

ADDRESSING SOME
MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT
THE WISCONSIN AND
MISSOURI SYNOD
POSITIONS ON
CHURCH AND MINISTRY

FREE CONFERENCE
Milwaukee WI
August 26, 1993
John F. Brug

Wisconsin and Missouri Synod Positions on Church and Ministry

INTRODUCTION

The doctrine of church and ministry is without doubt one of the hottest topics in Lutheranism today. After several years of having no doctrinal position ELCA is on the verge of adopting a position on this subject. Will ELCA adopt two levels of ordination, one level for pastors and a second for teachers and other ministers? At present the tide seems to be running against this recommendation. (If ELCA were to adopt this recommendation it would have the ironic effect of making WELS an ecumenical pioneer of sorts.) Will ELCA distinguish bishops from pastors in some way? Within the WELS and LCMS current discussion centers on the relationship of the service of the laity to that of the called public ministry and on the relation of other forms of ministry to the pastoral ministry. Discussion of this topic between members of these two synods is, of course, complicated by the differences between the so-called "Wisconsin Synod view" and "Missouri Synod view" of the ministry.

In the brief time we have today we will have to confine our discussion to an overview of this last issue. What is the status of the controversy between the so-called Wisconsin Synod and Missouri Synod views of church and ministry? What are the main problem areas? What are some resources for further study?

It is, of course, a gross oversimplification to contrast "Wisconsin Synod" and "Missouri Synod" views of church and ministry. During the years in which this issue was being debated within the Synodical Conference the division was never strictly along synod lines. Both before and after the breakup of the Synodical Conference many people in the LCMS held the "Wisconsin Synod view." In fact, one could compose an excellent summary of the "Wisconsin Synod view" using nothing but quotations from LCMS sources. It seems to me that today the disagreement between various viewpoints held within the LCMS is much greater than the difference between the so-called Wisconsin Synod and Missouri Synod views as they have usually been expressed. The membership of the LCMS includes adherents of a rigid form of the "Missouri Synod position," adherents of what I would call "the modified Missouri Synod view" espoused by Professor Marquart and many others, adherents of the so-called "Wisconsin Synod position," as well as some individuals who emphasize lay ministry at the expense of the pastoral ministry in a way which goes beyond anything envisioned by defenders of the Wisconsin Synod position. I leave it to you who are closer to the situation in the LCMS than I am to judge if this impression of mine is correct.

At the risk of oversimplification I can say that we have usually thought of "the Missouri Synod position" as asserting that the local congregation is the only divinely instituted form of the church and that the pastoral ministry is the only divinely instituted form of the ministry. All other offices and forms of organization are human institutions, which are auxiliary to the divinely instituted forms. The most rigid version of this position would deny that the synod is church or that anyone other than a parish pastor is serving in the divinely instituted ministry. Some in the LCMS and in groups which have split from the LCMS hold this rigid view, but today most advocates of "the Missouri Synod view" seem to hold a modified version of this view.

In reacting to the "Missouri Synod view" I am going to refer primarily to the 1981 LCMS-CTCR study of *The Ministry, Offices, Procedures and Nomenclature* and to the recent books on this topic by Kurt Marquart (*The Church and Her Fellowship, Ministry and Governance*) and Robert Preus (*The Doctrine of the Call*

in the Confessions and Lutheran Orthodoxy). Since both of these men are widely respected as solid scholars who represent the more conservative confessional wing of the LCMS, their views give at least some indication of what the key questions would be if it ever becomes possible for the WELS to discuss past and present differences with the LCMS. In reviews of these books in the *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* (Fall 1992, p 312-315, Winter 1993, p 71-73) I categorized both of these books as valuable contributions to the discussion of church and ministry. WELS readers would find themselves in agreement with most of both presentations. Today, however, I will be referring primarily to the areas which cause problems or raise questions for adherents of the "Wisconsin Synod view."

Within the Wisconsin Synod there is a consensus that Christ established one ministry in the church, the gospel ministry, and that this one ministry may be exercised privately by any Christian and publicly by those who have been called by the church to do so. The public ministry has been instituted by Christ, but the church is free to create various forms of public ministry according to needs and circumstances. The form or forms into which the church organizes itself to carry out its work are not prescribed by Scripture, but are left free to the church.

THE MAIN ISSUES

We turn now to a consideration of the main questions or difficulties that would have to be addressed in any attempts to resolve the differences between the "Wisconsin Synod view" and the "Missouri Synod view." A thorough consideration of any one of these questions would be more than enough to fill our time this morning, so we will have to limit ourselves to a brief overview of each issue.

1) *What is the proper use of the terms "minister" and "ministry?"*

The English word "minister" like its Latin parent originally meant servant. At the time of the King James translation, which shaped theological English, the word referred to servants of every sort. Gradually however, it came to be used almost entirely as a technical term for two types of service. My English dictionary lists "clergyman" or "pastor" as the number one meaning of "minister." The other main meaning of "minister" is a government official like the Prime Minister of England.

I would, therefore, have no problem agreeing with Professor Marquart's warning against a simplistic parroting of the claim, "Everyone is a minister." This claim can, however, be properly used and properly understood.

Although in recent years "minister" has most often meant "pastor," older English translations of the Bible, such as the King James, used "minister" and "ministry" to translate a group of words in the Greek New Testament which more recent translations, such as the NIV, often translate with the concept of "service." In the New Testament the most important of these words, *diakoneo* and *diakonia*, are not limited to describing the service rendered by men whose work corresponded to that of our pastors. These words also refer to other kinds of service, including waiting on tables.

*Then the devil left him, and angels came and attended him.-- Matthew 4:11
He touched her hand and the fever left her, and she got up and began to*

wait on him.-- Matthew 8:15

Joanna the wife of Cuza, the manager of Herod's household; Susanna; and many others. These women were helping to support them out of their own means.-- Luke 8:3

They urgently pleaded with us for the privilege of sharing in this service to the saints.-- 2 Corinthians 8:4

When we use the words "minister" and "ministry" to refer to other forms of service in the church besides that of the pastor (such as the service provided by Christian teachers), we are simply returning to this wider usage of the term "service" or "ministry" found in the New Testament. We are simply recognizing that the New Testament uses the same term to refer to waiting on tables, to the pastoral ministry, and to other forms of spiritual service. It did not have a specialized technical term, equivalent to the term "minister" in recent English usage. This wider usage of the term "minister" is also supported by a less common use of the English word "minister," which my dictionary also defines as "one who acts as the agent of another." In this sense everyone who is called by the church to carry out some service in their name is a "minister." This is what we often call "public ministry."

If we are going to use "ministry" in this wider sense, a number of cautions are necessary. Since the wider usage of "ministry" is called archaic by the dictionary, to avoid confusion we must make it clear to our hearers that we are returning to a wider usage of the term "minister" than that which has been common in the recent past. We must be careful that we do not confuse the service which Christians do on their own initiative as part of the priesthood of all believers with the "ministry" which they carry out in response to the church's call and in the name of the church (public ministry). We also must be careful that we do not diminish respect for the pastoral ministry, the most comprehensive form of the public ministry of the Word, which was established by Christ. If "ministry" is going to be used in a wider sense which reflects its Latin etymology and the usage of the Greek word *diakonia*, this should not be done without careful explanation of the shift in usage, so that the distinction of the priesthood of all believers from the pastoral ministry and other forms of public ministry is not blurred or confused.

In the recent past there has not been a clear and consistent use of terms for ministry in American Lutheranism. It would be good if we agreed on uniform, consistent terminology to avoid confusion. If properly explained, all of the following uses of the terms "ministry" and "minister" are valid. We generally recommend the following distinction of terminology to avoid confusion.

1) In its widest and most basic sense the term "the ministry" refers to *the gospel ministry* or *the ministry of the Word* established by Christ and given to the whole church. This usage is essentially the same as our usage when we speak of the "ministry of the keys." This one ministry of the Word is exercised in two ways, privately and publicly.

This wide usage of the term is present both in Scripture and the Confessions:

Now if the ministry that brought death, which was engraved in letters on stone, came with glory, so that the Israelites could not look steadily at the face of Moses because of its glory, fading though it was, will not the

ministry of the Spirit be even more glorious? If the ministry that condemns men is glorious, how much more glorious is the ministry that brings righteousness!--2 Corinthians 3:7-9

Because the priesthood of the New Testament is the ministry of the Spirit (Latin) or an office (Amt) through which the Spirit works (German) as Paul teaches (2 Cor 3:6) it, accordingly has but the one sacrifice of Christ, which is satisfactory and applied for the sins of others... The ministry of the Spirit is that through which the Holy Spirit is efficacious in hearts. AP24, Trg.404.

The ministry of the Church, the Word preached and heard.. EP12, Trg.840.

Through the office of the ministry He brings us into the Christian Church. TD2, Trg.894.

These things cannot come except by the ministry of the Word and the Sacraments, as Paul says, in Romans 1:16: The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes. Therefore, since the power of the church grants eternal things, and is exercised only by the ministry of the Word, it does not interfere with civil government. AC28, Trg 84,10.

That we might obtain this faith, the ministry of teaching the Gospel and administering the sacraments was instituted. AC5, Trg44.

Time does not permit full discussion of Marquart's view that the divine institution of the public ministry is the topic of AC5, other than to note that AC14 is the specific locus dealing with the public ministry (church order). In spite of the appearance given by its title, AC5 really speaks about the New Testament ministry confessed in 2 Cor 3:6-9, that is, about the means of grace, rather than about the public ministry. A number of LCMS writers, such as Eugene Klug, agree with this opinion.

The LCMS-CTCR report accepts this wide usage of the term, but "for the sake of clarity" prefers the narrower use to refer to the public ministry. (p. 12)

2) All Christians may exercise this ministry in their private dealings with others. They do this whenever they use God's law to condemn sin and his gospel to proclaim forgiveness. We call this *personal ministry* or *private ministry*. Such ministry is part of the exercise of the priesthood of all believers.

3) Only Christians who are properly qualified and who are called by the church may exercise this ministry publicly, that is, in the name of the church. We call this *public ministry* or *representative ministry*.

The *pastoral ministry* is the most comprehensive form of the public ministry of the Word, but it is not the only form. Sometimes when speaking of the pastoral ministry, we may call it "the public ministry," "the ministry of the Word," or even "the ministry," but we should remember that in such cases we are using these more inclusive names for one specific form of public ministry.

4) In the preceding sections we have been assuming that that we have been talking about *ministry of the Word*. Can areas of service in the church which do

not deal with the Word be called "ministry"? Although the area of service of the "deacons" in Acts 6 was distinguished from the ministry of the Word, their work was called "ministry," they were called by the church to act as its representatives, and they were placed into office with the laying on of hands. From this it is clear that they were exercising public ministry for the church.

Whether the later preaching done by Stephan and Philip was done privately as laymen or on the basis of a later call not mentioned in Acts is not determined by the text. Luther was of the opinion that they did it as laymen (LW 40:37,38, 39:309-310) Much later, Philip is called an evangelist (Acts 21:8).

Since "public" means representative and "ministry" means service, it would be legitimate to speak of a "*public ministry*" of the church which does not involve the Means of Grace. However, we in the WELS do not customarily use this term in this way.

5) We advise against the use of the term "*lay ministry*." It is confusing because it does not distinguish clearly between service which lay people carry out privately as part of the priesthood of believers and that which they carry out publicly as called representatives of the congregation.

2) *Is the pastoral ministry divinely ordained in contrast to other forms of public ministry which are only human institutions or auxiliary offices to the pastoral ministry?*

It must be emphasized that the Wisconsin Synod position strongly defends the divine institution of the public ministry, including the pastoral ministry, every bit as fully as the "Missouri Synod position." *The public ministry ... constitutes a special God-ordained way of practicing the one ministry of the Gospel.* (WELS Theses on Church and Ministry, IID)

The following are among the points of evidence for the divine institution of the public ministry, which are regularly cited in WELS sources:

- *Ministers are explicitly said to be given by God. (Acts 20:28
1 Cor 12:28, Eph 4:11)
- *No one can serve as a public minister without a call. (Ro 10:15)
- *There are special qualifications for the public ministry. (1 Tim 3)
- *Specific offices or forms of the public ministry are named (1 Tim 3,
1 Cor 12)
- *Public ministers are supported by those they serve. (1 Cor 9:7-14)

The view of Hoefling, which traces the origins of the public ministry to mere expediency is explicitly rejected (*WELS Theses II,D,5*).

The *WELS Theses* do, however, deny that the pastoral ministry is specifically instituted by the Lord *in contrast to other forms of public ministry.* (II,D6) The reasons for this include the following considerations:

There is no divine command, comparable to the institution of baptism or the Lord's Supper, commanding the form which the public ministry of the Word should take in New Testament congregations. The situation, therefore, is somewhat analogous to the divine institution of government. That government is instituted by God is directly stated in Romans 13 and 1 Peter 2, but there are

no specific commands or regulations concerning the form of government. Although kings are mentioned as an existing form of government, the divine institution is not limited to monarchy, but applies to other forms developed by human beings. Therefore, specific forms of government are both divine institutions (Romans 13:1) and human institutions (1 Peter 2:13).

Various forms of ministry existed in the New Testament churches. There is no indication that they were derived from the office of pastor, or even that the office of pastor existed in the exact form in which we have it today. The New Testament explicitly says there are "different forms of ministry" (1 Cor 12:5). Numerous examples show that this statement is true not only of ministry in the wide sense, but of public ministry of the Word as well. (1 Tim 3:2,8, 5:17, Eph 4:11, 1 Cor 12:28-30, Rom 12:6-8, etc.)

Various forms of ministry have been recognized throughout church history, including the time of the Reformation. (Cf. especially LW 46:220, 37:364; Chemnitz, *Examination II*, p. 682-685; Koelpin, *Compendium*, p. 756-758)

Concerning such forms of the ministry it is striking that Prof Marquart begins his presentation with the admission, "At first sight the New Testament features a luxuriant and irreducible variety of offices" (p 120). He goes on to state, however, that behind the appearance of multifomity there is one basic ministry, the "one Gospel-ministry which is confessed to be divinely instituted in AC V." We would have no problem with this claim that there is one gospel ministry, as long as that one gospel ministry is not narrowly limited to the pastoral office as we know it, but includes other forms of called ministry of the Word. Although the public ministry is divinely instituted, no single form of it (except perhaps for the apostolate) is divinely instituted by specific command or job description, not even the pastoral office as we have it today, which is a historical development.

There are positive points about Marquart's approach. He does not limit the one office only to the parish pastorate. He includes seminary teachers, for example, in the divinely instituted ministry of the Word. We would not have to quarrel with Marquart's assertion that the "diaconate" in Acts 6 was a human institution and an auxiliary office, in so far as it was limited to meeting the physical needs of members and in so far as it was distinguished from the ministry of the Word and prayer. Although we do not have this office of "deacon" in the church today, we do have auxiliary positions in our synod and in our congregations which are filled by people whom we do not classify as called ministers of the Word.

Problems arise, however, when Marquart arbitrarily excludes certain forms of ministry of the Word which the church has established from the ministry of the Word established by Christ. He grants that teachers in institutes of theological training and possibly some catechists may be within the one gospel ministry, but asserts that Christian day school teachers whose main work is to teach secular subjects are not (p 141-142).

Robert Preus makes the same kind of distinctions without adequate scriptural basis to justify them. (p 21 ff) He includes theological professors in the ministry of the Word in the strict sense. He seems to approve of Gerhard's view that the office of theological professor is by divine right and can be traced to Christ's ministry as rabbi. He laments the fact that in the

LCMS theological professors no longer function as teachers of the whole church as professors did during the Reformation period, but this function has been taken over by the CTCR, an appointed group with no call to the ministry of teaching. (p 16-17) But if the church may call some men to teach future pastors and to serve as teachers to the whole church (seminary professors as envisioned by Preus), why may it not call some men to teach future pastors (seminary professors) and other men to serve as teachers of the whole church (a doctrinal committee). Whether the two jobs are joined together or separated depends on the call of the church. It also does not make any essential difference whether either of these jobs is full-time or part-time. Among us the job of seminary professor is normally full-time (with a bunch of other things thrown in too). In a small free church the seminary teaching might be done on a part-time basis by parish pastors. This is determined by the needs of the church and by the call it extends.

Preus excludes the following from the call: social work, works of mercy, political action, fundraising, accounting, public relations, Sunday school and parochial school, director of education, evangelism, and church administration (including synod president.) (p 21, 31, 32) We don't have much quarrel with his exclusion of most of the first items on the list. Normally, we do not call workers whose primary role is social work or purely administrative to the ministry of the Word. But people who serve in works of mercy may be serving in a public ministry of the church as Acts 6 shows. However, when it comes to the later items on Preus's list, such as Christian teaching, evangelism, and certain types of administration, it is arbitrary to exclude them from the ministry of the Word. A person who is chosen simply to serve as an administrative "bookkeeper" would not be called to the ministry of the Word. But our synod and district presidents are not to be administrators in this sense. They are called to be spiritual leaders to the church, responsible for the supervision of doctrine, and must have pastoral qualifications. It does not make an essential difference whether the men who serve in this way do so on a full-time or a part-time basis. This is determined by the needs and the call of the church. (Incidentally all WELS district presidents and synod vice presidents are parish pastors. Only the synod president is a full-time calling.)

As has been shown by the discussion above, we must reject as confusing Marquart's opinion that the Wisconsin Statements lead to a "virtual identification of universal priesthood and ministry" and to a "failure to distinguish the one gospel ministry from auxiliary offices." (p 220) The first confusion arises because Marquart here fails to acknowledge adequately our distinction between ministry in the wide sense and public ministry. The universal priesthood may exercise both ministry in the wide sense and private ministry of the Word, but it does not exercise public ministry. The proper place to make a distinction, therefore, is not between the priesthood of believers and ministry, but between ministry in the wide sense, private ministry of the Word, and public ministry of the Word. In the second instance the important distinction is not between the one gospel ministry, defined as the pastoral office, and other auxiliary offices in the ministry of the Word, but between the public ministry of the Word (including the pastoral office) and other auxiliary offices which do not involve the ministry of the Word and prayer.

In his summary (p 144), Marquart states that the church has the evangelical freedom to create new auxiliary offices and to change old ones, to recognize and provide for specializations and concentrations within the one gospel ministry,

to attach auxiliary functions to gospel ministers or to detach them. Except for his arbitrary distinction between the pastoral ministry as primary and all other offices as auxiliary, I could read this as a statement of the WELS position. Marquart's position is not as sharp a contrast with the "WELS position" as the more rigid version of "the Missouri Synod position." There are potential openings for fruitful discussion, but there are remaining problems concerning Marquart's exclusion from the gospel ministry of certain offices which he regards as only auxiliary.

The LCMS-CTCR report limits "the office of the public ministry" to the pastoral ministry (p. 12). It includes district presidents, professors who prepare pastors, college deans or chaplains, and military chaplains in the pastoral ministry (p 21).

2b) The situation created by Marquart's views concerning forms of the church is very similar to that which exists concerning forms of the ministry. In contrast to the narrower version of the Missouri position which denies that synods are church, Marquart maintains that synods very clearly are churches (p 221), but he would apparently exclude from the classification "church" some other types of cooperative groups formed by Christians which WELS would recognize as groups which carry out some duties and exercise some rights of the church.

Auxiliary groups within WELS congregations, such as a women's group or a youth group, do not exercise independent church functions or church discipline, as caricatures of the WELS position have sometimes suggested. The point of the WELS claim that other organizations of Christians besides the local congregation and synod can and should function as the church can be illustrated by imagining a situation in which a professor at an independent Lutheran college, affiliated with the synod, but not directly controlled by the synod, becomes a persistent defender of false teaching. The governing body of the college should remove him from office, not only on the basis of violation of his contract or by denial of tenure, but on the scriptural grounds of adherence to false doctrine which disqualifies him from service in the church. If he is on the clergy roster, the district and synod should deal with him in regard to his synodical membership. His congregation should deal with him in regard to his congregational membership. In each case a form of the church is acting in its own area of responsibility. Each acts in obedience to Christ's command. Each bases its removal of the offender on the power entrusted by it by the Word.

4) What is the relationship of ordination to the public ministry of the Word?

Marquart holds that the substance of ordination, namely, the bestowal of the divinely instituted office, is a divine institution. The how of that bestowal, namely, through a ceremony of laying on of hands, is not a divine institution. We can accept this as correct if it means that no one should preach or administer the sacraments in the name of others without a call (AC XIV). But there is no divine institution in Scripture for a rite of ordination, nor is there any limitation of the laying on of hands to pastors.

WELS observers have been concerned about the views on ordination expressed by some LCMS writers, notably David Scaer. Time does not permit a discussion of the issue here, but questions about this topic would undoubtedly be a necessary part of any discussion of the doctrine of ministry between adherents of the

Wisconsin and Missouri views.

4b) The ordination of teachers

The WELS has recently authorized the ordination of male teachers. This was a controversial decision. It was defeated the first time it was presented, and some have requested its repeal. However, both those who are for and those who are against this practice recognize that this is an issue of adiaphora and tradition, not a question of scriptural doctrine.

The purpose of this change was to give a public testimony that we classify teachers as called ministers of the gospel, not as hired employees. There was no intention of removing necessary distinctions between the scope of the calls extended to pastors and teachers. There was no intention to authorize teachers to celebrate the Lord's Supper as some LCMS writers have incorrectly implied. In WELS congregations both teachers and lay leaders of the congregation are sometimes authorized to assist in the distribution of the Lord's Supper. I know of no cases in which either teachers or laymen are authorized to celebrate the Lord's Supper without a pastor.

5) Can women serve in the gospel ministry?

We certainly have no quarrel with Marquart's assertion that women may not be ordained to the pastoral ministry which leads and serves the whole congregation. We would, however, have to disagree with his statement, "Women cannot occupy the office of the gospel ministry," (p 166) since it is a reflection of his narrow view of the gospel ministry which excludes from this ministry Christian day school teachers and other forms of ministry by women which are not in conflict with the scriptural principle of headship and submission. (cf also Preus, p 41) This position is apparently not accepted in the LCMS as a whole, since the press has reported legal action by the LCMS to gain government recognition of its women teachers as ministers of the church for tax purposes. This is just one of many indications of the division within official levels of the LCMS on this doctrine.

Christian women may use the keys entrusted to them in private ministry. They may also be called by the church to serve in forms of ministry of the Word which do not violate the scriptural principles concerning the roles of men and women. Some treatments of this topic from LCMS sources seem to deny to women a privilege of serving in the ministry which Scripture does not deny to them. On the other hand, LCMS treatments of the topic sometimes too narrowly limit the application of the scriptural principles governing the roles of men and women. The application of these principles cannot be limited to the pastoral office nor to pastoral functions. Christian women should observe these principles in both private and public ministry and in all areas of church work. Furthermore, limitations which restrict women from serving in some forms or some circumstances of ministry should be based on the scriptural principles of headship and submission as taught in 1 Corinthians 11 & 14 and 1 Timothy 2, not on analogies to the maleness of Christ and the apostles.

Since ordination is not a scriptural term, and Scripture does not limit the laying on of hands to the pastoral ministry, women could be installed into permitted forms of public ministry with the laying on of hands. There is no doctrinal reason why such laying on of hands could not be called "ordination,"

if a clear distinction was maintained between such "ordination" and ordination to the pastoral ministry. This could not be done without offense at this time because of the traditional limitation of the term "ordination" to the pastoral ministry and because of the confusion that this practice would cause at a time when most Lutherans are ordaining women to the pastoral ministry and others are being pressured to do so.

5) *What is the relationship of the public ministry of today (especially the pastoral office) to the office of the apostles?*

Another area that would need careful discussion would be the relationship of the pastoral office to the apostolic office. From our point of view Marquart and others seem to make the pastoral office too directly descendant from the apostolic office, although he makes a definite effort to preserve the distinctness of the apostolic office.

The faithful gospel ministry is always apostolic in its doctrine. However, nothing in Scripture indicates that the office of pastor or any other public ministry of the Word is derived from the apostolic office. Christ appointed other servants of the Word without connecting their office to that of the apostles. (Luke 10:1,16. Cf AP, Trg.243) There is nothing in the New Testament which indicates the other forms of the ministry current during the New Testament era, were derived from the apostolic office (although holders of such offices were sometimes appointed by the apostles, acting as leaders and representatives of the church). Even while the apostles were on the scene, ministers of the gospel were appointed by Christ through the church, not through the apostles without the church. "By Christ through the church" is the origin of all forms of ministry in the New Testament, except in those few cases where there was a direct call from Christ.

"By Christ through the church" is also the position of Walther. (Thesis 7) It is ironic that an excessive emphasis on the role of the public ministers, rather than the church, in appointing more ministers of the church seems closer to the view of Grabau than to that of Walther.

(Cf CTCR, p 26)

Some Secondary Issues

How widely would you apply the stipulation of AC XIV, "no one should teach unless rightly called"?

This requirement applies not only to pastors, but to anyone who represents the church in any form of the ministry of the Word. The formality of the call may vary in different circumstances. For example, the call of a Sunday School teacher may be quite informal. No one, however, can assume this office without being called by the church to do so. No one should publicly represent the congregation in any way without a call to do so. A congregation might have to ask a self-appointed evangelist who was going around in the name of the congregation to desist if he was unqualified and hindering the work of the congregation rather than helping it. Such an individual would, of course have the right to speak in his own name, not as a representative of the congregation.

What is priesthood of believers? How does it relate to the public ministries of the Old and New Testaments?

This is not necessarily point of controversy, but both WELS and LCMS writers need to speak about this a little more carefully than they sometimes have in the past. The impression has sometimes been given that the New Testament priesthood of believers is a new thing, which in some ways replaced the Old Testament priesthood. This is incorrect. The New Testament priesthood of believers is simply a continuation of the priesthood of believers which existed already during Old Testament times. (Ex 19:6) The New Testament priesthood of believers is described in terms which applied to the whole people of Israel, not in terms descriptive of the levitical priesthood. (1 Peter 2:9) Both the levitical priesthood and the New Testament pastoral ministry are special forms of the called public ministry. The priesthood of believers does not give any individual the right to usurp the duties of either of these public ministries without the call to do so. Misguided attempts to usurp the public ministry on the basis of a universal priesthood are not new. They were already happening during the Old Testament era. (Numbers 12:2, 16:3) Reference to the call refuted the pretensions of Miriam and Korah, Dathan and Abiram. It also refutes those who despise the called ministry today.

The unique duties of the levitical priesthood find fulfillment and succession neither in the NT priesthood of believers nor in the NT public ministry, but in the unique priesthood of Christ.

The History of the Controversy

Both Marquart (p 220) and Preus (61) oversimplify the historical development of the "Wisconsin view" and the resultant differences that arose between Wisconsin and Missouri.

It is sometimes stated that "Old Missouri" and "Old Wisconsin" agreed on this doctrine. It is true that there are statements in Hoenecke's dogmatics which could be characterized as in accord with the so-called Missouri position, but it must be remembered that these were written before the careful restudy of Scripture which was brought about by the fallout of the Cincinnati case. The WELS would also maintain that our position is in agreement with that of Walther and that his position has not been correctly understood by some of his followers, nor has enough attention been given to the circumstances which he was addressing in his writings. In some places we would not word things the same way Walther did, but we have no disagreement with his doctrinal position. We do not find the Drickamer translation acceptable in some places. Special areas of concern for us would be the understanding of Predigtamt and Pfarramt in Theses 1,2 and 7 and the translation of Gemeinschaft in Thesis 7 as congregation. A full treatment of this topic can be found in Lawrenz, WLQ, Spring 1982, or Compendium, p. 465-521.

The role of J.P. Koehler in developing the "WELS position" should not be overstated. He was in some ways the exegetical pioneer, but J. Schaller and A. Pieper had crucial roles in the thorough restudy of Scripture and the explanation and defense of the WELS position. It was this careful restudy of everything which Scripture has to say on this doctrine which was the impetus for the "new Wisconsin" view. A thorough treatment of this topic can be found in the articles by Fredrich (1992) and Dobberstein (Part 3, 1991) in the WELS

Compendium.

WELS has sometimes been accused of being crypto-Hoeflingites on the basis of a favorable comment Koehler made about Hoefling, but Koehler distanced himself from his early comments which could be understood as a blanket endorsement of Hoefling, when he realized more fully what Hoefling had really said. (It is interesting to note that Walther was also accused of being a Hoeflingite. *Lehre und Wehre, 1858, p. 354*)

When we read the writings of men like Walther, Hoenecke and Pieper, we must be careful to keep in mind the specific historical circumstances in which they were writing and the specific questions they were addressing. If they were writing today in changed circumstances and when different issues and dangers are confronting the church, they might word things differently or emphasize different points. Even when applying the statements of the Confessions and of Scripture, we must be careful to give full attention to their whole context, so that we do not misapply the passages by using them to answer questions which the authors were not addressing.

Like Luther, some of our synodical conference writers (including August Pieper) sometimes emphasized their point by making strong sweeping statements which have to be qualified or explained when one is presenting a complete view of the doctrine in question. We would not insist on defending every choice of wording of Pieper, Schaller or other authors if changed circumstances now make their words likely to be misunderstood.

Inaccurate Caricatures

In the last year it has been disappointing to see a number of inaccurate misrepresentations of the WELS view published in independent Lutheran journals which have the alleged purpose of promoting discussion and understanding among confessional Lutherans. Unlike the writings of Marquart and Preus referred to earlier in this paper, such writings have not been a positive contribution to the discussion.

Suggestions that the WELS position sees "no distinction between St Paul and the believer," that there is now no valid reason for the Wisconsin not to go ahead and give women supervision over Holy Communion, that the WELS position is that of Schleiermacher, and that the LCMS tolerated in WELS what it rejected in Hoefling (*Logia, Jan 93, p. 15, 16*) are gross distortions which serve no good purpose for either synod. The WELS position clearly maintains that the public ministry is a divine institution and it is distinct from the priesthood of all believers. Even in their strongest writings A. Pieper and J. Schaller were writing against the belief that one form of the ministry was divinely instituted in contrast to other forms, not against a divine institution of the public ministry.

Conclusion

The studies by Marquart and Preus perform a service in helping to define the issues, but they also show that a lot of work would have to be done to reach agreement between adherents of the "Wisconsin" and "Missouri" views. If it ever becomes possible for the WELS and LCMS to have substantive doctrinal discussions, the doctrine of church and ministry would have to receive a place

of prominence right after church fellowship.

The first serious obstacle to any intersynodical discussion of this topic would be the significant disagreement at official levels of LCMS (doctrinal committee, seminary and college faculties, and published works) concerning this doctrine and its practice. This is greater than the difference between the so-called WELS and LCMS views.

If this problem could be resolved, there would be significant problems that would have to be overcome before the WELS could reach a scriptural agreement concerning the doctrines of church and ministry and church fellowship even with those in the LCMS most faithful to the Synodical Conference's doctrinal heritage.

To conduct a profitable discussion adherents of the Wisconsin and Missouri viewpoints would have to give priority to two approaches to the problem:

They would have to define their terms clearly, so that people would not be speaking past each other. In what sense, is the term "ministry" being used? Unless there is clarification and understanding of the terms which are being used by the two parties there will be continual confusion.

Initially, the discussion would have to focus on thorough exegesis of all of the pertinent passages of Scripture. Unless there is agreement on what Scripture says about the matter, little progress can be made by debating interpretations of the confessions, historical precedents and contemporary practice. Useful as they are, most recent works by adherents of the LCMS view have focussed on the Confessions without laying an adequate foundation for this discussion in a thorough exegesis of Scripture. We must do a thorough study of the *norma normans* before we are ready to discuss our understanding of the *norma normata*.

The key factor in the development of the Wisconsin Synod position was the willingness of all the participants to set aside for the moment all their preconceptions and even the works of their teachers and to go *ad fontes*, back to the Scriptures. They were willing to reexamine every detail of their position in the light of Scripture alone. If this study revealed areas in which they had been operating with assumptions or interpretations not supported by Scripture, they were ready to correct their view. We cannot justify any doctrinal position which places any limitations on the freedom of the church to organize itself and its ministry into forms which meet its needs, unless those limitations are directly commanded in Scripture. We must preserve for the New Testament church all the freedom which Christ has given to it. On the other hand, we must require the NT church to observe every command which Christ has given to it. This is the goal (and I believe also the effect) of the so-called Wisconsin Synod view of church and ministry.

WELS MINISTRY COMPENDIUM

*Study Papers
on the doctrine of Church and Ministry*

*Compiled by
WELS Parish Services
1992*

CONTENTS

(Arranged in order of date of publication)

	<u>Page Number</u> <u>Center Right</u>
Hoenecke, Adolph, "Theses on the Church," Proceedings of the Wisconsin Synod, 1869-1871.	1
Reports of the Synodical Conference Interim Committee, Proceedings of the Fortieth and Forty-Second Conventions, 1949, 1952.	3, 13
Peters, Paul W., "Are the Terms Elders, Bishops, Deacons, Evangelists, and others used interchangeably in the New Testament?" WLO, 1955, p183.	15
Pieper, August, "Concerning the Doctrine of the Church and of Its Ministry, With Special Reference to the Synod and Its Discipline," translation by H.J. Vogel, WLO, April 1962.	27
Pieper, August, "Luther's Doctrine of Church and Ministry" WLO, January 1963,	83
April 1963,	119
October 1963.	149
Meyer, John, "Synod and Congregation," October 1964.	169
Pieper, August, "The True Reconstruction of the Church," WLO, April 1965, July 1965.	203 243
Kretzmann, A.T., "Church and Ministry," November 1965 Study Essay.	267
Some 16th Century Theses Based on Articles 5,7, and 8 of the Augsburg Confession, Aegidius Hunnius, WLO, July 1967.	289

	Page Number, Center Right
Habeck, Irvin J., "Who May Officiate at the Lord's Supper?" WLQ, July 1968.	313
Doctrinal Statements of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, 1970.	333
Wicke, Harold, "Is the Pastorate in the Congregation the Only God-ordained Office in the Church?" WLQ, April 1971.	399
Vogel, Heinrich, "The Doctrine of the Church and Ministry," WLQ, January 1976.	409
Rutschow, David N., "The Congregation's Relationship to the Synod (With Special Reference to the Doctrine of the Church)" October 1976 Conference Essay.	423
Schaller, John, "The Origin and Development of the New Testament Ministry," WLQ, January 1981.	443
Lawrenz, Carl, "An Evaluation of Walther's Theses on the Church and Ministry," WLQ, Spring 1982.	465
Lawrenz, Carl, "The Scriptural Truths of the Church and Its Ministry," WLQ, Summer 1985.	521
Schuetze, Armin, "The Significance of the Reformation for Our Ministry Today (Lecture II, WLQ, Spring 1986).	541
Mueller, Wayne, "One Lord, One Church, One Ministry" Essay to the 1988 Western Wisconsin District Convention.	553
Mueller, Wayne, "A Biblical Perspective of Christian Ministry," prepared for BPS Task Force on Alternate Forms of Ministry, 1988.	581
August Pieper, "Are There Legal Regulations in the New Testament?", WLQ, Winter 1989.	593
Gawrisch, Wilbert, "The Doctrine of Church and Ministry in the Life of the Church Today," Essay to the Fifty-first Biennial Convention, Proceedings, August 1991.	623
Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Restudy the Terminology, "Ordination Into the Teaching Ministry", to the Fifty-first Biennial Convention, 1991 BoRaM	667
Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Staff Ministry to the Fifty-first Biennial Convention, 1991 BoRaM	675

LCMS Sources on Church and Ministry

Kurt Marquart, *The Church and Her Fellowship, Ministry and Governance*, Fort Wayne, Ind: International Foundation for Confessional Lutheran Research, 1990.

-----, *Church and Ministry: A Schematic Analysis*, *Christian News*, Dec 18, 1972, p. 5.

Robert Preus, *The Doctrine of the Call in the Confessions and Lutheran Orthodoxy*, Fort Wayne, Ind: Luther Academy, 1991.

LCMS-CTCR, *The Ministry, Offices, Procedures, and Nomenclature*, 1981.

Concordia Journal, July 1988, Six articles on ministry, esp Karl Barth, *The Doctrine of the Ministry, Some Practical Dimensions*, p. 204-214.

Issues in Christian Education, Spring 1993, Special issue on this topic. Shows a diversity of views.

David Scaer, *The Integrity of the Christological Character of the Office of the Ministry*, *Logia*, Jan 93, p 15-18.

-----, *Augsburg V, and the Doctrine of Ministry*, *LQ*, 1992, p. 403-419.

-----, *The Clergy as the New Testament Ministers with a Proposal for Parochial School Teachers*, *Issues in Christian Education*, Spring 1993, p. 6-9, 24.

-----, *Ordination, Human Rite or Divine Institution*, Fort Wayne, Ind.: Concordia Seminary Press, 1983.

Paul Burgdorf, *The Historic Difference Between the LCMS and the WELS concerning the Doctrine of Church and Ministry*, *Christian News*, July 28, 1986. p. 10.

Norman Nagel, *The Doctrine of the Office of the Holy Ministry in the Confessions and in Walther's Kirche und Amt*. *CJ*, Oct 1989, p. 423-446.

Ken Schurb, *Melanchthon on Church and Ministry*, *CJ*, Oct 1989, p. 447-466.

Eugene Klug, *Augsburg V, Intent and Meaning on the Confessors on "Ministry"*, *CJ*, Jan 1991, p. 30-42.

John C. Wohlrabe, *Ministry in Missouri till 1962*. Private Publication 1992.

James Pragmann, *Traditions in Ministry*, CPH, 1983.

A.C. Mueller, *The Ministry of the Lutheran Teacher*, CPH, 1964.

William Rietschel, "A.C. Stellanhorn and the Lutheran Teacher in Ministry," *Lutheran Education*, Jan-Feb 1980, p 147- 162. ?

Richard Caemmerer & Erwin Lueker, *Church and Ministry in Transition*, CPH, 1964.

Oscar Feucht, *Everyone A Minister*, CPH, 1974.

Jerald Joersz, *Walther and the Ministry*, *CHIQ* 63 (Fall 1990), p. 123-131.

C.F.W. Walther, *Church and Ministry*, CPH, 1987 edition.

F. Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics III*, CPH, 1950, p 397-438, 439-462.

E.E. Foelber, *The Office of the Public Ministry, The Abiding Word II*, CPH, 1947, p 474-493.

Jobst Schoene, *Church and Ministry, Systematic Formulation*, *Logia* July 92, p. 4-14; Oct 1992, p. 35-40.

Earling Teigen, *The Universal Priesthood in the Lutheran Confessions*, *Logia*, July 1992, p. 9-15.

=====

John Reumann, *Ministries Examined*, Augsburg, 1987.

William Lazareth, *Two Forms of Ordained Ministry*, Augsburg-Fortress, 1991.

Todd Nichol & Marc Kolden, *Called and Ordained*, Fortress, 1990.

Some Additional WELS materials

A. Hoenecke, *Dogmatik IV*, NPH, 1909, p 175-205.

James Huebner, *The Relationship of the Doctrine of the Priesthood of All Believers and the Public Ministry*, Conference Paper 1993.

Dan Simons, *The Doctrine of Church and Ministry in the WELS and LCMS*, Conference Paper, 1990.

J.P. Meyer, *Synod and Congregation*, *WLQ* Oct 1964, p. 233-265.

Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary file folders relating to the Thiensville Theses.

Page Number, Center Right

Dobberstein, LeRoy A., "Ministry: A Synodical Conference Issue," Part 3 of 1991 Pastors' Institute Presentation.	709
Lauersdorf, Richard E., "The Doctrine of the Call With Special Reference to the Question of its Permanence Under Changed Circumstances," to the Board for Worker Training, April 1988.	721
Koelpin, Arnold, "Ministry in the Minds and Lives of the Confessors," WELS Ministry Symposium 1992.	747
Fredrich, Edward C. II, "The Scriptural Basis and Historical Development of WELS Doctrine of Ministry," WELS Ministry Symposium 1992.	763
Valleskey, David, "Coworking of Pastors, Teachers, Staff and Member Ministers," WELS Ministry Symposium 1992.	789
Mischke, Carl, "How Beautiful the Feet: The Dignity of the Public Gospel Ministry," WELS Ministry Symposium 1992.	823

Other related articles in the *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*

Toepel, Adolph, "Wird durch Suspension von der Synodalgemeinschaft die Glaubensgemeinschaft oder 'Bruderschaft' aufgehoben?", April 1906.

August Pieper, "Menschenherrschaft in der Kirche," January, April 1911.

August Pieper, "Die Suspension Noch Einmal," July 1911.

August Pieper, "Die Stimme unserer Kirche in der Frage von Kirche und Amt," A. January 1912,

John Schaller, "Von der Entlessung aus einer Ortsgemeinde," April 1912.

August Pieper, "Die Lehre von der Kirche and ihren Kenntseichen in Anwendung auf die Synode," April 1912.

July 1912, "Die Lehre vom heiligen Predigtamt," Ed. R. (Editor, Rundschau, Kaehler - Koehler, History of the Wisconsin Synod, p. 238).

August Pieper, "Abschluss der Diskussion ueber die Lehren von der Kirche etc.," January 1913.

August Pieper, "Luthers Lehre von Kirche und Amt," July 1917; Jan., Apr. 1918.

August Pieper, "Was lehren wir im Artikel von der Kirche und ihrem Amt?" April 1921.

August Pieper, Die Grundlagen und die rechte Ausfuehrung der synodalen Kirchenzucht," January 1928.

Lehninger, Max, "Development of the Doctrinal Position of the Wisconsin Synod during the Century of its History," January, April 1950.

Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library
 1831 N. Seminary Drive, GBW
 Mequon, Wisconsin