

The Practice Of Private Confession And Absolution In The Lutheran Church

[Presented on August 9, 1979]

by Mark A. Jeske

Outline: Private Confession in the Lutheran Church

Introduction: 1. Reason for the paper
2. Scope of the paper

I. Private Confession in 16th Century Germany

- A. Roman Catholic practice
- B. The Lutheran reform
- C. Attitude of the Reformed churches
- D. Brief summary of the practice's fortunes

II. Private Confession in 19th Century America

- A. The East
 - 1. Muhlenberg
 - 2. Definite Platform
- B. Midwestern Synods
- C. Missouri-Wisconsin relations
 - 1. The Lebanon case
 - 2. The Watertown case
 - 3. Evaluation of the respective positions

III. Private Confession in the 20th Century

- A. The demise of the practice
- B. Some observations on its value

THE PRACTICE OF PRIVATE CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH

The practice of private confession, i.e. a troubled soul unburdening himself privately to a fatherly confessor who then absolves him privately, has virtually disappeared as such in WELS circles and, if general impressions are to be believed, in the LC-MS, ALC, and LCA as well. An investigation into its history, however, is no mere antiquarian's exercise; at issue are two articles of the Augsburg Confession, some heated, bitter intersynodical relations, and a void today where once there was a vital element of Lutheran *Seelsorge*.

Although the course for which this paper is written properly treated only the years 1820-1880, this writer feels that the topic of *Privatbeichte* cannot adequately be explained without first having examined its roots in the Reformation. And since this study is certainly of some relevance today, some concluding observations will be made on the practice of private confession in Missouri and Wisconsin in the 20th Century.

I. PRIVATE CONFESSION IN 16TH CENTURY GERMANY

Private confession to a priest, as opposed to a sinner's confession directly to God or the congregation's general confession, developed quite early in the Roman church. Koehler says that the whole confessional system was an outgrowth of the hierarchical paternalism of the first centuries.(1) In the passage of time the practice became more and more solidly entrenched; in 1215 Innocent III and the Fourth Lateran Council issued the famous canon on penance, requiring the faithful to confess privately at least once a year on pain of excommunication. On paper, at least, nothing has changed of this decree; a Catholic adult catechism published recently concedes only:

“When for extraordinary reasons groups of people are not able to confess their sins individually, they may in some circumstances receive communal absolution. Such communal absolution, however, may be given only where there is a grave need, which is to be determined by the local bishop. ...Unless it is morally impossible for them to do so they are obliged to go to confession within a year.” (2)

In practice, however, Roman discipline seems to have broken down; Catholic acquaintances make no secret of having avoided the confessional for years with impunity.

The Roman Catholic practices of penance, indulgences, and the confessional were at the center of what the Lutherans were striving to reform. Specifically, they objected to the following aspects of auricular confession:

- a. that members were compelled legalistically to confess privately at least once a year;
- b. that members were to enumerate all sins in order to receive absolution for them;
- c. that the priest acted as judge, deciding on his own whether to remit or retain sins;
- d. that personal confession to God was pronounced invalid in favor of priestly mediation;
- e. that doing penance was explicitly taught as an act whereby the sinner atoned (at least in part) for his own sin (cf Lawler, p.486, “The Church believes that there are ‘temporal punishments’ for sin. This means that a just and merciful God *requires that the penitent sinner atone for his sins.*”(emphasis mine).
- f. that *satisfactio* payments had become a source of auxiliary income for the Church; (N.B. the Lutherans later on were guilty of this same abuse);
- g. that the forced, artificial requirements tended to foster an artificial view of sins as actions alone rather than as the disease as well;
- h. that indulgences were further burdening souls with doubt and work-righteousness;
- i. in general, that auricular confession focused not outward, on Christ's promise of forgiveness (Gospel), but rather inward, on the sinner's act of contrition (Law), even to the point of viewing the confession as meritorious.

And yet, Luther and the others were convinced that there were positive benefits to be derived from a purified, reformed private confession. While the sermon convicted of sin and absolved the congregation in a general way, the practice of private confession could apply Law and Gospel where it hurt, directly. Stripped of its Roman Catholic legalism, private confession could be a magnificent opportunity for *Seelsorge*. Luther said:

“I think that it is a truly necessary thing for souls, so much so that it may not forced on anyone by laws and commands, but may be free to each according to his need, to be made use of when and where he will.” (3)

In the Large Catechism's "Brief Exhortation to Confession," Luther adds, "If you are a Christian you should be glad to run more than 100 miles for confession." (4) Wherever the great Reformer speaks of private confession (and he does frequently and at length), it is as a tremendous treasure which people need only to become acquainted with to enjoy, rather than as a distasteful discipline which must be imposed.

These, then, were the concerns which were embodied in the Augsburg Confession, Article XI (and its supplement, Article XXV). A careful reading of the brief article reveals two chief points:

1. The emphasis is evangelical, Gospel-centered, on private *absolution*- the point is that should private confession be discontinued, the people would be deprived of a special source of comfort, not that they would escape an unpleasant duty.
2. The sinner does not need to enumerate all sins in order to receive the promise of absolution for all sins. In Article XXV three reasons are mentioned for this: a) (enumeration) is impossible; b) such enumeration does not comfort the penitent but makes him more anxious; c) the ancient Church (e.g. Chrysostom, Gratian) did not require it.

Luther's Small Catechism contained a form specifically intended for private confession, and he urged its use on the people.

The attitude of the Lutheran reformers, who in general preferred to preserve traditional practices whenever possible so long as they did not conflict with God's Word, differed sharply from the Swiss reformers. Calvin wrote:

"Confessionem et absolutionem privatam a foetidis antichristi Romani lacunis fuxisse et ab ipso diabolo in ecclesiam invectam esse."(5)

The reason for their antipathy, says Hoenecke:

"Sie argumentieren meist von dem Moglichen Miszbrauch der Privatbeichte and sodann auch von dem Mangel eines ausdruecklichen Schriftgebots fur diesselbe aus." (6)

Almost from the start there was trouble when the evangelical freedom and evangelical good sense of Article XI was not followed. In Nuernberg Osiander demanded private confession and absolution as a prerequisite for the Lord's Supper; the city council utterly rejected the entire notion of "pastoral jurisdiction," however. (7) The *Kirchenordnung fuer Brandenburg-Nuernberg* of 1533 solved the problem by requiring personal announcement, leaving the matter of confession optional. So heated were emotions at this seemingly minor point that in 1541 Osiander was depicted as burning in hell in one of the floats in a carnival parade, (8) and riots were averted only by Luther's personal intervention.

And yet, the institutionalization and establishment of any Gospel-centered practice will eventually lead to some abuse through negligence and indifference. So it was with private confession— after some decades it began to die out as it became mechanical, as the *Beichtpfennig* was introduced. It suffered, as did everything else from the ravages of the Thirty Years' War, and by 1670, Spener was publicly criticizing the practice— how could anyone

confess 10-20 people an hour? Parishes in the *Landeskirchen* had grown so large that personal *Seelsorge* was impossible; John Winkler, chief pastor of the Lutheran church in Hamburg, was said to have had some 30,000 souls under his care.(9) In general, Pietism had little use for the established form, preferring instead that the individual confess his sins to God alone. The Elector of Saxony in 1698 ordered the removal of all confessionals.

The rise of rationalism during the Enlightenment further reduced the practice; after all, it restricted man's autonomy and inner freedom. It was demeaning to have to humble oneself before another mortal. First in the country, oddly enough, and then in the cities private confession declined, abandoned almost totally by the end of the 18th Century.

Private confession enjoyed a revival in Germany in Germany along with the confessional resurgence in the early 1800's. Klaus Harms favors its reinstatement, along with psychological and "psychiatric" training for pastors; he even envisioned larger congregations with one of its pastors assigned solely to visitation and *Privatseelsorge*. Kliefoth and Steinmeyer urged the practice. In Neuendettelsau Loehe reintroduced not only private confession or but penance, too. Every three Sundays communion would be celebrated, and the previous Saturday all communicants would be expected to visit Loehe's confessional. "The worst confession (private) is better than the best general confession," he said once. (10)

Once again, however, decline set in. Perhaps the preparation for the Supper was so thorough that people preferred to stay away, and average communion attendance dropped off to once a year. In 1873 Frankfort got rid of its confessionals. Meusel (1897) says of private confession:

"Die Privatbeichte ist nicht bloss ausser uebung geraten, sondern ouch den Gemeinden so fremd und unbekannt geworden, dass sie von dem religioesen Unverstand immer wieder mit der roemischen Ohrenbeichte verwechselt wird, und die von Kliefoth, Loehe, Steinmeyer, und andere befuerworteten Versuche zu ihrer Wiejereinfuehrung meist auf Widerstand in den Gemeinden stossen." (11)

II. PRIVATE CONFESSION IN 19TH CENTURY AMERICA

The differences between Germany's established *Landeskirchen* and America's free congregations, along with the concomitant problems, must have overwhelmed the Lutheran immigrants. The most devastating challenge which the young synods had to face was the lack of seminary-trained clergy. As a result parishes were usually large and scattered, making weekly worship something of a luxury at first outside of the major cities. In his history Jacobs describes one of Muehlenberg's circuits through southern Pennsylvania, especially his visit to York. Since communion was held only twice a year and no regular pastor was in residence, Muehlenberg evidently felt that he could not take for granted that all who intended to commune on the morrow were worthy recipients. So one by one those who announced were examined, confessed, and absolved. Occasionally, if he would arrive early enough, the entire week would be devoted to counseling, straightening out family quarrels, admonishing, etc. with a preparatory service on Saturday. On Sunday morning private confession was held again, in addition to general confession. Public offenders were expected to ask public forgiveness; sometimes there was quite a queue. Jacobs quotes an observer as remarking that no one, not even members of their own congregations, received the Lord's Supper without a personal conference with the pastor. (12) Muehlenberg's 1748 liturgical agenda began with general confession in the services without communion, and with communion there was a series of pointed questions for the communicants in addition to the public confession.

The succeeding years, though strengthening the church numerically, were not kind to its confessional stance. Rationalism, the war, Deism, and the change to English all damaged the Lutheran Church in varying degrees. As it had in Germany, so in America the healthy practice of private confession declined and virtually disappeared in the East. Schmucker and the “American Lutherans” were not sorry to see it go, and when the German immigrant tide began in the 30’s and 40’s, he and Kurtz and Sprecher were dismayed to see Pennsylvania drifting rightward, a remarkable turnaround in only 25 years or so. Schmucker’s answer was the at first anonymous “Definite Platform,” which he urged the General Synod to accept.

What confessional Lutherans found most offensive about this document, however, was the chapter entitled “An American Recension of the Augsburg Confession,” a barefaced hatchet job on the fundamental Lutheran symbol. The sacraments were robbed of their life-giving power, the Donatistic heresy was revived, and Sabbatarian views were advanced. These changes were introduced supposedly as a further purging of the Augustana of “remnants of Romish error.”

Article XI of the Recension read as follows:

“A Private Confession and Absolution, which are inculcated in this article, though in a modified form, have been universally rejected by the American Lutheran Church. The omission of this article is demanded by the principle on which the American Recension of the Augsburg is constructed; namely, to omit the several portions, which are rejected by the great mass of our churches in this country, and to add nothing in their stead.” (13)

The normally laissez-faire Schmucker suddenly became exclusivistic: “...at the same time we will not admit anyone into our Synod who believes in...Private Confession and Absolution.” (14) His reason:

“As the Sacred Volume contains not a single command, that laymen should confess their sins to ministers, anymore than ministers to laymen; and as not a single such example of confession and absolution is contained in the Word of God, our American Church has universally repudiated the practice. By the old Lutheran Synod of Missouri, consisting entirely of Europeans, this rite is still observed.” (15)

To his dismay, however, Schmucker saw the Definite Platform boomerang. It was accepted by only three small Ohio synods, and suddenly his power base had shrunken drastically; he, Kurtz, and Sprecher were on the outside looking in upon General Synod policies. Doubtless what gagged Schmucker about private confession was that it presupposed a solid doctrinal platform (which he knew the General Synod did not have) and a solid determination to exercise discipline on the basis of such a platform (which any liberal of any denomination would find repulsive.)

Meanwhile the immigrants poured in, and the character of their synods was much more traditionally Lutheran than their century-old relatives in the East. Buffalo, for obvious reasons, strongly favored, yea demanded, private confession. The Norwegians did, too, at least on paper. Through Loehe’s *Sendlinge* Iowa retained the practice, although Deindorfer noted that “too great insistence on these matters often hindered the synod’s growth.” (16) Loehe’s influence was felt also in Michigan; consider the following excerpt from the model constitution of the “Franken” congregations:

#79. Announcement for confession is to be made personally to one's own confessor one or several days before confession.

#80. As a body, we practice private confession and desire private absolution. (17)

The foremost proponent of private confession of all the Midwest synods was, of course, Missouri. The Saxons' adamantness came perhaps from habits which they acquired from Stephan; perhaps they were convinced that they were truly obeying Augustana XI. At any rate, the pertinent clause from the first constitution reads:

"Where (private confession) is not in use, the pastor is to strive through teaching and instruction to introduce it. Yet in congregations where the total abolishing of general confession and absolution is hindered by insurmountable obstacles, general confession may be kept along with private confession." (18)

Keyl's congregation in Frohna, Missouri, tried to block that final "loophole" which permitted general confession but was overruled. Keyl thereupon wrote what was to have been a lengthy serial in the *Lutheraner*; after three installments it broke off and another appeared, "Christian Freedom in Respect to Private and Public Confession and Absolution." (19) Here the observation might be ventured that the intersynodical troubles were not the fault of Missouri's official stand, but the result of some strong personalities jockeying for control in a congregation. In regard to Missouri's attitude Koehler has two rather interesting observations. On the one hand he says:

"The Missourians on the whole cannot be charged with false doctrine or legalism in respect to either of the two forms of the confessional. On the contrary, they must be credited with faithfully having counseled their congregations by extensive doctrinal discussion." (20)

On the other hand:

"Still, the question remains whether in individual cases the advice not to introduce general confession was always proper, no matter how faultless the presentation of the doctrine." (21) (On occasion, for example, Ottomar Fuerbringer had strongly advised against even permitting general confession alongside of private confession.) Again, "The severity of the Old Lutherans, whose firm and faithful stand for the confessions will always remain to their credit, was not always of the Spirit, and made it hard for untrained and often unclear minds to see it in its proper perspective and cover it with the cloak of charity." (22)

The practice of private confession was never introduced by the Wisconsin men. (23) In fact, some congregations even wrote into their constitutions an express prohibition of it; this was condemned in synodical reports, however, as legalistic. Bading remarked in his presidential address of 1861:

"(Unser Synode) allezeit bereit sein wird, sowohl die christliche Freiheit der einzelnen Gemeinden zu wahren, als auch die Gewissen der Einzelnen zu beruecksichtigen."

This writer has several guesses for Wisconsin's aversion. Perhaps the difference between synods on this point is regional. In Germany the practice seems to have died out faster in the North than elsewhere, and the old Wisconsin Synod seems to have had a significant percentage of Lutherans from Pomerania and other Prussian states. Perhaps Wisconsin's aversion might trace back to its background in the Prussian Union; because of Reformed antagonism to things Roman, Frederick would certainly have soft-pedaled so distinctly Lutheran a practice as private confession. But perhaps the best guess would be that the Pietistic background of the Wisconsin founders meant that the practice never got started, and if a new pastor in the area was looking for synodical affiliation, he would naturally turn to Missouri if he had strong feelings about private confession.

At any rate, before the two synods reached concord at the Milwaukee colloquy in 1868, there were some rather sour intersynodical quarrels, involving usually the questions of parochial boundaries and mutual recognition of discipline cases. Some of the reasons for these painful congregational schisms were the weighty matters of *Schwagerehe*, "worldly entertainments," and the private confessional; of the latter the two most famous cases were those involving the Missouri congregations in Lebanon and Watertown. Since Koehler on pp.56ff treats the affairs at some length (though not always as clearly and with as much care about casual references as we might like), we shall merely outline them here.

The Missouri man in Lebanon, Geyer, was an ardent advocate of private confession and used it exclusively, imposing it even on those who preferred general confession. Two factions developed in the congregation; the protesters were led by the school teacher, a Germany-trained man named Wetzel. Geyer eventually relented and permitted general confession alongside private confession, but refused to admit that his earlier practice of 13 years had been legalistic. Wetzel's group persisted in its complaint and various attempts were made for official mediation. Although speculation is always risky, it surely seems from this point in history that the protesters were as much opposed to Geyer as to private confession, which they termed a yoke of bondage. It was surely not a one-issue problem. At any rate, the official investigation did not seem to be immediately forthcoming (Wyneken had mistaken the appeal letter and thought that the matter had been taken care of; Fuerbringer's letter of intent to visit had been lost in the mails) and so the group asked Wisconsin's Bading, currently pastor in Theresa (1857), to serve them with the sacraments. Muehlhaeuser consented, and Bading visited and communed them that fall. The group was excommunicated. In 1858 the Wisconsin convention approved Bading's action for three reasons:

- a. the forcing of private confession was a legalistic yoke;
- b. Geyer had treated the protesters in an unchristian manner;
- c. satisfaction was not obtained from the district or synodical presidium.

Recognizing, however, that the protesters had not acted wholly without blame, the resolution expressly did not support their actions unconditionally. One month later (June, 1858) Missouri's Northern District met at *Dreieinigkeitskirche*; Wisconsin was excoriated and Geyer was exonerated as actually having been too lenient in permitting general confession to stand at all. The word *Rotte* and its compounds crept into the official records rather frequently.

Meanwhile there was trouble also at St. Johannis in Watertown. Its pastor Wagner had also enforced exclusive use of private confession (which was only natural, since the Lebanon

congregation was the mother of the Lutheran churches in the area). A dissident group gathered around the teacher, Hass; incidents escalated into confrontations, and finally the protesters were excommunicated. This group now joined with the members of a synodically non-aligned congregation in Watertown whose Franckean Synod-trained pastor, Sans, was dismissed in 1858 on charges of pastoral unsuitability to the Lutheran ministry. In 1859 this resultant St. Michaelsgemeinde was admitted into Wisconsin's membership, to be served temporarily by supply pastors. Bading had earlier declined a formal call to the Lebanon-Watertown area because his Theresa congregation would not grant him an honorable release. In 1860, however, Bading was elected synodical praeses; upon being called again to Watertown, he accepted, reasoning that Watertown's access to rail and road communications made it a more suitable synodical base of operations. Thus it came about that Watertown was the synodical hub until Bading was called to Milwaukee.

Koehler makes a number of interesting observations scattered throughout his account:

- a. Wagner had the truth of the matter (though is Koehler referring here to private confession or to the propriety of the disciplinary dealings?)
- b. Bading admitted privately that the Watertown secession (separation) had been unjustified. (24)
- c. The Wisconsin men's procedure had not been quite proper.(25)
- d. The tenor of Fuerbringer's correspondence, despite its amiability, conveyed an air of superiority that was calculated to arouse resentment.(26)

In addition, Fuerbringer preferred the hard Missouri line, that permitting general confession beside private confession would cause harm to the individual, the congregation, the synod, and to posterity. (27)

At the 1861 Wisconsin convention two papers assigned by Bading were read: one by Reim on the synod's confessional status and one by Fachtmann on private confession. The minutes unfortunately did not print Fachtmann's "because of its thoroughness." A pity. Koehler, p.81, has reproduced an eleven-thesis summary of the paper which adequately sets forth the Lutheran confessional viewpoint; note especially #9:

9. "Introduction of private confession may be effected only by agreement of the preacher with the congregation... Otherwise the Catholic restraint of consciences is to be feared."

Koehler, however, faults the paper for beginning with a preconceived objective and for failing adequately to apply the truths correctly set forth to the current situation with the proper historical perspective and judgment. (28)

As Wisconsin's confessional position began to firm up in the 1860's, Missouri's attacks in the *Lutheraner* and in convention grew less strident and less frequent. There were other intersynodical cases during the decade (for example there was private confession and *Schwagerehe* trouble between Missouri's Dicke and Wisconsin's Sauer in Town Herman(29)) but as the synods drew together in 1867 and 1868 any further problems along these lines must have been resolved more quietly.

III. PRIVATE CONFESSION IN 20TH CENTURY AMERICA

As the 19th Century drew to a close, the practice of private confession slowly began to give way to general confession. Walther's 1872 *Pastoraltheologie* still urged the old ways in page after page in an attempt to maintain the practice:

“...so hat (den Prediger) die Pflicht, auf vorherige persoenliche Anmeldung derjenigen, welche das heilige Abendmahl empfangen woolen, zu halten und dieselbe zu eiinen Exploratio treulich und weislich zu benutzen.” (30)

He quotes Chrysostom as preferring to die before giving the Lord's body and blood to an unworthy recipient.

Private confession's days in Missouri were numbered, though. In 1928 George Luecke wrote in the *Theological Monthly*, “Private confession and absolution has, in the course of time, fallen largely into disuse also in our Lutheran church, and public, or general confession has taken its place.” (31) The *Beichtgottesdienst* and *Beichtrede*, too, were disappearing. Fritz says in his *Pastoral Theology* (1932), “It is to be deplored that some churches dispense with the confessional service, thus eliminating the confessional address of the pastor.” (32) Missouri's most recent volume of pastoral theology, *The Pastor at Work* (1960), does not even mention it.

Wisconsin never endorsed the practice with Missouri's enthusiasm, but always sought the middle course. Schaller says in his *Pastorale*, while praising the virtues of *Privatseelsorge*,

“Zwar gehoert das Bestehen den Privatbeichte nicht zu den Kennzeichen einer lutherischen Gemeinde, auch wird der Prediger weder ihrer Einfuehrung stuermisch betreiben noch die Abschaffung ihrer ausschliesslichen Gebrauchs durchaus zu hindern versuchen.” (33)

Schuetze and Habeck content themselves with urging personal communion announcement (p.86).

How did the practice disappear? Gradually, of course. First to go would be the special Saturday evening confessional service; then would go the early Sunday morning *Beichtgottesdienst*; then the *Abhang* after the service would lose the *Beichtrede* (this form is still used by St. Mark's in Watertown); then the *Abhang* would go, too, and the general confession in the Sunday morning service would suffice. Private confession yielded to the five-minute personal announcement which yielded to a 30-second telephone call which yielded to filling out a card and dropping it into a box before the service which yielded to signing a list after the service if you went to communion that day.

Why did the practice of private confession disappear? There is probably no single overwhelming reason; some guesses would include the changes undergone in American Lutheranism— German to English, rural to urban, multiple parishes to single parish, small parish to larger parish. The pastor is no longer the authority figure in the community that he used to be, and can no longer count on his word as law. As America's materialism and material possessions increased, there was an accompanying increase in a feeling of individualism, doing it my way. There also seems a greater willingness these days on the part of the pastor to give the members the benefit of the doubt in the question of worthiness in receiving the Supper; the *examinatio* is a thing of the past.

Is its passing to be lamented? Sort of. Some aspects of the practice are gladly forgotten, such as the temptation to a legalistic *Gewissensverbindung*, using the Lord's Supper as a club

instead of as a promise of life, and the horrendous *Beichtgeld*. Yet overall this writer thinks we are the poorer for the death of private confession. It was a rare opportunity to personalize Law and Gospel, in private, with no hurry, where there was no danger of one's dozing off or daydreaming. To judge from the writings of our German forebears, they had a deeper sense of their own sinfulness, as well as a corresponding gratitude and relief at hearing the Good News. Communion doesn't seem to be a big deal any more, and it should be.

What ought confessional Lutheran pastors to do? In all teaching situations— sermon, Bible class, confirmation class, Sunday School and day school— the Lord's Supper ought to be presented from both angles as vividly as possible. We must see both our desperate need for it and the blessed release which it brings. Pastors need to be ready to invest large amounts of time into building deep, personal relationships with their members so that the people trust them, will come to them, will unburden themselves. Without having to advertise "We practice Private Confession" a pastor can, in private, personalize both the darts of the Law and the warmth of the Gospel in a way which will fulfill his role as *Seelsorger*, one who is looking after people's souls.

END NOTES:

- 1 Koehler, *History*, p.82.
- 2 Lawler, *Teaching*, p.494.
- 3 Allbeck, *Studies*, p.126.
- 4 Tappert, *Concord*, p.460.
- 5 quoted in Hoenecke, *Dogmatik*, III, p.315.
- 6 Hoenecke, III, .316.
- 7 Jungkuntz, "Confession," p.111.
- 8 Jungkuntz, p.112.
- 9 MacNeill, *History*, p.183.
- 10 Westberg, "Private Confession," p.154.
- 11 Jacobs, *History*, pp 227-232.
- 12 Jacobs, p. 277.
- 13 Nelson, *History*, p.223.
- 14 Meyer, Carl S. *Moving Frontiers*, p.43.
- 15 Nelson, p.225.
- 16 Neve, *Brief History*, p.375.
- 17 Carl Meyer, p.113.
- 18 Suelflow, *Plan*, p.129.
- 19 Suelflow, p.130.
- 20 Koehler, p.33.
- 21 Koehler, p.83.
- 22 Koehler, p.65.
- 23 Koehler, p.83.
- 24 Koehler, p.58-59.
- 25 Koehler, p.59-60.
- 26 Koehler, p.60.
- 27 Suelflow, p.240. 28.
- 28 Koehler, p.82.
- 29 Koehler, p.84.
- 30 Walther, p.142.

- 31 Luecke, "Confession," p.145
 32 Fritz, *Pastoral Theology*, p.134.
 33 Schaller, *Pastorale*, p.43.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Allbeck, Willard D. *Studies in the Lutheran Confessions*. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1952.
2. Caspari, W. "Confession of Sins," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1909.
3. Fredrich, Edward C. "Wisconsin's Interchurch Relations in the Early Years," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*, April, 1976
4. Fritz, John H.C. *Pastoral Theology*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1932
5. Hoenecke, Adolf. *Ev. Luth. Dogmatik*. Milwaukee: Northwestern, 1912.
6. Jacobs, Henry E., *A History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church States*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893.
7. Jungkuntz, Theodore. "Private Confession: A 20th Century Issue Seen From a 16th Century Perspective," *Concordia Theological Monthly*, February, 1968.

- 8 Koehler, John Philipp. *The History of the Wisconsin Synod*. St. Cloud, Minn.: Sentinel Publishing Co., 1970.
9. Lawler, Ronald, ed. *The Teaching of Christ*. Huntington, Ind.: Our Sunday Visitor, 1976.
10. Lindroth, Hjalmar. "Confession," *The Encyclopedia of the Lutheran Church*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1965.
11. Luecke, George. "Confession and the Confessional," *Theological Monthly*, May, 1928.
12. MacNeill, John Thomas. *A History of the Cure of Souls*. New York: Harper, 1951.
13. Meusel, Carl, ed. *Kirchliches Handlexikon*. Leipzig: Justus Naumann, 1897.
14. Meyer, Carl S., ed. *Moving Frontiers*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1964.
15. Meyer, John P. *Studies in the Augsburg Confession*. Mequon: Seminary Mimeo Co., 1965.
16. Meyer, John. "Shall We Restore the Confessional?" *Theologische Quartalschrift*, April, 1927.
17. Nelson, E. Clifford. *The Lutherans in North America*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

- 18.-Neve, J.L. *A Brief History of the Lutheran Church in America*. Burlington: German Literary Board, 1916.
19. Schaller, John. *Pastorale Praxis*. Milwaukee: Northwestern, 1913.
20. Schuetze, Armin, and Habeck, Irwin. *The Shepherd Under Christ*. Milwaukee: Northwestern, 1974.
21. Suelflow, Roy A. *A Plan for Survival*. New York: Greenwich, 1965.
22. Tappert, Theodore, trans. *The Book of Concord*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1959.
23. Walther, C.F.W. *Amerikanish-Lutherisch Pastoraltheologie*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1872.
24. Westberg, Granger. "Private Confession in the Lutheran Church," *Augustana Quarterly*, Vol. 24, 1945.