

Concordia Theological Monthly



J U N E

•

1 9 5 1

Concordia Theological Monthly

VOL. XXII

JUNE 1951

No. 6

Concerning the Ministry of the Church

By ELMER J. MOELLER

EDITORIAL PREFACE

The editorial committee had hoped to publish this article in the February issue of this journal as a companion article to the one by H. G. Brueggemann, "The Public Ministry in the Apostolic Age," February issue, 1951. Circumstances beyond the control both of the editorial committee and of the author made it impossible to carry out this plan.

Both articles deal with the same basic issue, to wit, Did Christ institute merely the ministry in the abstract, *das Predigtamt*, the *genus* of the ministry, or did He institute the pastorate of the local congregation, *das Pfarramt*, the *species* of the ministry? The point of departure in both articles is an examination of C. F. W. Walther's statement that the ministry is the highest office in the church from which all other ecclesiastical offices are derived (*Kirche und Amt*, Thesis VIII). The points of divergence and of agreement are summarized in the official *Proceedings of the Synodical Conference* and are reprinted as part of the editorial preface to Brueggemann's article, pp. 81—83 of this journal. The Synodical Conference encouraged all pastors to study this question carefully. The study of this question has received additional impetus by the action of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod in its recent convention. In its report to the convention the Board for Parish Education stated:

Our synodical officials found it necessary during World War I and World War II, and in connection with the late Selective Service Act, to clarify the status of the Lutheran teacher to Government officials in connection with the draft. During the past year, problems have arisen in connection with the payment of income tax on a teacherage and with the proposed amendment to the Social Security Act which

made it necessary for the Board for Parish Education to prepare statements concerning the official position of the Lutheran male teacher in our Church. These statements were needed by our synodical officials to clarify to the Government the status of the teacher. Our synodical officials and the Board for Parish Education have gone on record in stating the following:

"1. That Lutheran teachers are officially defined by our Church as 'ministers of religion,' 'ministers of religious education,' 'ministers of the Gospel,' and 'servants of the Word.'

"2. That they are called upon or may be called upon to perform or to help perform sacerdotal and other pastoral functions.

"3. That while they are not commonly called, installed, or ordained as *pastors*, they are formally called, installed, and consecrated for life as '*ministers of religion*' and devote themselves primarily to teaching and altogether to the spiritual service of the Church.

"4. That the main obligation of these men is to conduct and teach Lutheran elementary, secondary, and higher schools and that in the local church they commonly instruct also the confirmed youth and adults and, in general, assist the pastor in ministering to the congregation.

"5. That, although these men are popularly known as 'teachers,' they are in reality members of the clergy." (Synodical *Proceedings*, 1950, p. 363 f.).

Synod resolved as follows:

"WHEREAS, The Board for Parish Education has requested Synod officially to approve the clarification given to the Government by Synod's officials; be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That Synod grant approval of this action of its officials in said matter; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That such approval is in no way to be construed as Synod's final acceptance of all statements made on this subject; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the President of Synod appoint a committee to review and study the question of the status of the teacher, said committee to report back to Synod at the next delegate convention." (Synodical *Proceedings*, 1950, p. 388.)

Before a doctrinal formulation on these points can be established, a careful exegetical study is essential. It is in this interest that the editorial staff herewith submits the following article. There remain some areas for further exegetical investigation which could not be covered adequately in the study appearing in this issue and the

one in a previous issue. Such an area is the question whether the article with *episkopos* in 1 Tim. 3:2 is anaphoric or generic. Some grammarians maintain that the article is anaphoric, i.e., it has individualizing force, and that St. Paul therefore in 1 Tim. 3:2 has in mind only one man as occupying the bishop's office. Others maintain that the plurality of elders in the Ephesian congregation (the *presbyteroi* and *episkopoi* in the one *ekklesia*, Acts 20:17, 28) is a compelling reason to take the article in 1 Tim. 3:2 in its generic force. — F. E. M.

THIS study proposes to investigate whether the term "ministry," *diakonia*, as it is used in the New Testament is the public ministry (*Predigtamt*), the ministry as a comprehensive concept, or whether the ministry is equivalent to our modern pastorate in the local congregation (*das Pfarramt*). While the doctrine of the Church, more specifically the definition of the *ecclesia*, is basic in this entire discussion, it was felt that this paper should restrict itself to a discussion of the problem whether the *diakonia* is the genus or the species.

I

We shall begin our study by investigating the term "ministry" as it is used in the New Testament. Passing over the usage, classical and Koine, which refers to waiting on tables and similar service, Luke 10:40; 17:8; 22:26 f.; John 12:2, we find that in the New Testament the peculiar work and responsibility of the Twelve is called *diakonia*, Acts 1:17, 25. As the growing church in Jerusalem demanded more and more of the energy and time of the Twelve, the Seven were chosen to serve (*diakonein*) tables, in order that the Twelve might give themselves to the service of the Word, τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ λόγου, Acts 6:2, 4.

The Apostles here distinguish between a *diakonia* of the Word and what we might call welfare service. That the Apostles had at first performed this latter *diakonia* would not necessarily make it essential to their *diakonia*, Acts 1:25. They were called primarily to preach the Gospel, Matt. 28:19-20; Mark 16:15; John 20:21. Apparently the latter *diakonia*, as different from the *diakonia* of the Word, is referred to in 1 Cor. 16:15, "the ministry of the saints"; Rev. 2:19, "I know thy service"; Rom. 12:7, "or ministry,

let us wait on our ministering"; 1 Pet. 4:11, "if any man minister"; and possibly 1 Cor. 12:4, "differences, διαιρέσεις, of διακονιῶν," distinguished from διαιρέσεις χαρισμάτων and διαιρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων. Even among the *charismata* are listed giving and showing mercy, Rom. 12:8, which were not *diakonia* of the Word. The question arises: Shall the *diakonia* that was not "of the Word," but which is called a *charisma*, Rom. 12:7, be included in the *diakonia* of the Church? The answer is really one of adopting a particular terminology. Beyer remarks: "Early Christianity learned to consider and designate every activity in the church (Gemeinde) that was important for its increase as *diakonia*."¹ If one speaks of the "Ministry of the Church," as including *diakonia* both with and without the Word, then one must acknowledge the two species within the genus *diakonia*. We personally prefer to identify the *diakonia* of the Church with the *diakonia* of the Word, and consider not as essential, but accidental such kinds of *diakonia*, διαιρέσεις διακονιῶν, as are similar to the kind of *diakonia* for which the Seven were selected. The *diakonoι*, therefore, of 1 Tim. 3:8 and Phil. 1:1 would not participate in the ministry of the Church, the ministry of the Word, in their capacity as deacons. The "ministry of the Word" would then not be species, but genus. We shall revert to the terminology later.

Called by God for a special work, Paul some years later speaks of his activity as Apostle to the Gentiles as *diakonia*, Rom. 11:13; cf. Acts 21:19, and calls himself a *diakonos* of the Church, Col. 1:25. In 2 Cor. 3:6 he uses the same term for himself, a *diakonos* of the New Testament, describes the proclamation of New Testament truths as the *diakonia* of the Spirit and of righteousness, ch. 3:8-9, refers to his responsibility to proclaim these truths as "this *diakonia*," ch. 4:1; cf. 1 Tim. 1:12; Acts 20:24; states that he has received the *diakonia* of reconciliation, which makes use of the "Word of Reconciliation," ch. 5:18-19; cf. 1 Tim. 1:12; Acts 21:24, and is careful not to give offense, that the *diakonia* be not blamed, ch. 6:3, in all things presenting himself as a *diakonos* of God, ch. 6:4. It is difficult to determine whether these passages, 2 Corinthians 3—6, refer only to Paul, since in ch. 7:5-6 Paul definitely excludes Titus from his term "we," or include Silas and Timothy, mentioned in ch. 1:19. The latter is more likely, since

from 1 Thess. 2:6 (cf. 1:1) we are quite definitely required to consider Silas and Timothy as Apostles. Besides these, Apollos is termed with Paul a *diakonos* of Christ, 1 Cor. 4:1.

Timothy is called by Paul a *diakonos* of God, 1 Thess. 3:2, is charged to make full proof of his *diakonia*, 2 Tim. 4:5, and in the latter connection is titled an evangelist. Epaphras, whose official capacity is not known, is called a *diakonos* of Christ, Col. 1:7. Archippus, whose office we know not, has a *diakonia*, Col. 4:17. Mark, a fellow laborer of Paul, Philemon 24, is profitable for *diakonia*, 2 Tim. 4:11. Even false apostles claimed to be *diakonoi* of Christ, 2 Cor. 11:13, 23.

In Eph. 4:11-12, Apostles, prophets, evangelists, and "shepherd-teachers" (one article governs the two terms) are gifts, given εἰς ἔργον διακονίας. Since prophecy is spoken of as a *charisma* in Rom. 12:6, where also *diakonia* is used, quite evidently to refer to the ability to render a bodily or social service as contrasted to spiritual service through the Word (cf. Acts 19:22, Timothy and Erastus "serving" Paul; Philemon 13; 1 Cor. 16:15); and since prophesying is not described as the exclusive function of a designated office-bearer or congregation official in 1 Corinthians 12 and 14, but as a spiritual gift which all members of the congregation may pray to receive, ch. 14:1, 5, 24, 29, 31, one is led to conclude that *diakonia* is not a technical term which *per se* defines a *public* office in which a person represents and serves a congregation in the sense that a pastor or teacher does. It rather is used, applied in the realm of spiritual things, in its regular function; namely, *diakonia* designates what is carried out in *diakoneo*. Beyer remarks, concerning the New Testament usage: "*diakonia* always expresses the activity effected in *diakonein*."² Therefore, those who served their fellow men in general, or the believers in general or their own congregation in particular, through the application of God's Word, whether they were Apostles, evangelists, "shepherd-teachers," or prophets, who may have been "laymen," all were engaged in the activity which is designated sometimes by *diakonia* alone or otherwise by modifications which fit into the category of the "ministry of the Word."

We shall now consider the people who rendered the *diakonia*.

Here we come to the *sedes doctrinae* of the universal priesthood of all believers, 1 Pet. 2:9; Matt. 28:19, 20; Col. 3:6, and such passages as speak of the obligation of *all* Christians to preach the Word. Acts 8:4 gives a fine example of this obligation being fulfilled: "And they that were scattered abroad went everywhere, preaching the Word." We hold that this obligation to proclaim the Gospel and the activity of doing so, not only by officeholders, but by laymen, is included in the concept of *diakonia*, basing our conclusion on the fact that prophecy, a gift of God for *diakonia*, was also a *charisma* which lay people exercised. We therefore personally speak of *diakonia*, the ministry of all believers, of the Church, to preach the Gospel to all mankind, which includes, of course, the use of the Word within a Christian local congregation and also outside to people, Christian or not, wherever they may be.

The New Testament word *diakonia* also refers to the activity of men who had very evidently some sort of public office, i. e., they performed their *diakonia* in the name of the *ecclesia*. While the Twelve were called and sent by Christ directly, *immediately*, Matthew 10; John 20:21, Matthias was chosen *mediately*, Acts 1, to take the place of Judas. It does not appear, however, that Matthias, chosen by the Jerusalem church, was considered as performing the *diakonia publice* only in the congregation at Jerusalem. The Matthias whom Eusebius mentions as the eighth bishop of Jerusalem could hardly be the Apostle.³ On the other hand, the Eleven, not chosen by the believers of any given congregation, were always received in the Church as *diakonoi tou logou*, no matter where they preached, Acts 8:14; 9:32; 38:10; Gal. 2:11; 1 Cor. 3:22; James 1:1; 1 Pet. 5:13; Rev. 1:4. Their immediate call was acknowledged.

Paul, who received his Apostleship directly from the Lord, *immediately*, Galatians 1, nevertheless, according to direction from the Holy Ghost, with Barnabas was "sent away" into his first missionary journey, after the laying on of hands. Those who sent him were, at least, the prophets and teachers, perhaps even the entire congregation. There is in this instance an element of *mediacy* also in Paul's office. And although he was the spiritual father of other congregations, e. g., the one in Corinth, 1 Cor. 4:15, and the *diakonos* of Christ to them, 1 Cor. 4:1, on the one hand responsible

to Christ and not to them, vv. 3-4, yet, on the other hand, forgiving in their behalf a repentant brother, 2 Cor. 2:10, none the less he reported back to the church, the local congregation, at Antioch, which had sent him out, Acts 14:26-28. He evidently considered himself also a *diakonos tou logou* who represented the Antioch congregation. There is no reason to believe that also Barnabas, Silas, and Mark did not stand in the same relationship to the Antioch congregation.

Timothy, assisting in Paul's Apostleship and doing the work of an evangelist, 2 Tim. 4:5, had entered his *diakonia*, v. 5; Acts 16:3, "with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," 1 Tim. 4:14, the officeholders of the congregations in Galatia. Yet we have no evidence that Timothy served a single congregation as its own private servant of the Word, to the exclusion of other congregations. He had received his *diakonia* mediately, yet served not specifically the local congregation or congregations in which he had entered his work.

We number among the "ministers" of the Word also the evangelists, Eph. 4:11, given for the work of *diakonia*. Philip, originally one of the Seven in Jerusalem, Acts 6:5, is called an evangelist, ch. 21:8. Although the work for which he had originally been selected is distinguished from the *diakonia* of the Word, ch. 6:3-4, we find him journeying to Samaria and along the road from Jerusalem to Gaza, chapter 8, preaching the Gospel. It is our opinion that here we have a ministry of the Word into which Philip entered, not by virtue of his induction into the number of the Seven, who were to "serve tables," but because of receiving the special *charisma* or *charismata* that had to do with the Word and which the evangelists evidently possessed, such as are mentioned in Rom. 12:7-8, preaching and teaching, and which were conferred through the laying on of hands, 1 Tim. 4:14; 2 Tim. 1:6; Acts 6:6. Philip, accordingly, without a mediate call to preach the Word or without being sent, as were Paul and Barnabas, by a particular congregation, yet sent by God, Acts 8:26, immediately and equipped with *charismata*, was working publicly in the *diakonia* of the Word. We feel safe to conclude that this same is true of all the evangelists; namely, they were holders of *charismata* and were sent by God directly, immediately; were accepted because of their *charismata*

as public servants of the Word, yet were not necessarily considered the *diakonoï* of any particular congregation.

The same seems to have been true of all who had received *charismata* that had to do with the proclaiming of the Word, e. g., the prophets and teachers of Antioch. Romans 12 numbers prophecy and teaching among the *charismata*, and the prophets and teachers of Antioch are quite apparently accepted as public officeholders, Acts 13:1-3. The prophesying of laymen who had the *charisma* of prophecy was also received by the assembled congregation as the proclamation of the Word, 1 Corinthians 14. This is entirely in accordance with Eph. 4:11, where prophets are described as having been given for the work of *diakonia*.

We note from the foregoing that the public *diakonia* of the Word, i. e., the proclamation of the Word on behalf of the congregation, as Paul and Barnabas did for the congregation at Antioch, or to a congregation, as did Paul and Apollos to the Corinthians, and as did the prophets, teachers, and evangelists, is following the inherent stipulation of Rom. 10:14: "How shall they preach except they be sent?"; 1 Cor. 12:29: "Are all teachers?"; James 3:1: "Be not many teachers"; Jer. 23:21: "I have not sent these prophets." The men who proclaimed the Word publicly, i. e., to a local congregation or to believers in general or to the heathen, had either an immediate call, direct from God, or a mediate call, through a local congregation, or both.

It is the call, accordingly, which distinguishes the public *diakonia* of the Word from the preaching of the Word by the individual Christian, Acts 8:4; Col. 3:16, which is the exercising of the privileges and obligations of his universal priesthood, and which we have called the *diakonia* of the Church. Where there is no evidence of the immediate call with its attendant *charismata*, there must be the mediate call for public service of the Word. Wherever there is the call by a congregation or group of congregations, the person who proclaims the Word, whether to the congregation itself or on its behalf to others, is participating in the public *diakonia* of the Church. Such a person may be a pastor, a parochial school teacher, a Sunday school teacher — one within a local congregation — or a chaplain in the Armed Forces, a foreign missionary, a theological

professor — someone functioning outside a local congregation and on its behalf. All these are positions or offices of the public ministry of the Church. They might be called species of the genus *diakonia tou logou*, which is the ministry of the Church.

II

On the basis of our discussion thus far it is evident that the office of the public ministry is divinely instituted. The question which now confronts us is: What is the scope of this public ministry? It is at this point where divergent opinions appear. While there is full agreement that the office of the public ministry is a divine institution, some maintain that Christ ordained the office of the congregational ministry, the pastorate, and that all other ecclesiastical offices in the modern Church are derived from this one divinely instituted office. The so-called auxiliary or branch offices are said to be of divine character because they are derived from the divinely instituted pastorate.⁴ Others maintain that all ecclesiastical offices flow from the public *diakonia* and that all offices, including the pastorate, are the result of the historical development according to the needs of the Church.⁵ All synodical and extracongregational offices must be considered divine because they are derived from the divinely instituted public *diakonia*. While it is evident that the public *diakonia* cannot be equated with the congregational pastorate — as Walther apparently did — there is ample Scriptural basis for the special institution of the pastoral office within the public ministry of the Word.

It is the contention of many theologians that the New Testament *presbyteroi* and *episkopoi* occupy the one divinely instituted office in the Church, the local pastorate. We readily grant that many outstanding New Testament scholars maintain that the church polity of the Episcopal Church is a purely historical development which took place during the first and the second centuries. But in evaluating the views of these scholars one must consider their critical attitude toward the New Testament. To illustrate our point, we refer to Weizsaecker, who denies that Luke wrote Acts and contends that there are discrepancies between Acts and Paul's Letters. He holds that Philippians is the last Letter from Paul's hand, that Ephesians and Colossians are not written by Paul, that 1 and

2 Timothy and Titus likewise are not Pauline, but were written after John's death. It is no wonder that he accepts 1 Clement and the Shepherd of Hermas as better authorities than the Pastoral Letters, that he finds no mention of *presbyteroi* in the Letters of Paul which he accepts as authentic and therefore concludes that *presbyteroi* and *episkopoi* were not identical.⁶

Hatch throughout his presentation leaves one with the impression that all his sources, canonical Scriptures, Apostolic Fathers, whatever they are, are of the same value. Earlier or later development in church government is immaterial to him.⁷

Bartlett dates Acts after A. D. 80, assumes "liberal interpolation or reediting of genuine Pauline letters," and puts 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus into the period after Paul's death.⁸ McGiffert places Acts into the reign of Domitian, A. D. 81—96, contends it is not written by Luke, expresses doubt as to the authenticity of the Pastoral Letters, and holds that 1 Timothy has no genuine elements in it, that Titus 1:7-9 and most of 10-16 are not Pauline, and that even the rest of Titus and 2 Timothy are the results of a reader's work on some original Letters of Paul.⁹

A. Harnack gathers into one group, as arising during the period from Vespasian (69) to Hadrian (139), Revelation, John's Letters and Gospel (correctly so if early in the period), 1 Peter, James, Hebrews, the Pastoral Epistles (which then are not from Paul's hand), 1 Clement, Shepherd of Hermas, the Didache, the Epistle of Polycarp, and the Epistle of Ignatius. One can hardly expect a proper evaluation of New Testament church polity with such an approach to source material. One is not surprised that Harnack is willing to consider Titus 1:7-9 and 1 Tim. 3:1-13 as interpolations.¹⁰

Lindsay, a more conservative scholar, while accepting Luke as author of Acts and Paul as the writer of the Pastoral Epistles, concedes that there are undoubtedly interpolations in the latter, put there in order "to suit the requirements of the middle of the second century." Lindsay, accepting as a fact the historical development of ecclesiastical organization, does not consider of great importance questions of date and authorship of the New Testament books, since only the earlier or later date for the appearance of a stage

in development is determined thereby. And that, he says, "is comparatively unimportant."¹¹

Of interest, too, is the stress which those who deny Pauline authorship to the Pastorals place upon the basis of the ecclesiastical polity which they set forth. Vincent, who takes 1 Clement as basic in arriving at his conclusions, writes concerning the Pastoral Letters: "If these letters are the work of Paul before his first imprisonment, their notes on Church polity do not agree with those of his other letters written during that period. If they were composed by Paul a few years after his first imprisonment, the period is too early for the change in polity which they indicate."¹² We ask, why not accept Paul's polity as he sets it forth?

It will be of value, we believe, to consider the references in the New Testament to the office of *presbyteros* and *episkopos* against their historical background. In order to do so, we present them herewith in a chronological setting. We are following the chronology which Dr. Wm. Arndt has used in his lectures on New Testament Introduction, the chief difference between it and the more frequently presented chronology being that he accepts the Ephesian origin of the "captivity letters," Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon. The only bearing this would have on our discussion is that, according to the latter position, *episkopoi* would be mentioned as existing in Philippi already in the year 54, instead of in the year 60 or 61. — Key dates from contemporary history which help establish this chronology are the date of the famine, Acts 11, in A. D. 46, mentioned by Josephus,¹³ and the beginning of the proconsulship of Gallio, mentioned in Acts 18, as about July 1, A. D. 51,¹⁴ at which time Paul had been in Corinth about a year and a half, Acts 18:11.

A. D. 30	Pentecost.
32	Paul's conversion.
43	Barnabas brings Paul from Tarsus to Antioch, Acts 11:25-26.
46	The famine. Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, Acts 11:30; Gal. 2:1-10.
<i>Presbyteroi</i> of Jerusalem, Acts 11:30	
47—48	Paul's 1st missionary journey.
<i>Presbyteroi</i> installed in Galatia, Acts 14:23.	
48 or 49	<i>Galatians</i> , prior to the Apostolic Council.
48 or 49	Apostolic Council.

Presbyteroi of Jerusalem, Acts 15; 16:4.

- 49—51 Paul's 2d missionary journey. Philippi visited.
- 50, early 1 *Thessalonians*, in Corinth.
- 50, summer 2 *Thessalonians*, in Corinth.
- 51, fall Paul visits Ephesus, goes to Jerusalem and Antioch.
- 52, spring Paul's 3d missionary journey, until 56, spring.
- 52, fall Arrival in Ephesus. Imprisonment.
- 54 *Philemon*, *Colossians*, *Ephesians*, *Philippians*.

Episkopoi of Philippi, Phil. 1:1.

- 55, spring 1 *Corinthians*, from Ephesus.
- 55, summer or fall 2 *Corinthians*, from Macedonia.
- 56, early *Romans*, from Corinth. Luke joins Paul in Philippi, Acts 20.

Presbyteroi of Ephesus, met by Paul on way to Jerusalem, Acts 20:17 ff.

- 56—58 Paul in Jerusalem, imprisonment in Caesarea.

Presbyteroi of Jerusalem, Acts 21:18.

- 50—60 *James* and *Matthew*.

Presbyteroi among scattered Jewish Christians, James 1:1; 4:14.

- 50—60 *Mark* (or in early 60's).
- 56—58 or 59—61 *Luke*, from Caesarea or Rome.
- 59 Paul to Rome.
- 61 Paul freed.
- 61 *Acts*, in Rome.
- 61—62 Paul in Spain, to Ephesus and Macedonia.
- 61—62 1 *Peter*, 2 *Peter*.

Presbyteroi throughout Asia Minor, 1 Peter 1:1; 5:1-4. Peter a *sympresbyteros*.

- 62—63, winter
- or spring 1 *Timothy*, in Macedonia.

Presbyteroi spoken of in Pastoral Letters.

- 63, spring Paul to Crete, then Ephesus.
- 63, summer *Titus*, in Ephesus. Paul taken prisoner to Rome.

Presbyteroi and *episkopoi* in Crete.

- 64, spring
- or summer 2 *Timothy*.
- 64, July 19 Rome burned. Death of Paul; possibly soon thereafter of Peter also.

- 60 to destruction of Jerusalem, 70 *Jude*; *Hebrews*.

- ca. 90 2 *John*, 3 *John*, in Ephesus.

John calls self *presbyteros*.

- 94 *Revelation* (Irenaeus' testimony).
- 96—97 *John*, from Ephesus.
- 97—98 1 *John*, from Ephesus.

From this chronological presentation we feel that several inferences which have a direct bearing on our present discussion may be correctly drawn.

We note that Luke has been traveling and living with Paul at least five years, 56 to 61, before he writes Acts. If *Philippians* was written in Ephesus, Luke had been with Paul there already in 54,

Col. 4:14, although they were not yet apparently traveling together. Luke is again mentioned, 2 Tim. 4:11, as being with Paul during the second imprisonment, in Rome in 64. We don't know if he accompanied Paul between the first and second imprisonment. It is most logical to assume, therefore, that when Paul and Luke write about *presbyteroi* and *episkopoi*, they are writing of a church office they both know well; that the *presbyteroi* that Paul writes about are the same kind that Luke writes about; and that Luke was acquainted with whatever position Paul took toward the establishing of the episcopate.

We must assume that when Peter and James mention *presbyteroi*, they write of the same office that Paul discusses. To hold otherwise would not be in accordance with Peter's intimate statement about Paul, 2 Pet. 3:16, which indicates that Peter had maintained close personal contact with Paul and was well acquainted with Paul's Letters and activities.

It is worth while to keep in mind also the time element, since we are considering what may have been a purely historical development, or a divine ordinance, or a combination of the two. It was sixteen years from Pentecost until Paul's visit to Jerusalem, in 46, in connection with which *presbyteroi* are mentioned in a manner which takes for granted that Theophilus, Acts 1:1, knew all about them. We may deduce that the presence of elders at Jerusalem was nothing extraordinary. It is two years later, 48, that Paul installs *presbyteroi* in the southern Galatian congregations. Again Luke explains nothing about the office. Lightfoot remarks about this single mention of ordaining elders: "The same rule was doubtless carried out in all the brotherhoods founded later; but it is mentioned here, and here only, because the mode of procedure on this occasion would suffice as a type of the Apostles' dealings elsewhere under similar circumstances."¹⁵ Zahn also opines that as soon as possible, as was the case in Crete, where conditions prevented immediate establishment, the institution of elders was always effected.¹⁶

It is only another fourteen years or so later that Paul writes his Letters to Timothy and Titus. During the intervening time, Paul had founded many congregations, the presbyters of some being

mentioned, namely, Ephesus and Philippi. During the same time, as Peter indicates in his writings, in congregations all over Asia Minor presbyters were in office. And the Jewish Christians to whom James wrote, wherever they were, had presbyters. Within the short space of about sixteen years, from the visit of Paul to Jerusalem, 46, to his imprisonment in Rome, the institution of *presbyteros* had spread through the Christian world.

It must be granted that there is no mention of elders in Corinth, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, Troas, etc. But it is a mistake to place too much weight on the argument from silence. The fact is that Luke tells us that Paul had installed elders in the Galatian congregation, Acts 14:23, while in his Letter to these same Galatians,¹⁷ Paul makes no mention of *presbyteroi*. In another case, Luke writes that Paul was in Ephesus for a short time on his second journey, Acts 18:19, and spent more than two years there during his third journey, Acts 19:10; yet Luke tells us nothing about officers of the Ephesian congregation, nor does Paul in his Letter to the Ephesians. But in Luke's report of Paul's return to Jerusalem from Greece via Miletus, the *presbyteroi* of Ephesus are specifically mentioned, Acts 20:17.

In yet a third instance, Luke makes no special mention of *presbyteroi* or *episkopoi* in the Philippian congregation, Acts 20:1-6, while, in his Letter, Paul specifically mentions the *episkopoi* of Philippi, Phil. 1:1. Upon the basis of these instances, we feel that silence on the part of either Paul or Luke, or of both, is no indication that Paul had not instituted the office of presbyter, or bishop, or that it did not exist in a particular congregation. Paul's practice in Galatia, the manner in which both Luke and he mention or are silent about the *presbyteroi* in cases where they actually did exist, and Paul's treatment of the office in his Letters to Timothy and Titus indicate that it was his practice, throughout his Apostleship, to establish the office of episkopos or presbyteros as soon as necessary and possible. The instances where there is no mention of the existence of *presbyteroi* may be explained by peculiar local conditions, e. g., at Corinth, where the pneumatics participated in the public services, 1 Corinthians 12—14, or where the office was exercised by special men, e. g., by Apollos in Corinth and Achaia, Acts 18:27; 19:1; by Paul himself in Ephesus, by his Letters, or

by the visit of Titus, 2 Cor. 2:13 *et al.* Paul then could later come and help solve the problem of congregation leadership, which might have happened in his next recorded visit, Acts 20:2-3. In summary, silence on the part of Luke or Paul does not prove the absence of elders; evidence indicates that Paul's practice was that sooner or later elders were provided for a congregation.

III

We turn now to the consideration of the several passages which speak of *presbyteroi* and *episkopoi*. On the basis of Titus 1:5, 7 we hold that *episkopos* equals *presbyteros*: ". . . ordain elders in every city . . . for a bishop must be blameless. . . ." Since there is some difference of opinion among exegetes on this matter, we shall check some that are available to us. Harnack¹⁸ will accept the equation if Titus 1:7-9 is not an interpolation. The identification is also upheld by Lightfoot,¹⁹ whose treatise on the subject is very thorough. Huther,²⁰ Hatch,²¹ Seeberg,²² Meyer,²³ Godet²⁴ — the latter ably refutes the opposite position taken by Eichhorn, de Wette, Baur, Holtzmann, Weizsaecker, Pfeiderer, von Soden, and Beyschlag — Schlatter,²⁵ Beyer,²⁶ Schaff,²⁷ and Zahn²⁸ — who writes in his *Einführung*: ". . . no exegetical skill can becloud the fact that there (Titus 1) the identity of the *episkopos* and *presbyteros* is set forth as self-evident." — Weizsaecker²⁹ and Vincent,³⁰ who deny the identification, base their position upon a denial of Pauline authorship to the Pastoral Letters. Wendt,³¹ who questions Luke's veracity on several counts, disagrees with Meyer's identification on the ground that the *presbyteroi* of Jerusalem were the old members of the congregation and included the Apostles. He incidentally denies that the *presbyteroi* were the successors of the Seven. Jeremias³² explains *presbyteros* as a designation of age. Elderly men were to be the *episkopoi*. But he bases his conclusion on the premise that Paul never uses the word *presbyteros* as a designation of office, which premise is based on the denial of Luke's authorship of Acts. Jeremias dates Acts after Paul's death and after the Pastoral Epistles, a position which Beyer³³ upholds, who sets the time of composition in the 80's of the first century. Sasse considers the *presbyteroi* and the bishops plus deacons as two separate developments which did not become unified until the time of the Pastoral Epistles.³⁴

The identification of *presbyteros* and *episkopos* in Titus 1, a position which we are convinced is correct, is in accordance with Paul's words to the presbyters of Ephesus, Acts 20:28: "Take heed . . . to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers (*episkopoi*).” While we must take *episkopos* here at least in a descriptive sense, on the basis of Titus we are able to consider it also an official designation.

IV

The work and responsibility of the *episkopos* are set forth in both 1 Timothy 3 and Titus 1. It is a good work to which a man aspires, if he desires the ἐπισκοπή, the work of the overseer, 1 Tim. 3:1. A bishop, among other things, should be *didaktikos*, apt to teach, v. 2. He should be "one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity," v. 4; ". . . faithful children, not accused of riot or unruly," Titus 1:6. "For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God," 1 Tim. 3:5. He must be blameless, as the steward of God. He must "hold fast the faithful Word, as he has been taught" [holding fast the faithful Word that is in accordance to the teaching], "that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers," Titus 1:7-9.

The responsibility over an entire congregation which is described here is also attributed to the elders of Ephesus by St. Paul: "Take heed unto yourselves and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers — *episkopous* — to feed the church of God," Acts 20:28. The Apostle Peter emphasizes the same responsibility when he singles out the *presbyteroi* among the scattered recipients of his Letter: "Feed the flock of God which is among you," 1 Pet. 5:2.

From these passages we would summarize the following as essential concerning an *episkopos*: (1) he is to have spiritual charge of an entire congregation and is to feed it, encourage it, discipline it, with the Word of God; and (2) this office is a "must" for a congregation. We read, Titus 1:5: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting (τὰ λείποντα) and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." It is evident that the words τὰ λείποντα demonstrate a lack

in the congregations in Crete, namely, the lack of *presbyteroi*. Titus was to see that the lack was supplied. Paul did not leave it to Titus' judgment, nor to the will of the individual congregation, nor to its convenience. Rather, it was to be done "as I appointed thee." This office, therefore, through St. Paul, is God's ordinance. It is the same office which a pastor of a congregation fills. He, in our day and age, being over a congregation and feeding it with God's Word, is its *episkopos*, filling the one office in the public ministry of the Word which dare not be lacking.

We realize that objections have been raised to the position which we have outlined. One of the chief objections centers around 1 Tim. 5:17 ff., and its interpretation: "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the Word and doctrine." Walther³⁵ speaks of "the elder-office of those who do not labor in Word and doctrine," and he bases the congregational office of lay elder on this passage, together with Acts 15:6; Rom. 12:8; and 1 Cor. 12:28.³⁶ Accordingly, August Pieper³⁷ contends that acceptance of the divine institution of the office of *episkopos* requires that also the office of the non-teaching *episkopos* be accepted as a divine institution.

There are many scholars who hold that there were two kinds of elders, ruling and teaching. Among them are Hatch,³⁸ Wohlenberg,³⁹ Bartlett,⁴⁰ and Wendt.⁴¹ Seeberg takes a middle, or intermediate, position: every elder should be able to teach, yet was not required to teach.⁴² Jeremias considers the elders of 1 Timothy 5 not officers, but a ruling group of old men, of which number some taught.⁴³ Zahn⁴⁴ takes much the same position; Neander⁴⁵ and Schlatter⁴⁶ also. Godet⁴⁷ finds here a transition from the free exercise of charismata to the monarchical episcopate and agrees with Seeberg's position. Sasse⁴⁸ considers those who labor in Word and doctrine bishops within the college of presbyters.

Several considerations compel us to conclude that Paul does not refer to two kinds of *presbyteroi*, those who teach and those who rule but do not teach. Paul stipulates most clearly that the *episkopos* is to use the Word of God in his care for his flock. We note that *didaktikos*, "apt to teach," in 1 Tim. 3:2, is a qualification which Paul stipulates. Lenski⁴⁹ emphasizes the necessity for this

qualification which is found in *dei*, a bishop "must" be *didaktikos*. The *episkopos* is also to hold fast the faithful Word as he has been taught, or the Word which is in accordance with the teaching, in order that he may be able to exhort by sound doctrine (*didaskalia*, used also in 1 Tim. 5:17) and to convince those who gainsay. Peter instructs the *presbyteroi* to whom he writes: feed, shepherd, the flock of God which is among you, 1 Pet. 5:2. Paul had used the same expression in addressing the Ephesian elders: "feed the church of God," Acts 20:28. Beyer⁵⁰ describes the concept contained in the words of Paul, Acts 20:28, thus: "The content of these instructions pictures, as the context of the passage shows, the watchful and careful (both are in *episkopein*!) guidance of the Church on the basis of Christ's completed work of salvation, to which alone the congregation credits its existence."—It seems most unlikely that Paul should speak of elders who do not teach, at the same time when he so definitely requires of an *episkopos* the ability to teach the Word of God and also the active exercise of this ability.

Nor do Paul's words indicate that he speaks of two types of *presbyteroi*. He does not distinguish between ruling and non-ruling elders, but between those who rule well and those who do not. Beyer⁵¹ makes the same observation.—The instructions to Timothy deal first with the honor due the *presbyteroi* who fill their position well, v. 17, then with the care to be exercised in investigating charges against a *presbyteros*, v. 19, finally with the treatment of *presbyteroi* who have been proved to be wrongdoers, v. 20.

A parallel use of *καλῶς προϊστημι* in ch. 3:4 indicates that this is the distinction here made. Paul, describing a bishop says: "one that ruleth well his own house," ch. 3:4. Quite obviously the point is not that an *episkopos* should be the head of his own household, but that he perform his duties *well*.

It is the well-ruling *presbyteroi*, therefore, rather than those who preside badly, who are to be worthy of double honor. Huther⁵² writes:

That with *τιμή* one must think of the recompense which the congregation is to pay the *presbyteroi* is shown by the context; but that *τιμή* here designates only the "recompense" is an assertion that is based neither in the expression nor in the context. *Τιμή* is esteem and honor, here used, to be sure, with special relationship

to the recompense as a special testimony thereof. Διπλῆς is to be taken not strictly, but with general significance, referring to the higher measure of τιμή in which the designated *presbyteroi* should participate, in relationship, not to the widows, or to the deacons, or to the poor, etc., but to those who do not carry out their office καλῶς. Also the latter should be shown τιμή in their office; but they should defer to the former.

Among the well-ruling bishops, who by virtue of their office are expected to be *didaktikoi* and to hold fast the faithful Word, exhorting by sound doctrine—*didaskalia*—and convincing the gainsayers, 1 Tim. 3:2; Titus 1:9, are those who *labor* in the word and doctrine. Jeremias⁵³ refers ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ to preaching and teaching. These men are especially to be held worthy of double honor.—What is the Apostle here telling Timothy? That there were some who teach the Word and some who do not? Hardly. What then? We find the answer in “laboring”—κοπιῶντες. Basically κοπιᾶω means to work hard, to toil.⁵⁴ Paul uses the verb and the noun κόπος without modification to apply to the work for the Lord, both direct and indirect, 1 Tim. 4:10; Rom. 16:6, 12; 1 Cor. 15:58; 2 Cor. 10:15. In 1 Thess. 5:12, used with προιστάμενοι, it is quite likely the work of presbyters or, at any rate, officers of the congregation, “those who labor among you.” In each instance the context gives the specific meaning. Here, then, in view of the immediate context and the other references of Paul to the *presbyteroi*, κοπιᾶω very evidently points out that men who, in addition to carrying out their care for the congregation well, holding fast the faithful word, and exhorting with sound teaching (*didaskalia*), also toil, labor, fatigue themselves, in Word and doctrine (*didaskalia*)—and these especially should be held worthy of high esteem.

We find here, therefore, no reference to two kinds of elders, teaching and non-teaching. To be sure, we do not deny that some men worked harder at preaching and teaching than others, although both types of men “ruled well” over their congregation. Where there were several elders over one congregation, as is apparently the case in most instances, each man would follow his own bent or gift. That would not mean, however, that he did not teach or did not rule.

Schaff⁵⁵ writes that in his opinion this passage "only speaks of two functions of the same office. Whatever may have been the distribution and rotation of duties, Paul expressly mentions ability to teach among the regular requisites for the episcopal or presbyteral office." Lightfoot⁵⁶ states: "... there is no ground for supposing that the work of teaching and the work of governing pertained to separate members of the presbyteral college. As each had his special gift, so would he devote himself more or less exclusively to the one or the other of these sacred functions." He footnotes this as follows: "The distinction of lay or ruling elders, and ministers proper or teaching elders, was laid down by Calvin and has been adopted as the constitution of several presbyterian Churches. This interpretation of St. Paul's language is refuted by Rothe, p. 224, Ritschl, p. 352 *sq.*, and Schaff, *Hist. of Apost. Ch.* II, p. 312, besides older writers, such as Vitringa and Mosheim."

V

The claim is made that even if there was only one form of eldership which Titus was commanded to establish, the deacons, deaconesses, and other New Testament offices must also be considered divine institutions and ordinances, along with elders.⁵⁷ But St. Paul does not say that these are "wanting"; this applies only to *presbyteroi* and *episkopoi*, and only these Titus is commanded to set into office. Plummer⁵⁸ writes of this command: "... the appointment of Church officers is regarded as imperative: it is on no account to be omitted. And it is not merely an arrangement that is as a rule desirable: it is to be universal."

The plurality of elders at one congregation is usually advanced against the claim that Christ instituted only the one office of the local pastorate. We readily agree that each of the congregations which the New Testament specifically mentions as having elders apparently had several elders. Zahn emphasizes that fact.⁵⁹ Ephesus, Philippi, Jerusalem, each had several elders, Acts 20:17; 11:30; Phil. 1:1. The two passages, however, which speak of the institution of elders use a distributive term: *κατ' ἐκκλησίαν πρεσβυτέρους*, Acts 14:23, "elders in every church"; and *κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους*, Titus 1:5, "elders in every city." We are convinced that these phrases do not necessarily mean that each congregation was re-

quired to have a plurality of elders. Scholars vary in opinion. Lechler and Gerok⁶⁰ insist that in each congregation a plurality of elders was required. Wendt,⁶¹ Wiesinger,⁶² and de Wette,⁶³ to mention a few whose opinions we have checked, take the expression to mean a college of presbyters in each congregation. On the other hand, Plummer finds that the expressions under discussion allow for one elder or for several elders in each congregation.⁶⁴ Huther⁶⁵ takes the same position.

Guericke,⁶⁶ in discussing the development of the monarchical episcopate, assumes the existence of congregations which originally had only one presbyter. E. de Pressensé indicates that in the early Christian Church there were small congregations which had only one *episkopos* and no groups of presbyters, while others had presbyters and a monarchical *episkopos*. He writes:

Sometimes a bishopric comprised only one hamlet. We read in the "Coptic Constitution": "Is there a spot where the little company of believers competent to elect a bishop does not amount to twelve, let them write to the neighboring churches, if these are populous, and let three delegates be sent to ascertain with care who is worthy to undertake this office." It follows that the pastor of a church which might be contained in the humblest of upper rooms is called a bishop, no less than the spiritual head of a flock numbering thousands of members. . . . In the small churches three men appointed by the neighboring churches preside, instead of the elders, at the election of the bishop.⁶⁷

An additional consideration in this connection is the use of the singular in 1 Timothy 3 and Titus 1. Paul speaks of *episkopos*, in the singular, as being over a congregation. We hold, therefore, that a single *episkopos* and not a college of presbyters satisfies Paul's directive to Timothy and fulfills what is essential in the institution of the *episkopos*.

In this connection it is sometimes contended that if a plurality of elders were placed over a congregation, no single one of the group can be said to have been over the entire congregation. But the singular use of *episkopos* in 1 Timothy 3 and Titus 1, with the full care of the church attributed to this person, refutes this contention.

Peter's and John's use of *presbyteros* is said to indicate that the

term does not necessarily apply to a position over a congregation, especially in view of the fact that Peter — himself an Apostle — calls himself a *sympresbyteros*, 1 Pet. 5:1. Two explanations, however, seem to refute this. For several years Peter had been stationed at Jerusalem, and with the other Apostles and presbyters he had had oversight of the congregation, Acts 15:2. On his trips he, as other Apostles, had helped regulate the affairs of local congregations with the presbyters. That he should call himself a *sympresbyteros* would be quite in accordance with his relationship to the congregations. We must remember also that it is generally accepted that Peter was in Rome while writing this Letter. It is quite inconceivable that Peter should not be a member of the ruling group, the *presbyterion*. Why should he not call himself a fellow presbyter, when addressing the presbyters, even though he also claims his Apostolic position in the beginning of his Letter, 1 Pet. 1:1? The same holds true for John, who calls himself a *presbyteros* in his Second and Third Letters, because of his long and close association with the Ephesian presbyters.

Having now analyzed the position of *episkopos*, and keeping in mind that Luke and Paul make no special effort to mention *episkopoi* even when we know they existed in a particular locality, we find quite a few references that may well be applied to the *presbyteroi* of a particular congregation. We believe that the pastor-teachers of Ephesians 4 may well be the *presbyteroi*. The ones who teach in the Word, Gal. 6:6, are quite possibly the elders of the congregations. Archippus of Col. 4:17 may well be a local *episkopos*. Those who were laboring among the Thessalonians and were over them in the Lord and admonished them, 1 Thess. 5:12, could very well have been elders. The command to obey those who rule, watch for the soul, and admonish, Heb. 13:17, could well have reference to *episkopoi*. It is not impossible that also the "angels of the churches" of Rev. 1:20 were representative *episkopoi*, although there is no way of determining the exact meaning.

We do not claim to find an absolute identification in these instances. But recalling how Luke and Paul take for granted that their readers are well acquainted with the office and its functions, we can easily imagine that these references pertain to *presbyteroi*.

VI

On the basis of the picture which the New Testament gives us of the early Church, we arrive at the following summary, with application to our own day and age.

The Lord had sent His disciples out into the world to bear witness to Him as Savior to all men, Matt. 20:19-20. All Christians have this responsibility. At the very outset He gave also special gifts, *charismata*, of all kinds, 1 Corinthians 12; Romans 12; some of which, however, had to do especially with the proclamation of the Word. The preaching and teaching of those who exercised such gifts was received as the proclamation of the Word of God, 1 Cor. 14:31, provided that they spoke in accord with the Word and Epistles of the Apostles and the Scriptures of the Old Testament, 1 Cor. 14:37; Acts 17:11. These men whom God had blessed in a special way for the proclamation of the Word of God were called Apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastor-teachers, Ephesians 4. In the case of some the function of proclaiming the Word was based upon the fact that God had called them either personally, as in the case of the Apostles, or through the giving of *charismata*, as in the case of the prophets and evangelists, possibly also the pastor-teachers. But the Lord indicated that He did not commission everybody to proclaim the Word *publice*, on behalf of the believers, Rom. 1:5; 1 Cor. 12:29; James 3:1. He furthermore indicated that he desired a local permanent public ministry of the Word in each local congregation, Titus 1, the episcopate, even though there might be in the congregation those who possessed special *charismata*. Accordingly, we find both the ministry of those who had received an immediate call and the ministry of those who had received the mediate call through their being made *episkopoi* by the congregation. With the Apostles, the *episkopoi* became responsible for the ministry of the Word in a congregation.

The beginning of the office of the *episkopos* lies hidden. Possibly the institution of Jewish elders furnished an example for the Jerusalem congregation. At any rate, some sixteen years after the first Pentecost we find *presbyteroi* in Jerusalem. The Apostles thereafter introduced presbyters into new congregations elsewhere. Just how much preaching of the Word was done in congregations by holders of *charismata* who were not presbyters depended ap-

parently on the moving of the Holy Spirit. But in the final analysis it was the *episkopos* who was responsible for the spiritual welfare of the congregation, a responsibility to be carried out through the use of the Word of God. The presence of at least one elder in a congregation was stipulated through St. Paul in his Letter to Titus. Whatever the origin of the office, therefore, we find that the office of *presbyteros*, or *episkopos*, is something that is "wanting" if a congregation does not have it. By "congregation" we understand the Christians in a locality who are united for the preaching of the Word and administration of the Sacraments, in whose local fellowship there is of necessity the feature of duration, of relative permanence.

A number of arguments are advanced against this conclusion. It is stated that because the initial usage of the term *episkopos* cannot be dated nor is referred to by the sacred writers, the institution of *episkopos* is not a special ordinance of God. Furthermore, the fact that it bears a similarity to the Jewish institution of elders in the synagog necessitates that one view it as a historical development. Finally, the fact that early in the Church the preaching of the Word was done by others than the *episkopoi*, and that only as the *charismata* disappeared the *episkopoi* alone did what before also the bearers of the *charismata* had done, is said to prove that the pastorate is a historical development and not a divine institution. Against such a conclusion we maintain that Titus 1 still stands. We also find an analogy in the institution of the Sacrament of Holy Baptism. Edersheim⁶⁸ shows that the Baptism of proselytes was practiced by the Jews before the coming of Christ. Then John the Baptist practiced Baptism, Mark 1:4; Acts 19:1 ff. The disciples of Christ baptized, under authorization of Jesus, John 4:1-2. But this "historical development" did not prevent Jesus from making of Baptism a divine institution, Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:16.

Local congregations are required by God to establish this divinely instituted office, and they do establish it by calling a man who meets the standards set by God in 1 Timothy 3 and Titus 1. By virtue of his call he is "to discharge to all the members of our congregation the functions of a pastor and curate of their souls"⁶⁹ and to function as the *episkopos*, or *presbyteros*, of the congregation. That a large congregation may have more than one bishop,

or "associate pastors," a senior pastor and several assisting pastors, is certainly in accord with Apostolic example. Any "rank" among such pastors is something that the congregation establishes for the sake of good order; each pastor remains an *episkopos*.

When a congregation calls a parochial school teacher "to instruct and train the children in his charge in the Word of God . . . to perform such other offices as are in the interest of Christian education and the welfare of church and school and as have been mutually agreed upon, as the circumstances of the congregation may require and as time and ability may permit,"⁷⁰ the congregation has every right to do so. "All things are yours," 1 Cor. 3:21. Such an office is certainly one into which God through the congregation calls suitable men, possessed of God-given gifts necessary to fulfill their chosen work. Such a man is certainly a participant in the public ministry of the Word. He may well be called "minister." But he is not an *episkopos*, a *presbyteros*. For he has not been placed over an entire flock or local congregation. And above him and the children in his charge is yet his own *presbyteros* or *presbyteroi*, the minister of the Word to the entire congregation.

The same principle holds in the instance of extracongregational offices. A group of congregations join hands and send a missionary to India and a chaplain into the Armed Forces. They call a professor to train young men for the public ministry of the Word on behalf of Christians, who indeed have the right to choose men to carry out work purposed to fulfill the commission to preach the Word to all nations. These men are public ministers of the Word. They have certainly been called by God through the congregations for their work. But they are not *episkopoi*.

We may distinguish here, for the sake of terminology, between men, other than an *episkopos*, who exercise the public ministry of the Word within a congregation, and men who exercise the public ministry of the Word outside a congregation. They are not *episkopoi*. The former may be said to participate in the public ministry of a local congregation. Just where to place the latter we are not sure. They are men who carry out the general command to preach the Gospel, which command each Christian has, and they do it on behalf of others.

In closing, it must be stated that the entire discussion must rise

above any subjective basis. In Kingdom work there is no place for such questions as: Is the pastor above the parochial school teacher or the synodical officer? Does the pastor have a divine call, each of the latter a call less divine? Our "rank" is not important. God has placed the pastor as *episkopos*, the other ecclesiastical officers as helpers. What is important is that each one prove to be a good *diakonos tou theou*, that he make full proof of his *diakonia*. For whatever public office in the Church one holds, pastor, parochial school teacher, professor, synodical official, the words of our Shepherd and Bishop must be branded into our consciousness so that no pride of flesh nor coveting of the esteem of men nor "eyeservice" may ever blur or dim them:

You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. Not so shall it be among you. But whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be your slave; even as the Son of man came not to be served but to serve, and to give His life as a ransom for many. Matt. 20:25-28 R. S. V.

Milwaukee, Wis.

FOOTNOTES

1. Herman Wolfgang Beyer, under *diakonia*, Gerhard Kittel, *Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1933—38.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Die Kirchen-Geschichte des Eusebius von Caesarea*, translated by F. A. Stroth, St. Louis, L. Volkening, 1869, IV, 5, p. 104.
4. C. F. W. Walther, *Amerikanisch-Lutherische Pastoraltheologie*, 1906, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, p. 391. Franz Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik*, III, 1940, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, pp. 506—507. "The Laymen's Movement in the Light of God's Word," translated by J. T. Mueller, in *What is Christianity? and Other Essays*, 1933, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, pp. 114, 119. "Von dem Beruf der Lehrerinnen an Christlichen Gemeindeschulen," *Lehre und Wehre*, 43, No. 3, p. 66. "Ueber das evangelische Verhalten eines christlich gesinnten Gemeindeschullehrers, theils gegen seine Schulkinder, theils gegen die Gemeinde, theils gegen den Pastor," *Lehre und Wehre*, 9, 1, p. 12. Translation our own. This same position is presented by L. Dornseif, "Die Stellung des Pastors und Lehrers zueinander," *Lehre und Wehre*, 53, No. 6, pp. 241 ff.
5. August Pieper, "Die Lehre von der Kirche und ihre Kennzeichen," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 9, No. 2, p. 86. "Die Lehre vom heiligen Predigtamt," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 9, No. 3, p. 149. "Development of the Doctrinal Position of the Wisconsin Synod during the Century of its History," *Quartalschrift*, 47, No. 2, p. 89.
6. Carl Weizsaecker, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche*, Freiburg, 1886, J. C. B. Mohr, pp. 20, 88, 74, 467, 495—497, 560 ff., 637.

7. Edwin Hatch, *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches*, 1882, London, Rivingtons, pp. 216—217.
8. James Vernon Bartlett, *The Apostolic Age*, 1899, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, pp. 511 and 514.
9. Arthur C. McGiffert, *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, 1898, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, pp. 238, 405 ff., 437, 577.
10. Adolf Harnack, *Entstehung und Entwicklung der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten*, 1910, Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, pp. 46 ff.
11. Thomas M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, New York, George H. Doran Company, pp. 141, 137.
12. Marvin R. Vincent, *Word Studies in the New Testament*, IV, Pastoral Epistles, 1901, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, pp. 196—197.
13. Flavius Josephus, *Von der alten Juedischen Geschichte*, in *Die Werke des Flavius Josephus*, translated by J. F. Cotta and A. Fr. Gfroerer, 1864, Philadelphia, Schaefer and Koradi, XX, 5, p. 555.
14. Jack Finegan, *Light from the Ancient Past*, 1947, Princeton University Press, p. 282.
15. J. V. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, 1883, London, Macmillan and Co., 7th ed., p. 193.
16. Theodor Zahn, *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas*, 1921, A. Deichert, Leipzig, *sub* ch. 14, 23.
17. Cf. L. Fuerbringer, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1927, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, p. 51.
18. *Op. cit.*, pp. 50—51.
19. *Op. cit.*, p. 952ff.
20. John Ed. Huther, *Handbuch ueber die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus*, 1859, Goettingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Sec. 11 of H. Q. W. Meyer's *Kritisch Exegetischer Kommentar, sub loco*.
21. *Op. cit.*, p. 39.
22. Reinhold Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, I, 1920, Leipzig, A. Deichert, 3d ed., p. 239.
23. Hein. Aug. Wilh. Meyer, *Handbuch ueber die Briefe an die Philipper, Kolosser, und an Philemon*, 1859, Goettingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2d ed., part of Meyer's critical commentary (cf. footnote 45), *sub* Phil. 1:2.
24. G. Godet, *Introduction to the New Testament*, I, The Epistles of St. Paul, translated by Wm. Afflick, 1894, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, pp. 572 ff.
25. Adolph Schlatter, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 4. Teil von *Erlaeuterungen zum Neuen Testament*, 1948, Calwer Verlag, Stuttgart, under ch. 20, 17; *Die Briefe an die Thessalonicher, Philipper, Timotheus und Titus*, 8. Teil, *op. cit.*, 1950, under 1 Tim. 5:17 ff. and Titus 1:5 ff. Schlatter, under Titus 1:7, remarks that surely at the same time elders were installed as deacons, but gives no reason for his statement, either here or under 1 Timothy 3.
26. Hermann Wolfgang Beyer, Kittel, *op. cit.*, *sub episkopos*.
27. Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, I, 1914, New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 3d ed., pp. 491—492.
28. Theodor Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, I, 1906, Leipzig, A. Deichert, 3d ed., p. 467, translation our own; *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas*, *op. cit.*, footnote to discussion of ch. 14:23.
29. *Op. cit.*, p. 637.
30. *Op. cit.*, *sub loco*.
31. Hans Heinrich Wendt, editor of 6th ed., H. A. Meyer's Commentary, *Apostelgeschichte*, 1888, Goettingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, under Acts 11:30.

32. Joachim Jeremias, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus*, Teilband 9, Das Neue Testament Deutsch, 1949, Goettingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, edited by Paul Althaus and Johannes Behm, *sub loco*, 1 Tim. 5:17-25; also Einleitung, p. 6.
33. Hermann Wolfgang Beyer, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Teilband 5, Das Neue Testament Deutsch, *op. cit.*, Einleitung, pp. 5—6.
34. Hermann Sasse, "On the Problem of the Relation Between the Ministry and the Congregation," *Letters Addressed to Lutheran Pastors*, translated by E. Reim, *Quartalschrift*, 47, No. 1, p. 29.
35. *Kirche und Amt*, *op. cit.*, p. 24.
36. *Amerikanisch-Lutherische Pastoraltheologie*, *op. cit.*, pp. 355 ff.; also *Die rechte Gestalt einer vom Staate unabhaengigen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Ortsgemeinde*, 1890, St. Louis, Mo., Lutherischer Concordia-Verlag, 6th ed., pp. 54 ff.
37. "Zur Verstaendigung in der gegenwaertigen Diskussion ueber Kirche und Amt," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 9, No. 3, p. 205.
38. *Op. cit.*, p. 64.
39. G. Wohlenberg, *Die Pastoral Briefe*, 1906, Leipzig, A. Deichert, p. 179.
40. *Op. cit.*, p. 484.
41. *Op. cit.*, *sub* Acts 20:28.
42. *Op. cit.*
43. *Op. cit.*, *sub* 1 Tim. 5:17.
44. *Einleitung*, *op. cit.*, pp. 469—470.
45. August Neander, *Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion und Kirche*, Vol. I, 1826, Hamburg, Friedrich Perthes, pp. 187 ff.
46. *Die Briefe an die Thessalonicher*, etc., *op. cit.*, *sub loco*.
47. *Op. cit.*, p. 547.
48. *Op. cit.*
49. R. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians, to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, to Titus, and to Philemon*, 1946, Columbus, Ohio, Wartburg Press, *sub loco*.
50. Kittel, *op. cit.*, *sub episkopos*, translation our own.
51. *Ibid.*
52. *Op. cit.*, *sub loco*, translation our own.
53. *Op. cit.*, *sub loco*.
54. Henry Stuart Jones, Roderick McKenzie, A New Edition, *Greek English Lexicon*, Henry George Liddel and Robert Scott, 1940, Oxford, Clarendon Press, *sub loco*.
55. *Op. cit.*, *sub loco*.
56. *Op. cit.*, p. 195.
57. August Pieper, "Gibt es im Neuen Testament gesetzliche Verordnungen?" *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 13, No. 3, pp. 168 ff.
58. Alfred Plummer, The Pastoral Epistles, in *Expositor's Bible*, 1903, A. C. Armstrong and Son, New York, p. 217.
59. *Die Apostelgeschichte*, *op. cit.*, *sub* Acts 14:23.
60. G. V. Lechler, Karl Gerok, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, *Lange Bibelwerk*, 4th ed., 1881, Bielefeld und Leipzig, Velhagen und Klasing, *sub* Acts 14:23.
61. *Op. cit.*, *sub* Acts 14:23.
62. J. C. Wiesinger, *Die Briefe des Apostel Paulus an die Philipper, an Titus, Timotheus und Philemon*, in Herman Olshausen's *Biblischer Commentar*, 1851, Koenigsberg, Aug. Wilhelm Unzer, *sub* Titus 1:5, 7.
63. W. M. L. de Wette, *Das Neue Testament*, 1885, Halle, Eduard Anton, *sub locis*.
64. *Op. cit.*, pp. 213, 217.
65. *Op. cit.*, *sub* 1 Tim. 3:2.

66. H. E. F. Guericke, *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, 1840, Halle, Gebauer, 4th ed., 106, text and footnote 53.
67. *The Early Years of Christianity*, translated by Annie Harwood-Holmden, 1878, New York, Nelson and Phillips, pp. 58, 59, 61.
68. Alfred Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus, the Messiah*, 1942, Wm. B. Eerdmans's Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, New American Edition, Vol. II, page 745.
69. J. H. C. Fritz, *op. cit.*, p. 51.
70. *Supplemental Brief, op. cit.*, pp. 12—13.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achelis, Hans, *Das Christentum in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, 2d ed. Quelle & Meyer, 1925.
- Arndt, Wm., "Predigtstudie ueber Matt. 18, 15—22," *Homiletic Magazine*, 49, 7, pp. 225 ff.
- Bartlet, James Vernon, *The Apostolic Age*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1899.
- Beyer, Herman Wolfgang, under *diakonia* and *episkopos*, Gerhard Kittel, *Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1933—38.
- , "Die Apostelgeschichte," Teilband 5, *Das Neue Testament Deutsch*, ed. Paul Althaus and Johannes Behm, Goettingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949.
- Boerger, J. F., "The Call of the Teacher," *Building the Parochial School of Tomorrow*, Racine, Wis., South Wisconsin District Teachers' Conference, 1941.
- Brueggemann, H. G., "The Public Ministry in the Apostolic Age," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, XXII, 2, pp. 81 ff.
- de Pressensé, E., *The Early Years of Christianity*, trans. Annie Harwood-Holmden, New York, Nelson and Phillips, 1878.
- de Wette, W. M. L., *Das Neue Testament*, Halle, Eduard Anton, 1885.
- Dornseif, L., "Die Stellung des Pastors und Lehrers zueinander," *Lehre und Wehre*, 53, 6, pp. 241 ff.
- Ebrard, J. H. A., *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 4th ed. of H. Ohlhausen's *Biblischer Commentar*, Koenigsberg, A. W. Unzer, 1862.
- Eusebius, *Die Kirchen-Geschichte des Eusebius von Caesarea*, trans. F. A. Stroth, St. Louis, L. Volkening, 1869.
- Finegan, Jack, *Light from the Ancient Past*, Princeton University Press, 1947.
- Fischer, Geo. Park, *History of the Christian Church*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1889.
- Foelber, E. E., "The Office of the Public Ministry," *The Abiding Word*, ed. Th. Laetsch, Vol. II, p. 474, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1947.
- Fritz, J. H. C., *Pastoral Theology*, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1932.
- Fuerbringer, L., *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1927.
- , "Walther als Kirchenmann," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, VII, 10, pp. 721 ff.
- Fuerbringer, O., "Zur Lehre vom heiligen Predigtamt," *Lehre und Wehre*, I, 1, pp. 1 ff.; 2, pp. 33 ff.
- Gildersleeve, B. L., *Syntax of Classical Greek*, II, New York, American Book Company, 1911.
- Godet, F., *Introduction to the New Testament*, I, The Epistles of Paul, translated by Wm. Afflick, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1894.
- Guericke, H. E. F., *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, 4th ed., Halle, Gebauer, 1840.

- Harnack, Adolf, *Entstehung und Entwicklung der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten*, Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1910.
- , "Verfassung," *Realencyclopaedia fuer protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, Albert Hauk, Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs.
- H—h, "Die goettliche Stiftung des heutigen Pfarramts," *Lehre und Wehre*, 64, 4, p. 151.
- Hatch, Edwin, *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches*, London, Rivingtons, 1882.
- Hoefling, J. W. F., *Grundsaeetze evangelisch-lutherischer Kirchenverfassung*, Erlangen, Theodor Blaesing, 1850.
- Hoenecke, Adolf, *Ev.-Luth. Dogmatik*, Band IV, Milwaukee, Northwestern Publishing House, 1909.
- Huther, J. E., *Handbuch ueber die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus*, Goettingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1859, Section 11 of H. A. W. Meyer's *Kritisch Exegetischer Kommentar*.
- Jeremias, Joachim, "Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus," Teilband 9, *Das Neue Testament Deutsch*, Goettingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949, edited by Paul Althaus und Johannes Behm.
- Jones, Henry Stuart, and Mackenzie, Roderick, *A New Edition, Greek English Lexicon*, Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Josephus, Flavius, "Von der alten Juedischen Geschichte," in *Die Werke des Flavius Josephus*, translated by J. F. Cotta and A. Fr. Gfroerer, Philadelphia, Schaefer and Koradi, 1864.
- Juelicher, Ad., "Titus," "Timotheus," Albert Hauk *Realencyclopaedia fuer protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs.
- Kaehler, E. W., "Hat die Gemeinde das Recht, ordentlicher Weise einen wesentlichen Theil des heiligen Predigtamts irgend einem Laien temporaer zu uebertragen?" *Lehre und Wehre*, 20, 9, pp. 257 ff.; 11, pp. 331 ff.; 12, pp. 363 ff.
- Koehler, Edward, *A Summary of Christian Doctrine*, Koehler Publishing Co., River Forest, 1939.
- Koehler, J. P., book review of *Pastorale Praxis*, J. Schaller, *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 10, 4, pp. 292 ff.
- , "Wie soll ein Bischof beschaffen sein?" *Theologische Quartalschrift*, Vol. 3, p. 213.
- Koehneke, P. F., "The Call into the Holy Ministry," *The Abiding Word*, Th. Laetsch, editor, Vol. I, pp. 366 ff., St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1946.
- Kretzmann, P. E., "Apostelamt, Predigtamt, Pfarramt, Synodalamt," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, III, 1, p. 32.
- , "Der Begriff *ekklesia* im Neuen Testament," *Lehre und Wehre*, 74, 12, pp. 353 ff.
- Kurtz, J. H., *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, 4th ed., by N. Bonwetsch and P. Tschackert, Leipzig, August Neumann, 1906.
- Lechler, G. V., and Gerok, Karl, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Lange Bibelwerk, 4th ed., Bielefeld und Leipzig, Velhagen und Klasing, 1881.
- Lehninger, M., "Development of the Doctrinal Position of the Wisconsin Synod during the Century of its History," *Quartalschrift*, 47, 2, pp. 88 ff.
- Lenski, R. C. H., *Commentary of the New Testament*, Columbus, Wartburg Press, 1946.
- Lightfoot, J. B., *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, MacMillan and Co., London, 1883, 7th ed.

- Lindsay, Thomas M., *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, New York, George H. Doran Company.
- Loehe, Wilhelm, *Kirche und Amt*, Erlangen, Theodor Blaesing, 1851.
- McGiffert, Arthur C., *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898.
- Meyer, H. A. W., *Handbuch ueber die Briefe an die Philippper, Kolosser, und an Philemon*, Goettingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1859, 2d ed.
- Von Mosheim, Johann L., *Kirchengeschichte des Neuen Testaments*, I, 2d ed., Ekebrecht, 1786.
- Neander, August, *Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion und Kirche*, I, Hamburg, Friedrich Perthes, 1826.
- Neve, J. L., *A History of Christian Thought*, I, United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia, 1943.
- Perlich, Geo. H., "The Lutheran Congregation," *The Abiding Word*, ed. Th. Laetsch, II, pp. 474 ff., St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1947.
- Pieper, August, "Die Stimme unserer Kirche in der Frage von Kirche und Amt," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 9, 1, pp. 21 ff.
- , "Abschluss der Diskussion ueber die Lehre von der Kirche," etc., *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 10, 1, pp. 35 ff.
- , "Die Lehre von der Kirche und ihre Kennzeichen," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 9, 2, pp. 83 ff.
- , "Gibt es im Neuen Testament gesetzliche Verordnungen?" *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 13, 3, pp. 157 ff.
- , "Luthers Lehre von Kirche und Amt," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 14, 3, pp. 211 ff.; 15, 1, pp. 65 ff.; 2, pp. 101 ff.
- , "Was lehren wir im Artikel von der Kirche und ihrem Amt?" *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 18, 2, pp. 95 ff.
- , "Zur Lehre von der Kirche und ihrem Amt, mit besonderer Anwendung auf die Synode und ihre Zucht," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 26, 4, pp. 202 ff.
- , "Zur Verstaendigung in der gegenwaertigen Diskussion ueber Kirche und Amt," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 9, 3, pp. 182 ff.
- Pieper, Franz, *Christliche Dogmatik*, III, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1920.
- , "Die Herrlichkeit des Studiums der Theologie und des Predigtamts," *Lehre und Wehre*, 44, 2, pp. 33 ff.
- , "The Laymen's Movement in the Light of God's Word," translated by J. T. Mueller, in *What is Christianity and Other Essays*, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1933.
- Plummer, Alfred, "The Pastoral Epistles," in *Expositor's Bible*, New York, A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1903.
- Proceedings of the Fortieth Convention of the Ev. Luth. Synodical Conference*, Report of the Interim Committee, pp. 135 ff., St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1949.
- Proceedings of the Forty-First Regular Convention of The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod*, 1950, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House.
- Rainy, Robert, *The Ancient Catholic Church*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916.
- Reim, Edmund, "Die Lehre vom heiligen Predigtamt," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 9, 3, pp. 141 ff.; 4, pp. 213 ff.
- Robertson, A. T., *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, New York, George H. Doran Co., 1915, 2d ed.
- Sasse, Hermann, "On the Problem of the Relation Between the Ministry and the Congregation, Letters Addressed to Lutheran Pastors," translated by E. Reim, *Quartalschrift*, 47, 1, pp. 16 ff.

- , "On the Relation of the Universal Church and the Individual Congregation in the New Testament, Letters Addressed to Lutheran Pastors," translated by E. Reim, *Quartalschrift*, 47, 2, pp. 108 ff.
- Schaff, Philip, *History of the Christian Church*, I, New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1914, 3d ed.
- Schaller, J., *Pastorale Praxis in der Ev.-Luth. Freikirche Amerikas*, Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, 1913.
- Schlatter, Adolf, *Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament*, Stuttgart, Calwer Verlag, 1948.
- Schmidt, Heinrich, *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, Erlangen, A. Deichert, 1880.
- Seeberg, Reinhold, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, I, Leipzig, A. Deichert, 1920, 3d ed.
- Sihler, Wm., "Ueber das evangelische Verhalten eines christlich gesinnten Gemeindegemeindeführers, theils gegen seine Schulkinder, theils gegen die Gemeinde, theils gegen den Pastor," *Lehre und Wehre*, 9, 1, pp. 8 ff.
- Steffens, D. H., "The Doctrine of the Church and the Ministry," *Ebenezer*, ed. W. H. T. Dau, pp. 140 ff., St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1922.
- Stellhorn, A. C., "The Lutheran Teacher's Position in the Ministry of the Congregation," *Report of the 1949 Educational Conference*, at Seward, Nebraska, under auspices of The Board for Parish Education, The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod.
- Stoeckhardt, Georg, "Von dem Beruf der Lehrerinnen an christlichen Gemeindegemeindegemeinschaften," *Lehre und Wehre*, 43, 3, pp. 65 ff.
- Stroebel, K., "Zur Amtsfrage und ihren Konsequenzen," *Lehre und Wehre*, 7, 6, p. 164.
- Terry, Milton S., *Biblical Hermeneutics*, New York, Hunt and Eaton, 1891.
- Thatcher, Oliver J., *A Sketch of the History of the Apostolic Church*, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1893.
- Triglot Concordia*, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1921.
- Vincent, Marvin R., *Word Studies in the New Testament*, IV, Pastoral Epistles, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901.
- Walther, C. F. W., *Amerikanisch-Lutherische Pastoraltheologie*, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1906.
- , *Die rechte Gestalt einer vom Staate unabhängigen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Ortsgemeinde*, 1890, St. Louis, Lutherischer Concordia-Verlag, 6th ed.
- , *Die Stimme unserer Kirche in der Frage von Kirche und Amt*, Erlangen, Andreas Deichert, 1882.
- Wiesinger, "Die Briefe des Apostel Paulus an die Philipper, an Titus, Timotheus und Philemon," in Herman Olshausen's *Biblischer Commentar*, Koenigsberg, A. W. Unzer, 1851.
- Weiss, Bernhard, *Evangelien und Apostelgeschichte*, 2d ed., Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1907.
- Weizsaecker, Carl, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche*, Freiburg, J. C. B. Mohr, 1886.
- Wendt, H. H., ed. of 6th ed., H. A. Meyer's Commentary, *Apostelgeschichte*, Goettingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1888.
- Winer, Geo. B., *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms*, ed. by Gottlieb Lueneman, Leipzig, F. C. W. Vogel, 1867.
- Wohlenberg, G., *Die Pastoral Briefe*, Leipzig, A. Deichert, 1906.
- Zahn, Theodor, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, I, 1906, Leipzig, A. Deichert.
- , *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas*, Leipzig, A. Deichert, 1921.
- , *Das Evangelium des Matthaeus*, 3d ed., Leipzig, A. Deichert.