cites 1 Peter 3:7 as cause to prayerfully consider other options of birth control. In appreciation for the health and well-being of the sexually weaker partner the man ought not to carelessly endanger his wife or family by unhindered sexual satisfaction that leaves the door open for insemination and subsequent pregnancy.

Finally, in his handling of family planning, Kirsten advocates a course of action which is appropriate for all matters of adiaphora, namely that the Christian carefully evaluate and prayerfully balance his liberty and responsibility. In no way can a Christian be motivated to set limitations to God's

¹³ Kirsten, Hans. "Birth Control as Ethical and Pastoral Problem." *Lutherischer Rundblick* (1967) p.4

¹⁴ Ibid p.4

¹⁵ Ibid p.6

¹⁶ Ibid p.8

gift of children out of a heart of avarice, lack of faith, and their corollaries of service to mammon, materialism and the idol of a certain living standard.¹⁷

Reproductive Technology

While family planning is an adiaphoron whose handling necessitates careful navigation of the motivations of the heart and the innumerable “grey areas” within the Christian family, reproductive technology is much more black and white. If a Christian couple with proper motivation and a clean conscience approaches a doctor seeking advice about birth control, they will be presented with two options. Either they can use contraceptives, devices that prevent fertilization, or they can use abortifacients, devices that destroy the fertilized egg or prevent it from being implanted on the uterine wall. Contraceptives, when used with a proper, God-pleasing motivation, are completely within the bounds of Christian freedom. Abortifacients, regardless of the heart of the user, run contrary to God’s law regarding the sanctity of life.

There remain, then, two lingering questions. The first question is, when does life begin, or, in other words, what constitutes conception¹⁸? Especially in the context of abortion, Christians are accustomed to campaigning for the sanctity of life even before birth, but how far back in the birthing process must a Christian go in defense of the life of the child? For the most part this debate takes two sides. Some people point to the implantation of the blastocyst on the endometrium as the beginning of life. Others point to the fertilization of the ovum, after which observable cellular growth takes place even before implantation. Based on the observable characteristics of living organisms,¹⁹ it seems

¹⁷ Ibid p.6

John W. Covach, in his essay, *The Moral Implications of Attempts to Control Human Reproduction*, lists the following similar false motives for birth control: materialism, lack of trust, “trouble free” immorality, arbitrarily eliminating the prospect of children. (p.3)

¹⁸ John W. Covach cites an example of miscommunication derived from the varying definitions or lack of clarity on what exactly constitutes “conception” with an anecdote from an Ann Landers column: “DEAR ANN LANDERS: I am 20 years old and have been married for one year to a wonderful man. I went off the birth control pill four months ago because my husband and I were concerned about the possible effects on my health. Recently I read a disturbing article in a magazine stating that birth control pills kill five times as many babies as abortion. I always believed life began at conception and that killing of that life was wrong. I thought birth control pills prevented conception, Ann. Do they? Please respond soon because this matter concerns me very much. –Upset in Butte. DEAR BUTTE: Birth control pills prevent conception. When there is no conception there is nothing to ‘kill.’” p.4 The inference is that the magazine was referring to the commonly stated case that birth control pills occasionally prevent the fertilized egg from implanting on the uterine wall. Therefore “Butte” defined conception as fertilization, whereas Ann Landers defined conception as implantation.

¹⁹ Covach uses a rather dubious exegesis of Hebrews 11:11 and Genesis 38:5 to “prove” that Scripture assigns the beginning of life to fertilization (pp.5-7). In Hebrews 11:11 Covach cites the use of the idiom δύναμιν εἰς καταβολὴν (literally: “the power to found”) as God’s way of encouraging Bible readers to “trace back...life to its

dubious and arbitrary to insist that life begins only after a certain amount of cellular growth and interaction within the body of the mother. Christians understand life to begin when the life-giving material of the man and the woman are joined together in fertilization.²⁰

The second question that remains is, which methods of birth control prevent fertilization and which methods prevent or destroy the implanted blastocyst? This question is more difficult to answer. First of all, there are numerous methods to consider. Pastor Otto states in his essay, “The text book of Endocrinology lists under the section – fertility control and its complications, seven general categories of fertility control.²¹

- (1) Hormonal contraceptives
- (2) Intrauterine device
- (3) Barrier methods
- (4) Natural family planning
- (5) Immunology
- (6) Sterilization
- (7) Abortion²²

In the context of the differentiation between contraceptives and abortifacients, Otto would cite hormonal contraceptives, intrauterine devices, and abortion as abortifacient. Barrier methods, natural family planning, immunology, and sterilization he would classify as contraceptive.

Another reason this question is difficult to answer is that there is not universal agreement as to the operative function of some of these methods, hormonal contraceptives and intrauterine devices in

very beginnings.” While this verse does draw the reader’s attention back to the way in which Abram and Sarai were able to conceive miraculously, there is no reference in the verse to any part of the anatomy, let alone a specific distinction between a zygote and a blastocyst implanted in the uterine wall.

Similarly, Covach cites Genesis 38:5 and its use of רָבַח and its basic root meaning of “to add, increase, multiply” as a specific reference to the cellular cleavage of the zygote into a multi-celled embryo and ultimately a well-developed blastocyst. Once again, the Bible does not speak on the cellular level. To insist that a verb that could much more easily be used to describe the increase in size of the woman during pregnancy is actually specifically referencing fertilization and the subsequent cellular development is untenable.

²⁰ “Therefore, while life is continuous, your life began when the nucleus of your father’s sperm fused with the nucleus of your mother’s ovum, or at fertilization.” WELS Lutherans for Life, “Silent Abortion”, 1985, p.2

²¹ Foster, Dr. Daniel W., and Jean D. Wilson, *Textbook of Endocrinology*. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders Company, 1985

²² Otto, p.2

particular. In his essay, Pastor Otto states the commonly expressed “fourth function”²³ of oral contraceptives (i.e. “the Pill”) as being to “create a condition that will not allow the blastocyst (fertilized egg or conceived being) to implant itself on the uterine wall.”²⁴ If this were in fact true about the fourth function of “the Pill,” then it would indeed function as an abortifacient on the condition that its first three functions failed. However, ever since the FDA approved “the Pill” for contraceptive use in 1960, there has been significant speculation as to exactly how this oral contraceptive works.

In an essay entitled *Hormone Contraceptives Controversies and Clarifications*, four Christian pro-life obstetrician-gynecologists write:

It is highly probable that the so-called “hostile to implantation” endometrium – heralded (without proof) from the beginning by the “pill” producing companies, echoed (without investigation) by 2 generations of scientific writers, and now adopted (as a scientific fact) by some sincere prolife advocates – simply does not exist six days after ovulation in a pill cycle.²⁵

Therefore, if what these medical professionals explain is true, and if the oral, hormonal contraceptive fails in preventing ovulation or fertilization, then there is no definitive evidence to suggest that “the Pill” operates as an abortifacient.²⁶ As a result, in the matter of reproductive technology, the Christian must be cognizant of the operations of both contraceptive and abortifacient birth control methods, and he must be diligent in wading through the murky waters of scientific speculation to ease his conscience as to validity of his chosen contraceptive.

Dogmatics Notes Analysis

A look at Appendix A will demonstrate all of the many additions that have been made to this portion of the dogmatics notes. The amount of red ink in this section could only be exceeded by the amount of red ink spilled in the evaluation of this thesis. The pertinent portion under the *Christian*

²³ The first three functions would be to 1) prevent ovulation, 2) create a condition in the fallopian tubes that makes the passage of the gametes difficult, and 3) thicken cervical mucus to impede the travel of the sperm. (Otto, p.3)

²⁴ Ibid p.3

²⁵ Crockett, Susan A., Donna Harrison, Joe DeCook, and Camilla Hersh. "Prolife OBGYNS – AAPLOG – American Association of Pro-life Obstetricians & Gynecologists » Hormone Contraceptives Controversies and Clarifications." Prolife OBGYNS – AAPLOG – American Association of Pro-life Obstetricians & Gynecologists . <http://www.aaplog.org/position-and-papers/oral-contraceptive-controversy/hormone-contraceptives-controversies-and-clarifications/> (accessed February 18, 2013).

²⁶ It is an interesting public relations issue for the contraceptive producers. Do they invent functions of “the Pill” to make it sound more effective and appeal to the blissfully ignorant who simply do not want pregnancy? Or do they honestly present the known, observable facts and possibly appeal to the conscientious pro-life consumer? In culture today, it is not terribly surprising that the former option wins out.

Marriage and the Family heading is found under sub-point 5, where the reader will note significant additions to the sexual happiness of the Christian couple as a corollary to companionship, the first of the three blessings found in marriage.

Also, sub-point 6 expounds on the concept of bringing children into the world with more clarity and depth. Notice especially 6.a, which emphasizes the indefinite article “A purpose...” in contradistinction from the Catholic *the* purpose. What is more, in 6.c., the notes expressly address family planning and birth control, defining them as adiaphora and even citing the Kirsten article referenced above. This section also differentiates between motivation for birth control and methodology for achieving it (which is brought out more fully in sub-point 7).

Conclusions

When considering the differences in doctrinal expression, it is only fitting to see a section like *Christian Marriage and the Family* increase by such an exponential figure. If the only changes that occurred in reference to this section were concerning the aforementioned topics of family planning and reproductive technologies, there would be more than ample material to add thirty pages to the dogmatics notes. These are real life issues that will find immediate application in the lives of every Christian family. However, recalling the extensive list above of all the additional topics covered under this heading, it is no surprise that there is so much material. Considering the current trends in America alone, it would, in point of fact, be surprising if this section did not receive a goodly amount of biblical bolstering in other areas as well in the near future.

Finally, the lessons that a theologian might take away from these observations are many. Of particular note, however, is the necessity to be thoroughly informed by quality sources before speaking authoritatively in matters of adiaphora. There is no room for burdening consciences with speculation or, even worse, faulty information. Therefore, the theologian must take care to stay up to date and informed on the matters pertinent to the lives of his people, not to mention his own life as a Christian.

Lord's Supper

Introduction

In comparison to the heading *Christian Marriage and the Family*, the *Lord's Supper* is not a section that has experienced drastic changes because of recent developments within society. The Lord's Supper has been celebrated in much the same way for nearly two millennia. Neither the composition of

the world population nor technology play any significant role in the doctrinal expression regarding Holy Communion. Rather, in this case, many of the additions and alterations that have been made to the dogmatics notes are reiterations of old controversies. Once more, in view of the limited scope of this thesis, special attention will be narrowly devoted to a specific issue within the broader content of Holy Communion, particularly to the controversy surrounding the moment of presence within the use of the Lord's Supper.

Historically speaking, within the Lutheran Church there has always been a vast array of opinions regarding when the body and blood of Jesus are truly present within the Sacrament. In general these opinions are assigned into four different categories:

1. **Consecrationism:** Some Lutherans insist that the real presence in point of time most certainly begins with the consecration as the *verba* are read. These consecrationists, as they are called, do not mathematically set the moment by selecting a syllable. However, they say that it is appropriate to fix the moment in general with the consecration. Since the Word of God is powerful, they argue that the Word must immediately produce its effects in the Lord's Supper. They say it is Lutheran to talk about the body and blood on the altar and in the pastor's hand.
2. **Receptionism:** Some Lutherans insist that the body and blood of Jesus are present only when communicants receive the elements and not before. These receptionists, as they are called, still consider the *verba* of the consecration to be efficacious. However, they say that the effect of the *verba* is not instantaneous in time. Since the Lord's Supper is an action, they say that the real presence takes place only as the action of eating and drinking is carried out.
3. **Open Question:** Some Lutherans say that the entire issue is an open question. They say that the Scriptures do not fix the moment of the real presence, and that the Lutheran Confessions also do not make it a point of doctrine. These Lutherans say that the body and blood are most certainly present when the elements are received. Perhaps the body and blood are present earlier, but we can't know for sure.
4. **Moment not fixed, but prior to reception:** Some Lutherans speak in similar language as the Lutherans in category #3 but add the thought that the real presence must take place at some point prior to the reception. Though the moment is not fixed, they say that receptionism is not a possibility.²⁷

The reader will do well to remember, once more, that the aim of this paper is not to investigate Scripture to derive at a consensus as to which of these four categories is a correct exposition of God's divine Word, but to examine and evaluate the historical influences that have shaped the doctrinal expression in the current edition of the WLS Dogmatics notes.

²⁷ Nass, Thomas P.. "The Moment of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper" pp.3-4

Historical Overview

Shortly after the Protestant Reformation, when biblically conscientious theologians were reconsidering a wholesale reception of Roman Catholic dogma,²⁸ and when distinct Christian factions were being formed, a man by the name of John Saliger insisted that consecrationism was the only possibility. Saliger was a vocal German pastor serving in Lübeck and Rostock in 1569, and his stance on the moment of presence, as well as his temperament, incited controversy. The entire controversy was short-lived and was settled in the course of one year. In the fall of 1569, the “Mecklenburger Edict” stated:

The blessing, as some name it, or the recitation of Christ’s Words of Institution by itself, where the whole action of the Supper as Christ ordained it is not observed...does not make a Sacrament...The whole action or administration of the Sacrament ...must be kept unseparated and inviolate ...In this complete, inseparable action of the Holy Supper...Christ is truly and essentially present and distributes and delivers His true body and blood with the bread and wine, since the true presence of Christ’s body and blood is not to be denied for the reception.²⁹

Saliger rejected this edict and was subsequently deposed. On the surface, this would seem to solve the problem of insisting upon consecrationism. But it does not. Apparently more recently there have been those who are convinced that Saliger was deposed for his polemical spirit, and not for false or improper doctrine. Therefore the case, which had lain relatively dormant for 400 years, has seen an upswing of interest particularly in the interactions between the WELS and ELS in the past 50-60 years.

In the course of communication between these two synods, which are in full doctrinal fellowship, a set of theses was drafted in 1981 by the ELS Doctrine Committee (cf. Appendix C). These theses were found to be in agreement with the position of WELS. However, the discussion was not closed, and insistence upon consecrationism remained. In 1986, Bethany Lutheran College Professor Bjarne Teigen published a book which claimed the support of Martin Chemnitz³⁰ in his appeal toward

²⁸ This would necessitate a shift from transubstantiation to the doctrine of the Real Presence, which then opened up a whole new can of worms for the Protestant theologians to sort through.

²⁹ Scheling, Gaylin. “The Saliger Controversy.” *Lutheran Synod Quarterly* 27, no. 2 (1987): 42-43

³⁰ “Teigen is trying to use Chemnitz to prove something which interests Teigen, but did not interest Chemnitz in the same way. The result is a somewhat tortured handling of the second Martin, who nowhere makes the moment of the Real Presence a high priority item...It appears to be counterproductive to try to use an author who four hundred years ago was speaking on one subject to support an entirely different subject. Teigen is grasping at straws to enlist Chemnitz to his support.”

Preus, J.A.O. “Review Essay on ‘The Lord’s Super in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz’.” *Concordia Journal* (1987): 343-344.

consecrationism. Also, in the ELS synod convention of 1989, the delegates composed a six point explanation of the ninth thesis which they had drafted in 1981 (cf. Appendix D). In effect, sub-point b of that six point explanation undermines thesis 9's treatment of the moment of presence as an open question and does fix a point within the sacramental *usus* when the real presence of Christ's body and blood begins (even if sub-point c makes it clear that this fixed point is not mathematical, exact, or syllabic).

The true rub comes with the insistence on something that is not expressed in Scripture and therefore also not in the Confessions. None of the accounts of the Lord's Supper designate the moment of presence. That is not their intention. In fact, in view of Scripture, one could make the case that Jesus spoke the words of institution *after* his disciples began the process of eating and drinking, which would make a careful observation of a precise moment a moot point in the current performance of the Sacrament. As it stands, one might well take comfort in the fact that all four accounts in Scripture that treat the Lord's Supper fail to prescribe the minute details of a specific rite. Because of the variation and the lack of scriptural detail, the Christian will focus on what is being received, not how it is received. This is, after all, exactly the issue with which the Reformers were wrestling. In the Confessions and their own personal writings, the early Lutheran theologians were contending for the doctrine of the Real Presence in opposition both to the transubstantiationists and also to the representationalists. To cite them in support of issues of which they did not address is to turn their writings into a wax nose and to bend them and their words illegitimately. As Rick Curia succinctly concludes his essay, "Scripture leaves the question unanswered, and so should we,"³¹ and, "To sum it all up in the words of Professor Becker, 'For us it is enough to know that His body which was given for us, and his blood which was shed for us, truly are present, in order to give us certainty that our sins are forgiven.'"³²

Conclusions

In conclusion, the certainty of the forgiveness of sins is what is at stake. The pastoral heart of the preacher, teacher, and administrator of the Sacrament will be careful 1) not to impose his pious opinion where Scripture is silent, 2) to always consider the context and purpose of what he is citing as evidence or support to his claim, 3) not to cause doubt among his laity where Scripture intends to create

³¹ Rick Curia p.16

³² Ibid p.16

certainty and trust, and 4) not to incite division on the basis of “presumptuous, frivolous, [or] blasphemous questions and expressions.”³³

Dogmatics Notes Analysis

A look at Appendix B will demonstrate that the amount of change in the doctrinal expression of the moment of presence is not extensive, especially in comparison to *Christian Marriage and the Family*. The additions that have been made are almost exclusively inclusions of the confessions of individual theologians, some as recent as 2004. These are found in VII.4.c. Of note would also be the addition of more material from the Formula of Concord and the Augsburg Confession, which serves both to demonstrate that the position of the WELS remains faithful to the Confessions and the teachings of the Reformers, and to assist in setting the Confessions in their proper context and to preserve and proclaim their purpose.

Note especially VII.3. The notes that were used by Meyer read, “Sacramental union has place only in the moment of eating.” This reading might well lead to a receptionist interpretation. In order to avoid leaving the impression that the dogmatics notes attempt to define the moment of presence in the moment of eating, the notes have been amended to read, “Following the Lutheran Confessions, we refrain from attempting to determine the precise moment of the sacramental union, restricting ourselves to the fact that when the earthly elements are received the heavenly are also received.” This serves as a great example that the WLS dogmatics notes are flexible, particularly when it comes to clarifying language that might otherwise be misinterpreted.

The Ministerial Office

Introduction

In a paper dedicated to changes that a churchly-minded man might observe in his church’s confession, it comes as absolutely no surprise that even the slightest change within the expression of the doctrine regarding the ministerial office merits significant attention. After all, pastors are held accountable for transmitting the doctrines of the church to its people. Their role is highly influential in the faith lives of their members and it is subsequently deserving of understanding. How are church members to view and treat their spiritual leaders? How are pastors, in turn, to view and treat their flocks? The doctrine of the ministerial office is one with many very practical applications, and it is a

³³ Formula of Concord (VII 127)

doctrine that has caused friction within bounds of Lutheranism. When it comes to the function of the church, this is where the rubber meets the road.

If one were to examine the doctrinal trends of the articles published in the *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* in its first century of existence, the doctrine of the ministerial office would be noted as possibly the second most popular doctrine for discussion.³⁴ If the theological leaders of the Wisconsin Synod deemed it worthy of attention for such a long period of time, it is only fitting that it receive attention in this paper as well.

As is the case with all of the afore-treated doctrines, this one has been sculpted and shaped by a long history of use and abuse, discussion and practice. Historically speaking there was little discussion about the form of the ministerial office for many centuries while Christianity enjoyed at least formal unity under the Catholic Church. With the inflammatory arrival of the Reformation, and the vigorous rejection of the abuses of papal authority it became more necessary to develop a doctrinally sound understanding of the pastor's role. Later, as Lutheranism immigrated to America in search of even more religious freedoms than post-Reformation Europe, the relative freedom of form introduced by the Reformation needed to be corralled and a scriptural understanding of the ministerial office needed to be reinforced, particularly in view of the explosion of independent or newly formed church bodies. In other words, the reins had been loosed. Christianity was no longer governed by a single church body, nor was Lutheranism governed by the State. The religious freedom of America offered great blessings, but also great challenges, to the form of American Lutheranism and its scriptural understanding of the ministerial office.

With an understanding of the progressively liberal formation of church government from the strict hierarchy of Roman Catholicism to state-governed Lutheranism to complete freedom offered in America, it's no wonder that Christianity takes as many forms today as it does. On one side of the pendulum are those who harken back to the historical precedent of the Catholic Church, who allow the Romanizing influence to provide them with a concept of a divinely established hierarchy of ministers, which subsequently denigrates the right of the priesthood of believers to call public ministers.³⁵ On the other side of the pendulum are those who emphasize the priesthood of all believers at the expense of an established ministerium. As Doctor Brug states, "When either the relationship of the minister to

³⁴ Brug, John. *The Ministry of the Word*. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2009 p.vii

³⁵ Ibid p.251

Christ or the relationship of the minister to the church (that is, to believers) is overemphasized or underemphasized, problems result.”³⁶

Historical Overview

Since the Reformation there have been any number of disputations concerning the ministerial office and a number of errors that were in need of redress.³⁷ Many men poured many hours of study and composition into this field. Nonetheless divisions remain and doctrinal stances seem to be entrenching themselves deeper and deeper. The definition of the ministerial office is something that Lutherans have been striving to pin down for centuries, and yet the issues that most directly influenced the alteration of the WLS Dogmatics notes largely come from the debates between the Wisconsin and Missouri synods in the mid-1900s.

Not surprisingly, much of the debate arose from a disparate understanding of commonly used terminology, particularly the use of the term *Predigtamt* both in the Augsburg Confession and in the writings of C.F.W. Walther. The term itself is literally translated as the “preaching office,” and is commonly used to refer specifically to the pastoral office. This is an entirely legitimate understanding of the term and it can be appropriately used when speaking *about* the ministry. The problem arises when this term, *Predigtamt*, is *equated* with the public ministry or even the pastoral ministry. To oversimplify the case, this is at the root of the difficulty between the Lutheran Church – Missouri Synod and the Wisconsin Synod. On the one hand, the LCMS is often credited with asserting that the only divinely appointed form of ministry is the pastoral, or preaching, office. On the other hand, the WELS is often credited with asserting that the pastoral, or preaching, office is one form that the divinely appointed ministry of the Word can take.³⁸

As mentioned above, a confused reading of the Augsburg Confession contributed to this debate. In the German version Article V reads: Solchen Glauben zu erlangen, hat Gott das Predigtamt eingestzt. In the broader context of this article it becomes readily apparent that the term *Predigtamt* is used

³⁶ Ibid p.288

³⁷ Dr. Brug lists eight: 1. Ordination makes the pastor. 2. The pastoral office is a direct continuation of the apostolic office. 3. The pastor is the image of Christ or an incarnation or embodiment of Christ. 4. The Pastor becomes a means of grace along with the Word and Sacraments. 5. Exaggerated authority is given to pastors. 6. The pastoral ministry is the only divinely instituted form of the ministry. 7. All pastors must have all the functions of the public ministry. 8. A specific form of parish pastor is mandatory. Ibid p.289

³⁸ At this point it is worth noting that this dispute was never fought strictly along synodical lines. Men from each synod were known to have held each position. Therefore this was never a divisive doctrinal difference. It certainly contributed to strained tensions, but was not an official breaking point. Particularly at the time of the most heated controversy in the middle of the 20th century, neither synod was in complete unanimity regarding this doctrine, but the aforementioned oversimplification will serve to provide a general idea of trends within each synod.

synonymously with the ministry in general, or with gospel and sacraments. In fact, this use of the term is not unique to Article V, but is also evidenced in Article XXVIII, as well as Apology VII:20, XIII:7, and XV:42. However, those who interpret the Augsburg Confession with a slanted bias translate *Predigtamt* specifically as the preaching, or pastoral, office. This is an illegitimate translation that ignores the basic message of the Confession.

The problem of the definition of *Predigtamt* is not helped by the way that C.F.W. Walther uses the term. In his writings he often uses it in both the wide (ministry) and narrow (pastoral) senses, which makes it all the more imperative to understand the context in which he and others use the term. When defending the fact that pastors can appeal to a divine appointment of their office, it is appropriate to use the term *Predigtamt* in the narrow sense, because the work of a pastor, namely preaching and teaching, is part of the commission of the ministry that God gave to man. However, to use *Predigtamt* in the narrow sense to say that the pastoral office is the only divinely instituted form of ministry is inappropriate, because there are other avenues by which God's Word may be preached or taught than by a man with a seminary degree or certificate.

In a nutshell, this summarizes the debate that took place for the most part between the faculties of the St. Louis and Thiensville seminaries. After a difficult case of church discipline in Cincinnati at the turn of the century, it became apparent that further study into the issues of church and ministry was necessary, so that people could rightly understand the relationship between the pastor and the church and between the pastor and Christ. Professors from the seminary in Wauwatosa began publishing their conclusions on the matter, by which a number of the St. Louis faculty were troubled. Therefore, during the 1914 session of the Synodical Conference, men from each faculty met together to discuss the matter. Initially there was confusion as to whether the WELS theologians denied the divine appointment of the work of the pastoral ministry and relegated it to a matter of mere expediency. After a series of meetings in the course of the next two years, the two faculties were able to reach and publish an agreement in the winter of 1916. These were known as the "Wauwatosa Theses":

1. The church in the intrinsic sense of the term is the sum total of all those who have come to faith in Christ through the Gospel.
2. Local congregations are organizations of Christians who, conforming to the will of God, according to locality and circumstances, have associate themselves for the public administration of the Means of Grace and for joint work in the kingdom of God. They are associations formed according to the will of God. An occasional and causal meeting of Christians, also in the name of Jesus, is no local congregation in this sense.

3. The parish pastorate is the ministry delegated by the congregation to persons with the required aptitudes in order to exercise the rights of the spiritual priesthood of all Christians on behalf of the congregation.
4. This office is of divine institution, and its functions are exactly appointed in the Word of God. Hence, the establishment of this office is not an optional matter of Christians. The external form and arrangement of this office God has left to the wisdom and liberty of the Christians under the leading of His Spirit.³⁹

After these theses were agreed upon, the matter was dropped for almost a decade until further cases of church discipline were brought to the fore in the Protestant Controversy beginning in 1929. The wound was reopened and the same old issues resurfaced. However, as painful as it might be to rehash old arguments, it is worthy of note that this issue was still met with patience and the hope of resolution and agreement. For the next 40 years there were numerous further meetings and drafts of theses to establish some unity. One of the most important of the documents that was drafted was the *Brief Statement*, which was an official doctrinal statement of the LCMS. Part 31, which pertained to the Public Ministry, read:

By the public ministry we mean the office by which the Word of God is preached and the Sacraments are administered by order and in the name of a Christian congregation. Concerning this office we teach that it is a divine ordinance; that is, the Christians of a certain locality must apply the means of grace not only privately and within the circle of their families nor merely in their common intercourse with fellow-Christians, John 5:39; Eph. 6:4; Col. 3:16, but they are also required, by the divine order, to make provision that the Word of God be publicly preached in their midst, and the Sacraments administered according to the institution of Christ, by persons qualified for such work, whose qualifications and official functions are exactly defined in Scripture, Titus 1:5; Acts 14:23; 20:28; 2 Tim. 2:2.⁴⁰

It is noteworthy that the Wauwatosa men found this LCMS document acceptable. It is also noteworthy that the LCMS statement is listed under the title “public ministry” as opposed to “pastoral ministry.” This was a development that was reflected in later publications as well. For that reason it was justifiable to hope that the communication had been working and that each party involved was beginning to find the unity that was so desperately sought.

However, after continued discussion and following the dissolution of the Synodical Conference, what had begun as a peaceful desire for agreement had finally become the divisive doctrine that was feared. The Lutheran Churches of the Reformation, in an article published in *The Faithful Word, A*

³⁹ Ibid, p.412

⁴⁰ Ibid, pp.442,443

Journal of Doctrine and Defense, “suggested to their congregations that they no longer practice church fellowship with the congregations of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod as being a church body with persistently holds to an un-Scriptural doctrine on the Church and the Ministry.”⁴¹ In the meantime other issues had cropped up and continue to increase the gap of understanding, including questions of lay preachers, the ordination of women, and the Church Growth movement.

Currently the main issue pertains to how many divinely appointed forms of ministry there are detailed in the Bible. For the most part, Missouri still contends that the pastoral, or preaching, office is the only one, and all other “auxiliary” offices stem from it. The Wisconsin view remains that there is one ministry within the church, namely the gospel ministry, which may be carried out in a number of ways, whether by the divinely appointed work of a pastor in preaching and teaching, or by the divinely commissioned priesthood of believers.

Conclusions

Practically speaking, the difference between church governance in the LCMS and WELS is slight. A cursory glance would show many of the same or similar practices. Why, then, is this an issue? First of all, it is a matter of biblical interpretation. Those in favor of a Missourian definition of the one, single, divinely instituted ministry being the pastoral ministry, make a matter of doctrine that which is not expressly stated in Scripture. Passages like the ones cited above (e.g. Titus 1:5; Acts 14:23; 20:28; 2 Tim. 2:2, etc...) describe for us what the work and qualifications of a pastor are, but they do not prescribe the specific pastoral ministry as we have it today as the only form of ministry that is divinely instituted. In fact, the pastoral ministry as we have it today is not the exact form of ministry that is demonstrated by Christ or his apostles in Scripture. To insist otherwise would be to state something that Scripture does not, and that is untenable.

What is more, there are certain logical consequences if one asserts that the pastoral ministry is the only divinely instituted form of ministry. First of all, it results in an unhealthy exaltation of those who hold that office. Scripture makes it clear that pastors are ministers and servants of the people, not overlords (Matt. 20:25-28; 2 Cor. 1:24; 1 Peter 5:1-3). Also, in practical terms, one must take care not to invalidate the means of grace, as if they were only effective when performed by an ordained pastor or someone who acts on behalf of that pastor. God’s Word itself is the power chosen and used by God for

⁴¹ Wicke, Harold. “Is the Pastorate in the Congregation the Only God-Ordained Office in the Church,” WLQ 68, no. 2 (1971): 113

the salvation of everyone who believes (Rom. 1:16); pastors are merely jars of clay to show that this all-surpassing power is from God and not from us (2 Cor. 4:7). The final logical consequence is closely related to the former. When proclaiming the gospel, public ministers, synods, and individuals must take care not to rob Christians of the comfort that is theirs. The good news of the gospel gladdens hearts with or without an officially ordained called minister (not that Christians should demean or reject the ministry of a pastor, but they should recognize from where true comfort comes, and appreciate those who bring it to them).

Dogmatics Notes Analysis

A look at Appendix E will demonstrate some of the changes that took place specifically for the reasons cited above. For example, I.1.b. includes a number of passages which demonstrate both the abstract and concrete definitions of the term “ministry” as it is used in the New Testament. This inclusion serves to dispel confusion about the use of term, and to improve clarity of expression, which is a direct result of historical influence. Along these same lines, the current version of the dogmatics notes includes an extra section dedicated to showing how the Augsburg Confession and the early American Lutheran dogmatists are in agreement with using the wide sense of “ministry,” or the *Predigtamt*.

In addition, to remove any doubt about the WELS stance on the divine institution of the public ministry, there is significant supplementation to I.2.a.4.b., including lengthy quotations from Francis and August Pieper, Carl Lawrenz, *This We Believe*, and a number of Bible passages. Similarly, it would be beneficial to note the change contained in I.2.c.1. Originally it had read, “It is merely a special way or form of practicing the one ministry of the Gospel (in the name of a church body).” However, such a reading might lead to the interpretation that the public ministry is formed out of expediency alone, and not by divine ordinance. Understandably, once again, the dogmatics notes show themselves to be flexible in adapting to the historical needs of their readers. The altered text removes any hint of expediency and reads, “The public ministry is a special God-ordained way of practicing this one ministry of the gospel in the name of a group of Christians.”

Again, there are many, many more alterations to this portion of the Dogmatics notes, but because of the scope of this paper, these are the few that are illustrative of the historical influence of the controversies surrounding the doctrine of the ministerial office.

Conclusion

“The grass withers and the flowers fall, but the word of our God stands forever.” Isaiah 40:8

In a world that changes as swiftly as the seasons and as radically differently as the transition from day to night, the Christian takes solace knowing that God's Word never changes. God's righteous anger over sin is sure, but so is his salvation; so is his love for sinners, on account of his Son. In this ever-changing world there will always be lingering questions; there will always be doubts raised; there will always be confusion over new developments and old traditions. The work of the Christian, then, is to utilize the never-changing Word of God and to adapt its implementation to meet the needs of God's people. Doctrine does not change. But its expression does.

The distinction between doctrine and its expression is slight, but it is important. When adapting the implementation of God's Word, the Christian must take the utmost care not to alter what God's Word says. In this respect the four basic principles espoused by the Formulators are highly beneficial in determining when a new expression is valid or not. Is this new expression scriptural? Does it rob God of glory? Does it diminish the value of Christ's merit? Does it take away certainty from Christians? Clarity in all four of these principles is a primary concern.

A secondary concern – that is nonetheless beneficial – when adapting the implementation of God's Word is the ability to keep a finger on the pulse of Christianity. The theologian and pastor must be aware of the issues that trouble his people and be conscientious about the way God's Word is represented in those situations. He must also keep himself well informed on matters of adiaphora, especially so as not to unduly burden consciences out of ignorance or ineptitude. In this light, one should not be surprised to see significant work done in the near future to adapt the expression of doctrines like those concerning objective justification and homosexuality in order to strive for increased clarity and in order to more firmly anchor those expressions in God's Word, lest the increasing tide of anti-scriptural sentiment unmoor weak Christians by causing them to doubt the certainty of God's Word or strong Christians by causing them to overstate what God's Word says.

The use of the WLS Dogmatics notes will be of great benefit for those who wish to properly represent God's Word to this changing world. However, one must be careful not to equate these notes with God's immutable Word. They are an exposition of God's Word, and as such they can and must be adapted to suit the changing demands of society. Care must be taken, nevertheless, not to treat these notes or the teaching thereof casually, lest the impression be given that they reflect changing doctrine. While out of necessity these notes will change, they ought to be more plasmic than fluid, malleable not wishy-washy.

Finally, in all things, a pastoral heart and a respect for God's Word must always be maintained. The pastor and theologian will constantly be looking to connect troubled hearts with the salve of the gospel, because God's Word, in its truth and purity, is exactly what this world needs. May God grant a patient and steadfast heart to all the jars of clay to whom the treasure of his Word is entrusted. SDG.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Borgwardt, Wayne M. "Methods of Birth Control in the Light of Scripture" 1977 [available at www.wlsessays.net]
- Brandt, John P. "Birth Control and Abortion" 1973 [available at www.wlsessays.net]
- Brug, John. *The Ministry of the Word*. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2009.
- Codex Iuris Canonici, 1917 can. 1013, par. 1
- Covach, John W. "The Moral Implications of Attempts to Control Human Reproduction" 1985 [available at www.wlsessays.net]
- Crockett, Susan A., Donna Harrison, Joe DeCook, and Camilla Hersh. "Pro-life OBGYNS – AAPLOG – American Association of Pro-life Obstetricians & Gynecologists » Hormone Contraceptives Controversies and Clarifications." Pro-life OBGYNS – AAPLOG – American Association of Pro-life Obstetricians & Gynecologists . <http://www.aaplog.org/position-and-papers/oral-contraceptive-controversy/hormone-contraceptives-controversies-and-clarifications/> (accessed February 18, 2013).
- Curia, Rick "The Controversy Surrounding the Moment of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper and the Proper Scriptural Attitude" 1978 [available at www.wlsessays.net]
- Formula of Concord VII 127
- Foster, Dr. Daniel W., and Jean D. Wilson, *Textbook of Endocrinology*. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders Company, 1985
- Gawrisch, Wilbert R. "A Reaffirmation of the Scripture-Based Teaching of the Synodical Conference on the Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Lord's Supper" [available at www.wlsessays.net]
- Kirsten, Hans. "Birth Control as Ethical and Pastoral Problem." *Lutherischer Rundblick* (1967): 32-43 [available at www.wlsessays.net]
- Koehler, J.P. "The Importance of the Historical Disciplines," *The Wauwatosa Theology*, Vol. 3 (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House), p.434,435
- "The Message of the Georgia Guidestones." The Message of the Georgia Guidestones. <http://thegeorgiaguidestones.com/Message.htm> (accessed February 18, 2013).
- Nass, Thomas P. "The Moment of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper" 1989 pp.3-4 [available at www.wlsessays.net]
- Otto, Robert. *Are All Methods of Birth Control Acceptable For The Christian?* 1986 [available at www.wlsessays.net]

"Our Purpose and Objectives | Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary." Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary.
<http://www.wls.wels.net/about-us/our-purpose-and-objectives> (accessed February 18, 2013).

Pope Pius VI *Casti conubii*, 1931

Preus, J.A.O. "Review Essay on 'The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz'." *Concordia Journal* (1987): 343-344.

Purdue, Guy R.. *Contemporary Questions Concerning the Moment of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper* 1995 [available at www.wlsessays.net]

WELS Commission on Inter-Church Relations "A Response to 'The Six-Point Explanation of Thesis Nine of the ELS Lord's Supper Statement'" [available at www.wlsessays.net]

WELS Lutherans for Life, "Silent Abortion", 1985, p.2

Wicke, Harold. "Is the Pastorate in the Congregation the Only God-Ordained Office in the Church," *WLQ* 68, no. 2 (1971): 113

"World Developmental Indicators - Google Public Data Explorer." Google Search.

https://www.google.com/publicdata/explore?ds=d5bncppjof8f9_&met_y=sp_pop_totl&tdim=true&dl=en&hl=en&q=population%20of%20the%20world#!ctype=l&strail=false&bcs=d&nseml=h&met_y=sp_pop_totl&scale_y=lin&ind_y=false&rdim=region&ifdim=region&tdim=true&tstart=-311623200000&tend=1297836000000&hl=en_US&dl=en&ind=false (accessed February 18, 2013).

Appendix A

A. Christian Marriage and the Family

1. (When God created man and woman, he also instituted marriage as the basic unit of society.) **By instituting matrimony God laid the foundation of family life.**

Genesis 1:10, 12, 18, 21, 25; cp. Genesis 2:18-24

- a) **God ordained marriage as the union of one man and one woman.**

Matthew 19:4-6

- 1) It is God's will that this union should last a lifetime It is God's will that matrimony be kept inviolate**

1 Corinthians 7:39 Ex. 20:14; Lev. 20:10-13; Rom. 1:26,27; 1 Cor. 5:1; Eph. 5:3-6; Col. 3:5,6; Heb. 13:4

- 2) Yet marriage is only for this life**

Matthew 22:30; Lc. 20:34,35; 1 Cor. 7:12-14

- b) **God ordained marriage for society and not exclusively for the church.**

- 1) Marriage is not a sacrament like baptism or the Lord's Supper, which are means of grace.**

- a) A sacramental view is held by the Roman Catholic Church.**

Catechism of the Catholic Church: The matrimonial covenant, by which a man and woman establish between themselves a partnership of the whole of life, is by its nature ordered toward the good of the spouses and the procreation and education of offspring; this covenant between baptized persons has been raised by Christ the Lord to the dignity of a sacrament (Paragraph 1601).

- b) A sacramental view is held by the Eastern Orthodox Church.**

Pomazansky: A mystery (sacrament) is a sacred act which under a visible aspect communicates to the soul of a believer the invisible grace of God. The name of "mystery" has become established in the church as referring to seven rites: Baptism, Chrismation, Communion (the Eucharist), Repentance, Priesthood, Matrimony, and Unction (*Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*, p 263).

- c) Luther taught marriage was not a sacrament.**

Luther: Since marriage and the married estate are worldly matters, it behooves us pastors or ministers of the church not to attempt to order or govern anything connected with it, but to permit every city and land to continue its own use and custom in this connection. ("The Order of Marriage for Common Pastors," *LW* 53, 110-115).

- 2) God encourages Christians to look for a marriage partner who shares a common faith.**

Proverbs 31:10,30

- 3) Yet Scripture does not forbid the marriage of a believer and an unbeliever.**

1 Corinthians 7:39 A woman is bound to her husband as long as he lives. But if her husband dies, she is free to marry anyone she wishes, *but he must belong to the Lord.* NIV

1 Corinthians 7:39 A wife is bound to her husband as long as he lives. If her husband dies, she is free to marry anyone she wishes, *but let it be in the Lord.* GWN

Greek: Γυνή δέδεται ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῆ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς· ἐὰν δὲ κοιμηθῆ ὁ ἀνὴρ, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ᾧ θέλει γαμηθῆναι, *μόνον ἐν κυρίῳ.*

2 Corinthians 6:14

a) Scripture does show that the existing marriage of a believer and unbeliever should be maintained.

1 Corinthians 7:12,13

b) Many Evangelicals believe it is sinful for a believer to marry an unbeliever.

H. Norman Wright: When it comes to a believer and an unbeliever's seeking marriage, the Scriptures clearly forbid the uniting of such a couple (See 2 Cor. 6:14); this would be the standard for refusing to perform the ceremony (*The Premarital Counseling Handbook*, p 30).

Jay Adams: Christians must marry Christians. When they are free to marry, they are not free to marry any and every person; they may marry only believers (*Marriage, Divorce, and Remarriage*, p 87).

R. C. Sproul: While all men and women may marry, the Christian is called to marry only "in the Lord," Scripture is clear in its prohibition against Christians marrying non-Christians (*Essential Truths of the Christian Faith*, p 266).

For an evaluation of this claim see "Exegetical Brief: Does 1 Corinthians 7:39 Forbid a Believer to Marry an Unbeliever?" David J. Valleskey. *WLQ*, Vol. 94, 4 (Fall 1997)

2. God establishes marriage through the consent of the man and woman. (*Consensus facit matrimoniam.*)

Luther: The estate of marriage consists essentially in consent having been freely and previously given to one another (*LW* 44, p 11).

a) This truth is not explicitly stated in Scripture.

1) It is implicit in Genesis 2:24.

Genesis 2:24

2) Some point to the example of Rebekah.

Genesis 24:5,58

-a) This is a descriptive passage.

-b) Whether Rebekah is consenting to the marriage or to the time of travel is unclear.

b) The marriage consent consists of an unconditional commitment to love and faithfulness. (The word "unconditional" is not used in an absolute sense here. If one partner breaks the marriage bond, the other is no longer bound to the marriage.)

Ephesians 5:22,24,25

c) Such consent is to be given freely and publicly.

1) Consent is to be given freely. It cannot be obtained by deception or force or given in drunkenness or insanity. It cannot validly be given by someone already married to another.

Romans 7:2,3

2) Consent is to be given by those who are able to give a valid consent. There are certain restrictions about those who may give such consent, such as government restrictions based on age and relationship.

- a) Many Lutherans claim that the restrictions based on consanguinity and affinity in Leviticus 18 are based on the moral law, which is known, in part, through natural knowledge of the law. For a lengthy defense of this position see the German edition of Walther's *Pastorale*, p 204-215.**

Leviticus 18:24; 1 Corinthians 5:1

Fritz: Do the marriage laws of the Old Testament, Lev. 18, etc., still hold good in the New Testament? The marriage laws of the Old Testament were not a part of the Old Testament Political (judicial) Law, but of the Moral Law, that declaration of God's will which directs and binds all men of every age and place (*Pastoral Theology*, p 163). (See also Schaller's *Pastorale*, p 79)

Schuetze and Habeck: To what extent does Scripture set up forbidden degrees of consanguinity? Leviticus 18 is most often adduced to determine the exact degrees of consanguinity or affinity that prohibit marriage in the eyes of God. The convenient rule taken from Leviticus 18:6 that relationships up to the second degree prohibits marriage is based on translating שֵׁאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ "flesh of his flesh" and interpreting that to mean the second degree of consanguinity. However the two Hebrew nouns are joined through the construct state and here have a superlative meaning, best translated simply "nearest of kin," with no degree indicated. It is also to be noted that the New Testament in speaking of marriage nowhere refers to Leviticus 18. The Mosaic code, of which Leviticus 18 is a part, has no direct application to New Testament Christians (*The Shepherd Under Christ*, p 270).

Schaller: The question whether marriage is permitted with the sister of a man's deceased wife (*Schwagerehe*), despite much discussion, seemingly cannot be answered with such conviction that one can bind consciences either to a positive or negative answer (*Pastorale*, p 79).

Leviticus 18:16, 18; 20:21; Deuteronomy 25:5

- b) The Christian will follow governmental laws that regulate consanguinity in marriage.**

Romans 13:1

- 3) The nature of marriage as a public contract requires that the consent must be given publicly.**

Charles Sell: Marriage is a socially sanctioned commitment. The practice of living together without making a public declaration of marriage is neither biblically nor socially acceptable. The public nature of marriage is clearly seen in that the man is portrayed as leaving father and mother to marry (Gen. 2:24) (*Family Ministry*, p 80).

Note the confusion that Abraham and Isaac caused when they didn't acknowledge their marriages publicly: Genesis 12:10-20; 20:1-18; 26:1-11.

- d) The man and woman leave their former families to establish a new family.**

Genesis 2:24

- e) They will continue to love, honor, and care for their parents, even in old age.**

1 Timothy 5:4; Proverbs 23:22

3. Engagement is a social custom, which is neither commanded nor forbidden in Scripture
- a) Engagement, betrothal, and marriage customs may vary from culture to culture.**

Note: For purposes of this discussion, “engagement” is defined as an agreement to marry or to plan marriage; “betrothal” is an unconditional, witnessed commitment to marriage, and “marriage” is entering upon married life.

Matthew 1:18-21,24,25

Lenski: The Jewish betrothal was a solemn promise before witnesses, embodying the essentials of the marriage vow. No further promises followed. In later times it was ratified in writing. By virtue of the betrothal the bridegroom and the bride became husband and wife as is also shown in the next verse where Joseph is called Mary’s husband, and in v. 20 where she is called his wife. It is a mistake to regard “husband” and “wife” as proleptic terms denoting the husband and his wife to be. This is reading into the Jewish procedure our modern conception of an engagement. The Jewish betrothal was the marriage itself. But the Jewish custom placed an interval, longer or shorter, between the betrothal and the bringing home of the bride to her husband’s house. No religious ceremony and no vows of any kind accompanied this home-bringing although it was made a festive occasion with a procession and a feast following (*Commentary on St. Matthew’s Gospel*, p 40).

- b) Contemporary engagement is generally not tantamount to betrothal or marriage.**

- 1) Because of its undefined status, engagement may or it may not fulfill the moral requirement for unconditional consent.**

Gerhard: Engagements (*sponsalia*) may be contracted with conditions; marriages may not (*Loci*, Book VII, Concerning Marriage, p 100).

- 2) It does not fulfill the social, legal, or other practical requirements of marriage.**

- 3) Scripture nowhere makes a distinction between being married in the eyes of God and being married in the eyes of man. Even though Christians are in God’s Church, they are still in the world and are to fulfill the requirements of both realms. An engaged couple, which is not married in the eyes of the world, is not married in the eyes of God.**

2 Corinthians 8:21

Note: Even Jesus fulfilled the requirements of governmental laws as Matthew 17:24-27 indicates.

Matthew 17:24-27

- 4) Since engaged couples are not married, it is sinful for them to engage in sexual relations prior to marriage.**

Hebrews 13:4; 1 Corinthians 6:12-20; Ephesians 5:3; 1 Thessalonians 4:3-8

- c) God instructs us to take our promises seriously, including the promise to marry. It is God’s will that matrimony be kept inviolate. It includes also engagement for marriage.**

Ephesians 4:25; Colossians 3:9

- d) Those who break an engagement promise are guilty of sin and should be called to repentance.**

Matthew 18:15

4. God established different roles for man and woman at creation. Husband and wife are to reflect these roles in their marriage relationship. (The family consists of husband and wife, their children, and others (servants, dependents, etc.)
- a) **Man and woman are equal in status before God.**
- 1) **Man and woman were both made in the image of God.**
Genesis 1:27
 - 2) **Man and woman both fell into sin and share the guilt of the fall.**
1 Timothy 2:14; Romans 5:12
 - 3) **Man and woman share equally in the spiritual blessings God gives through Christ.**
Galatians 3:28; 1 Corinthians 15:22
- b) **God gave the husband the role of head and the wife the role of submission.**
Ephesians 5:22-24
- 1) **These roles were established at creation.**
Genesis 2:18; 1 Corinthians 11:3,8,9; Timothy 2:13
 - 2) **The New Testament indicates that these roles are a part of God's moral law that applies to all people of all time.**
1 Corinthians 11:3; Corinthians 14:34
 - 3) **These roles were not simply a part of the curse that God pronounced at the fall into sin.**
See WELS Doctrinal Statement *Man and Woman in God's World*.
- a) **Some believe these roles were imposed after the fall and do not apply to Christians who are freed from the curse of the law.**
Gilbert Bilezikian: The fall had spawned the twin evils of woman's suffering in labor and man's laboring in suffering. As a result of Satan's work, man was now master over woman, just as the mother-ground was now master over man. For these reasons, it is proper to regard both male dominance and death as being antithetical to God's original intent in creation. Both are the result of sin, itself instigated by Satan. Their origin is satanic (*Beyond Sex Roles: A Guide for the Study of Female Roles in the Bible*, p 56).
Gilbert Bilezikian: The ruler/subject relationship between Adam and Eve began after the fall. It was for Eve the application of the same death principle that made Adam slave to the soil. Because it resulted from the fall, the rule of Adam over Eve is viewed as satanic in origin, no less than death itself (*Beyond Sex Roles: A Guide for the Study of Female Roles in the Bible*, p 58).
- b) **Luther can be quoted on both sides of the issue.**
Luther: Thus she differs only in sex from the head of the household, inasmuch as she was taken from the flesh of the man. Although this can be said only of Eve, who was created in this manner, nevertheless in Matt.19:5 Christ applies it to all wives when He says that husband and wife are one flesh. In this way, although your wife has not been made from your bones, nevertheless, because she is your wife, she is the mistress of the house just as you are its master, except that the wife was made subject to the man by the Law which was given after sin (*LW*, Vol. 1, p 137, 138).
Commenting on 1 Timothy 2:13-14: Paul skillfully arranged this example that he might not appear to be speaking of the top of his head. This is the way God has ordained it. The principle role belongs to the man. "Adam was first," etc.

The role of greater authority lies in the man rather than in the woman. “Then Eve” that she should be, etc. Secondly, this situation stands, not only because of what God intended, but also from the history of Adam and Eve (*LW*, Vol. 28, p 277).

4) As a result of the fall, God indicated that rebellion against these roles would now be a source of pain and conflict.

Genesis 3:16-19

5) God applies these roles that were established at creation to marriage when he states that the husband is the head of his wife and the wife is to submit to her husband.

Ephesians 5:22-24

c) Both husband and wife are to use their different roles to serve each other.

1) Scripture teaches the broad principle that Christians are to use their roles to serve each other. This broad principle would include the relationship between husband and wife.

Philippians 2:5-8; Matthew 20:28

-a) Some use Ephesians 5:21 to deny that Scripture establishes roles for husband and wife in marriage.

Craig Keener: I am not saying that it is necessarily wrong for the man to lead in a household; I am suggesting that it is wrong for him to demand the position of leadership without his wife’s consent. Given the educational and vocational status of women in our culture, an egalitarian marriage must be permitted as a viable option (*Paul, Women, and Wives*, p 135).

-b) Some claim Ephesians 5:21 supports a mutual submission between husbands and wives.

Ephesians 5:21 Submit to one another out of reverence for Christ.

George W. Knight: In the admonition “submit to one another,” the verb (ὑποτάσσω) has as its basic meaning “to subject or subordinate.” Here Paul’s use of the middle voice focuses on what one does to oneself: one submits oneself to others. The Bauer-Arnt-Gringrich-Danker *Greek-English Lexicon* rightly describes this as “submission in the sense of voluntary yielding in love.” This voluntary yielding to others is a characteristic of the Christian community and is urged elsewhere in the New Testament. Compare, e.g., “In humility consider others [ἀλλήλους, the same word as in Ephesians] better than yourselves: (Philippians 2:3). This admonition is based on the example of Jesus (Philippians 2:5), who insisted on a servant mentality in imitation of him: “. . . whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be your slave—just as the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve” (Matthew 20:26-28).

Furthermore, the Apostle Peter, like the Apostle Paul, both urges particular people (younger men) to submit to particular people (elders) and all to submit to one another: “Young men . . . be submissive to (υποτάγητε) those who are older. All of you, clothe yourselves with humility toward one another (ἀλλήλους again) . . .” (1 Peter 5:4-5). Similarly, Paul urges masters to “Treat your slaves *in the same way*” (τὰ αὐτά, Ephesians 6:9) as their slaves were to treat them, i.e., “with respect and fear, and with sincerity of heart (verse 5). This implies reciprocity between masters and slaves. The exhortation to Christians in

Ephesians 5:21 is thus, like these other passages, a general exhortation of mutual submission to “one another” (*Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, p 166).

-c) Others question whether such a usage of ὑποτάσσω can be supported.

Grudem: This is not a legitimate meaning for the term ὑποτάσσω, which always implies a relationship of submission to an authority (*Systematic Theology*, p 465).

Peter O’Brien: The pronoun “one another” is not always fully reciprocal. Although advocates of the mutual submission interpretation assume that the relationships expressed by the Greek pronoun are always symmetrical (and so must mean “everyone to everyone”), this depends entirely on the context. On occasion, the pronoun does have a fully reciprocal significance. But in other contexts a symmetrical relationship cannot be in view. For example, Revelation 6:4, “so that men should slay *one another*”, cannot mean that each killed the other at precisely the same time as he or she was killed. Likewise, Galatians 6:2, “Bear *one another’s* burdens”, does not signify that “*everyone*” should exchange burdens of *others* who are less able (*The Letter to the Ephesians*, p 403).

2) As the servant leader, the husband is responsible for providing for his wife and family and protecting them from harm, both in a physical and spiritual sense. He is to do this in a spirit of love.

Ephesians 5:25-28; 1 Peter 3:7

-a) This does not mean that the husband must be the sole provider for his wife and family. The wife will assist in providing for the needs of the family.

1 Timothy 5:8; Proverbs 31:11-31

-b) The husband’s leadership role does not give him the right to dominate his wife and children in a cold, cruel, or careless manner. Nor does he have the right to abdicate his role as head—either actively or passively through laziness and apathy—to his wife.

1 Peter 3:7; Ephesians 6:4

3) As the servant helper, the wife will respect, support, and submit to her husband’s leadership role.

Ephesians 5:22,24; 1 Peter 3:1-6; Colossians 3:18

Note: A wife steps out of her role in marriage when she refuses to respect her husband as the God-given leader of the family or when she sets herself up as a rival.

4) The wife’s role is one of subordination (ὑποτάσσω).

Stephen B. Clark: In terms of the way in which subordination and governance are conducted, it is helpful to notice three main types: 1) Oppression. Oppressive subordination occurs in a relationship that works for the benefit of the ruler and the harm of the subordinate. Conquest normally leads to oppression as the conqueror exploits the conquered. 2) Care-subordination. Care-subordination characterizes a relationship in which the head is dedicated to the care of the subordinate and engages in the relationship for the benefit of the subordinate. The parent-child relationship is the most obvious example of such care-subordination

(where parents rear their children well). The master-disciple relationship is also an example of such subordination. 3) Unity-subordination. Unity-subordination occurs in a relationship that is carried on for the sake of a unity or higher cause. This is the kind of subordination that is integral to genuine community. Care-subordination and unity-subordination can often occur in the same relationship. Genesis is primarily concerned with unity-subordination (in this case, unity-subordination which is voluntary). The goal of the marriage relationship as presented in Genesis is oneness, the oneness described as “one flesh.” The woman is voluntarily subordinate to the man so that the two might be one and thus be in a position to fulfill the call the Lord gave the human race. This kind of subordination is also the key to the unity which God intended for the whole human race and for the new human race which is the Christian people (*Man and Woman in Christ*, p 41,42). George W. Knight: The meaning of ὑποτάσσω, used consistently in the charge to wives, is the same as its meaning in verse 21, that is, “submission in the sense of voluntary yielding in love.” This is not abandonment of the great New Testament truth also taught by the Apostle Paul that “there is neither . . . male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus” (Galatians 3:28). Rather, it is an appeal to one who is equal by creation and redemption to submit to the authority God has ordained (*Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, p 168).

The mother of the family shares the authority with the father.
Cf. Ex. 20:12; Dt. 5:16; Prov. 23:22; 30:17; Eph. 6:1-3; Col. 3:20

d) These roles complement each other.

Genesis 2:18; Genesis 2:22,23

Quenstedt (via Augustine and Aquinas): The wife was not formed from the head lest she aspire to dominion or be superior as a lord; nor was she made from the feet that she should be a slave or a footstool of man; but she was made from the side that she should be a helper (*TDP*, pars II, cap. I, sec. I, th. IV, p 512).

e) The egalitarian view denies that God gave different roles to husband and wife in marriage.

Note: In contemporary Christian circles the biblical view which recognizes that husband and wife are equal in status before God but have different roles is called the *complementarian* view. The view that husband and wife have no distinct roles is called the *egalitarian* view.

Craig Keener: I am not saying that it is necessarily wrong for the man to lead in a household; I am suggesting that it is wrong for him to demand the position of leadership without his wife’s consent. Given the educational and vocational status of women in our culture, an egalitarian marriage must be permitted as a viable option. ... This book is written not to tell any couple which partner, if either, should lead in the home; it is written to argue that those who think they know which partner should always lead on the basis of Scripture have not read Scripture as clearly as they should have (*Paul, Women, and Wives*, p 135, 136).

f) The egalitarian view argues that Ephesians 5:21 cancels out the roles that Paul teaches in Ephesians 5:22-31.

Keener: It is clear that the submission of verse 22 cannot be other than the submission of verse 21 from the simple fact that the word “submitting” does not even appear in the Greek text of verse 22: it has to be borrowed from verse 21. It is perfectly legitimate to read verse 22: “Wives, submitting to your husbands,” as long as we

understand that we must take verse 22 as an example of verse 21's mutual submission. Indeed, one commentator points out that verse 22 might be translated, "for example, wives to your husbands," and this is no doubt its force. Wives should submit to their husbands because Christians should submit to each other (*Paul, Women, and Wives*, p 169).

Keener: As has often been pointed out, Ephesians 5:22-33 advocates mutual submission. The only explicit definition of the wife's submission in the text is that she respect her husband (*Paul, Women, and Wives*, p 174).

g) Some egalitarians argue that κεφαλή means "source" rather than "head." They use this meaning to deny that God gave different roles to husband and wife. However, this meaning for κεφαλή is not found in classical or koine Greek.

Grudem: If you ever meet an egalitarian claiming that the word "head" in the Bible doesn't mean "authority" but means "source," you may wonder how to answer. Their purpose in this discussion is to eliminate the idea of authority from verses like, "The husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church" (Eph. 5:23). So they claim that the word "head" (the Greek word *kephale*) meant "source" rather than "authority" in the ancient world. Sometimes they quote some ambiguous ancient Greek texts which, they say, show Zeus to be the "source" of all things, or Esau to be the "source" of his clan, or which mention the "head" of a river. For a verse about husbands and wives, even this idea makes no sense (I am not the source of my wife!), but they will usually then suggest a more specific meaning like "source of encouragement" ("The Meaning of "Head" in the Bible," *CBMW News*, Vol 1, No 3, p 8).

h) As noted above, other egalitarians believe that since these roles were imposed after the fall they do not apply to Christian couples who are freed from the curse God pronounced on man and woman in Eden.

i) The family includes the servants, etc.

cf. Gen. 16:8,9; Eph. 6:5,6; Col. 3:22-25; 1 Tim. 6:1,2; Philemon

j) Parental authority extends also to the founding of new families by their children.

cf. Gen. 2:24; 24:3,50,51; 28:1,2; Dt. 7:3; Jer. 29:6; 1 Cor. 7:36,37

5. God blesses the marriage relationship. Family life promotes the happiness of husband and wife.

a) God blesses husband and wife with companionship.

Genesis 2:18

b) God blesses husband and wife with sexual happiness.

Song of Solomon 1:2

1) God created man and woman as sexual beings with sexual desires.

Genesis 1:27

Augsburg Confession, XXIII, 7: Gen. 1:28 teaches that men were created to be fruitful, and that one sex in a proper way should desire the other. For we are speaking not of concupiscence, which is sin, but of that appetite which was to have been in nature in its integrity, which would have existed in nature even if it had remained uncorrupted, which they call physical love. And this love of one sex for the other is truly a divine ordinance.

Augsburg Confession, XXIII, 12: The natural desire of sex for sex is truly a divine right, because it is an ordinance divinely impressed upon nature.

- 2) **God gave sexual happiness as a blessing to husband and wife at the institution of marriage.**
Genesis 2:24
- 3) **Chastity is a purpose for marriage after the fall.**
1 Corinthians 7:2-5
- c) **God blesses husband and wife with children.**
Genesis 1:28; Genesis 30:1,2;
 - 1) **God may bless a husband and wife with children.**
Psalm 127:3; Psalm 139:13
 - 2) **God may delay or withhold this blessing as he sees fit.**
1 Samuel 1:5,19,20
- d) **Not all these blessings will be found in every marriage in equal measure.**
- 6. God blesses the husband-wife relationship with the ability to bring children into the world.
Genesis 9:1
 - a) **A purpose of the sexual union is procreation.**
Genesis 4:1,2
 - b) **A purpose of the sexual union is also the consummation of marriage.**
Matthew 19:4,5
 - 1) **Sexual union does not establish marriage.**
1 Corinthians 6:16
 - 2) **The sexual union is an expression of the marital union.**
Schuetze and Habeck: In marriage a man and woman forsake the previous intimacy of family life with father and mother, are united or cleave to one another, and thus set up a new family. This cleaving, according to Jesus, is to continue so long as both live. Where this permanent relationship has been established, the two become one flesh through the sexual act. The latter does not establish the marriage bond but is the practice of it (*The Shepherd Under Christ*, p 280).
 - c) **According to Scripture, family planning and birth control are adiaphora.**
Note: The Roman Catholic Church and, historically, many Lutherans have regarded all birth control as wrong. Yet there are other scriptural principles to consider in this area. See "Birth Control as Ethical and Pastoral Problem," by H Kirsten, *Our Great Heritage*, II, p 106-124. Originally in *WLQ*, Vol. 65-1, Jan. 1968, p 24-44.
 - d) **When it comes to family planning, God wants Christian couples to pursue motives that are pleasing to God.**
Proverbs 16:2
 - 1) **As with all things, their motives are to glorify God.**
1 Corinthians 10:31
 - 2) **The Christian couple will remember that children are a blessing from God and be ready to receive them as such.**
Genesis 33:5; Psalm 127:3; Psalm 128:1-6
 - 3) **The husband is to be concerned about the emotional and physical health of his wife.**
1 Peter 3:7; 1 Thessalonians 4:4
 - 4) **The Christian couple will recognize that they will need to care and provide for their children.**

1 Timothy 5:8

5) The Christian couple will not let selfishness or greedy desires for a higher standard of living or personal advancement enter into family planning.

Hebrews 13:5,6; 1 Timothy 6:6-10; Luke 12:21-31

6) The Christian couple will realize that they cannot control the future but will let it in God's caring hands.

James 4:13-15

e) When it comes to family planning, God wants Christian couples to pursue methods that are pleasing to God.

1) They will recognize that human life begins at conception.

Note: See the section of dogmatics notes on the origin of the soul.

Psalm 51:5; Psalm 139:13-18; Jeremiah 1:5

2) They will recognize that abortion is the taking of a human life.

Exodus 20:13

3) They will pursue methods of birth control that are contraceptive and not abortifacient in nature.

Note: By "contraceptive" we mean a method that prevents fertilization and not a method that allows fertilization but interferes with implantation.

7. The Christian couple will be guided by God's Word when considering reproductive technologies.

a) Like other forms of medicine, reproductive technology must be evaluated in the light of God's Word and used to his glory.

Matthew 25:36; 25:40

b) Children are a blessing from God.

Psalm 127:3

c) While parenting can be burdensome, children are not to be viewed as a burden.

Genesis 3:16,19

d) Children are not a right of marriage. A Christian couple will recognize that sometimes God withholds the blessing children from a marriage.

Deuteronomy 32:39; 1 Samuel 1:5

e) Children are not merely a product of medical technology. A Christian couple will recognize that life begins at conception and treat all embryos as living human beings.

Deuteronomy 32:39; Psalm 139:13,14

f) A Christian couple will seek to manage their financial resources wisely recognizing that they are only managers of all that God places into their care.

Psalm 24:1; Matthew 25:14; 1 Corinthians 4:2

g) A Christian couple will come before the Lord in prayer, asking his help in applying the principles of Scripture and seeking his direction in matters that are not clearly addressed in his Word.

8. God regulates marriage as a lifelong union.
- a) **God reserves the right to end a marriage through death. (Only by the death of one party does God dissolve it) Even though spouses are able to break the marriage bond, such action is sinful. (It may be sinfully disrupted)**
 Gen. 2:24; Matthew 19:6; 1 Corinthians 7:39; Romans 7:2,3; Mt. 5:32; 1 Cor. 7:15
 - b) **God condemns divorce as sin.**
 Malachi 2:16; Matthew 19:3-8
 - c) **Scripture reveals that marital unfaithfulness (πορνεία) breaks the marriage bond.**
 Matthew 19:9; 5:31,32
 - d) **Scripture reveals that malicious desertion breaks the marriage bond.**
 1 Corinthians 7:15
 Armin Schuetze: Saint Paul makes mention of desertion in 1 Corinthians 7:15: "But if the unbeliever leaves, let him do so. A believing man or woman is not bound in such circumstances." To desert a spouse is an act of unbelief. It is sin. It breaks the marriage bond; the deserted person is no longer bound to the marriage. The one who deserts may or may not be involved in an adulterous relationship with another person. That is not the concern when speaking of desertion. Desertion by itself breaks a marriage. It would take us too far afield here to attempt a full scale study of all questions about desertion. Suffice it to say that not only geographical separation is desertion (*The Counseling Shepherd*, p 232).
 Note: For desertion to be malicious it must be 1) unilateral, 2) willful, and 3) permanent.
 - e) **In the case of marital unfaithfulness and malicious desertion, the innocent partner may obtain a divorce, which simply recognizes that the marriage bond has already been broken.**
 Matthew 19:9; 1 Corinthians 7:15
 - f) **The penitent sinner finds forgiveness also for the sin of divorce through Jesus who died for all sins.**
 2 Samuel 12:13; Psalm 32:3-5; Psalm 51:1-12
 - g) **The penitent sinner will also seek to apply appropriate fruits of repentance.**
 Luke 3:8; John 8:11
 Armin Schuetze: The term "fruit" implies willingness and a degree of spontaneity. Fruit is produced without legal compulsion. Hence we find that Scripture has not set up a code book that specifies the exact form which fruit of repentance must take in the case of every sin. But broad principles can be recognized.
 - Fruit of repentance is to desist from the sin for which one repents.
 - Fruit of repentance is to restore, if possible, what sin has ruined.
 - Fruit of repentance is to amend one's sinful life, to replace evil with good.
 - Fruit of repentance is to do all to the glory of God, whether we eat or drink, or work or play (*The Counseling Shepherd*, p 238).
 - h) **Annulment is a judgment that there never was a valid marriage, because there was no valid consent. It should not be used as a loophole to try to evade the Scripture's teaching on divorce.**
 Kevin Quirk, Judicial Vicar: The Roman Catholic Church presumes that a marriage entered by two baptized persons is a sacrament, and as a sacrament it is indissoluble.

This presumption can only be overturned by certain evidence produced by the couple and witnesses in a judicial process. However, the Church does not recognize the authority of civil courts in this matter, since it regards marriage as a sacrament. A civil decree of divorce is, in the mind of the Church, equivalent to a permanent separation from the common life but does not affect the validity or continued existence of the marriage. Since marriage is a sacrament, it is left to the Church to decide whether it is a valid sacrament or not. ... You cannot marry again without an annulment. This is because, following the teaching of Jesus Christ, the Church does not recognize a civil divorce. ... In a nutshell: a civil divorce says you were really and truly married and it didn't work out, so that State lets you out of the contract and out of your promises. An annulment says that on the day you married either you were incapable of marriage or your consent to marry was defective for one of a number of reasons; therefore, the marriage is invalid and did not sacramentally exist, though you both thought that it did. Until you receive an annulment, the Church assumes you and your former spouse meant your vows and that your marriage continues to exist, no matter what the State says. This is because marriage existed in the Garden (i.e., was created by God) and preexisted the State. And the State then does not have the right to divide what God has joined (Web site of the Diocese of Wheeling).

9. God ordained marriage as the basic unit for society. All human alternatives for marriage are contrary to his will.
 - a) **Scripture reveals God's original intention for marriage—one man and one woman in a one-flesh relationship. The Bible never explicitly forbids polygamy.**
 - 1) **God tolerated polygamy in the Old Testament, even among his people.**
Examples: Jacob (Genesis 29); Esau (Genesis 28); Elkanah (1 Samuel 1); David (2 Samuel 3); Solomon (1 Kings 11)
 - 2) **God regulated polygamy in Old Testament Israel.**
Deuteronomy 21:15-17
 - 3) **Yet God did not condone polygamy.**
Note: God also allowed other sins among his people to go unpunished. Moses murdered a man (Exodus 2:11,12); Abraham and Isaac lied about their wives (Genesis 12:10-20; 20:1-18; 26:1-11). See Acts 17:30.
 - 4) **Scripture presents Lamech, the first polygamist mentioned in history, as a godless man.**
Genesis 4:19-24
John Jeske: Lamech, the fifth generation after Cain, introduced polygamy into the human race. By doing so he showed contempt for God's stated purpose for marriage, that a man and a woman glorify God and serve each other by an unconditional commitment of love (*Genesis People's Bible*, p 65).
 - 5) **The examples of polygamy in the Old Testament illustrate the problems that such a relationship causes.**
Genesis 30:1-3,9,14,15; 1 Samuel 1:4-6
 - 6) **Scripture teaches that marriage is to be a monogamous relationship with mutual responsibilities.**
Genesis 2:24; 1 Corinthians 7:2-4
Schuetze and Habeck: Marriage as instituted by God at the time of creation was to be a lifelong union of one man and one woman. God created a monogamous

relationship. That the original institution is to be understood in this manner becomes evident when Jesus, referring to Genesis 2:24, concludes with the words, “and the two will become one flesh” (Mt 19:5). The marriage relationship involves two people. The fact that God-fearing men like Jacob and David were involved in polygamous marriages and divine disapproval in their cases is not directly evident does not change God’s original institution, reaffirmed in the New Testament (*The Shepherd Under Christ*, p 270).

b) Homosexuality is contrary to God’s will.

1) Homosexuality violates natural law.

Romans 1:26,27

2) Homosexuality violates God’s inscribed law.

1 Corinthians 6:9,10; Genesis 18:20,21; 19:24

3) God ordained marriage as a heterosexual relationship.

Genesis 2:24

4) The homosexual finds forgiveness for his sin in Christ who died for all sins.

1 Corinthians 6:9-11

5) The homosexual finds strength to avoid such sin in Christ who lives in him by faith and strengthens him by the gospel.

John 8:34,36; Philippians 4:13; Romans 7:21-25; 1 Corinthians 6:19,20; Romans 6:4

c) The “live-in” arrangement is contrary to God’s will.

John 4:16-18

1) The “live-in” arrangement violates the scriptural principles of marriage because it is not designed to be a lifelong union.

2) The “live-in” arrangement sets aside the scriptural purposes of marriage because it partakes of the blessings of marriage without assuming its responsibilities.

3) The “live-in” arrangement violates the scriptural principle of obedience to the government because it fails to fulfill both the legal and social requirements for marriage.

Gerhard: The blessing of the church is necessary for entering marriage rightly, not because of any special divine precept, nor on account of the nature of marriage (as is if it would not be whole without the blessing of the church), but it is necessary because of requirements of the church and state introduced for the sake of public utility and honesty. The blessing of the church is not necessary for the thing itself (that is, for the essence of marriage) but as a public testimony to all that the marriage was legitimately and honestly contracted (*Locj*, XV, 396).

4) The Christian will not conform to the ways of the unbelieving world but will seek to be the salt and light that he is.

Romans 12:2; Matthew 5:13-16

Cf. “Scriptural Principles as They Pertain to Live-in Arrangements,” *WLQ*, 96:4, Fall 1999.

God gave man and woman marriage as a blessing.

Large Catechism, The Sixth Commandment, 208: Therefore God has also most richly blessed this estate above all others, and, in addition, has bestowed on it and wrapped up in it everything in the world, to the end that this estate might be well and richly provided for. Married life is therefore no jest or presumption; but it is an

excellent thing and a matter of divine seriousness. For it is of the highest importance to Him that persons be raised who may serve the world and promote the knowledge of God, godly living, and all virtues, to fight against wickedness and the devil.

- a) **Family life promotes the happiness of husband and wife.**
Genesis 2:18,22,23; Proverbs 17:6; Proverbs 31:10-31
 - b) **Family life provides a positive environment for parents to raise their children in the training and instruction of the Lord.**
Deuteronomy 6:7; Ephesians 6:4
 - c) **Family life provides a positive environment where parents can apply loving Christian discipline.**
Proverbs 13:24; 19:8; 22:15; 23:13,14
 - d) **Family life promotes peace and stability (decency and order) in society.**
1 Corinthians 7:2-5
10. It is not God's will that every man or woman gets married.
- a) **The single state has the blessing and approval of God.**
1 Corinthians 7:1,2,7-9,25-28
 - b) **In this life we all stand before God as singles.**
Galatians 3:26-28
 - c) **In the next life we will all stand before God as singles.**
Matthew 22:30
 - d) **The single state is a spiritual gift that can be used to glorify God and serve his church.**
1 Corinthians 7:7; Matthew 19:12
 - e) **The single state is not a higher state. Scripture does not hold out virginity as the ultimate purity or abstinence as the ultimate act of devotion to God.**
Proverbs 18:22; 1 Timothy 4:3; Matthew 19:12
 - f) **Singles have gifts that can be used to glorify God and serve his church.**
1 Corinthians 7:7; Matthew 19:12
 - g) **God wants his church to address the spiritual needs of all members of the body of Christ, including the single members.**
Galatians 6:10
 - h) **God reminds all of us, whether single or married, that our main concern in this life is not to be our earthly relationships with each other but our spiritual status with Christ, our heavenly bridegroom.**
Matthew 6:33; 12:46-50

Appendix B

VII. Attempts to determine the precise moment and duration of the sacramental union have led some to formulate dogma and advocate practices that go beyond the institution of the sacrament given in Scripture. A decisive fact.

1) Roman Catholics assume a permanent “change in essence” (transubstantiation) that is brought about through the priestly recitation of the words of institution.

Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, Can. 4: If anyone should say that when the consecration has been performed in the sacrament of the admirable Eucharist it is not the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, but that it is only received in use, and that it is not there either before or after, and that the true body of Christ does not remain in the hosts or consecrated pieces, which are reserved after the communion or left over, let him be damned.

Catechism of the Catholic Church: The Eucharistic presence of Christ begins at the moment of the consecration and endures as long as the Eucharistic species subsist. Christ is present whole and entire in each of the species and whole and entire in each of their parts, in such a way that the breaking of the bread does not divide Christ (Par.1377).

2) Some Lutherans have expressed similar ideas regarding the recitation of the words of institution and the permanency of the sacramental union.

Hutter: There are even some among ourselves who dream that, when the words of institution have been recited, there results a permanent sacramental union of the bread with the body and the wine with the blood (Cited by Schmid, *Doctrinal Theology*, p 573).

Tom G. Hardt (d. 1998): According to the doctrine of the real presence, the body of Christ is at one and the same time present in its entirety in every single host on the altar as well as in every part of each host The Word spoken over the created element conveys directly the uncreated eternal power of God (*On the Sacrament of the Altar*, p 32, 49).

Bjarne W. Teigen (d. 2004): Through the words of Christ, spoken by the officiant, the sacramental union has been achieved so that the body and blood of Christ are present on the altar before the distribution and consumption (*The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz*, p 98).

3) Following the Lutheran Confessions, we refrain from attempting to determine the precise moment of the sacramental union, restricting ourselves to the fact that when the earthly elements are received the heavenly are also received.

(Sacramental union has place only in the moment of eating)

Formula of Concord, TD, Art. VII, p 976, 14-15: They confess, according to the words of Irenaeus, that in this sacrament there are two things, a heavenly and an earthly. Accordingly, they hold and teach that with the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ are truly and essentially present, offered, and received. And although they believe in no transubstantiation, that is, an essential transformation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, nor hold that the body and blood of Christ are included in the bread *localiter*, that is, locally, or are otherwise permanently united therewith apart from the use of the sacrament, yet they concede that through the sacramental union the bread is the body of Christ, etc. Apart from the use, when the bread is laid aside and preserved in the sacramental

vessel (the pyx), or is carried about in the procession and exhibited, as is done in popery, they do not hold that the body of Christ is present.

Formula of Concord, TD, Art. VII, p 1001, 83-84: However, this blessing, or the recitation of the words of institution of Christ alone does not make a sacrament if the entire action of the Supper, as it was instituted by Christ, is not observed, as when the consecrated bread is not distributed, received, and partaken of, but is enclosed, sacrificed, or carried about, but the command of Christ, "This do" (which embraces the entire action or administration in this sacrament, that in an assembly of Christians bread and wine are taken, consecrated, distributed, received, eaten, drunk, and the Lord's death is shown forth at the same time) must be observed unseparated and inviolate, as also St. Paul places before our eyes the entire action of the breaking of bread or of distribution and reception, 1 Cor. 10:16.

Augsburg Confession, Art. X, p 46: Of the Supper of the Lord they teach that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present, and are distributed to those who eat the Supper of the Lord; and they reject those that teach otherwise.

This We Believe: We reject any attempt to set the precise moment within the celebration of the Lord's Supper when the body and blood of Christ become present. We therefore reject the view that one must believe that Christ's body and blood are present as soon as the words of consecration have been spoken and the view that one must believe that Christ's body and blood become present only at the moment of eating and drinking (VI, 10).

Appendix C

Theses on the Lord's Supper by the Doctrine Committee of The Evangelical Lutheran Synod

On the basis of the Words of Institution (Matthew 26:26,27; Mark 14:22,24; Luke 22:19,20; 1 Corinthians 11:23-25) and other Scripture passages concerning the Lord's Supper (1 Corinthians 10:16,17 and 11:26-29,

1. We hold with Luther that "(the Sacrament of the Altar) instituted by Christ himself is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the bread and wine, given to us Christians to eat and to drink" (Small Catechism VI, Tappert Edition).
2. We hold that "in the Holy Supper the two essences, the natural bread and the true natural body of Christ, are present together here on earth in the ordered action of the sacrament, though the union of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine is not a personal union, like that of the two natures in Christ, but a sacramental union..." (Formula of Concord, Solid Declaration VII 37,38).
3. We hold that this sacramental union is in effect during the *usus* or *actio*: "Nothing has the character of a sacrament apart from the divinely instituted action (that is, if one does not observe Christ's institution as he ordained it, it is no sacrament). This rule dare not in any way be rejected, but it can and should be profitably urged and retained in the church of God. In this context 'use' or 'action' does not primarily mean faith, or the oral eating alone, but the entire external and visible action of the Supper as ordained by Christ: the consecration or words of institution, the distribution and reception, or the oral eating of the blessed bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ" (SD VII 85,86).
4. We hold that "it is the institution of this sacrament, performed by Christ, that makes it valid in Christendom, and that it does not depend on the worthiness or unworthiness of the minister who distributes the sacrament or of him who receives it, since, as St. Paul says, the unworthy receive the sacrament too. Therefore (we) hold that, where Christ's institution and command are observed, the body and blood of Christ are truly distributed to the unworthy, too, and that they truly receive it" (SD VII 16).
5. We hold that it is the almighty Word of Christ "which distinguishes it from mere bread and wine and constitutes it a sacrament which is rightly called Christ's body and blood...When (if) the Word is joined to the external element, it becomes a sacrament... The Word must make the element a sacrament: otherwise it remains a mere element" (Large Catechism V 10).
6. We hold that "No man's word or work, be it the merit or the speaking of the minister, be it the eating and drinking or the faith of the communicants, can effect the true presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper. This is to be ascribed only to the almighty power of God and the Word, institution and ordinance of our Lord Jesus Christ" (SD VII 74).
7. We hold that the Words of consecration repeated by the minister in a proper celebration of the Sacrament are the effective means by which the real presence of Christ's body and blood is brought into being. "For wherever we observe his institution and speak his words over the bread and cup and distribute the blessed bread and cup, Christ himself is still active through the spoken words by the virtue of the first institution, which he wants to be repeated....No human being, but only Christ himself who was crucified for us can make of the bread and wine set before us the body and blood of Christ. The words are spoken by the mouth of the priest, but by God's power and grace through the words that he speaks, 'This is my body,' the elements set before us in the supper are blessed...This his command and institution can and does bring it about that we do not distribute and

receive ordinary bread and wine but his body and blood, as his words read, 'This is my body,' etc., 'This is my blood,' etc. Thus it is not our work or speaking but the command and ordinance of Christ that, from the beginning of the first Communion until the end of the world, make the bread the body and the wine the blood that are daily distributed through our ministry and office." Again, "Here too, if I were to say over all the bread there is, 'This is the body of Christ,' nothing would happen, but when we follow his institution and command in the Lord's Supper and say, 'This is my body,' then it is his body, not because of our speaking or of our efficacious word. but because of his command in which he has told us so to speak and to do and has attached his own command and deed to our speaking" (SD VII 75-78).

8. We hold that "the words of institution are to be spoken or sung distinctly and clearly before the congregation and are under no circumstances to be omitted. Thereby we render obedience to the command of Christ, 'This do...'. And thereby the elements of bread and wine are hallowed or blessed in (for) this holy use, so that therewith the body and blood of Christ are distributed to us to eat and to drink, as Paul says, 'The cup of blessing which we bless,' which happens precisely through the repetition and recitation of the words of institution" (SD VII 79-82).
9. We hold that we cannot fix from Scripture the point within the sacramental *usus* when the real presence of Christ's body and blood begins, yet we know from Scripture and we acknowledge in the Confessions that what is distributed and received is the body and blood of Christ.

Appendix D

Six-point statement added in May, 1989 to clarify Thesis Nine:

We understand Thesis Nine in the light of the following statements:

- a) The words of consecration effect the real presence of Christ's body and blood in a valid administration of the Lord's Supper (consecration, distribution and reception).
- b) Because of this consecration Christ's body and blood are present in the elements of bread and wine before the reception of the elements by the communicants.
- c) We reject any attempt to fix the mathematical point or exact moment when the real presence begins.
- d) We reject the teaching that the presence of Christ's body and blood is in any way effected by the eating and drinking of the elements by the communicants.
- e) We reject the doctrine of transubstantiation, i.e., that the earthly elements cease to exist when the real presence of Christ's body and blood begins.
- f) We reject any celebration of the Lord's Supper without communicants.

Appendix E

5. *The Ministerial Office.*

I. Christ instituted one office in his church, the ministry of the gospel.

1. Christ assigned one task to his church: the office of preaching of the gospel.

- a) The one task given to the church is preaching the word and administering the sacraments.

Mark 16:15; Matthew 28:18-20; Matthew 26:26-28; John 20:21-23; Acts 1:8; 1 Peter 2:9

- b) This work is called an office or a ministry, that is, a service or an administration.

Note: In biblical usage, the word “ministry” is a synonym of “service.” Like “service,” the word “ministry” can refer to a wide variety of functions and offices, both secular and spiritual. The NIV makes it difficult to recognize this wide range of usage of the main Greek word for “ministry,” because of the variety of translations the NIV uses for this word and for other words based on the same Greek stem. The following arrangement of passages illustrates the various meanings of the biblical terms “ministry” and “minister.”

Examples of “ministry” in secular matters or physical things:

John 2:5; Luke 17:8; Mark 1:31; Luke 4:39; Luke 10:40; Acts 6:2; Luke 8:3; Romans 13:4

Examples of the ministry of Christians in general:

1 Peter 4:10-11; 1 Corinthians 12:5; Ephesians 4:12

Examples of ministry or service with the Word:

Ministry of the Word in the abstract—the means of grace and the responsibility to use them:

2 Corinthians 3:7,8,9; 2 Corinthians 5:18,19

Ministry of the Word in the concrete—service by public ministers of the Word, who hold a specific office:

Acts 6:4; Acts 1:17,25; Romans 11:13; Acts 20:24; 1 Timothy 1:12; Acts 21:19; 2 Timothy 4:5; Ephesians 3:7; 1 Corinthians 3:5; 2 Corinthians 3:6; 2 Cor. 3:7-9; 5:18,19; 6:3; Eph. 4:12; Col. 4:17; 2 Tim. 4:11; 2 Corinthians 6:4; 1 Timothy 4:6; Philippians 1:1

Augsburg Confession V speaks of the ministry of the Word in the abstract, the means of grace.

Augsburg Confession, V, 1,2; *Apology XXIV, p 404, 59-60*; Formula of Concord, T.D. XII, 30
II

U. V. Koren (d. 1910): There is no reference in this article to the work of the public ministry, by which the office of the word is to be performed in the congregation by certain persons who have been called to it. That is discussed later in the 14th Article. Here the reference is to the essence, power, and effectual working of the means of grace (*Faith of Our Fathers*, p 118).

Francis Pieper (d. 1931): Our article tells how a person comes to faith. It is through the *Predigtamt*, which means, through the Means of Grace established by God, the Gospel and the sacraments (*Das Grundbekenntnis der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, p 17).

Adolf Hoenecke (d. 1908): We can speak of the ministry of the Word, *Predigtamt* (preaching office), abstractly, understanding the expression to refer to the means of grace. Scripture itself does that, for example, in 2 Corinthians 3:4-8, where the apostle Paul designates the law as the ministry of the letter and the gospel as the ministry of the Spirit. Article V of the Augsburg Confession also speaks of the ministry of the Word in this abstract sense (ELD, IV, p 187).

C. F. W. Walther (d. 1887): The Apology does not have Grabau's understanding according to which the office of the ministry (*Predigtamt*) is always equivalent to the office of pastor (*Pfarramt*). ...No, when our old teachers ascribe such great things to the office of the ministry, they thereby mean nothing else than the service of the Word in whatever way (Weise) it may come to us ("The True Visible Church," in *Essays for the Church*, I, p 102).

c) **This office has been given to the church, that is, to every individual Christian as such; not in theory only, but to be put into practice.**

1) **Christ gave the keys to the church.**

Matthew 18:17-20; 1 Peter 2:5,9

Luther: Since the church owes its birth to the Word, is nourished and strengthened by it, it is obvious that it cannot be without the Word. If it is without the Word, it ceases to be a church. A Christian, thus, is born to the ministry of the Word in baptism (*zu dem Amt des Worts geboren ist* ("Concerning the Ministry," *LW* 40, p 37; *SL* X, 1592-1593).

Luther: We maintain firmly that there is no other Word of God than that alone which all Christians are told to proclaim; that there is no other Baptism than that which all Christians may administer; that there is no other observance of the Lord's Supper than that which belongs to every Christian and was instituted by Christ to be kept; also that there is no other kind of sin than that which every Christian may bind or loose, etc.... These are, however, always the priestly and the royal offices ("To The People At Prague," *SL* X, p 1589f.).

Luther: Even though not everybody has the public office and calling, every Christian has the right and the duty to teach, instruct, admonish, comfort, and rebuke his neighbor with the Word of God at every opportunity and whenever it is necessary. For example, father and mother should do this for their children and household; a brother, neighbor, citizen, or peasant for the other. Certainly one Christian may instruct and admonish another ignorant or weak Christian concerning the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer. And he who receives such instruction is also under obligation to accept it as God's Word and publicly to confess it (*LW* 13, p 333).

Luther: The preaching office is no more than a public service which happens to be conferred on someone by the entire congregation, all the members of which are priests (*LW* 13, p 332).

Walther: Through holy baptism every Christian has been consecrated, ordained and installed into the ministry (*geweiht, ordinirt, eingestetzt in das Amt*). ...What good is it my friends if we highly extol the spiritual priesthood as a great privilege, but do not fulfill the obligations. What good is it to be called spiritual priests if when we come together we do not exercise the office, but rather abandon it? What good is the name without the deed? (Sermon: "Bringing Souls to Christ," 1842; English in *Missio Apostolica* 6, 1998, p 10, 15).

This We Believe VII 7. We believe that every Christian is a priest before God (1 Peter 2:9). All believers have direct and equal access to the throne of grace through Christ, the mediator (Ephesians 2:17,18). God has given the means of grace to all believers. All Christians are to declare the praises of him who called them out of darkness into his wonderful light (1 Peter 2:9). In this sense all Christians are ministers, or servants, of the gospel. God wants all Christians to share the message of salvation with other people (Matthew 28:19,20; 10:32).

2) When Christ committed the keys to the church, he gave no detailed instructions about the manner of their use.

John Schaller: From all of this it should be clear to us that God certainly has given no definite commands about the time, person and form of preaching as far as the vast majority of situations that call for gospel preaching are concerned. It is his concern that the gospel sound forth loudly in the world for the salvation of sinners. For this reason he provides his Christians, all of whom have been called and equipped to preach, with all kinds of opportunities to fulfill the commission of their Lord, giving one this kind of opportunity and another a different kind. And so the preaching activity of Christians each time assumes a form that corresponds to the circumstances. ... Nevertheless, Scripture does indeed speak of special forms of the evangelical preaching ministry, both in the time before Christ's birth as well as after (WLQ, 1981, p 41).

See the section on the Church, V, page 532 ff.

2. From the beginning of the church there were men specially appointed to discharge the duties of this one ministry publicly, as the representatives of the church (ministry *in concreto*).

a) This public ministry is of divine origin. It is a divine institution.

1) All Christians are equal before God, knowing neither superiors nor subordinates. The spirit of brotherhood must not be violated.

Matthew 23:8-11; Luke 22:24-26; **1 Peter 5:2,3; 1 Corinthians 3:21-23**

2) God is a God of order. We are to conduct our affairs in an orderly way.

1 Corinthians 14:33,40; Colossians 2:5

3) Christians are not all equally qualified to perform publicly the functions of the ministry.

-a) God gives to the church people qualified for the various forms of the work required.

Romans 12:6-8; 1 Corinthians 12:4-11; Ephesians 4:7-11; **1 Timothy 3:2-7; Titus 1:5-9**

-b) These gifts should be gratefully received and developed.

1 Corinthians 4:1-2, 7; 1 Corinthians 12:31; 1 Timothy 4:14; 2 Timothy 1:6; 1 Th. 5:19,20

-c) These gifts should be used by the church for spiritual edification.

1 Corinthians 12:4-7; Ephesians 4:8-16; 1 Tim. 3:1-13; Tit. 1:6-9

Johann Bengel (d. 1752) comments on the significance of the word "enjoy" in John 5:35, "John was a lamp that burned and gave light, and you chose for a time to *enjoy* his light": John was to be *used*, not *enjoyed*. The Jews confused the means with the end. Those who seek merely the fruit of internal or external feelings in the Word and the servants of God, and not Christ himself, make a very serious mistake (*Gnomen*, I, p 597).

4) Public ministers are appointed by God.

-a) God establishes the ministry.

Ps. 68:11; Jeremiah 3:15; Acts 20:28; 1 Corinthians 12:28; Ephesians 4:11; 1 Corinthians 9:14

Quenstedt: God is the author of the New Testament ministry:

I. by promising teachers to the church (Jr 3:15; 23:4; Jl 2:23);

II. by giving what he promised (1 Cor 12:28; 2 Cor 5:18);

III. by preserving the ministry to the end of the world (Eph 4:11);

- IV. by functioning in the office of teaching himself (He 1:1);
- V. by equipping the teachers of the church with the necessary gifts (2 Cor 3:5) (*TDP*, Pt IV, chap. XII, sect. I, thesis III, note, p 394).

-b) It is an error to trace the origin of the public ministry to mere expediency. Johann Hoefling's *Grundsätze* (1852), contains much valuable material, but also the following error: As far as the ordaining of presbyters which was carried out or initiated by the apostles is concerned, it was nothing more than the fulfillment of a natural need for a leader, which becomes an imperative necessity not only for every fellowship but also for every kind of association (p 220 ff) (See the summary, Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*, III, p 445-449.)

Francis Pieper: One is inclined to judge Hoefling less severely because his opponents (Muenchmeyer, Loehe, Kliefoth, etc.) taught a strongly Romanizing doctrine of the ministry, namely, that the office of the public ministry is not conferred by the call of the congregation as the original possessor of all spiritual power, but is a divine institution in the sense that it was transmitted immediately from the Apostles to their pupils, considered as a separate "ministerial order" or caste, and that this order perpetuates itself by means of the ordination. Some also spoke as if the means of grace exerted their full power and efficacy only when they were administered by men of this "order." Against this caricature of the public ministry Hoefling correctly argues that it makes the officiant a "means of grace" alongside Word and Sacrament: "The believers might see themselves with their spiritual needs referred not so much to Word and Sacrament as rather to the organ (the minister) divinely privileged to administer and distribute them. The full efficacy of the means of grace appears dependent on an external legal institution; the Holy Ghost now operates not so much in and through the means of grace as rather through the nomistic organs of their administration." ...In short, Hoefling did not succeed in keeping his balance in opposing a coarse Romanizing error. Thoroughly to refute the immediate divine establishment of the public ministry as Loehe and others taught it, he thought it necessary to deny that the mediate establishment of this office through the congregation is God's ordinance or has divine command (*Christian Dogmatics*, III, p 447-448).

August Pieper: It does not follow from the spiritual priesthood of all believers that all Christians are *eo ipso* preachers for the congregation. That which all have in common, no one may take to himself ahead of the others. "No one should publicly teach or preach or administer the sacraments without an orderly call." Through the call to the office of preaching in the congregation the public administration of the priestly powers which are common to all are handed over to one or more individuals by a specific group of Christians. In this way the office of congregational preaching or the pastoral office comes into being. This is not to be regarded as a human, political arrangement, but as a divine ordinance. The pastoral office is mentioned in the Scriptures themselves along with the apostolate and office of evangelist as instituted (*eingerrichtete*) species of the general office of preaching won and commanded by Christ. To this arrangement (*Aufrichtung*)

the Christian church of all time is ordinarily bound. Whoever despises this despises Christ (*WLQ*, 1912, p 34).

Carl Lawrenz: In contrast to Hoefling we hold on the basis of Scripture, that it is not the church but our divine Lord himself, who before the New Testament church was ever called into existence, took note of its future need, prophesying in advance that he would take care of it through the gift of the public ministry, that he has set forth the qualifications for this public ministry for us in his New Testament word and continues to give to his church men with all the needed talents required to carry out all the tasks of the public ministry (*WLQ*, 1982, p 132).

Note: Walther was also accused of being a Hoeflingite by Romanizing Lutherans. *Lehre. und Wehre*, 1858, p. 354.

This We Believe, VII 8: We believe that God has also established the public ministry of the Word (Ephesians 4:11), and it is the will of God that the church, in accordance with good order (1 Corinthians 14:40), call qualified individuals into this public ministry (1 Timothy 3:1-10; 1 Corinthians 9:14). Such individuals minister publicly, that is, not because as individuals they possess the universal priesthood but because they are asked to do this in the name of fellow Christians (Romans 10:15). These individuals are the called servants of Christ and ministers of the gospel. They are not to be lords over God's church (1 Peter 5:3). We believe that when the church calls individuals into this public ministry, the Lord himself is acting through the church (Acts 20:28).

-c) That the public ministry is a special, God-ordained way of exercising the New Testament ministry of the Word is evident from the following points:

-1) Scripture speaks of the need for a call.

Romans 10:15

-2) The qualifications for the ministry are established in Scripture.

1 Timothy 3:1-12

-3) Called ministers are special gifts of God to his church.

Ephesians 4:11-13

-4) Those serving in the ministry are appointed by God.

1 Corinthians 12:28

-5) The ministry is designated by various special names.

For example, the office of a "bishop" or overseer in 1 Timothy 3:1: Here is a trustworthy saying: If anyone sets his heart on being an overseer, he desires a noble task.

-6) The ministry is a means of livelihood for full-time servants of the Word.

1 Corinthians 9:7-14; Luke 10:7; 1 Timothy 5:17-18; Galatians 6:6

b) There is, however, no direct word of institution for any particular form of the ministry.

1) Some claim Titus 1:5 is a specific institution of the parish pastorate.

Titus 1:5

2) A closer inspection will show that no divine institution of a specific form is spoken of.

-a) No command of the Lord is referred to, but a personal arrangement between Paul and his associate (assistant).

-1) Sometimes Luther is quoted to the contrary.

LW 36, 155: Whoever believes that here in Paul the Spirit of Christ is speaking and commanding will be sure to recognize this as a divine institution and ordinance, that in each city there should be several bishops, or at least one.

-2) But note Luther's point.

LW 36, 152: For this reason we are firmly convinced on the basis of the Holy Scriptures that there is not more than one office of preaching God's Word, and that this office is common to all Christians.... Since the Scriptures know of no other office of the Word of God.

LW 36, 156: The Holy Spirit appointed several bishops in one city, but each of you is over several cities, and a single pope wants to be bishop over all the cities of the world.

LW 29, p 16,17: First he gives Titus the general commission to appoint elders. Then he prescribes what kind of men they ought to be....Therefore it should be noted that it was Paul's ordinance that he should select "elders" [in the plural] in each city, and they are called bishops and elders. Therefore at the time of the apostles every city had numerous bishops. Then Christianity was in outstanding condition. This meaning of the word "bishop" disappeared, and it was subjected to very long and very distorted abuse. Now it is called the human ordinance by which a man is in charge of five cities. Every city ought to have many bishops, that is, inspectors or visitors. Such an inspector should be the parish clergyman along with the chaplain, so that they may share the duties and see how people live and what is taught. ...In every town, that is, many in each town. Note the parenthetical, zeugmatic position of the clause, "As I had appointed thee."

-b) The words "what was left unfinished" are alleged to imply the necessity of a specific form of ministry.

-1) This veiled reference is too general to draw from it a specific institution.

-2) It is sufficiently motivated in the context.

Titus 1:10ff

-c) If this was a word of institution of a specific form as the only divinely established form, then a sort of super-congregational form of church government was also instituted, and certain congregational boundaries were prescribed.

c) The public ministry and the common priesthood of all Christians are two species of the one genus, the ministry of the Word, since the same gospel is entrusted to both.

1) The public ministry is a special God-ordained way of practicing this one ministry of the gospel in the name of a group of Christians. (It is merely a special way or form of practicing the one ministry of the Gospel (in the name of a church body))

Luther: This is the way to distinguish between the office of preaching or the ministry and the general priesthood of all baptized Christians. The preaching office is no more than a public service which happens to be conferred on someone by the entire congregation, all the members of which are priests (LW 13, p 332).

2) When anyone does not have a call to this ministry, he is a member of the Christian laity.

When anyone leaves this ministry, he again ranks with the common Christian laity.

a. For a confessional statement cf. A.C. V (p.44); Apol. 310, 11-13; Art. Sm. 522. 67

On the 'character indelibilis' of Ordination

cf. Trid. Sess. XXIII, Cp. 4

Augsburg Confession, XIV: Of Ecclesiastical Order they teach that no one should publicly teach in the church or administer the Sacraments unless he is regularly called.

3. The public ministry of the gospel may take on various forms, as circumstances demand.

a) Various functions and offices are mentioned in Scripture.

1) There are lists of duties and offices.

1 Timothy 4:13; Romans 12:6-8; 1 Corinthians 12:28; Ephesians 4:11

2) There are examples of duties and offices.

Shepherding and feeding

John 21:15-17; Acts 20:28; 1 Peter 5:2

Teaching and equipping

1 Timothy 3:2; 1 Timothy 4:11; 1 Timothy 6:2; 2 Timothy 2:2

Watching, oversight

Acts 20:28,31

Ruling

1 Timothy 3:5; 1 Timothy 5:17; Hebrews 13:17; 1 Peter 5:3

Rebuking

2 Timothy 4:2; Titus 1:9-11; Titus 2:15

Baptizing

1 Cor. 1:17

3) However, it is not the function of the ministry in any form to decree articles of faith or to make church laws that go beyond or contrary to the Word, which is the sole source of doctrine.

Matthew 23:8; Romans 16:17; 1 Peter 5:3; Acts 15:19-21,28,29; Galatians 2:4,5

Apology XXVIII, p 446, 15-17 Although in the Confession we also have added

how far it is lawful for them to frame traditions, namely, not as necessary services, but so that there may be order in the church, for the sake of tranquillity. And

these traditions ought not to cast snares upon consciences, as though to enjoin necessary services; as Paul teaches when he says, Gal. 5: 1, "Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." ^{16]} The use of such ordinances ought therefore to be left

free, provided that offenses be avoided, and that they be not judged to be necessary services; just as the apostles themselves ordained for the sake of good discipline very many things which have been changed with time. Neither did they

hand them down in such a way that it would not be permitted to change them. For they did not dissent from their own writings, in which they greatly labor lest the church be burdened with the opinion that human rites are necessary services. ^{17]} This is the simple mode of interpreting traditions, namely, that we understand them not as necessary services, and nevertheless, for the sake of avoiding

offenses, we should observe them in the proper place.

offenses, we should observe them in the proper place.

b) In spite of the great diversity in the external form and in the titles of the ministry, the ministry is essentially one, since there is only one gospel.

1 Corinthians 3:5-8; 1 Corinthians 4:1, 6; 1 Peter 5:1; Acts 20:17,28; 1 Th. 1:1; Tit. 1:5,7

c) Also today the public ministry may take different forms.

1) **The most comprehensive is the pastorate.**

This We Believe, VII 9: We believe that the church's mission is to serve people with the Word and sacraments. This service is usually done in local congregations. We look upon the pastoral office as the most comprehensive form of the public ministry of the Word. Pastors are trained and called to provide such comprehensive spiritual oversight for the gathering and nurturing of souls in congregations (1 Peter 5:2).

2) **We also may have, for example, head pastors, associate pastors, assistant pastors, staff ministers, school teachers, deacons, circuit pastors, missionaries, professors, and synodical executive officers (visitors).**

This We Believe, VII 8b: We believe that the church has the freedom to establish various forms within the one ministry of the Word, such as pastors, Christian teachers, and staff ministers. Through its call, the church in Christian liberty designates the place and scope of service.

3) **It is instructive, illustrating the flexibility of forms of the ministry, to compare the present pastorate with the forms of the office as developed in Corinth and other New Testament congregations.**

1 Corinthians 12:1-14; Romans 12:6-8; Ephesians 4:11; Philippians 1:1; 1 Timothy 3:1,8; 1 Timothy 5:17

Luther, comparing preaching arrangements at Corinth with those he practiced in Wittenberg: But I would not be in favor of restoring this custom [1 Cor 14:29] and doing away with the pulpit. ... For St. Paul is not so rigidly concerned about the one method, but he is concerned about order and decent procedure, and gives this method as an example. We had better keep our custom in preaching since it more than the other will keep order among our stupid folk. In the days of the Apostle the custom of prophets sitting alongside each other was possible. For it was a habit of long standing and practiced daily among a well-disciplined people who had inherited it from Moses through the Levitical priesthood. It would hardly do to restore the practice among such uncouth, undisciplined, shameless people as ours (LW 40, p 392f)

Walther, "Address at the Installation of Two Academy Professors":

Theme: What should comfort us when men who have prepared themselves for the office of saving souls, yes, who have already carried on that office with blessing, take over the teaching office at our educational institution at the call of the church? In answer, we should be comforted by this: 1.) that also their office is the office of our God; 2.) that also their concern is the concern of our Lord. "God has really ordained only one office, namely, the office which in his name gathers, builds, governs, cares for, and preserves his church on earth" (Brosamen, p 346ff).

Chemnitz discusses various forms of the public ministry and then says: 1) that there is no command in the Word of God, which or how many such ranks or orders there should be; 2) that there were not at the time of the apostles in all churches and at all times the same and the same number of ranks or orders, as can be clearly ascertained from the epistles of Paul, written to various churches; 3) that there was not, at the time of the apostles, such a division of these ranks, but repeatedly one and the same person held and performed all the duties which belong to the ministry, as is clear from the apostolic history. Therefore such orders were free at the time of the apostles and were observed for the sake of good order, decorum, and edification, except that at that time certain special gifts, such as tongues, prophecies, apostolate, and miracles, were bestowed on

certain persons by God.... This example of the apostles the primitive church imitated for the same reason and in similar liberty. For the grades of the duties of the ministry were distributed, not however in identically the same way as in the church at Corinth or in that at Ephesus, but according to the circumstances obtaining in each church. From this one can gather what freedom there was in the distribution of the ranks (*Examination*, Part II, p 685, Kramer translation). Carl Lawrenz (d. 1989): In his "Confession Concerning Christ's Supper," for example, Luther says: "All who are engaged in the clerical office (*Pfarramt*) or ministry of the word are in a holy, proper, good and God-pleasing order and estate." That the public ministry was a very wide and comprehensive concept for Luther, covering every form and phase of the ministry of the word can be exemplified from a quotation from his "Sermon on Keeping Children in School." There Luther says: "The estate I am thinking of is rather one which has the office of preaching and the service of the word and sacrament and which imparts the Spirit and salvation, blessings that cannot be attained by any amount of pomp and pageantry. It includes the work of pastors (*Pfarramt*), teachers, preachers, lectors, priests (whom men call chaplains), sacristans, schoolmasters, and whatever other work belongs to these offices and persons." It is significant that Walther offers also this quotation as he supplies support from Luther's writings for Thesis I. Here Luther uses *Pfarramt* as a species of the genus public ministry. This gives us reason to conclude that Walther was not unaware of Luther's understanding of the wide scope of the public ministry nor in disagreement with it (*WLQ*, 1982, p 126-127).

- d) **From the fact that the functions of all public ministers are not the same it does not follow that there is a divinely established difference of rank.**
- 1) **The idea of divinely established hierarchy in the church is foreign to Scripture.**
 Matthew 18:1-4; Mark 9:33-35; Mark 10:42-45; Luke 22:24-26
 Quenstedt: In our churches we retain ranking (*ordinem*) among the ministers, so that some are bishops, some presbyters, some deacons, because also in the apostolic and early church there were distinct ranks (orders) of ministers, and indeed they were divinely instituted (*divinitus constituti*)(1 Cor 12:28; Eph 4:11). Meanwhile we say that the same power of the ministry, consisting of the preaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments, and the power of jurisdiction, consisting in the use of the keys, belongs to all ministers of the church (*TDP*, Pt IV, chap. XII, sect. I, thesis XIV, note, VI, p 396).
 - 2) **The area of responsibility that a minister has is spelled out in the call.**
 Acts 13:2; Acts 22:21; Galatians 2:7-8
 - 3) **The Roman Catholic demands acceptance of three ranks: bishops, priests, and deacons.**
 Council of Trent, Sess. XXIII, Can. 6: If anyone says that in the Catholic church there is not a hierarchy instituted by divine ordination, which consists of bishops, presbyters, and ministers, let him be damned.
 Can. 7: If anyone says that the bishops are not superior to presbyters or that they do not have the authority to confirm and ordain, or that the authority which they have belongs both to them and to the presbyters, or that ordination conferred by them without the call and consent of the people or secular authorities is not valid or that those who are not rightly ordained nor sent by canonical and ecclesiastical

authority, but who come from elsewhere, are legitimate ministers of the Word and the sacraments, let him be damned.

Dominus Jesus (2000): Section 17. Therefore, there exists a single Church of Christ, which subsists in the Catholic Church, governed by the Successor of Peter and by the Bishops in communion with him. ...On the other hand, the ecclesial communities which have not preserved the valid Episcopate and the genuine and integral substance of the Eucharistic mystery, are not Churches in the proper sense.

Francis A. Sullivan, S.J.: Most Christian scholars from both sides of this divide agree that the threefold structure of ministry, with one bishop among a number of presbyters and deacons in each church, does not appear in the New Testament.... Hardly anyone doubts that the church of Rome was led by a group of presbyters for at least a part of the second century (*From Apostles to Bishops*, p 217). No doubt proving that bishops were the successors of the apostles by divine institution would be easier if the New Testament clearly stated that before they died the apostles had appointed a single bishop to lead each of the churches they founded (p. 223).

- e) **Note that the order of headship established by God at creation prevents women from functioning publicly in the church in any way which would violate this principle of headship. Women do possess the priesthood of all believers and can and should exercise this priesthood privately and may serve publicly in the church in any way that does not violate this principle.**

1 Corinthians 11:3-16; 1 Timothy 2:11-15; 1 Corinthians 14:33-37

Augsburg Confession, XXVIII, 54-56, p 91: So Paul ordains, 1 Cor. 11:5, that women should cover their heads in the congregation, 1 Cor. 14:30, that interpreters be heard in order in the church, etc. ^{55]} It is proper that the churches should keep such ordinances for the sake of love and tranquillity, so far that one do not offend another, that all things be done in the churches in order, and without confusion, 1 Cor. 14:4; comp. Phil. 2:14; ^{56]} but so that consciences be not burdened to think that they are necessary to salvation, or to judge that they sin when they break them without offense to others; as no one will say that a woman sins who goes out in public with her head uncovered provided only that no offense be given.

Luther: Paul forbids women to preach in the congregation where men are present who are skilled in speaking.... Paul did not forbid this out of his own devices, but appealed to the law, which says women are to be subject.... Therefore order, discipline, and respect demand that women keep silent when men speak; but if no man were to preach, then it would be necessary for the women to preach (*LW*, 36, p 151f).

Luther: The second function, to baptize, they themselves [the Roman Catholics] have by usage allowed in cases of necessity even to ordinary women, so that it is hardly regarded any more as a sacramental function. Whether they wish or not we deduce from their own logic that all Christians, and they alone, even women, are priests, without tonsure and episcopal "character." For in baptizing we proffer the life-giving Word of God, which renews souls and redeems from death and sins. To baptize is incomparably greater than to consecrate bread and wine, for it is the greatest office in the church—the proclamation of the Word of God. So when women baptize, they exercise the function of priesthood legitimately, and do it not as a private act, but as a part of the public ministry of the church which belongs only to the priesthood (*LW* 40, p 23).

Walther: Women as well as men, young as well as old—all Christians are spiritual priests and teachers of the word (Sermon: “Bringing Souls to Christ,” 1842; English in *Missio Apostolica* 6, 1998, p 13).

This We Believe VII 10: We believe that women may participate in offices and activities of the public ministry except where that work involves authority over men (1 Timothy 2:11,12). This means that women may not serve as pastors nor participate in assemblies of the church in ways that exercise authority over men (1 Corinthians 11:3; 14:33-35).

LCMS: The Synod affirms that women on the basis of the clear teaching of Scripture may not serve in the office of pastor nor exercise any of its distinctive functions, and that women may serve in humanly established offices in the church as long as the functions of these offices do not make them eligible to carry out “official functions [that] would involve public accountability for the function of the pastoral office (Resolution 3-08A, 2004 Convention).

Ted Peters (ELCA): Given all I have said about eschatology and the open future, it is logical for me to stress that—regarding ordination of women as well as of gay and lesbian persons—there is room to be creative and to make changes even where traditions have long been ensconced (*God and the World's Future*, p 316).

4. **The purpose of the public ministry is to build up the church.**
 - a) **It is the edification of the church by serving with the means of grace and by equipping others to serve.**

1 Corinthians 12:7; Ephesians 4:11-14
 - b) **Therefore, ministers, recognizing their great responsibility, should discharge the duties of their office to the best of their ability.**

Romans 12:6-8; 1 Timothy 4:12-16; 1 Timothy 5:21; 1 Peter 5:2; **1 Thessalonians 2:8**
 - c) **Similarly, congregations should be diligent that the training of future ministers is as thorough as possible.**

1 Timothy 5:22; **2 Timothy 2:2**
- II. **No one may assume the functions of the public ministry except through a legitimate call.**
 1. **A call is necessary.**
 - a) **The necessity is expressed as an axiom: *nisi rite vocatus*.**

Romans 10:15; Hebrews 5:4-6; **Jeremiah 23:21**

Augsburg Confession, XIV Of Ecclesiastical Order they teach that no one should publicly teach in the church or administer the Sacraments unless he be regularly called.

August Pieper: The Lord has purchased the office of the Word, the New Testament preaching office, through his blood and expressly commanded it for his congregation. Along with the gospel he has entrusted his believers with the office of the keys, which is to be used by them. They should practice it in the whole world. The public preaching office is both inwardly and outwardly God's command and order for the Christian church. But it does not follow from the spiritual priesthood of all believers that all Christians are *eo ipso* preachers for the congregation. That which all have in common, no one may take to himself ahead of the others. “No one should publicly teach or preach or administer the sacraments without an orderly call” (WLG, 1912, p 33).
 - b) **The need for a call is clear from the fact that all Christians are brothers. The minister represents all who have called him in the public discharge of certain duties which were originally given to all.**
 - 1) **Individuals may represent the church on a special occasion.**

Acts 15:2,25,27; 2 Corinthians 8:18,19

- 2) They may represent them in preaching the Word to others.
 - a) It is the nature of every Christian to share the Word with others.
Acts 4:20; Acts 8:1, 4; Acts 11:19-21; 2 Corinthians 4:13; Mt. 12:34; 10:32,33
 - b) But individuals may also be appointed to represent certain churches.
Acts 8:14; Acts 11:22; Acts 13:1-3; Acts 14:26,27
 - 3) Called ministers have a special relationship with those who have called them.
 - a) Bonds of love unite all Christians in congregations.
Colossians 3: 12-14
 - b) The most intimate relation exists between pastor and flock.
1 Thessalonians 2:6-8, 11, 12
 - c) It would be contrary to love to usurp the ministry to oneself without the consent (call) of the congregation.
 - d) On the other hand, this relationship, once established, may not ruthlessly be severed. **Just causes for dismissing a called worker are false doctrine, neglect of duty, inability to perform the duties of the office, and moral disqualification.**
Chemnitz: Moreover, just as there is a lawful method for calling someone into the ministry of the church, so also there is a lawful method for removing someone or for transferring him from one church to another. ...In our churches many also do not understand this matter correctly. For just as, when one hires a servant, he has the power to dismiss him when he wishes, so some think that they have authority also to dismiss a preacher, though they have no just cause. ...Just as the one God properly claims for himself the right to call even when the call takes place mediately, so also is it properly of God to remove a person from the ministry. Therefore, as long as God endures in the ministry his minister who teaches correctly and lives blamelessly, the church does not have authority to remove someone else's servant. But when he no longer edifies the church by doctrine or life, but destroys it, then God himself removes him. ...And then also the church not only can but also should remove such a one from the ministry (*Loci*, Pt III, Ch IV, Sect I, Vol. II, Preus translation, p 703).
2. Some men were called by God directly (*vocatio immediata*).
- a) Scripture gives examples of such calls.
 - 1) Prophets and apostles were called by God.
Isaiah 6:8; Jeremiah 1:4-10; Exodus 3:10; Matthew 10:1; Mark 3:14; Matthew 4:21-22; Matthew 9:9; Acts 22:21
 - 2) Paul was very emphatic in pointing to his direct call when his apostolic authority was questioned.
Galatians 1:1; 2 Corinthians 12:12
 - 2) The call of Matthias was essentially a direct call
 - b. True, the congregation was to a certain extent instrumental in bringing it about.
cf. Acts 1:15-26
 - c. Yet
 - i. They did not nominate the candidates, but simply singled out those that had the required qualifications.
cf. Acts 1:8; Jh. 15:27

- ii. The actual choice was left to the Lord by casting lots.
 - 3) **Often those who received a direct call could substantiate their claim by signs and miracles.**
 Exodus 4:1-9; Deuteronomy 18:21,22; Deuteronomy 13:1-5; Acts 14:3; 2 Corinthians 12:12; **Mc. 16:20**
 - 4) **The direct call did not confer generically different functions on the apostles. All pastors have the same means of grace and treat each other as brothers.**
 - a) **Note, for example, the brotherly relationship between Paul and Timothy and others.**
 2 Timothy 1:6,11,14; **Colossians 1:1; 1 Thessalonians 3:2; 1 Peter 5:1; 1 Tim. 2:2**
 - b) **The apostles, however, possessed the special gift of inspiration and extra-congregational authority in the church.**
 1 Corinthians 2:13; 2 Peter 1:19-21
John Brug: The apostles are distinguished from all other ministers of the gospel by being given the special title of Apostle by Jesus, by having a unique role as a foundation of the church, by being assigned a special role as leaders of Israel, and by being specially designated witnesses of Jesus' resurrection. They are distinguished from subsequent ministers of the gospel by a direct call from Christ, by the special gifts of healing and power over demons, and by the gift of inspiration. These gifts were, however, shared with contemporaries of the apostles, who were in direct contact with Christ or the apostles. With the possible exception of Ananias, only the apostles were able to give these gifts to others. The apostles had a special calling as world missionaries. We have a detailed account of how that calling was fulfilled for only one apostle, Paul. We do not know if the other apostles were missionaries-at-large or whether they had territorial assignments from Christ, from the church, or by mutual agreement (WLQ Summer 1995, p 176).
3. **Ministers of the gospel today are called (by the Christians themselves) by Christ through the church (*vocatio mediata*).**
- a) **Scripture speaks of mediate calls.**
 - 1) **Paul, recognizing a call "by men," appointed ministers and instructed his disciples to do the same.**
 Galatians 1:1; Acts 14:23; 2 Timothy 2:2; Titus 1:5; **1 Timothy 4:14**; 2 Timothy 1:6
 - 2) **The right of congregations to appoint ministers is implied in their possession of the keys.**
 Matthew 18:18; 1 Corinthians 3:21; Ephesians 4:8,11; **Eph. 1:23**
 Smalcald Articles, Tractate, 67-69, p 522: For wherever the church is, there is the authority to administer the gospel. Therefore it is necessary for the church to retain the authority to call, elect, and ordain ministers. And this authority is a gift which in reality is given to the church, which no human power can wrest from the church, as Paul also testifies to the Ephesians when he says, Eph 4:8, He ascended, He gave gifts to men. And he enumerates among the gifts specially belonging to the church pastors and teachers, and adds that such are given for the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ. Hence, wherever there is a true church, the right to elect and ordain ministers necessarily exists. Just as in a case of necessity even a layman absolves and becomes the minister and pastor of another; as Augustine narrates the story of two Christians in a ship, one of whom baptized the

catechumen, who after baptism then absolved the baptizer. ^{68]} Here belong the statements of Christ which testify that the keys have been given to the church, and not merely to certain persons, Matt. 18:20, "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, etc." ^{69]} Lastly, the statement of Peter also confirms this, 1 Pet. 2:9, You are a royal priesthood. These words pertain to the true church, which certainly has the right to elect and ordain ministers since it alone has the priesthood.

Smalcald Articles, Tractate, 72, p 524: From all these things it is clear that the church retains the right to elect and ordain ministers. And the wickedness and tyranny of bishops afford cause for schism and discord, therefore, if the bishops either are heretics or will not ordain suitable persons, the churches are in duty bound before God, according to divine law, to ordain for themselves pastors and ministers. Even though this be now called an irregularity or schism, it should be known that the godless doctrine and tyranny of the bishops is chargeable with it, because Paul (Gal. 1:7f), enjoins that bishops who teach and defend a godless doctrine and godless services should be regarded as accursed.

3) Ministers so appointed have been appointed by the Holy Spirit.

Acts 20:28

4) Exercising the functions which were originally entrusted to the whole church, ministers are the servants of God and of the congregation.

2 Corinthians 4:5; 1 Corinthians 4:1,6; 1 Corinthians 3:5; Colossians 1:25; 2 Corinthians 1:24; 2 Corinthians 2:10; 1 Peter 5:3

b) No mode of election and calling is prescribed in Scripture.

1) (Historically) Scripture mentions mediate calls.

a) One election is fully described

cf. Acts 6:1-6

Others are merely noted

cf. Acts 14:23; Tit. 1:5

-a) Two "elections" are described.

Acts 6:1-6;

Acts 1:15-26 [There is some question if the reference is to casting lots or voting, *WLQ*, Summer 98, p 212-214.]

-b) Others are merely noted in passing.

Acts 14:23; Titus 1:5

2) Sometimes it may be expedient for the church to delegate the actual calling to a committee or board, for example in the calling of professors and mission workers and the assigning of seminary graduates.

3) It would be disorderly and inconsiderate if a congregation while calling did not avail itself of the advice of experienced pastors, for example, the district officials, as is the agreement in our synod.

Acts 14:23; Titus 1:5

Smalcald Articles Tractate, 13,14, p 506: Again the Council of Nicea determined that bishops should be elected by their own churches, in the presence of some neighboring bishop or of several. ^{14]} The same was observed for a long time, not only in the East, but also in the West and in the Latin churches, as Cyprian and Augustine testify.

4. In opposition to the scriptural doctrine of the call we find two extremes.

a) **Roman Catholics assert the authority of bishops to assign pastors without the consent of the congregation.**

Council of Trent, Sess. XXIII, Can. 7: If anyone says that the bishops are not superior to presbyters or that they do not have the authority to confirm and ordain, or that the authority which they have belongs both to them and to the presbyters, or that ordination conferred by them without the call and consent of the people or secular authorities is not valid or that those who are not rightly ordained nor sent by canonical and ecclesiastical authority, but who come from elsewhere, are legitimate ministers of the Word and the sacraments, let him be damned. Cp. 4: Moreover, the most holy Synod teaches that in the ordination of bishops, priests and other clergy neither the consent, call, or authority of the people or of any secular authority or magistrate is required in such a way that ordination without these would be invalid.

b) **Enthusiasts deny the necessity of the call.**

Racovian Catechism: Do not those who teach in the church and who watch over the upholding and preserving of order need to be sent in some special way? By no means, for they now bring no new or previously unheard doctrine. But what do you say about these apostolic words, "How shall they preach except they be sent" (Ro 10:15)? Since the preaching of present-day teachers is not of the same kind as that of apostolic times, as we taught a little earlier, a sending of the same kind is by no means necessary for this present-day preaching (505, 506).

c) **The Confessions reject both extremes.**

Apology XII, p 254, 10-13, p.310, 7-13 Nor do we have another priesthood like the Levitical, ^{11]}as the Epistle to the Hebrews sufficiently teaches. But if ordination be understood as applying to the ministry of the Word, we are not unwilling to call ordination a sacrament. For the ministry of the Word has God's command and glorious promises, Rom. 1:16, "The gospel is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believes." Likewise, Is. 55:11, "So shall My Word be that goes forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please." ^{12]} If ordination be understood in this way, neither will we refuse to call the imposition of hands a sacrament. For the church has the command to appoint ministers, which should be most pleasing to us, because we know that God approves this ministry and is present in the ministry ^{13]} And it is of advantage, so far as can be done, to adorn the ministry of the Word with every kind of praise against fanatical men, who dream that the Holy Spirit is given not through the Word, but because of certain preparations of their own, if they sit unoccupied and silent in obscure places, waiting for illumination, as the Enthusiasts formerly taught, and the Anabaptists now teach.

5. **Ordination is not necessary for conferring the office, (It is a liturgical form of confirming the legitimacy of the call, and invoking God's blessing.) which is conferred by the call.**

a) **(Ordination always presupposes a definite call) "Ordination" (that is, laying on of hands) is frequently referred to in Scripture. Note: This laying on of hands is not limited to pastors. See WLQ, Fall 1995, p 267-269.**

Acts 6:6; Acts 13:3; 1 Timothy 5:22; 1 Timothy 4:14; 2 Timothy 1:6

b) **Ordination or installation is a public declaration and testimonial that the called person possesses the required qualifications and the call was properly executed. It is a liturgical form for recognizing fitness for office and the legitimacy of the call and for invoking God's blessing on the minister.**

Smalcald Articles, Tractate, 70, p 524: And this also a most common custom of the church testifies. For formerly the people elected pastors and bishops. Then came a bishop, either

of that church or a neighboring one, who confirmed the one elected by the laying on of hands, and ordination was nothing else than such a ratification.

Chemnitz: Therefore, although ordination does not make the call, yet, if someone has been legitimately called, then that ceremony is a declaration and public confirmation that the call which preceded it is legitimate (*Loci*, Pt III, Ch IV, Sect I, p 137; Preus translation, II, p 705).

c) **It is (an abuse) confusing to ordain a person who has not been called (*ordinatio absoluta*).**

Chemnitz: But what we have said above about the apostolic calling, that it should stretch into the whole world, we cannot say also now about those who are called mediately. For teachers, pastors, bishops, and presbyters are called to certain churches and do not have authority to teach everywhere or in all churches. Thus in Acts 14:23 elders are ordained for individual churches, and in Titus 1:5 Titus is left in Crete to establish churches in every city. And thus God, through a special call, ordinarily shows where he wants someone's labor to be used. Therefore by virtue of this call they do not have authority to teach in other churches to which they do not have a special call. Hence in the Council of Chalcedon, in Canon 6, and in Gratian, Canon 16 [*CIC*, p. 256, dist. 70], it states that absolutely no one should be ordained except to a specific and particular church (*Loci*, Pt III, Ch IV, Sect I, Vol. II, Preus translation, p 703).

H. Orton Wiley: The Scriptures clearly teach that the early church ordained elders or presbyters, by a formal setting apart to the office and work of the ministry. While it may be true that no particular form is prescribed, it seems evident from numerous references that the elders were set apart by the imposition of hands. Furthermore, it is evident from the Scriptures that the power of ordination rested in the eldership itself; and that all candidates were to be adjudged as worthy or unworthy of the office only by those who had been themselves ordained. Ordination, therefore, is to be regarded as in some sense, a divinely authorized and prescribed form of investiture or inauguration to a particular order. But ordination does not make the elder an officer in a particular church. This can be done only as he is elected by the church, and freely accepts this election. Thus, the eldership is an order of the ministry, from which only pastors can be elected, but until so elected they are not pastors of particular churches. ...We may safely maintain, therefore, that there is one order in the ministry, but many and various offices (*Christian Theology*, p 135f)

d) **Roman Catholics falsely claim that ordination is a sacrament conferring an indelible character. The Orthodox view is similar.**

Council of Trent, Sess. XXIII, Can. 3: If anyone says that order ("holy orders") or holy ordination is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by the Lord Christ, or that it is a certain human invention thought up by men unskilled in ecclesiastical affairs, or that it is only a ceremony by which ministers of the Word and the sacraments are chosen, let him be damned.

Council of Trent Sess. XXIII, ch. 4: Since in the sacrament of ordination ... a recognized official rank (*character*) is impressed which cannot be erased or taken away, the holy Synod rightly condemns the opinion of those who assert that those who were once correctly ordained can again become laymen if they no longer carry out the ministry of the Word of God. *Can. 4*: If anyone says that through holy ordination the Holy Spirit is not given ... or that through it a recognized official rank (*character*) is not impressed, or that he who was once a priest can again become a layman, let him be damned.

Pomazansky (Orthodox): Thus the Church hierarchy is composed of the three degrees.

None of the three stages can be seized solely by one's personal desire; they are given by the Church, and the appointment to them is performed by the blessing of God through the ordination of a bishop (*Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*, p 251).

Apology XIII, p 310, 11-12 But if ordination be understood as applying to the ministry of the Word, we are not unwilling to call ordination a sacrament. For the ministry of the Word has God's command and glorious promises....^{12]} If ordination be understood in this way, neither will we refuse to call the imposition of hands a sacrament. For the church has the command to appoint ministers, which should be most pleasing to us, because we know that God approves this ministry, and is present in the ministry.

Chemnitz: This reminder must, however, be added, that the rite of ordination must be distinguished from the ceremony of baptism and the Lord's Supper, for ordination is not a sacrament in the same way as Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The difference is plain. Baptism and the Lord's Supper are means or instruments through which God applies and seals the promise of reconciliation or forgiveness.... There is therefore a difference between the promises which are added to ordination and those which are added to baptism and the Lord's Supper. Besides, there is also a difference in the ceremony or external rite. For in baptism and the Lord's Supper the Son of God himself prescribed and commanded a certain external element, a certain ceremony or rite. In ordination, however, such as we now understand it, Christ himself applied an external sign just once, when on the day of his resurrection he breathed on his disciples (John 20:22). He did not, however, add a command that the church should imitate that rite of breathing upon the ministers at their ordination. Now the ministry of the Word and the sacraments has divine promises, and the prayer at ordination rests on these, but these promises are not to be tied to the rite of the imposition of hands, about which there is neither a command of Christ nor such a promise as there is about baptism and the Lord's Supper. This reminder must be added, because the papalists contend that ordination is truly and properly a sacrament of the New Testament, just as are baptism and the Lord's Supper (*Examination*, II, Ninth Topic, Section III, Kramer translation p 694-695).

e) Some Lutherans have a Romanizing view of ordination.

Grabau and the Buffalo Synod: Ordination is a part of the divine ordinance by which a person is legitimately taken into the ministry ("3rd Synodical Report, p 7).

David Scaer (LCMS): I personally find it very difficult to designate as a human rite or adiaphoron any ceremony in which God is the Giver and the Holy Spirit is the recipient [sic], which can only be administered under certain stringent conditions, which carries with it a threat, which makes the acting participant in the rite responsible for the activities of the recipient of the rite, and which gives the recipient a gift which remains (*Ordination: Divine Rite or Human Ordinance*, p 12).

Office of the Church: An Orientation by the theological commission of SELK (1995): [Christ] himself calls into this office even today through his church by the rite of ordination (p 20). He irreversibly takes the office-holder with his whole life for this charge (p 20). In ordination, the ordinand receives the gift of the Holy Spirit through the laying on of hands to equip him for ministry. This petitioned gift is effectively given, not simply prayed for (p 23).

Adolf Hoenecke: Many Lutherans walk in the footsteps of the papacy when they take away from the church the right to call and have the preacher become a preacher through ordination as a sacrament, not through the call. That is what they do when...to a greater or lesser degree, they ascribe to ordination decisive importance and efficacy, so only through ordination does anyone become a pastor. Their reason is that the office actually rest with

the incumbents of the office, and thus they are the ones who confer it on the called person. In this connection several go so far as to attribute to ordination sacramental value and the effect of impressing on the recipient a permanent mark (*ELD*, IV, p 204).