Foreword

In this issue of the *Quarterly* we are pleased to share with our readers the 2004 annual Reformation Lectures, delivered on October 28-29, 2004, in Mankato, Minnesota. These lectures are sponsored jointly by Bethany Lutheran College and Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary. This was the thirty-seventh in the series of annual Reformation Lectures which began in 1967. The format of the Reformation Lectures has always been that of a free conference and thus participation in these lectures is outside the framework of fellowship.

This year there were three presenters. The first lecture was given by the Rev. Dr. Lawrence R. Rast, Jr., who is Associate Professor of Historical Theology at Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, Indiana. He joined the faculty in 1996 after serving as pastor of Ascension Lutheran Church, Madison, Tennessee (1992-96). Dr. Rast received his B. A. from Concordia College, River Forest, Illinois (1986), and his M. Div. (1990) and S. T. M. (1995) from Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne. A specialist in the history of Christianity in America with emphasis on nineteenth-century American Lutheranism, he earned his Ph. D. from Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, writing on "Joseph Augustus Seiss and the Lutheran Church in America." Dr. Rast also serves the seminary as Assistant Academic Dean and Associate Editor of *Concordia Theological Quarterly*. He is a contributing scholar to *Modern Reformation Magazine*, a member of the editorial committee of the *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly*, and is President of Concordia Historical Institute and chairman of the Institute's Board of Governors.

The second presenter was the Rev. Prof. Lyle Lange, Professor of Religion and History at Martin Luther College in New Ulm, Minnesota. Earlier he had served as pastor in Escondido, California, 1969-78, and professor at Dr. Martin Luther College, 1978-95. He has also held other positions: WELS Commission on Inter-church Relations, 1987-1999; Chairman of the CICR, 1995-1999; Theological Commission of the Confessional Evangelical Lutheran Conference, 1996 to the present; Chairman of the

Theological Commission, 2002 to the present. Prof. Lange was editor of the three-volume anthology, *Our Great Heritage*, and has produced Bible Studies, including the following: *The People of Promise (Exodus)*, *Church and State*, and *Sanctification*.

The third presenter was the Rev. Prof. David Jay Webber, an ELS pastor currently serving as the Rector of Saint Sophia Ukrainian Lutheran Theological Seminary in Ternopil, Ukraine, where he teaches courses in Dogmatic, Historical, and Pastoral Theology. In 1984 he received a B.A. in History from King's College in Briarcliff Manor, New York, and in 1988 he received an M. Div. from Concordia Theological Seminary in Fort Wayne, Indiana. Rev. Webber served as a parish pastor in Cape Girardeau, Missouri, from 1988 to 1990, and in Brewster, Massachusetts, from 1990 to 1997. He has published articles in the areas of theology and history in various journals, including the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register, Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly*, *Lutheran Quarterly*, *Lutheran Synod Quarterly*, *Bride of Christ*, and *Logia: A Journal of Lutheran Theology* (of which he is a contributing editor). He and his wife Carol are the parents of three children.

The topic of the lectures was "Reformation Legacy on American Soil." The first lecture presented by Rev. Dr. Lawrence Rast was entitled "The Legacy of Franz Pieper." In this presentation the essayist portrayed Pieper as a connecting link between the present age and that of the fathers and founders of Lutheranism. The second lecturer, Rev. Prof. Lyle Lange, presented "The Legacy of Adolph Hoenecke." In this lecture the essayist explains that by God's grace Adolph Hoenecke was the right man at the right time in Wisconsin Synod history. The third lecture, by Rev. Prof. David Jay Webber, was entitled "The Legacy of Charles Porterfield Krauth," in which he presented Krauth as the American Chemnitz.

The Reformation Lectures were centered on the lives of these three important leaders of American Lutheranism: Franz Pieper, Adolph Hoenecke, and Charles Porterfield Krauth. They upheld the central doctrine of the Reformation, justification by faith alone, and they sought to plant that doctrine on American soil. This Reformation heritage we desire to maintain today and are striving to pass on to the next generation.

May people consider the genealogies of the Bible to be long, boring lists of names which have no relevance or meaning. This is not the case, as can be seen in the essay by the Rev. Theodore G. Gullixson entitled *The Genealogies of Jesus Christ*. Rev. Gullixson is the pastor of Forest Lutheran Church, Forest City, IA, and Zion Lutheran Church, Thompson, IA, as well as the editor of *The Lutheran Sentinel*.

Contents

The 37th Annual Reformation Lectures
Reformation Legacy on American Soil

Franz August Otto Pieper (1852-1931): *"A Connecting Link between the Present Age and that of the Fathers and Founders of Lutheranism"*

Lawrence R. Rast Jr.

Introduction

"My father, my father! The chariot of Israel and the horseman thereof!" 2 Kings 2:12. These words told the people of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod of the news that their leading theologian, Franz Pieper, long-time professor and president of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, and former president of the Synod, had been called to glory. Theodore Graebner, co-editor of the *Lutheran Witness*, quoted the words of Scripture that we just heard. He then went on to say: "These words, the exclamation of Elisha at the translation of Elijah from this earth to heaven, were uttered by the sainted Rev. C. J. O. Hanser in 1887 in Old Trinity Church over the lifeless body of C. F. W. Walther. They will rise unbidden to the lips of thousands at the news of the death of Dr. F. Pieper."[1]

Graebner's linkage of Walther and Pieper was no coincidence. From the beginning of the professional relationship between the two men, it was assumed that Pieper would succeed Walther in most if not all of his responsibilities. First and foremost of these was the role of professor of dogmatic theology at the St. Louis Seminary. Pieper was specifically chosen to succeed C. F. W. Walther as professor at St. Louis. That much was assured. However, Pieper's promise no doubt led many to expect that he would fill many of the other roles of Walther: author of many articles and editor of *Der Lutheraner* and *Lehre und Wehre,* president of Concordia Seminary, and, potentially, president of the Missouri Synod. That Pieper filled

all of these roles shows the trust and confidence that the Synod had in him. More than that, however, it underscores the personal *and* theological continuity between Walther and Pieper. Simply put, Pieper would not have become what he did if he had departed radically from the theology of Walther. Certainly there are different emphases evident in the work of the two men—the questions they faced and the nature of the institutions they led differed markedly in some respects. Yet Pieper's expressed principle was that what he taught was not anything "new," either differing from the theology of Walther or from the Lutheran Reformation back through the early church to the Scriptures themselves. All he sought to do was to provide a link to the church's faithful confession of all times.

Nothing captures this perspective of Pieper better than a series of reflections he offered around the fiftieth anniversary of the Synod (1897). In a text titled "Church Government," Pieper described Missouri's experience over the first fifty years of its life. In words that may have sounded like a boast to some, he wrote:

> Let us look at ourselves. Our Synod has now gone through a 50-year experience of church government [guided] solely by the Word of God. The "nothing but confusion" and "disorder," which the whole world fears under such government, has not come to pass among us. That was also prophesied for us both here and on the other side of the ocean. The sentence, that the synod in relation to its congregations has only "advisory" and not legislative power, has been called the "real heart of anarchy." The Church which does not enjoy a government with legislative power, it was said, "is a little plant without a supporting stake." Confusion would soon rule such a constitution as ours.

Such has not been Missouri's experience, he replies.

> Nothing of all of this has come to pass. Also as far as outward order is concerned, we in our synod have experienced perhaps the most peaceful period which the Church has ever enjoyed. We must say: Government of the Church solely with the Word of God has proved itself among us in fifty years of practice. Indeed, the flesh of the Christians has made itself felt among us. It has not always submitted to God's Word. Here and there long discussions, much teaching, and continued exhortation were necessary. But God's Word has kept the upper hand. Also

> in seemingly hopeless cases it has manifested its ruling and governing power. Government solely with the Word of God has bound us and held us so *firmly* that outsiders thought and still think that we have a high-church government.[2]

In a second text, Pieper reflected on what he called the "Missourian perspective."

> So also the Missouri perspective is this; it is unfair and unjust to charge a church body with false doctrine if that fellowship practices doctrinal discipline and attempts, according to the Word of God, to put an end to the false doctrine which has arisen among its individual members.
>
> However, it is completely fair, proper, and required by God's Word to charge that church body with false doctrine if the fellowship has told its individual members and indeed its leaders, "You may say whatever you want to."
>
> We Missourians only then hold a church body as such to be orthodox when the true doctrine sounds forth from all its pulpits and professors' chairs and in all writings which are published within the church body, and every false doctrine, on the contrary, as soon as it makes its appearance, is eliminated in the way which God directs.
>
> According to this standard we judge others; according to this standard we also submit to be judged ourselves. We Missourians must and will submit to be judged according to the doctrine which is taught by individual pastors whether in San Francisco or New York, St. Paul or New Orleans, or which is taught in our publications whether they be published officially or unofficially.
>
> If anyone should prove against us that even one pastor preached false doctrine, or even one periodical stood in the service of false doctrine, and we did not eliminate this false doctrine, we would thereby cease to be an orthodox synod and would have become a unionistic fellowship. In short, the mark of an orthodox church body is that throughout that church the true doctrine alone prevails, not only officially and formally, but also in actual reality.[3]

Statements like these are at least one of the sources that

led some to label the LCMS "arrogant" and "triumphalistic." However, Pieper, like Walther before him, did not see any conceit in making such statements. In fact, faithful confession of the grace of God at work in the life of the church required them to make such assertions. And so Pieper, in another text authored about the same time, continued:

> The doctrine taught and professed by our Synod has been repeatedly called *new*. Such has been the experience of the fathers and founders of our Synod, and such is still our own experience at the present time. However, our doctrine is not new, neither wholly, nor in part, but is as old as the Revelation of the Holy Scriptures. Our doctrine is none other than that which God has revealed in the writings of the apostles and prophets, and which the Lutheran church in her public Confessions professes from, and in accordance with, the Scriptures. This fact is attested by every sermon which is preached on Sundays from the pulpits of our congregations. It can also be observed in our periodicals and in other publications of our Synod.[4]

Pieper's statement reflected a conviction on the part of Missouri that they had been singularly blessed by God in being able not only to articulate a biblical theology, but to practice it, as well. That is to say, Missouri's doctrine had its origin not in human activity, but in the gracious blessing of God, which enabled the Missourians to confess the true doctrine both in word and in deed. Hence, noting Missouri's achievements was not a boast, but an acknowledgment of God's grace in practice. And it was especially in the area of true doctrine practiced rightly that Pieper saw the most evident hand of God. For doctrine practiced was what the Missouri Synod was all about.

> There is no such thing in the Christian Church as mere teaching; all teaching is to be reduced to practise. The Christian Church is not a philosopher's school, where only teaching is done, but a society of people who by faith in the Gospel and mortification of the flesh are traveling on the way to everlasting life and are commissioned to lead others into this way. True, there is also teaching done in the Christian Church, and this is done first and ever continued. *Doctrine is the basis for every activity of the Church.* However, teaching is not the end, but only a means to the end. For the Word of God which is proclaimed

> in the Church must bring about the doing of that which each particular word requires of hearers. The Gospel is to be received believingly and held fast by the individual hearers, and the Law, too, is to be applied by them in its threefold use. Moreover, not only each person for himself is to see to it that he yield obedience to the Word, but in accordance with God's arrangement the Christians are to lend a helping hand to one another in this task. Everyone is to be his brother's keeper. In particular the pastor, by reason of his office, must see to it that his entire congregation and its individual members not only hear the Word, but also reduce it to practise. Briefly, since only *that* person is saved who with his heart believes the Gospel and does not cast out faith by living in sin, it is incumbent upon the Church—on each member, according to his capacity and in the divinely established order—to see to it that the Word of God is practised. In the Church nothing is mere theory. The church is the most practical institution in the world.[5]

Pieper is sometimes facilely dismissed as a rationalist, or at least as having rationalistic tendencies. Others dismiss him as a source for fundamentalistic thought within the confessional Lutheran tradition in America, specifically the Missouri Synod.[6] Pieper, however, viewed things differently. He was convinced that God's truth had been revealed in its fullness in the inerrant and inspired Scriptures. Those Scriptures had been faithfully confessed in the ecumenical creeds and again by the Lutheran reformers and the Lutheran orthodox theologians. Pietism and rationalism had obscured and denied the pure confession of the Gospel, but, by the grace of God, Pieper believed that the Missouri Synod, along with its partners in the Synodical Conference (the Norwegians and the Synods that later formed the WELS) had recaptured faithfully this unchanging truth. In a way, it was a very simple matter for him. If God is the author of the Scriptures—and He is—then what they say is true. And if it was true when they were written, it was still true for the faithful early church, still true for Luther, still true for Walther, still true today, and will *always* be true. For "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday today and forever" (Hebrews 13:8). In this respect Pieper simply saw himself as providing a link to the unchanging chain of those whom God had enabled to make the faithful, scriptural confession.

Biography

Missouri's members had been forewarned that Pieper's health was failing. Already in March the *Lutheran Witness* reported that "since March 5 our venerable Dr. Pieper is at the Lutheran Hospital, stricken with illness." Assured that his mental powers were "unimpaired" and that he had until recently been in class lecturing, still it was related that "since the beginning of the year he has been losing weight, and there was other evidence of decline in his physical condition."[7]

The end came, to many people's minds, all too soon. With the passing of Dr. Pieper a chapter in the history of the Missouri Synod came to a close. David Scaer, has argued that the death of Pieper left a vacuum of theological leadership that Missouri has yet to fill.[8] Kurt Marquart has argued that with Pieper's death, the "Silver Age" of Missouri history ended and it passed into a "Bronze Age." It is certain that with Pieper's passing, things changed in Missouri.

Franz Pieper was born June 27, 1852 in Carwitz, Pomerania, Germany. His father was mayor of the city, but died before Franz reached maturity. His education followed the typical pattern of nineteenth-century Germany. He attended gymnasium in Köslin and completed his degree in Kolberg in 1870. That same year he left Prussia for the United States, where two older brothers had already settled. And so, Franz, his mother, and his three younger brothers made their way to Wisconsin.[9] There Franz undertook further studies at the Wisconsin Synod's Northwestern College.

After completing his preparatory work, Pieper studied at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, and graduated in 1875. He was ordained by Rev. Adolph Hoenecke on July 11, 1875 in Centerville, Wisconsin. Pieper spent one year in Centerville before receiving a call to Manitowoc, Wisconsin. He accepted the call and served in that place for two years. While in Manitowoc, he married Minnie Koehn in Sheboygan (January 2, 1877). The Missouri Synod called him to be a professor at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. He first returned the call. However, when it was sent again, he relented, and in the fall of 1878 he made his way to St. Louis, where he served

on the faculty of the seminary for the next fifty-three years. He was specifically called to be trained as Walther's successor while Walther was still alive. He enjoyed nearly nine years of Walther's mentoring. At Walther's death in 1887 he became the seminary's president, holding that position until his death, June 3, 1931.

*Pieper's Liter*ary Legacy: Christian Dogmatics and the Brief Statement

Though Pieper is largely remembered for his work as president and professor at St. Louis, he also served the Synod and Synodical Conference in a variety of other ways. Of special note is his service on the Board of Colored Missions for the Synodical Conference from 1882 to 1899. Perhaps his most important service outside the classroom and written page, however, was his work as the president of the Missouri Synod, an office he held from 1899 until 1911. When Pieper declined to stand for reelection in 1911, it was due to several causes. First, the workload had become too great and was affecting his health adversely. Graebner notes that Pieper experienced several "nervous breakdowns" during this time. As a result, when Pieper retired from the Synod presidency, the Synod made it mandatory that the man holding the office of president occupy that office as his only vocation. Second, again related to workload, Pieper was, by 1911, fifty-nine years old. Administrative concerns had made it increasingly difficult for him to fulfill his desire to write. Because of these concerns, he closed the administrative chapter of his life so that he might leave the synod a lasting literary legacy.

Pieper succeeded in leaving a rich and varied literary corpus. In two documents in particular, Pieper has left us the record of his own affirmation of the Reformation. In his *Christliche Dogmatik* Pieper sought to defend the unchanging truth of the Scriptures as rightly confessed by the Lutheran reformers and their Confessions against the doctrinal aberrations and challenges to historic Christianity that characterized the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century theological scene. Not much later, six years, in fact, the first volume of his *magnum opus* appeared. *Christliche Dogmatik* (3 vols., 1917-1924, translated as *Christian Dogmatics,* 1950-1953) was the fruit of

Pieper's many years of lecturing on Christian dogmatics. Dismissed by some today as dated, it remains a remarkable work for the depth and breadth of the author's reading and the incredible work of synthesis that it is. It certainly shows, beyond a shadow of a doubt, the extent to which Pieper had read and engaged the theologians of his time. Yet the dogmatics features in every section the beauty and clarity of the Gospel, centered in the vicarious atonement of Christ for the sins of the world. Simply to dismiss the dogmatics as "outdated" misses the richness and profundity of what Pieper accomplished in this work.

Beyond the Dogmatics, Pieper was able to speak and to write more freely the last two decades of his life and thereby to leave confessional Lutheranism in America a lasting legacy, proceeding always from Pieper's conviction that the Lutheran confession was the biblical confession and, therefore, was true, right, and salutary for church and world.[10]

In addition to the Dogmatics, Pieper was also largely responsible for a document of long-standing importance for the Missouri Synod—*A Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Missouri Synod*. After a fissure within the Synod became evident at its 1929 convention at River Forest, Illinois, a committee featuring Pieper was tasked to draft a new statement that concisely addressed the questions at issue between the Missouri Synod and confessional Lutherans outside of Missouri's and the Synodical Conference's fellowship. The targets of this effort were the Ohio, Buffalo, and Iowa Synods, all of which had long-term quarrels with the synods of the Synodical Conference. By 1929 some Missourians concluded that the Chicago and Minneapolis Theses showed that Missouri's old foes had moved away from their former errors, and so urged adoption of the theses as a basis for talks that hopefully would eventuate in fellowship between the various bodies. Among those advocating adoption were several of Pieper's colleagues on the St. Louis faculty. However, two professors from the Springfield seminary cautioned against moving with too great haste. They believed the theses lacked detail. The Synod resolved the impasse by assigning a committee the task of drafting a new document, which would be submitted to the Synod as a whole for consideration and possible

eventual adoption. This document was explicitly to address the points at issue between Missouri and the aforementioned synods. The document was circulated in 1931 through the *Concordia Theological Monthly,* and then was adopted by the Synod in convention in 1932. When the three older synods—Ohio, Iowa, and Buffalo—merged into the American Lutheran Church in 1930, the *Brief Statement* served as the basis for ongoing discussions between the LCMS and the new ALC.[11]

The *Brief Statement* did not intend to be an exhaustive document. However, it did intentionally speak to issues of both "historic" importance, as well as more "contemporary" issues. As to the "historic" issue, we today will focus on the contested doctrine of conversion and how it relates to justification. The "contemporary" issue was the doctrine of Scripture. Notably, Scripture had not been at issue between the LCMS and the synods that now made up the ALC. However, with higher criticism on the rise—especially within the United Lutheran Church in America—Pieper was determined to make sure that the Reformation's teaching in regard to the nature and character of God's Word was maintained. In respect to both the historic and contemporary issues, however, Pieper firmly believed that the position he was maintaining was that of the Reformation in its truth and purity. First, then, to Scripture.

Sola Scriptura

The most familiar, concise statement that we have from Pieper on the nature and character of Scripture comes from the *Brief Statement.*

> 1. We teach that the Holy Scriptures differ from all other books in the world in that they are the Word of God. They are the Word of God because the holy men of God who wrote the Scriptures wrote only that which the Holy Ghost communicated to them by inspiration, 2 Tim. 3:16; 2 Pet. 1:21. We teach also that the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures is not a so-called "theological deduction," but that it is taught by direct statements of the Scriptures, 2 Tim. 3:16, John 10:35, Rom. 3:2; 1 Cor. 2:13. . . .

> 2. We furthermore teach regarding the Holy Scriptures that they are given by God to the Christian Church for the foundation of faith, Eph. 2:20. Hence the Holy Scriptures are the sole source from which all doctrines proclaimed in the Christian Church must be taken and therefore, too, the sole rule and norm by which all teachers and doctrines must be examined and judged.—With the Confessions of our Church we teach also that the "rule of faith" (*analogia fidei*) according to which the Holy Scriptures are to be understood are the clear passages of the Scriptures themselves which set forth the individual doctrines. (*Apology*. Triglot, p. 441, Paragraph 60; Mueller, p. 684). The rule of faith is not the man-made so-called "totality of Scripture" ("*Ganzes der Schrift*").
>
> 3. We reject the doctrine which under the name of science has gained wide popularity in the Church of our day that Holy Scripture is not in all its parts the Word of God, but in part the Word of God and in part the word of man and hence does, or at least, might contain error. We reject this erroneous doctrine as horrible and blasphemous, since it flatly contradicts Christ and His holy apostles, sets up men as judges over the Word of God, and thus overthrows the foundation of the Christian Church and its faith.[12]

In this text Pieper, as noted above, believed that he simply reproduced the position of the Lutheran reformers, which was maintained by the Lutheran orthodox teachers. In the first *Brief Statement,* published at the golden anniversary of the Missouri Synod in 1897, Pieper offered his perspective on Missouri's place in the line of Lutheran history and theology, as we have already heard. It bears repeating.

> Our doctrine is not new, neither wholly, nor in part, but is as old as the Revelation of the Holy Scriptures. Our doctrine is none other than that which God has revealed in the writings of the apostles and prophets, and which the Lutheran Church in her public Confessions professes from, and in accordance with, the Scriptures.[13]

From this fundamental position, that of professing nothing innovative, Pieper proceeds to a discussion of the nature of the Scriptures. Basic to his understanding of the Bible is its full inerrancy. He writes:

> We furthermore profess that no errors or contradictions of any kind are found in them, but that they are throughout *infallible truth*, . . . With our whole heart we reject the erroneous doctrine, which men seek to spread in the Christian Church of our day, *viz*., that the Holy Scriptures are *not* purely the Word of God, but, in part, the Word of God, and, in part, also *the word of man*, and that, hence, they also contain errors, or, at least, are *capable* of containing them, John 10:35.[14]

Thirty years later, when Synod asked Pieper to draw up a concise statement of its doctrinal position for use in discussions with other Lutheran church bodies, Pieper simply turned to his earlier work as a basis for the new statement.

> Since the Holy Scriptures are the Word of God, it goes without saying that they contain no errors or contradictions, but that they are in all their parts and words the infallible truth, also in those parts which treat of historical, geographical, and other secular matters.[15]

Beyond the *Brief Statement*, however, Pieper maintained his position in other writings. In an article that appeared in English translation in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, titled "Luther's Doctrine of the Inspiration," Pieper reflected on the nature and character of the Scripture as taught by the Great Reformer himself.

"The article of inspiration is an article of faith…" he stated, and for Luther, "…Holy Scripture and the Word of God are *identical terms*." He continues: "To him the Scriptures are not the joint product of 'a divine factor' and 'a human factor,' viz., of the Holy Ghost and the human penmen, so that the result would be in part divine and in part human, but with him 'the divine factor' is the only factor *productive* of Holy Scripture, the Holy Ghost using the human penmen as simple instruments."[16]

Indeed, Pieper's reading of Luther leads him to claim that "inspiration extends also to all chronological, historical and scientific matters that are contained in Scripture." Thus, "the question of the inerrancy of Scripture is the ultimate test as to whether one accepts inspiration in its full sense or not. By conceding that errors occur, or, at least, may occur in Scripture, we concede also that not all Scripture is given by inspiration of God."[17] Thus, even before Pieper

drafted the *Brief Sta*tement, he had already published on the nature of Scripture. What is rather striking is the consistency of language across more than forty years.

However, the bottom line is that for Pieper, the sole source, rule, and norm for all Christian theology is the Scriptures alone. And alone among the confessions of Christianity, only the Lutheran church—and among the Lutheran churches only the truly confessional churches—confess God's Word in its truth, purity, and clarity. "The Lutheran Church claims to possess the total truth only because it accepts the total Word of God as it reads."[18]

This perspective permeated Pieper's teaching and life. After his death, students reflected on the man who had taught them. In one case a student related a classroom event.

> "Doctor, will you kindly give us your interpretation of that verse again?" [asked a student.] Dr. Pieper looked disturbed, slightly bewildered, then, peering sympathetically and intently into the eyes of the questioner, slowly and emphatically said: "*My interpretation?* Never! We do not *interpret* Scripture. Just listen to that passage again." The doctor then read slowly (sounded like an angel) and with great emphasis the passage in question and added: "That is what *God* says. It needs no interpretation. Believe it."[19]

Sola Gratia

Another burden of the *Brief Statement,* and certainly also of *Christian Dogmatics*, is to affirm the free grace of God alone because of Christ as the sole ground on which sinful men are justified. In the *Brief Statement* the old concerns over conversion and election, and their relationship to the justification of the sinner before God, stand front and center. In the first *Brief Statement,* Pieper put it like this:

> Faith in Christ, by which alone men are saved, is not by nature found in man, but is wrought in man by conversion.
>
> Regarding conversion, we believe that it is neither wholly, nor one half, nor one thousandth part, the work of man, but *the work of God alone*, who by grace for Christ's sake works the same in man by His Word. We believe thus, because it is the plain

doctrine of the Holy Scriptures. Scripture, namely, states, in the first place, regarding unconverted man, that he is *dead* in sins, Eph. 2, 1, and that he does not advance toward salvation in Christ, but regards it as foolishness, 1 Cor. 2, 14. In the second place, Scripture *explicitly* declares conversion to be the work of God alone, yea, to be an operation of divine omnipotence. Eph. 2, 4.5: "*God*, who is rich in mercy , for His great love wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ." Eph. 1, 19. 20: "We believe *according to the working of His mighty power*, which He wrought in Christ, *when He raised Him from the dead.*"

We, furthermore, profess that the Holy Spirit is willing to work conversion not only in a few, but in all hearers of the Word, and that, if a part of the hearers, nevertheless, remain unconverted, this *is due not to a deficiency in the grace of God*, but must be ascribed solely to the obstinate resistance of man, as Christ says of unbelieving Jerusalem: "How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and *ye would* not," Matt. 23, 37, and as Stephen says of the unbelieving Jews: "Ye stiff necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do *always resist* the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye," Acts 7, 51. Grace, although it is seriously intended, yea, although it is an almighty grace, Eph. 1, 19. 20, can nevertheless be *resisted* on the part of man. Man cannot *promote* his conversion, but he can *hinder* it.

Since the question has been frequently raised in the Christian Church, especially in our day, *What is the cause* why not all men are converted, seeing that the grace of God is universal, and that all men are alike, found in a state of depravity? We profess that on Scriptural ground we know only this much, that it is due to the grace of God, and to it alone, if men are *converted*, while it is due to men, and to them alone, and is not due a defect in grace, if men are *not converted*, as is written Hos. 13, 9: O Israel, *thou* hast destroyed thyself; but in *me* is thine help." Here we rest the matter, since Scripture has revealed nothing further.

We reject with all our heart every kind of *synergism*, *i.e.*, every doctrine which teaches that conversion is not wrought *by the grace of God alone*, but in part, or "in a certain respect," also by man himself, or that it is effected by man's good "conduct." We reject this doctrine, because it contradicts Scripture, because it makes man, in part at least, his own Savior, and because it thus overthrows the chief article of our religion which teaches that

> we are saved by grace alone for Christ's sake. —We also reject every kind of *Calvinism, i.e.*, every doctrine which teaches that God would seriously convert *not all hearers of the Word*, but only a part of them. We reject this doctrine, because it also contradicts Scripture, and leads to despair. —Accordingly, we reject both the Calvinistic answer to the question why not all men are converted, *viz*., that the grace of God is not universal nor seriously intended; and the synergistic answer to the same question, *viz*., that conversion and salvation do not solely depend on the grace of God, but also on the good conduct of man. We reject both answers because they contradict Scripture. In answering questions we do not proceed further than Scripture leads us, and Scripture teaches that whoever is converted is converted solely by the grace of God, and whoever remains unconverted must ascribe this fact to the resistance which he has offered to the gracious operations of the Holy Ghost.[20]

The relationship of this text to that of the central article, justification, is clear for Pieper. Indeed, in the 1932 *Brief Statement,* he follows the article on conversion immediately with his discussion of justification. The key paragraph reads:

> 17. Holy Scripture sums up all its teachings regarding the love of God to the world of sinners, regarding the salvation wrought by Christ, and regarding faith in Christ as the only way to obtain salvation, in the article of justification. Scripture teaches that God has already declared the whole world to be righteous in Christ, Rom. 5:19; 2 Cor. 5:18-21; Rom. 4:25; that therefore not for the sake of their good works, but without the works of the Law, by grace, for Christ's sake, He justifies, that is, accounts as righteous, all those who believe, accept, and rely on, the fact that for Christ's sake their sins are forgiven. Thus the Holy Ghost testifies through St. Paul: "There is no difference; for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus," Rom. 3:23, 24. And again: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the Law," Rom. 3:28.[21]

Pieper's classic treatments of conversion, election, and justification have led many to rightly state that this teaching forms the center of his theology. Scaer writes: "In particular, his doctrine of grace (*sola gratia*), which entails a complete incarnation of God in Christ and a universal atonement (*gratia universalis*), helps keep the Missouri Synod true to its Lutheran heritage."[22]

In the classroom Pieper was said to reach the heights of

ecstasy as he considered the free grace of God and the justification of the sinner. As one student recalled:

> In his lectures on Pastoral Theology justification was again always set forth as the foundation on which all dealings of the pastor were to be based, and we were exhorted time and time again never to preach a sermon without preaching justification through Christ, bearing in mind that any sermon might be the last sermon heard by some mortal before entering eternity. What was taught in the classroom was also proclaimed by Dr. Pieper in his sermons and in his addresses before synodical conventions and conferences of various kinds.[23]

At his death, his student J. T. Mueller penned a poem that captured the centrality of Christology and justification for Franz Pieper.

He lived immortal; for to him to live
Was *solus Christus*; both by word and pen
His only message was a grand amen
To God's pure Word; naught else he had to give.

Sola Scriptura was the constant source
From which he drew theology divine
And *sola gratia* the matchless mine
Of sinful man's sole solace and recourse.

Salvamur sola fide. So did he
Rest every dogma on the precious blood
Which from Messiah's wounds on Calvary

Flowed for mankind with universal grace.
With Paul and Luther by the cross he stood
And visioned God in Christ with open face.[24]

Again, in regard to Scripture and grace, Pieper simply sought to restate the unchanging theological truths of the Reformation, based on Scripture, as he had learned them. Further, had he been challenged, Pieper would have stated that he was doing so in line with his mentor, Walther. Yet Pieper was certain that the Reformation

had spoken authoritatively in other areas as well.[25] On one particular point, however, that of church fellowship, later Missourians claimed that Pieper went beyond Walther, indeed, that Pieper went beyond Scripture and the Reformation.

Church Fellowship and the Walther Legacy

We have been working with the understanding that Pieper simply sought to affirm the theology he learned from Walther. Other interpreters, however, have argued that Pieper departed from Walther in basic ways, especially in the two men's teaching regarding church fellowship, but also that Pieper downplayed justification and replaced it with the doctrine of Scriptures as the central article. This argument, offered by the likes of Richard Koenig and Erwin Lueker became increasingly popular in the late 1950s through the 1970s in Missouri circles.

Richard Koenig has argued that Pieper adopted the Aristotelian method from Orthodox Lutheranism, stressing the distinction between the formal and material principles, as well as efficient and fomal causes. The result for Koenig is that Pieper ends up "majoring in minors." A discussion of the formal principle—Scripture—becomes the burden of the *Dogmatics*, while the doctrine by which the church stands or falls—justification and the Gospel itself—receive scanty attention.[26] However, David Scaer has rightly pointed out that this misses Pieper's point. For him, justification could not be isolated from Christology. As Scaer states it: Koenig "fails to consider that Pieper regarded justification as a subsidiary article to Christology, to which he devoted over three hundred pages, and that the discussion of election is really about justification."

Koenig also was critical of Pieper's stance on fellowship, claiming that the "Pieper Tradition," created during the second generation of Missouri Synod history by Pieper and his faculty colleagues at St. Louis, actually went beyond that of Walther.[27] Lueker joined Koenig in his criticism of Pieper. Lueker argued that Walther had been far more flexible in his fellowship practice with other Lutherans than Pieper was. The best example of Walther's

inclusive practice, in his opinion, was the prayer fellowship practiced at the "Free Conferences" of the late 1850s.[28] Featuring joint prayer among Lutherans who had not yet decreed formal church fellowship, Lueker claimed these events defined Walther's position in regard to inter-Lutheran prayer fellowship.

However, looking beyond only the Free Conferences, a clearer picture of the mature Walther's position emerges, a very different picture than that offered by Lueker. For example, in his explanation of thesis VI of *The True Visible Church*, offered at the LCMS's Western District in 1867, Walther posed the question:

> "Why don't we just overlook the false doctrine?" People seemingly cannot understand why Christians are so intolerant; they call testimony against false doctrine "nitpicking" (*Schelten*), needless and purposeless criticism. That is why we must inculcate this doctrine and pay special attention to the three points of this citatation.
>
> 1). It is God's command that we teach pure doctrine. That cannot be done if we are silent about false doctrine. Error will creep in unnoticed, if we don't constantly testify against it. It is the duty of every Christian to help maintain pure doctrine, and that is why every Christian must continue to study this doctrine. This should all be easier for us, since, among other things, we have 20 years of experience. Twenty years have slipped by since Synod met right here [in Chicago for the first time in 1847], and God has greatly blessed us. It takes holy zeal to maintain a wall of separation; it takes a holy fear to continue opposing the sects. On the one hand, since the cause of separation lies in the sects themselves, because they are the ones who are departing from the truth, this should fill us with joyful courage to continue in our witness to grow in zeal. The pope and unionism are the two most dangerous forces facing us. The pope makes salvation uncertain and unionism makes the truth uncertain. Just as we should, therefore, be filled with true hatred against the pope, so we should be filled with hate against unionism. Let no one object, "I don't like quarrels." A Christian is always called to do battle and to wage war.[29]

Walther goes on to tell of the three dangers that allowing error into the church produces.

> 1) If heresies are not stopped at the start, they will spread farther and farther. 2) Truth becomes suspect and is questioned more and more. 3) The errorists are confirmed in their heresy.
>
> To remain silent in the face of false doctrine is not a demonstration of love, but rather of hate; for how then can the errorists be saved? If a blind man is walking down a street with a deep ditch at the far end of it, I would certainly warn him, and even if he disregarded my warning, I would persist, "No, no, I won't let you go there." It might even become necessary for me to use force to deter the blind man, and yet all of this would be done, not out of hatred, but out of love for the man.
>
> That's how it is with carrying on a controversy too. If I truly love someone who has fallen prey to false doctrine, I would be obligated to tell him, "If you continue in your blindness, you will be forever lost," and if he refused to be admonished, I will put increasing pressure on him. So, if we faithfully warn people, being truly motivated by love, God will also bless our efforts.[30]

Lueker's criticism of Pieper for going beyond Walther, since Walther did not demand complete agreement in doctrine and practice prior to any expression of fellowship, is not sustained by a comparison of the two men.[31] Listen to the language of Pieper as he addresses a similar matter. It is very "Waltherian."

> The unionists say that *love* should be allowed to come into play, that this can happen only in the absence of a rigid approach to all articles of doctrine. We reply: What a strange sort of love that would be which places us in glaring opposition to God's Word! It is God's will that we believe and accept all that stands written and that we do not disregard the smallest commandment.[32]

These words appear in an essay Pieper delivered to the Synodical Conference gathering at Milwaukee (August 8-14, 1888), little more than a year after Walther's death. In this essay, titled "Unity of Faith," Pieper did, indeed, demand complete unity in doctrine and practice prior to church fellowship. But in so doing, he was simply being consistent with Walther. While we lack the time for a complete consideration of this important essay, the theses are worth hearing, for they capture Pieper's position well:

1. Unity of faith is agreement in all articles of Christian doctrine as revealed in Holy Scripture.

2. Unity of faith is possible because all articles of Christian doctrine are clearly revealed in Holy Scripture.

3. God desires unity of faith because he both commands the acceptance in faith of His entire revelation and stoutly forbids every deviation therefrom.

4. The necessary outward testimony of the unity of faith consists in this that those who stand in the unity of faith profess each other to be brethren in the faith.

5. Those who stand in the unity of faith, recognizing this unity as a glorious blessing of God's grace, should diligently seek to nurture and preserve it.[33]

More than three decades later, Pieper addressed the topic of unionism in an essay delivered at the convention of the Washington-Oregon District of the Missouri Synod. In it he was totally consistent with his earlier position.

> Then let us not forget: if we so-called "Missourians" and those synods who stand with us in unity of faith and confession would allow ourselves to be drawn into the broad stream of unionism, we would be acting contrary to the will and command of God, outside of the calling which we have as Christians on earth. We would then have fallen away from the truth, which God raised again as brightly as the stars through the Church of the Reformation . . .[34]

Here we see Pieper being consistent in his affirmation of the Reformation heritage. The Holy Scriptures clearly teach God's truth in its fullness and purity. The Lutheran Reformation was a legitimate movement only because of its faithful confession and practice of this unchanging biblical truth. The Missouri Synod must continue in this path because the blessing of God comes in its full breadth only where this unchanging truth is confessed comprehensively.

> Although, by the great mercy of God, there are found children of God also in the church communities of errorists, still such church organizations of errorists do not exist by the will of God, but are earnestly *prohibited*, since God desires to have His Word, in every particular, both preached and believed with purity, as is written 1 Pet. 4, 11: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." Hence, it is the will of God that Christians should affiliate only with orthodox church organizations, and that Christians who have strayed into heterodox church organizations should *leave* the same, and seek the communion of the orthodox Church, as is written Rom. 16, 17: "I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned and *avoid them*." Accordingly, we reject the unionistic practice prevalent especially in our time, that is, the rather unchurchly practice of churches which make it a duty of Christians not to separate from false teachers, but to *remain* with them. We reject unionism as disobedience to the express command of Christ, as the real cause of the origin and continuance of divisions in the Church, and as a standing danger, threatening the *entire* loss of the Word of God.[35]

Conclusion

I have argued that Franz Pieper left a twofold literary legacy to the Missouri Synod and in so doing provided Missouri and confessional Lutheranism in America with a link to its Reformation heritage. The first is his magisterial *Christliche Dogmatik*, a text that is still used in the two seminaries of the Missouri Synod as the basic text. Appearing in German at the time the Synod was beginning its transition to English, *Christliche Dogmatik* became the standard dogmatics until it was displaced by J. T. Mueller's abridged and edited *Christian Dogmatics* in the 1930s. Two decades after Pieper died it finally arrived in English translation—a translation not immune to criticism—and reclaimed its dominant position. However, even at that point certain faculty members at Pieper's institution, Concordia, St. Louis, were expressing dissatisfaction with the text. Pieper was relegated to simply being read, rather than studied, and, again according to David Scaer, the message offered in the classroom was one quite contrary to that of Pieper. After the confrontation over the doctrine of Scripture in the 60s and 70s, Pieper regained his earlier

position—at least to a certain extent. Even today Pieper has his critics. However, today's criticisms differ from those of the past in this respect. Few read Pieper beyond the *Brief Statement* and the *Dogmatics,* which is an unfortunate reality. Further, when they read these texts, they tend to focus on what is lacking in the text. Why didn't Pieper spend more time on the doctrine of God? Why didn't he spend more time on the Trinity? and so forth. Strange as it may seem, that may stem from Pieper's debt to the Reformation. The doctrine of God (Augsburg Confession Article I) was not the pressing issue of the Reformation. Rome's *Confutatio* happily recognized the orthodoxy of Article I. Perhaps Pieper, therefore, spent less time on this section of the dogmatics for this reason.

Or perhaps he spent so much time on Christology and the means of grace because he was so intimately bound up in his context and his time. He clearly knew that the "Lutheran difference" lies in these areas. Particularly in America, the problem of Reformed distortions of Christology and the means of grace obscure the pure preaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the Sacraments. Because of that, the burden of the *Dogmatics* has to be in these areas. And, in the light of the Reformed twisting of Scripture on these points, it seems to me that Pieper has left us a marvelous inheritance in his work. That is no less true of the *Brief Statement* on these points, I might add.

At times in the Missouri Synod and beyond, there is concern that Pieper is "being done away with" in the seminary curriculum. I can only speak of the situation at the institution where I have been called to serve. At Concordia Theological Seminary in Fort Wayne, there is no intention of "doing away with" Pieper. However, neither should we assume that Pieper's dogmatics will be sufficient *in its application for all times*. We should remember that Pieper's *Dogmatics* itself replaced an earlier dogmatics—the Baier/Walther *Compendium*. In other words, Pieper replaced Walther! Now, does this mean that Pieper thought that the text that Walther himself had produced and used as professor, and which Pieper himself had used for years, was suddenly insufficient? I would argue both yes and no. Yes, it was insufficient because it did not specifically address questions of contemporary import. As Walther himself reminded us

in his tremendous paper, "The Kind of Confessional Subscription Required," while the truth has been presented in its fullness in the Scriptures and rightly confessed in the Lutheran Symbols, we still may develop different lines of argumentation given our varying circumstances and questions.[36] This is precisely what Pieper did with Walther. Did he "develop" Walther's theology? No. Did he take Walther's theology and apply it to questions of his time? Yes. Could there be a such a supplementary work in confessional Lutheranism's future? Perhaps. Indeed, with the Wisconsin Synod completing the task of translating and publishing Hoeneke, we can celebrate the appearance of yet another text that complement's Pieper's work.

Pieper may be supplemented by other texts that address more contemporary questions. Yet Pieper will remain. His ongoing legacy to the Missouri Synod and confessional Lutheranism in America and throughout the world continues, largely through the literary legacy he has left in German, English, and a number of other languages. He was born 152 years ago, the year after the publication of the first complete translation of the *Book of Concord* in English by the Henkels. By the end of his life even Missouri was using English with greater frequency, as was he. However, whatever changes he faced, he did so from an unchanging posture and conviction. Pieper, like Walther before him, attempted, unashamedly, to *restate* the theology of the Reformation and seventeenth-century Lutheran orthodoxy. Not for the sake of itself, not as an end in itself, and not because of itself—rather because it faithfully captured and articulated that theology/doctrine/confession of the Scriptures.

So is Pieper relevant anymore? My answer, obviously, is a hearty yes. Certainly his concerns demonstrate the influence of the times in which he lived. On the other hand, the threat of the Reformed errors in Christology and the means of grace has certainly not subsided in the seventy-three years since Pieper's death. If anything, the challenge has become more overt, with Reformed doctrine and practice now making its way into the remnant of confessional Lutheran synods in America.

In this respect, Pieper still has much to say to us and we have much to learn from him. Certainly times have changed. But they have also stayed the same. When Pieper tells us of the tension

between the religion of the law and the religion of the Gospel, he makes a worthy point. And when Pieper points us to the centrality of Christology and the means of grace as our distinctive Lutheran confession, we need to listen.

It is difficult to end an essay of this sort. There is still so much that could be said. However, in closing, it might be best to let a student of Pieper summarize the man for us. For those who sat at his feet can give us the pointers as to what truly captures the man.

> His knowledge of Scripture was astonishing, quotations from the original Hebrew and Greek being interluded with great frequency and utmost ease. Luther was ever at the command of his tongue, and the pages of his *Christliche Dogmatik* will convey an idea of the scholastic learning and acquaintance with the old dogmaticians which made his lectures, as it were, a connecting link between the present age and that of the fathers and founders of Lutheranism.[37]

Endnotes

[1] Theodore Graebner, "Francis August Otto Pieper, Doctor of Theology, 1852-1931," *Lutheran Witness*, June 9, 1931, 197. For other considerations at Pieper's death, see P. E. Kretzmann, "†Prof. Franz August Otto Pieper," Dr. theol.†," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 2 (August 1931): 561-65; L. Fuerbringer, " Dr. F. Pieper als Theolog," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 2 (October 1931): 721-29; W. H. T. Dau, "Francis Pieper the Churchman," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 2 (October 1931): 729-36; Th. Laetsch, "Dr. Pieper als Prediger," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 2 (October 1931): 761-71. See also Richard Klann, "In Memoriam: Franz August Otto Pieper, June 27, 1852-June 3, 1931," *Concordia Journal* 7 (May 1981): 91-93. J. F. Pfotenhauer, "Funeral Sermon for Dr Pieper [June 6 1931]," trans. M. C. Harrison *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly* 66 (Spring 1993): 39-43.

[2] Francis Pieper, *Church Government* (Okabena, MN: Published by Geo. Schweikert, 1956), 27-28.

[3] Fancis Pieper, "Die Missouri-Synode und das General Council," *Lehre und Wehre* 36 (August 1890): 262. Recently this quote has been used against contemporary Missouri as proof of its falling away from orthodoxy. If one grants Pieper's contention in the last paragraph, one might come to that conclusion. However, simply wrenching the text from its historical context misses Pieper's overall point. He is arguing here over against the General Council, a church body that had only two years before affirmed what Pieper believed was an aberrant reading of the old Akron/Galesburg Rule and thereby had made this false position its official doctrine. In this article Pieper was appealing to orthodox Lutherans within the General Council to come out from it and join the orthodox Missouri Synod. In this respect he echoed Walther's earlier statement in Thesis VIII on the Church in *Kirche und Amt*, where he writes: "Although God gathers for Himself a holy church of elect also where His Word is not taught in its perfect purity and the sacraments are not administered altogether according to the institution of Jesus Christ, . . . nevertheless, every believer must, at the peril of losing his salvation, flee all false teachers, avoid all heterodox congregations or sects, and acknowledge and adhere to orthodox congregations and their orthodox pastors wherever such may be found." In 1851, when Walther's statement was approved, and in 1890, when Pieper wrote, both men were utterly convinced that the Missouri Synod and later the Synodical Conference fulfilled the requirement of absolute orthodoxy. In such a setting it is easy to appeal to a Pieper statement abstracted from its historical context. However, in 2004 the situation may be more analogous to that of Walther in 1841, when, not finding an unequivocally orthodox synod in America, he wrote in the Altenberg Theses: "Even heterodox companies are not to be dissolved, but reformed." See August R. Suelflow, *Servant of the Word: The Life and Ministry of C. F. W. Walther* (St. Louis: CPH, 2000), 60. One commentator on Walther at Altenberg stated (Suelflow, 59): "It was shown with convincing clarity that in spite of our mistakes we still had the Lord Jesus, His Word, His true Sacrament, and the Office of the Keys in our midst; that the Lord had also heard His people, His Church."

[4] Francis Pieper, *A Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Missouri Synod, in the Year of Jubilee,* trans. Dau (n.p., n.d.). Pieper was not the only one to speak in this manner. In the 1890s the *Pilger durch Welt und Kirche*, a publication from within the General Council tradition, wrote: "I see no more striking instance of the blessing which God bestows on men's faithfulness than this very Missouri Synod. If it had

not with such iron tenacity held to its confession of pure doctrine; if it had not offered such trenchant testimony, and had not fought against each and every deviation from the path which it had recognized to be the only true way; if it had shown itself more yielding in its church-polity (*Praxis*) than in its teaching; if it had adapted itself in every so small a measure to the views of our rather impressionable age, it would *not* have the results it may now claim." Cited in W. H. T. Dau, "At the Milestone," in *Ebenezer: Reviews of the Work of the Missouri Synod during Three Quarters of a Century* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1922), 530-31.

[5]Franz Pieper, *Unsere Stellung in Lehre und Praxis: Vortrag gehalten vor der Delegatensynode 1893 der Synode von Missouri, Ohio, und Andern Staaten* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1896): 42, cited in W. H. T. Dau, "Francis Pieper the Churchman," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 2 (October 1931): 729-730. Emphasis added.

[6] Leigh D. Jordahl, "Theology of Franz Pieper: A Resource for Fundamentalistic Thought Modes among American Lutherans," *Lutheran Quarterly* 23 (May 1971): 118-37. For an article that challenges this perspective, see Roy A. Suelflow, "Franz August Otto Pieper: Orthodoxist or Confessionalist?" *Lutheran Historical Conference* 8 (1980): 42-56.

[7] Theodore Graebner, "Dr. Pieper's Illness," *Lutheran Witness*, March 31, 1931, 121. Strikingly, Pieper was preceded in death by his colleague on the faculty, G. Friedrich Bente, who passed away in December 1930. See "†Dr. G. Frederick Bente†," *Lutheran Witness,* January 6, 1931, 3.

[8] David P. Scaer, "Francis Pieper: His Theology and Legacy Unmatched in Stature," in *The Pieper Lectures: The Office of the Holy Ministry*, vol. 1., ed. Chris Christophersen Boshoven (St. Louis: Concordia Historical Institute and the Luther Academy, 1997), 9.

[9] David Scaer points out that the two younger brothers, Reinhold and August, went on to distinguished pastoral and academic careers of their own: Reinhold as professor and later president at Missouri's Springfield seminary, and August at the seminary of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod. David P. Scaer, "Francis Pieper," in *Handbook of Evangelical Theologians,* ed. Walter A. Ewell (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1993), 40-41.

[10] Other texts include *What Is Christianity and Other Essays,* trans. John Theodore Mueller (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1933); *Das Grundbekenntniss der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1930); *Zur Einigung der amerikanisch-lutherischen Kirche in der Lehre von der Bekehrung und Gnadenwahl* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1913) and its English translation, *Conversion and Election: A Plea for a United Lutheranism in America* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1913). Articles are too numerous to mention, but one may see P. E. Kretzmann, "†Prof. Franz August Otto Pieper," Dr. theol.†," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 2 (August 1931): 563-65 for a brief biography of Pieper's articles in *Lehre und Wehre* during the last portion of his life.

[11] The exact wording of Missouri's adoption of the *Brief Statement* follows: "We recommend that the theses be adopted as a brief Scriptural statement of the doctrinal position of the Missouri Synod. . . . We recommend that Synod adopt these theses. We recommend that the title remain as it is." From *Proceedings*, 1932, IV. Constitutional Matters, Intersynodical Matters (Report of Committee 20), p. 155. There were further resolutions supporting the *Brief Statement* in 1932, 1941, 1947, 1956 and 1959.

[12] http://www.lcms.org/pages/internal.asp?NavID=563, cited October 13, 2004.

[13] Pieper, *Brief Statement* (1897), 1. His purpose in producing this document is comparable

to the position taken by Hodge. Pieper inherited this understanding from C. F. W. Walther, who had previously stated: "He who imagines that he finds in holy Scripture even only one error believes not in Scripture, but in himself; for even if he accepted everything else as truth, he would believe it not because Scripture says so, but because it agrees with his reason or with his heart." Walther quoted the above cited statement from Quenstedt as perfectly summarizing his views on the inerrancy of Scripture. For a more detailed analysis of Walther's views on the Scripture see Robert Preus, "Walther and the Scriptures," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 32 (November 1961): 669-91.

[14] Pieper, *Brief Statement* (1897), 2.

[15]http://www.lcms.org/pages/internal.asp?NavID=563, cited October 13, 2004.

[16] Franz Pieper, "Luther's Doctrine of Inspiration," *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* 4, 249, 251, 252.

[17] Pieper, "Luther's Doctrine of Inspiration," 256.

[18] Franz Pieper, "Unity of Faith," trans. E. J. Otto (Fort Wayne: Concordia Theological Seminary Press, 1980), 10.

[19] Benedict Schwartz, "The Many-Sided Dr. Pieper, I: We Do Not Interpret," *Lutheran Witness*, September 29, 1931, 326.

[20] Pieper, *Brief Statement* (1897), 8-9.

[21] http://www.lcms.org/pages/internal.asp?NavID=570, cited October 13, 2004.

[22] Scaer, "Francis Pieper," 52

[23] W. E. Buszin, "The Many-Sided Dr. Pieper, II: As Professor of Pastoral Theology," *Lutheran Witness*, October 13, 1931, 345.

[24] John Theodore Mueller, "In Memory of Our Teacher Dr. Francis Pieper, †June 3, 1931†," *Lutheran Witness*, June 23, 1931, 213.

[25] One area not touched on in this paper is the Office of the Ministry. For my reading of Pieper on this crucial point, see Lawrence R. Rast Jr., "Franz Pieper on the Office of the Holy Ministry," *The Pieper Lectures: The Office of the Ministry,* vol. 1, ed. Chris Christophersen Boshoven (St. Louis: Concordia Historical Institute and the Lutheran Academy, 1997), 145-79.

[26] For another challenge, see William J. Danker, "Who Wrote the Pivotal Quotation in Francis Pieper's *Christian Dogmatics*," *Currents in Theology and Mission* 4 (August 1977): 235-39.

[27] In a series of articles first printed in *Lutheran Forum* and later reprinted as a stand-alone treatment, Richard E. Koenig argued that "The Missouri Synod after 1938 was different. The difference was not to be seen in the area of theological propositions or formal statements *at first*, but on another level—on the level of assumptions, attitudes and consequences implied in the older Tradition. This is the reason for the passionate conservative opposition to resolutions such as those passed in 1938 paving the way for fellowship with the American Lutheran Church. On the surface the resolutions strike the observer as wholly unexceptional and quite conservative. Those who held to the Pieper Tradition in its original stridency, however, sensed what the resolution implied. They understood rightly, that a change in the relationship between Missouri and the ALC meant changes in attitude and approach which eventually would show up in some kind of alteration in Missouri's theology." Richard E. Koenig, "What's Behind the Showdown in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod?" (New York: Lutheran Forum, 1973), in the section titled "Conservative reaction: 1965-69" (emphasis added). Koenig's articles are insightful of the changes coming to the LCMS in the years following Pieper's death. One error he makes, however, is arguing that certain theological positions, which he labels the "Pieper Tradition," were in fact advanced

by the founders of Missouri. For example, one might consider the way the First Constitution of the LCMS cites Romans 16:17 specifically to reject "separatism and sectarianism." See "Our First Synodical Constitution," *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly* 16 (April 1943): 2.

[28] Erwin Lueker, "Walther and the Free Lutheran Conferences of 1856-1859," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 15 (August 1944), 529-63.

[29] C. F. W. Walther, "The True Visible Church, Theses III-VI," Western District Essay (1867), in *Essays for the Church,* vol. 1, trans. Everette Meier (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1987), 123.

[30] Walther, "True Visible Church," 124. Walther speaks very much to this point also in a quote cited in "Walther the Lutheran," *Theological Quarterly* 15 (July 1911): 138-41.

[31] Erwin L. Lueker, "Second Generation Theologians: Pieper, Stoeckhardt, Graebner," unpublished manuscript, copyright 1972, 56.

[32] Franz Pieper, "Unity of Faith," trans. E. J. Otto (Fort Wayne: Concordia Theological Seminary Press, 1980), 15.

[33] Pieper, "Unity of Faith," 1. Pieper goes on to note that "the Synodical Conference in its *Denkschrift* of 1871" affirmed this position. Walther would have had a role in the production of this statement (3).

[34] Franz Pieper, "Theses on Unionism," trans. Laurence L. White (Fort Wayne, IN: Concordia Theological Seminary Press, 1980), 2. See also Franz Pieper, "Unionism," *Concordia Journal* 11 (May 1985): 94-100.

[35] Pieper, *Brief Statement* (1897), 19.

[36] C. F. W. Walther, "The Kind of Confessional Subscription Required," in *Lutheran Confessional Theology in America,* ed. Theodore Tappert (New York: Oxford, 1972), 58: "Furthermore, since the argumentation in behalf of a teaching may be imperfect, although the teaching that is to be proved and the conclusion itself rest on irrefutable divine ground and the teachings adduced for demonstration and the major and minor premises have a measure of correctness, unconditional subscription by no means implies that none of the arguments for pure teaching in the symbolical writings are capable of improvement or, in other words, that the form, the method, and the procedure of argumentation are perfect and that every faithful minister is therefore obligated to employ the method used in the symbols and none other."

[37] Theodore Graebner, "Dr. Pieper—the Teacher," *Lutheran Witness*, August 4, 1931, 262.

Gustav Adolf Theodor Felix Hoenecke (1835-1908) *By Grace, The Right Man At The Right Time In Wisconsin Synod History*

Lyle W. Lange

I was neither a prophet nor a prophet's son, but I was a shepherd, and I also took care of sycamore-fig trees. But the Lord took me from tending the flock and said to me, "Go, prophesy to my people Israel." Amos 7:14,15.

Amaziah was the priest of Bethel during the reign of Jeroboam II, king of Israel (793-753 B.C.). He told the prophet Amos to get out of Israel, because Amos prophesied that God would soon judge the Northern Kingdom. Amos responded with the words printed above. He was not a likely prospect to deliver God's message to the Northern Kingdom. Amos was not a prophet by profession. He did not come from a long line of prophets, whose work he was continuing. Yet, he was sent by God to deliver his message. Unlikely a messenger as Amos was, God called and equipped him to be his spokesman. God made Amos the right man to serve at just the right time in Israel's history.

The same could be said of Adolph Hoenecke. He, too, was an unlikely prospect for the ministry. How unlikely, we shall see later. Yet, God led Hoenecke into the ministry. He equipped and prepared him for the work he was to do, so that he could be his tool to guide the Wisconsin Synod. God made Adolph Hoenecke the right man to lead the Wisconsin Synod doctrinally at just the right time in its history.

In order to gain a deeper appreciation for the importance of Hoenecke in Wisconsin Synod history, we will view his life and

work against the broader background of the influences which made the world of Hoenecke's time what it was. As an introduction, we will briefly consider:

1. The influences of the Enlightenment which caused religious Liberalism of the nineteenth century.

2. The influences, from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century, which affected Lutheranism in Hoenecke's day.

3. The influences which shaped the Wisconsin Synod in its early years, before Hoenecke's arrival in America in 1863.

After we have considered these introductory matters, we will proceed to discuss in more depth:

4. The life and ministry of Adolph Hoenecke.

5. The crucial issues through which God guided Hoenecke to lead the Wisconsin Synod to a truly Confessional Lutheran position.

6. The legacy of Adolph Hoenecke.

7. Lessons from Hoenecke and history for Lutherans in the twenty-first century.

1. The Influences of the Enlightenment Which Caused Religious Liberalism of the Nineteenth Century

The Attack on the Authority and Inerrancy of Scripture

Prior to the beginning of the eighteenth century, the western world generally accepted the authority of the Bible. True, the Roman Catholic Church maintained there were two sources of doctrine (the Bible and Tradition),[1] over against the Lutheran *Sola Scriptura* teaching. Yet, Rome still accepted the Bible as an authority. Lutherans, Reformed, and Roman Catholics alike accepted the Bible as God's Word. The western world viewed science as subservient to

God's Word.

Things changed in the eighteenth century. The French Revolution with Voltaire's exaltation of reason[2] challenged the authority of Scripture. The French professor of medicine in Paris, Jean Astruc (d. 1766), taught the composite authorship of Genesis. This gave rise to the practice of biblical criticism. Two Germans supported the views of Astruc. One was Johann Eichorn (d. 1827), who has been called the father of Old Testament criticism. The other was Johann Semler (d. 1791), professor at Halle, who has been called the father of German rationalism. Karl Graf (d. 1869) and Julius Wellhausen (d. 1918) later enlarged on Astruc's hypothesis, producing the Documentary Hypothesis of the Pentateuch.[3]

Challenges to the authority of Scripture arose from other quarters as well. Philosophers and scientists[4] asserted that all concepts must be doubted until proven, and adequate proofs must have the certainty of mathematical equations. David Hume (d. 1776) challenged the possibility of miracles by appealing to the uniformity of nature. Deists in England, France, and America also contributed to the attack on the authority of Scripture. Deism rejected the Book given by God and replaced it with the "book of nature."[5]

The influences at work in the eighteenth century undermined the Bible's authority and elevated the reason of man as authoritative. When that happens, the next step down is sure to come. Man attempts to create God in his own image, and finally doesn't see the need for God at all. Thus, we may characterize the nineteenth century as:

The Assault on the Existence of God

In the nineteenth century, four men in particular led the assault on the existence of God. They were:

- In science, Charles Darwin (d. 1882) removed the Creator from his creation and replaced him with chance (natural selection and survival of the fittest). His views also fueled the fires of biblical criticism.[6]

- In politics and economics, Karl Marx (d. 1883) viewed religion as the "opiate of the people."[7]

- In philosophy, Friedrich Nietzsche (d. 1900) proclaimed the death of God and the rise of *der Übermensch*. [8]

- In psychology, Sigmund Freud (d. 1939) asserted that religion perpetuated infantile psychological problems.[9]

What was the reaction of many Protestants to this assault on God? It was to conform their theology to Darwin's theory of evolution. Religious Liberalism came into being with an overly optimistic view of man and a devalued view of God and his Word. It had the idea that mankind was progressing ever upward. Religious Liberalism rejected the inspiration and authority of the Bible and the deity of Jesus Christ. It's overly optimistic view of man was summed up by Emil Coue (d. 1926), the French auto-suggestionist, who encouraged people to say, "Day by day, in every way, I am getting better and better."[10]

The result of the assault on the authority of Scripture and on the existence of God was a loss of the biblical Christ. Men like Ferdinand Christian Baur (d. 1860),[11] Heinrich Paulus (d. 1851),[12] and David Strauss (d. 1874)[13] rejected the biblical record of Jesus. As a postscript to the Christology of the nineteenth century, Albert Schweitzer (d. 1965) wrote his book, The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of its Progress From Reimarus to Wrede (1906). In this study, Schweitzer decried the inability of the previous studies of Christ to produce anything but a fictitious Christ.[14]

These were the influences which produced the climate of Rationalism in Hoenecke's day. Liberalism had produced a barren and ravaged religious terrain devoid of the living water of the Gospel, having little or nothing to offer the pilgrim through this barren land. Of those Protestants who avoided religious Liberalism in the nineteenth century, many fell into the camps of American Revivalism, the Holiness movement, and other sects.

It should be noted that at this time, Roman Catholicism resisted the temptations of Modernism. Rome would wait until the twentieth century before it was beguiled by the seductive voice of

biblical criticism and all of its attendant evils.[15]

2. The Religious Influences, from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century, Which Affected Lutheranism in Hoenecke's Day

Melanchthon's Doctrinal Compromises in the Interest of Union with the Reformed

There were a number of major differences between Luther and Melanchthon. We wish to note two of them in order to serve us in our understanding of later Lutheranism. The first was Melancthon's willingness to subject Scripture to reason to solve a mystery. When faced with a mystery of Scripture, Luther was content to stop with what Scripture said and take his reason captive to Scripture. Melanchthon, on the other hand, was willing to subject Scripture to his reason. He attempted to find an answer to what Scripture left as a mystery. By doing this, he fostered a number of errors with which the Formula of Concord had to deal. Though the Formula of Concord settled these errors, they did not go away, but continued to plague the Lutheran Church in years to come. [16]

Secondly, when faced with opposition from Roman Catholicism, Luther was willing to trust God to take care of the church. He believed that unity in the church was produced through agreement on all the Bible taught. Melanchthon felt it was necessary to form a union with the Reformed in order to survive. For this reason, he was willing to make doctrinal concessions in order to obtain outward union. Melanchthon's willingness to compromise doctrine to achieve union troubled the Lutheran Church after Luther's death and on through the centuries.

The State Church

England had its established church, which had the king as its head. Norway and Sweden had their Lutheran state churches. Germany had its territorial churches. America had religious freedom. The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States says:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof" (1791). Church work would be conducted differently in a land with religious freedom.

The early pastors who came to America from the German universities and mission societies were not prepared for the practical work of the ministry in America. The only experience they possessed came from the state church situation. As Koehler observed, "Here in America, a new pastoral theology had to be born."[17]

Pietism

The state church situation in Germany tended to foster a nominal Christianity. The incredible suffering of the Thirty Year's War (1618-1648), and Orthodoxism's[18] lack of response to the needs caused by the Thirty Years War, produced the soil from which Pietism grew. Spener (d. 1705), Franke (d. 1727), and Zinzendorf (d. 1760) guided its development. However well-intentioned it was, Pietism was poison for the church. Its many doctrinal aberrations obscured the Gospel and robbed sinners of its comforts.[19] With its subjectivism, Pietism proved totally unable to resist the inroads of Rationalism into the church. Pietism was carried by Lutherans and by the Methodists to America.[20]

The Prussian Union of 1817 and the Rhine Country Unions

On the 300th anniversary of the Reformation in 1817, Frederick William III of Prussia instituted the Prussian Union. His goal was to bring Lutherans and Reformed into an apparent union. Each group was to retain its distinctive doctrines, such as real or spiritual presence in the Lord's Supper.[21] "Old Lutherans"[22] resisted with vigor. They were willing to suffer imprisonment rather than compromise. They established "free churches" in areas where the state church favored union, or they left for Australia or America. For example, Pastor J. A. A. Grabau left with a group of Prussians in 1839, leading some to Buffalo and sending others on to Wisconsin. In 1845 Grabau organized the Buffalo Synod. In 1839, "Old Lutherans" from Saxony emigrated to St. Louis and to Perry County

in Missouri. This was a step in the organization of the Missouri Synod (1847).

"New Lutherans" believed they could participate in the Union as long as no doctrinal compromise was involved. They failed to see that the Union was already a compromise. There had been Lutheran-Reformed unions in the Rhine country earlier than 1817. It was no problem for these unions to operate union mission societies. They agreed that, with so much work to be done and with so much support needed, it was only logical to join Lutheran and Reformed resources. The motive of these societies to reach people with the Gospel was noble. The unionistic means chosen to deliver the Gospel could only undermine it.

The missions schools at Basel,[23] St. Chrischona[24] and Barmen[25] furnished pastors for the Wisconsin Synod in its early history. These pastors were to minister to Reformed and to Lutherans alike, in a way that did not ruffle anyone's feathers. If a person took doctrine seriously, this was an impossibility.

Thus, the stage was set for the founding of the Wisconsin Synod. Pastors sent out by unionistic mission societies had to learn what it means to be Confessional Lutheran pastors. It was for this purpose the Lord of the church equipped and sent Adolph Hoenecke to assist in leading the Wisconsin Synod to a Confessional Lutheran position.

3. The Early History of the Wisconsin Synod Before Hoenecke Arrived

In 1863, Adolph Hoenecke boarded a ship and came to America. What were the influences at work in the Wisconsin Synod before Hoenecke arrived in America? We shall start at the beginning, with the "founders" of the Wisconsin Synod and the people whom they served.

Muehlhaeuser, Weinmann, Wrede, and the Early Germans

John Muehlhaeuser, John Weinmann, and William Wrede met together in December of 1849 at Granville, Wisconsin. They eventually formed "The First German Evangelical Lutheran

Synod of Wisconsin."[26] Their immediate purpose was to care for the spiritual needs of the hosts of Germans who were emigrating to Wisconsin. When these men met in May 1850, to adopt a constitution, Pastors Pluess and Meiss joined them. These five men served eighteen congregations. By 1850 there were about 38,000 German-born people in Wisconsin.[27] They came through the ports of Sheboygan and Milwaukee. Brochures had depicted Wisconsin as the land of opportunity for land-hungry and poverty-stricken Germans. By 1860 there were close to 124,000 German-born people in Wisconsin.[28]

These Germans did not find the paradise they envisioned. They could not afford to buy the more expensive prairie land that lay west and northwest of Racine and Milwaukee toward Waukesha and Whitewater. Instead, they had to buy the land covered with hardwood forests. It cost $1.25 an acre. This was the land that was close to Lake Michigan, from Milwaukee to Manitowoc. The work of clearing the land was hard, and getting settled in homes was difficult. Yet, the land produced when it was worked.

To appreciate the need for pastors among the Germans, we need to remember that there were very few settled German communities in Wisconsin by 1850. Except for some large groups of Germans who had settled in Racine, Milwaukee, and Sheboygan, the Germans lived scattered in the woods or in very small communities. As a result, a small number of pastors would have a large number of places to serve.

Not all of the Germans who came to America were of German-Lutheran background. Some were Roman Catholics, Reformed, free-thinking Turners, and "Latin" farmers who were rationalists. The greater number of those who came from the agricultural districts of Northern Germany came from the state church background, where the combination of Reformed and Lutheran confessions had been established by decree.

Missouri synod pastors and followers of Grabau were active among the Germans in Wisconsin. So were the Methodists. The Methodists called themselves Evangelicals and fooled many Germans into thinking they were the same as the church they had belonged to in Germany. The need for pastors to care for these

Germans was great, but the cry for help rarely came from these people. Rather, it came from the mission societies in Germany. As E. E. Kowalke, former president of Northwestern College, observed:

> State control of church functions and state dictation had taken away from the congregations and from the individual Christian the dignity and the responsibility of the priesthood of the believer. So it was hardly to be expected that people who had been regimented into state-dictated forms at home would in a new country be very active about providing pastors and teachers for themselves. It took time for them to learn that they needed to help themselves if they wanted their children baptized and taught the Way of Life and if they themselves wanted spiritual care.[29]

The Mission Societies and the Pastors They Sent to America

The mission society which most directly showed concern for the Germans in Wisconsin was the Langenberg Society. Though Rationalism had devastated the churches in Germany, the Langenberg Society and the other mission societies were still dedicated to the spread of the Gospel among the Germans in Wisconsin. The men sent by the Langenberg Society were usually second-career men. Muelhaeuser had been a baker; Reim, a shoemaker's apprentice; Philipp Koehler, a weaver; Bading, a wheelwright.[30] These men were trained and then sent to America. However, they were sent to take care of both Reformed and Lutheran groups. It is no wonder that confused theology was the order of the day. One pastor in Washington County served two congregations. In one, he used the Reformed Catechism and administered the Lord's Supper in the Reformed style. In the other congregation, he used Luther's Catechism and the Lutheran liturgy.

The pastors sent out by the mission societies were poorly trained theologically. Philipp Koehler was one of the few pastors who had a knowledge of Greek or Hebrew. Neither Muehlhaeuser nor Weinmann had any knowledge of biblical languages. Some men like John Bading and Philipp Koehler had a more confessional Lutheran training. Bading studied in Hermannsburg where Louis Harms was the director. Philipp Koehler studied at Barmen where

John Wallmann headed the mission house. Wallmann, as did Martin Luther, believed a theologian should have a thorough grounding in the original languages.

It is assumed that Wrede was responsible for the paragraph in the constitution of the Wisconsin Synod that dealt with the requirements for ordination. A candidate needed to be acquainted with the biblical languages and to be well-grounded in exegesis, dogmatics, church history, ethics, apologetics and homiletics. However, the proviso was made that the requirements could be waived if the candidate showed fitness for the ministry and promised to devote himself faithfully to the study of theology.

From Muehlhaeuser to Bading

It is no wonder that the early ministers of the Wisconsin Synod were not entirely "Old Lutheran." Muehlhaeuser did not find "Old Lutheranism" appealing. He said of himself, "I am in a position to offer every child of God and servant of Christ the hand of fellowship over the ecclesiastical fence."[31] Muehlhaeuser did reject the "Definite Platform" of S.S. Schmucker in 1856, but he sought no contact with the men of Missouri at the free conferences conducted in the late 1850s. Though the Buffalo and the Missouri Synods were active in Wisconsin, Muehlhaeuser deliberately started another synod there. He did not like the "Old Lutheranism" for which these two synods stood.

One man who moved the Wisconsin Synod in the direction of Confessional Lutheranism was John Bading (1824–1913). He arrived on the scene in America in 1853. At his ordination, he insisted upon subscribing to all the Lutheran Confessions, against the wishes of his Synod president, Muehlhaeuser. Joined by Philipp Koehler and Gottlieb Reim in what was known as the "Northwestern Conference,"[32] the three formed a strong nucleus committed to the Lutheran Confessions and opposed to unionistic practice. Bading began to influence the Wisconsin Synod in a more Confessional Lutheran direction. In 1860, Muehlhaeuser declined re-election. The Synod elected Bading as president. He served in that capacity until 1863, and then from 1867 to 1889.[33] At his direction, doctrinal

papers became a part of the Synod Conventions.

Steps Away from Reformed Practices

In 1862, the Wisconsin Synod repudiated a practice it had mandated just eight years earlier. In 1854, the congregation at Slinger had complained that their pastor was introducing Lutheran ceremonies. The complaint obviously came from the Reformed segment of the congregation. The Synod's answer to the complaint was to direct the Lutheran segment to cater to the Reformed, especially in Communion practices. By 1862, views had changed. The same pastor who was told to cater to the Reformed in Communion was censured *in absentia* for doing what he had been told to do eight years earlier. Things were changing in the Wisconsin Synod concerning unionistic practices. Bading and the men from the "Northwestern Conference" were making a difference.

The Beginning of the Seminary

In 1863, the Wisconsin Synod resolved to begin its own worker-training school. The Lord had blessed the efforts of the early pastors in gathering people together into preaching stations. For example, Edward Moldehnke, the first teacher at the Watertown Seminary, had earlier served as *Reiseprediger*. At the time of the 1863 Convention, he was reporting for 22 preaching stations. The Wisconsin Synod needed pastors. The mission societies could not supply enough. The attempt to have existing pastors train apprentice pastors did not work. The pastors simply did not have enough time to do this. Relying on pastors who were not trained, or whose character and capabilities were not tested, was a worse problem than not having enough pastors. So, the Wisconsin Synod began its own Seminary, and the Lord of the church eventually supplied Adolph Hoenecke to fill the post of chief theological educator for the Wisconsin Synod.

4. The Life and Ministry of Adolph Hoenecke

From Childhood to his Decision to Study for the Ministry

Adolph Hoenecke was born on February 25, 1835, in Brandenberg, on the Havel River, about 50 miles southwest of Berlin. His father was a military hospital superintendent. August Pieper described the elder Hoenecke as follows: "His father was not a church-goer, to say nothing of being a believer… He concerned himself very little with the religion of his son."[34] Was Hoenecke's mother like Hannah of old, who dedicated her son to the Lord's service from birth? Pieper observed, "His mother, personally a believer, taught him to pray in his childhood, but had little influence on his later religious training."[35]

The Lord himself would have to lead Hoenecke into the ministry. He used a strange way to do it. When Hoenecke graduated from the Gymnasium, he did not have any firm ideas as to what he wanted to do. He was physically too frail to follow his brothers into the military. The Lord used the joking remarks of an unbelieving music director of the Gymnasium, Thomas Taeglichsbeck, to lead Hoenecke to study for the ministry. After his final examinations, Hoenecke was invited to the music director's house for the evening. A pastor who made a comfortable living in the ministry was also present as Taeglichsbeck's guest. The music director, taking note of Hoenecke's frail frame, suggested, "Look, Adolph, become a pastor and then you will have a good thing." [36] So, Hoenecke studied for the ministry.

The Training at Halle

Hoenecke enrolled at the University of Halle. He had not previously contemplated studying for the ministry, so he had not learned Hebrew, a prerequisite for enrolling as a student of theology. Hoenecke enrolled as a student of philosophy until he could meet the Hebrew requirement. He devoted himself to the study of Hebrew. After six weeks, he attempted to pass his examination; but he failed. Six weeks later he passed the exam, meeting the Hebrew

requirement needed for a student of theology. It was as such that he then enrolled at Halle.

The spirit of Johann Semler, the father of German Rationalism, haunted Halle. However, Pietists and some staunch Lutherans also taught there. H. E. F. Guericke was a staunch Confessional Lutheran who taught at Halle. However, he had little effect on Hoenecke. Guericke's long-winded lectures and his lack of personal interest in his students did not win him any fans. Hoenecke learned Hebrew from Hermann Hupfield, an Old Testament critic who was the successor to H. F. W. Gesenius [37](d. 1842). Hoenecke regarded Hupfield's lecture style as boring. Hoenecke also had Julius Mueller as a teacher. Mueller tried to harmonize science and the Bible (*Vermittlungstheologie*). Hoenecke regarded him as a melancholy pessimist.

The teacher who had the most profound influence on Hoenecke was August Tholuck, the Dean of Students. Some have described Tholuck as a pietist and a unionist. August Pieper, however, indicated that we must be careful about judging Tholuck. In those days, Rationalists called anyone who held to the inspiration of Scripture a "Pietist." Further, Tholuck did not actively promote the Union. He was averse to controversy. For that reason, he could not bring himself to support a fight for separation from the Union.

August Pieper described Tholuck as follows:

> Tholuck was one of the most gifted, brilliant, and learned theologians of his time. He reportedly knew nineteen ancient and modern languages. He was at home in all areas of theology. Moreover, in contrast to the university theologians of his time, he did not teach in the spirit and tone of an objective scientific method. No, with his childlike faith in the word of Scripture as the Word of God, all his teaching was at once an exercise of pastoral care for the souls of his students, a testimony concerning sin, grace and sanctification.[38]

Tholuck took a personal interest in Hoenecke, as he did with all of his students. He liked to take walks with his students, using the occasion as a time for peripatetic *Seelsorge*. Tholuck also gave Hoenecke quite a few free meals, which he had sorely needed.

Hoenecke received no support from home for his schooling. The poverty he endured as a student had a profound effect on him. It influenced him eventually to go to America against Tholuck's advice. Yet, we can thank God that he made the nest in Hoenecke's homeland uncomfortable enough that he was ready to travel to America rather than endure further poverty.

From Hoenecke's Graduation to the Opportunity to Go to America

Hoenecke took his examinations in 1859, at the age of 24. Tholuck had encouraged Hoenecke to continue his studies in the field of Lutheran dogmatics, focusing on the writings of Calov (d. 1686)[39] and Quenstedt (d. 1688). [40] However, Hoenecke did not have the money for further study. Tholuck arranged for Hoenecke to serve as a tutor in Switzerland. On January 11, 1860, Hoenecke began his work. He served as a tutor for two years. The favorable climate and less-demanding schedule allowed Hoenecke to strengthen his health. It also gave him time to deepen his knowledge of Lutheran theology by studying Calov, Quenstedt and the Lutheran Confessions. It was also at that time that Hoenecke met the woman he would eventually marry. She was Rosa Mathilde Hess, the daughter of Rudolph Hess, a Reformed pastor in Bern, Switzerland. She became the mother of their nine children.

The Decision To Go To America

The Berlin Mission Society was faced with the problem of a surplus of trained candidates for the ministry. The Mission Society requested permission from the High Consistory to call candidates to do work among their fellow Germans who had emigrated to America. The Prussian Church officials readily approved this request. They called on the Prussian universities to bring the request of the Mission Society to the attention of the graduating candidates. Hoenecke was ready to go to America.

Hoenecke's decision to go to America brought him into conflict with his mentor. Tholuck had wanted Hoenecke to further

his education so he could secure a position at a prestigious university. However, this would have cost a great amount of money, money which Hoenecke did not have. Tholuck also had advised Hoenecke to wait for a call to a congregation in Prussia. However, that could take three to seven years. Besides, Hoenecke did not want to keep his fiancée on hold for years while she waited for him to be able to support her.

The mission societies encouraged men to go to America as pastors by telling them that after a few years they could return to the fatherland. The time they spent in America would count toward their seniority. Upon return, they could get a call into a congregation in their homeland.

Uncharitably, Tholuck suggested that Hoenecke was going to America to seek material gain. He told Hoenecke so in a letter. Hoenecke never responded to that letter. The tie between teacher and pupil was broken–perhaps providentially–to the benefit of the Wisconsin Synod. Hoenecke was ordained at the Dome in Magdeburg in 1863. He boarded a ship in the spring and came to America. He promised his fiancée he would send for her when conditions were right.

Hoenecke left Prussia with an understanding of the way things worked in the Prussian Union. There, Lutheran pastors worked with divided loyalties. They could minister to Lutherans as Lutherans so long as they did not condemn Reformed doctrine and so long as they conducted the weekly Union service. We can surmise that as Hoenecke had grown in his knowledge of the Confessions, he would have found the Union situation more and more distasteful. At the same time, Hoenecke left Germany without a clear understanding of the Confessional practice of the Wisconsin Synod and of the other Lutheran churches in America. It would take time for him to arrive at that understanding. When Hoenecke did, the Wisconsin Synod was the better for it.

The Earliest Experiences in America

Hoenecke thought he would be installed in the vacant congregation in LaCrosse. By the time he arrived in Wisconsin, the

vacancy was already filled. Muehlhaeuser recommended Hoenecke to the congregation at Racine. He served there for a time, but was not called as pastor. The reason was that the daughter of an influential, well-to-do member of the congregation had taken an interest in Hoenecke. Her father did not want his daughter married to "such a poor bugger,"[41] so he blocked Hoenecke from being called to the congregation at Racine. If the man had known about Hoenecke's engagement to Rosa, he may not have worked to keep Hoenecke from being called there. But, the Lord had other plans for Hoenecke.

The Time at Farmington

Hoenecke was called to Farmington, Wisconsin, seven miles south of Watertown, on the road to Jefferson. A Lutheran teacher had gathered seven or eight families together there for reading services. Hoenecke readily accepted the call to serve at Farmington. He didn't even ask what his salary would be. At Farmington he was free to preach the Gospel. He could be a Confessional Lutheran, without interference from the state church. Hoenecke sent the High Consistory a letter in which he permanently relinquished a position in the Prussian state church. The ties with the state church were broken.

The years at Farmington were good for Hoenecke–and good for the Wisconsin Synod. The small membership at Farmington allowed Hoenecke time to study Luther, Lutheran dogmatics, and the Lutheran Confessions. Hoenecke used the time to deepen his understanding of Confessional Lutheranism. While at Farmington, he also came into contact with John Bading and the men of the Northwestern Conference, men who were interested in Confessional Lutheranism. While Hoenecke was at Farmington, the Lord was preparing him for what was to come. Also, while at Farmington, Hoenecke was able to send for his fiancée. Bading performed their marriage.

The Early Seminary Years

In 1863, the Wisconsin Synod had opened its own Seminary. Edward Moldehnke was called as the sole professor. At this time, Hoenecke was serving in Farmington. In 1864, Hoenecke was elected Secretary of the Wisconsin Synod. In 1865 he became Associate Editor of the *Gemeinde-Blatt* (parish paper). Hoenecke's work as Synod Secretary included correspondence concerning problems with the Reformed and the mission societies. These were cases which had been dealt with by the Synod. This work and his writing for the *Gemeinde-Blatt* helped him focus on the problems in the Wisconsin Synod.

Disciplinary problems developed at the Seminary. The governing board created the office of Inspector (Dean of Students). In 1866, they called Hoenecke as Inspector and Theological Professor–after only three years of service in the ministry.[42] Moldehnke immediately resigned from his call as a professor and as Editor of the *Gemeinde-Blatt*. He viewed two professors at the Seminary as a waste of money. So, Hoenecke became the sole theological professor at the Seminary and the Editor of the *Gemeinde-Blatt* as well.

The Years at St. Matthew's and Back at the Seminary

After the Wisconsin and the Missouri Synods declared themselves in fellowship (1869), the Seminary at Watertown was closed. The Wisconsin Synod sent its seminary students to St. Louis for training. Hoenecke was to go to St. Louis as the Wisconsin Synod's representative on the faculty. Hoenecke never went, however. He believed that he was needed more at the college in Watertown. Besides, there was even a more basic reason why Hoenecke did not go to St. Louis. The Wisconsin Synod did not have the funds to finance the professorship in St. Louis. St. Matthew's in Milwaukee then called Hoenecke to serve as its pastor, which he did beginning in July 1870.

Because of the state synods issue (which we will discuss later), the Wisconsin Synod opened its own Seminary again in

Milwaukee in 1878. Hoenecke and Eugene Notz (d. 1902) were called as professors. In 1889, ill health prompted Hoenecke to submit his resignation to the Seminary. From 1878 though 1889, Hoenecke had served as pastor at St. Matthew's and as professor at the Seminary. The Seminary Board responded by calling Hoenecke as full-time professor to work solely at the Seminary, a position he held until the time of his death. In 1903, Northwestern University and Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, conferred upon Hoenecke an honorary doctorate. At the same time, an honorary doctorate was conferred upon Franz Pieper. At the ceremony held at the Seminary in Wauwatosa, Pieper addressed Hoenecke in classical Latin, and Hoenecke responded in church Latin.

In 1904, Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary began publishing the *Theologische Quartalschrift*. Hoenecke served as its editor until the time of his death. Shortly before the 1907 Christmas recess, Hoenecke became ill with pneumonia. He entered his eternal rest on January 3, 1908, at the age of not quite 73 years. So ended his years of faithful service to his Lord and to the Wisconsin Synod. As we remember his life and work, we are reminded of the words of Revelation 14:13: "'Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, from now on.' 'Yes,' says the Spirit, 'they will rest from their labor, for their deeds will follow them.'"

5. The Crucial Issues Through Which God Guided Hoenecke to Lead the Wisconsin Synod to a Truly Confessional Lutheran Position

A Break with the German Mission Societies

The Wisconsin Synod had made some progress in its fight against unionism before Hoenecke had arrived in America. It had rejected the "Definite Synodical Platform" of Samuel Schmucker and the General Synod. [43] Though the Wisconsin Synod rejected this crass attempt at unionism, it had to work toward dealing with its own problems with the German mission societies.

Prior to Hoenecke's time, the Wisconsin Synod had a fraternal relationship with the "United" mission societies of Germany, with

the Berlin Mission Society of the Prussian state church, and also with the United Church of Prussia. From them the Wisconsin Synod had obtained the additional pastors and teachers it needed. However, the demand for candidates outstripped the supply. It became apparent that the Wisconsin Synod needed its own seminary, which it opened in 1863.

In 1866, Hoenecke was called to the Seminary. He noted that many pastors lacked a thorough theological training. He also noted the ties of the Wisconsin Synod to the German mission societies were a source of the Synod's problems with fellowship. Hoenecke did not mount a frontal attack on the mission societies. Rather, through the *Gemeinde-Blatt,* Hoenecke instructed his readers in the biblical basis for rejecting unionism and for separating from unions with the Reformed.

The mission societies did not like the new direction in which the Wisconsin Synod was moving. They criticized the Wisconsin Synod for being too strict in its dealings with the Reformed. Implicit in the criticism was the reminder that the Wisconsin Synod was biting the hand that had fed it. On the other side of the issue, the Missouri Synod was vocal in its criticism of the Wisconsin Synod's fellowship practices.

The matter of the relationship with the mission societies came to a head in 1867 at the Synod Convention. As Synod Secretary, Hoenecke had handled complicated correspondence with the mission societies who questioned the Wisconsin Synod's handling of cases involving dealings with the Reformed. Hoenecke headed the committee at the Synod Convention which dealt with the issue of the mission societies. The eight-man committee brought in a divided report. The majority report, signed by six men, distinguished between a God-created unity and a man-made union. In connection with man-made unions, the majority report distinguished between doctrinal unions and organizational unions. They concluded that the Prussian Union was a misuse of the power of the state over the church by which consciences were enslaved. The majority report condemned both a manufactured doctrinal union and an enforced organizational union as wrong.

The minority report condemned man-made doctrinal unions

but attempted to justify fellowship with the mission societies and acceptance of their money and their trained workers. The convention accepted the minority report but published both reports. Even the minority report was too much for the mission societies. They demanded that the Wisconsin Synod renounce the position it had taken at the 1867 Synod Convention, or there would be no more men and money coming from them. The 1868 Wisconsin Synod convention refused to back down, so the associations with the Langenberg and with the Berlin Societies were broken. Hoenecke had been instrumental in the process.

Iowa and Open Questions

In the midst of the turmoil of dealing with the German mission societies and with the General Council (of which we will hear more later), Hoenecke was decisive in rescuing the Wisconsin Synod from being sucked in by the Iowa Synod and its "Open Questions." Men from the Iowa Synod came as guests to the 1867 Wisconsin Synod Convention. Brothers Sigmund and Gottfried Fritschel came to make propaganda for their theory of "Open Questions." They maintained that in "minor" points of doctrine in the Lutheran Confessions, people could deviate from them without losing their Lutheranism.[44] They held that a distinction must be made between essential and non-essential doctrines, with agreement necessary only on essential doctrines. Concerning Iowa's approach, Missouri's *Lutheraner* had said that Iowa "tosses together hierarchical and chiliastic ideas with some truth and is again coming forth more boldly with claims for their so-called historical but very unhistorical interpretation of the Symbols. It makes a show of scholarly learning and will need in-depth correction."[45]

The Iowans came armed with a "*Gutachten*" from "eminent" theologians in Germany. The arguments of the Fritschel brothers may have won the day if it were not for Hoenecke. He argued it is one thing to be patient with some who, in weakness or ignorance, deviate from the Confessions. It is another to demand that false teachings be given authoritative status in the church. His arguments separated the Wisconsin Synod from the Iowa Synod and their "Open Questions."

Membership in the General Council

The small size of the congregation at Farmington had allowed Hoenecke time for study. However, his work with the Synod became more and more demanding. In 1864 he had been elected Secretary of the Synod. He was involved in a great amount of correspondence dealing with the problems in connection with the Reformed. In 1866 he was called to the Seminary. In 1867 he led the Synod in dealing with the separation from the mission societies. He took the lead in dealing with the Iowa Synod and their "Open Questions." From 1867 to 1869 Hoenecke was instrumental in extricating the Wisconsin Synod from the General Council. The following is a brief history of the Wisconsin Synod's brief membership in the General Council.

In 1864 the Pennsylvania Synod protested at the General Synod Convention against receiving the Frankean Synod into membership. Their protests were to no avail. In 1866 the Pennsylvania Synod withdrew from the General Synod. They then issued a call to all synods faithful to the Augsburg Confession to meet in Reading, Pennsylvania, on December 12. Their goal was to form a union of new church bodies faithful to the Augsburg Confession. The Wisconsin Synod accepted the invitation.[46]

Wisconsin Synod President Streisguth and President Martin of Northwestern were the delegates for the Wisconsin Synod at the preliminary meeting at Reading. They brought back with them the "Fundamental Principles of Faith and Church Polity," presented by Dr. Charles P. Krauth. The statement looked good to the 1867 Wisconsin Synod Convention.[47] John Bading, Adam Martin, and Johannes Muehlhaeuser were chosen as delegates to the 1867 assembly of the General Council in Ft. Wayne. On September 15, 1867, Muehlhaeuser died and was replaced by Adolph Hoenecke as delegate.

The General Council's Convention was held in late fall of 1867. The Ohio and the Iowa Synods did not join the General Council, but placed a number of questions concerning fellowship practices before them for consideration. These questions were the "four points" which asked the Council's position on the following:

- Millennialism
- Pulpit fellowship–sharing Lutheran pulpits with pastors who were not Lutheran
- Altar fellowship–allowing those who were not Lutheran to attend the Lord's Supper
- Membership in secret societies–allowing Lutheran members to join antichristian societies

The Wisconsin Synod also raised questions concerning these issues. Hoenecke served on the Committee which was to study Ohio's questions. He pressed the General Council for an immediate response to them. However, the General Council responded by evading a definite answer. It appealed for time until all churches could see "eye to eye" on all details of practice. The Wisconsin Synod representatives said they considered their Synod as a member of the Council, but they would have to report the Council's answer concerning the "four questions" to the Wisconsin Synod in convention.

The 1868 Wisconsin Synod Convention dealt with the issue. It was in this discussion that Hoenecke was very influential. He set forth a position of unbending opposition to all advocates of exchanging pulpits and practicing altar fellowship with the heterodox. As a result, Pastor G. Vorberg of St. Matthew's in Milwaukee, Pastor Kittel of LaCrosse, and President Adam Martin of Watertown parted ways with the Wisconsin Synod.

Hoenecke and Bading attended the 1868 General Council meeting in Pittsburgh. The Wisconsin Synod had indicated in its 1868 resolutions concerning the General Council that, unless satisfactory answers were given to its concerns, it would no longer consider itself a member of the General Council. The General Council continued to refuse to give a definite answer to the four questions. In 1869, the Wisconsin Synod, acting on a proposal from Hoenecke, Goldammer, and Gausewitz, formally ratified the withdrawal from the General Council. The issues of unionism had been dealt with, and the door was opened for fellowship with the synod from Missouri.

Fellowship With the Missouri Synod

Relations between the Wisconsin and the Missouri Synods

had been rocky over most of the first two decades of the Wisconsin Synod's existence. Missouri did not appreciate the establishment of a "New Lutheran" group in an area where it had been working. Articles in *Der Lutheraner* and *Lehre und Wehre* criticized the Wisconsin Synod for its unionistic practices. Some of the criticism was justified. Some of it was overstated.

By 1865 the *Gemeindeblatt* was able to offer justified rebuttals of Missouri's charges. Up until 1868 Missouri continued its charges, failing to note the changes which had taken place in the Wisconsin Synod. To add to the problem, the two Synods were working in the same state, and found their paths crossing. "Opposition congregations" had their own personal feuds and complaints, which added fuel to the fires of discord.

However, private conversations between Wisconsin Synod and Missouri Synod pastors indicated there were no doctrinal differences between the two Synods. At the October 21-22, 1869 meetings, a "Document Concerning Peace and Concord Between the Honorable Synod of Missouri and the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Wisconsin" was signed. Among the signers for Missouri were President C. F. W. Walther and Prof. C.A. Brauer. President John Bading and Prof. Adolph Hoenecke were among those who signed for the Wisconsin Synod. Topics which had been discussed and agreed upon were:

- The position towards unionism and open questions
- Church and Ministry
- Ordination
- Inspiration
- The binding force of the Lutheran Confessions
- Millennialism
- The Anti-Christ

Walther observed, "All our reservations … about Wisconsin have been put to shame."[48] Hoenecke had been instrumental in furthering the cause of peace between the two Synods. Concerning him, Walther is said to have remarked, "I have my eye on this young man and expect great things of him in the future."[49]

The result of the declaration of fellowship was an agreement on worker training. Wisconsin was to transfer its seminary operation to St. Louis and to supply a professor for St. Louis. Missouri was to provide a professor for the college at Watertown. The agreement was ratified by both Synods.

The Formation of the Synodical Conference

Little is written concerning Hoenecke's individual efforts with regard to the establishment of the Synodical Conference. Suffice it to say that he was involved in its formation. He and Bading were among the Wisconsin Synod's representatives who took part in its formative meetings. The result was that in July of 1872, the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America met at St. John's Church in Milwaukee. Original members were the Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Norwegian, and Illinois Synods. The Synodical Conference would furnish the setting for the next two issues through which the Lord used Hoenecke to guide the Wisconsin Synod.

The State Synods Controversy

The Wisconsin Synod could have disappeared from the scene had it not been for the efforts of Hoenecke. When the Synodical Conference was formed, an effort was made to break down the existing synodical bodies in the Synodical Conference and substitute for them units which would conform geographically to state lines. The common language was to be German. Those using Norwegian or English were not included in these plans. A practical purpose for the state synods was to eliminate squabbles between so-called "opposition" congregations and their pastors.

The plan was to have one larger synod which would be in association with the non-German speaking bodies. There also was to be one seminary. The Wisconsin Synod expressed some reservations throughout the process of discussion. The concern was not with the state synods *per se*. Wisconsin was concerned with the formation of a state synod in Wisconsin. If the Wisconsin Synod joined with

Missouri Synod congregations in Wisconsin to form a state synod, the Missouri Synod would want the newly formed state synod to join Missouri as a district. If that happened, the Wisconsin Synod would be dissolved and would become part of the Missouri Synod.

The 1877 Wisconsin Synod convention decided it did not wish to join the state synod merger, voted against establishing one joint seminary, and voted to re-open its own seminary. The state synods and the joint seminary were pet projects of Walther. He castigated the Wisconsin Synod's desires to retain its identity. He called their attitude *widergoettlich,*[50] infringing on Christian liberty and the province of the Holy Spirit. Hoenecke responded that organic union was not necessary to preserve the bond between those united in doctrine and practice, and that the desire to remain independent did not imply a departure from pure doctrine, as Missouri was implying. In 1878, the Wisconsin Synod opened its Seminary again, this time in Milwaukee. Hoenecke and Eugene Notz were called as professors.

The Election Controversy (Gnadenwahlstreit)

The controversy over the doctrine of election began to surface in the early 1870s, and resurfaced with vigor in 1877. Dr. Walther suggested scrapping the term *intuitu fidei*, which had been used by some Lutheran dogmaticians.[51] In 1879 Friedrich August Schmidt (d. 1928)[52] and Frederick William Stellhorn (d. 1919)[53] declared "war" and launched an all-out attack on Walther. Without going through all of the details concerning the Election Controversy, it can be said that Hoenecke was instrumental in keeping the Wisconsin Synod from suffering major defections because of it.

In spite of the disagreement over the matter of state synods, which had taken place in 1877, Hoenecke took his stand solidly alongside Walther. He stated that Walther's teaching on election was the teaching of Scripture, of St. Paul, of Martin Luther, and of the Formula of Concord. Hoenecke also served as a steadying influence for Walther. In his zeal during the conflict, Walther had written several sentences that said too much. Hoenecke persuaded Walther to make a public correction of his dubious sentences, which

he did. Through his articles in the *Gemeinde-Blatt* Hoenecke set the Wisconsin Synod on firm ground with regard to the doctrine of election. As Pieper observed, "Humanly speaking, our synod might well have been torn apart if Hoenecke's theology–not outwardly dazzling, but strong because it was Lutheran to the core–had not held us together."[54]

The Free Conference Questions

From 1903 through 1906 five "free conferences" were held at Watertown, Milwaukee, Detroit, and Fort Wayne. Participants at these "free conferences" were not delegates of their synods but had been invited by a committee formed from several synods. Participation in the conferences did not equal an acknowledgment of an opponent's doctrinal position. It was at these meetings that an Ohio Synod spokesman referred to the "analogy of faith" as a method of interpretation which needed consideration. The Ohio and Iowa spokesman defined the "analogy of faith" as a method of interpretation which consisted of all the important teachings of the Bible. These were considered to be in harmony with each other. When a lack of harmony is observed between a less-clear doctrine and the "aggregate of Scripture," then the "analogy of faith" must be applied. Schmidt went so far as to say that God gave man reason so he could harmonize contradictory statements of Scripture. The Ohio Synod saw in the "analogy of faith" a way that it could "prove" *intuitu fidei*.

Hoenecke responded to this view with an article published in the *Theologische Quartalschrift,* which began publishing in 1904.[55] The article was entitled, "Agreement on the Correct View of the Authority of Scripture as the Source of Doctrine–the Way to Unity in the Church." In this article he also addressed the issue of the "analogy of faith." He demonstrated that there is no Scriptural warrant for making an "analogy of faith" an authority over the *sedes doctrinae* of Scripture.[56]

The free conferences also discussed the doctrines of conversion and election. Again, Hoenecke was instrumental in stating that both were brought about by the grace of God alone, in

Christ. Another issue which surfaced at the conferences was whether they should begin and end with prayer. Prof. Ernst of Watertown had been the chairman of the second conference in Milwaukee. He had arranged for the sessions to begin with silent prayer. The men of Wisconsin had no problems with that. The *Gemeinde-Blatt* later said, "There no doubt was much earnest praying: The Lutherans longed for unity."[57]

The Synodical Conference members at the free conference spoke out against opening and closing the sessions with prayer. They offered the following reasons:

- Every participant prays privately.
- Public, joint prayer is an evidence of and a practice of church fellowship.
- Public prayer could give the false impression that all participants were one in faith.
- Public prayer would imply the doctrinal differences were of no further significance.[58]

Hoenecke was again instrumental in reaching these conclusions.

6. The Legacy of Adolph Hoenecke

The Person

What is the legacy of Adolph Hoenecke? As a person, he was recognized as having a sharp mind, being precise in his definitions of terms and concepts, and having a thorough knowledge of his subject matter. Pieper observed, "In exegesis and in clear dogmatic exposition he simply was the unexcelled master in our circles."[59] Hoenecke was humble, polite, always a gentleman, even in the heat of doctrinal controversy. Pieper said of him, "Even when practicing polemics, he never offended against Christian courtesy…He strengthened and girded his co-workers in the synod and gave his students a firm grounding in sound Lutheranism, and with great patience he eagerly pursued peace with all who loved divine truth."[60]

Hoenecke taught dogmatics and homiletics at the Seminary. In that capacity he would give much advice to his students. However, Hoenecke also was able to receive advice. The following story is told about him. "In America he trained his wife to be a kindly but sharp private critic of his sermons so that he might break himself of unconscious bad habits and of disturbing pulpit mannerisms. But she was also intelligent and knowledgeable enough to tell him now and then in an unabashed and half-joking way regarding the edifying value of his sermons: 'Well, Papa, today was one of those times when it didn't come off well at all.'"[61]

Hoenecke's Writings

Among the many writings of Hoenecke were his articles in the *Gemeinde-Blatt* (from 1865 on) and his essays at Synod Conventions.[62] Perhaps his most influential writings came during the Election Controversy. It was his clear presentations and his defense of Walther's position that held the Wisconsin Synod together. He presented three more convention essays during the years of 1893 to 1897. Hoenecke had only four years to write for the *Quartalschrift*. He wrote the forewords to volumes 1,2 and 4, and six theological articles, plus homiletical studies and one book review. He also wrote two volumes of Lenten sermons, translated by Werner Franzmann.[63] Hoenecke produced a four-volume text on dogmatics. He put off writing it until later in his life. After his death, his sons Walter and Otto finished work on the text. It is too bad that more people have not benefited from his text because of their inability to handle the German. Thankfully, the matter is being remedied by having his dogmatics text translated. Volumes three and four have been translated and published. We eagerly wait for Volumes one and two to be completed.

Hoenecke's Influence

The following two quotes will help us assess the influence Hoenecke exerted in the Wisconsin Synod:

> If there is one note that characterizes Hoenecke's theological-dogmatic position as it is expressed in the forwards and

> articles of the *Quartalschrift*, it is the oft repeated emphasis that the ultimate source and authority in dogmatics is the *sedes doctrinae*, the individual Bible passages that convey the details of Scripture's teachings to us. Koehler, in his obituary of Hoenecke, aptly describes the latter's approach to theology thus: "that one take the Scriptures simply, the way they read." Another generation would term this careful attention to the actual wording and import of the original Bible passages rather than to formulations of later systematicians the "Wauwatosa Gospel." From another perspective one could call it the faithful applications of Luther's *Sola Scriptura* principle in the context of the 19th and 20th centuries. We…have reason to treasure the heritage Adolph Hoenecke left us in and through his *Theologische Quartalschrift*.[64]
>
> Adolph Hoenecke went on to become the Synod's theological teacher. He filled that role at Watertown until the synod's seminary training was transferred to St. Louis in 1869 without him. When it returned to Wisconsin in 1878, he resumed the role for another 30 years, eventually training almost two whole generations of Wisconsin pastors in theology, especially in its dogmatical and homiletical branches. By the time of his death in 1908 there were 250 pastors on the synodical roll. Over 200 were Hoenecke's students.[65]

7. Lessons from Hoenecke and History for Lutherans in the Twenty-first Century

Permit a few brief observations at the close of this essay. I am no historian nor am I the son of a historian. However, I am a student of history, and I firmly believe in the principle enunciated by George Santanya that "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."[66]

Much has changed since Hoenecke's day, and not for the better. When Liberalism ran into the solid wall of man's inhumanity to man in World War I, it lost its vision that man was moving ever upward. What arose to fill the void? Neo-orthodoxy, with Karl Barth, simply retained the old critical attitudes toward the Bible. Rudolph Bultmann gave us demythologizing and made Existentialism

popular. The next step down was Thomas Altizer and the "Death of God Movement." Then came "Post-Modernism." The Roman Catholic Church has succumbed to the tenets of biblical criticism, [67] which has also made great inroads into Lutheran circles.

The twentieth century also has seen the spread of Pentecostalism and the Charismatic Movement.[68] Pentecostalism insists on speaking in tongues as necessary to receive the "Full Gospel." In so doing it undermines the Gospel of free grace. Fundamentalism arose in reaction to Liberalism. While it was intent on preserving the fundamentals of the Christian faith, it withdrew into its own camp and spent its time in conducting end-times conferences or trying to make inroads into politics. Evangelicalism of the twentieth century has its roots in seventeenth-century Pietism, eighteenth-century Methodism, and nineteenth-century Revivalism. With that background, it is heir to all the false doctrine taught by all three groups.

There are many lessons to take away from a study of Hoenecke's legacy. Among them we might mention:

- The importance of careful exegesis in the study and presentation of Christian doctrine
- The importance of Confessional Lutheranism
- The importance of agreement on all Scripture teaches for unity in the church
- The importance of working together in love to maintain unity in the church
- The importance of a clear understanding of what the Bible teaches concerning fellowship and the importance of a practice that is faithful to what the Bible teaches concerning fellowship

One thing that struck me as I prepared this essay was that it took our forefathers a while to see the dangers involved in working with the Reformed and in using Reformed materials in their ministries. It would seem that a word of caution could be raised today about the same issue. It is in three areas in particular that Lutherans today are making liberal use of Reformed materials: in the areas of church growth, worship and hymnody, and teaching about sanctification. Lutheran churches that use church growth

materials without understanding their theological background may soon lose sight of the relationship that exists between the Gospel and God's work of building the church through the Gospel. The method may get in the way of the message. Contemporary Christian music is so full of the emphasis on how I feel about God that it neglects the needed emphasis on the objective means of grace and on objective justification. Reformed materials on sanctification are full of legalism, the attempt to produce sanctification through the law. The end result of legalism is that it will create Pharisees or it will drive people to despair. *Caveat emptor!* As our forefathers discovered, you cannot package the gospel in Reformed theology without losing the message of *Sola Scriptura, Sola Gratia, Sola Fide.*

On this 487th anniversary of the Lutheran Reformation, we thank God for men like Martin Luther and Adolph Hoenecke, through whom God restored to his church the pure and unadulterated Gospel of Jesus Christ! May we treasure our great heritage of the Gospel, preserved for us through the Lord's servants. In thankfulness to God, we will proclaim it in its truth and purity to the generations yet to come.

Bibliography

Fredrich, E. C., *The Wisconsin Synod Lutherans,* NPH, Milwaukee, WI, 1992.

Frey, I. P., "Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary 1863-1963." Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary (WLS) Library file.

Hoenecke, Adolph, "The Agreement on the Correct View of the Authority of Scripture as the Source of Doctrine — the Way to Unity in the Church," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, Vol. I: No. 4. pp. 177-205. Reprinted in English, *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly,* Vol. 73:1,2.

Hudson, Winthrop, *Religion in America,* Charles Scribners Sons, New York, NY, 1965.

Koehler, J. P., *The History of the Wisconsin Synod,* edited by Leigh Jordahl, Faith-Life, The Protestant Conference, 1970.

Kowalke, E. E., *Centennial Story: Northwestern College,* Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, WI, 1965.

Montgomery, J. W., *The Shape of the Past,* Bethany House Publishers, Minneapolis, MN, 1975.

Ostling, Richard, "With the Question of God, PBS tackles an ultimate TV Challenge," *The Journal TV Times*, Sept. 19, 2004.

Pieper, August, "The Significance of Dr. Adolph Hoenecke for the Wisconsin Synod and American Lutheranism," *Theologische Quartalschrift,* Vol. 32, 1935. Translation by Werner Franzmann. WLS Library file.

Reckzin, Dale, "Three Doctors of the American Lutheran Church," paper for the Southern Conference of the North Atlantic District, 1994. Available through WLS Library file.

Santanya, George, *The Life of Reason or the Phases of Human Progress,* 2nd ed, Charles Scribners Sons, New York, NY, 1924.

Schroeder, H. J., *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent,* B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, MO, 1941.

Schuetze, Armin, "By Grace–Confessional in Practice," WELS Convention Essay, 1975. Available through WLS Library file.

Schuetze, Armin, *The Synodical Conference: Ecumenical Endeavor,* Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, WI, 2000.

Wendland, E. "Pietism," essay printed in *Our Great Heritage,* Vol. III, edited by Lyle Lange, Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, WI, 1991.

Westerhaus, G., "Melanchthon's Doctrinal Compromises," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly,* Vols. 62-65.

Westerhaus, M., "Adolph Hoenecke and the Quartalschrift, " available through WLS Library file.

Endnotes

[1] H. J. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent,* B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, MO., 1941: p. 17.

[2] An example of the result of his influence and that of Descartes was what occurred on November 9, 1793. A veiled woman representing reason appeared before a convention of people. The people were told: "Mortals, cease to tremble before the powerless thunders of a God whom your fears have created. Herewith, acknowledge no divinity but reason." At Notre Dame, the woman was elevated on the altar and received the adoration of those present. Quoted from J.W. Montgomery, *The Shape of the Past*, Bethany House Publishers, Minneapolis, MN, 1975: pp. 95-96.

[3] The JEDP hypothesis.

[4] Examples: Descartes (d. 1650), Spinoza (d. 1677), and Leibnitz (d. 1716).

[5] Some prominent Deists influential in America were Thomas Paine (d. 1809), Benjamin Franklin (d. 1790), Thomas Jefferson (d. 1826), and even George Washington (d. 1799).

[6] Darwin published *Origin of the Species* in 1859 and *The Descent of Man* in 1871. Concerning Darwin's influence, Winthrop Hudson observed: "With…evolutionism penetrating every realm of thought, a new history began to be written which was based on the application of evolutionary thought to the understanding of the past. And this new historical understanding bolstered the developing "higher criticism" of the Bible—first in Germany and then in Britain and America." Winthrop Hudson, *Religion in America*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1965: p.208.

[7] The works of Karl Marx are *The Communist Manifesto* (1847) and *Das Kapital* (1867).

[8] Nietzsche's key works are *Die Froehliche Wissenschaft* (1882) and *Also Sprach Zarathustra* (1883-1891). In the former, he declares that God is dead. In the latter, he states that only the superman can live in the world without the illusion of God.

[9] Cf. Freud's work, *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900). Concerning Freud, Richard Ostling, AP religion writer, observed that he is "arguably the most influential atheist of modern times, now that the credibility of communist Karl Marx has imploded." (Ostling, Richard, "'With the Question of God, PBS tackles an ultimate TV challenge," *The Journal TV Times*, September 19, 2004.

[10] Quoted in *The Shape of the Past,* John Warwick Montgomery, Bethany Publishing House, Minneapolis, MN, p. 118.

[11] Baur was founder of the Tübingen school of theology. He applied the Hegelian dialectic to develop his view of New Testament church history.

[12] Paulus is the father of the "swoon" theory concerning Christ. This view was revived by Hugh Schonfield in the *Passover Plot* (1965) and by Donovan Joyce in *The Jesus Scroll* (1972).

[13] Strauss asserted that the Christ of the New Testament was essentially a creation of myth.

[14] Note the distinction in terms for the N.T. critic:

The "Jesus of History" is the man who actually lived 2000 years ago. He is virtually unknowable because of the alleged unreliability of the Gospel accounts.

The "Historical Jesus" is the historical reconstruction of the words and deeds of Jesus as accomplished by critical research.

[15] In 1854, Pius IX declared the "Immaculate Conception of Mary." In the "Syllabus of Errors" (1864) he rejected the contention that the pope should reconcile himself with progress, Liberalism, and modern civilization. In 1870, Vatican I affirmed the doctrine

of papal infallibility.

[16] Examples:

a. The Majoristic controversy (FC IV).
b. The Synergistic controversy (FC II).
c. The Crypto-Calvinistic controversies (FC VII and VIII).
d. The Adiaphoristic controversy is an example of Melanchthon's willingness to compromise in the interest of achieving peace.

For a summary of Melanchthon's doctrinal compromises, see the series of articles by G. Westerhaus in the *Quarterly,* Volumes 62 to 65.

[17] J. P. Koehler, *The History of the Wisconsin Synod*, edited by Leigh Jordahl, Faith-Life, The Protestant Conference, 1970: p. 65.

[18] Orthodoxy is good. Orthodoxism is bad. It reduces the Christian faith to an intellectual knowledge of Scripture doctrine. People who have reduced faith to an intellectual assent to a system of doctrine will fail to reflect the love of Christ as they see the misery of others.

[19] Among the errors of Pietism were;

- The belief that sanctification is a cause of justification.
- A confusion of law and gospel.
- A focus on the sins of society rather than on the sins of the individual.
- Subjectivism. The emphasis was on how I feel about God, rather than on his love for me.
- The means of grace were de-emphasized.
- Prayer was treated as a means of grace.
- Ictic conversion (the belief that conversion is achieved by man's will and is an experience which can be identified as to the time when it occurred)
- Religious unionism.
- Legalism–attempting to produce sanctification through the law.
- Rejection of pastoral absolution.
- Rejection of any adiaphora.
- The weak in the faith were not regarded as converted.
- Perfection was considered possible in sanctification.
- Every baptized child was looked upon as having fallen from the state of baptismal grace, which necessitated a conscious pledge and completion of the efficacy of the covenant.
- The acquisition of secular knowledge was despised.

[20] John Wesley went to America to work among the Native Americans in Georgia. On his voyage he met Moravian missionaries with whom he was impressed. Wesley went to Herrnhut to learn strategies for renewal from Nicolas von Zinzendorf. In 1784 Wesley sent Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury as superintendents to a mission in America. They brought along with them what Wesley had learned from Zinzendorf.

[21] The formula for distribution of the Lord's Supper was designed to allow for belief either in the real presence or in representation. It was, "Jesus said, 'This is my body…This is my blood."

[22] Those Lutherans dedicated to maintaining Confessional Lutheranism.

[23] Brothers-in-law Gottlieb Reim (Wisconsin Synod president from 1864 to 1865) and Wilhelm Streisguth (Wisconsin Synod president from 1866 to 1867) came from Basel.

[24] L. Ebert and F. Hilpert are Wisconsin Synod men who came from St. Chrischona, as was C. J. Albrecht of the Minnesota Synod.

[25] The Langenberger Verein (Officially, the Evangelical Society for North America)

contributed the most heavily in missions and money to the Wisconsin Synod from 1850-1868. The three founding fathers of the Wisconsin Synod were Langenberg missionaries.

[26] A traveling companion of Weinmann and Wrede to America was a Pastor Rauschenbusch, who came from a line of Lutherans. However, he joined the Baptist church when he came to America. His son, Walter, was the founder of the Social Gospel movement in America. By the grace of God the Wisconsin Synod was spared from becoming a breeding ground for the Social Gospel movement.

[27] E. E. Kowalke, *Centennial Story: Northwestern College*, Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, WI, 1965, p. 1.

[28] *Ibid.*

[29] *Ibid.,* pp. 3,4.

[30] *Ibid.*

[31] Koehler, *Op. Cit.,* p. 43.

[32] The multiple use of the word "Northwestern" in Wisconsin Synod history is not without significance. Northwestern College, Northwestern Prep, Northwestern Publishing House, the *Northwestern Lutheran*, and Northwestern Lutheran Academy, Mobridge, all carried the name. Originally "Northwestern" implied a deep commitment to a more confessional stance than was available elsewhere.

[33] In the interim Bading was traveling in Germany and Russia, collecting funds for the new seminary.

[34] August Pieper, "The Significance of Dr. Adolph Hoenecke for the Wisconsin Synod and American Lutheranism," 1935, p. 8. This article first appeared in four installments in the *Theologische Quartalschrift*, Vol. 32, No. 3, and the next three issues. The translation was made by Werner Franzmann.

[35] *Ibid.*

[36] *Ibid.*

[37] His works include *Hebräische Grammatik* and *Thesaurus philologicus criticus linguae Hebraeae et Chaldaeae Veteris Testamenti*.

[38] *Ibid.,* p. 9.

[39] His greatest work was his *Biblia Illustrata* (1672-1676), a commentary on the Bible which treats both individual texts and longer sections. Next in importance was his *Systema locorum theologicorum* (1655-1677), a 12 volume scholarly dogmatic work.

[40] His major work was *Theologia didactico-polemica, sive Systema theologicum*.

[41] *Ibid.,* p. 13.

[42] Apparently the practice that a man should have ten years of parish experience before being called to the Seminary developed after Hoenecke's time.

[43] The "Definite Platform" had left out alleged errors in the Augsburg Confession. The alleged errors were:

- The approval of the ceremonies of the Mass
- The approval of private confession and absolution
- The denial of the divine obligation of the Christian Sabbath
- The affirmation of baptismal regeneration
- The affirmation of the real presence of the body and the blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper

It also left out articles XXII through XXVIII of the Augsburg Confession, rejected the remaining confessional writings, removed the descent into hell from the creeds, and left out the Athanasian Creed. It also proposed a plan for establishing a union with the Protestant sects in America.

[44] The "Open Questions" were identified as the teachings of the Confessions on:

- The observance of Sunday
- The papacy is the Antichrist
- Millennialism
- The resurrection of the martyrs
- The conversion of the Jews
- The perpetual virginity of Mary (The Latin translation of Luther's articles in which occurs the *ex Maria, pura, sancta semper virgine, nasceretur*, did not come from the pen of Petras Generanus until 1541, and the translation that was taken up into the Concordia in 1580 and 1584 most likely was written by Selnecker. The expression is not symbolically binding. Luther's German Articles did not win acceptance in the form in which he wrote them for the Smalcald meeting, but in the altered and expanded form which he wrote in the next year. Kolb/Wengert translates "he was born of the pure, holy Virgin Mary" (I:4). They indicate that the Latin translation reads: "always virgin" (p. 300).

[45] Armin Schuetze, *The Synodical Conference: Ecumenical Endeavor*, Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, WI, 2000: p. 32, 33.

[46] The church bodies represented at the meeting were the Pennsylvania Synod, the five districts of the General Synod of Ohio, the English Synod of Ohio, the Pittsburgh Synod, the Michigan Synod, the Wisconsin Synod, the Minnesota Synod, the Missouri Synod, the Iowa Synod, the Norwegian Synod, the Canada Synod, and the New York Ministerium. The Missouri and the Norwegian Synods did not join the Council. They were of the opinion that "free conferences" were the avenue through which to pursue unity.

[47] Remember that at the 1867 Synod convention they also dealt with the issue concerning the mission societies in Germany and with the "Open Questions" issue with the Iowa Synod.

[48] E. C. Fredrich, *The Wisconsin Synod Lutherans*, Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, WI., 1992: p. 52.

[49] Immanuel P. Frey, "Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary 1863-1963," p. 8.

[50] Fredrich, *Op. Cit.,* p. 58.

[51] For example, John Gerhard (1582-1637) used the term. Among his major works were *Loci theologici* and *Meditationes sacrae.*

[52] F. A. Schmidt was a brother-in-law of pastor H.A. Allwardt who served the Missouri Synod congregation in Lebanon, Wisconsin. Walther had trained Schmidt. The Norwegian Synod called Schmidt in 1861 to its Luther College in Decorah, Iowa. In 1872 he served as its professor to St. Louis, and he was then called in 1876 to their newly established seminary in Madison. In 1878 Schmidt had unsuccessfully attempted to become Missouri's English professor of theology at St. Louis. Walther may well have remembered that Schmidt had opposed him in the discussions on conversion with the Iowa Synod. It wasn't long after Schmidt did not receive the call to St. Louis that he began his attacks on Walther. Schmidt, together with Stellhorn and Allwardt, launched the journal *Altes und Neues* (Old and New). Their purpose was to protect the "old" doctrine of predestination against what they considered to be the "new" doctrine of Walther and Missouri.

[53] F. W. Stellhorn had served as Missouri's professor at Northwestern College from 1869 to 1874. At that time already he had expressed false views on conversion at a conference of Missouri Synod pastors. Hoenecke, who was attending as a visitor, took the floor to show Stellhorn the error of his ways.

[54] Pieper, *Op. Cit.,* p. 43.

[55] Adolph Hoenecke, "Agreement on the Correct View of the Authority of Scripture as the Source of Doctrine–the Way to Unity in the Church," Vol. 1:4 in German; vol 73:1,2 in English.

[56] It should be noted that J.P. Koehler also wrote an article in the 1904 *Quartalschrift* on "The Analogy of Faith." *Die Analogie des Glaubens* appeared in the first three issues of the *Quartalschrift*, vol. 1, Nos. 1-3. The article is included in *The Wauwatosa Theology*, Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, WI., 1997: pp. 221-268.

[57] Armin Schuetze, *Op. Cit.,* p. 181.

[58] *Ibid.,* p. 184.

[59] Pieper, *Op. Cit.,* p. 17.

[60] *Ibid.,* p. 3.

[61] Pieper, *Op. Cit.,* p. 11, note 7.

[62] From 1870 to 1878 Hoenecke presented essays at seven of the nine conventions.

[63] *A Lamb Goes Uncomplaining Forth* and *Glorified In His Passion*.

[64] Martin Westerhaus, "Adolph Hoenecke and the *Quartalschrift,"* p. 7.

[65] Fredrich, *Op. Cit.,* p. 17.

[66] George Santanya, *The Life of Reason or the Phases of Human Progress: Reason in Common Sense*, 2nd edition, Charles Scribner's Sons, NY, NY, 1924: p. 284.

[67] In 1943, Pius XII issued the encyclical entitled *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, which encouraged Roman Catholic scholars to study the Bible by applying the tools of modern scholarship.

[68] The Azusa Street Revival in Los Angeles in 1906, with William Seymour, set off a three-year revival which gained the attention of the entire nation.

Charles Porterfield Krauth: The American Chemnitz

David Jay Webber

Introduction

C. F. W. Walther, the great nineteenth-century German-American churchman, has sometimes been dubbed by his admirers "the American Luther."[1] While all comparisons of this nature have their limitations, there is a lot of truth in this appellation. Walther's temperament, his leadership qualities, and especially his theological convictions would lend legitimacy to such a description.

Similarly, we would like to suggest that Charles Porterfield Krauth, in light of the unique gifts and abilities with which he was endowed, and in light of the thoroughness and balance of his mature theological work, can fittingly be styled "the American Chemnitz." Krauth was in fact an avid student of the writings of the Second Martin, and he absorbed much from him in both form and substance. It is also quite apparent that the mature Krauth always attempted to follow a noticeably Chemnitzian, "Concordistic" approach in the fulfillment of his calling as a teacher of the church in nineteenth-century America. We will return to these thoughts in a little while. Before that, though, we should spend some time in examining Krauth's familial and ecclesiastical origins, and the historical context of his development as a confessor of God's timeless truth.

Krauth's Origins

In the words of Walther, Krauth was, without a doubt,

> the most eminent man in the English Lutheran Church of this country, a man of rare learning, at home no less in the old than in modern theology, and, what is of greatest import, whole-heartedly devoted to the pure doctrine of our Church, as he had learned to understand it, a noble man and without guile.[2]

But Krauth's pathway to this kind of informed Confessionalism was not an easy one. He passed through many trials of conscience as he grew, throughout his life, into an ever deeper appreciation of the pure doctrine of the Gospel as confessed in the orthodox Lutheran Church, and into an ever fuller understanding of how this doctrine works itself out in the life and practice of the church.

Charles Porterfield Krauth was born in a Lutheran parsonage in Martinsburg, Virginia (now West Virginia), on March 17, 1823. Because of the largely Puritanical mindset of "General Synod" Lutheranism at that period in history, we doubt that anyone noticed at the time that this was St. Patrick's Day. In any case, he was not named after the "Apostle to Ireland," but after his two grandfathers, Charles James Krauth and (Robert) Porterfield Augustus Heiskell. His father, Charles Philip Krauth, who later served as the president of Pennsylvania College in Gettysburg, and as a professor in the General Synod's theological seminary in the same town, was a Lutheran pastor. Krauth's more remote ancestors, however, were a mixed bag of Lutherans, Reformed, and Anglicans. His was a very "American" family. His forebears had emigrated from Germany to Pennsylvania and Virginia in the eighteenth century, and from England to Virginia in the seventeenth century.

The "East Coast" tradition of American Lutheranism into which Krauth was born left much to be desired in the early nineteenth century. The Lutheran pastors who had served in the eastern seaboard colonies during the time when Lutheranism was first being planted in the New World, such as Wilhelm Christoph Berkenmeyer and Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, did embrace and promote a distinctively Lutheran theological identity. They unreservedly pledged themselves to the Lutheran Confessions, and for the most part they conducted their ministries accordingly. But the situation among the Lutherans in America began to change not long after the American Revolution. Krauth himself summarizes this sad history, down to the time of the organization of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (as an association or federation of state and regional synods) in 1820:

After our fathers fell asleep our Church in America began to exhibit evidences of decline in faith and life. The struggle for our independence left the land under that demoralization which follows war, however just it may be. Deism had run riot in England, and Atheism in France, and from those powerful nationalities had spread their influence through Europe and America. Rationalism in the Lutheran, Reformed, and Romish Churches, had been growing stronger in times so well fitted for its growth. Socinianism, which had triumphed in the Calvinistic Churches of the Continent, and of England, … appeared in New England, the American Geneva, and from it went forth with a might which seemed to threaten the very existence of the Gospel faith in all the churches. Universalism arose and spread. The doctrines of the French revolution were widely diffused. The religious life characteristic of the period, in some sense, aided the evil. Unionism, Pietism, Moravianism, and Methodism were alike in the indeterminate character of their doctrinal basis. The defenders of revelation showed a difference of opinion, rather than of spirit, from its assailants; the maintainers, in some degree, of the old faith, often made good their cause by abandoning a large part, and half betraying what they pretended to advocate. It was the saddest era in the history of the Church since the Reformation – the era of spurious "illumination." The light itself had become darkness, and the darkness was great indeed. Our Church in America shared in this terrible defection. Socinianism worked furtively, and at length openly, in parts of it. Precious doctrines were diluted, ignored, or abandoned. The Confessions were set aside virtually, even where the antecedents of the past made it impossible to abandon them openly. The history of our Church, the tradition of her faith and life, was still strong enough to make caution necessary; and the evil worked rather by the withholding of the truth, than by the formal annunciation of error. The Church was drugged with narcotics, not with irritants, or, indeed, was starved to death, rather than poisoned. We had a weak, indecisive pulpit, feeble catechisms, vague hymns, [and] constitutions which reduced the minister to the position of a hireling talker, and made Synods disorganizations for the purpose of preventing anything from being done. Our sun had gone down, and the only relief from absolute night was the diffused light which still lingered from a happier time. The General Synod was organized in the period when the fearful thrall of rationalism was most complete over portions of our Church, and was felt in some degree in almost every part of it, and by no means least in parts of our own land. … In the United States there were nominally Lutheran Synods

> which were largely Unitarian… In the deadness of our whole land, in the rationalism of Europe which was imported, and in the Socinianism of New England, which was of native growth, had originated the fearful change which came over our Church, and to these influences we owe nearly every trouble under which our Church afterward labored. The General Synod then embraced elements which were relatively, at least, distinctively Lutheran, and others distinctively Latitudinarian, and a third class distinctively nothing…[3]

Krauth also minces no words in criticizing what he considers to have been the worse element in the General Synod, which contributed significantly to its failure actually to become the Lutheran body that it claimed to be. This element was comprised of the "moral weaklings, who deem themselves miracles of gentleness, prudence, and moderation, snaky doves, or dove-like serpents, refusing to be reduced to a class." They are "amiable inanities," who "play at neutrality and conservatism."[4] Krauth continues:

> They think that there are no real differences in the world, and that…there is nothing which could not have been healed by a cataplasm of soft words and soft soap, or an ointment of love and lard. … They now go with the one side, now with the other, and now with neither, but take a path exactly midway between them… The indistinct classes are alike in this, that as their position is ambiguous, they become make-weights on this or that side, as circumstances may determine. Their general affinities and mysterious fate ordinarily, however, bring them out in the end with the wrong. Finding that instead of winning the confidence of extremes, they lose the little of it they may have had, they grow weary of being wandering stars, and tumble at last into the bosom of the largest orb that attracts them.[5]

This was the ecclesiastical mess in which Krauth was raised. This was the conviction-starved religious environment, bearing the appellation "American Lutheranism" or the "American Lutheran Church,"[6] in which he received his formal theological education at the Gettysburg seminary, and in which he began his ministry in 1841. In many ways, ironically, it is not dissimilar to the circumstances

that obtain in many parts of the church of our day.[7]

Krauth's Development and Maturation

But something stirred within this man – something that would not allow him to be at peace with this situation. Krauth's own father had never completely forgotten the theology of the Lutheran Reformation, and he encouraged his son at the very least to become familiar with the dogmatic history of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Lutheranism. More than the elder Krauth could have ever imagined, however, when Krauth the younger began to study this theology, it completely captivated and permeated him. Krauth's long-time friend J. B. Bittinger observed in later years that as a result of this study

> Dr. Krauth underwent a complete transformation. The poet and preacher turned into the theologian and controversial writer. I once questioned his venerable father about the great change. His reply was that, so far as he knew, the turning point was his presentation to "Charles" – as he always affectionately called him – of a copy of Chemnitz. Of so great significance is a book which has in it the soul and seeds of things.[8]

In the mid to late 1840s Krauth prepared a catalogue of the books that he had already amassed in his personal library. It listed the following works by Martin Chemnitz: *Loci Theologici*, *Examen Concilii Tridentini* (regarding which he had noted, "from father"), *Oratio de lectura Patrum*, *Fundamenta Doctrinae de Coena Sacra*, and *De Duabus Naturis*.[9] Sigmund Fritschel also contributes this reminiscence regarding Krauth and his theological development:

> We once asked him in what manner God had led him to that knowledge and appreciation of the truth, as confessed in the Lutheran Church, which he possessed in such admirable thoroughness, clearness, and firmness. We thought that the Lord perhaps used as an instrument one of the few remaining witnesses of a former better time, or one of the confessors of His truth that were raised in recent times; and we would have liked to know the Ananias through whom this chosen vessel had been

> rescued from American Lutheranism, and restored to the pure and simple faith of the Church. But to our great astonishment we were informed that he had reached his decided Lutheran views without such personal acquaintance and direct influence of earlier or modern Lutheran theologians, simply through the study of the Lutheran Confessions themselves. When he turned away from the illusions of American Lutheranism in total disappointment and dissatisfaction, he found in the Confession the very thing that he had longed for, as an old treasure, shining in ever clearer and more perfect luster.[10]

According to William Alfred Passavant, Krauth's long-time friend and colleague, Krauth

> was truly a prince in Israel. The son of a noble sire, he grew up in the sanctity of a Christian home and in the atmosphere and surroundings of Christian nurture and sanctified learning. His personal experience, history and studies led him through the various schisms, sects, tendencies and systems of religion and philosophy in vogue for the last half century; and, in the wonderful providence of God… he came to the conviction that the true solution of the troubles of Protestantism was in the loving reception of the Divine Word as confessed by the Lutheran Church. What this position cost, to a nature generous, sensitive and catholic, it is not possible to express. It caused him nights of waking and days of suffering. In the midst of all the goings forth of life and love, it for a time left him well-nigh alone. His name was cast out as evil. He lost the regard of former associates and brethren. He was looked upon as one who dreamed. Men counted his life a failure and his learning foolishness. But none of these things moved him. He took no steps backward. He went to the Holy Scriptures with new love for the divine communications. How he grew strong and great, thus alone with God, and powerful before men in the defence of the divine Word, the whole Church knows; for the influence of his studies and his writings has infused into it a new and diviner life.[11]

Krauth was the leader of an ever-growing and ever-maturing Confessional movement in the General Synod during the 1850s and early 1860s. Contacts were established with pastors in Confessional Lutheran synods that had never been a part of the General Synod,

such as the Tennessee and Missouri Synods, especially through the Free Conferences that were held at the instigation of C. F. W. Walther between 1856 and 1859. In 1861 Krauth became the editor of the *Lutheran and Missionary*, a periodical that advocated a return to sound doctrine and practice in the General Synod. The Pennsylvania Ministerium, which belonged to the General Synod but which was becoming increasingly uncomfortable with the weak theological position of that body and of its seminary, established its own seminary in Philadelphia in 1864. We are not surprised that Krauth was elected to be one of its first professors.

This was also the period of time when Krauth once and for all shook the remaining dust of "American Lutheranism" from his feet in his definitive retraction of any and all former ambiguities regarding the Confessional principle of the Lutheran Church. Samuel Simon Schmucker was Krauth Sr.'s more liberal colleague on the faculty of the Gettysburg seminary, and Krauth Jr.'s former professor there. He and the other theological leaders of the General Synod had always asserted that the outward unity of the church required agreement only in the so-called "fundamental" articles of the Christian faith, by which they meant those beliefs on which all Protestants supposedly agree. They were willing to admit that they did not, "after the additional experience and light of more than three centuries, feel any reluctance in departing from some of the minor doctrines of the Augsburg Confession."[12] These "minor" doctrines, of course, included some that the sixteenth-century Reformers would certainly not have considered minor, such as baptismal regeneration and the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper. With this as the backdrop, on July 13, 1865 (three months after Lee's surrender to Grant), Krauth published the following declaration:

> As for ourselves, we wish no one who feels any interest in our opinions to doubt where we stand. … We do not feel ashamed to confess that time and experience have modified our earlier views, or led us to abandon them, if we have so modified or so forsaken them. … In Church and State the last years have wrought changes, deep and thorough, in every thinking man, and on no point more than this, that compromise of principle, however specious, is immoral, and that however guarded it

> may be, it is perilous; and that there is no guarantee of peace in words where men do not agree in things. So far, then, as under influences, for which we were not responsible, we once believed that there can be true unity in the Church, which does not rest on the acceptance of the doctrines of the Gospel, in one and the same sense, so far we acknowledge that time and the movement of God's providence have led us to truer and juster views. *To true unity of the Church is necessary an agreement in fundamentals, and a vital part of the necessity is an agreement as to what are fundamentals. The doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession are all articles of faith, and all articles of faith are fundamental. Our Church can never have genuine internal harmony, except in the confession, without reservation or ambiguity of these articles, one and all*. This is our deep conviction, and we herewith retract, before God and His Church, formally, as we have already earnestly and repeatedly done indirectly, everything we have written or said in conflict with this our present conviction. This we are not ashamed to do. We thank God, who has led us to see the truth, and we thank Him for freeing us from the temptation of embarrassing ourselves with the pretense of a present absolute consistency with our earlier, very sincere, yet relatively very immature views.[13]

Finally, in 1866, a separation occurred in the General Synod, and the synods that had come to embrace a more Confessional doctrinal position – led by the Pennsylvania Ministerium – withdrew from that body. In 1867 Herman Amberg Preus of the Norwegian Synod noted these developments with sympathetic interest:

> The oldest Lutheran synod in America, over 120 years old, is the Pennsylvania Synod. Its congregations are partly German and partly English. Until last autumn it belonged to the large so-called "Lutheran General Synod in America." This General Synod is comprised of more than half a score of synods, among which there are still to be found some who have never explicitly acknowledged the symbolical books of the Lutheran Church. The General Synod itself acknowledges only the Lutheran confessions with reservations. In recent years, however, a more decidedly Lutheran tendency has begun to make itself felt. This tendency finds its best champions in the bosom of the old Pennsylvania Synod and for the last four or five years has had its own organ, *Lutheran & Missionary*, edited by the gifted Professor Krauth in Philadelphia, as well as its own seminary in the same place.[14]

When the Pennsylvania Ministerium called for a meeting of representatives of all genuinely Confessional Lutheran synods in America to discuss the possibility of organizing a new general body, representatives of the Norwegian and Missouri Synods were among those who attended. At this meeting, which was held in Reading, Pennsylvania, in December of 1866, a statement on "The Principles of Faith and Church Polity of the General Council of the Lutheran Church in North America," authored by Krauth, was adopted. This statement unambiguously endorsed the principle of a *quia* subscription to the Confessions, and the principle that the true unity of the church is to be found in a Biblically-based unity in doctrine.[15] It was also resolved by a majority of those present that a new general organization should be established on the basis of these Principles in the nearest future. Preus recounts that

> Representatives from the Missouri Synod and our synod, however, declared themselves against these resolutions. While they also desired such a bond of unity among the orthodox Lutherans in America, it was their opinion that it could be established only among those who actually stood on the ground of one faith and who were from the heart united in the doctrine of the Lutheran church. They were convinced that this was not the case with several of the synods represented in the convention in spite of their assent to the Fundamental Principles of Faith.[16]

The Missourians and the Norwegians suggested that some more free conferences be held before the organization of a new body, to discuss the outstanding doctrinal issues and to work toward the establishment of complete doctrinal agreement within and among the various synods.[17] But the majority was not persuaded, and the General Council was organized in the following year, without the Norwegian and Missouri Synods as members. The membership of the new body did, however, include the Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan Synods – the predecessor bodies of the modern-day Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod.

Krauth certainly would have agreed that there were still some issues that needed to be sorted out within and among the synods that he wanted to see become a part of the new body. But

instead of delaying the formation of the Council, as the Norwegians and Missourians had recommended, he thought that a more patient and "educational" approach within the parameters of a recognized ecclesial communion would be more appropriate, given the circumstances that existed among Lutherans in nineteenth-century America. Just before the Reading meeting, on December 6, 1866, Krauth wrote:

> The Lutheran Communion on this Western Continent has one of the grandest problems which have ever been given to the Church to solve. She is numerically one of the largest of the churches; she has varied nationalities to combine into one well disciplined host of her Lord. Her sons hold the Word of God, and teach its precious truths in more tongues than any of the other churches in the land, perhaps in more than all the others together. Her people have been trained under different governments and diverse forms of church polity, and thousands of them have endured wrongs of State usurpation and the mischief of rationalistic or pseudo-unionistic teachings. To bring this mighty mass into a harmonious whole will not be the work of a day; but it is a work so glorious, so happy, so divine, that it may fill the measure of the fullest ambition which a holy heart can cherish, to do something, even a very little something, toward its consummation.[18]

The "fullest ambition which a holy heart can cherish," which Krauth describes here, was indeed his personal and vocational ambition, and the defining mission of his life, for as long as he lived. Krauth was certainly aware of the kind of problems that the stricter Lutherans were noticing, but he considered these problems to be evidences of weakness among sincere brethren who were on the right pathway and who were simply in need of more instruction, and not evidences of persistence in error. We must remember, too, that Krauth was already in fellowship with these men and with the synods to which they belonged. They had all come out of the General Synod together for sound Confessional reasons. So, his perspective was different from that of theologians and church leaders whose synods had always remained aloof from the General Synod, and who were now considering the prospect of recognizing, for the first time, a new fellowship relationship with these bodies.

Krauth the Churchman and Teacher

A significant milestone in the fulfillment of the churchly "ambition" to which Krauth had referred was the publication, in 1871, of his *magnum opus*, *The Conservative Reformation and Its Theology*.[19] Several of its chapters were comprised of material that had been previously published in various periodicals, and that had been revised and reworked for inclusion in the book. *The Conservative Reformation* is basically an *Apologia* for Lutheran Confessionalism, especially as this Confessionalism was at that time re-emerging in the nineteenth-century context and was asserting itself ecclesiastically in the principles of the General Council. Theodore Emmanuel Schmauk, who had been one of Krauth's first students at Philadelphia, describes this great literary monument of his former professor as a "mighty protagonist of confessional English Lutheranism, lifting up its stature and spear head and shoulders above all the host of Israel, establishing the Church in her old faith, and defending her against all assault."[20] In the book's Preface Krauth very frankly admits that

> The positions taken in this book are largely counter, in some respects, to the prevailing theology of our time and our land. No man can be more fixed in his prejudice against the views here defended than the author himself once was; no man can be more decided in his opinion that those views are false than the author is now decided in his faith that they are the truth. They have been formed in the face of all the influences of education and of bitter hatred or of contemptuous disregard on the part of nearly all who were most intimately associated with him in the period of struggle. Formed under such circumstances, under what he believes to have been the influence of the Divine Word, the author is persuaded that they rest upon grounds which cannot easily be moved.[21]

Also in the preface, Krauth lays out the full implications of what he is prepared to say about the catholicity and apostolicity of the Confession of his church, with assertions that were no doubt just as shocking in 1871 as they are today, in our age of pseudo-ecumenical post-modern skepticism:

> No particular Church has, on its own showing, a right to existence, except as it believes itself to be the most perfect form of Christianity, the form which of right should and will be universal. No Church has a right to a part which does not claim that to it should belong the whole. That communion confesses itself a sect which aims at no more than abiding as one of a number of equally legitimated bodies. That communion which does not believe in the certainty of the ultimate acceptance of its principles in the whole world has not the heart of a true Church.[22]

In the meantime, Krauth's friend C. F. W. Walther, whom he held in high esteem, was following a different pathway in contending for the faith.[23] He and his synod (Missouri) had not been able to see their way clear to affiliate with the General Council, and in 1872 they participated in the organization of an alternative general body, the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference. But Krauth never considered Walther and the Missourians to be his enemies. As Carl Adolf Frank notes,

> He was a great friend of the work which Missouri and its allies were doing and, though he sometimes thought the strictures which Missouri and its Friends were applying to General Council ways to be too severe, he would not write a word against them lest he might disturb or retard the good things they were accomplishing in the Church. Owing to the origin and former connections of the churches of the Council, and the poor means which especially the American ministers had to acquaint themselves with the treasures of Lutheran theology in former days, he thought it would take a long time and a great deal of instruction before the Council-churches and pastors would be able to reach that point of thoroughness and confessionalism which our German churches had attained to.[24]

Sometimes, however, Krauth did vent his frustrations regarding the criticisms of certain Missourians over against the General Council. In a letter to (Hans Heinrich Philipp) Justus Ruperti in 1876, in which he was responding to Ruperti's own observations of the laxity of some General Council men in their fellowship practices, Krauth expressed the thought that

> One of the most serious obstacles in the way of the advance of the truth is the harshness of the men of the Synodical Conference towards those who have not been able to see entirely with them. If we don't speak in their way, they abuse us without stint: if we do speak in their way, they say, we are dissemblers, and don't mean what we say. While you are doing good by standing up in the General Council for the truth, do good for the General Council by helping the Missouri Synod to look with justice and kindness upon it, for they cruelly misunderstand its real spirit.[25]

And yet, later in the same year, Krauth wrote a letter to Christian Spielmann of the Ohio Synod (a Synodical Conference member-church) concerning the General Council's ongoing discussions on altar and pulpit fellowship, in which he said the following:

> I have been saddened beyond expression by the bitterness displayed towards the Missourians. So far as they have helped us to see the great principles involved in this discussion, they have been our benefactors, and although I know they have misunderstood some of us, that was perhaps inevitable. They are men of God, and their work has been of inestimable value.[26]

Almost immediately after the founding of the General Council, the differences that the Norwegians and Missourians had perceived within and between the various constituent synods did in fact flare up into intense discussions. The focus of these debates was distilled down to "Four Points": millennialism or chiliasm, altar fellowship, pulpit fellowship, and secret societies or lodgery. Despite its strictly Lutheran Confessional basis, as articulated in its "Principles of Faith and Church Polity," the General Council "never issued a declaration satisfactory to strict Lutherans regarding the Four Points."[27] For this reason the Wisconsin Synod withdrew in 1869, and the Minnesota and Illinois Synods in 1871. All three bodies then participated in the organization of the new Synodical Conference in 1872.[28]

Among the synods that stayed, however, the debate on the Four Points continued. Just as Krauth had led the way in

the Confessional movement in the old General Synod, resulting ultimately in the organization of the General Council, so too he now led the way in attempting to guide the General Council toward a truer and more consistent Lutheran viewpoint and practice in regard to these matters. And all the while his own understanding of the proper Lutheran approach was becoming ever clearer, and his own commitment to it was becoming ever stronger. In particular, the subject of altar and pulpit fellowship was continually brought up and discussed at successive General Council meetings. A crucial apex, of sorts, was reached at the 1875 convention in Galesburg, Illinois, with the adoption of the final form of the "Galesburg Rule":

> The rule, which accords with the Word of God and with the confessions of our Church, is: "Lutheran pulpits for Lutheran ministers only – Lutheran altars for Lutheran communicants only."[29]

At the direction of the Council Krauth then prepared his comprehensive "Theses on the Galesburg Declaration on Pulpit and Altar Fellowship," 105 in number, which were presented to the 1877 convention and discussed there and in successive meetings.[30] Those members of the General Council who were more lax in their practice did not like them, but they made a very positive impression on those who, like Krauth, wanted to be consistently Lutheran. Stephan Klingmann, the president of the Michigan Synod (a member-church of the General Council), offered this glowing report on the Theses soon after they were presented: "They are so lucid and so persuasive; they are gleaned from the Word of God and the Confessional Writings of our Church, so that everyone who will not willfully close his mind against their biblical basis must be convinced by them."[31]

Adolph Spaeth, Krauth's son-in-law, opines that Krauth eventually became

> the most powerful and consistent champion of "Close Communion" the Lutheran Church has ever had in this country or in Europe. It brought down upon him the censure, condemnation and estrangement of brethren whom he loved

> and esteemed, and who considered his attitude as uncharitable, intolerant and quite inconsistent with positions he had formerly held and defended. But he held that there is no peril greater to a man's love of truth than a false pride of mechanical consistency. His seeming inconsistencies were the long growth of ripening consistency.[32]

As his own study and reflection in the area of pulpit and altar fellowship continued, Krauth remarked, a year after the adoption of the Galesburg Rule, that

> Our aim is to see whether, in the light which we now have, we can come to the full comprehension of our own language: for often nothing is harder than to comprehend the full force of our own words. We have often found a principle, to the acceptance of which we had been brought in the providence of God, unfold and again unfold itself, until we have been astonished at the result. We have admitted the acorn and it has become an oak.[33]

These discussions were still going on in the General Council at the time of Krauth's death, in the prime of his professional life at the age of 59, on January 2, 1883. His pen had given so much to the church, and the church had expected so much more from him, but alas, in the infinite wisdom of the Almighty it was not to be. Still, the writings that he has left for us, on the important subjects of Lutheran Confessionalism and church fellowship, and on many other themes, are still recognized to be of enduring worth by those who have breathed in the same Confessional spirit that animated him, and who have embraced – or rather been embraced by – the same unchanging Gospel that saved and comforted him. Considering the totality of his work, we can venture to say that it might have been better if some of his propositions had been formulated differently, and if some of his judgments had been made differently. But even with the hindsight of one and a quarter centuries, there is relatively little that a Confessional Lutheran of today would want to criticize in Krauth, and there is very much that a Confessional Lutheran of today would want to learn from him. As Spaeth observed in 1909,

> Not what we, who knew him face to face, may say of him, will be of permanent value to the Church, but what Dr. Krauth

> himself thought and spoke on the great questions that agitated the Church in his days, and will continue to agitate her for some time to come. … Dr. Krauth, in many respects, was ahead of his time. With all the admiration and affection he gained among his contemporaries, there were comparatively few English Lutherans ready to follow him consistently to the end, through all his arguments and conclusions. His day is yet to come, if we are to have a harmonious Lutheranism that truly represents, in doctrine and life, the Mother-Church of the Reformation in the English world-language. …we are fully convinced that the truly Catholic Protestantism of the Conservative Reformation, that is Lutheranism, has its greatest mission yet to fulfill in this Western world, and if it is to abide and to do the work assigned to it in the providence of God, it must be on the lines and principles mapped out and maintained by its greatest English-speaking teacher and representative, Dr. Charles Porterfield Krauth.[34]

The General Council as a whole never reached the level of consistency in Lutheran practice toward which Krauth was trying to lead it, and it did not take very long, after Krauth's death, for the trend to start going in the opposite direction. The Michigan Synod (to which we have previously referred) withdrew from the General Council in 1887, as the Council was already beginning the sad and gradual regression in doctrine and practice that resulted finally in its 1918 reunion with the General Synod in the United Lutheran Church in America – a forerunner of today's Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. Michigan's withdrawal from the General Council was not, however, a repudiation of the Krauth legacy, but it was precisely an act of solidarity with it, at a time when the rest of the Council was even then beginning to turn away noticeably from Krauth's principles.[35]

Krauth the Theologian: The Confessional Principle

We can benefit from a review of some of the writings of Krauth particularly on the two main subjects that occupied most of his attention as a Lutheran churchman: the Confessional Principle and Church Fellowship. This is not, of course, a mere academic

exercise, since these issues are pressing ones in our day as well. Within the purview of this paper we can touch on only a few of his statements. We would hope that this brief exposure to Krauth would, however, whet the appetites of our listeners and readers for more of the same. In the examples that we will share here, we also hope that our listeners and readers will be able to see some of the evidence of the Chemnitzian character of Krauth's work that we have noticed and admired throughout the corpus of his writings.

In his mature theologizing, Krauth is unswerving in his commitment to those principles that form the bedrock of a Lutheran Confessional consciousness, without a hint of compromise or equivocation. At the same time, his generous and peace-loving mind does everything it can to avoid battles over words, and the unnecessary divisiveness that such battles often foment among committed Lutherans. In his calm and thorough discussions of the various articles of faith, Krauth tries always to acknowledge the legitimacy of, and to find the proper place for, each genuinely Lutheran accent and nuance that would contribute in some measure toward a complete and balanced exposition of the doctrine under examination. In some cases Krauth did almost exactly what Chemnitz did, so that in his writings we can see the same sort of terms and arguments that appear in the writings of the great sixteenth-century Concordist. In other cases Krauth did what Chemnitz no doubt would have done, employing Chemnitz's judicious methods and imitating his even-handed approach in answering new questions, in clarifying new misunderstandings, and in settling (or trying to settle) new disputes.

In discussing the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures by means of the human writers through whom they were brought forth, Krauth observes that there is a highly illustrative comparison to be made between the divine-human character of the Bible and the divine-human character of Jesus Christ:

> The word of God is perfectly divine in its contents; but except where the divine form is as necessary as the divine fact, no book is more perfectly human in its form. It is inspired, for it comes from God; it is human, for it comes through man. But remember, we do not say that the human is without the divine.

> The Spirit is incarnate in the Word, as the Son was incarnate in Christ. There is deep significance in the fact that the title of "the Word" is given both to Christ, the Revealer, and to the Bible, the revelation of God, so that in some passages great critics differ as to which is meant. As Christ without confusion of natures is truly human as well as divine, so is this Word. As the human in Christ, though distinct from the divine, was never separate from it, and his human acts were never those of a merely human being – his toils, his merits and his blood were those of God – so is the written word, though most human of books – as Christ, "the Son of Man," was most human of men – truly divine. Its humanities are no accidents; they are divinely planned. It is essential to God's conception of his Book, that it shall be written by these men and in this way. He created, reared, made and chose these men, and inspired them to do this thing in their way, because their way was his way.[36]

On behalf of himself and his colleagues at the Philadelphia seminary, Krauth was also unequivocal in his confession of the unique and unquestionable authority of Holy Scripture in all matters of doctrine and practice:

> We stand upon the everlasting foundation – the Word of God: believing that the Canonical Books of the Old and New testaments are in their original tongues, and in a pure text, the perfect and only rule of faith. All these books are in harmony, each with itself, and all with each other, and yield to the honest searcher, under the ordinary guidance of the Holy Spirit, a clear statement of doctrine, and produce a firm assurance of faith. Not any word of man, no creed, commentary, theological system, nor decision of councils, no doctrine of churches, or of the whole Church, no results or judgments of reason, however strong, matured and well informed, no one of these, and not all of these together, but God's Word alone is the Rule of Faith. No apocryphal books, but the canonical books alone, are the Rule of Faith. No translations, as such, but the original Hebrew and Chaldee of the Old Testament, and the Greek of the New, are the letter of the Rule of faith. No vitiation of the designing, nor error of the careless, but the incorrupt text as it came from the hands of the men of God, who wrote under motions of the Holy Spirit, is the rule of faith. To this rule of faith we bring our minds; by this rule we have humbly tried to form our faith, and in accordance with it, God helping us, we will teach others

> – teaching them the evidences of its inspiration, the true mode of its interpretation, the ground of its authority, and the mode of settling its text. We desire to teach the student of theology the Biblical languages, to make him an independent investigator of the word of the Holy Spirit, as the organ through which that Spirit reveals His mind. We consecrate ourselves, therefore, first of all, as the greatest of all, as the groundwork of all, as the end of all else, to teaching and preparing others to teach God's pure Word, its faith for faith, its life for life; in its integrity, in its marvelous adaptation, in its divine, its justifying, its sanctifying, and glorifying power. We lay, therefore, as that without which all else would be laid in vain, the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets – Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone.[37]

Krauth's conviction that Holy Scripture is the only Rule of Faith does not mean, however, that he fails to see the important role that the Lutheran Confessions play in the life of the Church. He writes:

> The basis of the Evangelical Lutheran Church is the Word of God, as the perfect and absolute Rule of Faith, and because this is her basis, she rests of necessity on the faith of which that Word is the Rule, and therefore on the Confessions which purely set forth that faith. She has the right rule, she reaches the right results by that rule, and rightly confesses them. This Confession then is her immediate basis, her essential characteristic, with which she stands or falls. The Unaltered Augsburg Confession and its Apology, the Catechisms and Schmalcald Articles, and the Formula of Concord, have been formally declared by an immense majority of the Lutheran Church as their Confession of Faith. The portion of the Church, with few and inconsiderable exceptions, which has not received them formally, has received them virtually. They are closely cohering and internally consistent statements and developments of one and the same system, so that a man who heartily and intelligently receives any one of the distinctively Lutheran Symbols, has no difficulty in accepting the doctrine of the whole. They fairly represent the faith of the Church, and simply and solely as so representing it are they named in the statement of the basis of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. … The propositions we have just advanced, no Lutheran, in the historical sense of the word, can deny; for the man who would deny it, would, in virtue of that denial, prove that he is not in the historical sense Lutheran; for he, and

> he only, is such who believes that the doctrine of the gospel is rightly taught in the Augsburg Confession.[38]

When we study God's Word we do not do so from the starting point of some kind of feigned religious neutrality, but from the starting point of consciously knowing ourselves to be members of the believing *and confessing* Church of Jesus Christ. As Krauth said in another context, "We belong to the Church, it does not belong to us."[39] And the "Lutheran Church" to which we belong is bigger than any particular synod at any particular time in its history. It is this greater and transcendent "Lutheran Church" that teaches us, through the Confessions, about the Biblical faith that the Lord of the Church has entrusted to her, and that she in turn has entrusted to us, her grateful sons and daughters. In this way, then, the Confession of our Church becomes also our own individual Confession:

> We do not interpret God's word by the Creed, neither do we interpret the Creed by God's word, but interpreting both independently, by the laws of language, and finding that they teach one and the same truth, we heartily acknowledge the Confession as a true exhibition of the faith of the Rule – a true witness to the one, pure, and unchanging faith of the Christian Church, and freely make it our own Confession, as truly as if it had been now first uttered by our lips, or had now first gone forth from our hands.[40]

It is true, of course, that our doctrine is to be taken only from Scripture. But it is also true that we are not the only people in the history of the Christian Church who have known this. The doctrine that is in the Lutheran Confessions is doctrine that has been taken by their authors from Scripture. Again, as Krauth explains, the historic Confession of the Lutheran Church, enshrined chiefly in the Book of Concord, "is her immediate basis, her essential characteristic, with which she stands or falls."

A sermon on "the right of private judgment" in the Lutheran Church that Schmucker preached at the 1866 convention of the General Synod[41] – just before the more Confessional synods separated from that body – was "an extraordinary mingling of the most dangerous assumptions of Romanism in the one direction, and of

the dreariest rationalism in the other, …a plea for hopeless schism, sectarianism and heresy."[42] Krauth offered a stinging critique of this manifesto of nineteenth-century "American Lutheranism" which also finds a target in some of the attitudes that can be found in the limping Lutheranism of our day:

> One great fallacy which underlies the whole argument and comes to the surface in a great variety of phases is, that Lutheranism is not a system of doctrine, but merely one of the rules of Hermeneutics; not a *result*, but a *process*, – or, rather, a theory of process. This process, according to Dr. S[chmucker], goes on indefinitely; and the results may vary according to the time, place, person or church which uses the process. Lutheranism may successively mean everything and anything which the craziness of an abuse of the right of private judgment may cover with the pretenses of Protestant investigation. Lutheranism may be Unitarian, Pelagian, Calvinistic, Baptist, Arminian, as the current shifts. Provided only that nothing in the way of "writings or creeds of men come between them and the examination of the Bible," twenty men may reach twenty different results, and all be equally good Lutherans. A man may have twenty different phases of credence, and be equally Lutheran through the whole. The Lutheran Church may have a new set of doctrines in every generation, and teach the children to deride the faith, and trample on the teachings, of their fathers and mothers. … It has hitherto been supposed that the Lutheran Church owed her being to her having "proved all things," and having by this process found that which is good, holding fast to it, and to this very end embodying it in her Confessions. But it seems this was a mistake. It is not what she finds, but the way she hunts for it, that gives her [her] character. She is to assume that the proving is never done, but always to be done, and three centuries after her credulous profession that she has the truth, is to go to work seriously to find it… Poor, fond, old mother! She thought her merchantman had found the great pearl at the old Wittenberg long ago, but it seems that it was but paste. … The fact is that these principles root up the faith utterly. They ignore the divine origin, perpetuity, and heavenly guidance of the Church, they put the teaching power of the Bible and of the Holy Ghost, below that of an ordinary arithmetic and of a country schoolmaster. It is too mild to call such views Latitudinarianism; they are logically Nihilism. They do their work so effectually that they would not only leave no Lutheran Church, but they would leave no Church at all, – they leave no

> solid ground of the "one faith" which has always been held, and must ever be held, somewhere in the world, and whose perishing would be the perishing of the Church itself. We have left us but a mere mirage of whimseys and notions. They give us a rule of faith which never generates faith, a Creed by which no man can know what we believe; they give us a state of mind in which we do not know what we believe, or whether we are to believe at all.[43]

In response to the "American Lutheran" supposition that the Confessions are not really that important, since they are "human explanations" of the Word of God and not the Word of God itself, Krauth points out that the Confessions are *correct* explanations of what Scripture teaches, and

> that *correct human explanations* of Scripture doctrine are Scripture doctrine, for they are simply the statement of the same truth in different words. … There is no personal Christianity in the world which is not the result of a human explanation of the Bible as really as the Confession of our Church is. It is human because it is in human minds, and human hearts, – it is not a source to which we can finally and absolutely appeal as we can to God's word. But in exact proportion as the word of God opened to the soul by the illumination of the Holy Spirit, is truly and correctly apprehended, just in that proportion is the "human explanation" coincident with the divine truth. I explain God's truth, and if I explain it correctly, my explanation is God's truth, and to reject the one in unbelief, is to reject the other. … Our English translation of the Bible is a human explanation of a certain humanly transcribed, humanly printed text, the *original*; which original alone, just as the sacred penmen left it, is absolutely in every jot and tittle God's Word; but just in proportion as our translation is based upon a pure text of the Hebrew and Greek, and correctly explains the meaning of such an original, it too, is God's Word. Our sermons are human explanations of God's Word, but so far as they explain it correctly, they do set forth God's Word, and he who hears us, hears our Lord. Our Confession is a human explanation of God's Word, but so far as it correctly explains it, it sets forth God's Word.[44]

Because the Scriptures are the *norma normans*, we do not go

to the Symbolical Books instead of going to the Bible. But because the Symbolical Books are the *norma normata*, we also do not go to the Bible with the pretense that we are unaware of the Symbolical Books, or with a feeling of shame or embarrassment that our faith has been shaped by the instruction we have received through them. The Confessions were written by Fathers and Reformers who were providentially raised up by God, as divinely-called pastors and teachers, at pivotal times in the Church's history. Krauth's acknowledgment of the faithful ministry of these extraordinary men for the timeless benefit of the Church, under Scripture and in the service thereof, is expressed pithily in this way:

> We do not claim that our Confessors were infallible. We do not say they could not fail. We only claim that they did not fail.[45]

The Lutheran Confessions do not, of course, directly address every question with which the contemporary Church is struggling. One will not, for example, find detailed treatments in the Book of Concord of historical criticism, evolutionism, or feminism, or of how the Church should guard itself against these errors. But those who are unfamiliar with the Confessions may be very surprised, if they begin to examine them, to see how applicable they actually are to contemporary times. The sixteenth century was a virtual cauldron of ideas, which were swirling around every corner of the western church. Among the many erroneous teachings that have become popular in various segments of Christendom in the past 400 years, there are very few that had not already been proposed in the sixteenth century, in at least a germinal form, and that had not already elicited a Biblical response from the Lutheran Confessors. Those who doubt this should simply read the Book of Concord, and find out for themselves.

Krauth the Theologian: Church Fellowship

We have already noted that Krauth dedicated an increasing amount of time to a consideration of the doctrine and practice of pulpit and altar fellowship once the General Council had taken shape. Those who are familiar with Krauth's theology chiefly

through his book on *The Conservative Reformation* may be unaware of the equally important writings that he produced soon after that on church fellowship. These were a direct working-out of the principles of Lutheran Confessionalism that he had so ably articulated in that more widely-known volume. In these writings Krauth also demonstrates his grasp of the intimate connection between sound Lutheran principles of church fellowship and the more fundamental Lutheran conviction that it really is possible to know objectively, and to confess clearly, the saving truth that God has revealed in Scripture. Krauth laments that

> It is one of the greatest sins and calamities of the Church of our day that there is widespread and utter carelessness in regard to doctrine, or a fixed aversion to it; in some a contempt for it, in many ignorance or an ignoring of it. Men sometimes array the Gospel against itself by urging that they "want the Gospel," they "don't want doctrine"; as if there could be any real Gospel which is not doctrine, or any Gospel in its totality, which does not embrace all the doctrine of the Gospel. It is as if they said: "We want nourishment; we don't want food"; "We want warmth; but none of your fuel and clothes for us." Whether the laxity of the time helps men toward the extreme [of] pseudo-ecclesiasticism or the extreme of unionistic sectarianism, the beginning of the healing must be a Bible estimate of the indispensable nature of Bible doctrine. Our Church, once chosen of God to lead His people back to the pure faith, must realize that none can take her vocation from her. The front of the host is still her place, if she is faithful to the Captain of her salvation, and she can do now no work more characteristic of her, and more worthy of her great name and responsibility, than to help in awakening the mind of Christendom to a consciousness of the disastrous tendency of the time.[46]

As we examine the theological and ecclesiastical landscape of the early twenty-first century, we cannot but share in Krauth's lament, and for the same reasons. In Krauth's day and in ours, the spirit of "unionism" was and is all-pervasive. Krauth generally uses the phrase "pulpit and altar fellowship" when he is talking about those arenas of church life that must especially be preserved from this destructive spirit. But he also makes it clear that the sacred transaction of preaching and learning from a sermon, or the sacred transaction

of administering and receiving the Lord's Supper, cannot somehow be isolated from other aspects of the overall life of the church and of its members, which naturally flow from the administration of the means of grace and point back again to them. There are many ways by which Christians confess themselves to the pure marks of the church, or, in contrast, by which they confess themselves to something other than the pure marks. The spirit of unionism seeks to permeate and corrupt the spiritual life of the body as a whole, and the spiritual life of each of its members. Therefore both the body as a whole and each of its members need to be protected against this spirit. Krauth, in the midst of his own confessional struggles, observes:

> From the first quarter of the nineteenth century there has been a general breaking down of the old landmarks in this country. Popular and influential forms of embodying union sentiment have become more and more common. We have Sunday School and Tract Unions, union revivals, union prayer meetings, the Evangelical Alliance, Young Men's Christian Associations, all involving compromise on the [basis of the] principles of individualism and all tending to laxity and indifferentism. The world has been coming into the church with its easygoing policy. There has been a large influx of unworthy professors [of the faith], a relaxation of discipline, a spirit of social complaisance taking the place of principle. … Denominationalism with spread sails filling in the gale of unionism, and without pilot or helmsman, is bearing full upon the rock of absolute individualism. When the rock is fairly struck, the vessel will go to the bottom.[47]

Krauth is remarkably prescient also in his discernment of the trends that would lead to modern phenomena like "Evangelicals and Catholics Together," and that would lead to the kind of compromises with Rome that have been made of late by many nominal Lutheran bodies, especially through the notorious *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*. He writes:

> There is no sufficient bulwark against Rome but the doctrine of *justification by faith*, with all it involves. The struggle for the

> possession of the future is between Romanism, Protestantism, and Atheism; and Protestantism, robbed of its great material principle, will be absorbed into Romanism or Atheism. A Bible unbelieved will not save us. A Rule of Faith which we will not allow to make our faith, will not help us. The decline of the power of the great doctrine of justification by faith is the result of the decline of faith itself. Men have less and less confidence and interest in justification by faith, because they have less and less of the faith which justifies. As faith is regarded after the Romish fashion as an intellectual assent, and intellectual assent to divine truth dwindles more and more in the sectarian construction into individual notions and opinions, all of equal validity, the great New Testament doctrine of faith and of justification by faith, is fading more and more out of sight.[48]

Krauth also deals with the phenomenon of the general disintegration of those church traditions that have their roots in the sixteenth-century Reformation, and that historically identified themselves with the dual principles of the clarity and sufficiency of Holy Scripture. The times in which we live, wherein we have seen countless examples of Evangelicals, mainline Protestants, and Lutherans of all shades crossing either the Tiber or the Bosporus, are anticipated in the nineteenth-century Protestant attitudes that Krauth here addresses:

> Our church does indeed rest its relations to the denominations around us on its conviction that its system is in all its parts divine, derived from the Word of God and in accordance with it. And there are those who object to this position, not that they charge any specific error on our church – they waive even the consideration of that question – but that in general they assume that we are not prepared to treat any system as throughout divine. A system, they say, may be divine, but we cannot know that it is. We see in part, we know in part. It is not probable that any one denomination has all the truth on the mooted questions. We think we are right. Others think they are right, and they are as much entitled to assert the possession of truth for themselves as we are for ourselves. The church is still seeking: the church of the unknown future may perhaps see things in their true light. … It is true that the church on earth is imperfect and that in its best life, and because of it, it ever grows. But it must have a complete life to have a constant growth. An acorn is not an oak, but the vital force in the acorn is that which makes the oak and

abides in it. The question here is, has the church reached such a clear, binding faith on the great vital questions, not only of individual salvation but of her own highest efficiency and well-being, as justifies it in making them a term of communion and of public teaching? The question is not whether it can reach more truth, or apply more widely the truth it has, but whether what it now holds is truth and whether by seeking more truth by the same methods it can be assured of finding it. The Old Testament has been teaching for thousands of years, the New Testament has taught for two thousand years, and yet it is pretended by those who profess to hold [to] the clearness and sufficiency of Holy Scripture that no part of the church of Christ, not even that part which they declare they hold in highest esteem, has reached a witness which can commend itself to human trust or can tell whether it has failed or not.[49]

Krauth then asks,

If the divine truth has no self-asserting power, sufficient to dispel doubt, how shall we reach any sure ground? Shall we say that all nominally Christian systems are alike in value, or that if they differ in this no one can find it out? This on its face seems self-confuting, but if we had to confute it, we could only do so by showing that God's Word is clear on the points on which churches differ. If we do not believe that we are scriptural over against Rome, we have no right to be separate from Rome. If the churches divided from us do not believe that they are scriptural, they have no right to be divided from us, and if we have no assured conviction that we have the truth, we have no right to exist. This agnosticism is at heart unbelief, or despair, or indolence, or evasion of cogent argument. Of all Romanizing tendencies the most absolute is that which puts the dishonor on God's Word and on the fundamental principles of the Reformation implied in this view. It may be safely asserted that ecclesiastical bodies will not claim less for themselves than they are entitled to, and when it shall be said that no part of the churches of which the Reformation was the cause or occasion even pretends to have an assurance of the whole faith it confesses, then will men regard Protestantism as self-convicted and, if they do not swing off to infidelity, will say: Rome at least claims to have the truth, and if truth is to be found on earth it is more likely to be found with those who claim to have it than with those who admit they have it not. To sum up, we say Rome is fallible, the denominations are fallible, and the

> Lutheran Church is fallible: but the Romish Church has failed in articles of faith, so have the denominations; the Lutheran Church has not.[50]

In the matter of the admission of preachers to the pulpits of the Church, and of the admission of communicants to its altars, Krauth tries to get Lutherans to think these things through in a consistent and objective way. Specifically on the subject of making "exceptions" to the rule, Krauth warns:

> We must either demand Lutheran authentication from every man who enters a Lutheran pulpit, or demand it of none. However the matter may be covered over with a plausible pretext, it is simply moral suicide for a church to discriminate against her own children, and to exact from her own preachers pledges and guarantees which she does not exact of others. It is either right to give others constant admission, that is, to throw away our confessional and distinctive life altogether, and abandon to sect the whole idea of a church, or it is wrong to give them occasional admission. If it be right in principle to admit them at one time, it is right to admit them at another time, and at all times. It is no longer exceptional, it is normal. It is not a privilege, it is a right. The principle on which rests constant admission to Lutheran altars, demands that those who are there received shall have been taught and examined as to their knowledge of the fundamental truths of the Gospel system, which is the confessed system of our Church; shall have solemnly bound themselves, by God's help, to persevere in the Lutheran faith, and in fidelity to the Lutheran Church, to conform and be subject, as communicant members, to its divine government and discipline. There can be no principle of occasional admission to the altar distinct from and in conflict with this. In a word, the principle of a constant admission precludes the existence of any separate principle of occasional admission.[51]

The unwillingness of the orthodox Lutheran Church to open its pulpits and altars to the heterodox, or to send its pastors and people to heterodox pulpits and altars, will always bring upon it, in a society that is dominated by religious latitudinarianism, a multi-

tude of reproaches. And these reproaches, or the fear of them, can be felt to be too much of a burden – so much so that a "negotiated surrender" to the sects can become, after a while, an increasingly appealing option to some or many who bear the Lutheran name. In our day we certainly know this to be so. But Krauth also knew this to be so. Speaking from both conviction and experience, he writes:

> When the Lutheran Church acts in the spirit of the current denominationalism it abandons its own spirit. It is a house divided against itself. Some even then will stand firm, and with the choosing of new gods on the part of others there will be war in the gates. No seeming success could compensate our church for the forsaking of principles which gave her her being, for the loss of internal peace, for the destruction of her proper dignity, for the lack of self-respect which would follow it. The Lutheran Church can never have real moral dignity, real self-respect, a real claim on the reverence and loyalty of its children while it allows the fear of the denominations around it, or the desire of their approval, in any respect to shape its principles or control its actions. It is a fatal thing to ask not, What is right? What is consistent? but, What will be thought of us? How will the sectarian and secular papers talk about us? How will our neighbors of the different communions regard this or that course? Better to die than to prolong a miserable life by such compromise of all that gives life its value.[52]

In commenting on the main issue that came to the fore at the Marburg Colloquy in 1529, and that has been the focus of Lutheranism's debates with the Reformed ever since, Krauth points out that

> A Zwinglian may admit that a Lutheran is not in fundamental error; a Lutheran cannot admit it in regard to a Zwinglian. To claim that what is really but bread and wine is Christ's body and blood may be a great absurdity – but it is the result of too absolute a trust in his word – it is the superstition of faith. But to say that what he really tells us is his body and blood is but bread and wine implies lack of trust in his word – it is the superstition of unbelief. … They have a metaphor to literalize; we accept a verity deep as the incarnation itself, a verity involving the incarnation and involved in it.[53]

And from the perspective of the Lutheran Church, unionistic fellowship arrangements with the Reformed, or with outright apostates, definitely are surrenders, and not merely compromises (as distasteful as even a compromise would be). Krauth observes that

> When there is official fellowship between those who hold the higher and positive position and those who hold a lower and negative one, the communion is always to the benefit of the lower at the expense of the higher. For however the holders of the higher view may protest as to their personal convictions, the act of communion is regarded as a concession that the convictions, if held at all, are not held as articles of faith but only as opinions. If a Socinian and a Trinitarian commune, each avowing his own opinion as neither changed nor involved, which cause is hurt and which benefited? It looks equal, but Socinianism, whose interest is laxity, is advantaged; Trinitarianism is wounded. It gives fresh life to error; it stabs truth to the heart. Contact imparts disease but does not impart health. We catch smallpox by contact with one who has it, but we do not catch recovery from one who is free from it. The process which tends to the pollution of the unpolluted will not tend to the purification of the evil.[54]

Krauth also sees no enduring place for the kind of "moderate" or "centrist" position in matters of doctrine and practice that would be defined or understood by its advocates in relativistic or ecclesio-political terms, and not on the basis of theological principle. He says, quite simply, that

> There is no firm ground between strict confessionalism and no confessionalism. All between is hopeless inconsistency.[55]

Krauth's Lutheran ecclesiological vision is best summarized in these words:

> When we speak of *genuine* Lutheranism, we do *not* mean that the thing itself can be other than genuine – that there can be of right two kinds, that anything but the real thing is entitled to the name – *but*, that in common with all names the name Lutheran may be, and is, misapplied. That may be called Lutheranism which is not Lutheranism. Gold must be gold, yet we can

> distinguish for convenience sake between genuine gold and spurious gold; gold pure and gold alloyed. We can speak of genuine, true, pure Christianity, and of spurious, false, corrupted Christianity. … Genuine Lutheranism we contrast as a thing of intelligence, over against ignorance. It is the Lutheranism of those who know why they are what they are – who know the hope that is in them and have a reason for it. They know what the Confessions teach, and what is in the Word on which the Confession rests. They know the genius of their Church, its history, its wants, its glories, its defects, the prospects which animate it, the discouragements it has to overcome. A genuine Lutheranism is a *living*, devoted, earnest Lutheranism, over against aversion, frigidness, and indifference. … It is a Lutheranism which is *consistent*, as over against one which is continually denying the just inferences of its own profession. … Genuine Lutheranism is *firm*, over against all vacillation, all temporizing, lowering of principle, and abasement before the idols of the hour. It lifts itself above the blandishments of the time and the dread of its odium and persecution. It does not fear being left a little flock if the evidence remains of the Father's good pleasure to give it the kingdom. It sings "Ein feste Burg" with heart as well as voice, confessing that nothing on earth or in hell can move it.[56]

Conclusion

Numerically and institutionally, at least in the western world, the kind of "genuine Lutheranism" for which Krauth yearned is in decline. The inner life of the massive structures of the European state churches collapsed long ago, and only the outer shells remain, surrounding the ecclesio-cultural rubble within. For the past several decades, free churches and synods with long and respectable Lutheran pedigrees have also been tottering, and toppling, one by one. This process continues with a vengeance. Are these sad occurrences frightening empirical evidence that Confessional Lutheranism has really been, after all, a well-intentioned but misguided dream, and that it will not – indeed cannot – survive? Should we look instead to something more outwardly stable, like Roman Catholicism or Eastern Orthodoxy, which in their institutional strength seem more plausibly to be pointing toward an ultimate ecclesiastical success? Should we look instead to something more overtly powerful, like

Evangelicalism or Pentecostalism, which in their zeal and energy seem more able to draw to themselves the masses of humanity? Krauth would not think so in either case. In view of Lutheranism's ecclesiology of the cross, he says:

> The obligation to stand by truth is not conditioned by the human probabilities of its triumph. While there may be again, as there has been in the past, a relative advance of truth, error will abide upon the earth, and we know not in what proportions, while the earth stands. The harvest will open on tares and wheat together. The Church may have relative rest, but she will have no absolute rest; but will bear the cross till she is lifted to her crown in heaven. We do not stake the great principle, nor the right of our Church to abide by it, on any prophetic pretense of its earthly triumph or of hers.[57]

The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews states:

> Remember those who led you, who spoke the word of God to you; and considering the result of their conduct, imitate their faith. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever. Do not be carried away by varied and strange teachings… (Heb. 13:7-9, NASB)

With the qualification that Scripture itself gives us, regarding their speaking of the Word of God and not of unprofitable opinions, the noble company of those whom Confessional Lutherans "remember" and "imitate" includes Athanasius, the Cappadocian Fathers, and Chrysostom; Hilary, Ambrose and Augustine; Luther, Melanchthon, and the Concordists; and, especially in certain American circles, Walther, Hoenecke, and the Pieper brothers. But let us not neglect to include also in this worthy band of brothers and fathers the man whom Walther described as "the most eminent man in the English Lutheran Church of this country," Charles Porterfield Krauth.

We conclude with this message of hope and encouragement that Krauth addressed to Matthias Loy in 1876, but which could just as well have been addressed to us at the beginning of the twenty-first century:

> Our Church has a terrible battle before her, but with her great divine principles and God blessing her, she need not fear the

issue. The true Church will always be relatively a little flock, but it will be none the less the hope of the world.[58]

Those who have insight will shine brightly like the brightness of the expanse of heaven, and those who lead the many to righteousness, like the stars forever and ever. (Daniel 12:3, NASB)

Addendum: Krauth on the Ministry

During his very fruitful ministry Krauth produced much useful material on many specific articles of faith that we have had neither time nor space to explore here. This we regret. There is one subject, however, which is currently the focus of intense discussion in the Lutheran Church, about which we would like to share at least a few brief thoughts from Krauth's writings: the doctrine of the Public Ministry. We are persuaded that Krauth's insights on this topic can go a long way in helping the orthodox Lutheran Church of our day to arrive at a God-pleasing resolution of a multi-faceted debate that has been going on for quite some time.

In the context of studies pertaining to the preparation of a model constitution for General Council congregations, Krauth prepared eighteen very extensive Theses on the Doctrine of the Ministry that deserve to be much better known than they are.[59] In these Theses he begins with an acknowledgment of the divine institution and perpetual necessity of the Public Ministry:

> To the end that God may be glorified in the *salvation* of men, our Lord Jesus Christ, in his Divine Unity with the Father and the Holy Ghost, has instituted the ministry; to *teach* the pure Gospel, and to *administer* the Sacraments rightly in the Church. … This divinely instituted ministry is a sacred public office, conferred by legitimate vocation, on suitable men. … The ministry is necessary as the ordinary instrumental medium ordained of God, whereby the Word and Sacraments which are the only means of grace in the strict and proper sense, are to be brought to men. … Though God is the perpetuator of the ministry, as he is its author, He continues it on Earth *by means of his Church* through which He exercises his power of appointing teachers of the word. … A minister, New Testament Bishop, Presbyter, Elder, or Evangelical Pastor, is a man legitimately called by God, through the Church, to teach the word publicly in the Church; to administer the sacraments, and to maintain sound discipline and good government.[60]

Later, in his discussion of the origin and character of the office of deacon, Krauth introduces a very helpful distinction between

the Public Ministry in the "stricter sense" and the Public Ministry in a "broader sense"[61]:

> The deacons received power and entered on duties originally held and exercised by the Apostles as pastors of the Church at Jerusalem. The office was created by a separation of certain powers and duties of the ministry, and devolving them on a new class of officials. The deacons are not a part of the people to do the work pertaining to the people in common, but are a part of the officials of the Church, taking a share in the ministry and being in that broader sense ministers; aiding the pastoral ministry in its work by taking upon them, in conformity with the instructions of the Church, such collateral portions of the work as do not require the most important and special powers of the pastor and teacher. … The true original conception of the deacon is that of the pastor's executive aid. The particular work assigned to the seven deacons, first chosen, was simply a determination of this general conception, produced by the specific nature of the case. The distribution of a common fund in alms, or the service of poor widows is not the whole generic idea of the diaconate, though it was its whole actual function at first. … Deacons were not originally appointed to preach the Gospel, or to administer the Sacraments, or to bear official part in the government of the Church. They are in their proper intent executive aids of the ministry, in its collateral labors, or in the incidental, not essential, parts of its proper work. … Deacons are not ministers in the specific or stricter sense, nor are they essential to the organization of every congregation. A congregation now, like the congregation at Jerusalem in its first stage, can exist as an organization without deacons… So far as is not inconsistent in any manner or degree with the sole direct Divine authority of the ministry of the Word to teach publicly in the Church and to administer the Sacraments, nor with the rights and duties inseparably connected therewith, the Church has liberty to enlarge the functions of the diaconate in keeping with its original generic idea, so as to make it, in accordance with her increasing needs, a more efficient executive aid to her ministers. In the Ancient Church, enlarging in her liberty the functions of the deacons, as executive aids to the ministry of the Word in the service of the Church, the deacons took care of the sacred utensils employed in the sacraments; they received the contributions of the people, and conveyed them to the pastor; they took part in reading the Scriptures in public worship; at the request of the pastor they might take part in

> the *distribution* (not in the consecration) of the elements; they helped to preserve order and decorum in the service of the sanctuary; they furnished to the pastor information that would be useful to him in his labors – they were his almoners – in short, they were the executive aids of the minister of the Word, in the closest relations of official reverence, and of faithful service to him…[62]

As Krauth continues his discussion of the diaconate, he goes on to a consideration of the ancient church's office of deaconess, which in the nineteenth century was in the process of being revived within Lutheranism:

> In some Churches, especially among the Gentile converts, there were Deaconesses, Christian women, largely selected from the widows known as faithful and holy. They were occupied with the care of the sick and of the poor, and with the externals of the Church's work. They were in the one diaconate with its official character, as an executive aid of the ministry unchanged, and with its specific characteristics determined by the special gifts and facilities pertaining to Christian women. In the Ancient Church they gave instruction to the female catechumens, rendered the necessary aid at their Baptism, were guardians of the private life of Christian women, gave useful information to the pastors and such assistance as the pastors desired. They tenderly cared for the martyrs, confessors, travelers, sick and needy persons, especially though not exclusively of their own sex, and preserved order among the women in public worship.[63]

Obviously, Krauth sees no female equivalent to deaconesses within the category of the Public Ministry in the stricter sense. The ordinary offices of spiritual oversight in the church that involve the carrying out of the distinctive duties of the pastoral ministry ("Bishop, Presbyter, Elder, or Evangelical Pastor") are not open to women. Again, to quote Krauth, such offices are to be "conferred by legitimate vocation, on suitable men."

According to Krauth, neither deacons nor deaconesses were serving in the "ministry of the Word" in the stricter or narrower sense. They were, however, carrying out certain limited spiritual duties that were, in their origin, constituent components of the

"ministry of the Word," and that would otherwise be carried out by the church's pastors as a natural and necessary part of their own ministry. Deacons, for example, were authorized to read publicly from the Scriptures and to assist in the distribution of the Lord's Supper, while deaconesses were authorized to give instruction to female catechumens and to assist at their baptisms. Those who serve in diaconal offices like this, also in our day, would therefore properly be understood to be ministers of the Church in a "broader sense."[64] Krauth elsewhere approaches this from a slightly different angle:

> The Apostles were missionaries, not merely under the necessity of the case, but, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit gave security to the work and wrought and made a basis for its extension by organizing congregations in which the life of the disciple found its home and sphere of labor. With the establishment of these congregations, and as an essential part of their organization was connected the institution of the congregational pastorate, the vocation which was to superintend and spiritually rule the congregations, to conduct the public services, to administer the sacraments, to labor in the word and in doctrine and to watch for souls to the conversion of sinners and the building up of saints. The pastorate was the determination to a distinct office of so much of the Apostolate as pertained to the single congregation. The institution of the Apostolate was the general institution of the entire ministry, whose specific forms, especially the Presbyterate-episcopate, and the diaconate, were but concrete classifications of particular functions involved in the total idea of the ministry. The specific ministries are but distributions of the Apostolate in its ordinary and permanent functions.[65]

The debate over the necessity, or at least over the ecumenical desirability, of embracing the so-called "historic episcopate" has been agitating certain segments of world Lutheranism in recent years. On this subject in general, Krauth writes, with his typical wit, that

> In their extraordinary powers and functions the Apostles had no *successors*. In their ordinary ones all true ministers of Christ are their successors. There is a ministerial succession unbroken in the Church; but, there is no personal succession in a particular line of transmission. The ministry that is ordains the ministry

> that comes. The ministry of successive generations has always been inducted into the office by the ministry preceding; but, the so-called Apostolical succession or canonical succession does not exist, would be incapable of demonstration if it did exist, and would be of no essential value even if it could be demonstrated.[66]

Historically, Krauth observes that, in the Lutheran Church,

> The idea of the universal priesthood of all believers at once overthrew the doctrine of a distinction of essence between clergy and laity. The ministry is not an order, but it is a divinely appointed office, to which men must be rightly called. No imparity exists by divine right; an hierarchical organization is unchristian, but a gradation (bishops, superintendents, provosts) may be observed, as a thing of human right only. The government by consistories has been very general. In Denmark, Evangelical bishops took the place of the Roman Catholic prelates who were deposed. In Sweden the bishops embraced the Reformation, and thus secured in that country an "apostolic succession" in the high-church sense; though, on the principles of the Lutheran Church, alike where she has as where she has not such a succession, it is not regarded as essential even to the order of the Church. The ultimate source of power is in the congregations, that is, in the pastor and other officers and the people of the single communions. The right to choose a pastor belongs to the people, who may exercise it by direct vote, or delegate it to their representatives.[67]

Endnotes

[1] Note especially the title of the book *C.F.W. Walther: The American Luther*, a collection of essays published in Mankato, Minnesota, by Walther Press in 1987.

[2] C. F. W. Walther, *Lehre und Wehre* XXIX:1 (January 1883), p. 32; quoted in F. Bente, *American Lutheranism* (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1919), Vol. II, p. 182.

[3] C. P. Krauth, "The General Council Before Its First Anniversary," *The Lutheran Church Review*, Vol. XXVI, No. 4 (October 1907), pp. 660-62. Here and elsewhere in this paper we have included some relatively lengthy quotations from the writings of Krauth that preserve the context of his more memorable remarks. The essayist is of the opinion that his hearers and readers are (or should be) more interested in what Krauth had to say for himself, than in any summaries of Krauth's ideas that we might formulate.

[4] Krauth, "The General Council Before Its First Anniversary," p. 662.

[5] Krauth, "The General Council Before Its First Anniversary," pp. 662-63.

[6] In a key example of his life-long intolerance for inane sloganeering, Krauth writes that "The 'American Lutheran Church' lacks three elements to justify its name. 1. It is not *American* – this is its first lack. Its fundamental principles were asserted by ancient errorists, renewed in part by Zwingle, in other parts by the Anabaptist fanatics, and carried out by the Socinians and Rationalists. These principles are simply an adoption and adaptation of European error, and are not American. 2. This so-called Church is *not Lutheran* – this is its second lack. Its whole distinctive life turns upon the denial of the Lutheran faith. 3. It is not a *Church* – this is its third lack. It has no separate organization, no creed, and no history. Not American, not Lutheran, and not a Church, where and what is the 'American Lutheran Church?'" Quoted in Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, Vol. II, p. 111.

[7] In an incisive ecclesio-historical analysis, equally applicable to the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries, Krauth explains that "When error is admitted into the Church, it will be found that the stages of its progress are always three. It begins by asking *toleration*. Its friends say to the majority: You need not be afraid of us; we are few, and weak; only let us alone; we shall not disturb the faith of the others. The Church has her standards of doctrine; of course we shall never interfere with them; we only ask for ourselves to be spared interference with our private opinions. Indulged in this for a time, error goes on to assert *equal rights*. Truth and error are two balancing forces. The Church shall do nothing which looks like deciding between them; that would be partiality. It is bigotry to assert any superior right for the truth. We are to agree to differ, and any favoring of the truth, because it is truth, is partisanship. What the friends of truth and error hold in common is fundamental. Anything on which they differ is *ipso facto* non-essential. Anybody who makes account of such a thing is a disturber of the peace of the church. Truth and error are two co-ordinate powers, and the great secret of church-statesmanship is to preserve the balance between them. From this point error soon goes on to its natural end, which is to assert *supremacy*. Truth started with *tolerating*; it comes to be merely tolerated, and then only for a time. Error claims a preference for its judgments on all disputed points. It puts men into positions, not as at first in spite of their departure from the Church's faith, but in consequence of it. Their recommendation is that they repudiate the faith, and position is given them to teach others to repudiate it, and to make them skilful in combating it." *The Conservative Reformation and Its Theology* (Philadelphia: General Council

Publication Board, 1871), pp. 195-196. Emphases in original.

[8] J. B. Bittinger, quoted in C. A. Frank, "Dr. Charles P. Krauth" (Editorial), *The Lutheran Witness*, Vol. 1, No. 17 (January 21, 1883), p. 132.

[9] Adolph Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, Vol. I (New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1898), p. 70.

[10] Sigmund Fritschel, "In Memorium," *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 1883, p. 30; quoted in Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, Vol. I, pp. 72-73.

[11] William Alfred Passavant, *Workman*, 1883; quoted in G. H. Gerberding, *The Life and Letters of W. A. Passavant* (sixth edition) (Greenville, Pa.: The Young Lutheran Co., 1906), p. 524.

[12] S. S. Schmucker, *The American Lutheran Church* (Springfield, Ohio: D. Harbaugh, 1851), p. 203. For a general introduction to the phenomenon of "American Lutheranism," and to the nineteenth-century Confessional reaction to it, see David Jay Webber, "Confessing the Faith in the Language of America," *Logia*, Vol. IV, No. 3 (Holy Trinity/July 1995), pp. 39-48.

[13] Krauth, quoted in Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, Vol. II, pp. 114-15. Emphasis in original.

[14] Herman Amberg Preus, *Vivacious Daughter* (Northfield, Minnesota: The Norwegian-American Historical Association, 1990), pp. 113-14.

[15] The text of this statement can be found in the companion volume (Vol. II) of *The Book of Concord*, edited by Henry Eyster Jacobs (reprint: Decatur, Illinois: The Johann Gerhard Institute, 1996), pp. 338-42.

[16] Preus, p. 194.

[17] The Missourians especially had reason to believe that such meetings could indeed bear the desired fruit, if they were entered into with the proper seriousness. Just days before, representatives of the Missouri Synod had held a successful fourteen-day colloquy with representatives of the Buffalo Synod, which resulted in the establishment of fellowship between Missouri and a majority of Buffalo's pastors on the basis of full doctrinal unity, even though there had previously been very significant differences between the two synods in their teaching on church and ministry. See Preus, pp. 188-91.

[18] Krauth, quoted in Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, Vol. II (Philadelphia: General Council Publication House, 1909), pp. 173-74.

[19] This book is now out of print, but it is available in its entirety on the Internet: http://www.hti.umich.edu/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=moa;idno=AJK2557

The present essayist also maintains a web site on which quite a bit of material from Krauth's writings can be found:

http://www.angelfire.com/ny4/djw/lutherantheology.html

[20] Theodore E. Schmauk, *The Confessional Principle and the Confessions of the Lutheran Church* (Philadelphia: General Council Publication Board, 1911), p. xviii.

[21] Krauth, *The Conservative Reformation*, p. xiii. As an example of the kind of changes that occurred in Krauth, we will first note this statement from an 1845 letter to his father: "I shall never be able to believe in the *substantial* presence of Christ's body and blood in, with, and under the elements." Quoted in Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, Vol. I, p. 135. Emphasis in original. Compare this to the following statement from *The Conservative Reformation* regarding the Confessional Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper: "Men have talked and written as if the doctrine of our Church, on this point, were a stupid blunder, forced upon it by the self-will and obstinacy of one man. The truth is, that this doctrine, clearly revealed in the New Testament, clearly confessed by the early Church, lies at the very heart of the Evangelical system – Christ

is the centre of the system, and in the Supper is the centre of Christ's revelation of Himself. The glory and mystery of the incarnation combine there as they combine nowhere else. Communion with Christ is that by which we live, and the Supper is "*the* Communion." Had Luther abandoned this vital doctrine, the Evangelical Protestant Church would have abandoned him. He did not make this doctrine – next in its immeasurable importance to that of justification by faith, with which it indissolubly coheres – the doctrine made him. The doctrine of the Lord's Supper is the most vital and practical in the whole range of the profoundest Christian life – the doctrine which, beyond all others, conditions and vitalizes that life, for in it the character of faith is determined, invigorated, and purified as it is nowhere else. It is not only a fundamental doctrine, but is among the most fundamental of fundamentals." p. 655. Emphasis in original.

[22] Krauth, *The Conservative Reformation*, pp. xiv-vi.

[23] Adolph Hoenecke writes that, in the nineteenth century, "Like unto Walther Charles P. Krauth also entered the lists for a theology solely based on the Scriptures and in accord with the Confessions of the Lutheran Church." *Dogmatik*, Vol. I, p. 189; quoted in Paul Peters' review of a reprint edition of *The Conservative Reformation and Its Theology* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1963), *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*, Vol. 60, No. 4 (Oct 1963), p. 316. Kurt E. Marquart laments: "With the benefit of a century's worth of hindsight, it seems indeed a great pity that those two Lutheran stalwarts, C. F. W. Walther and Charles Porterfield Krauth, the great theological leader of the General Council, were unable to join forces." *Anatomy of an Explosion* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1977), p. 39.

[24] Frank, "Dr. Charles P. Krauth" (Editorial), p. 132.

[25] Krauth's letter continues: "If the General Council be broken down, it would be an immeasurable calamity to our Church. The Synodical Conference might pick up some of the fragments, but the larger part of it would be too disheartened to attempt a new organization, and would certainly not unite with any of the existing ones." Quoted in Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, Vol. II, pp. 218-19.

[26] Krauth, quoted in Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, Vol. II, p. 236.

[27] "General Council," *Lutheran Cyclopedia* (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1975), p. 325.

[28] The Illinois Synod merged into the Missouri Synod in 1880.

[29] "Galesburg Rule," *Lutheran Cyclopedia*, p. 321.

[30] Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, Vol. II, p. 222. The text of the Theses can be found in *Lutheran Church Review*, Vol. XXVI, No. 3 (July 1907), pp. 515-27; No. 4 (October 1907), pp. 740-48; Vol. XXVII, No. 1 (January 1907), pp. 129-37; No. 2 (April 1908), pp. 321-30.

[31] Stephan Klingmann, quoted in "A Brief History of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Michigan and Other States" (1910); in *Michigan Memories: Things Our Fathers Have Told Us* (Michigan District of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, 1985), p. 177.

[32] Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, Vol. II, p. 197. In 1877 Krauth summarized his position on "Close Communion" as follows: "It is a principle of the New Testament universally recognized in the Church, that the reception of the Lord's Supper in a particular congregation or particular communion, has, as one of its objects, the confession of the pure faith as against the false or mingled, the complete as against the imperfect, the sound doctrine as against the corrupt or dubious, the true Church as against the spurious or doubtful. It is the most solemn mode of marking church conjunction, and of witnessing for a particular communion as over against all

communions in any way arrayed against it, or officially separate from its fellowship." Charles P. Krauth, "Theses on the Galesburg Declaration on Pulpit and Altar Fellowship," Part II, *Lutheran Church Review*, Vol. XXVI, No. 4 (October 1907), p. 745.

[33] Krauth, quoted in Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, Vol. II, p. 220. In an 1876 letter to Henry Eyster Jacobs, Krauth wrote: "My own convictions have become so clear, I have found so completely the ground toward which I have been struggling, that I am full of hope for all earnest minds, however miseducated they may have been. Nothing fills a man with such faith in the truth as the possession of it does." Quoted in Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, Vol. II, pp. 227-28.

[34] Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, Vol. II, p. vi.

[35] Specifically, at first, this was in the area of pulpit fellowship, but a pervading spirit of laxity soon spread also to other areas. If we may be permitted to add a somewhat personal note, we believe that it is correct to say that Krauth is, in every sense, a true Father of the ecclesial fellowship to which the present writer's church body (the Evangelical Lutheran Synod) belongs. This is so not only according to the sense in which any sound and orthodox teacher of the past can be honored as a Father, but also according to the particularly "provincial" or "synodical" sense in which people like Walther and Preus are Fathers for Lutherans in the Synodical Conference tradition. The modern-day Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, the largest member-church of the Confessional Evangelical Lutheran Conference, came into existence through the 1892 federation of its three nineteenth-century predecessor bodies: the (old) Wisconsin Synod, the Minnesota Synod, and the Michigan Synod. (The federation became a formal amalgamation in 1917.) Of these three, the Michigan Synod had remained a member of the General Council, and in fellowship with Charles Porterfield Krauth, throughout his lifetime. The Michigan Synod heritage that resides institutionally within the WELS – and especially in its Michigan District – has therefore brought the Krauth legacy directly into the fellowship of churches of which the WELS (and ELS) is now a part. May this noble legacy, which is ours by birthright and not only by adoption, be continually rekindled and burn brightly in our midst!

[36] C. P. Krauth, *The Bible a Perfect Book* (Gettysburg, Pennsylvania: Henry C. Neinstedt, 1857; reprint: Decatur, Illinois: The Johann Gerhard Institute, 1996), p. 10. On at least one occasion Luther had used the same Christological analogy in describing the character of Holy Scripture, but because it was in a somewhat obscure inscription it is unlikely that Krauth was aware of it. Luther had written: "The Holy Scripture is God's Word, written and, so to speak, lettered and put into the form of letters, just as Christ, the eternal Word of God, is clothed in humanity." WA 48, 31; quoted in *What Luther Says* (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959), p. 71. This analogy has been used many times since Krauth put it into print in 1857. For example, Siegbert W. Becker wrote in a 1965 essay on "The Inspiration of Scripture" that "it is not surprising that men who 10 years ago were saying that the Bible cannot be perfect because it is a human book, today are ready to assert that the Lord Jesus too, since He was a true human being, was mistaken in many things. It is only another demonstration of the truth that, when men lose the Scriptures, they must eventually also lose Christ. For just as Christ is human and divine, so the Scriptures, too, are both human and divine. The words are human words spoken and written by men, but they are also divine words spoken and written by God through human agency. The holy writers were His scribes, His penmen, whom He used to produce the sacred Scriptures, just as the king of Assyria was the rod of His anger which He used to punish recalcitrant Israel. There is no warrant, therefore, for any attempt to separate the divine words from the human

words, or to distinguish the divine message from the human assertions in this book." *This Steadfast Word* (Lutheran Free Conference Publications, 1965), p. 40.

[37] A statement of the faculty, drafted and delivered by Krauth, on the occasion of the inauguration of the Philadelphia Seminary in 1864; quoted in Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, Vol. II, p. 143-44.

[38] Krauth, *The Conservative Reformation*, pp. 179-80. Most of this excerpt is also quoted approvingly by Peters in his *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* review of Krauth's book, p. 318.

[39] Charles P. Krauth, *Christian Liberty in its Relation to the Usages of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (reprint: Decatur, Illinois: The Johann Gerhard Institute, 1996), p. 65. This pamphlet was originally published in 1860.

[40] Krauth, *The Conservative Reformation*, p. 169. We see here Krauth's way of trying to overcome the seeming impasse between those who maintain that the Scriptures should be interpreted in light of the Confessions, and those who maintain that the Confessions should be interpreted in light of the Scriptures.

[41] This convention was held in Fort Wayne, Indiana. Krauth attended it as one of the delegates from the Pennsylvania Ministerium. "On the Sunday between the sessions the Ministerium delegation worshiped and received Holy Communion at the Missouri Synod's St. Paul's Lutheran Church where Wilhelm Sihler was pastor. The fervent hope was expressed that the day would soon come when America's Lutherans would be one." August R. Suelflow and E. Clifford Nelson, "Following the Frontier," *The Lutherans in North America*, edited by Nelson, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980 revised edition), p. 234.

[42] Quoted in Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, Vol. II, p. 157.

[43] Krauth, in the *Lutheran*, August 23, 1866; quoted in Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, Vol. II, pp. 157-58. Emphases in original.

[44] Krauth, *The Conservative Reformation*, pp. 184-86. Emphases in original.

[45] Krauth, *The Conservative Reformation*, p. 186.

[46] Krauth, "Theses on the Galesburg Declaration on Pulpit and Altar Fellowship," Part II, pp. 747-48.

[47] Charles Porterfield Krauth, "The Right Relation to Denominations in America," *Lutheran Confessional Theology in America, 1840-1880*, edited by Theodore G. Tappert (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), pp. 112-13.

[48] Charles P. Krauth, "Theses on the Galesburg Declaration on Pulpit and Altar Fellowship," Part III, *Lutheran Church Review*, Vol. XXVII, No. 1 (January 1908), p. 128.

[49] Krauth, "The Right Relation to Denominations in America," pp. 129-30.

[50] Krauth, "The Right Relation to Denominations in America," pp. 130-31.

[51] Charles P. Krauth, "Theses on the Galesburg Declaration on Pulpit and Altar Fellowship," Part IV, *Lutheran Church Review*, Vol. XXVII, No. 2 (April 1908), pp. 325-26.

[52] Krauth, "The Right Relation to Denominations in America," p. 135.

[53] Krauth, "The Right Relation to Denominations in America," p. 124.

[54] Krauth, "The Right Relation to Denominations in America," pp. 135-36.

[55] Krauth, "The Right Relation to Denominations in America," p. 128.

[56] Charles P. Krauth, "Religion and Religionisms," *Lutheran Church Review*, Vol. XXVI, No. 2 (April 1907), p. 231. Emphases in original.

[57] Krauth, "Theses on the Galesburg Declaration on Pulpit and Altar Fellowship," Part III, p. 135.

[58] Krauth, quoted in Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, Vol. II, p. 235.

[59] These Theses can be found sequentially in the following articles: "Thetical Statement

of the Doctrine Concerning the Ministry of the Gospel" [First Article], *Lutheran and Missionary*, Vol. XIV, No. 12 (December 31, 1874), p. 1; "Thetical Statement of the Doctrine of the Ministry" (Second Article), *Lutheran and Missionary*, Vol. XIV, No. 13 (January 7, 1875), p. 1; "The Doctrine of the Ministry Thetically Stated" (Third Article), *Lutheran and Ministry*, Vol. XIV, No. 15 (January 21, 1875), p. 1; and "The Doctrine of the Ministry Thetically Stated" (Fourth Article), *Lutheran and Missionary*, Vol. XIV, No. 19 (February 18, 1875), p. 1. Also helpful are Krauth's lectures on "Church Polity," published posthumously as follows: Part I, *Lutheran Church Review*, Vol. II, Whole No. 8 (October 1883), pp. 307-23; Part II, *Lutheran Church Review*, Vol. III, Whole No. 10 (April 1884), pp. 139-51; and Part III, *Lutheran Church Review*, Vol. III, Whole No. 12 (October 1884), pp. 320-34.

[60] C. P. Krauth, "Thetical Statement of the Doctrine Concerning the Ministry of the Gospel" [First Article], *Lutheran and Missionary*, Vol. XIV, No. 12 (December 31, 1874), p. 1. Emphases in original.

[61] A distinction between the Public Ministry in the "narrow sense" and the Public Ministry in a "wider sense" is also used by E. W. Kaehler in an essay that was originally published in *Lehre und Wehre* (in three parts) in 1874: "Does a Congregation Ordinarily Have the Right Temporarily to Commit an Essential Part of the Holy Preaching Office to a Layman?," *Logia*, Vol. VI, No. 3 (Holy Trinity 1997), pp. 37-43. This exact terminology does not appear in the writings of people like Luther, Chemnitz, or David Chytraeus, but the idea that this terminology is intended to clarify and expresses can definitely be found in their writings. See, for example, Martin Luther, "A Sermon on Keeping Children in School," *Luther's Works*, Vol. 46 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), pp. 219-31; Martin Chemnitz, *Examination of the Council of Trent*, Part II (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1978), pp. 682-88; and David Chytraeus, *On Sacrifice* (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1962), pp. 97-102.

[62] Krauth, "Thetical Statement of the Doctrine Concerning the Ministry of the Gospel" [First Article], p. 1. Emphasis in original.

[63] Krauth, "Thetical Statement of the Doctrine Concerning the Ministry of the Gospel" [First Article], p. 1.

[64] Krauth had not learned this approach in seminary. His own Dogmatics professor taught categorically and without qualification: "As to the deacons, for whose election Paul gives directions, they were not ministers, but, as we are expressly told, laymen elected by the members of the church 'to serve at tables,' in order that the apostles might be released from that duty, and be able to give themselves 'continually to prayer and the ministry of the word.'" S. S. Schmucker, *Elements of Popular Theology*, 5th edition (Philadelphia: S. S. Miles, 1845), pp. 221-22.

[65] C. P. Krauth, "Church Polity," Part I, *Lutheran Church Review*, Vol. II, Whole No. 8 (October 1883), p. 317.

[66] Krauth, "Thetical Statement of the Doctrine Concerning the Ministry of the Gospel" [First Article], p. 1. Emphasis in original.

[67] Krauth, The Conservative Reformation, pp. 152-53.

The Genealogies of Jesus Christ

Theodore Gullixson

Introduction

Because of God's promise to send a Messiah to the Jews, Jewish families in Bible times had a vital interest in knowing the lineage of their people, especially of their priests and kings. Mark identified blind Bartimaeus as "the son of Timaeus." As he sat near the road from Jericho, he learned that Jesus was passing by. He cried out, "Jesus, Son of David, have mercy on me!" (Mark 10:47). This statement of faith also included a genealogical statement of known facts about Jesus.

The Old Testament contains a genealogical history of the Messiah whom God promised Adam and Eve that He would send. The birthright, which included the promise of the Messiah, was passed down by many generations through Abraham, Judah, and David.

Josephus wrote that the Jews kept public genealogies at the Temple (from oldest to youngest) and private records in their homes (from youngest to oldest).[1] Bernham also states, "It is likely that official records were kept of family lineage, but that these were destroyed when the Romans invaded Jerusalem after Jesus' death. In this case the genealogies in the gospels need only be in summary form." He added that the command that everyone go to his ancestral town to be taxed by the Romans required that genealogical knowledge must have been kept in some form.[2]

The genealogies of Jesus in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke are important because they show the fulfillment of God's promises given throughout the Old Testament era. The genealogies also demonstrate that the Son of God became flesh, as the writer to the Hebrews states: "As children have partaken of flesh and blood, He Himself likewise took part of the same." When he says that "in all things He had to be made like His brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest" (Hebrews 2:14,17), we should also include Scripture's list of Jesus' ancestors as part of "in all things."

That list includes a depressing number of wicked people along with some of the heroes of faith mentioned in Hebrews 11.

P. G. Mathew summarizes the genealogies of Jesus that appear in the Bible:

> Matthew begins his gospel with "the genealogy of Jesus Christ the son of David, the son of Abraham," and traces Christ's genealogy in a descending order from Abraham to Jesus. After telling of the events surrounding Christ's birth and the beginning of his public ministry, Luke traces Christ's genealogy in ascending order from Jesus to David to Abraham to Adam. Mark does not give a genealogy, but John traces the origin of our Lord to eternity. He says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God... the Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us." [3]

The Attack on Christ's Genealogies

However, Jesus' genealogies present great problems to the critics of Christianity. Kent Crutcher wrote about a man who questioned the Bible's inerrancy: "He replied with great assurance and confidence in his position: 'THE BEGATS!' 'The begats are simply a genealogy that needs no inspiration and are not inspirational.' 'They are not even accurate!'"[4]

The critics have a long list of complaints against Jesus and Scripture. The **first** concerns the two genealogies: "Even though these genealogies are not exhaustive, they cannot be reconciled. They have different grandfathers (JACOB vs. ELI), and they descend from David through two different sons (SOLOMON vs. NATHAN)."[5] Another author notes that Matthew's genealogy disagrees with that of First and Second Chronicles.[6] **Second**, there is the matter of Jesus as a descendant of David: "According to 1Chronicles 22:9 —Solomon's throne of his Kingdom, not Nathan's, is supposed to last forever. Both Solomon and Nathan were sons of David. Since Luke states the lineage of Jesus is through Nathan, Jesus cannot be part of Solomon's everlasting kingdom."[7] The **third** issue concerns King Jechonias: "According to Jeremiah 22:28 no descendent of Jechonias is to sit on the throne of David ever. Since Matthew includes Jechonias in the lineage of Jesus, Jesus cannot be part of

the everlasting Kingdom."[8] **Finally** there is the problem of Joseph: "Is Jacob or Heli the father of Joseph? In Matthew, Jacob is the father of Joseph; in Luke, Heli is the father of Joseph. Another major disagreement between Matthew and Luke."[9] These issues will be further discussed below.

Given these problems, many conclude that Jesus is not the Messiah, as Michael Levy does quite forcefully:

> 1) If the virgin birth is true (which is highly unlikely since it goes against the grain of supporting Jesus' messianic claim) then Jesus cannot be the Messiah.
>
> 2) If you trace Jesus' line through Joseph (by which you claim Jesus inherits the throne by adoption) in Matthew's genealogy, then you run into the curse of Jeconiah, and Jesus cannot be the Messiah.
>
> 3) If you trace Jesus' line through Luke's genealogy (regardless of whether you attribute it to Joseph or Mary) Jesus cannot be the Messiah because it does not include King Solomon; it includes his brother, Nathan, eliminating any legitimate claim to the throne.
>
> Jesus' genealogy, as we have it in the Christian Scriptures, does not allow him to be the Messiah. **This point cannot be stressed strongly enough.** No other "prophecies" one thinks Jesus fulfilled are relevant without this crucial brick in the wall.[10]

However, the brick that many find missing is not so impossible to see. Answers do exist. How we deal with these apparent problems depends on the presuppositions we bring to our study.

Biblical Presuppositions

While the genealogies of our Savior present some apparent problems, it is important to keep in mind a wider perspective on our study. The modern scholars and other commentators who disparage the Bible on the basis of this genealogy often are looking for

evidence to prove the Bible wrong. When they find their "evidence" they ridicule the Bible's claim of inspiration.

All Bible study must begin with the principle that "All scripture is written by inspiration of God" (2 Timothy 3:16). Since Jesus states, "Your word is truth" (John 17:17), we do not have to be afraid of over-emphasizing the word "all." We are to assume that the Bible records are true and accurate. Where we may have an issue or problem with Scripture and where we cannot know which solution is correct, we are to trust that the Holy Spirit knows more than we do and that He will reveal it all when we enter heaven.

Jesus enunciated another presupposition and hermeneutical principle: "[Moses] wrote about Me" (John 5:46). Jim Lesenby writes, "Before we get into the meat of the story we need to establish one fact. The Holy Bible contains a record of events from Adam to Christ, **but throughout it the central thread is Christ and His genealogy (ancestors).** It is important that you absorb this concept thoroughly because it is the basis of the problem in the story of Judah and Tamar."[11]

Two other arguments are made of which we should take note before we look into some of the problems in the genealogy. First, Nizar states, "In fact, the biggest proof for genealogy is the **silence of the Jewish people** who did not attack the two genealogists—that shows the authenticity of the scripture."[12] The Jews who rejected Jesus had every reason to attack the genealogical lists of Matthew and Luke: their hatred of Jesus would move them to find any error, and the records of the Temple could still be consulted to determine if an error of fact did occur.

Christian apologetics has noted a second argument with regards to the Church Fathers:

> Second, do any critics actually think that those who collected the books of the New Testament, and who believed it was inerrant, were unaware of this blatant differentiation in genealogies? Does anyone actually think that the Christians were so dense that they were unaware of the differences in the genealogy lists, closed their eyes and put the gospels into the canon anyway hoping no one would notice? Not at all. They knew the cultural context and had no problem with it knowing that one was of

Joseph and the other of Mary.[13]

Then there is the difference in culture, as noted by Kent Crutcher: "But we are looking from our culture into theirs. One of the most difficult things for a modern Bible student to learn is how to read the scriptures from the perspective of those who wrote and originally read them. These and other differences were acceptable to the contemporary readers who had access to the genealogies and knew the rules for how they were set up and how they could be used."[14]

Believers should keep these pre-suppositions and arguments in mind as they deal with the issues raised by Christ's genealogies.

The Purpose of Christ's Genealogy

While a list of the names of people who died long ago might seem boring to the modern reader, the Holy Spirit certainly had a gracious purpose for including them in the Gospels. In fact, several purposes can be identified: **First**, the genealogies show that Jesus is the promised heir from Jacob, not a stranger or an imposter. **Second**, they reveal how God fulfilled certain Messianic prophecies. **Third**, they prove the authenticity of Scripture as one sees its unity. **Fourth**, the genealogies prove the divinity and humanity of Jesus. **Fifth**, the genealogies give important information about the human race. **Sixth** and most important, genealogies demonstrate God's love for the sinful human race by sending a Savior.[15]

Since everything in the Old Testament was "written for our admonition" (1 Corinthians 10:11), another author declared: "In these names, we see a history of God's dealing with His people: His judgment, His mercy, His redemption, His grief, and above all, His faithfulness throughout the history of His dealing with His people, signified most by the last name of the genealogy 'Jesus, who is called Christ.' "[16]

Matthew's Genealogy

Matthew's genealogical list has four distinctive features: 1) it begins with Abraham to whom God gave the covenant promise of the Messiah, 2) it is divided into three groups of fourteen individuals, 3) it lists four women in the genealogy, which is unusual for Hebrew genealogies, and 4) several known people are left out of his genealogical list.

Matthew is writing to Jews who were awaiting the coming Messiah, as is evidenced by the many Old Testament prophesies he used in his Gospel. Matthew also writes as a bridge between the 400 years that separated the prophet Malachi and Jesus.[17] By starting his genealogy with Abraham, Matthew connects Jesus with the promised covenant of Abraham, whose "seed" would bless all nations. St. Paul defines what God intended: "He does not say, 'And to seeds,' as of many, but as of one, 'And to your Seed,' who is Christ" (Galatians 3:16).

The distinctive feature in Matthew is his division of Christ's genealogy into three groups, as he wrote: "So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations, from David until the captivity in Babylon are fourteen generations, and from the captivity in Babylon until Christ are fourteen generations" (Matthew 1:17). Note that each of these three divisions covers a different extent of time: 1,000 years from Abraham to David, 400 years from David to Jeconiah, and 600 years from Jeconiah to Jesus, yet each division has only fourteen generations.[18]

The three divisions show three periods in the history of Israel: the section of the fathers, the section of the kings, and the section of the civilians.[19] Another author described the divisions historically: the first is from promise to kingship, the second from kingship to exile, and the third from exile to the birth of the Messiah.[20]

Why did Matthew use these three divisions? Various answers have arisen. Kent Crutcher states, "The arrangement of the three groups into fourteen each was apparently a teaching device to make the list easier to memorize. Ease of memorization, it should be noted, was of crucial importance before the age of printed books."[21] Another answer points to the consonants in David's name—which

add up to fourteen—showing the central importance of David in Jesus' line.

Lenksi gives another reason, "He wanted us to understand that all three groups had equal weight and importance as far as the Messiah is concerned."[22] Lenski criticizes those who count Jechoniah twice, or add Mary's name to come up with fourteen in the third group. He discounts another solution where a translator from Hebrew Matthew wrote "Jechoniah" instead of "Jehoiakim." For this would mean that Matthew omitted a "begot" between the names. Lenski finds his solution in 2 Kings 23:30-25:7 and in Matthew. Matthew writes, "Josiah begot Jeconiah and his brothers about the time they were carried away to Babylon" (1:11). Since Jeconiah had only one brother (also named Zedekiah in 1 Chronicles 3:15,16), the phrase καί τούς ἀδελφοὺς αυτοῦ refers to the two sons of Josiah who reigned before Jeconias and the one son who reigned after him.[23]

Matthew also omits the names of some kings. This is not a problem caused by a lack of inspiration, as some claim. For in the Bible "son" can mean son, grandson, descendant, adopted son, and a disciple.[24] Kent Crutcher also writes about the difference in standards between modern time and 2,000 years ago:

> "Another thing a Bible student will quickly notice is that Matthew's genealogy is incomplete. In verse 8, three names were left out between Jehoram and Uzziah: Ahazaiah, Joash, and Amaziah. Verse 11 leaves out Jeconiah. Why? So they would come out to 14. This does not seem like an accurate, logical, or even a truthful thing to do. But we are looking from our culture into theirs. One of the most difficult things for a modern Bible student to learn is how to read the scriptures from the perspective of those who wrote and originally read them. These and other differences were acceptable to the contemporary readers who had access to the genealogies and knew the rules for how they were set up and how they could be used."[25]

Luke's Genealogy

The evangelist Luke was writing to a Gentile named Theophilus (Luke 1:3). Luke traces Jesus' ancestry back to Adam,

"the son of God" (Luke 3:38). Lenski notes that although "a son of God" "expresses a different relation than that of the others, it is perfectly true."[26] He stresses that this phrase "disposes of the pagan myths about the origin of man and shows that God is the Creator of the whole human race, Father of all men in that sense."[27]

By going back to Adam, Luke emphasizes that Jesus was the Savior of the whole human race, a point made by Luke's companion, St. Paul, in Romans 15:9-13. Lenski adds, "In carrying the ancestry back to Adam's creation by God, Luke presents Jesus as the Savior of the race (universality), and that this is the chief import of this genealogy." [28] [29]

The Genealogies Compared

Many people declare that the two genealogies in Matthew and Luke are contradictory. One author put the issue this way: "I am not able to find any statement at all in Scripture that the Lucan geneology [sic] is that of Mary. Is there a valid and consistent reconciliation—or are the two geneologies irreconcilable? The theory that Luke's geneology being [sic] that of Mary sounds like an intellectually dishonest attempt to placate questioners."[30] Another called the matter absurd, "Doesn't it seem absurd now, that the authors of Matthew and Luke would spend so much time fabricating lineages for Jesus if he was not born of man? If Jesus was God Incarnate, then he would not have a biological father, his Father would be God himself and the genealogies would be irrelevant"[31]

Lenski provides two pieces of evidence by which he concludes that Luke's genealogy is that of Mary. First, How could Luke write a genealogy of Joseph after writing the phrase ὢν υιός, ὡς ενομίζετο, Ἰωσὴφ, "being the son of, as **was supposed**, Joseph"? Furthermore, in his Gospel Luke has demonstrated through Gabriel's visit to Mary that Joseph is not the father of Jesus. Second, there is no τοῦ before Ἰωσὴφ, though τοῦ is before every other name in Jesus' genealogy. "The difference in the wording between the two evangelists is so marked as alone to settle the question." For Matthew wrote, "the husband of Mary of whom was born Jesus;" whereas Luke wrote, ὡς ενομίζετο."[32]

The traditional answer is that Matthew wrote to a Christian-Jewish audience so that "he presents Jesus as their promised Messiah, their king from the lineage of David, who fulfills all the prophecies" Luke writes to all people. Thus he writes about Christ, the Son of Adam, the Son of God.[33] Because Jewish families trace their lineage through males, "Matthew had no choice but to trace the lineage through Joseph."[34] Coffmann summarizes:

> Two separate genealogies of Jesus Christ are absolutely necessary in the establishment of the Christ, first as the blood descendant of David, and secondly, as the legal heir to the royal throne of the Hebrews. Matthew shows Christ as the legal heir to the throne by tracing his ancestry down through the royal line of the kings of Israel. Luke's genealogy is utterly different, because it is not concerned with title to a throne but with the blood ancestry of Jesus.[35]

The Bible leads us to believe that both genealogies name real people who were ancestors of Christ, that the lists serve God's purposes instead of our demand for full disclosure, and that Jesus is the Christ who is "true God, begotten of the Father from eternity, and also true man, born of the Virgin Mary."[36]

The Major Problems in Jesus' Genealogies

There are four major problems with Jesus' genealogies: 1) Are the genealogies in Matthew and Luke irreconcilable? 2) Is Jesus truly descended from David? 3) The problem of God's curse of Jechonias, and 4) The problem of Joseph having two "fathers." We have already discussed the first item, that of the genealogies of Matthew and Luke. The other three problems, plus another, are discussed below.

The problem of the generation numbers

One writer states that a simple comparison of the genealogies of Mathew and Luke reveals some apparent "discrepancies between them. For instance, 40 generations are represented from Abraham to Joseph in Matthew's genealogy, but in Luke there are 56 from

Abraham to Joseph."[37] Another author figured out that in the last 562 years of both genealogies, Matthew's twelve generations would mean an average of 48 year-old fathers, where Luke's 21 generations would mean an average age of 27 years between generations, a number closer to reality.[38] In order to avoid the charge of a direct conflict, one must assume that Matthew did not list every generation, since Matthew is known to have excluded four kings of Judah from his genealogy.

The same practice was used for the period of the Judges (from Rahab to David, about 366 years). "Obviously, therefore, only the most noted of intervening ancestors are given in the tables. This was, of course, a procedure well known to the Jews and fully acceptable to them in every way."[39]

The problem of David's Kingdom

The critics conclude that Jesus cannot be the Messiah because He is not descended from David through Solomon. That is, Joseph is not Jesus' biological father. The problem is that 1 Chronicles 22:9, 2 Samuel 7:8, Psalm 89:3, and Psalm 132:11 all state that Jesus must be a physical descendant of David and inherit the throne of Solomon. God told David, "Your house and your kingdom shall be established forever before You" (2 Samuel 7:15). Since Luke states that because of the virgin birth Jesus' lineage is through Nathan, some conclude that Jesus cannot possess Solomon's everlasting kingdom.[40]

Note that in Matthew's genealogy only David is called "king" because it was through him that the kingship entered Jesus' lineage. Solomon was not the direct forefather of Christ. "The Old Testament did not say that Christ would be Solomon's descendant, but it prophesied repeatedly that Christ would be a descendant of David (2 Sam. 7:13-14; Jer. 23:5)."[41]

The problem of Jeconiah

The first issue with Jeconiah is in Matthew, who writes, "Josiah begot Jeconiah and his brothers about the time they were carried away to Babylon" (1:11). However, Jeconiah was his

grandson and his father Jehoiachim was Josiah's son. Both Jeconiah and Jehoiachim were wicked kings.

The second problem deals with God's curse on Jeconiah/Jehoiachin/Coniah, who ruled only three months and ten days before King Nebucadnezzar carried him off to Babylon along with the first wave of exiles. Jeremiah prophesied that he and his mother would die in a foreign country, and added, "For none of his descendants shall prosper, sitting on the throne of David, and ruling anymore in Judah" (22:30). DeLashmutt stated the problem this way, "God said earlier that the Messiah would have to come from this kingly line—then he cursed that line and never replaced it! Unless you come from Jeconiah's line, you're disqualified—and if you come from Jeconiah's line, you're disqualified!?!"[42] So the critic concludes, "According to Jeremiah 22:28 no descendant of Jechonias is to sit on the throne of David ever. Since Matthew includes Jechonias in the lineage of Jesus, Jesus cannot be part of the everlasting Kingdom."[43]

The standard explanation of this issue is: "The point is that Jesus is not a biological descendant of Jeconiah, but through the other lineage—that of Mary. Hence, the prophetic curse upon Jeconiah stands inviolate. But, the legal adoption of Jesus by Joseph reckoned the legal rights of Joseph to Jesus as a son, not the biological curse. This is why we need two genealogies: one of Mary (the actually biological line according to prophecy), and the legal line through Joseph."[44]

Other solutions have been proposed, such as that the curse is not to be taken literally, since Jeconiah did know prosperity in Babylon and did have children there. Another solution is that God annulled the curse (see Haggai 2:23) after Jeconiah repented and God did bless Zerubbabel.[45]

These explanations will not suit the Bible critic because to them Jeconiah stands as a barrier to Jesus being the Messiah.

The problem of Shealtiel and Zurubbabel

The next two generations also present a problem because we are not given all the details. Keil and Delitzsch state the problem this way: "According the genealogy of Jesus in Luke iii, 27, Shealtiel

is the son of Neri, a descendant of David, of the lineage of Nathan, not of Solomon; and according to Haggai i.1,12, Ezra iii.2, v. 2, and Matt. i.12, Zerubbabel is son of Shealtiel; while, according to vers. 18 and 19 of our chapter [2 Chronicles 3] he is a son of Pedaiah, a brother of Shealtiel.[46]

There are several explanations. Gaudreau quotes Esaton's Bible Dictionary as saying, "He was the son of Neri, the descendant of Nathan, and thus heir to the throne of David on the death of Jeconiah (comp.) Jer. 22:30." Gaudreau responds, "How would Esaton know that this is so when Neri's genealogy is nowhere to be found in the OT."[47]

Another explanation is, "There is no evidence that the names Shealtiel and Zerubbabel in the two lists refer to the same individuals. It would be just as reasonable to suppose that the two Eliakims refer to the same man."[48]

The standard explanation is made by Keil and Delitzsch, commenting on 1 Chronicles 3:

> "The discrepancy…is removed by the supposition that Jeconiah, besides the Zedekiah mentioned in ver. 16, who died childless, had another son, viz. Assir, who left only a daughter, who then, according to the law as to heiresses (Num. Xxvii.8, xxxvi.8f), married a man belonging to a family of her paternal tribe, viz. Neri, of the family of David, in the line of Nathan, and that from this marriage sprang Shealtiel, Malchiram, and the other sons (properly grandsons) of Jeconiah mentioned in ver. 18.
>
> "If Shealtiel died childless, his second brother Pedaiah married his widow and begot Zerubbabel, who is the prince of Judah who returned to Jerusalem in the reign of Cyrus in the year 536."[49]

The problem of Joseph's father

Finally there is the problem of Joseph: "Is Jacob or Heli the father of Joseph? In Matthew, Jacob is the father of Joseph; in Luke, Heli is the father of Joseph. Another major disagreement between Matthew and Luke."[50] Or is it?

"The only real difficulty in this view is the statement in Luke 3:23 that Joseph is the 'son of Heli.' R. A. Torrey stated that 'Joseph's name is introduced into this place instead of Mary's, he being Mary's husband. Heli was Joseph's father-in-law; and so Joseph was called "the son of Heli." While Joseph was son-in-law of Heli, he was, according to the flesh, actually the son of Jacob (Matthew 1:16). This type of double entry was not confusing to the Jews, for a woman's name did not usually stand in the tables of genealogy.[51]

Lenski agrees, "Thus Matthew's genealogy presents Joseph as the legal father of Jesus, which makes Jesus legally the heir of David and of Abraham. If Jesus had been born without a legal father, of Mary without a legal husband, his legal right to the inheritance from Abraham and David by virtue of the divine promise would have been void."[52]

One other solution based on Scripture is suggested. There is an exception to the rule that inheritance goes only through the son. In Numbers 29:33 Moses states that Zelophehad had no sons, but five daughters. The daughters petitioned Moses for a portion of the Promised Land after their father died. The Lord told Moses that they should be given an inheritance (Numbers 27:7). God commanded that the daughters marry within their own tribe so that the inherited land would not change from tribe to tribe (Numbers 36:6-7). If Heli, Mary's father, had no sons, Mary had to marry within the tribe of Judah to keep her lineage with the house of David and carry the legal title to the line, but without the blood curse of Jeconiah.[53]

Since the Holy Spirit has not supplied all the information, one cannot declare which solution is the correct one. However, Scripture clearly calls Jesus the Son of David and the Holy Spirit has inspired the authors to write two genealogies which show that Jesus' lineage is from David. The writer of the book of Hebrews states that Jesus' lineage is clearly known, "For it is evident that our Lord **arose** (ἀνατέταλκεν, [a perfect] means tropically: 'be descended from') from Judah" (Hebrews 7:14).[54] To deny the virgin birth or the descent from David would destroy the basis for the fulfillment of all other prophesies about Jesus. The Jews were well aware of the Messiah's lineage, as when Nathanael asked, "Can any good thing

come out of Nazareth?" (John 1:46). Philip's answer is still true, "Come and see."

The Notable Genealogy of Jesus

Jesus has many notable ancestors in His genealogical background. All the then-living descendants of Adam were destroyed in the Flood except Noah and his family. The pre-flood names in Luke's genealogical list are all heroes of faith even though only Enoch and Noah are mentioned in Hebrews 11. Both Enoch and Noah are called righteous, and walking with God. This righteousness could come only by faith in the promised Messiah, their descendant in the flesh. Not much is told about these men who lived hundreds of years in a virtual paradise—except for sin and death. Public worship began about the time Seth's son Enosh was born (Genesis 4:26).

Though we do not know how much God revealed about the promised Messiah beyond Genesis 3:15, these men displayed great faith in that promise. God blessed Enoch by taking him away without death. Enoch prophesied to those who opposed God that the Lord would return "to execute judgment on all" (Jude 15). His son Methuselah lived the longest life of any one whose years are recorded (969 years). He died within a year before the great flood began.

By faith in God's promises, Noah became the second father of the human race through his three sons, born to him twenty years after God told him to build an ark. Building the ark was an act of faith in God's Word. Living in the new "empty world" also required great faith and courage. Peter compares the salvation that Noah's ark provided his family with the baptism instituted by Jesus, which baptism saves us (1 Peter 3:21).

Luke included **Cainan** in his list of men after the Flood, which name is absent in Genesis. There are two possible explanations: 1) This was an error of an early scribe when the "Cainan" of Luke 3:37 was added to verse 36;[55] or 2) Luke follows the list in the Septuagint. This would mean that Moses skipped a generation for whatever reason. By inference, this also could mean that other generations might not have been listed and that more generations existed after

the Flood, especially between the Flood, Babel, and Abraham.

It is significant that the names given to the descendants between Shem and Abraham are not connected with Elohim or Yahveh, as was the case with many of Judah's kings. However, the meanings of the names after the Flood do reflect some of the history that Moses does not tell us directly. For example, **Eber** means "the other side of the River." This is the origin of the name "Hebrew." **Peleg** has always intrigued commentators because of its meaning "division." It is not known whether it referred to the division into languages or the division of continents, or both. **Terah,** meaning "Wild goat" certainly lived up to his name. He is of sad interest because Joshua states that Terah was an idolater (Joshua 24:2). Yet he is the progenitor of **Abram**, who is the father of the Children of Israel and of all believers (Romans 9:8). The Bible does not tell us if he later repented, nor how Abram came to faith in the true God.

Abram is significant because he was a hero of faith (Hebrews 11:8) as well as one who was given a new name by God to reflect His covenant promise. By faith Abraham was truly the "father of many nations" and, more importantly, the "father" of the Messiah.

Much more is known about the lives of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob than about their immediate ancestors or descendants. For the Holy Spirit intends to describe the fulfillment of God's promise to Abraham, the origin of the tribes of Israel, and the blessings of faith in the covenant promise about the Messiah. In addition, we also are shown their sins—impatience, doubt, lack of trust, scheming, adultery, etc.

Matthew broadens the genealogy when he writes, "Jacob begot Judah and his brothers" (1:2). Lenski states, "Although Judah represents the actual line of descent of Jesus, all the twelve patriarchs were the direct heirs of the Messianic promise. The twelve together produced the chosen nation from which the Messiah sprang"[56]

The three generations of Jacob, Judah, and Perez have much in common. First, all three are not the first-born, yet they became the ancestors of Jesus. Second, all three ended their lives in Egypt, not in Canaan. Third, all three are born into troubled families where favoritism, jealousy, and other sins influenced their lives. Yet they are included into Jesus' family and by faith they traveled to Egypt

trusting that their descendants would return to the Land of Promise from which they came.

Ram, Amminadab, and Nahshon lived in Egypt, experienced the wretched slavery of the new pharaoh, and perhaps participated in the Exodus. Ram's brother is Caleb, one of the twelve spies sent into the land of Canaan who urged the people to trust in the Lord. Caleb and Joshua were only two of those over twenty to enter Canaan because they trusted God's Word. Nahshon was a chief of the tribe of Judah at the time of the Exodus (Numbers 1:7), being over twenty years old when he was chosen as prince. All three died in the wilderness without entering Canaan.

Salmon, Nashon's son, crossed over the Jordan and settled in what we know as Bethlehem. According to Matthew, Salmon married Rahab the harlot of Jericho and she became the ancestor of Jesus. His son/descendant Boaz married Ruth, the Moabitess, by levirate marriage.

Hebrews 11:32 lists David as a hero of faith. God raised up this youngest son of Jesse to be king over the twelve tribes and promised that his Descendant would establish an everlasting kingdom (1 Chronicles 17:14). Matthew also mentions David's sins of adultery with Bathsheba and of the murder of her first husband.

After David's repentance, God blessed David and Bathsheba with four more sons: Shimea, Shobab, Nathan, and Solomon (1 Chronicles 3:5). From the last two sons came the two genealogies found in Matthew and Luke. Solomon's genealogy is well-known, since his descendants are the kings of Judah. The names of Nathan's descendants are recorded but nothing is known about them, though they also participated in the triumphs and tragedies of the Judean kingdom.

The kings of Judah were a mixture of faithful believers and wicked idolaters. One low point in the history occurred when Jehoram married Athaliah, the daughter of Israel's king Ahab and Jezebel. This action brought great wickedness to Judah and the near-extinction of David's lineage because of God's promise that Ahab's children would all be destroyed. This may be one reason why Matthew did not mention three kings in his list: Joash (good, then evil), Amaziah (wicked), and Azariah (wicked).

Yet three of the next four kings were good, especially Hezekiah, the last king whose reforms could have turned away God's wrath. Later Manassah and Josiah tried reforms, but they got nowhere in the face of the people's idolatry and wickedness.

Jehoiachin/Jeconiah was the last king of Jesus' lineage to occupy the throne of David—only for three months and ten days! The last king on the throne was Zedekiah, Josias' son from a different wife. After being a captive in Babylon for 37 years, Jeconiah was set free by the Babylonian king Evil-merodach in B. C. 562 at his accession, after King Nebuchadnezar died. After he was released Shealtiel was born, perhaps from a new wife.

The disaster that came upon Jerusalem almost destroyed David's line. Both lines of David and Nathan seem to converge with the names Shealtiel and Zerubbabel. Matthew states "after they were brought to Babylon, Jeconiah begot Shealtiel" (1:12), but Luke has Neri as the father of Shealtiel (3:27). Here there is a discrepancy, or two individuals existed with the same name, or this was a case of a levirate marriage.

After this, the two genealogies mention names of people about whom nothing is known until Joseph. During those five hundred years the Jews returned to Jerusalem and rebuilt the Temple and the city walls. They experienced the relative peace of the Persian period. Then they suffered through the attacks by Alexander the Great, the internecine wars of his generals (the Ptolemies of Egypt versus the Seleucids of Syria), successfully rebelled against the Seleucids under the leadership of the Maccabees, and came under the protection and influence of Rome. Then "a decree went out from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be registered" (Luke 2:1) so that Jesus could be born in Bethlehem, since both Joseph and Mary were "of the house and lineage of David" (Luke 2:4).

The Five Women in Christ's Genealogy

The distinctive feature in Matthew's genealogy is that he mentions four women who are among Jesus' ancestors. While the four women had pasts blemished by sin or unbelief, yet it was important for Matthew to include them. A Roman Catholic commentary asks,

"Why were women mentioned in the genealogy? Sts. Jerome, Chrysostom, Ambrose answer, because Christ would signify that 'He who came for the abolishing and putting away of sins wished to be born of sinners.' This is the allegorical reason, and is often used because St. Matthew was a public sinner yet was called by Jesus"[57] Lenksi says that Matthew's purpose was more than revealing stains on the line, or humbling Jewish pride. Matthew notes that when Mary was found with child, Joseph was minded to divorce her. Jewish slanderers in later years also made grave accusations against Mary. "These base slanderers are reminded by Matthew of what they might well call real blemishes in the Messiah's Abrahamitic and Davidic bloodline."[58]

Tamar is the first woman Matthew mentions. Her husband Er, the first-born of Judah, was killed by God because of his wickedness (Genesis 38:7). When it became clear that Judah would not provide her with another husband and Judah's wife had died (38:12), Tamar decided to take matters into her own hands. She played the harlot and became the mother of Perez and Zerah. The general conclusion to this story is: "Incest, an unmarried mother, and a patriarch with dubious morality came early on in Jesus' line."[59] In Tamar's defense, Lesenby declares, "If the events recorded in *Judah* and *Jubilees* are correct, her marriages had never been consumated and she was still a virgin, so her bridal clothes were not inappropriate."[60] Judah himself judged that "She has been more righteous than I, because I did not give her to Shelah my son" (Genesis 38:26).

Another least likely candidate for inclusion into Jesus' family is **Rahab.** Not only was she a Canaanite, but the Bible says that the two spies of Jericho "came to the house of a harlot named Rahab, and lodged there" (Joshua 2:1). During the destruction of Jericho the lives of Rahab and her family were spared, and then "Rahab, also a Canaanite, married Salmon (note: the Old Test. does not state this—Matt. 1:5 alone does)"[61] so that she is included in Jesus' family! Because of this lineage Rahab is included in the list of heroes of faith: "By faith the harlot Rahab did not perish with those who did not believe, when she had received the spies with peace" (Hebrews 11:31). When James states that "Rahab the harlot [was] also justified by works when she received the messengers"

(2:25), the *Apology* declares, "He [James] does not omit faith nor exalt love in preference to it, but keeps it, lest Christ, the propitiator, be excluded from justification"[62] "He says that a faith which does not produce good works is dead, but it is alive when it brings forth good works"[63]

The next unlikely woman to be in Jesus' family was **Ruth**. Crutcher sums up the situation this way: "Even though Ruth seems to be virtuous enough, she is a Moabitess. Her people were the product of the incestuous relations of Lot and his daughters. They were some of Israel's worst enemies!"[64] Ruth's first husband was not a direct ancestor of Jesus. But by faith in the Messiah, Ruth turned away from her idolatrous family and held to Naomi and her God. By God's grace, both women were preserved from starvation and God arranged that Ruth be married to Boaz, a direct ancestor of David and Jesus. The book of Ruth ends with this list: "Nahshon begot Salmon, Salmon begot Boaz, and Boaz begot Obed, Obed begot Jesse, and Jesse begot David" (Ruth 4:21-22). Since these four names cover the span of 400 years under the judges, many commentators wonder if this lineage is not compressed.

Bathsheba was another woman who had no "right" to be an ancestor of Jesus. She was already married to Uriah, the Hittite. Perhaps she was a Hittite herself. However, the Holy Ghost did not indicate what some state, that "Bathsabee was not only consenting in the adultery, but in having her husband killed."[65] Yet this incident is a skeleton in the lineage, because it involved adultery, murder, a cover-up, and the death of their first born. By His grace God did forgive David. Repentance and faith brought spiritual maturity and God blessed them with four additional children, two of them becoming branches of Jesus' lineage.

Last but not at all least is **Mary**, the fifth woman inferred by Matthew. She also is a most unlikely ancestor of Jesus because she lived in Gentile-Jewish Galilee and in the back-water town of Nazareth. There is nothing in her status that would suggest to the world that she was the descendant of a king or a mother of the King. Nevertheless, by God's wise grace she is chosen from all the women then living to be the "mother of God." The evidence that God chose wisely is seen in Mary's song, known as the *Magnificat*, with its

Old Testament references to the new covenant God was giving His people. Unlike the other four women in Jesus' genealogy, Mary was not guilty of public sins, yet she was like all descendants of Adam and Eve—a sinner. God made her a saint by faith in the Messiah. "Interestingly, the Talmud contains a possible reference to Mary, and names her father as "Heli" (Chagigah 77:4)."[66]

From Gabriel's comment to Mary that "Elizabeth your cousin has also conceived a son in her old age" (Luke 1:36), some conclude that Mary is not from the family of David at all, but is of the tribe of Levi. But a few verses before Gabriel declares of Mary's Son that, "The Lord God will give Him the throne of His father David" (Luke 1:32). Since Jesus received no genes from Joseph, this implies that Mary must be from Judah's tribe.

Conclusion: What Does This Mean?

These genealogies of Jesus are not boring lists of names, since some of the names involved include the most important people and events in Old Testament history. Nor does this study fall under Paul's admonition, "Avoid foolish disputes, genealogies, contentions…" (Titus 3:9) because the truth about Jesus as the Messiah is at stake. These genealogies are written that people might believe that Jesus **is** the son of David and the Son of God, and that by believing on Jesus they might be given eternal life through His name. The genealogies list many Old Testament people who believed in the promised Messiah and are in heaven by faith in Him. Thus, nothing is unimportant in the Scriptures.

Crutcher describes the main reason why the genealogies are important: "What kind of people can Yahweh save through the One born of Mary? The answer flashes through from the genealogy: Jesus can save people like Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, Bathsheba, and David. He can save anyone! Thus we find Matthew preaching the gospel even in his genealogy!"[67] When Isaiah wrote that "The Lord laid on Him the iniquity of us all" (Isaiah 53:6) that included Jesus' family, as Dawson states: "He took it all as his own. Incest, rape, murder, sorcery, child sacrifice, gross idolatry, excess in wealth, pride, ego, theft, violence of all types—he came into the world with the weight

of that heritage upon him. He turned aside from none of it."[68] Jesus took all this with Him to the cross and made atonement for all sin (1 John 2:2).

Copeland states some lessons we can learn from the study of generations: 1) As God made promises to Abraham about the Messiah, He fulfilled them through the blood of Christ; therefore we can trust God to keep His promises in Jesus. 2) As many godly fathers ended up with ungodly sons, we should thank God that the sins of the father or son are not punished in another generation; be diligent in training the future generation to know God's Word; and realize that God can lead even the wicked to repentance. 3) Jesus came in all humility to be the Savior of the world. He came "a. To taste death for everyone - **He 2:9,** b. To help bring us to glory - **He 2:10,** c. To deliver us from the fear and power of death - **He 2:14-15,** and d. To become our merciful and faithful High Priest - **He 2:16-18.**"[69]

While in various places the two genealogies present information that may puzzle us, we must assume that the Holy Spirit has revealed the truth. We are to trust that the genealogies prove that Jesus is the son of David, the son of Abraham, and the son of Adam. And we are to rejoice that God intended to include believers from all nations into His family, that is, forgiven sinners "out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation, and have made them kings and priests to our God" (Revelation 5:9-10).

Bibliography

Aland, Kurt; Black, Matthew; Metzger, Bruce; Wikren, Allen. *The Greek New Testament*. New York: American Bible Society, 1966.

Aikin, James, "The Genealogies of Christ", 1997.

Arlev, "The Genealogy of the Messiah, or 'Whose line is it anyway?'", http://www.arlev.clara.net/genealog.htm

Barnes, Barnes Notes on the New Testament, "Matthew." Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1962.

Burnham, H. A., "The Ultimate Pedigree—Back to Adam and Eve", Comparison of Biblical Geneologies, 1999, www.kurrc.org/uk/gene2.htm

Christian Apologetics & Research Ministry, "Why are there different genealogies for Jesus in Matthew 1 and Luke 3?", www.carn.org

Coffman, James Burton, "The Ancestry and Birth of Christ, The Son of the Living God", "Commentary on Matthew 1". "Coffman Commentaries on the Old and New Testament,"Abilene Christian University Press, Abilene, Texas, USA. 1983-1999.

"Contradictions in the NT: Some Apparent Problems and Contradictions in the 'New Testament'"

Copeland, Mark A., "The Gospel of Matthew: The Genealogy of Jesus Christ" (1:1-17) Executable Outlines, 2003.

Cortright, Michael, "The Genealogy of Jesus Christ," December, 1999, http://redbay.com/ekklesia/genejc.htm

Crutcher, Kent, "The Begats" [Sermon of December 27:1997], McDonald Road Seventh-day Adventist Church, McDonald, Tennessee.

Custance, Arthur C., "The Combined Genealogies of Matthew and Luke" (from *The Seed of the Woman*), (http://custance.org)

Dawson, Gerrit Scott, "Skeletons in the Closet," sermon on May 5, 2002 at First Presbyterian Church, Lenoir, North Carolina.

DeLashmutt, Gary, "Luke 3:23-28—The Genealogy of Jesus" The Xenos web on cd! ©2002 Xenos Christian Fellowship.

"Genealogies of Jesus Compared" www.JesusGeneology.com

Gildea, Sarah, "Commentary on St. Matthew," Roman Catholic commentary.

Lenski, R.C.H., "Interpretation of St. Luke's Gospel," Minneapolis: Augsburg Publ. House, 1946.

Lenski, R.C.H., "Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel," Minneapolis: Augsburg Publ. House, 1943.

Levy, Michael, "Jesus' Genealogy" at http://ww.MessiahTruth.com.

Lisenby, Jim, "Judah and Tamar" Our Father's Word, 2000, www.ourfathersword.org

Living Stream Ministry, 1997-2003.

Mathew, P. G., "The Genealogy of Jesus Christ: Matthew 1:1-17", sermon on December 8, 1996.

McCarthy, John F., "The Historical Meaning of the Forty-two Generations in Matthew 1:17." Roman Theological Forum | Living Tradition Index, 1987.

Missler, Chuck, "Why A Virgin Birth?" added to the Custance article at http://custance.org

Nizar, "The Genealogy of Jesus Christ," Crossroads, C.C.C.I., 2002.

Posted: 7/25/02 10:08:01 pm, "how do we explain this???"

Religious Information Source web site "Genealogy of Jesus (and about 2500 others)" http://mb-soft.com/believe/txc/genealog.htm.

The Rock, "Why is the Geneology in Luke and Matthew Different?" www.rockinauburn.com/columns/geneology.html

For further reference:

Religious Information Source web-site, "Genealogy of Jesus (and about 2,500 others), http://mb-soft.com/believe/txc/genealog.htm

Appendix A

The geneology in Matthew 1:1-16 compared with that of First and Second Chronicles:

1 and 2 Chronicles	**Matthew**
Solomon	Solomon
Rehoboam	Rehoboam
Abijah	Abijah
Asa	Asa
Jehoshaphat	Jehoshaphat
Joram	Joram
Ahaziah	
Joash	
Amaziah	
Azariah	Uzziah
Jotham	Jotham
Ahaz	Ahaz
Hezekiah	Hezekiah
Manasseh	Manasseh
Amon	Amon
Josiah	Josiah
Jehoiakim	
Jeconiah	Jeconiah

["Contradictions in the NT", pg 1]

Endnotes

[1] DeLashmutt "Genealogy," pg. 1 [Note: the order of the genealogies implies that Matthew and Luke used different sources.]
[2] Burnham, H. A., "The Ultimate Pedigree", 1999, pg. 1
[3] Matthew, P.G., "Genealogy Matthew" pg 1
[4] Crutcher, Kent, "The Begats," pg. 1
[5] DeLashmutt "Genealogy" pg 1
[6] Contradictions in the NT" pg 1 See chart in Appendix A
[7] "Genealogies Compared" pg 4
[8] "Genealogies Compared" pg 4
[9] "Genealogies Compared" pg 4
[10] Levy, "Jesus' Genealogy," pg 1
[11] Lisenby, "Judah and Tamar," pg 1 [emphasis the author's].
[12] Nizar, "The Genealogy of Jesus Christ" pg 2
[13] Christian Apologetics & Research Ministry, pg 1
[14] Crutcher, "The Begats," pg. 2.
[15] Nizar, "The Genealogy of Jesus Christ," pg 1 and Burnham, H. A., "The Ultimate Pedigree—Back to Adam and Eve", 1999, pg. 1
[16] NT Study Genealogy of the Lord, pg 2
[17] Nizar, "The Genealogy of Jesus Christ" pg 1
[18] McCarthy, "Historical Meaning", pg 2.
[19] Living Stream Ministry, 2003, pg. 4.
[20] Another described the divisions historically: the first is from promise to kingship, the second from kingship to exile, and the third from exile to the birth of the Messiah [Dawson, "Skeletons", pg. 1]. Another defines these periods as 1) the rise of the Davidic kingdom, 2) its decline, and 3) its eclipse [Mathew, P.G. "Genealogy Matthew, pg 2]. A third author describes the three periods as: First, the Golden Era from Abraham to David, showing that the Messiah would be great. Second, a Period of Shame from David to the captivity, showing that man is lost in sin. Third, the Time of Restoration from the captivity to Jesus, who comes to save His people. [Nizar, "The Genealogy of Jesus Christ," pp. 1-2.]
[21] Crutcher, Kent, "The Begats", pg. 2
[22] Lenski, "Matthew," pg. 36.
[23] Lenski, "Matthew," pg. 31.
[24] Barnes, "Matthew," pg 221. James Coffman notes, "Matthew had Scriptural precedent for this, to say nothing of his inspiration. Ezra, in giving his own genealogy, omits six names in a single group. This will appear in a comparison of Ezra 7:1,2 with 1 Chronicles 6:6-11" [Coffman, James Burton, "The Ancestry and Birth of Christ" pg 2.]
[25] Crutcher, Kent, "The Begats", pg. 2.
[26] Lenski, "Luke," pg 221.
[27] Lenski, "Luke," pg 221.
[28] Lenski, "Luke," pg 221.

[29] An interesting side note about Luke's genealogy: "There are two each of the following names in the Luke account of the 76 generations from Christ to Adam: Cainan, Matthat, Melchi, Levi, Joseph, Mattathias, and Jesus!" [Coffman, James Burton, "The Ancestry and Birth of Christ" pg 1].
[30] Contradictions of the Bible Geneology, pg 1
[31] "How do we explain this???" pg 1.
[32] Lenski, "Luke," pg. 219.
[33] Nizar, "Genealogy," pg. 2.
[34] "Genealogy Different" p. 1.
[35] Coffman, James Burton, "The Ancestry and Birth of Christ" pg 1.
[36] Luther, "Small Catechism," ELS Explanation, pg. 16.
[37] Rock "Genealogy Different" pg 1.
[38] Religious Information Source, pg. 18,19.
[39] Coffman, "The Ancestry and Birth of Christ," pg. 2.
[40] "Genealogies Compared" pg 4
[41] Living Stream Ministry, pg. 2.
[42] DeLashmutt "Genealogy" pg 1.
[43] "Genealogies Compared" pg 4
[44] Christian Apologetics & Research Ministry, pg 1.
[45] Levy, "Genealogy," pg 2.
[46] Keil, "First Book of Chronicles," page 81.
[47] Gaudreau, Generations of Jesus," pg. 3.
[48] Coffman, James Burton, "The Ancestry and Birth of Christ" pg 1.
[49] Keil, "First Book of Chronicles," pg. 81. SEE ALSO: Lenski, "Matthew," pg. 33: "So in the case of Zerubbabel: he is the legal son and heir of Shealtiel, the natural son of Pedaiah. When Shealtiel married the widow in accordance with the Levirate law (Deut. 25:5-10; Matt. 22:24-28), raising up seed to his brother." AND Custance "Combined Genealogies, pg 5: "In order to account for the subsequent relationships shown in the two converging genealogies, we have to assume that this woman was a widow whose husband had probably been killed in one of the many sieges which Jerusalem had suffered. It seems as though the prophet Zechariah had this circumstance in mind (12:12). This widow already had a son by her deceased husband when Jechonias took her as a wife. This son's name was Pedaiah. His name is not numbered in the genealogy shown in the chart. It appears only in 1 Chronicles 3:18 where he is shown as a son of Jehoiakin (i.e., Jechonias). If his widowed mother were married to Jechonias, he would by Jewish custom become the son of Jechonias automatically.

"But Jechonias appears to have had a son of his own by this widow of the royal line. This son's name was Salathiel (No. 2 and No. 56 in the two pedigree lines). By this marriage of a widow to Jechonias, these two boys - sons of the same mother - would become brothers by Jewish custom.

"However, Salathiel appears to have died childless, though not until he had reached manhood and married a wife. Jehoiakim's *bloodline* thus came to an end in his grandson Salathiel. But as it happens the actual *title* to the throne remained active. The curse of Jeremiah 36:30 was to be fulfilled not by the removal

of the title itself from Jehoiakim's line but by the denial of that title to anyone who happened to be a blood relative in the line. With the death of Salathiel this blood line terminated.

"But now, according to Jewish custom as set forth in the principle of the Levirate (Deut. 25:5,6), it became incumbent upon Pedaiah, the deceased Salathiel's (step) brother, to take his widow and raise up seed through her who would not therefore be of Salathiel's blood line but would be constituted legally as Salathiel's son through whom the title would pass to his descendants. The son of this Levirate union was Zerubbabel. In Matthew 1:12 and Luke 3:27 Zerubbabel is listed legally as Salathiel's son: but in 1 Chronicles 3:19 he is listed as the son of Pedaiah by actual blood relationship."

[50] "Genealogies Compared" pg 4.

[51] Coffman, James Burton, "The Ancestry and Birth of Christ" pg 1.

[52] Lenski, "Matthew," pg. 34.

[53] Missler, "Why a Virgin Birth?" pg. 1. He states that C. I. Scofield first noted this connection between Numbers and Mary.

[54] "The Ultimate Pedigree," pg. 1.

[55] Cortright, "Genealogy" pg 3. "Genesis 11:12 lists Sala as the immediate and direct son of Arphaxad. Although most manuscripts include the "Cainan" listed in verse 36, the error may have come in when an early scribe copying this section of Luke allowed his eye to drop to the Cainan of Luke 3:37 and mistakenly copied the name in verse 36 as well. The Codex Bezae omits "which was *the son* of Cainan" in verse 36; the third-century papyrus known as p75 appears to support this omission."

[56] Lenski, "Matthew," pg. 28.

[57] Gildea, "Commentary on St. Matthew," pg. 2.

[58] Lenski, "Matthew," pg. 28.

[59] Dawson "Skeletons" pg 1.

[60] Jim Lisenby, "Judah and Tamar", pg 3. His sources are the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (called *Judah*) and *The Book of Jubilees* (called *Jubilees*), found in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* by James H. Charlesworth.

[61] Gildea RC "St. Matthew" pg 2.

[62] Apology, IV:245.

[63] Apology, IV:249.

[64] Crutcher, Kent, "The Begats", pg. 2.

[65] Gildea RC "St. Matthew" pg 2.

[66] DeLashmutt "Genealogy" pg 2.

[67] Crutcher, Kent, "The Begats", pg. 2.

[68] Dawson "Skeletons" pg 2.

[69] Copeland, Matthew, pg 2.