

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

4-1-1931

Quenstedt's Discussion on the Ministerial Office

Robert A. Biegner

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_biegnerr@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Biegner, Robert A., "Quenstedt's Discussion on the Ministerial Office" (1931). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 739.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/739>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

QUENSTEDT'S DISCUSSION OF THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE

A Thesis presented to the
Faculty of Concordia Theological Seminary

in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity

by

Robert A. Biegner

Concordia Seminary,
April 1931

Approved by

Dr. Graebner

Dr. Kretzmann

Outline.

Introduction pp.I-3

1. Short biography of Quenstedt
2. Quenstedt's greatest work, "Theologia Didactico Polemica."
 - (a) Its great value
 - (b) Quotations from various sources
3. The four divisions of the Theologia Didactico-Polemica
4. The locus under discussion, "De Ministerio Ecclesiastico"

I.The Dogmatical System pp 3-25

A. Didactica pp. 3-6

1. Quenstedt's characterization of the system of the Didactica -Title Page and Preface to Reader.
2. Meusel's characterization of the system of the Didactica
3. Characteristics of the Didactica
4. Epitome of the Didactica of the locus under discussion

B. Polemica pp6-25

1. Quenstedt's characterization of the system of the Polemica -Title Page and Preface to the Reader pp.6-9
2. Characterization of the system of the Polemica pp.I0-II
3. "Catholic Encyclopedia", characterization of the system of the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard pp.I2-I3
4. A comparison of the systems of Lombard and Quenstedt
5. Characterization of the system of the Polemica from various sources pp.I6-I7
6. Illustration of the system of the Polemica- "Questio II" pp. I8-25

II.The Dogmatical Method pp.26-29

1. Aristotle's four principles of Reality
2. Quenstedt's use of Aristotle's four principles
3. An example of scholastic argumentation

III.The Dogmatical Discussion pp.30-40

- #### IV.A Dogmatical comparison with Walther's discussion of the "Amt" in his "Kirche und Amt" pp.41-50

Biography.

Johann Andreas Quenstedt (1617-1685), a nephew of Johann Gerhard, "studied at Helmstedt and at Wittenberg, where he became professor, first of geography, logic, and metaphysics, and in 1660 full professor of theology, occupying after Calov's death first place in the faculty. Though educated as a student under Calixt, he afterward, at Wittenberg, refuted the syncretistic tendencies of the former..... Quenstedt was noted for his quiet and mild irenic disposition." (The Concordia Cyclopedia, p.633.)

Theologia Didactico-Polemica.

The Lutheran Cyclopedia, p.400 says, "His great work is his Theologia Didactica-Polemica, the most elaborate and thoroughly systematized treatise on Lutheran theology." The worth of Quenstedt's best work is unquestionably great. The Realencyklopaedie fuer protestantische Theologie und Kirche, vol. 16, p.382, says, "Nicht sowohl in originellen Ansichten und selbststaendiger Forschung liegt das Verdienst dieser (Theologia Didactico-Polemica) in ihrer Art trefflichen Arbeit als in der ausgebreiteten Belesenheit, den begruendlichen Litteraturangaben und der logisch strengen Zusammenfassung. In leichter und buendiger Uebersicht traegt er darin die Resultate der lutherischen dogmatischen Forschungen von den Zeiten Hutters an bis auf Calov vor nach dem Masstabe strengster Orthodoxie, wie er durch Calov aufgestellt worden war. Als Schema liegt... Koenigs Theologia Positiva Acroamatica zugrunde."

Meusel, Kirchliches Handlexikon, p.481 says of the worth of Quenstedt's great work, "Andererseits verdient jener Scharfsinn, mit dem hier das Dogma nach allen Seiten hin abgegrenzt, jede missverstaendliche Fassung vermieden und jeder Einwand mit unermuedlicher Gruendlichkeit und allen Mittel der Logik abgewiesen wird, unsere volle Bewunderung....."

Fleiss

Dazu ist es sein besonderes Verdienst, dass er mit bewundernswertem Fleiss noch einmal alles zusammenfasste, was seine Vorgaenger und Zeitgenossen in dogmatischer Hinsicht geleistet. Er ist deshalb der "Buchhalter und Schriftfuehrer" der alten Dogmatik genannt worden (Tholuck), der die Reihe der grossen objektiven Dogmatiker des siebzehn Jahrhunderts absschliessend uns ihren Ertrag am umfassendsten vor Augen stellt." In the strict sense, Quenstedt is not the mere "Bookkeeper" of Lutheran orthodoxy. Dr. Pieper rightly says, "Von Tholuck 'der Buchhalter und Schriftfuehrer' der orthodoxen Theologie genannt. Das Urteil trifft sachlich nicht zu, weil Quenstedt mit eigenem Urteil gearbeitet hat. Um ueber Quenstedt urteilen zu koennen, muss man ihn gelesen und mit andern Dogmatikern verglichen haben." (Pieper, Dogmatik, Band I, p. 175, note 582.)

The Lutheran Cyclopedia, p. 400, says, "Because of its convenience for reference and the compact statements of its definitions, this work of Quenstedt has become a great favorite and commands a high price..... His definitions and theses, however, are almost entirely from Koenig's very compact text-book Theologia Positiva Acroamatica."

division

Quenstedt's Theologia Didactico-Polemica consists of four divisions or "capita". They are as follows:

- I. Theology in General.
- II. The Subject of Theology.
- III. The Principles of Salvation.
- IV. The Means of Grace.

The twenty-seven page locus, "De Ministerio Ecclesiastico", discussed under the fourth division of Quenstedt's two thousand and seventy-nine page work will be the subject of this present writing. The locus is representative of the entire book and therefore furnishes a representative insight into Quenstedt's dogmatical method. The study of this locus will be considered under four viewpoints:

- I. The Dogmatical System.
- II. The Dogmatical Method.
- III. The Dogmatical Discussion.
- IV. A Dogmatical Comparison with Walther's "Kirche und Amt".

I. The Dogmatical System.

Quenstedt's great work in every locus is divided into two sections, Didactica and Polemica. The discussion of the dogmatical system, therefore, will be divided into a discussion of the Didactica and then of the Polemica. In content, the Polemica is by far the larger.

A. Didactica.

Of his Didactica, Quenstedt says, "All and individual articles of the Christian faith are perspicuously treated according to the succession of subjects, explained with the necessary notes, and proven by fundamental dicta of Scripture, (which dicta are) illustrated and explained by an impartial commentary". (Title-page.)

In his preface to the reader, Quenstedt says "The didactic section presents the causes, effects, definitions, attributes, 'adjuncta', etc. of all and individual articles of faith, according to the leading of the Positive Theology of B.D. Frid. Koenig,

4.
formerly my most intimate friend. And since nothing can be asserted concerning divine things except what is expressed in the inspired Scriptures,.....I have chosen the proving of the theses from the sacred Scriptures of both covenants which are the foundation and one principle of our faith.....And I have not promiscuously adduced all the dicta of Scripture, "ut fieri amat", but only the fundamental and very concise dicta, since I am mindful of that axiom of Thomas Aquinas, "When, in proving the faith, one introduces reasons which are not cogent, one enters into the derision of unbelievers. For they believe that we support ourselves with such manner of reasons, and ground our faith on them." Now, in order that in the naked examination of the dicta of Scripture, there may be no trickery, I have accurately investigated their genuine sense, prolixly set them forth, and shown their use both in polemics.....and homiletics."

As Meusel (Kirchliches Handlexikon, p.481) says, "Der didaktische Teil enthaelt die eigentliche Entwicklung des Dogmas, wobei Quenstedt wie Calov sich der Casualmethode bedient, und bei jedem Lehrsatz die causae principales oder minus principales, instrumentales, efficientes, formales oder auch die causa agens, movens, interna, externa, usw. mit grosser Sorgfalt erörtert und ausserdem auch die effectus, definitiones attributa, und adjuncta feststellt."

In the Didactica of the locus now under discussion, we find the following characteristic expressions: "causa efficiens principalis", "causa minus principalis", "materia in qua", "materia circa quam", "objectum personale", "objectum reale", "forma interna", "forma externa", "actus principui", "finis", "definitio" and "adjuncta". All these expressions are characteristic of the Didactica of every locus in Quenstedt's Theologia Didactico-Polemica.

5.

In order to visualize the system of the Didactica, an epitome of the entire Didactica of the locus, "De Ministerio Ecclesiastico", now follows:

Thesis I. Three divine ordinances on earth-church, state, home.

Thesis II. The church-its names in Scripture.

Thesis III. Causa Efficiens Principalis- God alone.

Thesis IV. Causa Minus Principalis-the whole church.

Thesis V. Materia Ministerii - twofold.

(a) Materia in qua sive subjectum.

(b) Materia circa quam sive subjectum.

Theses VI. Materia Ministerii in qua sive subjectum are suitable and skillful persons legitimately called.

Nota: The call is twofold, mediate and immediate.

Thesis VII. Materia Ministerii circa quam sive objectum is personale or reale.

Thesis VIII. Objectum personale is the flock of God.

Thesis IX. Objectum reale are the sacraments and office of the keys.

Thesis X. Forma Ministerii is the right and authoritative public administration of the sacred office.

Nota: Forma interna - edification of men.

Forma externa-- the various grades and orders of the ministry.

Thesis XI. Actus ministerii praecipui.

(a) Pure and incorrupt preaching.

(b) Legitimate dispensation of the sacraments.

(c) Right use of the keys.

Thesis XII. Finis Ministerii.

- (a) Finis ultimus seu principalis - glory of God.
- (b) Finis subordinatus et intermedius - salvation of mankind.

Thesis XIII. Definitio Ministerii.

"The sacred and public office (Thesis II), divinely instituted (Thesis III, causa efficiens principalis), by which certain and suitable persons, legitimately called (Thesis VI, materia ministerii in qua sive subjectum) by the common consent of the people (Thesis IV, causa minus principalis) decently (decenter) administer (Thesis X, forma ministerii) the Word of God, the sacraments and church discipline (Thesis XI, actus ministerii praecipui) for the conversion of men and the glory of God.(Thesis XII, finis ministerii)"

Nota Bene: The information in brackets in the definitio ministerii is not Quenstedt's.

B. Polemica

On the title-page to his great work Quenstedt tersely says, "In the second section (Polemica), in every controversy

- (I) The real status of the question, false statuses having been removed, is rightly formed.
- (II) The orthodox decision is proposed in simple words.
- (III) The individual members of the Thesis are set forth at greater length by means of short and perspicuous observations and distinctions.

- (IV) The antithesis of allheretics and heterodox, both ancient and recent, is adduced in their own words.
- (V) The dicta of Scripture proving the Thesis are briefly repeated from the first section (Didactica).
- (VI) They are defended from the limitations and corruptings of the adversaries.
- (VII) The contrary arguments, if not all, at least the outstanding, are explained and refuted.
- (VIII) The authors opposing and contending for the orthodox Thesis are appended."

In his preface to the reader Quenstedt says, "The second section, scil. Polemica, treats the controversies concerning the articles of faith, begun in ancient times or agitated to-day; but only the outstanding controversies, which seem to be of some importance and weight, and not the remote, curious, obtruse and empty (controversies) whose decision is neither useful nor necessary."

He then adds the "Arrangement of the question in dispute":

- I. The true status of the controversy is rightly formed, after false statuses have been removed. For the majority of the adversaries of heavenly truth either maliciously pervert the status of the question, or they do not present it faithfully, or they often invent (opinions) for themselves, or they ascribe to us monstrous opinions, in order that they may then overcome (debellent) them.
- II. The sure Thesis is firmly established, in which the orthodox decisions are succinctly and perspicuously proposed.
- III. The Ekthesis follows, in which the difficulties which come up in the status of the controversy are broken down by means

PRITZLAFF MEMORIAL LIBRARY

CONCORDIA SEMINARY

ST. LOUIS, MO.

of distinctions and observations which deserve to be known and infixed in the memory, and the Thesis itself and its termini are set forth at greater length.....

- IV. The Antithesis is concerned with examining all the truth-opposing opinions of all heretics and heterodox, both ancient and recent, namely Jews, Papists, Calvinists, Socinians, Arminians Syncretists, Weigelians, Anabaptists and other fanatics, whose express words or their substance, are faithfully and as much as is possible, adduced from their own books. For, as Irenaeus says, victory is won over heretics by showing them their own sentences.
- V. Theseos Bebalooosis, in which the Scripture passages proving and confirming the Thesis are repeated from the first section (Didactica). For in controversies of faith, the most certain decision can be had from no other source than from the Word of God..... But in confirming the truth, I do not wish to pile up the testimonies of antiquity, partly because they may be found anywhere among us, partly lest this book grow too large. But I have adduced the sentences of the Fathers which present the matter sharply, briefly, and in a complete and meaningful manner. I have also strengthened the Thesis by reasons deducted from Scripture which weaken and enervate the strophes and sophisms of the opponents; reasons, I say, from the fountains of Scripture, not from the muddy rivulet of corrupt reason.....
- VI. Ekdikesis, in which the sacred texts are protected from the frivolous interpretations, distortions and perversions of the heterodox.

VII. **Objectionum Dialysis**, in which the strongholds, which the adversaries craftily gather from sacred Scripture and from the Fathers for their hopeless cause, are snatched away from them and the heavenly truth, which they wish to mancipate to their errors, is restored to itself and its liberty.

VIII. The authors of both sides in the individual controversies are indicated, and I have frankly adduced the majority of opinions in the opposing Antithesis, as anyone can see. Next, the writers of our own party... at the end of each controversy. The authors are quoted not only that those who are rather virtuously virtuously consecrated to study may know from what theologian this or that controversy may be considered at greater length, more exhaustively and ex professo; but also that I might sincerely acknowledge through whom I have profited and especially from what source I have produced the opinion..... For my labor was not for this purpose to strike the systems of theology out of the hand of studious wise men of God who are accustomed to read these systems diligently, but rather are students recommended and led down to the fountains from which my rivulets are derived; and my studies are fruitfully conjoined with the most praise-worthy works of others."

On pages 3-4, 6-9, a resume of Quenstedt's System, in his own words, taken from the Title Page and Introduction to the Reader of his "Theologia Didactico-Polemica", has already been given. But a reconsideration of Quenstedt's System, on the lines of Quenstedt's own resume, will bring out some new and interesting observations. Hence, a reconsideration of the System now follows:

Status Controversiae.

The Status Controversiae asserts the real bone of contention, after denying every false presentation of what the controversy is about.

Thesis.

The Status Controversiae having established the question in dispute, the Thesis now presents the orthodox judgment on the controversy.

Ekthesis.

The Ekthesis, by means of "distinctions and observations", "breaks down" all the difficulties or objections which the heterodox raise against the true statement of the controversy. Further, it enlarges on the Thesis, especially by fixing the boundaries or limits of the controversy, thus obviating many heterodox objections.

Antithesis.

As said above, the Ekthesis "breaks down" the difficulties or objections that arise in the statement of what the controversy is about (Status Controversiae). The heterodox now answer this solution of difficulties and objections with various arguments. The Antithesis therefore, quotes these heterodox counter arguments against the Ekthesis.

Theseos Ebalosis.

The Theseos Ebalosis is the "corpus", the center and most important part of the controversy. It concerns itself with proving the Thesis from Scripture or reasons deduced therefrom.

Ekdikesis.

In the Theseos Ebalosis, Quenstedt has proved the Thesis from Scripture or reasons deduced therefrom. The heterodox now attack these Scripture proofs. In the Ekdikesis, therefore, Quenstedt quotes these "frivolous interpretations, distortions and perversions" of Scripture, and refutes them. A very good example of this is to be found in the detailed consideration of Question II on pages 18-25.

Objectionum Dialysis.

The Objectionum Dialysis "breaks down" any and every argument and perversion of Scripture that the heterodox present. A similarity between the Objectionum Dialysis and the Ekthesis can't but attract attention. The Ekthesis presents merely the heterodox objections against the Status Controversiae. The Objectionum Dialysis, however, "breaks down" any and every heterodox argument on any phase of the entire question, and thus is the final and complete demolishing of the heterodox false, and at times, almost childish exegesis and logic.

Authors.

The opposing authors are all mentioned in the Antithesis. But now, in order to show his sources, and to encourage consultation of these sources, Quenstedt mentions the orthodox authors and their works, of which he has made use. The authors he made use of in the study of Question II, are reproduced from Quenstedt on page 25.

With the scheme of Quenstedt's System in mind, it is interesting to note the comment of the "Catholic Encyclopedia", Vol. I3, p. 550, in its discussion of the "Details of the Scholastic Method". The comment of the "Catholic Encyclopedia" reads as follows:

"There is a great deal of divergence among the principal scholastics in the details of arrangement.....All, however, adopt the manner of treatment by which thesis, objections and solutions, of objections stand out distinctly in the discussion of each problem."

Quenstedt's System, in the words of the "Catholic Encyclopedia" is nothing more than a system of "thesis, objections and solutions of objections", and is thus typically scholastic. That Quenstedt's System is scholastic is further shown by the comment of Schaff-Herzog, Vol X, p. 267, in the discussion of the Scholastic "Method." It reads thus:

"As a rule, the schoolmen present their teaching in the form of commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. The problems raised by him are resolved by him into an increasing multiplicity of questions, often so remote from the text, that this is soon forgotten by the reader. The series of distinctions by Lombard remain as an outline for the accumulating material. To extract the basic ideas of the theologians is one of the gravest impediments to the modern understanding of the peculiarity of the scholastic systems. Another is the repeated differentiation of the material into new questions, the basis for the opposite views of which, are thoroughly established and thoroughly refuted. For instance, a distinction of Lombard is resolved into a number of "questions" and each of these into a number of articles. Other subdivisions may follow; such as "Membra principalia, partes, tractatus, dubia, ad infinitum." In detail, each article is so treated as to raise a question; then citations for and against are quoted from the Church Fathers down to the scholastic masters. After the "quod non" or "quod sic" is concluded,

17.

follows the "responsio" of the author or the "corpus" of the article. Then follows the discussion in much detail of the views produced first for, then against, the question, not infrequently including the characteristic opinions of the author. Into this endlessly irksome mold, the explanation of every problem is dragged. But its great service was the vitalization of dialectic art and of logical categories for scholars and for the development of education to the present day.."

In order to visualize the similarity of Lombard's and Quenstedt's systems, a comparison of their systems, on the basis of the foregoing quotation from Schaff-Herzog, now follows:

"The series of distinctions by Lombard remain as an outline for the accumulating material."

This sentence fits Quenstedt's Status Controversiae, Thesis and Ekthesis admirably. "The Status Controversiae is rightly formed, after false statuses have been removed" (by distinctions).

The Thesis proposes "orthodox decisions succinctly and perspicuously" by means of distinctions and observations. The Ekthesis "breaks down" the "difficulties which come up in the Status Controversiae by means of distinctions and observations."

"To extract the basic ideas of the theologians is one of the gravest impediments to the modern understanding of the peculiarity of the scholastic systems."

This statement is not at all true of Quenstedt. Quenstedt's argument is not too difficult to follow if one makes notes as one goes along.

"Another (impediment to understanding) is the repeated differentiation of the material into new questions."

This statement is true, for Quenstedt, on his way to victory over

his adversaries, makes skirmishes against every argument, no matter how remote it may be, in order to annihilate the foe completely.

"The opposite views of which, are thoroughly established,"

This corresponds to Quenstedt's Antithesis, which is "concerned with examining the truth-opposing opinions of all heretics and heterodox... .., whose express words or their sum, are faithfully and as much as is possible, adduced from their own books."

"and thoroughly refuted."

This corresponds to Quenstedt's Objectionum Dialysis, "in which the strongholds which the adversaries craftily gather from Sacred Scripture and the Fathers... .., are snatched away from them...and the heavenly truth liberated."

The following sentences of Schaff-Herzog are a repetition of the previous sentences, but from a different angle:

"After the "quod non" or "quod sic" is concluded,"

This corresponds to Quenstedt's Status Controversiae, Thesis and Ekthesis, all of which are concerned with declaring what the question is and what it is not-"quod sic", and "quod non."

"follows the "responsio" of the author or the "corpus" of the article."

This fits Quenstedt's Theseos Bebaiosis, which is the "corpus", the center and most important part of every question.

"Then follows the discussion in much detail, the views produced first for, then against the question."

This corresponds to Quenstedt's Ekdikesis and Objectionum Dialysis. Quenstedt, however, first gives the opposing view and then refutes it. The Ekdikesis gives and then refutes the Scripture perversions of the heterodox. The Objectionum Dialysis gives and then refutes

These Scripture perversions are perversions of the Scripture passages which Quenstedt offers in the Theseos Bebaiosis as a Scriptural proof of his Thesis.

any and all heterodox objections that come up on any phase of the controversy.

"Into this endlessly irksome mode, the explanation of every problem is dragged." "The problems raised by him...are resolved into an increasing multiplicity of questions, often so remote from the text, that this is soon forgotten by the reader."

Unless one makes careful note of Quenstedt's arguments, one often see ^{all} no progress of thought, or at best one sees much irksome, monotonous repetition. The consideration of every problem, no matter how seemingly remote from the principal argument, was necessary in order to thoroughly refute every and any heresy standing in the way of a convincing proof of the Thesis. German scholars are very thorough, and therein lies their great strength and worth.

"But its great service was its vtilization of dialectic art and of logical categories for scholars and for the development of education to the present day."

Quenstedt's scholastic (Aristotelian) terminology, and thoroughness gave rigor and preciseness to his doctrine, permitting no compromise or loophole in any single argument. Such preciseness of doctrine naturally discouraged heresies within the Lutheran Church. Since all the great Lutheran dogmaticians of that time were of the same stamp as Quenstedt, it is no wonder that the pure inheritance of the Lutheran Church from Luther was preserved in those days, and transmitted to the present day in all its pristine purity and beauty.

The following opinions are substantially correct, and are worthy of mention because they characterize Quenstedt's scholastic tendencies in brief, but very comprehensive words.

The "Realencyklopaedie fuer protestantische Theologie und Kirche", vol. XVI, p. 382, offers the following opinion:

"Die formalistisch secierende Analyse, welche statt den dogmatischen Gedanken von innen heraus zu entwickeln, nur auesserlich an demselben operiert, hat hier den hoechsten Grad erreicht, und so wird auch den polemischen Bedenken mehr durch auesserliche Distinktionen begegnet, als aus dem Begriffe der Sache heraus."

Schaff-Herzog^{Vol. X, p. 276.} on "Quenstedt", says in a very terse way about the life and great work of Quenstedt:

"Quenstedt represents the old orthodox reaction after the period of reconstruction had set in; the fruit of his thirty years of work in the (Wittenberg) University lectureship was published in his Theologia Didactico-Polemica, a work according to the strictest standard of Lutheran orthodoxy, based upon the Theologia Positiva Acroamatica of J. F. Koenig, characterized by external dogmatization instead of a development of the subject from within, and abounding in artful scholastic refinements."

Meusel's "Kirchliches Handlexicon",^{Vol. 5, p. 481.} after giving a very thorough sketch of Quenstedt's life, says the following:

"Quenstedt's System (ist) ein vielgliedriger und ueberaus schwerfaelliger Bau, scholastischen Characters..... Es herrscht auch hier die formalistische Weise, jeden Lehrsatz in seine einzelnen Bestandteile zu zerlegen, die entlegensten Dinge zur Begrueundung oder Widerlegung heranzuziehen..... und so an die Stelle eine aus der Tiefe der Schrift geschoepten Entwicklung des Ganzen ein dem Einzelnen sich zuwendendes, demonstrierendes Beweissfahren zu setzen, das schliesslich doch zu keinem innerlich ueberwindenden Gesamt-

eindruck verhilft."

Meusel's last statement that Quenstedt's "Beweissfahren...schliesslich doch zu keinem innerlich ueberwindenden Gesamteindruck verhilft", is quite true. But it must be borne in mind that a study of Quenstedt's^{1's} argument requires careful notes. If notes are taken, the great mass of material resolves itself into a few primary thoughts that constantly recur, but from different viewpoints.

In order to illustrate the dogmatical system of Quenstedt's Polemica, a rather **detailed** presentation of Question II, "Who has the Right of Choosing and Calling Ministers?", is herewith given.

" Status Controversiae.

The question is not concerning the immediate, but the mediate call. The question is, Who are those men through whom the mediate call ought legitimately and in right order to be made ?

Thesis.

- I. Distinguish between the autocratic right of call of God in mediate ^{-iate} and immediate calls, and the delegated right belonging to the whole church.
- II. Observe, the church consists of three parts - bishops and presbyters; magistrates; the people. Each part has its own sphere in the call, and can't be excluded.
- III. Observe, each part has its own functions - the priests examine and ordain; the magistracy nominates, presents and confirms the called and examined; the people call, confirm by vote and elect.
- IV. Distinguish between call and ordination; the call belongs to the whole church; ordination belongs to the presbytery alone.
- V. Observe, for preventing contentions in election of Bishops and Presbyters, a consistory of clergy and honored citizens is established, which inquires into the life, morals and knowlege of candidates. In Electoral Saxony there are three consistories.

Antithesis.

- I. Papists, **who** according to the Council of Trent, refer the call to the clergy alone (Papo-Caesarate), not dependent on the vote of the magistracy and people.

- II. Donatists, Socinians and Anabaptists, who would abolish all civil authority, and hence refer the call to the people alone.
- III. Arminians, who refer the call to the magistracy alone (Caesaro-Papate). Also most Calvinists.
- IV. Batavian Calvinists, who give almost no power to the consistories.

Theseos Bebaiosis.

We prove our Thesis from (I) Holy Scripture and reasons deduced from it. (II) Apostolic examples. (III) Practise of the early church.

I. Holy Scripture and reasons deduced from it.

- (a) Giving of the keys to the whole church, Math. 16, 19; 18, 18.^{18.}
- (b) The trying of teachers and spirits by the whole church, Math. 7, 15; John 5, 39; 10, 27; Gal. 1, 9; 1 Thess. 5, 19. 21.
- (c) The appellation of ministers -- are called ministers of the church, 1 Cor. 3, 21. 23; 2 Cor. 1, 24; 1 Pet. 5, 23. Therefore they should be called by the whole church.
- (d) The benefit of the hearers. He teaches all, and ought to be called by all. If he needs a good reputation from those without, much more from those within, 1 Tim. 3, 7.
- (e) The names of the church - a royal priesthood, 1 Pet. 2, 9; Christ's bride, John 3, 29; given the oracles, Rom. 3, 2, sacraments and keys, Math. 16, 19; 17, 18.

II. Apostolic examples.

The whole church chooses, Acts 1, 23; 6, 3-6; 14, 23; 15, 22; 1 Cor. 16, 3; 2 Cor. 3, 19. Titus was chosen ("Cheirotontes").

III. The practise of the early church.

Shown by decrees of councils, testimonies of fathers and proved examples of legitimate call (even Leo P. chosen by all).^{a. 11.}

Ekdikesis.

I. (a) Bellarmin on Math. 16, 19 says, "Peter received the keys for the benefit of the whole church, but he was to hand them down to his successors."

Response; Peter accepted the keys for the benefit of the whole church and use of the whole church, not the use of the clergy alone. Peter is only the steward of the keys, not the owner. The whole church is the owner.

Bellarmin on Math. 18, 18, "The church is made up of prelates and not of people. 'Tell it to the church' means ^{to} it to the prelates."

Response; He can't prove that "the church" refers to prelates only for there is no such distinction in the New Testament. Hearers are an essential part of the church.

(b) Bellarmin on the trying of teachers, says, "The people should discern, but on the basis of what other pastors preach and what the Roman See declares."

Response: The Bereans discerned on the basis of Scripture. Bellarmin says, "The people are commanded to obey their pastors, Luke 10; Math. 23."

Response: But only when in accord with Scripture.

Bellarmin says, "The people can't depose, merely shouldn't listen to false pastors."

Response: The church calls and removes pastors.

(c) Bellarmin says, "Bishops are called ministers of the church, because they are to rule and not to obey the church."

Response: 1. A call by vote of the people and the respect to pastors are not opposed to each other. The people should obey, but should also call.

2. Pastors are ministers of the church and of God also. Diakonia excludes "Despotiken Kurioteta". Christ retains "Ten Archen" to himself, John 13,13; Math.23,8, but commands and entrusts "Diakonian" and "Oikonomian" to pastors.

II. Bellarmin on the Apostolic examples says:

(a) "In the election of Matthew, Peter required the vote of the church by concession, not necessity."

Response: The text proves otherwise. Peter recognized the right of all to call.

(b) "Acts 1,12 does not describe an election as much as a ^{mand.} demand."

Response: God, through the church, commanded the election and guided the lots, and the church approved of the choice.

(c) "A rule can't be made from one single example."

Response: In the Bebaioosis we gave many examples.

(d) "Acts 6,5, teaches that the deacons are elected by the church, but it does not prove the divine right of the procedure."

Response: Otherwise the Apostles would not have permitted it

(e) "I Tim.3,7-done by the indulgence of the Apostles."

Response: In I Tim.3,3.7, Paul exhorts the people to choose men with a good reputation.

(f) "The Apostolic examples do not treat the call of Bishops, but of Deacons, the superintendents of the poor."

Response: (1) These Deacons excelled in teaching-^{Acts 7.} Stephen,

(2) Both Bishops and Deacons had to be "Cheirotontes" and "Marturoumenoi" and have a good reputation outside of the church.

Bellarmin replies, "Cheirotonein" has a two-fold meaning, to elect by any method whatever,

and to ordain by the laying on of hands."

Response: The native force of the word, "Cheiros Tenein", "Assent by raising hands", and its use in the New Testament, Acts I4,23; 2 Cor.8,I9, refutes Bellarmin's objection.

III. The answer to all the objections raised by Bellarmin and against the "Practice of the Early Church." others, is found in Gerhard's "Locci."

Objectionum Dialysis.

I. Bellarmin and Utenbogard say, "Aaron was elected to the priesthood without the consent of the people, Lev.8,I."

Response:

- (a) The call of Aaron was immediate, and the people had no right to vote on it.
- (b) Aaron was chosen by God and publicly installed by Moses.
- (c) Moses was a "princeps". Therefore a call pertains also to "principes".
- (d) An unusual fact can't be made an example.

II. Observe, It is not a valid conclusion that ministers are today called in the same way as Christ called the Apostles-without vote of the people, for then all pastors would have to be called immediately and would be apostles. "Sicut" in Joh.20,21 does not denote absolute equality, but an agreement in another mode of comparison. "Just as" God sent Christ, with gifts, to teach, so Christ sent his apostles.

III. Distinguish between an established and an unestablished church. In the former, the people call, Acts I,23;I4,22. In the latter they can't.

VIII. Objection, "The Coucils of Laodicea, Nicea and Constantinople exclude the magistrates and the people from the right to call."

Response:

- (a) The Council of Laodicea elected priests because the ^{peo-}ple had abused the right; but the council was 'nt able ^{to} to abolish the old franchise of the people.
- (b) In the Council of Laodicea, the people is not excluded, but care is taken that the election be not in the hands of the people alone.
- (c) Those canons of Nicea and Constantinople were made ^{when} when the clergy tried to snatch the power for themselves.

IX. Observe, We concede that in apostolic and in ecclesiastical ^{times} times until Constantine, the magistracy had no part in the election. But that was because the magistracy was full of heathen.

X. Objection, "There are many testimonies and examples of the Father ⁻²⁷ against allowing the people to call."

Response:

- (a) The testimonies and objections are not all of the same kind.
- (b) Very few of them indicate general usage.
- (c) We must distinguish between specific and ordinary ^{cases} cases.

XI. Objection, "There are some disadvantages:

- (a) The people are inexperienced and unfit to judge.
- (b) The wicked defeat the good and elect the wicked.
- (c) Popular election is liable to tumults and seditions."

Response:

- (a) Disadvantages? Much more so if only one Bishop or only the clergy has the right to elect the clergy.
- (b) The counsel and consent of the other orders are required ⁻²⁴ Hence this is a vain objection.

IV. "It is not the right of the sheep to call the pastor."

Response:

- (a) The elected is not the pastor of the electors until he has been elected.
- (b) The sheep know the voice of the shepherd from the hireling, and will not follow him-will not choose him.
- (c) Hearers are called sheep, not so much in respect to the pastors who feed them, as to Christ, which shepherd they cannot choose.
- (d) Since the people are called sheep in respect to the pastors, as rational beings, they must be given an equal right of following as irrational sheep.
- (e) Arguments from "disimilia" are not "Apodeiktika."

V. "The apostles occasionally chose bishops without the vote of the people."

Response:

- (a) We have proved the contrary, Acts I;6,I4.
- (b) Because it was done with extraordinary, i.e. apostolic authority and in peculiar circumstances, we can't make it a perpetual and ordinary rule.
- (c) The church sending missionaries also did so by the "Cheirotonia", 2 Cor.6,I9;Acts I;6,I4.

VI. "The inexperienced and power loving people is entirely unfit for such an important work."

Response: The election of Bishops is not the work of the people alone. It is one thing to have a part and another to have the whole right.

VII. Observe; We do not deny that many canons deny the people the right to call, but these canons were made with imperial consent under papal tyranny.

XII. Objection, "Tit. I, 5, Paul gave Titus the power to appoint Presbyters just like a Bishop."

Response:

(a) Even if Titus were director of the entire affair, it does not follow that the consent of the whole church was not required.

(b) Because Titus acted with apostolic authority in the ^{begin-}ning of the church, Bishops can't infer the right to do the same.

XIII. Observe, The three divisions of the church do not have equal authority in every phase-to nominate, call, elect, place, etc., but it is the duty and right of the whole church to dissent from the decision of any division in its respective duty.

Authors.

The opposing authors are mentioned in the Antithesis.

Chemnitz, Loci; Examen-in the locus "de Sacramento Ordinis."

Gerhard, "System"; "Confessio Catholica."

Tarnovius, "Tractatus de Ministerio Ecclesiastico."

Eckhardt, "Pandecta."

Thummius, "Tractatus de Legitima Vocatione Ministrorum."

Giessenses, "Disputationes Theologici."

Brochmann, "Systemata Theologica."

Huelsemann

Calov, "Systemata Theologica."

II. The Dogmatical Method.

According to Aristotle, the four principles of Reality are:
 The Efficient Cause; the Material Cause; the Formal Cause; the Final Cause.^{Causel.}
 These four Aristotelian principles are found in Quenstedt's Didactica.
 Because of the nature of the Polemica, one does not find these four
 Aristotelian principles in the Polemica. Quenstedt's Didactica, there-
 fore, in regard to Method, is truly Aristotelian. Herewith follows the
 portion of the Didactica, about one half of the entire Didactica, when
 epitomized, which contains the four principles of Aristotle.

A. The Efficient Cause.

"Thesis III. The Causa Efficiens Principalis Ministerii is God alone.

Thesis IV. The Causa Minus Principalis Ministerii is the whole church.^{church.}

B. The Material Cause.

"Thesis V. The Materia Ministerii is twofold:

(a) The Materia In Qua (Subjectum).

(b) The Materia Circa Quam (Objectum).

Thesis VI. The Materia Ministerii In Qua (Subjectum) are suitable
 and skilfull persons rightly called.

Thesis VII. The Materia Ministerii Circa Quam (Objectum) is
 Personale or Reale.

Thesis VIII. The Objectum Personale is the flock of God.

Thesis IX. The Objectum Reale are the Divine Mysteries and Church
 Discipline."

C. The Formal Cause.

"Thesis X. The Forma Ministerii is the right and authoratative public administration of the Sacred Office.

Thesis XI. The Actus Ministerii Principui are:

- (a) Pure and incorrupt preaching.
- (b) Legitimate dispensation of the Sacraments.
- (d) Right use of the Power of the Keys."

D. The Final Cause.

"Thesis XII. The Finis Ministerii is:

- (a) Ultimus or Principalis--the glory of God.
- (b) Subordinatus and Intermedius--the conversion of man."

The following is an example of curious scholastic argumentation. It is taken from Question III, "Was Luther's Call Legitimate and Ordinary?", *Objectionum Dialysis V*:

"Argumentatur Becanus; omnis vocatus per larvam et figmentum fictus est Ecclesiae minister; Lutherus vocatus est per Sacerdotium Papisticum quod eidem est larva et figmentum; Ergo fictus est Ecclesiae minister. Respondeo. (I.) Major patitur instantias; omne id, quod sit per larvatum et fictum, est fictum: Atqui saepe carnifex larvatus occidit personam illustrem, an igitur, qui occisus, fictus est, vel fecte occisus. (2.) Limitanda igitur major, qui per Sacerdotium Larvatum, qua tale, vocatus est, et tali se larvae assimilatur, is fictus est: Res Dei distinguendae a sordium humanarum affluxu. Sunt quidam in Papatu Ordines mere larvati, primatus oecumenicus, status Cardinalium, Sacerdotium^{-tium} Missificum; Sunt alii, in quibus vile a pretioso distinguendum, nempe Episcopatus et Presbyteriatus, in quo pretiosum est praedicatio Verbi, Catechesis, Sacramentorum Administratio, vile, dependentia a Papa, Missificatio, fermentum doctrinae, etc."

A translation of the above is the following:

"Becanus argues: Every one who is called through the agency of a hypocritical and false institution, is a false minister of the church. Luther was called through the papal priesthood, which (you Lutherans say) is a hypocritical and false institution. Therefore he is a false minister of the church. I respond. (I.) The major premise is resolved by means of examples; everything which comes into being through the agency of a hypocritical and false institution, is indeed false; but it often happens that a bogus (unofficial) hangman slays a person of noble character. Now, the question is, was the slain man a non-existent being, or was he actually slain, but in an illegitimate manner?"

(2.) The major premise, therefore, must be limited: He who is called through the false priesthood, inasfar as he absorbs into himself its (the priesthood's) false elements, to that extent he is a false priest. Divine things must be separated from the additions of human corruptness. Some institutions in the papacy are out and out deceptions, the ecumenical primacy, the cardinalate, priestly sacrifice of the mass. There are other institutions, in which that which is worthless must be distinguished from that which is valuable, for instance, the Episcopacy and Presbytery, in which the valuable elements are the preaching of the Word, catechization, the administration of the Sacraments, while the ^{worth} worthless elements are, reliance on the pope, sacrifice of the Mass, doctrinal fermentings, etc."

III. THE DOGMATICAL DISCUSSION.

Herewith follows an epitome of Quenstedt's dogmatical discussion, as contained in his Polemica, of Question I, Question III, Question IV, Question V and Question VI. The Didactica and Question II of the Polemica, in point of dogmatics, have been considered under the first division, "The Dogmatical System", pp. 5-6, 18-23.^{-12.}

Question I.

Question I is, "Is a peculiar call necessary to enter the ministry?"

Quenstedt says, "In short, the question between us and the Socinians and Arminians is not concerning the necessity of good order, but the necessity of divine command". "A peculiar call is necessary". "The Forma Ministerii consists of a legitimate call, sacred ordination and decent administration of office". He concedes that every Christian has the right and duty to teach an erring brother the Gospel and to preach in a case of extreme necessity. He then adds, "We must distinguish between Vocationem Immediatam et Mediatam, between Vocationem Mediatam Ordinariam et Extraordinariam. The mediate call is given thru men and is necessary for the ministry and administration of the Sacraments". (Against the Socinians). "The Vocatio Mediata Ordinaria obtains in the Lutheran Church by divine command, I Tim. 3, 2 etc." "The Vocatio Mediata Extraordinaria we find in men raised up by God, such as Luther, who had both calls combined in an unusual manner".

Quenstedt then mentions the errors of the "Schwaermer" of his day: The Anabaptists, who permit all to teach; The Arminians, who say that in an organized congregation there may be a mediate call, but only for the sake of order and not at all by divine com-

mand, and in an unorganized congregation no mediate call is needed at all; the Socinians and Weigelians, who deny the mediate call, saying that a call is of God alone; the Puritans, who deny the necessity of the call; the Quakers, who reject the ministry entirely; the Calvinists, who have no mediate or immediate call, but a third kind of call, in order, as Quenstedt says, to "steal into the ministry".

Quenstedt's Scripture proofs are: Jer. 23,3; John 3,27; Rom. 10,14.15; Heb. 5,14 and II Cor. 5,20 and many other passages, which by deduction prove the Thesis. In the *Exdikesis* he defends these Scripture passages against the "Trivoltous interpretations, distortions and perversions of the heterodox". Almost all the counter-interpretations of the heterodox betray a startling disregard of exegesis and logic.

In the *Objectionum Dialysis* he refutes the abundant objections of the heterodox, some of which are: 1. A good work requires no special call. Any Christian can perform a good work. The preaching of the Gospel is a good work. Ergo. 2. It is a good work to desire to be a Bishop. Therefore a call is not necessary. 3. Aquila and Priscilla, private persons, instructed Apollos. 4. All believers are Kings and priests.

Question III.

Question III is, "Was Luther's call legitimate and ordinary?"

Quenstedt says, "Luther's call was legitimate, h.e. according to the prescription of God's Word." He then mentions the startling fact that it was not until after the Reformation had gotten well under way that the Papists, Anabaptists and Enthusiasts began to question Luther's call.

His historical arguments are the following:

1. In 1507 Luther was ordained Presbyter by his Bishop.
2. In 1508 Luther was called to the Presbytery and Professorship in the church and University of Wittenberg by John Staupitz with the consent of Elector Frederick the Wise. His call said, "Vestrum est, legem divinam interpretari et librum vitae docere".
3. In 1512 he was given the imperial and pontifical authority, thru the Augustinian assembly, to dispute and lecture anywhere.

His external arguments for the legitimacy and divinity of Luther's call are:

1. Luther was called forth by God in a peculiar manner to oppose and reveal the Antichrist.
2. He was adorned with excellent and unusual gifts before all others. Quenstedt then quotes:
 Masius, "In una Scriptorum Lutheri pagina plus solidae Theologiae esse, quam interdum in toto libro alicujus Patris."
 Melanckthon, "Fulmina erant linguae singula verba tuae."
3. Luther's literary work.
4. Luther had the gift of prophecy.
5. Luther was preserved in a marvelous manner from all the treacheries of his adversaries.
6. Luther was always unperturbed in the greatest dangers.
7. Luther's work was brought to a most amazing and successful finish.

The historical and logical objections of the Catholic Theologians, Becanus, Bellarmine, and Ungersdorff, are for the most part ridiculous. There is one objection, however, which is worthy of notice: "Luther was either bound to his oath, or he was not. He was either a perjurer, who violated a valid obligation, or else he bound his conscience to an invalid obligation." Quenstedt answers this objection thus:

1. "Luther was, and was not validly and truly obligated to his oath. He was, because he swore ^{not} to teach any vain and foreign doctrines, or those condemned by the church as impious, scandalous and offensive to pious ears."
2. "He was not, because he did not swear blind obedience. He did not swear obedience to the Roman Church inasfar as it was anti-Christian."

But the Roman Catholics counter with this objection: "Luther swore not only on the Bible, but also on the decrees of the Pope." Quenstedt answers, "He did not swear on the decrees except on condition, as far as they conform to God's Word, and he rightly rejected those decrees when he later learned to distinguish between them and the rules of God's Word."

Some examples of Roman argumentation are the following:

1. "The devil was Luther's master because he afflicted Luther with the severest temptations." Quenstedt replies: "If so, the devil was also the master of Christ in the wilderness, and of Paul, 2 Cor. 12,17."
2. "Luther received his doctrine of abrogating the Mass from the devil."
3. "There is no scripture passage stating that Luther was sent to reform the Church."
4. "Luther was marked with public infamy because he married a nun."

Question IV.

Question IV is, "Is there a true church order in the Lutheran churches?"

Quenstedt's answer is unqualifiedly "Yes". He opposes the Papist theologians, Bellarmine, Becanus and Reihingius, who deny that Lutheran ministers are legitimately called and ordained. They make two major contentions;

1. "By divine right, bishops are superior to presbyters, both as to order and jurisdiction."

To this Quenstedt answers that the distinction is of human institution alone, and not at all of divine and canonical authority.

2. "By divine right bishops alone can ordain."

To this Quenstedt answers that it is not of divine institution, because the Papists themselves admit that by arrangement of the Apostles, presbyters ordain^{ed} priests, 1 Timothy 4,14; Acts 9,17; and Ananias, who was not a bishop, layed^{hands} on Paul, Acts 22,12.

Moreover, it is not of canonical institution because presbyters, in defect of bishops, have ordained presbyters both in the Greek and Latin churches in all ages. This is shown by the fact that it was so in the time in the council of Florence; by the fact that the council of Trent did not condemn it and by the fact that the present Papal Archbishops of Germany do not ordain by their own hand.

Having disproved these two major contentions, Quenstedt proceeds to disprove the minor contentions of the Papists:

1. "Your ministers are not called by the Pope or his bishops who alone can call."

Quenstedt answers that the right to call belongs to the whole church.^{church.}

2. "You do not have the apostolic succession."

Quenstedt replies, "There is a personal and doctrinal succession".

"The doctrinal succession alone is necessary and sufficient. Our

25.
ministers have never lacked it. The personal succession is not everlasting in such a way that where there is no personal succession there is no doctrinal succession."

3. "Your ministers are not ordained by bishops and are not ordained."

Quenstedt replies that presbyters also have the right to ordain.

4. "Your ministers are not sent immediately by God."

Quenstedt replies that such is neither the claim of the Lutherans, nor in fact of the Papists themselves. He says, "The immediate call is but one species of a legitimate call....It is not valid to deny the genus (call) from the denial of the species (immediate call)".

His proofs from the Word of God and deductive reasoning are the following:

1. In whatever church, according to example of the Apostles and the early church, suitable men are ordained by presbyters and with the consent of the magistracy and vote of the people, there there is a true church-order. The Lutheran churches have all these. Ergo.
2. Those whom the church calls to preach the Gospel and administer the sacraments, according to 1 Timothy 3,2-5, and ordains them, and they preach the Gospel faithfully, they are legitimate ministers of the Word. The Lutheran ministers preach the Gospel faithfully. Therefore they are legitimate ministers of the Word.
3. The hypothesis of the Papists admits a true ministry where there is a true dispensation of the sacraments. The Papists admit that our baptism is legitimate. By inference, our Sacrament of the Altar is legitimate. In the Lutheran churches, therefore, there is a true dispensation of the sacraments. Therefore we have a true ministry."

Question V.

Question V is, "Do ministers of the church have the power to forgive sins?"

In the status controversiae Quenstedt says, "The question is not concerning:

1. The autocratic or authoritative power, but the organic and ministerial power.
2. The instrument of necessity, but of free will.
3. The nature of the person of the minister, but the nature of the ministry itself.
4. The declarative and significative, but effective power.

In the Thesis he says, "Church ministers have the power to forgive sins, not only ἰσορρακῶς, declaratively and annunciatively, but also effectively, and yet ἰργακῶς.

In the Antithesis he refutes the Calvinists who say that ministers can't forgive sins not even "organice", but only sacramentally and by metonymy; the Enthusiasts, Schwenkfeldians, Weigilians and Anabaptists, who deny in genus that the ministry is the medium of conferring faith and salvation; the Socinians and Arminians who say that ministers can't reverently forgive sins "organice", but only "significative" and "declarative".

In the Objectionem Dialysis he refutes the Photinians who declared that the power of the keys was given to the Apostles alone and the authority died with them.

In the Theséos Bebaiosis he proves his Thesis from:

1. The power of the keys, Mt. 16,19; 18,18.
2. The attributes of preachers, Dan.12,3; Luke 1,77; Acts 26,18; Luke 1,16; 1 Cor.4,15; 9,1; Phil.5,10; Gal.4,19; Rom.11,14.
3. Christ's statement, Luke 10,6, "He that heareth you heareth me." ^{me.}

He says, "God alone forgives sins magisterially, principally --- but God in his magisterial absolution uses the ministry of men." "The blasphemy that Christ before his resurrection did not have the power to forgive sins, is expressly refuted in Mt.9,6; 2,10; Lk.5,24."

Question VI.

Question VI. is "Can ministers Marry and Live in Marriage?"

The Papists give the Status Controversiae thus: "The Apostles themselves not only observed continual continence, not because of divine command but partly from the counsel of Christ and partly of free will, but also persuaded and declared that other ministers should be celibate."

Quenstedt's Thesis is, "Marriage is divinely conceded to priests as to other men. It can't be forbidden then. Celibacy ought not to be imposed on them as necessary."

In the Ekthesis he says, "We do not discourage Celibacy, but we do fight against the indiscreet placing of the yoke of celibacy upon all priests." He then gives a history of celibacy. He shows that in the first three centuries of Christianity bishops and priests married and lived in marriage. At the Council of Nicea, the first step in the celibate movement was taken, for the Council decreed that in the future bishops who were not celibate should not be chosen and admitted. The Greek Church in the Trullan Council separated the bishops from their wives. At the end of the fourth century, the Greek Patriarch and Pope Simicius forbade marriage to all, even Presbyters and Deacons. But the decree was relaxed or enforced according to the policy and opinion of the succeeding popes. About 1050 the Synod of Moguntia forever condemned priestly marriage. Hildebrand, Gregory VII, with great violence forced celi-

bacy upon the German Presbyters. "And so finally at a late period, priestly celibacy became a law, but not without many great disturbances. In all the church it has been contradicted in word and deed for eleven centuries."

In the Theseos Bebaioosis he offers a twofold proof: from Scripture and from reason. His Scripture proof is 1 Tim.3,2; 1 Cor.9,5; Hebr.13,4; 1 Tim.4,3. The following is his proof from reason:

1. "That which does not conflict with divine right, public honesty or the dignity of the priestly office, should not be forbidden. The marriage of priests does not conflict with divine right, public honesty, etc. Ergo."
2. "Whatever decree is followed by filthy desires, filthy cohabitations, violation, etc.. is a doctrine of devils."

In the Ekdikesis he answers the false Scripture interpretations of the Papists:

1. On 1 Tim.3,2 and Tit.1,6, Papists say "A bishop ought to have been etc." so that if he has been married he ought not to be kept from the Episcopacy.
Quenstedt answers "It does violence to $\delta\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\iota\psi\alpha\iota$ "; besides the text speaks of the bishop as he who in the present tense "rules" his house and "has" his children in subjection."
2. On Hebr.13,4 the Papists say "If marriage is honorable for all, so is also the marriage of blood relatives in the first and second degree, and the marriage of adolescents without parental consent."

Quenstedt answers that Lev. 18 and the Fourth Commandment

forbid such marriages but there is no Scripture forbidding priestly marriage.

In the Objectionem Dialysis, Quenstedt refutes the objections of the adversaries:

1. "Tit.1,4,8, requires that a bishop should be "σωφρονα"; ^{ἐγκρατῆς} "ἐγκρατῆς" i.e. refraining from the sexual act."

2. Quenstedt answers that "σωφρονα" per se never denotes a married man; "ἐγκρατῆς" never means perpetual chastity.

3. "2 Tim.2,4 says that a soldier does not tangle himself with worldly affairs. Soldiers left their wives when they went to war. Soldiers of God should do the same."

Quenstedt replies that Paul warns against any marriage which would prove a curse and hindrance to the Christian soldier. A marriage is such if it causes a Christian soldier to neglect the worship of God. That it is not a curse and hindrance per se is shown by the fact that the Old Testament priests, God's soldiers, were married. Moreover the whole church is spoken of as the church militant. If marriage were a curse and a hindrance per se, no Christian could marry.

4. "1 Cor.7,5 commands married men to cease from knowlege for a time by mutual consent, in order to devote themselves to prayer. Priests ought to devote themselves to prayer every day. Therefore they ought to observe perpetual continence."

Quenstedt replies that Paul is not speaking of common daily prayers, but of special prayers in time of calamity. "Paul does not command. He counsels and approves that they do so."

4. "1 Cor. 7, 32 says celibates care for the affairs of Christ, and adhere to God without distraction."

Quenstedt replies that Paul is speaking of that peculiar time of persecution, and is speaking not only of priests but of all Christians.

5. "Numerous councils command celibacy."

Quenstedt replies, "Councils which decree anything contrary to God's word are rightly rejected."

IV. A Dogmatical Comparison with Walther's "Kirche und Amt."

Thesis I

Walther says in his first thesis, "The holy office of preaching (Predigtamt) or the ministry (Pfarramt) is not identical with that of the priesthood of all believers."[†]

In his proof from the Scripture, Walther says, "Although the holy Scripture testifies that all believers are priests (1 Pet. 2,9; Rev. 1,6; 5,10), yet it expressly teaches that in the church there is an office to teach, to shepherd, to rule, etc., which the Christians because of their common calling (allgemeiner Christenberuf) do not have."

Quenstedt's entire *Questio I* (Is a Peculiar Call Necessary to Enter the Ministry?) treats of the necessity of the call, and hence of the proper distinction between the universal priesthood of all believers and the public ministry. He admits that every Christian has the duty of teaching an erring brother, but shows that private instruction and public teaching are two entirely different activities. He also admits that in the case of extreme necessity any Christian can teach. He opposes the Anabaptists, who permit any and every Christian to teach; the Socinians, who deny the necessity of a peculiar and mediate call; and teach that ordinarily, not in extreme necessity, any Christian, out of love to his neighbor, or for the sake of order, like St. Paul, can administer the sacraments and teach publicly. He opposes the Arminians who deny that only a called minister of the Gospel may preach publicly or administer the sacraments. He rejects the Weigilians and Puritans who deny the mediate call, declaring that God alone can call. He opposes the Quakers, who reject the ministry entirely. He rejects the inner call of the Calvinists, stating that it is but a sly method of stealing into the ministry.

† Ebenezer p. 152.

Thus Quenstedt recognizes the priesthood of all believers, but requires a special call into the ministry and so makes the proper distinction between the universal priesthood and the public ministry. In the Polemica, Question I, Objectionem Dialysis, Thesis VIII, he says tersely, "It does not follow that since believers are called priests and kings, they can preach without a call, for they are spiritual kings and priests, 1 Pet. 2,9".

Quenstedt's discussion of this question embraces almost every important statement that Walther has adduced from the writings of Luther and other early Lutheran teachers on this particular question. In fact, the same can be said of every one of the following ten theses. His Scripture proofs are very numerous.

Thesis II

Walther says, "The office of preaching (Predigtamt) or the ministry (Pfarramt) is no human institution, but an office instituted by God himself."

Quenstedt in his entire Question I (Is a Peculiar Call Necessary to Enter the Ministry?), proves that a call into the ministry is necessary by divine command. He thus considers the call into the ministry and the ministry itself as divine institutions. He says tersely in his Didactica, Thesis III, "The efficient principle cause of the ministry is God alone", and then adduces those Scripture passages which ascribe the ministry first to ^{to the Holy Trinity, then to the} God the Father, thereafter to God the Son, and last to God the Holy Spirit. Walther on the other hand adduces 1) the prophecies of the prophets declaring God's will to give shepherds and teachers. 2) The passages in

which Christ calls the Apostles to the ministry. 3) The passages which consider the mediately called as called of God. 4) The passages in which the Apostles consider the mediately called servants of the church as their equals. It is also interesting to note that Walther quotes twenty Scripture passages, while Quenstedt quotes nine-teen and that twelve passages are common to both.

Thesis III

Walther's Thesis III reads as follows: "The establishment of the office of the ministry is not optional, but is divinely enjoined upon the church, and until the end of days the church is ordinarily bound to honor it."

In his proof from God's Word Walther says, "Christ says, Matthew 28, 19.20, "Go ye therefore," etc. From this it is clear that by Christ's command, the ministry of the Apostles should endure until the end of days; but for this to come to pass, the church must until the end of days continually establish the orderly public ministry."

Quenstedt in his Polemica, the entire Question I, considers the call into the ministry and the ministry itself as divine institutions. He says, "The Lord sends laborers into his harvest, and hence as long as the harvest lasts, Math. 9, 38", "The ministry of reconciliation, 2 Cor. 5, 18.20, lasts until the end of the world. Hence also the ambassadors."

Thesis IV.

Walther's Thesis IV reads, "The office of the ministry is no separate holy estate, like the Levitical priesthood, standing out as more holy than the common estate of all Christians, but an office of service."

Quenstedt's entire Question II, "Who has the right of choosing and calling ministers of the church?", is concerned with disproving the Roman Catholic contention that the clergy alone has the right to choose and call ministers. In the Exdikesis he refutes the various misinterpretations of Scripture by Bellarmine. Bellarmine on Matthew 16,19, declares that the power of the keys belonged to Peter and his successors only, not to the whole church, to which Quenstedt replies that Peter was not the owner, but the mere steward of the keys. On Matthew 18,18 Bellarmine says, "The church is made up of prelates and not of the people." "Tell it to the church, therefore, means, Tell it to the prelates." Quenstedt replies that Scripture never makes such a distinction between the clergy and the laity, since the laity is ~~also~~ a part of the Church. On the various passages in which Christians are urged to try false pastors, Bellarmine says that the people should do so only on the basis of the judgment of the Roman See. Quenstedt disproves this statement with the example of the Bereans, who judged on the basis of Scripture. Bellarmine says, "The people can't depose false teachers. Their duty is merely not to hear false teachers." To this Quenstedt replies that it is the right and the duty of the whole church to call and depose. Bellarmine says, "The people are commanded to obey their pastors;" to which Quenstedt replies, "But only when in accord with Scripture". Bellarmine says, "Bishops are called ministers of the church because they are to rule and not to obey the church." To this Quenstedt answers, "DIAKONIA excludes DESPOTIKEN KURIOTETA. Christ retains TEN ARCHEN for himself, but commands and intrusts DIAKONIAN KAI OIKONOMIAN to his ministers."

Thus Quenstedt disproves the Roman Catholic teaching that the clergy is a more holy estate than the laity; for that reason the clergy alone has the right to call and depose ministers, to exer-

cise the power of the Keys, to judge false doctrine; and that because of Scriptural command it is the clergy's part to rule, and the laity's to obey. Quenstedt's attack on the hierarchical tentacles of the Roman octopus are very vehement and effective.

Thesis V.

Walther says, "The office of the ministry has the power to preach the Gospel and to administer the Holy Sacraments and the power of Spiritual jurisdiction."

Quenstedt, in his Didactica, Thesis XI, tersely enumerates the "Principal acts of the ministry" as "1) Pure and incorrupt preaching. 2) The legitimate dispensation of the Sacraments. 3) The right use of the power of the Keys." The first two acts are treated at quite sufficient lengths in Question I, "Is a peculiar call necessary to enter the ministry?", and Question IV, "Is there a true church order in the Lutheran Churches?" The third act is the subject of the entire Question V, "Do ministers of the Church have the power to forgive sins?"

Thesis VI.

Walther says, "The office of the ministry is conferred by God thru the congregation, as possessor of all church power or the Keys; and by the congregation's divinely prescribed call. Ordination, with laying on of hands on those called, is not a divine institution, but an Apostolic, ecclesiastical rite and only a public, solemn attestation of such call".

In regard to the first point, Walther quotes Quenstedt, who says, "The principal efficient cause of the ministry is God alone". "The lesser principal cause is the whole church". Walther further quotes Question II, "Who has the right of choosing and calling

and calling ministers?", which entire question declares that it is the right of the entire congregation to call; not of the clergy alone.

In regard to the second point, that ordination is not a divine institution, but an Apostolic, ecclesiastical rite and only a public, solemn attestation of the call, Quenstedt is silent. He seems to consider ordination as divinely commanded and sanctioned by Apostolic use. But his view of Ordination may perhaps be explained in much the same way as Walther, "Kirche und Amt", p 201, explains Luther's view on Ordination. Walther says, "Indem Luther sagt, das Auflegen der Haende ist keine Menschensatzung, so will er damit nur dem mittelbaren Beruf zum Kirchenamt, welcher eben gewoehnlich durch Haendeauflegen geschieht, die goettliche Einsetzung vindiciren".

Thesis VII.

Walther's Thesis VII reads as follows: "The Holy ministry is the power conveyed by God thru the congregation, as the possessor of the priesthood and all church power, to administer by public consent, in public office, the rights of the spiritual priesthood."

Quenstedt in Question II, "Who has the right of calling and choosing ministers of the church", vehemently attacks the Romanist contention that the clergy alone has the right to call ministers; to exercise the power of the Keys; to judge false doctrine and depose false teachers; that the laity must obey the clergy in all things because of divine command. Quenstedt refers all these rights and duties to the entire church. It is difficult, however, to judge whether Quenstedt had a clear-cut judgment on this question. The entire church, in his judgment, consists of the clergy, the magistracy and the laity. To each of these classes there belong certain special duties. Thus it is the ministry's duty to examine and ordain the candidates; the magistracy's to nominate, present and

confirm the called and examined; the people's to call, and confirm by vote and election; but he adds, "to prevent contention in the election of Bishops and Presbyters, a consistory of clergy and honored citizens is established which inquires into the life, morals and knowledge of candidates. In Electoral Saxony there are three consistories". Because of the vote of the Magistracy and the Consistory in congregational affairs, it is difficult to state Quenstedt's teaching on this question whether the ministry exercises the public Priesthood only by delegation of the congregation. He does say, however, that in extreme case of necessity, any Christian may preach the Gospel.

Thesis VIII.

In his Thesis VIII Walther says, "The office of the Ministry is the highest church office in the church, and the source of all other offices in the church." In his proof from Scripture, Walther says further, "With the Apostolate the Lord has instituted only one office, which comprehends within itself all church offices, and thru it the congregation of God is to be taken care of in every respect; the highest office is the ministry, to which also all other offices are entrusted; every other public office in the church is a part of it or an auxiliary office, subordinate to the ministry, whether it be the office of elders, who do not labor in the Word and doctrine (I Tim. 5,17), or the office of ruling (Rom. 13,3), or the Diaconate (Office of Service in narrower sense), or whatever offices in the church may be entrusted to special persons for special superintendence."

Quenstedt does not say expressly that the ministry is the highest office and the source of all other church offices. Rather does he give the impression that he accepts the peculiar mixture of church and state of his time, which he indicates by his consent to

the voice of the Magistracy and Consistory in ecclesiastical affairs. He mistakenly says that in the Apostolic and primitive church there were three distinct orders of ministers and some were divinely ordained, but that all had the same power in the preaching of the Gospel, administering of the Sacraments and Keys, and this because of ancient custom, wherefore the Lutheran churches retain this ancient distinction between ministers, viz. Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons (Didactica, Thesis XIV.).

Quenstedt vehemently opposes the Romanist contention that by divine right Bishops are superior to Presbyters, both as to order and jurisdiction, declaring that the distinction is a human distinction alone. He moreover refutes the Romanist contention that Bishops alone may ordain, by proving that Presbyters, in Apostolic times, ordained. (The entire ^{of Section V,} **EXTHESIS**, "Is there a true church order in the Lutheran churches?") He thus proves that by divine and canonical right there is no difference between the Episcopacy and the Presbytery. He error consists in supposing that the Scriptural Bishops and Presbyters refer to different officials of the Church, whose rank and jurisdiction are greater and lesser respectively, yet, however, merely by Apostolic and primitive ecclesiastical usage, not at all by divine institution. He seems also to suppose the Deacons to have been of equal power and authority with the Bishops and Presbyters.

Thesis IX.

Walther says, "To the Holy Ministry there is due honor and unconditional obedience whenever the minister applies the Word of God; nevertheless, the minister may not exercise dominion in the Church; he, therefore, has no right to make new laws, arbitrarily to arrange the adiaphora and ceremonies in the Church, or alone, and without previous knowledge of the whole congregation to impose and

49.
carry out the sentence of excommunication."

Quenstedt vehemently opposes the Romanist contention that the laity must obey the clergy in all things by declaring that obedience is due the clergy only when in speaks in accord with God's word; that "DIAKONIA excludes DESPOTIKEN KURIOTETA"; that "Christ alone has TEN ARGHEN; ministers have the DIAKONIAN KAI OIKONCHIAN" (Question II, Ekdikesis I, "Who has the right to choose and call ministers?")

Quenstedt further opposes the Romanist contention that the power of the Keys, the judging of false doctrine, the deposing of false pastors, and the choosing and calling of new pastors belongs to the clergy alone. (Question II, Ekdikesis I)

Cf. the discussion under Thesis IV.

Thesis X.

Walther in his Thesis X says, "The holy ministry, indeed, has the divine right to judge doctrine; however, the laity also has this right; for which reason laymen have also seat and voice with the ministers in church courts and councils."

Quenstedt opposes Bellarmine's contention that the Scriptural command to try teachers and spirits should be effected by the people only on the basis of what the Romanists preach and the Roman See adjudges. He disproves this contention with the Scriptural example of the Bereans, who searched the Scriptures to ascertain the truth of Paul's preaching. Bellarmine says that the people ~~cannot~~ depose a false pastor because deposing is the privilege and duty of the clergy alone, whereas the people's privilege and duty is merely not to hear false pastors. Quenstedt replies that since the people have the right to determine who should rule over them and to choose and call their own pastors, they also have the right to depose their pastors for false doctrine.

Bellarmino declares that the voice of the people in choosing pastors was merely an Apostolic concession, and not at all a necessary divine condition. Quenstedt replies that the Apostles exhorted the people to choose their pastors, which they surely would not have done had it not been pleasing in God's sight. The objection that the inexperienced and power-loving people is entirely unfit to call pastors, Quenstedt answers by the statement, that the election of pastors is not entirely in the hands of the people, for the advice and vote of the clergy are necessary factors. There are many more objections which Quenstedt ably answers. It must be noted that Quenstedt advocates his "three stations" (State, Church and Home) in the choosing of pastors and in the judging of doctrine. Seemingly, the separation of church and state is not necessary or Scriptural in his eyes - which is due, of course, to his peculiar inheritance and background. It must be noted, however, that Quenstedt advocates that the people also should have a voice and seat in the choosing and deposing of pastors and in the judging of doctrine. Whether he considered the people as entitled to a representation and voice in all ecclesiastical courts and councils may be inferred, but not ascertained, from his discussion.

Bibliography.

Quenstedt, "Theologia Didactico -Polemica sive Systema Theologicum"

Part Four, pp.393-420

Concordia Cyclopedia, p.633

Lutheran Cyclopedia, p.400

Meusel, "Kirchliches Handlexikon", vol.5, pp.481-482

Catholic Encyclopedia, vol.13, p.550 ff.

Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, vol.10, p.267 ff.

"Realencyklopaedie fuer protestantische Theologie und Kirche",

vol.16, p.382 ff.

Walther, "Kirche und Amt", Part Two, "Amt"

Pieper, "Dogmatik", vol.1, pp.172-187; vol.3, pp.501-534

"Ebenezer", pp.140-160