

The Revised *This We Believe* of the WELS on the Ministry

by Thomas P. Nass

[This article was published in *LOGIA*, vol. 10, no. 3 (Trinity 2001): 31-41.]

When *LOGIA* announced that this issue was to be a symposium on the ministry, I thought it ironic. One could argue that *LOGIA* throughout its history has been an ongoing symposium on the ministry! The doctrine of the ministry, of course, continues to be the most hotly discussed topic in contemporary Lutheranism. *LOGIA* has frequently published articles on this doctrine.

Readers of *LOGIA* may find it interesting to know that, when the Commission on Inter-Church Relations (CICR) of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (WELS) recently produced a revised edition of the WELS doctrinal booklet *This We Believe* (TWB) for the WELS Conference of Presidents,¹ the doctrine of the ministry was also the most thoroughly discussed topic in our revision process. There are some seventeen editions of TWB saved on floppy discs in my files as secretary of the revising committee. Without a doubt the section that was the most difficult and time-consuming was the doctrine of the ministry. It is not that the WELS has changed its teaching on this or any other point. The revision of TWB was undertaken simply to clarify the original TWB first produced in 1967, and to add some important points not previously addressed. But it was not easy to come upon just the right wording for this topic.

In this article I would like to share the final wording of the revised *This We Believe* on the ministry, especially for those who may not have seen it in any other place. I will also add commentary that may prove helpful in understanding more fully the intention of TWB.

I will also comment on some of the past discussion that has appeared in *LOGIA* and in other places on the doctrine of the ministry. In the ongoing discussions on the ministry, WELS readers sometimes feel that the WELS position is misunderstood when articulated by others. WELS readers also sense that statements are sometimes made that go beyond the “pattern of sound teaching” (2 Ti 1:13). Examples of both will be shared in light of the revised TWB.

The Priesthood of Believers

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

The revised *This We Believe* devotes the first of its four paragraphs on the ministry to the priesthood of all believers. The point is clearly made that all believers in Jesus are priests. One aspect of their priesthood is the ability and responsibility to use the keys.

Here one is faced immediately with the issue of the word *minister*. It is fair to say that the use of this word has broadened in general WELS usage in recent years. At one time, the word *minister* was in most cases a synonym for “pastor.” Now the word is freely used for forms of the public ministry other than the pastoral office. The church I attend has a full-time “minister of family and youth” and a full-time “minister of administration” in addition to two full-time pastors. Laypeople are sometimes also said to be “ministers” in that they are to serve other people by sharing the gospel with them.

This does not mean that laypeople are in the public ministry, however, or that the priesthood of believers and the public ministry are now blended into one. It does not mean that all forms of the public ministry are identical. Subsequent paragraphs in TWB make clear that the WELS teaches the divine institution and

importance of both the royal priesthood and the public ministry. The WELS looks on the pastoral ministry as a distinct form of the public ministry with special responsibilities. There have also been cautions expressed in the WELS that we be sure to communicate clearly about our use of the word *minister* so there is no misunderstanding.ⁱⁱ

It is true, however, that the word *ministry* has been used in WELS circles over the years to refer to the authority given to all Christians to forgive and retain sins, as expressed in the fifth chief part of Luther's Small Catechism. The Gausewitz Catechism of 1917, the first English catechism produced by the WELS, translated the German expression *Das Amt der Schlüssel* as "The Ministry of the Keys." *Amt*, like *ministerium*, is a word that can refer to a function or an office.ⁱⁱⁱ In this context *das Amt* is referring to something given to all believers. It makes good sense to translate *Amt* with the English word *ministry*, a word that can connote a duty or work that all believers are to do. Then the English word *office* can be reserved for the discussion of the public ministry where people are called into specific positions. The 1982 WELS Catechism by David P. Kuske translated *Das Amt der Schlüssel* as "The Use of the Keys."^{iv} So WELS people have been accustomed to think that there is a general "ministry" given to all believers to open the doors of heaven by telling others about Christ. The 1969 WELS "Theses on the Church and Ministry" say, "This office or service, the ministry of the keys, has been given to the Church, i.e. to the believers individually and collectively."^v

It is no secret that there have been voices in Lutheranism and *LOGIA* who have wanted to deny to laypeople the ministry of the keys.^{vi} One *LOGIA* writer has asserted that not only the Great Commission in Matthew 28, but the entire book of Matthew is addressed to the apostles, and then to their successors in the office of the holy ministry.^{vii} The WELS agrees with Luther when he states that the keys were given to the whole church. Luther wrote: "The keys belong to the whole church and to each of its members, both as regards their authority and their various uses."^{viii} The WELS recognizes that in the New Testament, "texts parallel to the Great Commission indicate that the Great Commission too is applicable to all Christians."^{ix} Of course the Tractate also insists that "the keys belong immediately to the entire Church" (Tr 24).

There have even been those who have maintained that the sacraments,^x absolution, and the Word of God itself^{xi} are efficacious only when used by a called pastor, and not by a layperson. This, to the WELS way of thinking, is a return to Romanism in conflict with the Lutheran Confessions (AC VIII; FC SD VII:24-26, 89). The power of the means of grace is in the Word and promise of Christ, not in the office or person of the pastor.

There are also voices that put unscriptural limits on the use of the keys by laypeople. There are those who say that laypeople have been given the keys, but laypeople are to use them only as they collectively call pastors. They say that laypeople relinquish their use of the keys when pastors are called. Thereafter, if laypeople use the keys, they are acting only as surrogate pastors.^{xii} Some quote Tractate 24 for support.

This seems to be an example of taking a confessional statement and using it to address an issue foreign to its context. The issue in the Tractate was whether or not the Lutheran pastors were true pastors because they had not been ordained by Roman bishops. The answer was that all Christians have the keys, and groups of Christians therefore have the power to call pastors for themselves. The Lutheran pastors were legitimate. The Tractate does not say or imply, however, that this is the *only thing* laypeople can do with the keys. This is one use; it does not deny the ongoing use of the keys by laypeople in their daily lives of service.

Certainly additional Bible passages could be given beyond those in TWB to show that believers are to share the gospel with others. It is not just the called pastors who are to use the keys. In the book of Acts we hear that all the believers "preached the word" when they were scattered (Ac 8:1,4; 11:19-20). All Christians are to be prepared "to give an answer" (1 Pe 3:15). All Christians are told to "encourage," "teach," "admonish," and "instruct" one another (1 Th 4:18; 5:11; Heb 3:13; 10:24-25; Col 3:16; Ro 15:14). Christian brothers are to "restore" the person who is caught in a sin (Gal 6:1). Parents are to teach their children (Eph 6:4).

One also thinks of Matthew 18:15-18. The first step in the admonition of an erring brother is for the individual Christian to "show him his fault." Only later does one take the matter to the church and involve the public ministers. Here it seems evident that individual Christians are expected to use the keys on their own

without functioning as substitute pastors. Their use, however, is not at odds or in competition with the public ministry of the church. It is in addition to and in harmony with the public ministry of the church.

The Public Ministry

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

Divine Institution

Over the years the WELS has sometimes been accused of denying the divine institution of the public ministry. The WELS has been accused of following Höfling by teaching that the public ministry is just a human innovation designed out of expediency.

Attention in this regard focuses on the Wauwatosa theologians (J.P. Koehler, August Pieper, and John Schaller) who restudied the issue of church and ministry in the early twentieth century. It is true that the Wauwatosa theologians stressed the divine institution of the one gospel ministry given to all believers in the church.^{xiii} Yet they also insisted that all forms of the public ministry are established by God in that the church develops the forms under the providence of God and the forms carry out the divinely established work of spreading the gospel.^{xiv} In addition, August Pieper stated, "Not only the one species, the local pastorate, but the public ministry of the Word *in genere* is a divine institution."^{xv} Further study could be done on exactly what the Wauwatosa theologians meant when they talked about divine institution. But certainly they would have denied that the public ministry is a strictly human creation.

Subsequent WELS writing has made clear that the WELS does teach the divine institution of the public ministry. In 1932, WELS theologians were able to agree with LCMS theologians on thesis 2 of the Thiensville Theses: "2. Again, it is God's will and order, as we learn from the Scriptures, that such local congregations have shepherds and teachers to discharge the common task of the office of the Word in their midst."^{xvi} The 1969 WELS Theses state: "This public ministry...constitutes a *special God-ordained way of practicing the one ministry of the Gospel*...It would be wrong to trace the origin of this public ministry to mere expediency (Hoefling)."^{xvii}

In the past decade a stream of WELS publications have made clear, along with this paragraph from TWB, that the WELS affirms the divine institution of the public ministry. The People's Bible Teachings book *Church—Mission—Ministry* says, "It is important to know that God himself instituted the public ministry for his church."^{xviii} Recent articles in the *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* have provided Bible support beyond the Ephesians passage quoted in TWB.^{xix}

In short, the WELS teaches that the public ministry is not optional. Wherever Christians are, God wants there to be servants who shepherd them with the means of grace as representatives of Christ.^{xx}

Relationship between the Royal Priesthood and the Public Ministry

What is the relationship between the royal priesthood and the public ministry? The WELS would say that both have the same overall commission and goal. It is "proclaiming the Gospel in Word and Sacrament"

for “the edification of the Church.”^{xxxi} Both are driven by a desire to save lost sinners by guiding them to faith in the crucified and risen Savior Jesus Christ.

Yet the royal priesthood and the public ministry are not equated. The WELS defines “public ministry” as ministry that is not done at the initiative of the individual Christian. It is ministry done because a group of Christians have called a person to do it on their behalf. The WELS recognizes that not every believer serves in the public ministry, but only those called by the church to use the means of grace. “Christians are not all equally qualified to perform publicly the functions of the ministry” and “no one may assume the functions of the public ministry except through a legitimate call.”^{xxiii} Some Christians are called by the church to full-time positions of public ministry. Some are called to part-time positions of public ministry, such as Sunday school teaching. But in all cases, the royal priesthood and the public ministry are kept distinct. Believers are to carry out the tasks that have been assigned to the public ministry only when they have been called to do so.

For example, when a layperson is asked to make elder calls on behalf of the congregation or assist in the distribution of the Lord’s Supper, the WELS would say he is functioning in a limited form of the public ministry. He is doing this work on behalf of the congregation because he is “called” to do it. When a layperson witnesses about Christ at the work place, however, he is functioning in his capacity as a royal priest.

It would be wrong for a layperson to perform the functions of the public ministry without being called to do so. A layperson should not set up a Bible study in his home and invite members of the church without the commission and call of the church. A layperson should not baptize his own children or conduct his own Lord’s Supper services at home. The royal priesthood and the public ministry are not blended together. Public ministry is to be performed only by those properly called.

In addition, it would be misleading to say that the public ministry is derived from the royal priesthood.^{xxiii} The origin of the public ministry is with God himself. God has brought it into existence. The public ministry is not a human innovation, created by people to fulfill a need. We would agree with John Johnson when he says, “Lutheranism keeps the universal and special priesthood in dialectical tension, avoiding the temptation of deriving one from the other.”^{xxiv}

Yet it is true that the church fills the offices of the public ministry by calling individuals into the public ministry. As John Johnson also states, “The divine gift of the Office has been given to the church and demands filling. The church, the Priesthood of all Believers, has the authority to fill the Office and to regulate it.”^{xxv} Perhaps the best way to describe the public ministry, then, is Walther’s axiom “by Christ through the church.” When a person serves in the public ministry, he is a “servant of Christ” first and foremost. He has authority from Christ as Christ’s representative. But he also is serving on behalf of the Christians who called him. One could say he is both a representative of Christ and a representative of the calling body of Christians.

In 1998, as part of the 150th anniversary celebration of the LCMS, a theological convocation was held on the topic of church and ministry, and the essays have been published. Throughout the essays there is a consistent theme that “the Office of the Public Ministry and the Priesthood of Believers are gifts of God; they are givens.”^{xxvi} It is stressed that the priesthood of believers and the public ministry are not to be “at odds with one another, or in competition with each other.”^{xxvii} The church needs both the priesthood of believers and the public ministry doing their parts to spread the gospel with harmony and mutual support. These themes are the same themes that are heard and held to in the WELS.

Various Forms

The objection that WELS readers do have to the recent LCMS anniversary essays, however, is in regard to the forms of the public ministry. Throughout the essays it is assumed consistently that the public ministry is the pastoral ministry. Every single essay displays this understanding. Pastors comprise the public ministry, and no one else.

This understanding has not always been consistently maintained in the LCMS. Authors such as Arnold C. Mueller allowed for Lutheran teachers to be included in the public ministry.^{xxviii} An instructive essay by Robert M. Toepper recently laid out the history of this issue in the LCMS.^{xxix} But it seems that, since the publication of *The Ministry: Offices, Procedures, and Nomenclature* in 1981,^{xxx} LCMS leaders have stressed

that only pastors are in the office of the public ministry. *LOGIA* has printed an article maintaining that the vocation of a Christian teacher is “in the same category as a butcher, baker, or candlestick maker.”^{xxxix}

For an outsider to the LCMS, this narrowing of the public ministry is hard to understand. In the LCMS men and women teachers are considered “ministers of the Gospel” for tax purposes. They are called and officially commissioned or installed. They are servants of the church, carrying out gospel work for the church. Yet they are not considered in the office of the public ministry. They are only in “auxiliary offices”—not really laypeople and not really in the office of the public ministry.

The commonly expressed dividing lines seem arbitrary. Some say that only ordained pastors who serve in a parish or teach the whole church as seminary professors are in the public ministry. Others are not.^{xxxii} I wonder about my own status by this definition, since I am an ordained pastor who teaches Hebrew to future pastors at the college level. Two *LOGIA* writers, in keeping with this mindset, have argued that missionaries should be included in the office of the public ministry.^{xxxiii} Such a point would never be an issue in the WELS. Others say that only those qualified for the whole ministry of Word and sacrament are in the public ministry. They say those trained as pastors are included, or those who are ordained.

The WELS teaches that the church has freedom to establish different “forms” or positions or offices of public ministry. The WELS *Yearbook* has three categories of full-time public ministers who may circulate from one congregation to another: pastors, men and women teachers, and staff ministers. The term “staff ministry” has come to be used as a catchall category for individuals who are part of a church staff, but are not pastors or teachers. In the “staff ministry” category are ministers of evangelism, ministers of family and youth, ministers of administration, deaconesses, gift planning counselors, and numerous other offices.

The reason why the WELS allows for a variety of “forms” of the public ministry is that the New Testament manifests a variety of “forms” and nowhere dictates that only pastors are in the public ministry. Ephesians 4:11 says that Christ “gave some to be apostles, some to be prophets, some to be evangelists, and some to be pastors and teachers.” This implies different offices or different job descriptions for different people. In 1 Corinthians 12:28-29 Paul says:

In the church God has appointed first of all apostles, second prophets, third teachers, then workers of miracles, also those having gifts of healing, those able to help others, those with gifts of administration, and those speaking in different kinds of tongues. Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Do all work miracles?

In 1 Timothy 3:1-13 Paul gives qualifications for overseers, deacons, and possibly deaconesses (or else deacons’ wives).

It is not just WELS writers who have taken note of this variety of forms in the New Testament. Chytraeus^{xxxiv} and Chemnitz^{xxxv} have been quoted in support of various “grades” or forms of the public ministry. Gottfried Herrmann has pointed out in a recent essay that both Carl Manthey-Zorn and Wilhelm Oesch allowed for the possibility of other forms of the public ministry in addition to the office of the parish pastor.^{xxxvi}

It is interesting to note that the Tractate itself uses a variety of titles when it describes church offices. There is the pastor (*pastor/parochus/Pastor/Pfarrherr*), bishop (*episcopus/Bischof*), minister (*minister/ecclesiastes/Kirchendiener*), elder (*presbyterus*), teacher (*doctor/Lehrer*), superintendent (*superintendens*), and preacher (*concionator/Prediger*). The Tractate says that a local pastor may ordain suitable persons to the church offices (*zu den Kirchenämtern*) (Tr 65). In neither the New Testament nor the Lutheran Confessions is there an effort to limit the public ministry of the church to one form.

Luther also is commonly quoted as allowing various forms in the public ministry. In his “Sermon on Keeping Children in School” of 1530 he said:

The estate I am thinking of is rather one which has the office of preaching and the service of the word and sacraments and which imparts the Spirit and salvation, blessings that cannot be

attained by any amount of pomp and pageantry. It includes the work of pastors, teachers, preachers, lectors, priests (whom men call chaplains), sacristans, schoolmasters, and whatever other work belongs to these offices and persons.^{xxxvii}

To maintain that only pastors are in the public ministry, some assume that these various titles were different names for the same office, the “pastoral ministry.” Or, they assume that these positions were different “grades” of the pastoral ministry, much in the way that we have senior pastors and assistant pastors. In this connection, some say that the deacons in the New Testament were equivalent to pastors.^{xxxviii}

To this a WELS person would respond: “How do we know for sure that all these forms were different grades of the pastoral ministry? How do we know for sure that the deacons were equivalent to pastors?” Certainly the title “elder” was interchangeable with “overseer” in the New Testament, and both referred to a position of oversight similar in many ways to our pastors (Ac 20:17,28; Tit 1:6,7; 1 Pe 5:1,2). But there is nothing clearly indicating in the New Testament that all the other positions were different titles for the same office, or different “grades” in the same office. The office of deacon especially seems to be a separate office (Php 1:1). The fact that the office of deacon has qualifications listed side-by-side with the office of overseer implies that it was distinctly different (1 Ti 3:8-13). Otherwise, why would there be two lists?

It has also been assumed that some of these New Testament positions were not really in the public ministry. Some say that to be in the public ministry, one has to be entrusted with the full use of the means of grace. An article in *LOGIA* argued that the public ministry is an all-or-nothing proposition. If a person is in the public ministry, he must have all the functions of the ministry. If a person hasn’t been entrusted with all the functions, then he is not in the public ministry.^{xxxix} In keeping with this argument, some would say that the deacons were not really in the office of the public ministry but in an auxiliary office, because they weren’t entrusted with the full use of the means of grace.^{xl}

Again, a WELS reader would ask: “How can we know for sure that to be in the public ministry one needs to be entrusted with the full use of the means of grace?” When Jesus established the public ministry by calling followers to be “fishers of men” (Mt 4:19; Lk 5:10), by picking the twelve apostles (Lk 6:13), and by sending out the seventy-two (Lk 10:1), it is not clearly articulated that each of these individuals was to carry out all of the functions of the means of grace. In the epistles there are a variety of offices without it being said that each officeholder did everything. For example, can we say for sure that the prophets had the full use of the means of grace, so they were in an office equivalent to the apostles and elders? Can we say for sure that the teachers and evangelists of Ephesians 4:11 had the full use of the means of grace? The WELS would say these are assertions that go beyond what we can know with certainty on the basis of the New Testament. Perhaps the teachers were catechists who left the administration of the Lord’s Supper to the elders. Perhaps the evangelists were individuals specially commissioned for outreach who left the administration of the Lord’s Supper to the elders. The point is that “nothing in Scripture says every minister of the Word must be called to do all of these things.”^{xli}

The issue comes to a head with the deacons. The WELS would say that it is at least a possibility that the deacons were public ministers who were helpers in some way to the elders or overseers in a subordinate office of the public ministry of the Word that did not include the full use of the keys. This is how the office of deacon often showed itself in church history. If this were granted, it seems a small step to make a comparison with the school teachers or staff ministers of our modern congregations. Here then is a form of public ministry distinct from the office of overseer that helps in the gospel ministry of the congregation.

Though every comparison limps, some WELS writers have compared the situation of the public ministry of the church with that of civil government. According to Romans 13:1-6, civil government is something that God has instituted. In addition, each individual governing authority has been “established by God” and should be respected as “God’s servant.” Yet God’s Word never mandates any particular form of government or any particular title. So it is also with the ministry of the church. God wants there to be public ministers of the gospel. Each public minister should be received as a servant of Christ who has been put into authority by God.

Each public minister serves in the divinely instituted public ministry of the church. Yet no one form or position is mandated, and the forms may vary in scope of work.

How Wide is the Public Ministry?

How wide then is the public ministry? Can there be public ministers of the church who do not minister with the means of grace, but only support the ministry of the church in other ways? Here some WELS writers have been willing hypothetically to allow the possibility of some sort of “public ministry” without any direct use of the keys on the basis of the “Seven” in Acts 6 who were called to a “ministry” of food distribution.^{xlii} Without a doubt the work of the Seven supported the preaching of the gospel because it permitted the apostles to devote themselves to the “ministry of the word.” Yet it could be argued that a different title should be given to service of this sort, since the term “public ministry” has historically been used to refer to the ministry of the gospel itself.

In practice, the WELS thinks of the public ministry only in terms of those who minister directly with the means of grace. TWB in its public ministry section speaks only of the “ministry of the Word.” I recently attended a meeting of ELS and WELS leaders where ELS leaders asked the president of the WELS and the WELS seminary president if there are any positions of public ministry in the WELS that do not involve direct ministry with the means of grace. The answer was a clear no. All of the one hundred or so staff ministers in the *Yearbook* minister in some way with the Word of God. The “minister of administration” at the church I attend, for example, writes articles for the church newsletter giving Bible encouragement. He has opened meetings with Scripture reading and prayer. He has given stewardship training to the congregation and conducted Bible classes. We consider our schoolteachers on all levels to be in the public ministry, because they serve young people with the Word. They serve on behalf of the church and not just on behalf of the parents of the children. Often they serve children of mission prospects whose parents are not even members of the church. Even the physical education professors at Martin Luther College are called into the public ministry, because they are expected to use the Word of God with students. As coaches, they may lead their teams in prayer. As faculty advisors for students, they are expected to counsel students with God’s Word. Customarily when a decision is being made in the WELS whether some office in the church should be a “called” position of public ministry or a “hired” position, the decision is made on the basis of whether or not the individual will be using the Word of God to instruct, train, and counsel. Whenever a group of Christians calls a person to use the Word of God on their behalf, we consider that individual to be in the public ministry.

Though none of the individual forms are directly commanded by God, yet the individuals who serve in each of the forms know they serving in a divine calling. Each form is a concrete manifestation of the public ministry that is established by God. As stated by August Pieper:

It would be false, however, if one would declare the distinctive pastoral office to be a human arrangement. What is human in every species of the public ministry is only the form, the outward arrangement. The content, the command, the commission, the power directed to the Church to preach the Gospel through capable men as also to dispense the Sacraments in an orderly way is and remains divine.^{xliii}

The Pastoral Ministry

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

The Most Comprehensive Form

This paragraph is a new addition to TWB. It was added, in part, because the WELS is sometimes accused of having too low a view of the pastoral ministry. Some say that in the WELS the pastoral ministry is just one form on an equal level with many others, and that the pastoral ministry is therefore basically expendable or superfluous. A *LOGIA* book review stated that in the WELS, “pastors and stewardship directors are equally necessary or expendable.”^{xliv} A recent *LOGIA* article claims that there is a very strong impulse in the WELS “to denounce the clerical office, and to dissolve the office of preaching into functions of people other than the ordained clergy.”^{xlv}

In reality, the WELS has a high view of the pastoral office. This is the one form of the public ministry that is universally found. Every WELS member belongs to a local congregation; every congregation has a pastor or pastors who shepherd it. The training program for pastors in the WELS continues to be thorough, with a minimum of four years of college at Martin Luther College in New Ulm, Minnesota, and four years of seminary at Mequon, Wisconsin, for most students. The majority of our students begin studies for the pastoral ministry on the high school level.

When the CICR wrestled with the writing of this paragraph, it considered a number of different adjectives to describe the pastoral ministry. We considered saying that the pastoral ministry is the “most common” form of the public ministry. In the WELS, if a group of Christians has only one form of the public ministry, it inevitably is a pastor. Every single one of the approximately 1250 congregations of the WELS has a pastor (or vacancy pastor) to shepherd it. Many congregations do not have any other full-time forms of the public ministry, inasmuch as there are about 365 Lutheran elementary schools in the WELS and about 100 staff ministers. But “most common” was rejected as a description for the pastoral ministry because numerically across the synod there are more teachers than pastors. According to the WELS *Statistical Report*, there are about 1300 active parish pastors and missionaries. In contrast, there are about 2750 active male and female teachers.^{xlvi}

Other adjectives considered were “essential” or “necessary.” Again, the way things are structured in the WELS, there are no free-floating members of the WELS. All WELS members find themselves under the oversight of a local pastor. Every congregation has a pastor. This is the one form that is universal and in a sense required, in the way that we operate. Yet theoretically, we would say that if a congregation somewhere wanted to structure itself differently, this would not necessarily be sinful, because the New Testament doesn’t give regulations about church polity and forms of ministry. If a group of Christians had a committee of elders who took turns preaching and conducting services or divided up the public ministry duties in some other way, we could not say that this arrangement is contrary to God’s Word. Actually the situation in Corinth according to 1 Corinthians 14 may have been more like this than our usual arrangement.

The CICR also considered referring to the pastoral ministry as the “foundational” or “basic” form of ministry. These words could be properly understood. The pastoral ministry is the most basic form in that it is the one that will always be put in place first among us. If a congregation has only one form, it will be a pastor. Yet these adjectives were rejected because they too could be subject to misunderstanding. Christian theologians often talk about the apostolic ministry as the foundational form of ministry in the church, and certainly the church is not built on pastors in the way that it is built on the apostles. In addition these words could convey the notion that other forms of ministry are direct offshoots or branches off of the pastoral ministry. The WELS would not say this.

Finally the commission considered calling the pastoral ministry the “most important” form of the public ministry. Without a doubt, I sometimes say to pastor students that I think more good can be done for the kingdom of God by a pastor than any other position on earth. Pastors shepherd congregations and preach God’s Word week in and week out. Tremendous good can come to the kingdom through this office. August Pieper was bold enough to state, “The parish ministry in the form familiar to us is the chief species, the most complete, most important, and most necessary species of the ecclesiastical ministry.”^{xlvii} The apostle Paul himself called some offices greater than others because of their usefulness in edifying the church (1 Co 12:28,31; 14:5). Yet the term “most important” was rejected because it too could be open to misunderstanding. We do not want the people in other forms of the public ministry to sense in any way that they are not important. We don’t want

pastors to develop wrong notions of self-importance. True greatness in all forms of ministry comes through humble service (Mt 18:1-4; Mk 10:42-44).

In the end, the adjective that was agreed upon was the adjective “comprehensive.” The way the pastoral ministry has been designed among us and among Christians generally, is as an office that involves the general spiritual oversight of congregations. It is wide-ranging and broad in scope. The ministry of teachers is limited to one activity and often to a selected age-group of students. Staff ministers are not trained and called to lead worship or preach. Pastors, however, are trained as general practitioners who serve as the overall shepherds of all the members of the congregation.

We would say that the pastoral office is the one office that is not limited by its nature in the use of the means of grace. The calls of pastors are not from the beginning circumscribed in the way that the calls of teachers and staff ministers are. Certainly not every pastor uses all of the means of grace in every way possible. C.F.W. Walther once said it is impossible for any one person anywhere to carry out all of the possible functions of the keys.^{xlvi} For example, parish pastors usually do not train their own successors. Yet the pastoral ministry is the “most comprehensive” form. It could be said that the pastoral ministry includes the possibility for using the keys in every way imaginable.

The Relationship between the Pastoral Office and Other Forms

This puts one in a position to understand the relationship between the pastoral office and other forms of ministry in the WELS. All forms are received as gifts of God. Individuals in all forms are to respect each other and work together in love and harmony. Yet according to the way the forms have been designed, the pastoral office has overall leadership responsibilities. The following was written in 1992 when the WELS staff ministry program was coming into existence:

Those called to staff ministry positions are not called to supplant the pastor, to whom a congregation assigns oversight of the entire ministry of the gospel. Rather, working hand in hand with the pastor and under his leadership, those serving in staff ministry positions will see themselves as assisting the pastor in the congregation’s ministry in accordance with their gifts and the scope of their call. Unless extraordinary circumstances prevent it, the norm for the spiritual leadership of our congregations certainly should continue to be that they are served by one who has both the thorough theological training and the gifts that enable him to oversee the whole spiritual ministry of the congregation. Staff ministers, whose training will be relatively narrow in scope, can hardly qualify as a replacement for the pastor, no more than can a teacher in one of our elementary schools.^{xlvi}

The pastoral office is also the form of ministry in the WELS that is specially trained and called for worship leading, preaching, and the administration of the sacraments. It has been said that the “WELS allows its teachers as ministers to preach and celebrate the sacrament.”^{li} This is too broadly stated. In forty-five years as a WELS worshipper, I have never witnessed a teacher preach in a congregational worship service or celebrate the sacrament. That is not to say it has not happened or could not happen. Certainly in cases of a pastoral vacancy or absence, a congregation could call a teacher, staff minister, or lay elder to conduct services, and some WELS congregations may do this regularly. In high school and college chapel services teachers will often take their turn in leading devotions, but this is natural in a setting where they have been called as spiritual leaders for the students. Yet teachers and staff ministers are not trained for congregational worship leading, preaching, or the administration of the sacraments. It is our regular practice to call individuals to carry out the functions for which they are trained and qualified, and pastors are trained for these three functions.^{li}

So if someone says that all forms of public ministry in the WELS are equal and on the same level,^{lii} that is not a fair and complete statement. If someone says that pastors in the WELS are expendable, it is an inaccurate representation of our position and our practice. All forms pursue the same goal through the means of grace. Yet the different forms of ministry have different duties. The pastoral ministry is unique and special as

the “most comprehensive” form for general spiritual oversight. It is the form that is universally found in our congregations. It has been called the “primary form which the ministry will usually take.”^{liii}

Also, if someone says that the WELS doctrine will lead to the other forms of ministry challenging the authority of the pastor and supplanting him, I can simply say that this has not been my experience. Having served and worshiped in three congregations with teachers and/or staff ministers in addition to pastors, I have only seen blessings in this arrangement. When the individual duties are spelled out in the individual calls, there is no reason why the various forms cannot work together in love with each individual serving in the capacity to which he was called in keeping with his training. This is not to say there cannot or will not be abuses. But the possibility of abuse lurks on every hand with every doctrinal position, and one does not reject sound doctrine simply out of a fear of possible abuse.

“Missouri” versus “Wisconsin”

I suspect that when one reads about this relationship between pastors and other offices in the WELS, one may conclude that it sounds very similar to the “Missouri” position. It is likely that the way church life operates in everyday practice according to the “Wisconsin” view is probably not much different in most cases than according to the “Missouri” view. Pastors are called for general spiritual oversight. Other offices may or may not exist to help with the work in the congregation. These other forms work under the leadership of the pastor.

To a certain extent one may even conclude that the differences between the “Wisconsin” view and “Missouri” view are a matter of terminology. Certainly the term “public ministry” has to a degree been understood differently. This term, of course, is not found in the Bible, and it therefore necessarily receives ecclesiastical definition. The difference can be illustrated by this comparison:

Pastors	LCMS = the public ministry	WELS = universal and most comprehensive form of public ministry
Teachers/Staff ministers	= auxiliary offices	= other forms of the public ministry
The Public Ministry	= the pastoral office	= called workers using the keys on behalf of others according to the scope of the call

If the difference is only a matter of terminology without a difference in substance, the difference should be tolerated.

There is a difference in substance, however, if Missouri proponents say that the pastoral office is a divine office directly instituted by God and all other forms or offices in contrast are human innovations. The WELS Theses on Church and Ministry state:

There is, however, *no direct word of institution for any particular form of the public ministry.* The one public ministry of the Gospel may assume various forms, as circumstances demand.... We hold it to be untenable to say that the pastorate of the local congregation (*Pfarramt*) as a specific form of the public ministry is specifically instituted by the Lord in contrast to other forms of the public ministry.^{liv}

The Authority of the Pastor

If pastors are to be comprehensive overseers of local congregations, the next question naturally is, How much authority do they have?

In the eyes of this writer, some unfortunate positions have been articulated in *LOGIA* on this point. There has been an article advocating that pastors are to “rule” the congregation, and no distinction was made

between spiritual matters decided by the Word of God and adiaphora.^{lv} There has been an article suggesting that Grabau was more on target than Walther on the topic of the ministry.^{lvi} Another article has advocated that the pastor is the “ecclesiastical embodiment” of Jesus.^{lvii}

On this point the WELS would stand side by side with Walther against Grabau. Grabau and the Buffalo Synod said that congregations owe obedience to their pastors in everything that is not contrary to the Word of God. The Second Synodical Report of the Buffalo Synod said:

Lutheran Christians know that when God’s Word says “obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves,” this does not merely apply to preaching but to all good Christian things and affairs which are bound up with the Word of God and desired by it, which also belong to the good government of the churches and to Christian welfare in life and work, and that honor, love, and obedience is demanded according to the third and fourth commandment...Here the demanded obedience is throughout a matter of conscience.^{lviii}

Walther responded with his Thesis IX, “To the ministry there is due respect as well as unconditional obedience when the pastor uses God’s Word. But the minister must not tyrannize the church. He has no authority to introduce new laws or arbitrarily to establish adiaphora or ceremonies. He has no right to inflict and carry out excommunication without his having first informed the whole congregation.”^{lix}

TWB quotes 1 Peter 5:3. Public ministers are not to lord it over the church. In matters decided by the Word of God, we acknowledge that public ministers need to be obeyed. They have authority by divine right in such matters. But in matters not decided by the Word of God, public ministers have no right to bind the congregation to their opinion. In matters of adiaphora, public ministers have authority only if the congregation chooses to give them authority by human right.

Ordination

Careful readers will notice that nothing is said about ordination in the revised TWB. This is because the WELS agrees with Walther that ordination is not a matter of Bible doctrine. Walther’s Thesis VI.B states, “The ordination of the called [persons] with the laying on of hands is not a divine institution but merely an ecclesiastical rite [*Ordnung*] established by the apostles; it is no more than a solemn public confirmation of the call.”^{lx} The WELS continues to use ordination to give public recognition that an individual is qualified and called to serve in the public ministry. But the WELS looks upon ordination as a church custom and not something mandatory according to God’s Word.

It should be mentioned that discussion is continuing in the WELS about who should be ordained. Since 1991 the WELS has been ordaining its male teachers when they begin their public ministries. There has been ongoing debate within the WELS about this decision, however. It was restudied and reaffirmed at the 1995 synod convention. Some would like it to be reconsidered again at the 2001 convention.

When the WELS ordains male teachers, however, this does not equate the office of teacher with the office of pastor. Teachers are ordained into the “teaching ministry” and pastors into the “pastoral ministry.” This action is also not a novelty in the history of the church. The Roman Catholic Church has traditionally ordained its deacons, and yet the ministry of the deacons is kept separate from that of priests and bishops.^{lxi} The “Seven” in Acts 6:1-6 went through a ceremony of the laying on of hands that seems like an ordination (Ac 6:6). Luther himself ordained George Roerer into the office of deacon in 1525. Those in the WELS who have misgivings about the decision to ordain teachers are concerned that this action is insensitive to the way the term “ordination” has been used generally in the Lutheran heritage. Yet all participants in this discussion in the WELS realize that the matter is an adiaphoron upon which brothers can disagree, because ordination is not commanded in Scripture.

There have been *LOGIA* articles that have taken the position that ordination is a necessity for one to serve in the pastoral ministry.^{lxii} This was the position held by Grabau, and it once again smacks of Roman Catholicism to WELS readers. The WELS would hold to the thoughts of Adolf Hoenecke: “Whoever has the

legitimate call of a congregation is a pastor and needs nothing further to be a pastor. Ordination is nothing more than the church's act of recognizing and confirming someone's calling...We therefore teach that ordination gives the ministerial office to no one, because Scripture does not say so or command it."^{lxiii}

The Ministry of Women

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

This paragraph is also an addition to the revised TWB, needed for current conditions. Here the WELS finds itself defending its practice on both sides. Some say that women should not be in the public ministry at all. One *LOGIA* article goes so far as to say that women do not have the keys, and "can therefore neither bind nor loose a person in respect to sin."^{lxiv} Others say women should serve in all forms of the public ministry, including the pastoral office. The WELS says women may be in the public ministry in positions that do not involve authority over men. Presently the WELS has over 1600 women active in the full-time teaching ministry. There are a growing number of deaconesses listed in the staff ministry section of the *Yearbook* who minister in some way to women and children. But there are no women pastors, and women do not vote in the decision-making assemblies of the church.

To defend the practice of calling women into some forms of the public ministry, the WELS appeals primarily to the variety of forms in the New Testament and the freedom given to the church to establish the forms necessary to carry out its work. It is certainly true that there were many women involved in the work of the early church (Ro 16). There may have been an embryonic deaconess office already at Paul's time. When Phoebe is called a *diakonos* (Ro 16:1), many assume this is a technical term for "deaconess."^{lxv} The qualifications in 1 Timothy 3:11 may well be for such deaconesses.^{lxvi} Without a doubt the church made use of deaconesses in many locations in its subsequent history, and in some circumstances they were even ordained.^{lxvii} It is no novelty for the WELS to involve women in the work of the church.

To defend its limitation of women to roles that do not involve authority over men, the WELS again appeals to the New Testament. First of all, women in the New Testament were not selected to be apostles, and women are never associated with the office of elder or overseer. But even more importantly, there are clear prescriptive passages based on God's creation order that place limitations on the service of women. Paul says, "I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must be silent. For Adam was formed first, then Eve" (1 Ti 2:12-13). In a section concerned about preaching at the worship services, Paul says, "Women should remain silent in the churches. They are not allowed to speak, but must be in submission, as the Law says" (1 Co 14:34). This is the same argument presented by Jobst Schöne in a *LOGIA* article:

Women have been given a specific position according to creation which places them into a specific relationship to men. The New Testament does not cancel this created order; rather the Holy Spirit affirms this order explicitly through apostolic instruction. There are clear passages of Scripture which support this position: Eph 5:21-33; 1 Cor 14:33-38; 1 Tim 2:11-15.^{lxviii}

When writing this paragraph of TWB, the CICR had to decide whether or not to include the word *pastor*. Could a woman be called, for example, to be the "pastor" of a group of women? Luther once said, "If, however, only women were present and no men, as in nunneries, then one of the women might be authorized to preach."^{lxix} The CICR decided to state clearly that women should not serve as pastors. The reason for this strong statement is that the word *pastor* is used among us for the office of general congregational oversight. This office invariably involves the teaching of men and authority over men, and women therefore should not be called into it. The CICR also sensed that an unambiguous statement on this crucial point would be useful in our

current age. This is not to deny, however, that women may be called into positions of public ministry that serve women and children. Increasingly there are WELS congregations who are calling women into such wholesome positions for the good of the church. The CICR assumes the title *deaconess* will be used for such positions.

Past *LOGIA* articles, to my knowledge, have spoken with one voice on the prohibition of women's ordination into the pastoral ministry. This may be the only aspect of the doctrine of the ministry where such uniform agreement has been evident in this publication. Nevertheless, I am not sure that the reasons have always been equally valid.

The LCMS in recent years has allowed women to vote in decision-making assemblies, to serve on decision-making boards and committees, and to serve as elders and congregation presidents. To the WELS way of thinking there has been a capitulation on the basic principle of headship; women are allowed to serve in many positions of authority. Now it is a difficult task to draw the line so that they are not ordained as pastors. More and more the reason given in the LCMS for women not serving as pastors seems to be that Christ was male and pastors represent Christ.^{lxx} More and more the argument is made in the arena of the public ministry, and not in the arena of the creation order, that "the head of the woman is man" (1 Co 11:3). There is an appeal to precedent rather than precept.

This is a weaker argument, and I wonder if it can be sustained. Rome has always insisted that priests must be celibate because Christ was celibate, but Lutherans have not followed. How far can one go in constructing one's doctrine on the basis of analogy? I also wonder whether this situation does not exacerbate the need in Missouri to draw a tight circle around the pastoral office and not to speak of any other office as "the public ministry" except the pastoral office. Limiting the public ministry to the pastoral office, I suspect, is considered useful in opposing women's ordination.

As is evident in TWB, the WELS charts a different course. The WELS prefers to use the Pauline passages about men's and women's roles as the basis for its practice. Then we are free to admit women into appropriate offices of public ministry without fear that they will enter into the pastoral office or other positions of authority over men.

Conclusion

I would not be surprised if there are readers who have always imagined that the WELS is on the extreme fringe in Lutheranism when it comes to the doctrine of the ministry, based on impressions (or sometimes misinformation) that have circulated.

As a person who has grown up in the WELS and preached and taught in the WELS, however, I have just the opposite impression. The doctrine found in this revision of TWB presents itself as the teaching of God's Word, and in this discussion, as in all doctrinal discussions, the Bible must remain on center stage as the source of all doctrine. The doctrine of TWB shows itself to be in harmony with the Lutheran Confessions and the conservative Lutheran heritage. The doctrine of TWB also *avoids* the extremes on both sides.

First, consider the relationship of the royal priesthood to the public ministry. On one extreme are those who highlight the public ministry to the detriment of the royal priesthood. Some say the public ministry is a means of grace, the only channel through which God works. Some say the royal priesthood does not have the keys. On the other extreme are those who highlight the royal priesthood to the detriment of the public ministry. Some say the public ministry is not important or divinely necessary. Some say the royal priesthood can carry out all the public functions of the ministry. In contrast TWB gives full value and importance to both the royal priesthood and the public ministry.

Second, consider the relationship of the pastoral ministry to other forms of the public ministry. On one extreme are those who say that only pastors are in the public ministry. On the other extreme are those who say that pastors are not important or are on an equal plane with all other forms. TWB gives the honor of the public ministry to all who are called to use the means of grace on behalf of the church. But TWB also recognizes the pastoral ministry as a special form, in that it exercises comprehensive spiritual oversight over local congregations.

Finally, consider the role of women in the church. On one extreme are those who deny that women can serve in any form of the public ministry. On the other extreme are those who ordain women into the pastoral ministry and put them into any and all positions of leadership in the church. TWB opens the door for service in the public ministry to women in roles that are appropriate. TWB, in faithfulness to God's Word, limits their service to roles that do not involve authority over men.

One could argue that the doctrine of TWB presents a wholesome middle ground that avoids saying more or less than Scripture on the topic of the ministry.

Endnotes

ⁱ *This We Believe* (Milwaukee: Northwestern, 1999).

ⁱⁱ John F. Brug, "Current Debate Concerning the Doctrine of the Ministry," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 91, no. 1 (Winter 1994): 31.

ⁱⁱⁱ Mark Nispel, "Office and Offices: Some Basic Lutheran Philology," *LOGIA* 6, no. 3 (Trinity 1997): 6.

^{iv} David P. Kuske, *Luther's Catechism* (Milwaukee: WELS Board for Parish Education, 1982), 270.

^v *Doctrinal Statements of the WELS* (Milwaukee: Northwestern, 1997), 48.

^{vi} Lowell C. Green, "Grabau and Walther: Theocentric versus Anthropocentric Understanding of Church and Ministry," *LOGIA* 5, no. 2 (Eastertide 1996): 25.

^{vii} Thomas M. Winger, "The Office of the Holy Ministry according to the New Testament Mandate of Christ," *LOGIA* 7, no. 2 (Eastertide 1998): 42.

^{viii} AE 40:27.

^{ix} John F. Brug, "The Ministry of the Apostles and Our Ministry," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 92, no. 3 (Summer 1995): 171.

^x Douglas Fusselman, "Only Playing Church? The Lay Minister and The Lord's Supper," *LOGIA* 3, no. 1 (Epiphany 1994): 48.

^{xi} Jonathan Lange, "How Are They to Believe?" *LOGIA* 7, no. 3 (Trinity 1998): 40.

^{xii} James D. Heiser, *The Office of the Keys in the Ecclesiology of C.F.W. Walther and the Lutheran Confessions* (Decatur, IL: Johann Gerhard Institute, 1996): 14-16.

^{xiii} John Schaller, "The Origin and Development of the New Testament Ministry," trans. Roger Fleming, Mark Jeske, Daniel Schaller, Wilbert R. Gawrisch, *The Wauwatosa Theology* (Milwaukee: Northwestern, 1997), 3:78, previously published in *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 78, no. 1 (January 1981): 35.

^{xiv} August Pieper, "Are There Legal Regulations in the New Testament?" trans. Carl J. Lawrenz, *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 86, no. 1 (Winter 1989): 50-51. Similar thoughts are found in August Pieper, "Concerning the Doctrine of the Church and of Its Ministry, With Special Reference to the Synod and Its Discipline," trans. H.J. Vogel, *The Wauwatosa Theology* (Milwaukee: Northwestern, 1997), 3:115, previously published in *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 59, no. 2 (April 1962): 106; and in August Pieper, "Luther's Doctrine of Church and Ministry," trans. Harold R. Johnne, *The Wauwatosa Theology* (Milwaukee: Northwestern, 1997), 3:200-201, previously published in *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 60, no. 4 (October 1963): 257-258.

^{xv} Pieper, "Luther's Doctrine of Church and Ministry," 200.

^{xvi} Three recent publications where the Thiensville Theses may be found are: Edward C. Fredrich, *The Wisconsin Synod Lutherans* (Milwaukee: Northwestern, 1992), 183-184; John M. Brenner, "Forward in Christ: Doctrinal Challenges and Language Change," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 97, no. 3 (Summer 2000): 169-170; and Mark F. Bartling, "Book Review on *The Wauwatosa Theology*," *LOGIA* 9, no. 4 (Reformation 2000): 57.

^{xvii} *Doctrinal Statements of the WELS*, 49-50.

^{xviii} Armin W. Schuetze, *Church—Mission—Ministry* (Milwaukee: Northwestern, 1995), 99.

^{xix} Brian R. Keller, "Church and Ministry: An Exegetical Study of Several Key Passages With Reference To Some Contemporary Issues," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 93, no. 4 (Fall 1996): 267; and John F. Brug, "Current Debate," 33.

^{xx} An interesting but unpublished WELS essay on this topic is Joel Fredrich, "The Divine Institution of Gospel Ministry," presented at a pastors' conference in Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin on October 18, 1994.

^{xxi} *Doctrinal Statements of the WELS*, 48-49.

^{xxii} *Ibid.*, 49.

^{xxiii} John F. Brug, "The Priesthood of All Believers and the Ministry," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 91, no. 2 (Spring 1994): 124.

^{xxiv} John Johnson, "The Office of the Pastoral Ministry: Scriptural and Confessional Considerations," *Church and Ministry: The Collected Papers of The 150th Anniversary Theological Convocation of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod*, ed. Jerald C. Joerz and Paul T. McCain (St. Louis: LCMS Office of the President, 1998), 89.

^{xxv} *Ibid.*, 91. Dr. Johnson has some very sensible things to say about the words "function" and "office" in regard to the public ministry. The way some people describe the "functional" view, it would not fit with the WELS.

^{xxvi} Lance G. Steicke, "Response to the Convocation," *Church and Ministry: The Collected Papers*, 253.

^{xxvii} J.A.O. Preus III, "Response to the Convocation," *Church and Ministry: The Collected Papers*, 252.

^{xxviii} Arnold C. Mueller, *The Ministry of the Lutheran Teacher* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1964).

- ^{xxxix} Robert M. Toepper, "Is the Lutheran Teacher a Minister?" *Lutheran Education*, Nov/Dec 1995, Jan/Feb 1996, May/June 1996. This article is in error, however, when it says, "Women teachers in the WELS are not called" (262). Women teachers in the WELS do receive divine calls in the same way that male teachers do.
- ^{xxx} *The Ministry: Offices, Procedures, and Nomenclature* (LCMS Commission on Theology and Church Relations, 1981).
- ^{xxxi} Daniel S. Johnson, "The Ministry and the Schoolmaster," *LOGIA* 6, no. 3 (Trinity 1997): 22.
- ^{xxxii} Robert David Preus, *The Doctrine of the Call in the Confessions and Lutheran Orthodoxy*, 16-21.
- ^{xxxiii} Naomichi Masaki, "Confessing Christ: Office and Vocation," and Klaus Detlev Schulz, "Christ's Ambassadors," both in *LOGIA* 7, no. 3 (Trinity 1998).
- ^{xxxiv} David Chytraeus, *On Sacrifice*, trans. John W. Montgomery (St. Louis: Concordia, 1962): 98-102.
- ^{xxxv} Martin Chemnitz, *Examination of the Council of Trent*, trans. Fred Kramer (St. Louis: Concordia, 1978): 2:682-688.
- ^{xxxvi} Gottfried Herrmann, "The Path of the Evangelisch-Lutherischen Freikirche (ELFK) into the Confessional Evangelical Lutheran Conference (CELC) and the Doctrine of Church and Ministry," trans. Michael Seifert and John Brug, unpublished essay delivered in Finland in June 2000, 9.
- ^{xxxvii} AE 46:220. Similar thoughts are found in AE 37:364.
- ^{xxxviii} David P. Scaer, "The Clergy as the New Testament Ministers with a Proposal for Parochial School Teachers," *Issues in Christian Education* 27, no. 1 (Spring 1993): 7.
- ^{xxxix} E.W. Kähler, "Does a Congregation Ordinarily Have the Right Temporarily to Commit an Essential Part of the Holy Preaching Office to a Layman?" trans. Mark Nispel, *LOGIA* 6, no. 3 (Trinity 1997): 41. Similar argumentation is found in "A Response to an 'Overture to Establish an Ordained Diaconate'," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 63, no. 3 (July 1999): 213-215.
- ^{xl} Kurt E. Marquart, *The Church*, Confessional Lutheran Dogmatics 9, ed. Robert Preus (Fort Wayne, IN: International Foundation for Lutheran Confessional Research, 1990), 140, 144.
- ^{xli} John F. Brug, "An Ordained Diaconate for the LCMS?" *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 97, no. 2 (Spring 2000), 137. This article is a WELS response to the CTQ article of July 1999 on an ordained diaconate.
- ^{xlii} Armin J. Panning, "Acts 6: The 'Ministry' of the Seven," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 93, no. 1 (Winter 1996): 17.
- ^{xliii} Pieper, "Luther's Doctrine of Church and Ministry," 248. Similar thoughts are found in Carl Lawrenz, "An Evaluation of Walther's Theses on the Church and its Ministry," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 79, no. 2 (Spring 1982): 127.
- ^{xliv} David P. Scaer, "Book Review on *Church—Mission—Ministry: The Family of God*," *LOGIA* 6, no. 1 (Epiphany 1997): 47.
- ^{xlv} Lowell C. Green, "The Discipline of Church Law and the Doctrine of Church and Ministry," *LOGIA* 9, no. 3 (Trinity 2000): 44.
- ^{xlvi} *Statistical Report of the WELS for 1999* (Milwaukee: WELS Statistical Office, 2000), 2, 116. In addition there are about 175 pastor-trained workers who serve as professors, teachers, administrators, or other church workers. Sometimes such workers are loosely referred to as "pastors" because they have been trained for the pastoral ministry, they may be called back into the parish ministry, and they often fill in on a temporary basis as pastors. Technically they are not pastors in the pure sense, however, since they are not serving as overseers of congregations.
- ^{xlvii} August Pieper, "Zur Verständigung in der gegenwärtigen Diskussion über Kirche und Amt," *Theologische Quartalschrift* 9, no. 3 (Juli 1912), 204-205. The translation is from Joel Fredrich, "The Divine Institution of Gospel Ministry," 40.
- ^{xlviii} C.F.W. Walther, "Sermon at the Installation of Two College Professors," trans. J.W. Klotz, *Lutheran Sentinel* 32 (March 28, 1949): 85.
- ^{xlix} David J. Valleskey, "Coworking of Pastors, Teachers, Staff, and Member Ministers," *WELS Ministry Compendium* (Milwaukee: WELS Parish Services, 1992), 2:815.
- ^l Scaer, "The Clergy as the New Testament Ministers," 9.
- ^{li} Thomas P. Nass, "The Pastoral Ministry as a Distinct Form of the Public Ministry," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 91, no. 4 (Fall 1994): 259-262.
- ^{lii} James Kalthoff, "The Pastor: God's Servant for God's People," *Church and Ministry: The Collected Papers*, 130.
- ^{liii} Harold E. Wicke, "Is the Pastorate in the Congregation the Only God-ordained Office in the Church?" *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 68, no. 2 (April 1971): 120.
- ^{liv} *Doctrinal Statements of the WELS*, 50-51.
- ^{lv} Paul R. Harris, "Angels Unaware," *LOGIA* 3, no. 1 (Epiphany 1994).
- ^{lvi} Green, "Grabau and Walther."
- ^{lvii} Douglas D. Fusselman, "It's Jesus! The Minister as the Embodiment of Christ," *LOGIA* 6, no. 1 (Epiphany 1997): 28.
- ^{lviii} T. Johannes Grosse, *Unterscheidungslehren* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1889), 5. Translation is from Carl Lawrenz, "An Evaluation of Walther's Theses," 99.
- ^{lix} C.F.W. Walther, *Church and Ministry*, trans. J.T. Mueller (St. Louis: Concordia, 1987), 303.
- ^{lx} *Ibid.*, 219.
- ^{lxi} *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1994), 384ff.
- ^{lxii} Roger D. Pittelko, "The Office of the Holy Ministry in the Life of the Church: A View from the Parish," *LOGIA* 2, no. 1 (Epiphany 1993): 37.
- ^{lxiii} Adolf Hoenecke, *Evangelical Lutheran Dogmatics*, trans. Joel Fredrich, Paul Prange, Bill Tackmier (Milwaukee: Northwestern, 1999), 4:201. People interested in this newly published translation should read the recent review by John F. Brug, "Review of

Evangelical Lutheran Dogmatics: Volume IV,” *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 97, no. 4 (Fall 2000), 315-317. Hoenecke died of pneumonia on January 3, 1908, so his *Dogmatics* was completed prior to the writings of the Wauwatosa theologians on church and ministry that began about 1911. Some have assumed that his position on church and ministry was different than the current WELS position. It is fair to say that not everything in Hoenecke is expressed the way the WELS expresses things today. Yet the differences should not be overblown. Brug in his review minimizes the differences. Certainly Hoenecke was not privy to the later discussion, and it is unfair to make judgments about how he would have reacted if he had been a participant. When the decision was made to print an English translation of Hoenecke, it was decided not to encumber the translation with notes on this issue.

^{lxiv} Ulla Hindbeck, “Women and the Ministry,” trans. Milton Tweit, *LOGIA* 9, no. 1 (Epiphany 2000): 22.

^{lxv} Marquart, *The Church*, 140.

^{lxvi} Michelle Gallmeier, “The Diaconate: A Misunderstood Office,” *LOGIA* 6, no. 3 (Trinity 1997): 24.

^{lxvii} Jeannine E. Olson, *One Ministry Many Roles* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1992), 58.

^{lxviii} Jobst Schöne, “Church & Ministry: Part II: Systematic Formulation,” *LOGIA* 2, no. 2 (Eastertide 1993): 40.

^{lxix} AE 30:55.

^{lxx} David P. Scaer, “The Integrity of the Christological Character of the Office of the Ministry,” *LOGIA* 2, no. 1 (Epiphany 1993): 16.