

# The Pastor as Overseer (A Study of the Word ἐπίσκοπος)

By Luke C. Werre

[A paper presented to the Southern Conference of the North Atlantic District at Peace Ev. Lutheran Church in King of Prussia, Pennsylvania on Wednesday, October 19, 1994.]

The writer realizes that today there are those who would already take issue with the title of this paper. One of our brothers points out, for example, that it cannot “be documented from Scripture that the ‘pastors’ of Ephesians 4:11. . .are the equivalent of our pastorate today” (Compendium 734). This same point may be made of the word ἐπίσκοπος. But this paper is written with the point of view and it hopes to show that by merit of the word’s own meaning and usage ἐπίσκοπος can be used for the office of the traditional parish pastor of today. Consequently, the writer also hopes to point out the implications of the word ἐπίσκοπος to the pastor’s duties, to his relationship to Christ and to his relationship to others within the Church.

Let us begin with the root of ἐπίσκοπος, namely σκόπος. The most basic meaning of σκόπος is “goal” (Kittel, VII, 413). In this light the same word can be used to mean “a watchman,” or “an observer” (Thayer, 579). Its verb form, σκοπέω, is more aggressive with its meaning, “to look at critically; to gaze at; to keep one’s eyes fixed on something (like a goal); to aim for; to look out for one’s interests” (Kittel, VII, 414ff; Thayer 579; B.A.G. 756).

The word and its meaning are well established in secular usage, but also are quite common throughout Scripture. We may think of Ezekiel, the watchman on the city wall (Ez 33, LXX for Hebrew **הַצִּפּוֹר**). He was to keep his eyes fixed so as to warn the city inhabitants of approaching disaster. It was his aim or goal to warn people of their sin in hopes that they would repent. In Philippians 3:14 Paul wrote, “I press on toward the goal (*κατὰ σκοπὸν*) to win the prize for which God has called me heavenward.” The Christian’s goal has already been achieved for him by Christ. It awaits him the same as the finish line in a race. The new man in the believer strives against the flesh and all adversity to reach that goal. Paul was instructing the mature to have such an invisible, not-yet-realized goal in mind (3:15). In line with this thought Paul also wrote to the Corinthians, “So we fix our eyes (*μη σκοπούντων*) **not** on what is seen, but on what is unseen. For what is seen is temporary, but what is unseen is eternal” (2 Co 4:18 - Emphasis mine, but I believe it is reflected clearly in the Greek.).

The pastor’s job is to direct the eyes of his people to the heavenly goal already won for them. Eschatology is so very important to us because that finally is the answer to all earthly dilemmas. Therefore in all his sermons, private devotions, council meetings, etc., the pastor puts forth Christ crucified. It reminds us that God has already declared us holy in Christ, encourages us to live up to what we already have become in His sight through Christ—and all this to keep us focused on the day (goal) that we will finally, actually, fully be made what He has now already declared. The cross keeps us mindful of the eternal prize waiting for us. The pastor continually sets this before the eyes of the people, especially when everything visible in the world would indicate that the reality of such a goal could not be further from the truth.

All of this the pastor keeps before his own eyes as the motivation for his own work. He really will not see all the fruits of his labor until the Last Day. Are we perhaps doing a disservice to the pastoral ministry if we stress earthly objectives and goals as our motivators? Does it possibly detract from the one invisible goal by bringing our eyes from heavenward to earthward? Granted, the sinful flesh will never be converted. All it ever knows, comprehends, and is moved by are law and law-based objectives. But when such goal-mindedness comes on recommendation of reformed circles who make no distinction between the church-visible and the church-hidden it is rooted and motivated only by law (visible, tangible things like earthly goals) instead of the invisible promise of God. Such tainted theology and practice we want to avoid. The sinful flesh is to be

crucified, not pandered and emboldened by looking for visible results. For example, a pastor may not see a visible sign of the Church's presence other than Word and Sacrament being rightly used. Yet, he relies on the promise that the Church nonetheless exists, whether near him or far away. A pastor must keep his own eyes fixed on the goal of one day seeing the Church Triumphant when it will be revealed in all its glory and completeness. He must keep his eyes focused on this guaranteed, permanent goal as the thing he is constantly working toward. Otherwise, his entire life's work will have burnt up with the earth on the Great Day. All of this is inherent in the word, *ἐπίσκοπος*.

The verb, *σκοπέω*, may go one step further to mean, "look at carefully; investigate," or even, "scrutinize" (Kittel, VII, 414ff). Jesus used it this way when he warned us, "See to it (*σκόπει*), then, that the light within you is not darkness" (Lk 11:35). Paul wrote to the Romans, "I urge you, brothers, to watch out for (*σκοπεῖν*) those who cause divisions. . ." (16:17). Given that the pastor's work is directly with Word and Sacrament, the title, *ἐπίσκοπος*, assumes he must be able to scrutinize and distinguish between spirits—good and bad, law and gospel, wholesome and polluted (1 Co 10:12; He 5:14; 1 Tm 4:16; 2 Tim 2:15). Titus 1:9 is speaking specifically of the overseer when it says, "He must hold firmly to the trustworthy message as it has been taught so that he can encourage others by sound doctrine and refute those who oppose it."

A WELS professor states, "The message creates both *das Predigtamt* and the need for it; the message bearers bring Christ and all his saving benefit in the faithful proclamation of the message which is the source and the reason for their office" (Deutschlander, *Faith*, 4). Christ is the Word. An *ἐπίσκοπος* is a public representative of Christ. His job, therefore is to bring that very same Word to the people. He is the vessel of the Word, who carries it to the people. He is to say what Jesus says—no more, no less. (We will discuss more on the relationship between Christ and the *ἐπίσκοπος* later.) For this reason the *ἐπίσκοπος* **must** be able to distinguish what is Christ's message and what is not. He must be able to distinguish this in all his speech and even in all his behavior and the programs he promotes. He must continually scrutinize (*σκοπέω*).

The fact that the message is the power of God for salvation, gives it the highest value to us. Given the high value we have for the Word, and the fact that the office of *ἐπίσκοπος* and the message are so intimately interwoven, it is natural for us to insist that our pastors must have an exceptional and exhaustive education in the Word. Cutting away at the smallest fibers of the Word is like cutting away at the very rope which is intended to pull us up to our rescue.

If some in our circles suggest that we should rethink our view of ministry and imply that we need to relax our stringent demands for those we deem qualified to be teachers of the Word—is this not, at least in an underlying way, a despising of the Means of Grace? Granted, the objective is to get more Word of God proclaimed to more people. But if we were discussing drinking water during a drought, would we loosen our demands on its purity? Instead of having scientists with microscopes scrutinize the water we distribute, would we start relying on accountants with magnifying glasses to determine if it's wholesome? Any water is better than no water, right?

Dare we fall back on the catch-phrase, "reliable materials," for those who will be leading Bible classes in our circles, but have not been thoroughly trained to scrutinize in matters relating to the Word? Or, if we are interested in a spiritual renewal would not a root solution be to beef up the rigors of our present pastoral educational system to insure even more that the Word of God is being taught purely, rightly and effectively by those who are to "equip the saints?" It is interesting that in Acts 11, when Barnabas was sent from Jerusalem to Antioch to complete the instruction of the converts there, he did not establish cell groups, even though that might have been a much more efficient way to get all the information disseminated. He felt it was necessary to send for Paul to help him teach. We consider this in the light of having teachers who are able to "scrutinize" and distinguish between spirits.

When we combine the word, ἐπί, with the word, σκοπέω, you can see the result. Clearly the activity of an office of responsibility, authority, and accountability is described, namely, “to scrutinize over something; to investigate upon; to watch over,” and in secular usage, “to supervise.”

We call this oversight. The LXX uses ἐπίσκοπος or ἐπισκοπέω/ἐπισκέπτομαι to designate the times God “visits” someone with His blessing or judgment as part of His providence (Kittel, II, 605). Thus in Job 20:29 the LXX renders the Hebrew, לָקַח, as ἐπίσκοπος, when it says, “Such is the fate God allots the wicked, the heritage appointed for them by God.” In the same vein we read in Luke 7:16, “[The people] were all filled with awe and praised God. ‘A great prophet has appeared among us,’ they said, ‘God has come to help (ἐπεσκέψατο) his people.’” The KJV says, “God hath **visited** His people.” We also see in the LXX this word used for the shepherd’s oversight over his sheep (Ez 34:11-12; Jr 23:2). The noun and verb forms are also used in the LXX to refer to various offices of oversight such as those who oversee the work of the temple (Ne 11:9, 14, 22).

The use of this word in the New Testament is very similar. It tells us much about the pastor’s relationship to Christ as well as to the congregation. Most notable is that the actual word, ἐπίσκοπος, is used only five times throughout the New Testament. The limited use of the term itself would seem to indicate that it was a special designation or office not exercised by everybody in the early Church.

But the question remains: Can we equate ἐπίσκοπος with the office of today’s parish pastor? And can we suggest that such an office was God-instituted or even God-created? There is no passage that explicitly states it. And yet there is also no passage that explicitly says, “You must baptize babies.” Our practice of baptizing babies arises from our teaching on original sin, and is therefore also deduced from clear passages which command baptism for all. We know that the ministry of dispensing Word and Sacrament emerges from the Word and Sacrament themselves (2 Co 2:14-3:6; 4:1-12; 5:11-21). Scripture does make a definite distinction between the universal priesthood of all believers and the office of dispensing Word and Sacrament. In 1 Corinthians 3:9 Paul writes, “For we are God’s fellow workers; you are God’s field, God’s building” (Emphasis mine). We remember, Paul was not speaking only of himself as an apostle, but also of Apollos who was not an apostle. 1 Peter 5:2 says, “He shepherds of God’s flock. . . serving as overseers.” There are the shepherds and there is the flock.

Does this distinction mean that we have a New Testament ceremonial law, after all? Not a ceremonial law, but a perfect balance and a healthy tension. The two serve over against, and at the same time, in harmony with each other. On the one hand, the universal priesthood of all believers is given episcopal responsibility as is shown by Hebrews 12:15 which was written to the entire congregation: “See to it (ἐπισκοποῦντες) that no one misses the grace of God and that no bitter root grows up. . .” The balance is that the same job is given specifically to the overseer of a congregation. For example, if the congregation is promoting false teaching it is the overseer’s job to correct that. If the pastor is teaching falsely, it is the congregation’s job to correct him. The two (universal priesthood and office of overseer) serve each other, and even on behalf of each other. But the two should never be confused or equated.

Therefore, I would have to disagree with the statement: “The public ministry differs from the ministry of all believers only in this, that it is public. It is carried out on behalf of, in the name of, and in the place of other believers” (Compendium 558). Such a statement seems to dismiss the distinction which the Bible makes. We must remember that the administration of Word and Sacrament is not **our** ministry *per se*. It is **Christ’s** ministry. “We are therefore Christ’s ambassadors, as though God were making his appeal through us. We implore you on Christ’s behalf: Be reconciled to God” (2 Co 5:20). This passage alone could be the ground premise for the institution of the public office—if we were to cite a single passage. Who was speaking? Paul and Timothy, public dispensers of the Word. To whom? The congregations in Corinth and throughout Achaia. All of 1 and 2 Corinthians have the underlying theme that Paul is defending the public ministry of the Word. One cannot read them and come to the conclusion that the public ministry is only the creature of the universal priesthood. The pastor is not the employee of the congregation. He is the slave of Christ (1 Co 4:1).

The same writer supports his point by adding: “The Bible speaks of no forms of service for public ministers which all Christians do not already have” (Compendium 558). This is true enough. I suppose that it is also true that if I am in an airplane, there is nothing that applies to the pilot that doesn’t also apply to all the passengers. If I was told abruptly to start flying the plane, I could not do it differently from the pilot and still keep the plane in the air. That doesn’t mean I should be flying that plane. It doesn’t mean I even know how. It definitely doesn’t mean that the airline company appointed me to the job. Yet in a sense, the pilot operates on my behalf, but especially on behalf of the airline company. I would have no business assuming such a responsibility that was not given to me. It would even be disastrous. In the same way 1 Peter 4:15 speaks of an ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος, that is, a stranger to the office, someone assuming responsibilities not given to him.

A third argument often cited to encourage the universal priesthood, and promote lay-ministry is the word διάκονος used in Acts 6:2 and 4. You are familiar with the choosing of the Seven to wait on tables. It is said that since διακονεῖν is used for waiting on tables in verse 2, and since τῇ διακονίᾳ is used for the ministry of the word in verse 4, they are really one and the same ministry, just different forms. But this reasoning is faulty. Διάκονος is descriptive of the action or work involved, but not of the office. In one case the work (διακονεῖν) was distributing food. In the other case the work was proclaiming the Word. But no one would have said that Stephen was an apostle for that reason. Nor would they have suggested that Peter was a deacon. Ultimately, the work of every Christian is the same, a service, but the office is not.

If we step back and look at the situation, we see that originally the apostles were responsible for the ministry of prayer and the Word **and** distributing the food. We might say they were the earliest “overseers” before actual congregations started forming. To support this we find the word, τὴν ἐπίσκοπην, applied to the **office** of Judas Iscariot in Acts 1:20. As the apostles were seeking God’s guidance to find a replacement for Judas, Peter quoted Psalm 109:8, “May another take his place of leadership (or oversight).” It would be fair to say that those who were chosen to distribute food worked as an arm or a branch from the main episcopal office of the apostles. The apostles were still ultimately responsible for this public work.

Furthermore, in 1 Timothy 3 we see the office of overseer (ἐπίσκοπος), distinguished from the office of deacon (διάκονος), not equated with it. The overseer is mentioned first with the recognition that it is “a noble task.” There is also a distinction made by the mention of the two in Philippians 1:1. The title of deacon seems to indicate that he would assist with specific duties. The title of overseer indicates rather the overall responsibility to see that all the “ministry” is carried out faithfully and rightly. But we will discuss more on this later.

We need to be careful if we are trying to spur on a spiritual renewal in our circles by means of an over-emphasis on the universal priesthood—or should I say a slightly-off-the-mark emphasis? Trying to say, “everyone is a minister,” or “there’s only one ministry, after all,” seems to put more emphasis on the idea that the ministry is how the Church serves Christ. Especially is this true when our banner becomes, “Ministry means ‘service!’” Again, the root of this over-emphasis is found in reformed theology which is based on visible, tangible law—as though we need visible, tangible evidence of “ministry” done by the universal priesthood **for** Christ. Rather, ministry in the Lutheran sense is primarily how **Christ** serves His Church. That is why this Lutheran view of ministry puts all emphasis on Word and Sacrament—the Jesus **for** us instead of the Jesus **in** us.

Furthermore, we must never give the impression that only work that is given a title, or involves a training seminar, or is sanctioned by the church is a legitimate function of the universal priesthood. To borrow an old idea generally attributed to Luther: The woman nursing her baby as she gently rocks the cradle of another child with her toe, at the same time humming the melody of a hymn while she keeps her eye on a kettle on the stove where supper waits for her husband—she is doing more “service” in the Church than the most diligent of nuns (Cf. *The Estate of Marriage*, 1522)! What a marvelous wonder that God can take such common things which, as believers, we do so naturally, and consider them a pleasing exercise of the universal priesthood!

Does the writer of this paper mean to downplay the universal priesthood in a self-protecting effort to preserve the austere nature of the pastoral office? Not at all! But the key word here is **balance**. Let us maintain the Lutheran “middle ground.” If we must err, let it be on the side of preaching too much justification and not enough sanctification (if that were possible!). I believe C.F.W. Walther would agree. Is our present attempt at spiritual renewal and emphasis on universal priesthood actually a call to increased sanctification? Even the demand for an increased knowledge and use of the Word among our laity is a call to increased sanctification, not justification. In that case let us also remember that the fact God has made you a “royal priesthood” (1 Peter 2:9) is a gospel teaching, not a sanctification teaching. When it is taught that way it will produce its own sanctification (spiritual renewal) without our manipulating it. “You mean, God has actually declared a miserable wretch like me to be a royal priest? You mean, He is actually pleased for Jesus’ sake with things that I do?” The very idea makes us want to respond by doing more.

The root of why this writer believes *ἐπίσκοπος* can be equated with today’s parish pastor is the intimate comparison, even the equation made in the Bible between the office of overseer and Christ. In 1 Peter 2:25, Jesus is called an *ἐπίσκοπος*. He is the Overseer of the souls of the entire Church. He even carries out this office by exercising His authority over all the world (Eph 1:22). Inseparable are *ἐπίσκοπος* and *ποιμήν* (shepherd). Both convey the same responsibility and function. Jesus is called both the Shepherd and the Overseer in 1 Peter 2:25. The two words can almost be used interchangeably. In 5:1-2 Peter addresses the elders of the congregations also calling them both shepherds and overseers of their flocks just as Christ is both: “To the elders among you, I appeal as a fellow elder...Be shepherds of God’s flock that is under your care, serving as overseers.” Acts 20:28 uses both words again pointing out that the Holy Spirit appoints such overseers/shepherds.

The shepherd concept is very familiar and Jesus uses it extensively to describe Himself. We know that as a Shepherd Jesus leads, calls, lays down his life, and even gathers (Jn 10). He protects, provides, guides, corrects, soothes, comforts and sustains (Ps 23). With what does He do all this? Is it not with His saving Word and Sacrament—His invisible promises? What does a pastor use that is different from this? Really nothing. The overseer/shepherd’s job is to do all the same things: soothe, guide, protect, correct, sustain, call, gather, and if necessary lay down his life. However, it is not really the man doing it but Christ in and through His Word and Sacrament. Paul and Barnabas showed such concern for the congregations they started when Paul said, “Let us go back and visit (*ἐπισκεψώμεθα*, also “to show concern for”) the brothers in all the towns where we preached the word of the Lord and see how they are doing” (Ac 15:36). Naturally, Paul would have had this kind of pastoral concern for those who came to faith through him, although Paul never claimed for himself the title *ἐπίσκοπος*. He usually came to the aid of those who were overseers.

The pastor brings Christ (Word and Sacrament) to the people. In a sense, parents **are** God to their children. They are God’s representatives and the children’s perception of God to a large degree will be embodied in their parents. In an even more real sense—that is, by appointment of the Holy Spirit—the pastor is Christ to the congregation. He is to say what Christ says, no more, no less. He is even to act like it (1 Pe 5:3). When a frail, bed-ridden shut-in says, “I would like to see my Pastor,” it is very much as though she were saying, “I would like to see my Jesus.” Why? Because the man is something extra special? Because the office makes him something special? No. But rather because the office places on him the overall responsibility to bring her Jesus’ Words. She is not interested in seeing the man. She is interested in hearing what Jesus has to say to her. Again, this concept of a separately-existing pastoral office emphasizes the Jesus’ **for** us, instead of the Jesus **in** us, which the universal-priesthood ideas tend to emphasize.

What office in the Church today uses the Word and Sacrament in such an exclusive and comprehensive way as the office of pastor? The authors of the Augsburg Confession saw the office of administering Word and Sacrament as a unit concept. Article V says, “That we may obtain this faith, the Ministry of Teaching the Gospel and administering the Sacraments was instituted” (*Trig.* 45). Note the singular “ministry” and the singular “was.” Also note the connecting “and” which gives us the unit idea. It seems to communicate the

perception of episcopal responsibility. In addition, what office in the local congregation of today has the overall responsibility to “watch over” or oversee everything in light of the Word as much as the pastor? Most church councils even rely on their pastor to make sure that all the decisions in their meetings are in line with the Bible.

That would, then, bring us to the relationship of the overseer/pastor to other called workers of the Church. Before we even begin talking about this let us be square on our source of importance. We live in an age when it is unpopular (politically incorrect?) to say, “I am the pastor and you are not.” Authority is automatically under suspicion and unhesitatingly questioned. It is perhaps thought to belittle those who are not in a position of authority. What gives us importance or significance is the cross of Christ. Nothing else. If we seek our significance in an office or title, or by recognition of our duties, that is ungodly. Whether I am a janitor, a female secretary or a pastor, I am worth more than all the gold and silver in the world because of the price paid for me, Jesus’ blood (1 Pe 1:18-19). What role I am given here on earth has no bearing on that unchangeable fact.

Because of this, it should also be clear that a person’s spiritual gifts do not define his worth. The same price was paid for all. Neither should it be thought that a person’s gifts define the role he/she has been given. Someone with a gift for languages may never be called to a position of teaching languages. Thus he has no business interfering with the discharge of those duties given to someone else. A married man in his 30’s who has the ability to become a pastor may realize the stress that all the education and moving around would put on his family. Besides, it is financially unfeasible. Yet God still has given him the important role of being a God-fearing husband and father (which should not be despised). He also may serve in just as God-pleasing a way within the congregational framework. He may even simply pray for his pastor. The point is, just because he has the gifts to be a pastor does not dictate that therefore he is one or ought to act like one. The Holy Spirit has not appointed him to the responsibility. Let us caution ourselves how we talk about spiritual gifts. Those parts of Scripture that talk about spiritual gifts are not defining roles and responsibilities within the one body of Christ (e.g. Ro 12, 1 Co 12).

To say there is such an office of overseer today, does not deny the legitimacy of the call to others with other positions of labor. But it does show the scope of that call. The overseer/pastor is responsible that **all** the work is being carried out rightly and faithfully. Everything that has to do with the public work of the congregation in light of God’s Word is finally his responsibility. We might say that today’s teachers, youth counselors, evangelism ministers, etc., are comparable to the office of deacon in the Bible. They are there to assist the overseer with a particular scope of the congregation’s work. They might even assist directly with administering the Means of Grace. The overseer, however, is responsible for all things from the cradle to the grave. If anything is not as it should be among the called workers or the work they do, ultimately, it reflects on the man holding the office of overseer. If all things go well, Christ gets the glory. I would think this fact in itself would make any holder of the overseer-office tremble.

Phrases like “team-ministry” would seem to cloud the distinction somewhat. Does the principal of the Lutheran elementary grade school have a pastor? Yes. His pastor is the pastor (overseer) of the congregation. Is the principal’s ministry his own? No. He is ministering on behalf of the overseer, who in turn is ministering on behalf of Christ. (Yes, the pastor is also ministering on behalf of the congregation. The two elements sort of chase each other around when they are in action.) Thus the pastor will want to guide, encourage, correct, or even commend the way a principal is carrying out his ministry. Just because their calls are equally legitimate by the Holy Spirit does not mean that the offices or functions are at equal levels of responsibility. The word “overseer,” is all-encompassing. Might the principle be a more able minister than the pastor? Certainly! However, this does not mean the principle should be looked at as a fellow-overseer to the pastor.

Am I belittling our teachers? Certainly not! Our worth, work and calling all come from Christ, who paid the same for all of us. No doubt a teacher’s fruits will shine just as gloriously and numerous as a pastor’s when the Church Triumphant is revealed. As I said before, I should think that anyone would tremble to consider the office of overseer, not desire it for the sake of importance.

Some argue against this view of ministry as though it were creating a caste system, a hierarchy with pastors on the top. Let us consider the alternative. Imagine that you have multi-offices in the congregation,

which do not emerge out of the Means of Grace themselves, but rather out of the felt needs of the congregation where everyone is a minister. Then by necessity you have created a true legalistic bureaucracy, a caste system where offices are shaped, directed and driven not by the Means of Grace, but by job descriptions. Then you truly do wind up with levels of importance and it will be perceived that way. I say this is out of necessity because we were created under law (Ga 4:5). It is impossible for people to function with other people without a framework of laws. Just look already when you have two pastors in one congregation. Our nature dictates that one must be the senior pastor. We cannot function well otherwise or without confusion. The point is that those who would be trying to do away with a perceived hierarchy by diminishing the office of overseer and elevating the universal priesthood, would wind up with the very thing they were trying to expel.

On the other hand, there is not a specific job description in all of the Bible for the office of ἐπίσκοπος, except to discharge the Means of Grace. The pastors' different situations will call for different ways of using and administering the Means of Grace. It is entirely a Gospel-driven work, defined by the living Gospel itself which tries to reach all people where they are.

The writer knows that this feeble effort is by no means exhaustive, comprehensive, or conclusive. But perhaps as the Church wrestles with the doctrine of the ministry, we will think twice before we drop the historical understanding of the word, minister, which is so tied to the office of the parish pastor. Perhaps we should beware of using the word, ministry, in a way that clouds over biblical distinctions. Perhaps we should reemphasize that ministry is primarily how Christ serves His Church. Perhaps we should not be afraid to maintain that the rite of ordination recognizes the significance of the office of **overseer** over against the universal priesthood of all believers. For the role of pastor as the overseer of souls, the shepherd of the flock, the representative of the true Shepherd, is both beautiful and vital to the Church. It shows itself to be well established in Scripture and it continually proves its own necessity today. It insures that all things will be done decently and in order among those called to serve publicly, as well as throughout all the activities of the congregation. It maintains the healthy balance necessary with the universal priesthood for purity of doctrine. May every pastor be constantly mindful of the words of the hymnwriter: "Oh, may Thy pastors faithful be, not lab'ring for themselves, but Thee!" May every church member also regard the pastoral office with the regard of the same lyricist who wrote: "Oh, may Thy people faithful be and in Thy pastors honor Thee."

### Bibliography

- Bauer, Walter. et al., eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Bitter, Bruce A. "What Is Ministry?", read to the Manitowoc Pastoral Conference, September 20, 1993.
- Chemnitz, Martin. *Ministry, Word, and Sacraments: An Enchiridion*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1981.
- Deutschlander, Daniel. "What Do We Mean When We Say: 'Faith Saves?'" read to Colorado Pastoral Conference, September 27, 1993.
- Kittel, Gerhard. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vols. II, VI & VII. Grand Rapids: Wm. H. Eerdmans, 1964.
- Luther, Martin. *Luther's Works*, Vols. 40 and 45, St. Louis: Concordia, 1962.
- Peterson, Wilhelm W. "Properly Dividing the Word of Truth", read to the Confessional Evangelical Lutheran Conference, Oberwesel, Germany, April 27-29, 1993.
- Thayer, Joseph. H. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977.
- Trench, Richard C. *Synonyms of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- Triglot Concordia: The Symbolical Hooks of the Ev. Lutheran Church*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1921.
- WELS Parish Services, *WELS Ministry Compendium*. Vols. 1 & 2, 1992.