

THE VOICE OF OUR FATHERS ON THE CONTROVERSY OF THE MINISTRY:
THE WRITINGS OF ABRAHAM CALOV AND JOHANN ANDREAS QUENSTEDT

BY
ROBERT R. READ

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

PROF. EM. JOHN M. BRENNER, ADVISOR

WISCONSIN LUTHERAN SEMINARY

MEQUON, WI

FEBRUARY 16, 2024

CONTENTS

CONTENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
THE CONTROVERSY REGARDING THE MINISTRY IN AMERICA	4
The Key Issue, the Wisconsin View, and the Missouri View	6
Historical Context of Walther.....	8
Walther’s View	11
The Controversy Between St. Louis and Wauwatosa	16
Some “Middling” Missouriians	20
Some “Extreme” Missouriians.....	26
Some “Wisconsin” Missouriians	29
Other LCMS Documents	32
Observations	36
MINISTRY IN THE SILVER AGE OF ORTHODOXY.....	38
Historical Background of Calov	40
Historical Background of Quenstedt	42
Their Presentation of the Doctrine.....	43
Conclusions.....	52
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	54

ABSTRACT

The doctrine of the public ministry has long been an area of controversy between the confessional Lutheran churches of America. Differences between theologians of the Missouri Synod and the Wisconsin Synod came to light as early as the 1910s. In this controversy, the main issue pertained to the offices of pastor and school teacher, their relation to each other, and their relation to the public ministry. Given that doctrinal continuity from past to present is a hallmark of orthodox, confessional Lutheranism, one might expect that the theologians involved in the controversy would have drawn on the writings of the orthodox Lutheran dogmaticians of the seventeenth century in their argumentation. Based on John Brug's thorough treatment of the history of the controversy and the present situation, however, this was not the case. In this thesis I summarize the circumstances that gave rise to the controversy and how the controversy played out. Then, on the basis of writings of Abraham Calov and Johann Andreas Quenstedt, I seek to explain why the dogmaticians were not extensively referenced and evaluate how the dogmaticians might have spoken to the issues under dispute. I contend that their writings are compatible with the so-called Wisconsin view of the ministry.

INTRODUCTION

The doctrine of church and ministry has long been a subject of controversy in American Lutheranism. With the looser relation between church and government that existed in the new United States, Lutherans raised questions regarding the doctrine of church and ministry which the fathers of the Lutheran church had not clearly and directly addressed. The controversy over the ministry, in particular, is interesting. In this area, the questions often revolved around the status of the Lutheran day school teacher, an office which was not directly analogous to any office in the old state churches in Germany. It seems that because of the freshness and uniqueness of the situation in America, those involved in the controversy did not draw heavily upon the writings of Lutherans of the past—to be specific, they did not seem to cite the great dogmaticians of the age of Lutheran orthodoxy.

The controversy regarding the ministry in American Lutheranism had roots in the writings of John Grabau and C. F. W. Walther. The main focus of this paper, however, is the controversy that blossomed between the theologians of the Wisconsin Synod and the Missouri Synod in the early twentieth century. The Missouri Synod theologians (especially the professors at Concordia Seminary in St. Louis) were trying to hold to the teaching of Walther, it seems. But, as this paper will demonstrate, they probably misunderstood what Walther meant in his writing on the doctrine of the ministry. The Wisconsin Synod theologians (especially the professors of the seminary at Wauwatosa and Thiensville), however, were conscious that their stance was in agreement with Walther.

In the case of the Wauwatosa theologians, their operating principle was always to mine the doctrinal truths from Scripture first, and only then to consult other Christians and Lutherans, for additional confirmation and support. This principle served well in the controversy regarding the ministry. As one studies the history of the controversy, it quickly becomes apparent that their opponents could not cite scriptural support for their positions, or, if any Scripture was cited, its relation to the point being disputed was tenuous. Nevertheless, the differences persisted. Though the breakup of the Synodical Conference did not precipitate from the church and ministry issues between the member synods, the issues were always an unresolved tension. The Missouri Synod still seems to disagree with Wisconsin on the ministry. Therefore, if the two synods are ever to regain unity, the ministry will have to be a topic of discussion.

The scarcity of references to the dogmaticians in this controversy motivated this paper. In the Election Controversy in American Lutheranism, for example, the orthodox teachers had clear statements in the Formula of Concord to cite in support of their position,¹ and the *intuitu fidei* position was at least partly based on the unclear choice of wording of some dogmaticians. Was there a similar situation with the controversy over the doctrine of the ministry? Can one gain any insights into the origin of the controversy by studying the dogmaticians? Can one determine whether the great dogmaticians held to the Wisconsin view of the ministry, the Missouri view, both, or neither? For the purpose of this study, I have limited my research to the writings of Abraham Calov and Johann Andreas Quenstedt as representatives of the apex of Lutheran dogmatics. In this thesis, I will argue on the basis of their writings that Calov and Quenstedt, while not explicitly addressing the question at issue between Missouri and Wisconsin, wrote in ways that would be consistent with the so-called Wisconsin view. However, they also wrote

1. Here I am thinking in particular of FC Ep XI 20.

some things that have potential to confuse the issue and give the impression of a more romanizing position. I will indicate the places where this is the case and explain why such an impression is not necessarily what they intended to communicate. The first part of this paper will summarize the controversy regarding the ministry in America, providing context for the comparisons to be made in the second part. Then the second part will discuss Calov's and Quenstedt's presentations of the doctrine in question.

THE CONTROVERSY REGARDING THE MINISTRY IN AMERICA

The purpose of this paper is not to review the scriptural basis of the doctrine of the ministry. There will be reference to Scripture as I cover individual theologians' presentations of the doctrine, but the goal is to discern patterns of presentation within both the Lutheran Church – Missouri Synod (LCMS) and the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (WELS) in order to compare with the dogmaticians I have chosen to study, Calov and Quenstedt. In this comparison, I will discuss the official public doctrine of the LCMS, but also what some LCMS theologians have expressed in their own writings. It will become clear that there are a variety of opinions within LCMS today regarding the doctrine of the ministry. LCMS writers readily acknowledge this point: “Without question, regarding the doctrine of the ministry our synod is having problems.... The Lutheran Church Missouri Synod is in a state of crisis regarding the office of the public ministry.”²

As an example, LCMS in convention in 2001 resolved to “affirm” Walther’s *Church and Ministry* “as the definitive statement under Holy Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions of the Synod’s understanding on the subject of church and ministry,” “as the official position of the LCMS,” and further resolved that “all pastors, professors, teachers of the church, and congregations honor and uphold the resolutions of the Synod as regards the official position of

2. Cameron MacKenzie, quoted in John F. Brug, *The Ministry of the Word* (Milwaukee: Northwestern, 2009), 454–55.

our Synod on church and ministry and teach in accordance with them.”³ Therefore, when some within LCMS depart from Walther’s teaching and even criticize it,⁴ doctrinal disunity is evident. There are even “significant differences within the LCMS leadership.”⁵

Therefore, it is to some degree an oversimplification to speak of a *Missouri view* and a *Wisconsin view* of the doctrine of the ministry. Besides the fact that LCMS has not presented a consistent doctrine of the ministry, John Brug mentioned two reasons why this is the case: First, the debate started between seminary faculties rather than between the two synods, and second, many within LCMS have espoused the Wisconsin view.⁶ Therefore, it is imperative to ascertain each theologian’s understanding of the doctrine on the basis of his own writings rather than assuming, based on synodical affiliation, what his view is.

Brug pointed out that one of the factors that has hindered fruitful discussion of this doctrine is a lack of clearly defined terminology.⁷ Brug specifically mentioned *de iure divino* and *de iure humano* as an example of terminology that is used without clear definition. The noun *ius* can mean *law* or *right*, so one must specify which is meant when using such terminology.⁸ Another potentially confusing term is *pastoral office*. Some seem to use this term with reference

3. *Convention Proceedings: 61st Regular Convention* (St. Louis: Concordia, 2001), 172–73.

4. E.g. Daniel S. Johnson, “The Ministry and the Schoolmaster: The Relation and Distinction between the Offices of Pastor and Teacher in the Missouri Synod,” *Logia* 6.3 (1997): 15; Clyde Nehrenz, quoted in Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 358.

5. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 473.

6. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 398.

7. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 399.

8. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 381 n. 197.

specifically to the office of (parish) pastor.⁹ Others seem to use it in a broader sense as encompassing any sort of office which involves shepherding or oversight.¹⁰ Another factor which obstructs discussion is that, because of the differences within LCMS and its leadership, it has become “increasingly difficult to determine what the LCMS position is.”¹¹

Finally, Christian charity demands that one read the writings of those with whom he disagrees not to find fault and proclaim anathema but because he seeks to attain true doctrinal unity with those from whom he has been separated. As Brug says, “Today we have to try to understand how some good men who are afraid of the Church Growth ditch on the left are ending in the romanizing ditch on the right.”¹²

The Key Issue, the Wisconsin View, and the Missouri View

The key issue about which there was controversy in the Synodical Conference regarding the doctrine of the ministry is whether the office of pastor is specifically divinely ordained, while other forms of the public ministry, such as Christian day school teacher, Sunday school teacher, or theological professor, are merely human institutions.¹³

The so-called *Wisconsin view* is that God has instituted one office in his church, the office of the public ministry. This office of the public ministry is exercised by those whom God

9. In particular, this seems to be the case with those I list in the section discussing “Some ‘Extreme’ Missourians.”

10. Here I have in mind those I list in “Some ‘Middling’ Missourians.” This usage also seems to explain the position outlined in the 1981 CTCR document *The Ministry: Offices, Procedures, and Nomenclature*.

11. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 473.

12. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 392.

13. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 463.

mediately calls into the public ministry through the church. The public ministry is not optional nor merely expeditious. The church, however, is free to arrange and make use of different forms of the public ministry as it sees fit. No specific form is commanded by Scripture. Thus, regarding the key issue, the Wisconsin view holds it is *not* the case that the office of pastor is specifically divinely ordained over against other forms which are human institutions.¹⁴ Brug highlighted the pastoral concern and practicality of this doctrine: “We cannot justify any doctrinal position that places any limitations on the freedom of the church to organize itself and its ministry into forms which meet its needs, unless those limitations are directly commanded in Scripture.... For the men of Wauwatosa and their successors, the main concern was always to uphold the efficacy of the means of grace when used by all believers within any organizational form.”¹⁵

The so-called *Missouri view* is that the office of pastor *is* specifically and uniquely divinely instituted as the office of the public ministry. All other church offices are auxiliary (that is, helping) offices in service to the one divinely instituted office of pastor. There are various shadings of this view and degrees of rigidity with which it is held. Most of those in LCMS who hold this view today hold to a less extreme version of it, where the *pastoral ministry* is viewed in a broader sense, encompassing more offices which exercise theological oversight than simply the parish pastorate.¹⁶

How did this doctrine enter into controversy, and how did it happen that these each of these positions came to be associated with one synod in particular? These are the questions the

14. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 462–63.

15. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 479–80.

16. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 455.

next sections of this paper will seek to answer. It will require going back to events at the beginning of the Missouri Synod.

Historical Context of Walther

When studying the doctrine of the ministry and the controversy surrounding it in American Lutheranism, it is important to remember that theologians responded to the situations in which they found themselves. They wrote according to their specific context. For this reason, C. F. W. Walther wrote in a way that has been misinterpreted by some as defining the office of pastor as the one divinely instituted form of the public ministry. When looking at Walther's entire presentation of the doctrine in all his writings (and the context in which he wrote), however, his real understanding of the doctrine reveals itself.¹⁷

Martin Stephan was a confessional Lutheran pastor in Saxony. Stephan was the first pastor to clearly communicate the full gospel to Walther, who had been in a Pietist environment until that point. Walther regarded Stephan as the one who led him to salvation. Stephan had several qualities to his favor as a minister: a firm stand on total depravity, the gospel, opposition to rationalism and unionism. Unfortunately, Stephan apparently allowed others' high opinions of him to puff him up, becoming controlling and regarding himself as infallible. He thereby moved in the direction of Rome regarding the doctrine of the ministry.¹⁸

17. This same caution needs to remain in view when studying the dogmaticians. Since they were living under a state church situation, they did not address the issue precisely as it came under controversy in America.

18. Carl Lawrenz, "An Evaluation of Walther's Theses on the Church and Ministry," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 79.2 (1982): 88–89.

Stephan had been sowing the seeds of the possibility of a Saxon immigration to America. Walther had made preparations to participate in that immigration. When in 1838 Stephan led the immigration of some seven hundred Lutherans, Walther was among them. The pastors among this group, including Walther himself, bound people's consciences to participate in the emigration, following Stephan's romanizing views.¹⁹

The Lutherans immigrating with Stephan pledged themselves to him as their bishop. The wording of the document they signed to this end is particularly telling: “[W]e solemnly pledge ourselves ... to submit with Christian willingness and sincerity to the ordinances, decrees, and measures of His Reverence in respect to both ecclesiastical and community affairs, and not to regard them as an irksome yoke, but as the means of promoting our temporal and eternal welfare.”²⁰ They subjected themselves to Stephan even in matters not addressed in Scripture. It is especially objectionable that they regard such obedience as “promoting [their] ... eternal welfare.” One could argue that this is the very essence of Pharisaism—considering obedience in matters not commanded by God's law to be meritorious before God.

The disclosure of financial and sexual impropriety committed by Stephan, then, came as a shock and precipitated a crisis of faith for the Saxon immigrants. The community banished Stephan. The pastors were led to question whether their calls were truly valid. The fallout led to the resignation of some pastors and the removal of some others. Yet Walther and the Saxon congregations realized that the authority of the public ministry was the proclamation of the word of God.²¹

19. Lawrenz, “Evaluation of Walther's Theses,” 89–91.

20. Walter Otto Forster, *Zion on the Mississippi: The Settlement of the Saxon Lutherans in Missouri, 1839-1841* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1953), 294.

21. Lawrenz, “Evaluation of Walther's Theses,” 91–93; Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 291.

This left the Saxons well-positioned to respond to the *Hirtenbrief* of Pastor John Grabau, which proclaimed romanizing errors regarding the ministry strikingly similar to Stephan's. The Saxons sent their response to Grabau in July of 1843; Grabau responded harshly, accusing the Saxons of error.²² Among Grabau's claims in the *Hirtenbrief* and other documents were that the keys were not given "to the believers collectively and individually, but exclusively and only to the ministry," that not only a call but also ordination is necessary to confer the office of the public ministry, that the Sacrament administered by a layperson would be mere bread and wine, and that ordinarily God "wants to deal with us only through the holy preaching office in the Word and sacraments."²³

The dispute with Grabau was taxing because it dragged on until 1866, over two decades after Grabau sent out his *Hirtenbrief*. Walther commented already in 1852 that the conflict with Grabau and his Buffalo Synod was not easy. He listed four reasons for this: First, their opponent argued dishonestly with *ad hominem* and strawman arguments. Second, many did not see the significance of the points under dispute. Third, Grabau's error had gained a foothold in the Lutheran church long ago. Fourth, Grabau's error appeals to human reason and to the public minister's sinful nature.²⁴

Walther's theses on the church and ministry were undoubtedly written with the conflict with Grabau in mind and were aimed specifically at Grabau's error. Nor did Walther set out to systematically present the entire doctrine of the ministry. If Walther had been responding to different errors, he would have written differently. Indeed, those who read Walther as expressing

22. Lawrenz, "Evaluation of Walther's Theses," 94.

23. Lawrenz, "Evaluation of Walther's Theses," 97–99; Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 292–93.

24. Lawrenz, "Evaluation of Walther's Theses," 100–103.

the so-called Missouri view on the ministry seem to have lost sight of the pointed nature of his theses.

Walther's View

In this section I will discuss Walther's view of the doctrine of the ministry on the basis of his theses and his explanation of them, with additional evidence provided from other writings of Walther.

Walther's first thesis on the ministry, "The holy preaching office [*Predigtamt*] or pastoral office [*Pfarramt*] is an office distinct from the office of priest [*Priesteramt*], which all believers have,"²⁵ distinguishes the ministry from the priesthood of all believers. This basic point of the thesis is one that both the Wisconsin and Missouri views agree with. But the way Walther worded this thesis seems to equate the public ministry with the office of pastor (*Pfarramt*), so Wisconsin would probably phrase the thesis differently. However, I argue that Walther did not intend to establish an identity between the public ministry and the office of pastor. Walther adduced as scriptural evidence for this thesis Rom 10:15, placing special emphasis on the word *sent*, as well as 1 Cor 12:29 and Jas 3:1.²⁶ Therefore, Walther was emphasizing that the called public ministry is not given to everyone.

August Pieper offered another point of concern with the wording of the thesis, from the Wisconsin view. It is preferable not to refer to the office of the ministry as *distinct* from the

25. C. F. W. Walther, *The Church and the Office of the Ministry, the Voice of Our Church on the Question of Church and Office: A Collection of Testimonies Regarding This Question from the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church and from the Private Writings of Orthodox Teachers of the Same*, ed. Matthew C. Harrison (St. Louis: Concordia, 2012), 151. Square brackets are Harrison's indication of the underlying original.

26. Walther, *Church and Office*, 152.

office of priest because the office of the ministry is not a special status with more spiritual powers than the office of priest common to all believers, but the office of ministry is a special, God-ordained use of the office of priest common to all, done on behalf of all, in their name, and by their consent.²⁷ By faith, all believers possess the keys of the kingdom of heaven as true spiritual priests.

The second thesis on the ministry, “The preaching office [*Predigtamt*] or the pastoral office [*Pfarramt*] is not a human institution [*menschliche Ordnung*] but an office [*Amt*] that God Himself has established,”²⁸ emphasizes the divine institution of the office of the public ministry. Once again, the Wisconsin view will readily agree with this, but the wording could give the impression that Walther thought the office of pastor was a specifically instituted form of the ministry. That this is not the case can be seen, in part, from the evidence Walther cited from Luther for this thesis. He quoted a portion of Luther’s *Confession Concerning Christ’s Supper* which identifies the spiritual state (meaning the office of the public ministry) as one which has the office of preaching and the sacraments. Luther enumerated various offices which belong to this state besides pastors, including teachers, readers, sacristans, and schoolteachers.²⁹ August Pieper helpfully observed:

Luther speaks much about the divine institution of the local pastorate, but on the one hand it is clear from many passages that he does not declare this particular species, the local pastorate, to be divinely instituted in contrast to other species of the public preaching ministry or the ministry of the Word, but that rather he declares this species to be divine *together with* the other species. Since he usually speaks concretely in the figure

27. August Pieper, “Luther’s Doctrine of Church and Ministry,” trans. Harold R. John, *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 60 (1963): 247–48. This article is a translation of August Pieper, “Luthers Lehre von Kirche und Amt,” *Theologische Quartalschrift* 14 (1917): 211–41; 15 (1918): 65–80, 101–26.

28. Walther, *Church and Office*, 167. The square brackets are Harrison’s indication of the underlying original.

29. Walther, *Church and Office*, 171; Martin Luther, *Luther’s Works*, ed. Robert C. Schultz and Helmut T. Lehmann (St. Louis: Fortress, 1967), 46:220–21.

of speech known as *species pro genere*, he calls the local pastorate at the same time also the ministry of the Word, or the ministry of the Gospel, or by some similar name. On the other hand, he characterizes other species of the public ministry as being instituted by God.³⁰

In other words, Luther often referred to the office of pastor as the office of the public ministry not to the exclusion of other forms of the public ministry, but as an important and the most common form of the public ministry. August Pieper was even willing to grant, “The parish ministry in the form customary among us is the chief species, the most complete, most important, most necessary species of the ecclesiastical ministry, but not the only form of the ecclesiastical teaching ministry instituted by God.”³¹ To return to Walther’s view, when we see Walther using the above quote to support Thesis II, it “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.”³²

Walther’s Thesis IV also deserves comment: “The preaching office [*Predigtamt*] is not a special state in opposition to or holier than that of ordinary Christians, as was the Levitical priesthood; rather, it is an office of service [*Amt des Dienstes*].”³³ Here Walther explicitly rejects

30. Pieper, “Luther’s Doctrine” (trans. Harold R. John), 258. Emphasis is Pieper’s. The *species pro genere* is one form of synecdoche or metonymy, a figure of speech which refers to one concept by another, closely associated concept. Specifically, *species pro genere* refers to a class or category via a specific member or example of that category, e.g., when *coke* is used to refer to soft drinks in general. There is also a form called *genus pro specie*, which does the opposite—it refers to a specific member or example of a category using the category itself. In the context of the doctrine of the ministry, *species pro genere* is using *Pfarramt* when one means *Predigtamt*; *genus pro specie* is using *Predigtamt* when one means *Pfarramt*. Thus, it can appear that authors use the terms interchangeably even if they do not understand them in the exact same sense. This is, therefore, another instance where clearly defining terms is necessary.

31. August Pieper, “Toward an Understanding of the Current Discussion on Church and Ministry,” trans. James Langebartels, in *The Wauwatosa Theology*, ed. Curtis A. Jahn (Milwaukee: Northwestern, 2022), 4:272. The chapter is a translation of August Pieper, “Zur Verständigung in der gegenwärtigen Diskussion über Kirche und Amt,” *Theologische Quartalschrift* 9.3 (1912): 182–208.

32. Lawrenz, “Evaluation of Walther’s Theses,” 126–27.

33. Walther, *Church and Office*, 188. The square brackets are Harrison’s indication of the underlying original.

Grabau's romanizing error. Such romanizing errors create binding ceremonial law in the NT era. The Wisconsin view sees the same tendency towards manufacturing ceremonial law in the Missouri view's insistence on a specific divine institution of the office of pastor.³⁴

While Walther's remaining theses are certainly relevant, others have discussed them in greater detail than there is room for in this paper.³⁵ At this point I will introduce additional evidence from Walther's writings to support my contention that Walther was closer to the Wisconsin than the Missouri view of the doctrine of the ministry.

Walther delivered a sermon at the installation of two college professors. Walther's theme asked what comfort there is when men who have carried out the office of pastor assume the office of teaching. He answered this question in two parts: "1) that also their office is the office of our God; 2) that also their work is the work of our Lord."³⁶ Thus, Walther regarded the office of college professor as one form of the public ministry. That truth is evident throughout the manuscript:

It is therefore not a human arrangement, that there are men in the church, who train and instruct young boys so that they may some day carry out the office which preaches reconciliation. Their office is a holy, godly office, a branch of the office which Christ instituted and established in presenting the keys of heaven. Even not merely the gifts which are necessary to ground a young boy in a deeper understanding of the divine truths, but also the gifts that are necessary to educate the mind of a young boy in general and to teach him the different dead and living languages of the nations: also these gifts are gifts

34. Lawrenz, "Evaluation of Walther's Theses," 132–33. Cf. A. Pieper: "Divine statutes, i.e. divine stipulations about external modes and situations, which in themselves are not in the moral law or in the gospel and the sacraments, do not exist in the New Testament, and cannot exist, not even with regard to the ministry and the church. If there were, then there would either be new means of grace, or the ceremonial law would be introduced anew" ("Toward an Understanding," in *Wauwatosa Theology*, 4:275).

35. For a treatment of all of Walther's theses on the ministry, cf. Lawrenz, "Evaluation of Walther's Theses," 124–37.

36. Lawrenz, "Evaluation of Walther's Theses," 128.

of the Holy Spirit, which the Savior who ascended to heaven has poured out upon his church for the establishment and preservation of holy offices.³⁷

Here I must comment on the concept of *branch offices* that Walther mentions. Some adherents of the Missouri view have spoken of *auxiliary offices* as distinct from the office of the public ministry to the exclusion of branch offices, as if *all offices* other than that of pastor are auxiliary.³⁸ While there are such things as branch offices that do not take part in the public ministry, this exclusion seems to be based on a failure to recognize a distinction that Walther drew between branch offices and auxiliary offices. Brug explained well:

Here the critical issue is whether those serving in so-called auxiliary offices are serving in the ministry of the Word established by Christ or only in human offices created by the church. Walther's distinction between helping offices that are *part of* the one ministry of the Word and those that are *beside* it has been lost. Specific offices that serve in part of the ministry of the Word are instituted by God, not simply by the church, because though they are not *commanded* by God, they are *authorized* by God.³⁹

The branch offices are those that are *part of* (or, one could say, *forms of*) the one ministry of the word. When Walther spoke of auxiliary offices, he had in mind those that do not involve the preaching and teaching of the word or administration of the sacraments. That distinction is quite clear when Walther referred to the office of college professor as “not a human arrangement” and as “a branch of the office which Christ instituted.” By abolishing this distinction, one could conclude that Walther held to a special divine institution of the office of pastor, but it would be ignoring what he actually taught.⁴⁰

37. Lawrenz, “Evaluation of Walther’s Theses,” 129; the sermon is available in English as C. F. W. Walther, “Sermon at the Installation of Two College Professors,” trans. J. W. Klotz, *Lutheran Sentinel* 32.6 (1949): 82–89.

38. E.g., “The Ministry: Offices, Procedures, and Nomenclature,” 1981, 12.

39. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 456. Italics are Brug’s.

40. Cf. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 368.

Walther also sent back for correction an article submitted to *Der Lutheraner* by J. C. W. Lindemann in which Lindemann disagreed with Walther by deriving the office of teacher from the parent. Walther insisted that the school teacher belonged to the *Predigtamt*.⁴¹

The Controversy Between St. Louis and Wauwatosa

If Walther, as I have argued, held to the Wisconsin view, how did a different view become associated with his synod? As I have already pointed out in the previous section, some of his wording in the theses on the ministry left room for improved clarity—not because they were outright wrong nor because Walther wanted to leave the door open for different viewpoints, but simply because he did not know the future. He could not predict the questions people would ask regarding the ministry, nor that they would take his theses far beyond the points they intended to make.

As the heading of this section indicates, the controversy regarding the doctrine of the ministry in America in the early twentieth century did not start out along synodical lines but rather started as a controversy between the seminary faculties of St. Louis and Wauwatosa. According to Brug, “Until near the end of the process, the debate was conducted between the two seminary faculties. The differences were not brought before the Synodical Conference as such, nor did either synod publicly accuse the other of false doctrine.”⁴²

Within the Missouri Synod, the questions about the doctrine of the ministry went back to Stephan and his romanizing tendencies and continued during the conflict with Grabau. Within

41. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 374.

42. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 408.

the Wisconsin Synod, it seems that questions first arose in the late 1870s. At this point in the Wisconsin Synod's history, the doctrine of the ministry seems not to have been clearly understood. Some advocated a position closer to what is now considered the Missouri view. People could get the impression from such presentations that "teachers were not really in the public ministry at all."⁴³

In 1892, Adolf Hoenecke presented a paper repeating the usual thought that elevated the office of pastor as the only divinely instituted form of the public ministry. J. P. Koehler disagreed, and Hoenecke thought the issue deserved further attention. In 1909, Koehler disagreed with John Schaller on the same point.⁴⁴

From the disagreement between Hoenecke and Koehler and from a cursory reading of Hoenecke's *Dogmatics*, it seems some have concluded that Hoenecke always held that the office of pastor was the one divinely instituted office.⁴⁵ Looking at Hoenecke's writing, though, one will see that this is not necessarily the case. This is a common issue when reading about the controversy regarding church and ministry in America: Claims are frequently made about what certain theologians believed about the question with relatively little support from their writings.

This is what Hoenecke actually wrote in his *Dogmatics*: "The teaching office (*Lehramt*), by which we here mean the pastors, the estate composed of the servants of the Word, is divinely instituted."⁴⁶ Hoenecke did not write that the office of pastor is the only divinely instituted office. He bypassed the question. Instead, Brug explained, "He is saying that, in this chapter of his

43. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 405.

44. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 405–6.

45. Cf. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 402.

46. Adolf Hoenecke, *Evangelical Lutheran Dogmatics*, trans. Joel Fredrich, Paul Prange, and Bill Tackmier (Milwaukee: Northwestern, 1999), 4:187.

book, when he talks about the teaching office, he is only going to be talking about pastors and that their office is divinely instituted.”⁴⁷

Volume 4 of Hoenecke’s *Dogmatics* was originally published by his two sons in 1909 after Hoenecke’s death in 1908, working from Hoenecke’s manuscripts and notes. He has clearly backed away from the position he expressed at the 1892 pastors’ conference, probably as a result of Koehler’s challenge. Hoenecke also acknowledged different *grades* of the ministry.⁴⁸ While he did not specify whether these grades encompass different forms of the ministry including the office of Christian day school teacher, it seems fair to conclude that he would grant the legitimacy and divinity of the teacher’s call.

Also significantly, Hoenecke pointed out similarities between romanizing Lutherans and Roman Catholic doctrine regarding the call and ordination: “Many Lutherans walk in the footsteps of the papists 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.”⁴⁹ Hoenecke here rebuked those who make ordination an essential criterion for the office of the public ministry. What makes a public minister a public minister is the call, not some other criterion. It is a romanizing error, similarly, to invent criteria for what makes a valid call besides those given in Scripture. August Pieper made essentially the same point: “Whoever is called through the choice or consent of the local congregation, the synod, or other kind of church into any form of the ecclesiastical teaching ministry is called by God himself into a ministry instituted by God.”⁵⁰

47. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 402.

48. Hoenecke, *Evangelical Lutheran Dogmatics*, 4:215–16.

49. Hoenecke, *Evangelical Lutheran Dogmatics*, 4:204.

50. Pieper, “Toward an Understanding,” in *Wauwatosa Theology*, 4:273.

The first time the disagreement between the St. Louis and Wauwatosa seminaries emerged into the open seems to have been at a 1914 meeting of the Synodical Conference. Saint Louis Professors F. Pieper, Metzger, Bente, Dau, and Fuerbringer expressed disagreement in meetings with Wauwatosa Professors A. Pieper, Koehler, and Schaller.⁵¹ Then in 1916 the St. Louis faculty sent a letter to the Wauwatosa faculty in which they objected to the Wisconsin position. Tellingly, however, the letter itself admitted, “Though we are indeed able to offer no word of specific institution (*Einsetzung*), yet the whole New Testament shows us that a divine ordering (*Ordnung*) is involved.” So from the outset it seemed that St. Louis had granted the very point Wauwatosa men were concerned about—the lack of a specific institution of the office of pastor.⁵²

Meetings between the faculties continued to be held and attempts made to resolve the controversy. At one such meeting in November of 1931, Professor John Meyer asked St. Louis Professor Engelder, “Which form of the local congregation, with its office, did our Savior institute?” to which Engelder responded, “I cannot answer.” Here again the Wisconsin men appeared to have won concession on the key issue.⁵³ The Thiensville Theses, adopted April 16, 1932, by the faculty of Thiensville and part of the St. Louis faculty (and later by all of the St. Louis faculty), yet again seemed to signal the end of the controversy as the two sides reached agreement.⁵⁴ The Thiensville Theses grant that it is “God’s will and order” that Christian congregations have shepherds who carry out the public ministry. It is not specified what kind of

51. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 408.

52. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 410–11.

53. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 414.

54. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 415.

order is meant, leaving some ambiguity; St. Louis could have read the phrase with an explicit command in mind.⁵⁵ Thiensville would have used it in the sense of a divine *arrangement* or *ordering*. Nevertheless, Brug considered that the theses “probably would have marked the conclusion of the dispute if Missouri had not renewed its attacks.”⁵⁶

The faculties would again meet in 1942 after St. Louis men raised complaints against a sermon preached by the Wisconsin Synod’s President John Brenner and against a book review published in the *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*. The two faculties could not come to an agreement regarding the intention of Thiensville Thesis 3 nor regarding the correctness of the book review.⁵⁷ Finally, the issue came before the Synodical Conference, which in 1946 organized a committee to study the doctrine of the ministry, among other issues. The committee did not achieve any further agreement.⁵⁸ By this point, more pressing issues were detected in LCMS, so one can understand why the controversy regarding the ministry was pushed to the back burner.

Some “Middling” Missourians

At this point, I want to compare and contrast the views of some specific Missouri theologians with the “official” position of the synod, both to illustrate the diversity of views within LCMS and for later comparison to Calov and Quenstedt. I have grouped them into three categories (“middling” Missourians, “extreme” Missourians, and “Wisconsin” Missourians) to make

55. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 416.

56. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 418.

57. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 421–22.

58. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 423.

patterns more easily discernible. In the “middling” group I have tried to include those that express the so-called Missouri view with some modification, such as granting that synodical offices and others can be included in the ministry.

The first theologian I will discuss in this category is Francis Pieper. Brother to Wisconsin theologian August Pieper, Francis Pieper is well known in confessional Lutheranism for his magnificent *Christian Dogmatics*. Pieper’s expressed position in *Christian Dogmatics* partially explains why many LCMS pastors and theologians hold the Missouri view of the ministry.

On the basis of Scripture and the Lutheran confessions, Pieper rejected ordination as necessary to the office of the public ministry or as a divine ordinance. Instead, he said the call is what makes a man a pastor.⁵⁹ Wisconsin is in full agreement with him here. Pieper also explained the theological issue with an insistence on ordination: “The false officiousness promoted by the romanizing Lutherans undermined the article of justification. Basically, they made grace and forgiveness depend in the church on whether one was *rite ordinatus*.”⁶⁰

However, Wisconsin would be uncomfortable with how closely Pieper identifies the office of the public ministry with the office of parish pastor. Pieper wrote concerning the ministry in the narrow sense (that is, called public ministry), “The ministry in this sense presupposes Christian congregations. Only a congregation can establish the public ministry.”⁶¹ Here he is implicitly drawing an identity between the public ministry and the office of parish pastor, though he does not seem to make this identity explicit anywhere. One might well ask

59. Francis Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1953), 3:454–55.

60. Francis Pieper, quoted in Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 306. With the words *rite ordinatus*, meaning “regularly ordained,” Pieper subtly referred to the romanizing Lutherans’ corruption of AC XIV. The Latin text of AC XIV used *rite vocatus*, “regularly called,” to explain what is necessary for a person to publicly teach and administer the sacraments.

61. Pieper, *Dogmatics*, 3:439.

whether the evangelists of the New Testament—or modern-day missionaries—are engaged in the called public ministry, in Pieper’s view.

Pieper proceeded with his identification when he wrote, “That the public ministry presupposes congregations is evident also from the fact that Scripture mentions entire congregations and every member of them as coming under the care of this office.”⁶² The logic of Pieper’s inference is invalid. It is as if he wants to say, “Because Scripture says congregations are under the care of public ministers, all public ministers care for a congregation.” This is a formal fallacy called *affirming the consequent*. The rest of Pieper’s presentation of the doctrine—aside from his implicit limitation of the public ministry to the office of pastor throughout—would not be objectionable to Wisconsin theologians.

Edward Koehler presented a fairly moderate version of the Missouri view in *A Summary of Christian Doctrine*. While granting the divinity of the schoolteacher’s call, Koehler excepted the office of parish school teacher from having divine institution.⁶³ It is clear that Koehler wanted to distinguish the office of pastor—the only divinely instituted office, in his view—from those offices he viewed as human institutions. Incidentally, it was the review of this book that in part occasioned the complaints of St. Louis leading to the 1942 meeting.

Next, I want to discuss Kurt Marquart. Marquart authored the volume that covers the ministry in the *Confessional Lutheran Dogmatics* series edited by Robert Preus. Marquart began his chapter on “The One Gospel Ministry and Auxiliary Offices” by acknowledging the variety of terms that Scripture uses to refer to public ministry and ministers. But behind this variety, he

62. Pieper, *Dogmatics*, 3:439.

63. Edward W. A. Koehler, *A Summary of Christian Doctrine: A Popular Presentation of the Teachings of the Bible*, 2nd ed. (St. Louis: Concordia, 1952), 272.

wrote, “there is one basic ministry, for the church has not several life–principles but only one: Christ’s alone-saving Gospel.”⁶⁴ Wisconsin agrees that there is one gospel ministry. Marquart seems to be speaking in a way that is quite agreeable to WELS. He even cautioned, “Later Lutherans would have done well to retain, with Lutheran Orthodoxy, the traditional term ‘ministry of the church’ ... for the one divinely established office of the Gospel. Going too directly to, say, ‘πρεσβύτερος’ [elder], foreshortens the grand, evangelical sweep of both Scripture and Confessions, and short-circuits the real linkage to the divine institution.”⁶⁵

The WELS reader will begin to take issue, however, when he reaches Marquart’s discussion of AC V. Marquart seemed to ignore the distinction between ministry in the abstract, meaning the means of grace,⁶⁶ and *public* ministry in the abstract, meaning the one, divinely instituted, called ministry of the gospel. Marquart argued vehemently against speaking of ministry in the abstract: “A ‘ministry in the abstract,’ however, is as fanciful as an abstract Gospel and abstract sacraments.”⁶⁷ Marquart’s argument against the abstract use of *Predigtamt* in AC V to refer to the means of grace⁶⁸ must gloss over the variety of contexts in which the Reformers used the word⁶⁹—essentially an equivocation fallacy—and must ignore the logical structure of AC and other factors which clearly indicate that the means of grace are in view.⁷⁰

64. Kurt Marquart, *The Church and Her Fellowship, Ministry and Governance*, vol. 9 of *Confessional Lutheran Dogmatics* (Fort Wayne: International Foundation for Lutheran Confessional Research, 1990), 120.

65. Marquart, *Church and Her Fellowship*, 122.

66. Ministry in the abstract, meaning the means of grace, is the topic of AC V; cf. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 332–60.

67. Marquart, *Church and Her Fellowship*, 124.

68. Cf. especially Marquart, *Church and Her Fellowship*, 124–25.

69. Cf. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 332–35.

70. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 338–41.

Again, Wisconsin readers will be uncomfortable with Marquart's words on auxiliary offices. He did not recognize Walther's distinction between branch offices and auxiliary offices. Thus he perceived a tension in Walther's Thesis VIII regarding the ministry ("The preaching office [*Predigtamt*] is the highest office in the Church, from which flow all other offices in the Church."⁷¹) which is really no tension at all: "A certain tension arises from Walther's treatment of the *Predigtamt* (1) as the *one* office from which all others flow, and (2) as the *highest* office, distinct from the others, but assisted by them."⁷² Recognizing that Walther distinguishes between other church offices that *are* the *Predigtamt* and other church offices which *are not* would resolve the tension for him. So Marquart directly contradicted Walther's statement that "the offices of [Christian day] schoolteachers who have to teach the Word of God in their schools, distributors of alms, sextons, precentors at public worship, and others are all to be regarded as churchly, holy offices, which bear a part of the one church office, stand at the side (for they take over a part of the one church office) and stand beside the preaching office"⁷³ when he wrote, "What is quite clear is that also in Walther's view schoolmasters hold not the one *Predigtamt*, Gospel-ministry, but an important office auxiliary to it, like the diaconate, and the lay-eldership."⁷⁴

71. Walther, *Church and Office*, 284. The square brackets are Harrison's indication of the underlying original.

72. Marquart, *Church and Her Fellowship*, 143. Italics are Marquart's.

73. Walther, *Church and Office*, 286. The square brackets appear to be Harrison's clarification of Walther's intent. One must ask whether, in saying these offices "stand at the side ... and stand beside the preaching office," Walther meant that none of these offices are forms of the preaching office or whether he here used *Predigtamt* by synecdoche (*genus pro specie*) to refer to the office of pastor. The latter makes the best sense because it does not make Walther contradict himself, but Marquart read Walther with the former understanding. While the latter would mean that Walther did not always use language consistently or univocally, this is only to be expected from natural human language.

74. Marquart, *Church and Her Fellowship*, 144.

Consequently, Marquart also denied the possibility of women public ministers: “According to the revealed will of God, women cannot occupy the office of the Gospel ministry.”⁷⁵ With this, he wanted to deny the possibility of women serving as pastors, a point that Wisconsin would assent to. However, the impossibility of women pastors does not preclude the possibility of women serving in other offices of the public ministry which would not require a violation of headship principles.

Why did Marquart feel the need to make this stand? According to Brug, “It is clear that Marquart is taking aim mainly against those in his own synod and elsewhere who advocate and emphasize lay preaching and lay ministry and thereby, in his opinion, undermine the scriptural distinction between the priesthood of all believers and the public ministry.”⁷⁶ This concern is valid, but it is taken too far when Marquart suggests that offices such as Christian schoolteacher are not part of the public ministry.

Finally, I will treat Robert Preus. Brug summarized the position Preus expressed in a 1991 booklet, *The Doctrine of the Call in the Confessions and Lutheran Orthodoxy*.⁷⁷ I have put Preus in this category because he acknowledged that theological professors are in the *Predigtamt*. However, Preus is perhaps the most extreme of those I placed in the “middling” category. He excluded from the ministry Sunday school and parochial school teachers, directors of Christian education or evangelism, and church administrators.⁷⁸ Preus’s rationale was that

75. Marquart, *Church and Her Fellowship*, 166.

76. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 453.

77. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 452.

78. Robert D. Preus, *The Doctrine of the Call in the Confessions and Lutheran Orthodoxy* (Luther Academy, 1991), 21.

there is no call except that call to “the one public *ministerium evangelii docendi*.”⁷⁹

Unfortunately, Preus did not explain why such offices are *not* the gospel ministry.

Some “Extreme” Missourians

In the “extreme” group I include those that firmly insist on the Missouri view, elevate ordination to the level of necessity, and, in general, tend more towards Rome on the doctrine of the ministry.

David Scaer wrote concerning ordination, “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, 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.”⁸⁰ This is uncomfortably close to the romanizing position of Grabau, from the Wisconsin perspective.

Clyde Nehrenz argued for an extreme version of the Missouri view in an article entitled “The Missouri Synod and Its Churchless Ministry” in a 1984 issue of *Christian News*. He argued against the practice of having services with Holy Communion on seminary or college campuses on the grounds that “Synod is not a church; that is, it is not an assembly of believers ‘in which the Word of God is preached and the holy sacraments are administered.’ It therefore has no

79. Preus, *Doctrine of the Call*, 22. The phrase *ministerium evangelii docendi* is a reference to the Latin text of AC V, on which cf. above, n. 66.

80. David P. Scaer, *Ordination: Human Rite or Divine Ordinance* (Fort Wayne: Concordia Theological Seminary Press, 1983), 12.

authority, indeed no reason, to establish the office of the ministry.”⁸¹ Nehrenz was under the conviction that the office of pastor *is* the office of the ministry and accordingly argued that synod presidents, district presidents, and seminary professors do not hold the office of the ministry unless called by a local congregation.⁸² He also opposed the 1981 Commission on Theology and Church Relations (CTCR) report on the ministry (a document which I will discuss in a later section of this paper), seemingly suggesting that it is a compromise document which permits a false understanding of ordination.⁸³ Interestingly, in so doing Nehrenz firmly opposed David Scaer’s booklet, showing that not all those in this category agree with each other.

While in the *Christian News* article Nehrenz seemed to appeal to Walther, elsewhere he expressed a less positive view of Walther. The establishment of the idea that schoolteachers have a divine call, according to Nehrenz, “is credited to Dr. Walther and his contemporaries and has been the source of much mischief in the Missouri Synod ever since. It certainly must be one of the only instances where expediency won out over Dr. Walther’s honesty and integrity, qualities for which he was renowned.”⁸⁴

Daniel Johnson also took issue with Walther’s presentation of the ministry: “When Walther overemphasizes the authority of the congregation, he risks ignoring the unique gift Christ has given in the office of the ministry.”⁸⁵ Again, in speaking of a report to LCMS’s 1953 synodical convention which considered parochial school teachers “ministers of the gospel,”

81. Clyde Nehrenz, “The Missouri Synod and Its Churchless Ministry,” *Christian News*, 25 June 1984, 8.

82. Nehrenz, “Churchless Ministry,” 8.

83. Nehrenz, “Churchless Ministry,” 10.

84. Nehrenz, quoted in Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 358.

85. Johnson, “Ministry and the Schoolmaster,” 15.

Johnson wrote, “Not only did such an understanding confuse the uniqueness of the office, the *Predigtamt*, but 1 Timothy 5:17 was used in a way that implied that the schoolmaster was the object of Paul’s discourse. In fact the context and concern of Paul’s letter is the *Predigtamt*, the pastoral office.”⁸⁶ Here Johnson drew a direct identity between *Predigtamt* and the office of pastor. Later, Johnson said in passing that “the Confessions use *Predigtamt* interchangeably with *Pfarrer*, the parish pastor.”⁸⁷

Distinguishing the priesthood of believers from the public ministry, Eugene Klug wrote, “[M]inistry in the New Testament also has a more restricted, yet proper and pointed sense that refers to the office of the public pastoral ministry. By God’s express will, in accord with stated criteria, it is a specially authorized and chartered office into which a qualified man is to be called by the Christian believers gathered at one place in a congregation.”⁸⁸ The public ministry is too narrowly limited to the office of pastor. Also, Brug noted that Klug’s book was one of the first discussions from the LCMS perspective which explicitly attacked WELS’s understanding of the doctrine.⁸⁹

86. Johnson, “Ministry and the Schoolmaster,” 16. Even if it were granted that there is a precise identity between the office of elder in the apostolic era and the office of pastor today, that would not *invalidate* the application of a general truth taught regarding the public ministry in the passage to other forms of the public ministry. Indeed, from the portion of the report that Johnson quoted, this seems to be exactly what is being done: The parochial teacher “belongs to that class of elders who labor in Word and doctrine” (*Proceedings of the 1953 LCMS Synodical Convention* (St. Louis: 1953), 317, quoted in Johnson, “Ministry and the Schoolmaster,” 16). The report is simply saying that teachers are public ministers in that they are called to teach the word of the gospel.

87. Johnson, “Ministry and the Schoolmaster,” 17.

88. Eugene F. A. Klug, *Church and Ministry: The Role of Church, Pastor, and People from Luther to Walther* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1993), 135–36.

89. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 453.

Some “Wisconsin” Missourians

In the “Wisconsin” group I include those theologians of the LCMS that have expressed the so-called Wisconsin view of the public ministry.

Already in 1897 George Stoeckhardt wrote an article in *Lehre und Wehre* on the topic of the call of female teachers in Christian congregational schools.⁹⁰ Brug summarized the points Stoeckhardt made in the article which concur with Wisconsin: “He stated that nothing hinders the congregation ... from using the gifts of women in the ministry of the school. Such a female teacher teaches the Word on behalf of the congregation. She is a public minister (*persona publica*). Her work is basically the same as that of the male teacher. Her service does not conflict with the statements of Paul in 1 Corinthians and 1 Timothy since she is not teaching or exercising authority over men.”⁹¹ Thus Stoeckhardt recognized that the public ministry can be given to women and that the church in freedom may arrange many different forms of the ministry.

H. G. Brueggemann was another Missouri theologian who taught the Wisconsin view. He wrote, in a February 1951 article in *Concordia Theological Monthly*, “It is a mistake to identify the pastorate with the ministry or to speak of other church offices as auxiliary offices to the pastorate. To assume that the pastorate is the one divinely instituted office and that all other offices flow out of the pastorate is a misapprehension. The ministry of the Word is the one divinely instituted office, and the pastorate is a branch of that ministry, just as other church

90. Reprinted as George Stoeckhardt, “Von dem Beruf der Lehrerinnen an christlichen Gemeindeschulen,” *Concordia Theological Monthly* 5.10 (1934): 764–73.

91. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 373.

offices are a branch of the same ministry.”⁹² Thus, Brueggemann did not consider the public ministry identical with the office of pastor.

Brueggemann wrote in a way that implies that other offices are legitimate forms of the public ministry: “The teacher, the stewardship secretary, the college professor, the deaconess, the institutional missionary, and all others who constitute the *ministerium ecclesiae*, are sometimes required to serve in subordinate capacities and must perform secondary tasks in the ministry.”⁹³ He even directly stated that schoolteachers carry out the highest office, the office of the public ministry: “A schoolteacher performs the highest office in the ministry when he teaches the Word to his class of children, when he teaches the Bible to a youth group, when he addresses the congregation on the need for Christian training.”⁹⁴ The call to teach the word is what makes a person a public minister.

More recently, Paul Zimmerman (former president of Concordia River Forest) has expressed some of the same concerns Wisconsin has with drawing a straight line from the ministerial office(s) in the NT to the office of pastor today:

There is no evidence that there were exact counterparts to our present parish pastors and Christian teachers.... Many kinds of ministerial functions are evident without much said about structure.... The emphasis is on getting the Word of God out so it may grow in the hearts of men. There is the necessity of providing the sacraments and of aiding the brothers and sisters in the Christian community. This is the ministry. This is what is mandated, both in word and by example. Whoever engages in these activities is in the holy ministry.⁹⁵

92. H. G. Brueggemann, “The Public Ministry in the Apostolic Age,” *Concordia Theological Monthly* 22.2 (1951): 99.

93. Brueggemann, “The Public Ministry in the Apostolic Age,” 99.

94. Brueggemann, “The Public Ministry in the Apostolic Age,” 100.

95. Paul Zimmerman, “The Lutheran Teacher—Minister of the Church,” quoted in Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 452.

Zimmerman rightly observed that the modern office of pastor is not a one-to-one equivalent to any of the ministerial offices in the NT. The important aspect of the ministry is *the word*.

Wisconsin would also agree with Zimmerman's words here that include "aiding ... the Christian community" in the ministry. If this is talking about aiding the community through the means of grace, that would clearly be included in the public ministry, but even if it is talking about other forms of aid, such as Christian charity, Wisconsin would not exclude that work from the public ministry (cf. Acts 6:1–6).

Finally, Mark Schuler wrote an article in *Issues in Christian Education* making several points that support the Wisconsin view. Against the tendency to narrow the public ministry down to the ordained ministry, Schuler wrote, "[I]f one is to speak of ministry as a gift of the Spirit, from Paul's perspective one must reckon with the diverse nature of the gifts, as well as their plurality. The lists of divine gifts in 1 Corinthians 12, Romans 12, and Ephesians 4 are pluriform. ... To claim that there is only one ministry and that the ordained ministry is that ministry is contrary to the clear words of Paul."⁹⁶ Against the insistence that the office of pastor has a specific divine institution, he wrote,

The mandate for the pastoral/supervisory office is an inferred mandate based on the example of Jesus in calling and commissioning the twelve and on the relatively uniform practice of the early church in appointing supervisory leaders. In honesty, it must be said, however, that this mandate is not of the same kind as Jesus' direct mandates in Matthew 28:16–20 or Luke 22:19 (1 Corinthians 11:25). Those who would elevate the pastoral office and/or ordination to sacerdotal levels do so without sound exegetical support.⁹⁷

96. Mark Schuler, "Ministry: Some New Testament Perspectives," *Issues in Christian Education* 27.1 (1993): 13.

97. Schuler, "New Testament Perspectives," 16 n. 22.

Confusingly, Schuler wrote in the same article a statement that seems to contradict this one:

“There is, however, one mandated ministry, namely, the ministry of oversight (the pastoral office) which continues the apostolic work. It is public, and it is essential.”⁹⁸

Other LCMS Documents

There are also some documents produced by LCMS and its CTCR that deserve attention. These documents are perhaps the closest thing that exists to an “official position” of the LCMS on the doctrine of the ministry today.

The first of these is the *Brief Statement*. The LCMS put the *Brief Statement* forward as an official statement of doctrine in 1932.⁹⁹ Of the public ministry the *Brief Statement* had this to say:

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, 2.¹⁰⁰

The *Brief Statement* did not specifically limit the public ministry to the office of pastor, and Brug reported that nothing in the statement with regard to pastors caused concern for Wisconsin.¹⁰¹

98. Schuler, “New Testament Perspectives,” 15.

99. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 442.

100. *Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Missouri Synod* (St. Louis: Concordia, n.d.), §31. Italics are in the original.

101. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 442.

What could be concerning about the statement is what it did not say. With this statement, Missouri clearly did not wholeheartedly embrace the Wisconsin view of the ministry. There was enough latitude in the wording that one could read the statement as expressing the Missouri view; for example, a reader holding to the Missouri view could take the reference to “the office” as speaking only of the office of pastor, could limit the “Christian congregation” to only the local congregation, and could view the “official functions” as all being essential to the office.

In Brug’s analysis, “Undoubtedly there are some points that the Wisconsin men would have liked to have seen expressed more clearly or more fully here, but there was nothing in this official statement to cause them alarm or that they would have perceived to be an attack on them.”¹⁰² Such points would include the acknowledgement that other forms of public ministry besides the office of pastor are divinely instituted and the clarification that not only the local congregation, but the church as a whole, including synod, has the authority to call public ministers.

Finally, I will look at a document issued by Missouri’s CTCR in 1981, entitled “The Ministry: Offices, Procedures, and Nomenclature.” While it is difficult to ascertain the official status of this document or how binding it is on Missouri’s theological teachers, Brug said that this document is “probably the best source” for “the current official version of the Missouri Synod view.”¹⁰³ Therefore, it is a significant document for understanding the current landscape of the controversy.

In the document, the CTCR defined *public ministry* as follows: “To be in ‘public ministry’ a person must be formally assigned to labor in the work of the church on behalf of

102. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 443.

103. Brug, *Ministry of the Word*, 455.

those in the church who are not in public ministry (laity). It refers to offices that have specific duties, responsibilities, and accountability.”¹⁰⁴ This definition is weak in that it limits public ministry to service on behalf of the laity. In the first place, this creates a sort of circular definition. It also ignores the possibility of public ministers who are called to serve other public ministers, such as circuit pastors, district presidents, or convention essayists.

The document’s definition of *the office of the public ministry* is also objectionable. They defined it as “the divinely established office referred to in Scripture as ‘shepherd,’ ‘elder,’ or ‘overseer.’ This term is equivalent to ‘the pastoral office.’ Within this office are contained all the functions of the ministry of Word and sacrament in the church.”¹⁰⁵ Here the Missouri view of the ministry was asserted. They equated the office of the public ministry with the pastoral office.¹⁰⁶ Their definition implied a specific divine institution of “the pastoral office” over against other offices.

The section discussing “Office and Function” is confusing. The CTCR made the case in this section that in an emergency situation when a layman is asked to perform some of the functions of the office of the public ministry, that layman still does not hold the office of the public ministry. Instead, “Even in such emergency situations a congregation properly requests a man who does hold the office of the public ministry and is serving as pastor in a neighboring congregation to assume that office for them as ‘vacancy pastor’ or ‘interim overseer.’ Thus the oversight and accountability remain with one whom the church has called and designated as a

104. “The Ministry: Offices,” 12.

105. “The Ministry: Offices,” 12.

106. They made it clear later in the document that they did not understand “the pastoral office” as strictly limited to the office of parish pastor, but it is difficult to understand their criteria for regarding some forms of ministry as “pastoral” and other forms as “auxiliary.”

pastor and who supervises those who temporarily perform some pastoral functions.”¹⁰⁷ This is confusing because it manufactures some additional criterion for being in the public ministry besides the call to teach the word and administer the sacraments. By limiting the public ministry to “a man who does hold the office,” CTCR’s position resembles the concept of *character indelebilis* taught by the Roman Catholic Church.

The CTCR failed to recognize Walther’s distinction between branch and auxiliary offices.¹⁰⁸ They employed the usual argument which derives the office of parochial school teacher from the office of pastor, taking over some of its functions.¹⁰⁹

The CTCR did not hold to an extreme version of the Missouri view. They recognized that certain offices other than that of parish pastor which are filled by those with pastoral training, such as district presidents, seminary professors, and campus pastors, are forms of pastoral ministry: “District presidents who are charged with the oversight of the overseers of the flock, or professors who are charged with the oversight of the men who are preparing to be the shepherds of the church, or men who are charged with the oversight of the faith and life of the church’s youth on a college campus or in the military can be properly said to be serving in the office of the public ministry of the church.”¹¹⁰ This is encouraging to the Wisconsin reader. However, their criteria were again confusing, particularly when they asked, “Has the church formally called him to hold the office of the public ministry and entrusted him with the responsibility of that office,

107. “The Ministry: Offices,” 16.

108. Cf. the definition of “auxiliary offices,” “The Ministry: Offices,” 12, 34.

109. “The Ministry: Offices,” 19.

110. “The Ministry: Offices,” 20–21.

even though it may ask him to specialize in certain functions of this office?”¹¹¹ The question is again circular; to determine whether someone is called to the public ministry, one first has to determine whether he has been called to hold the office of the public ministry. This could be a subtle expression of the view that ordination is what makes a minister and that ordination imparts a *character indelebilis*.

Observations

From this comparison, the claim that there is not a single view of the doctrine of the ministry in the LCMS has substantial support. However, one theme that appears among many of these presentations is the insistence on a single office of public ministry, usually identified with the office of pastor, shepherd, or overseer. Some who insist on this point have a broader conception of oversight that encompasses offices such as theological professor and district president. It is difficult, in such presentations, to discern what the standard is for determining which offices are the public ministry and which are not. Similarly common is the tendency to speak of auxiliary offices without acknowledging or incorporating Walther’s distinction between branch offices and auxiliary ones. A less common, yet sometimes present, issue among Missouri theologians is the elevation of the rite of ordination to the level of necessity.

What is conspicuous about all these discussions of the doctrine of the ministry, in my view, is the scarcity of references or quotations from the great Lutheran dogmaticians. For example, Brug’s bibliography does not reference either Abraham Calov’s *Systema Locorum Theologicorum* or Johann Andreas Quenstedt’s *Theologia Didactico-Polemica*, and while Martin

111. “The Ministry: Offices,” 20.

Chemnitz's *Loci Theologici* and Johann Gerhard's *Loci Theologici* are referenced, Brug did not cite them frequently. What *is* very common is that writers refer to Walther or Luther. However, the goal of the next chapter of this thesis is to take a step towards incorporating Calov's and Quenstedt's voices into the conversation.

MINISTRY IN THE SILVER AGE OF ORTHODOXY

What do I mean when I refer to the *age of Lutheran orthodoxy*? Robert Preus, in his extensive work, *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, identified three defining characteristics of Lutheran orthodoxy: (1) effort to preserve the theological legacy obtained in Luther's rediscovery of the gospel, (2) zeal to maintain pure doctrine, particularly in the doctrine of the gospel, and (3) a clearly defined, unchanging doctrinal position based on Scripture and in harmony with the Lutheran Confessions. In connection with the zeal for purity of doctrine, Preus also reported that the *practicality* of theology and of pure doctrine was an important emphasis in the age of orthodoxy.¹¹² In connection with the doctrinal position of Lutheran orthodoxy, Preus wrote,

Since theology is based solely on God's written Word, its content does not change; Law and Gospel and the articles of faith remain the same, being the summation of God's unchangeable Word to man. This confessional and doctrinal constant is to the old dogmaticians more than a mere statement of belief and platform for action; it is an expression of the very Gospel, a power that controls and changes lives and ideas and movements in history. Lutheran orthodoxy is utterly convinced of this.¹¹³

The unchangeability of Scripture, to the orthodox Lutherans, went hand in hand with the unchangeability of doctrine. That doctrine is all in service to the gospel.

112. Robert D. Preus, *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1970), 1:27–30.

113. Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 1:30.

In Preus's analysis, "the period of Lutheran orthodoxy extends from the time of the writing of the Formula of Concord ... to the time of David Hollaz in the early 18th century."¹¹⁴ He further subdivided the age of orthodoxy into three periods: (1) the golden age of orthodoxy, extending from the writing of the Formula to about the first quarter of the seventeenth century, (2) the period of high orthodoxy, which lasted until the end of the Thirty Years' War, and (3) the silver age of orthodoxy, continuing until the end of the period of Lutheran orthodoxy.¹¹⁵

The silver age of orthodoxy was where my objects of research, Calov and Quenstedt, found their home. I will present a general characterization of Lutheran theology of the silver age before discussing the background of Calov and Quenstedt. Then I will discuss their contributions to the doctrine of the ministry and what applications one can draw relative to the controversy in American Lutheranism.

Preus praised the Lutheran orthodox theologians of the silver age as commanding a "breadth and depth of learning that was unexcelled in those days" while still showing concern for the practical nature of theology. The silver age also saw the introduction of a new method in dogmatics—the analytical method. The advantage of this method was enhanced clarity, but it came at a cost of more difficult reading. Preus did make an exception here in the case of Quenstedt, though.¹¹⁶ Preus remarked that Lutheran polemics became more measured during the silver age. In place of the sarcasm characteristic of Luther, there was a secure calmness which developed.¹¹⁷ This was incorporated into the presentation of dogmatics:

114. Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 1:44.

115. Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 1:45–46.

116. Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 1:46.

117. Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 1:34.

Dogmatics becomes *theologia didactico-polemica*, the didactic side consisting of a systematic, thetical arrangement of the Biblical material pertaining to each *locus*, and the polemic side dealing with the problems of terminology, Biblical interpretation, and historical development as these factors impinge on each dogmatic *locus*. The first to produce such a *systema*, as it was called, was Abraham Calov. He was followed by John Quenstedt, whose work was the very quintessence of thoroughness, clarity, and command of the issues. Each *locus* is divided into a didactic and polemic section; and it is interesting that the second section, designed primarily to bolster the first, is often less polemic in tone than the didactic section. Polemics to Quenstedt involved tracing the many antitheses to every article of faith, clearing up misunderstandings and difficulties connected with the Lutheran position, and particularly providing exegesis for the pertinent *sedes doctrinae*.¹¹⁸

Due to the pointed nature of the polemic section, it is in the didactic section that one will find the most illuminating material for the present study. Preus also commented on the inherent weakness of dogmatics. Dogmaticians are unable to present *all* of the biblical data pertaining to an article of faith. This, compounded with the fact that “theologians of that day were often preoccupied with disputed points of doctrine or with issues of interest in that day,” means that the modern reader can detect gaps in the dogmatic texts.¹¹⁹

Historical Background of Calov

Abraham Calov was born in 1612 in Mohrunge, Ducal Prussia. He enrolled in the *Gymnasium* at Thorn in 1624, but the plague caused him to return home before a year had passed. The next year, he enrolled at the *Gymnasium* of Königsberg, where plague again cut short his studies. Calov then entered the University of Königsberg in 1626, at age thirteen.¹²⁰ Calov earned his

118. Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 1:34–35.

119. Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 1:43.

120. Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 1:59–60; Timothy Schmeling, “Abraham Calov (1612–86): The Prussian on the *Cathedra Lutheri*,” in Timothy Schmeling, ed., *Lives and Writings of the Great Fathers of the Lutheran Church* (St. Louis: Concordia, 2016), 246–47. Assuming Schmeling is correct in identifying April 16 as

master's in April of 1632, at the age of nineteen or twenty. Next he was accepted into the philosophical faculty of Königsberg and simultaneously began his theological studies.¹²¹ This illustrates Calov's immense talent and capacity for work.

In 1634, Calov joined the philosophical faculty of Rostock University and began his doctoral studies. He earned his doctorate in June of 1637. His studies complete, he returned to Königsberg that September as an adjunct professor of theology. In the following years, he served as superintendent, as rector of the *Gymnasium* and pastor in Danzig, as professor at the University of Wittenberg, as a member of the Wittenberg consistory, and, in 1660, he became *professor primarius*—first theology professor.¹²² Throughout his life, Calov endured many calamities; he outlived five of six wives and all thirteen of his children.¹²³

The most important among Calov's numerous writings was his *Biblia Illustrata* (1672–76), the title of which Schmeling translated as *Elucidated Bible*. The work, in four volumes, was a commentary on the whole Bible, including correction of Arminian Dutch jurist Hugo Grotius's own commentary.¹²⁴ Second in importance was his *Systema Locorum Theologicorum* (1655–77), a twelve-volume dogmatics, which Preus said “was not so carefully done as [the *Biblia Illustrata*], and one gets the impression that Calov was in a great hurry in the last volumes.”¹²⁵

Calov's birthday, Preus has included a minor error in saying Calov entered the University of Königsberg at age fourteen, since Calov entered the University in February.

121. Schmeling, “Calov,” in Schmeling, *Lives and Writings*, 247.

122. Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 1:60; Schmeling, “Calov,” in Schmeling, *Lives and Writings*, 248–53.

123. Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 1:61; Schmeling, “Calov,” in Schmeling, *Lives and Writings*, 249.

124. Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 1:60; Schmeling, “Calov,” in Schmeling, *Lives and Writings*, 254.

125. Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 1:60–61. Square brackets are mine.

Evaluations of Calov's life and career have sharply diverged. August Tholuck adopted a negative view of him, but Walther and Hoenecke both spoke highly of him.¹²⁶

Historical Background of Quenstedt

Johann Andreas Quenstedt was born in Quedlinburg in 1617 to a relatively well-connected family. His mother was sister of the famous Jena theologian Johann Gerhard. Preus was perhaps unfair in claiming that Quenstedt's life "was not filled with the turmoil that Calov and other theologians of the day faced," for Quenstedt saw Quedlinburg engulfed by the armies of the Thirty Years' War during his youth, and he was afflicted with illness throughout his life.¹²⁷

Quenstedt began his studies at the Quedlinburg *Gymnasium* in 1633, at the age of sixteen. Though Quenstedt had planned to study at Jena with his uncle, his plans changed when Gerhard died in 1637. Instead, Quenstedt enrolled at the University of Helmstedt in September of 1637. There, he was influenced by Georg Calixt, the instigator of the Syncretistic Controversy. Quenstedt earned his master's degree in 1643.¹²⁸

In 1644, Quenstedt made the dangerous journey to Wittenberg, where he enrolled in the University to study theology. In Wittenberg, he housed with Wilhelm Leyser I, a former student of Gerhard. Schmeling gave Leyser the most credit for turning Quenstedt to Lutheran orthodoxy. Quenstedt became adjunct professor of philosophy in 1646, and during the Syncretistic

126. Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 1:61; Schmeling, "Calov," in Schmeling, *Lives and Writings*, 243.

127. Timothy Schmeling, "Johann Andreas Quenstedt (1617–88): The Consensus Builder," in Schmeling, *Lives and Writings*, 265–66, 270; Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 1:62.

128. Schmeling, "Quenstedt," in Schmeling, *Lives and Writings*, 266–68.

Controversy, the theological faculty called on him to outline the differences between Helmstedt and Wittenberg. In 1649, he turned down two calls—one to be deacon, another to be pastor. Instead, by September 1649, Quenstedt had become ordinary philosophy professor and extraordinary theology professor. He received his doctorate in theology on November 12, 1650. In the years that followed, Quenstedt became ordinary theology professor, finally becoming *professor primarius* a year before he died.¹²⁹

Of Quenstedt's writings, there can be no question that his *Theologia Didactico-Polemica sive Systema Theologiae* was the most important; Preus even ranked it as the greatest Lutheran dogmatics book after Chemnitz's and Gerhard's.¹³⁰ Further characterizing Quenstedt's writing in the *Theologia Didactico-Polemica*, Preus wrote, "Every possible point of doctrine that was discussed or at issue in those days is broached and treated with a lucidity that defies misunderstanding."¹³¹ Nor have orthodox Lutherans been the only ones to recognize the value of Quenstedt's work: Schmeling pointed to Friedrich Schleiermacher and Karl Barth as two figures who made heavy use of Quenstedt's *Theologia Didactico-Polemica*.¹³²

Their Presentation of the Doctrine

In this discussion of the doctrine of the ministry, I will follow Quenstedt's general outline in *Theologia Didactico-Polemica*, including elucidating and corroborating details from Calov's

129. Schmeling, "Quenstedt," in Schmeling, *Lives and Writings*, 268–70.

130. Schmeling, "Quenstedt," in Schmeling, *Lives and Writings*, 271; Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 1:62.

131. Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 1:62.

132. Schmeling, "Quenstedt," in Schmeling, *Lives and Writings*, 264–65.

Systema along the way. I made this decision because, unfortunately, Preus’s observation about the later volumes of Calov’s *Systema* holds true in Calov’s article on the public ministry; his writing is at times opaque and at times seems to wander from thought to thought without clear direction. Quenstedt’s writing is much clearer on this doctrine. The most relevant information for my purposes is in Quenstedt’s didactic section, but there is also helpful data in his polemic section.

The first point of interest for my discussion is Quenstedt’s third thesis. He stated that the one true God is the principal efficient cause (*causa efficiens principalis*) of the ecclesiastical ministry. Among the scriptural evidence for this point, Quenstedt cited Ps 68:11; Joel 2:23;¹³³ Matt 28:19; 1 Cor 4:1; 12:4–6, 28; Eph 4:11.¹³⁴ Of all his theses in the didactic section of this chapter, this was the one where Quenstedt cited the most passages. Therefore, I will give significant attention to the passages he cited and his comments on them.

Psalm 68:11 says, “The Lord announces the word, and the women who proclaim it are a mighty throng” (NIV). This passage is important for my discussion because it specifically mentions *women* who proclaim good news. Quenstedt acknowledged this fact in his comments, but he qualified it with the statement that women, in the OT, were types of the NT ministry. Still, it is worth noting that Quenstedt was aware of biblical data that spoke of women doing the work of ministers. I will return to this point in the discussion of Quenstedt’s sixth thesis, regarding the matter about which (*materia in qua*) of the ministry.

133. On this verse’s use for this doctrine, cf. Thomas P. Nass, “The Teacher of Righteousness,” in *Joel*, Concordia Commentary (Saint Louis: Concordia, 2023), 350–64.

134. Johann Andreas Quenstedt, *Theologia Didactico-Polemica: sive Systema Theologicum in duas sectiones, didacticam et polemicam, divisum* (Wittenberg: Johann Ludolph Quenstedt & Elerdus Schumacher, 1685), par. IV, cap. XII, sec. I, thes. III.

The next passage I want to discuss is Matt 28:19, “Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.” The Great Commission is given to all Christians; Quenstedt here highlighted its original context in which Christ gave power to the twelve disciples. Next, Quenstedt turned to 1 Cor 4:1, “This, then, is how you ought to regard us: as servants of Christ and as those entrusted with the mysteries God has revealed.” The significance of this passage is that Paul’s description of public ministers here is very general: They are Christ’s servants, and they are stewards of God’s mysteries—by which the means of grace can be understood.

The importance of the next passage, 1 Cor 12:4–6, is self-evident. Paul writes: “There are different kinds of gifts, but the same Spirit distributes them. There are different kinds of service, but the same Lord. There are different kinds of working, but in all of them and in everyone it is the same God at work.” The fact that Quenstedt cited this passage under this doctrine shows that he did not think this passage was speaking only of spiritual gifts. God is at work in various kinds of gifts, service, and ministry. This would argue that Quenstedt was not unaware of the diversity of ministerial offices possible in God-given gospel freedom.

The same point can be made from Quenstedt’s use of 1 Cor 12:28, “And God has placed in the church first of all apostles, second prophets, third teachers, then miracles, then gifts of healing, of helping, of guidance, and of different kinds of tongues.” This passage and Eph 4:11, “So Christ himself gave the apostles, the prophets, the evangelists, the pastors and teachers,” are the clearest indication of various sorts of ministerial offices existing. Calov also cited both of these passages under his listing of the ordering of holy persons in the NT.¹³⁵ The passages

135. Abraham Calov, *Systema Locorum Theologicorum ... exhibens* (Wittenberg: Johannes Wilkius, 1677), 8:289.

Quenstedt has cited here give adequate reason to conclude that he was aware of the possibility that God can use the gifts of women in his gospel ministry and that Quenstedt did not limit the gospel ministry to only a single form.

Quenstedt's fourth thesis said that the less principal cause (*causa minus principalis*) which establishes the ministry is the whole church, to which belongs the right of calling, sending, and ordaining.¹³⁶ In his second note under this thesis, Quenstedt distinguished between ordination and the right of issuing a call. According to Quenstedt, the latter pertains to the whole church. He derived this right from the power of the keys given to the church in Matt 16:19; 18:18. This point speaks against romanizing Lutherans who limit the power of absolution to the ordained ministry. Any Christian may apply the power of the keys privately.

In his sixth thesis, Quenstedt defined the matter about which (*materia in qua*) or substance as capable and suitable persons (*personae*), legitimately called.¹³⁷ One must ask whether it is significant that Quenstedt did not phrase this thesis in a way that makes the substance suitable *men* as opposed to women. He could have chosen a different word, such as *vir*, but he did not. Calov's definition of the ministry also did not speak only of men, saying that the ministry is composed of people (*hominum*) called to announce the word and will of God and administer the sacraments for God's glory and the salvation of humankind.¹³⁸ This observation should be tempered, however, by Quenstedt's first note under the thesis, where he limited the substance to the masculine sex based on 1 Cor 14:34–35. From this limitation, it is clear that Quenstedt was thinking about the ministry in terms of offices that function in the church in

136. Quenstedt, *Theologia Didactico-Polemica*, par. IV, cap. XII, sec. I, thes. IV.

137. Quenstedt, *Theologia Didactico-Polemica*, par. IV, cap. XII, sec. I, thes. VI.

138. Calov, *Systema*, 8:309.

public worship. The question, then, is whether Quenstedt would deny the possibility of women filling public ministerial offices which do not violate the headship principle.

In the second note under Quenstedt's sixth thesis, he made the point that according to Eph 4:11–12, "teachers and pastors, mediately called, are no less given by Christ to the church than prophets, apostles, and evangelists, immediately called."¹³⁹ It is significant that Quenstedt mentioned teachers (*doctores*) among those with mediate calls. Quenstedt likely would have included in this category the office of theological professors, which seems to rule out the possibility that Quenstedt, to speak anachronistically, had an "extreme" Missouri view whereby *only* the office of parish pastor is divinely established.

Next, I want to look at Quenstedt's tenth thesis. He said the form of the ministry is that of a sacred office.¹⁴⁰ What is significant here is Quenstedt's note; he cited Johann Gerhard, who in his *Loci Theologici* distinguished the internal and external form of the ministry. According to Quenstedt, Gerhard set up the external form of the ministry "in various grades and orders of ministers, adorned with which the external appearance of the ministry enters into the eyes of people."¹⁴¹ What is this saying, if not that there may be various forms and offices of the one public ministry established by the church?

Quenstedt's final thesis in the didactic section listed the adjuncts (*adiuncta*) of the ministry, among which he named ordination.¹⁴² What does Quenstedt mean by *adjuncts* in this

139. Quenstedt, *Theologia Didactico-Polemica*, par. IV, cap. XII, sec. I, thes. VI, n. II. English quotations of Quenstedt are my own translation.

140. Quenstedt, *Theologia Didactico-Polemica*, par. IV, cap. XII, sec. I, thes. X.

141. Quenstedt, *Theologia Didactico-Polemica*, par. IV, cap. XII, sec. I, thes. X, n.; cf. Johann Gerhard, *On the Ministry: Part Two*, trans. Richard J. Dinda, Theological Commonplaces (St. Louis: Concordia, 2012), §§204–6.

142. Quenstedt, *Theologia Didactico-Polemica*, par. IV, cap. XII, sec. I, thes. XIV.

context? The most prototypical meaning of *adiunctum* is simply something that is joined or added to something else. One could make the case that because Quenstedt listed a call (*vocatio*) among the adjuncts of the ministry, and a call is necessary for the ministry, Quenstedt was not here thinking of adjuncts in the sense of *non-essential attributes*. However, this argument is weak because it assumes that Quenstedt thought of all the adjuncts he listed in this thesis on the same level. Quenstedt has already discussed the necessity of the call in his sixth thesis, but properly speaking, the call is not *part* of the ministry, which is why he listed it under adjuncts as well. Ordination, on the other hand, was not mentioned in any of the previous theses. Though Quenstedt mentioned ordination in the explanation of some theses, nowhere did he say or imply that ordination is *necessary* for the ministry.

Moving on to the polemic section, Quenstedt's second question dealt with the power of calling ministers. Clarifying the question to be discussed, Quenstedt wrote: "Who are those people through whom that mediate call legitimately and with proper order ought to be done?"¹⁴³ His thesis answered that the power of calling ministers of the word belongs "not to the priests or the ecclesiastical estate alone, nor to the magistracy alone, nor to the people alone, but to the whole church."¹⁴⁴ Here is one place where Quenstedt's context—the state church in which he was living—is evident. Quenstedt assumed that the governmental authorities belong to the church. Nevertheless, the point Quenstedt made here is well-taken; he was rejecting the ideas of those who would limit the church's right to call ministers. This pertains to the discussion of church and ministry in America in that it is characteristic of the Missouri view of church and ministry to limit the right to call ministers to the local congregation only and to limit valid calls to those

143. Quenstedt, *Theologia Didactico-Polemica*, par. IV, cap. XII, sec. II, qu. II, status controversiae.

144. Quenstedt, *Theologia Didactico-Polemica*, par. IV, cap. XII, sec. II, qu. II, thes.

calling a parish pastor only. Quenstedt did not specify that the local congregation is the only form of church capable of calling ministers. It would follow from this point and his recognition of the various forms of ministry possible in gospel freedom that he would grant the right to call ministers, in any form, to every form of church.

This conclusion bears itself out in Quenstedt's evidence for the thesis. Quenstedt gave three classes of evidence supporting the thesis; the first class was taken from Holy Scripture and reasons deduced from it. To this first class, Quenstedt said, pertains the giving of the keys to the church in Matt 16:19; 18:18. From this Quenstedt argued,

To whomever the keys of the kingdom of heaven are given by Christ himself, the right of calling ministers of the church belongs to him, because through the keys ecclesiastical power is understood, part of which is the right of calling and setting up ministers of the church. But the keys of the kingdom of heaven are given by Christ to the whole church, in the places just now cited. Therefore the right of calling ministers of the church belongs to the church.¹⁴⁵

One of the verses Quenstedt cited immediately precedes Matt 18:19–20, “Again, truly I tell you that if two of you on earth agree about anything they ask for, it will be done for them by my Father in heaven. For where two or three gather in my name, there am I with them.” This passage is one of the *sedes* of the doctrine of the invisible church. It is indefensible to assume, then, that Quenstedt was only thinking of the local congregation when he used the word *church* here.

The last point to be discussed under this question has to do with Quenstedt's response to objections. Responding to arguments such as Bellarmine's in favor of excluding the people from participating in the call process, Quenstedt wrote,

The following inference is invalid: “In whatever way Christ called the apostles, so also ministers of the church are being called now. But without the suffrage of the people,

145. Quenstedt, *Theologia Didactico-Polemica*, par. IV, cap. XII, sec. II, qu. II, thes. bebaiōsis.

etc.”¹⁴⁶ For it would follow that all pastors would be called immediately and would be apostles. Therefore the particle *sicut*, John 20:21 (“As the Father sent me, I am also sending you”), does not denote absolute similarity, but a similarity of the sending of Christ and of the apostles meeting in some third thing, namely, just as Christ was sent by the Father to teach, endowed with gifts, so also the apostles are sent by Christ, endowed with gifts. Therefore, the inference from the immediate calling of the twelve apostles and seventy disciples to today’s calling of ministers is invalid.¹⁴⁷

Here, again, is evidence that Quenstedt was looking at the ministry with the office of pastor especially in mind. More importantly, Quenstedt’s logic implicitly denied that the office of pastor is equivalent to the office of apostle. Thus, he would disagree with those who draw a direct correspondence between apostles and pastors or directly derive the office of pastor from the office of apostle.

The third question in Quenstedt’s polemic section dealt with the legitimacy of Luther’s call into the ministry. (Calov also wrote on this question, following a similar outline to Quenstedt’s.)¹⁴⁸ Quenstedt argued that Luther was legitimately mediately called to the ministry, outlining Luther’s ordination to priesthood in 1507, his being called by Augustinian Vicar General Johann Staupitz in 1508 to priesthood and theological professorship (*professionem theologicam*) in the church and University of Wittenberg, and the conferral of his doctorate in 1512. Regarding the last of these, Quenstedt wrote that it conferred the power to defend true doctrine against heterodox individuals both with voice and with writing. Furthermore, he said that “although the grade of doctorate is said to be a call ἀκέρως [without authority], nevertheless, through doctoral promotion the preceding call to the pastoral office and theological professorship

146. The full inference would be that the apostles were called without suffrage, so ministers today should be called without suffrage.

147. Quenstedt, *Theologia Didactico-Polemica*, par. IV, cap. XII, sec. II, qu. II, objectionum dialysis, II.

148. Calov, *Systema*, 8:303–8.

was confirmed by public and solemn rite.”¹⁴⁹ Here Quenstedt transparently showed that he regarded the call to theological professorship as a valid call into the public ministry. Even though he mentioned Luther’s priesthood as well, he did not write that Luther would not have been a minister if he had only been a professor and not a priest also. Looking at the big picture of Luther’s career, one would probably say that it more closely resembled a seminary professor who did a lot of guest preaching than a prototypical parish priest or pastor. Yet Quenstedt did not for this reason deny Luther’s call was a call to the public ministry. This, of course, speaks against some “extreme” forms of the Missouri view.

Finally, I want to discuss Quenstedt’s fourth question. Here he asked whether the true ecclesiastical order is in the Lutheran churches. To this question he, of course, answered in the affirmative. This question was aimed at Roman Catholics who claimed otherwise, including Bellarmine. In his response to objections, Quenstedt made the following distinction:

Distinguish between the Roman pontiff and the whole church; he who is not called by the whole church is not a legitimate pastor, but he who is not called by the Roman pontiff is not an illegitimate one. For the right of calling pertains to the whole church, not to the Roman pontiff, and by all means the first evangelical doctors, such as Luther and others—by whom still others were ordained—were ordained by papists themselves and by papistic rite, as said above.¹⁵⁰

Quenstedt again emphasized that the *church* has the right to call ministers. Then, to Becanus’s objection that Lutheran ministers are not immediately sent by God, Quenstedt responded, “The following inference is invalid: ‘Lutheran ministers are not immediately sent and called by God; therefore, they are not legitimately called,’ for the inference from a denial of one *species* to a denial of the *genus* is not a valid inference. The immediate call is only one *species* of legitimate

149. Quenstedt, *Theologia Didactico-Polemica*, par. IV, cap. XII, sec. II, qu. III, thes. bebaiōsis.

150. Quenstedt, *Theologia Didactico-Polemica*, par. IV, cap. XII, sec. II, qu. IV, objectionum dialysis, I.

call. And let those belonging to the pontiff show that they are immediately called by God.”¹⁵¹

Quenstedt’s logic regarding mediate and immediate calls would apply just as well to different forms of ministry. Denying that the call of a Lutheran grade school teacher is the same as the call of a pastor does not prove that it is not a call to the public ministry. In other words, to prove that such a teacher’s call does not make him or her a public minister, one would have to prove on the basis of Scripture that the *species* of Christian school teacher called to teach God’s word to children does not belong to the *genus* of public ministry. This the Missouri view cannot do.

Conclusions

A Wisconsin theologian reading Quenstedt’s and Calov’s discussions of the public ministry will not find anything in their presentation of the doctrine that is unacceptable, as long as it is kept in mind that they were writing in a specific context and with a particular situation in mind. They did not say everything that could rightly be said about the ministry, but even in what they did say, there are indications that they would not have agreed wholeheartedly with the Missouri view of the ministry.

Quenstedt was aware of Scripture that spoke of women as gospel ministers. He emphasized the fact that the right to call to the ministry is given to the whole church. He cited passages which speak in very general terms about public ministers as stewards of the means of grace. He and Calov cited passages which name a diversity of gifts and a diversity of ministers given by God. Quenstedt derived the right of calling from the power of the keys given to the whole church and did not limit absolution to the ordained ministry. Both spoke of ministers in

151. Quenstedt, *Theologia Didactico-Polemica*, par. IV, cap. XII, sec. II, qu. IV, objectionum dialysis, II.

terms not limited to males but referring to humans in general. (Even though they discussed the restriction to the male sex based on the headship principle, this does not require that they would reject public ministry carried out by women without violating the headship principle. It is clear that they were looking at ministry with the most common and very important *species*, the office of pastor, at the forefront of their mind.)

They both recognized the divine call of Luther as a theological professor. They both recognized various grades and orders of ministry. Quenstedt called ordination an adjunct of the ministry and never specified that it was a necessary one. He argued against limiting the church's right to call ministers. Quenstedt's line of argumentation implicitly rejected the view which directly derives the office of pastor from the office of apostle. However, since they were not directly addressing the questions being asked during the controversy surrounding the ministry in American Lutheranism, it is understandable that the theologians involved in the controversy did not go directly to the dogmaticians for support.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brueggemann, H. G. "The Public Ministry in the Apostolic Age." *Concordia Theological Monthly* 22.2 (1951): 81–109.
- Brug, John F. *The Ministry of the Word*. Milwaukee: Northwestern, 2009.
- Calov, Abraham. *Systema Locorum Theologicorum ... exhibens*. Vol. 8. Wittenberg: Johannes Wilkuis, 1677.
- Commission on Theology and Church Relations of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. "The Ministry: Offices, Procedures, and Nomenclature," 1981.
- Forster, Walter Otto. *Zion on the Mississippi: The Settlement of the Saxon Lutherans in Missouri, 1839–1841*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1953.
- Gerhard, Johann. *On the Ministry: Part Two*. Translated by Richard J. Dinda. Theological Commonplaces. St. Louis: Concordia, 2012.
- Hoenecke, Adolf. *Evangelical Lutheran Dogmatics*. Translated by Joel Fredrich, Paul Prange, and Bill Tackmier. Vol. 4. Milwaukee: Northwestern, 1999.
- Johnson, Daniel S. "The Ministry and the Schoolmaster: The Relation and Distinction between the Offices of Pastor and Teacher in the Missouri Synod." *Logia* 6.3 (1997): 13–22.
- Klug, Eugene F. A. *Church and Ministry: The Role of Church, Pastor, and People from Luther to Walther*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1993.
- Koehler, Edward W. A. *A Summary of Christian Doctrine: A Popular Presentation of the Teachings of the Bible*. 2nd ed. St. Louis: Concordia, 1952.
- Lawrenz, Carl. "An Evaluation of Walther's Theses on the Church and Ministry." *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 79.2 (1982): 85–139.
- Luther, Martin. *Luther's Works*. Edited by Robert C. Schultz and Helmut T. Lehmann. Vol. 46. St. Louis: Fortress, 1967.
- The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. *Convention Proceedings: 61st Regular Convention*. St. Louis: Concordia, 2001.

- Marquart, Kurt. *The Church and Her Fellowship, Ministry and Governance*. Vol. 9 of *Confessional Lutheran Dogmatics*. Fort Wayne: International Foundation for Lutheran Confessional Research, 1990.
- Nass, Thomas P. “The Teacher of Righteousness.” Pages 350–64 in *Joel*. Concordia Commentary. Saint Louis: Concordia, 2023.
- Nehrenz, Clyde. “The Missouri Synod and Its Churchless Ministry.” *Christian News*, 25 June 1984.
- Pieper, August. “Luther’s Doctrine of Church and Ministry.” Translated by Harold R. Johne. *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 60 (1963): 13–47, 81–110, 247–65.
- . “Luthers Lehre von Kirche und Amt.” *Theologische Quartalschrift* 14–15 (1917): 14:211–41; 15:65–80, 101–26.
- . “Toward an Understanding of the Current Discussion on Church and Ministry.” Translated by James Langebartels. Pages 255–75 in *The Wauwatosa Theology*, vol. 4. Edited by Curtis A. Jahn. Milwaukee: Northwestern, 2022.
- . “Zur Verständigung in der gegenwärtigen Diskussion über Kirche und Amt.” *Theologische Quartalschrift* 9.3 (1912): 182–208.
- Pieper, Francis. *Christian Dogmatics*. Vol. 3. St. Louis: Concordia, 1953.
- Preus, Robert D. *The Doctrine of the Call in the Confessions and Lutheran Orthodoxy*. Luther Academy, 1991.
- . *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*. Vol. 1. St. Louis: Concordia, 1970.
- Quenstedt, Johann Andreas. *Theologia Didactico-Polemica: sive Systema Theologicum in duas sectiones, didacticam et polemicam, divisum*. Wittenberg: Johann Ludolph Quenstedt & Elerdus Schumacher, 1685.
- Scaer, David P. *Ordination: Human Rite or Divine Ordinance*. Fort Wayne: Concordia Theological Seminary Press, 1983.
- Schmelting, Timothy, ed. *Lives and Writings of the Great Fathers of the Lutheran Church*. St. Louis: Concordia, 2016.
- Schuler, Mark. “Ministry: Some New Testament Perspectives.” *Issues in Christian Education* 27.1 (1993): 10–16.
- Stoeckhardt, George. “Von dem Beruf der Lehrerinnen an christlichen Gemeindeschulen.” *Concordia Theological Monthly* 5.10 (1934): 764–73.
- Walther, C. F. W. “Sermon at the Installation of Two College Professors.” Translated by J. W. Klotz. *Lutheran Sentinel* 32.6 (1949): 82–89.

———. *The Church and the Office of the Ministry, the Voice of Our Church on the Question of Church and Office: A Collection of Testimonies Regarding This Question from the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church and from the Private Writings of Orthodox Teachers of the Same*. Edited by Matthew C. Harrison. St. Louis: Concordia, 2012.

Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Missouri Synod. St. Louis: Concordia, n.d.