Published to the web **HERE**; Hyperlinks added to individual pages of original book; also references indicated to corresponding pages in the English translated book from *Walther's Works: Predestination* CPH 2018 (“Chapter Two”), in red square brackets [ ]:

German text of 1880 General Pastoral Conference of the Missouri Synod over the doctrine of the Election of Grace, or just Election or even Predestination. The 1881 conference available **here**. Text prepared by BackToLuther using available OCR tools and spending many hours proofreading. Certainly many errors remain. Some spellings were modernized to assist online translation tools such as Google Translate. — First published at this blog post; last edit: **2025-08-20**.

Proceedings

of the

General Pastoral Conference

of the

Synod of Missouri, Ohio and Other States

on the

Doctrine of the Election of Grace.

Chicago, Illinois..,

from September 29 to October 5, 1880.

St. Louis, Mo.

Printing office of the "Lutheran Concordia Publishing House".

1880.

I. N. J.

In September 1880, the following letter was sent to all pastors and professors of the "German Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other states".

Invitation:

Since nothing has yet been done by the Synodical Conference to settle the doctrinal dispute that has broken out over the doctrine of election by grace; since, therefore, nothing else remains for us to do but to seek to restore doctrinal unity at least within our own Synod; since, finally, circumstances do not make a longer delay advisable: therefore, at the request of the Pastoral Conferences of Chicago and St. Louis, the undersigned assumes the responsibility of hereby inviting all pastors and professors of our Synod to an extraordinary general pastoral conference to be held on September 29th of this year in the church of Pastor A. Wagner in Chicago, Illinois.

The course of the proceedings might be this: that it be first ascertained on what they agree, then on what they disagree, and then the difference according to Scripture and Confession (especially Article 11 of the Formula of Concord) be examined, or that theses already submitted to a special conference be submitted to the discussion, or that some other course be adopted which the conference might deem more conducive to accomplishing the purpose of the meeting. Everyone should have the Book of Concord [*Concordia*] in his hands, in both languages.

I have no doubt that his member of our ministry, who has the salvation of our Church or our Synod at heart, will stay away from this important meeting, unless there are obstacles that cannot be removed, and I am confident that the merciful God will not fail to show his mercy. Committed to him!

Stonebridge, Canada, September 5, 1880.

H. C. Schwan.

In accordance with this invitation, these years were present in Chicago on September 29:

I. from the Missouri Synod:

a. the professors:

1. from St. Louis: Dr. C.F.W. Walther, G. Schaller, M. Günther, C.H.R. Lange, F. Pieper.
2. from Springfield: A. Crämer, H. Wyneken, G. Kröning.
3. from Fort Wayne: Dir F. Zucker, Rector G. Schick, F.W. Stellhorn, A. Crull, Conrector R.A. Bischoff.
4. from Addison: Dir E.A.W. Krauß, C.A.T. Selle, K. Brauer, C. E. Häntzschel, Th. Brohm, J. Merkel.

b. the pastors:

1. from the Canada District:

J. C. Borth, A. Ernst, J. Frosch, Chr. Hochstetter. (Total: 4 persons).

2. from the Illinois District:

W. Achenbach, C.A. Brauer, A. H. Brauer, C. Brauer, Th. Buszin, E. Beck, G. W. Brügmann, C. F. Brecht, W. Bohlen, J. E. Baumgärtner, C. Baumann, J. Bergen, W. Bartling, G. Blanken, Th. Biltz, B. Burfeind, F. Behrens, F. Brunn, F. Döderlein, J. Dunsing, J. Drögemüller, E. Göring, A. Detzer, H. Dageförde, W. Dorn, H. Dörmann, H. P. Duborg, C. Eißfeldt, H. F. E. Engelbrecht, F. Erdmann, D. W. R. Frederking, H. F. Früchtenicht, E. G. Franck, J.C.L. Frese, H. Flachsbart, G. Gößwein, P. Gräf, D. Gräf, G. Th. Gotsch, H. F. C. Ch. Grupe, J. G. Göhringer, A. D. Greif, T.J. Große, F.M. Große, H. H. Holtermann, P. Hansen, H.W. Hömann, W. Hallerberg, J.M. Hahn, J. Heyer, L. Hölter, M. Heyer, E. Hieber, G. Johannes, Chr. Kühn, G. Hühn, H. Kowert, L.E. Knief, C.S. Kleppisch, H. Kollmorgen, W. Krebs, F. Karth, O. Katthain, F. Lußky, J. Löschen, F. Lochner, F. Lehmann, F.A.H. Loßner, L. Lochner, G.S. Löber, C.F. Liebe, J.C.H. Martin, E. Martens, H. Meyer, W. Mertner, E.A. Mennicke, B. Mießler, E.L. Mangelsdorf, G.A. Müller, G. Mochel, G.J. Müller, H.F.C. Meyer, H.H. Norden, J.F. Nuoffer, J. Nachtigall, C.M. Otto, W.C.H. Oetting, F. Ottmann, A.C.Th. Ponitz, Th. Pissel, A. Reinke, E. Röder, J. Rauschert, E. Riedel, H. Ramelow, H. Schmidt, J. Strieter, C.G. Schuricht, C. Schrader, F. Schröder, C. Steege, F.H. Siebrandt, H. Sieving, A. Schüßler, E.A. Sieving, F.W. Schlechte, F. Schaller, W. Steffen, L. v. Schenk, A. Sippel, G.A. Schieferdecker, H. Succop, C.A. Trautmann, G. Traub, W. Uffenbeck, H. Weisbrodt, L. Winter, A. Wangerin, F. Wolbrecht, A. Wagner, H. Wunder, H.W. Wehrs, B. Zahn. (Total: 123 persons).

3. from the Iowa District:

J. Aron, F. Besel, J.H. Brammer, ... (Total: 35 persons).

4. from the Middle District:

F.W. Brüggemann, C.E. Bode, J.H. Bethke, ... (total: 67 persons).

5. from the Northern District:

F.W.M. Arendt, H. Bauer, W. Burmester, F. Düver, H. Gose, G.A. Henkel, J.C. Himmler, J.A. Hügli, F. Häuser, H. Jüngel, H. Koch, J. Karrer, G.B. Lange, C. Lohrmann, H. Lemke, J. List, J.F. Müller, K. L. Moll, J.H.P. Partenfelder, C. H. Rohe, F. Sievers, Ferd. Sievers, jun, F. Schmidt, J. Trautmann, H. Torney. (Total: 25 persons).

6. from the Northwestern District:

F.B. Arnold, G.E. Abner, E. Aulich, ... C.M. Zorn …

C.M. Zorn. (Total: 73 persons.)

7. from the Eastern District:

F. A. Ahner, J. P. Beyer, A. Biewend, F. Dreyer, H. Ebendick, C. H. F. Frincke, J. Feiertag, C. J. T. Frincke, W. A. Frey, H. Fick, A. Ch. Großberger, C. Groß, P. Heid, J. G. Hafner, F. T. Körner, A. Krafft, F. König, H. C. A. Kanold, S. Keyl, F. Lindemann, M. Michael, G. Rademacher, E. J. Sander, Cl. Stürken, G. F. Stutz, J. Sieck, M. Töwe, H. Walker, H. Weseloh, C. Zollmann. (Total: 30 persons.).

8. from the Western District:

H. Bartels, H. Bremer, A. Bäpler, H. Birkner, R. H. Biedermann, F. J. Biltz, C. C. E. Brandt, J. M. Bühler, A. Baumhöfener, C. H. Demetro, J. F. Döscher, J. P. Fackler, C. Günther, J. H. P. Gräbner, I. Griebel, K. Th. Gruber, H. F. Grupe, J. Hilgendorf, W. Heinemann, P. H. Holtermann, C. J.'O. Hanser, C. L. Janzow, H. Krause, F. Köstering, E. W. Kahler, E. Lehmann, E. O. Lenk, G. Link, F. W. G. Matuschka, C. G. Mödinger, Th. Mießler, J. A. Mayer, F. Nützel, J. J. Oetjen, C. F. Obermeyer, W. G. Polack, J. A. Proft, F. W, Pennekamp, G. Polack, F. Rohlfing, J. Noschke, O. Spehr, P. Schwankovsky, B. Sievers, C. F. W. Sapper, T. Stiemke, G. Stöckhardt, J. H. Theiß, O. F. Voigt, C. Vetter, H. P. Wille, R. Winkler, H. Wesche, L. Wahl, O. S. Zimmermann. (Total: 55 persons.).

c. Zuhöher *):

Teachers: J. Brase, Ch.H. Brase, G. Käppel, E.A. Zutz.

Parishioners: E.L. Arndt, W.M. Wrocklage, J. Wrocklage, E. Kretzschmar, ... (Total: 20 persons).

II. from other synods of the Synodical Conference:

a. from the Minnesota Synod: Pastor J.H. Sieker.

b. from the Norwegian Synod: Professors: H.A. Preus, J. Ylvisaker, F.A. Schmidt, H.G. Stub. The pastors: O. Juul, C. M. Hvistendahl, C.K. Preus, A. Andersen, A.G. Helgesen, V. Koren.

---

*) See page 8.

c. from the Ohio Synod: Pastors: P. Brandt, H. Henkel, F. Zagel.

d. from the Wisconsin Synod: Professor A.L. Gräbner, Pastor A. Pieper.

According to the signatures, a total of 467 persons were present: 431 persons from the ministry of the Missouri Synod, 20 persons from the audience of the Missouri Synod, and 16 persons from other synods.

Note: These figures would be even higher if all those present had complied with the wish of the conference and entered their names in the lists provided. [p 50]

The meetings of the Pastoral Conference began on September 29, Wednesday morning in the church of Pastor Wagner in Chicago and were concluded on October 5, Tuesday evening. In all there were 11 meetings, all of which began with a short service (singing of a hymn and reading of a Bible passage from the Altenburg Bible) and closed with the Lord's prayer. With the exception of the last two, all the minutes of the proceedings were read out to the conference, corrected by it and finally adopted; the last two minutes were revised by a committee chosen by the conference. In accordance with the decision of the Conference, these minutes are reproduced here word for word, unchanged.

First meeting.

Wednesday morning, September 29.

Pursuant to an invitation extended to all the professors and pastors of the Missouri Synod by the Reverend General President of that Synod, they assembled today at the church of the Pastor A. Wagner, in Chicago, Illinois, to settle the doctrinal dispute which had broken out within the Synodical Conference on the doctrine of election by grace. The first session opened in the usual manner with a liturgical service, during which the 17th chapter of the Gospel of John was read. The assembly then elected by acclamation Mr. [p 51] Pastor J. P. Beyer as moderator, and Pastors J. Fackler (Iowa), J.G. Nützel, A. Krafft and G. Runkel as secretaries. (At a later meeting, Director E.A.W. Krauß was appointed assistant secretary).

In response to the question now raised as to whether it was permissible for "reporters" to be present to report on the proceedings in the newspapers, the answer was given: These meetings are a family matter for our Synod; therefore reporters <pages 8> should be completely excluded. Nor should any conference member have the freedom to go public with reports at this stage. Everything will become public, as bright and clear as the sun; but it is obviously quite wrong to identify a family matter and make it known in the open. It was therefore decided: Nothing of these proceedings should now be published in the newspapers; newspaper "reporters" are therefore not allowed to be present here at all.

To the further question of whether the last part of this decision also included the present members of the audience — insofar as they came from Lutheran congregations — the conference replied: "Some lay people have come here in the hope that they might be allowed to attend the negotiations. Although this was only a pastoral conference, if someone from our congregations had come on the assumption that he would be admitted, it would not be fine to turn him away. The pastors could have taken precautions and told the people at home: We have a matter that the ministry wants to agree on first, so only pastors should be present. Because if one person can be there, then someone else can too, and there could easily be a weak Christian who takes great offense when he sees that the

preachers themselves are not in agreement. But because it would look unfriendly to reject such brethren once they are there, they may attend and behave as Christians who implore God to give them grace to recognize the truth, and do not take offence even if they hear something erroneous being spoken here by men. Accordingly it was decided: Whoever has come here on the condition that he can take part in the proceedings may attend the sessions; but whoever does not belong to the Missouri Synod may, if he wishes to attend the sessions, be so kind as to come forward. This resolution was supplemented by the following: that all such pastors and listeners who come from congregations not belonging to the Missouri Synod and who wish to participate in the proceedings must first register.

A roll was now to be duly read out, and thus the number of members present ascertained; but as too much time would be lost for the actual proceedings by calling the names of the individuals present, it was resolved: that as many sheets of paper should be laid out [**p 52**] as our Synod had districts, one sheet for the audience from the Missouri Synod, and one sheet for the pastors and audience not belonging to the Missouri Synod together; and that each person present should write his name on the sheet in question in the interval between the several sessions.

Finally it was decided that the morning sessions should last from 9:00 to 11:30 and the afternoon sessions from 2:30 to 5:00.

Once these external matters had been dealt with, the conference moved on to its main subject, concerning the doctrine of election by grace.

First, the course of the proceedings was discussed.

In the printed invitation addressed to the pastors and professors, two ways were indicated by which this business could be approached: namely, that it should first be determined on what there was agreement, then on what there was disagreement, and then the difference according to Scripture and confession (especially Article 11 of the Formula of Concord) should be examined; or that twelve theses — already submitted to a special conference, composed by Dr. Walther — should be submitted to the discussion of the above subject. In addition to these two proposed ways, a third was mentioned: that we simply read the eleventh article of the Formula of Concord and, by the grace of God, come to an understanding about the content of this article. For the question is this: whether one side among us or the other side teaches Lutheranism about the election of grace. How do we want to prove this? There is no other way than to see what the Confession teaches. Whoever teaches according to the confession is Lutheran in this, whoever does not teach according to the confession is not Lutheran in this. And as Lutherans we must also start from the premise that our confession is so clear, plain and unmistakable that, if we read it with simplicity, we must necessarily be of one mind; if only we construe nothing into it, put nothing into it, but take it as it stands. This is what we have all happily committed ourselves to in our confession, that we want to stick to it. Whoever therefore departs from the confession, either led to do so by his reason or by authorities, is thereby unfaithful to the Lutheran Church. Therefore, if we take this path, no one can say that we are taking a path by which he is being violated; no one can say that we are attacking the matter in a way that is more favorable to one side than the other. If we do no more than read our Confession as it deals *ex professo* with the doctrine in question, we must come to an understanding; for there is no one among us who does not wholeheartedly subscribe to the Formula of Concord. And if one now sees: Thus has the Lutheran Church spoken for 300 years in her public confession; so, if he has departed from it, he will confess: I have not looked at the matter in the right light; and then God will give grace that we may all look at everything in the right light and be united in the truth. Let us only, as long as we sit here, sigh to God that he will keep us from speaking unbrotherly against one another. And if it happens to one that he is wounded by his flesh, <page 10> others must be all the kinder. And if the [p 53] thought comes into one's heart: This is an unrighteous man who speaks against his convictions, such a thought must be suppressed immediately ; for it is said: Let no man think evil in his heart against his neighbor. And God will help us! He has given us the grace of unity of faith for 30 years; he will not take it away from us in this jubilee year, if only we do not willfully forfeit it.

But while this proposal received the most joyful approval from the majority of those assembled, it was argued that some brethren would perhaps remain unsatisfied if the 11th Article of the Formula of Concord were simply to be used, because this dispute concerned expressions which had been used by the disputing parties, but which are not at all used in this 11th Article of the Formula of Concord. Therefore, if only the Formula of Concord were to be used, with which, of course, both parties claim their agreement, sentences and expressions would be forgotten and omitted here and there which had been used by the disputants and which necessarily required further explanation.

This objection was countered: Once we have agreed on the correct understanding of the Formula of Concord, it will be a small matter to make the right judgment about those sentences and expressions, to come to a clear understanding of the way in which both sides present them; then we will immediately see whether or not the clear teaching of the Confession has been spoken against here or there. Once we are in agreement: This is Lutheran doctrine, then we have won. And if we agree on the content of the confession and we all accept it, then I believe, said the speaker, that it would be repugnant for us to continue to argue about this and that. He is a perfect man who does not miss a word, James 3:2. We do not want to quarrel about words. Of course, if one has made erroneous statements, one must retract them. This must be done. If we have made any statement that does not agree with the Confession, we must repent. This must be done, whether by us or by our dear opponents. If we did not want to do this, then we could cease to be a Synod, and everyone could return to his hut and believe what he wants. I am, concluded the speaker Dr. Walther, by the grace of God, of this mind: If I can be convinced that I am in error, I will be the first to recant what I have said, cursed and condemned.

Further objections were raised against the proposal: If we simply proceed with the 11th article of the Formula of Concord, there is a danger that we will lose too much time by <page 11> becoming too verbose, as the experience of a local conference shows. This Local Conference spent a whole year negotiating that very article of the Formula of Concord and only went through about a third of it. So if the current General Pastoral Conference follows the same path, it will run the same risk of wasting too much time on side issues. It would therefore be much more advisable to base our negotiations on the above-mentioned 12 theses.

But, it was replied, if we want to digress, we can do so with the 12 theses as well as with the 11th article of the Formula of Concord. It is also a fact of experience that, when theses are at hand, much time is spent in criticizing the [p 54] selection of individual expressions, and if much time is lost in this way, the Formula of Concord must be taken in the end, since we must necessarily agree on the right understanding of it. Therefore, it is far better to take the path of the 11th article of the Formula of Concord. Of course, if we do so, we must not be so foolish as to dwell on a point on which we are all agreed. However, it is also possible that we agree on the understanding of a passage, but the opponent does not know how important the understanding of this passage is for other passages, for the Book of Concord must be interpreted by itself, just as Scripture must be explained by Scripture. Everyone is his own best interpreter. For whoever would say that we must interpret the Formula of Concord according to Scripture would be saying that the Formula of Concord cannot be trusted and must first be corrected according to Scripture.

Since apparently all the disputes among us have arisen solely from the different interpretations of the Formula of Concord and there is no one among us who does not want to agree with this confession, the General Pastoral Conference decided to proceed with the 11th article of the Formula of Concord and to negotiate it. At the same time, Pastor W. Achenbach was instructed to read out the first 24 paragraphs of the *Solid Declaration* of the Formula of Concord.

After the latter had been done, Dr. Walther opened the doctrinal hearing by reading out § 1 and 2 again. These paragraphs read as follows:

> 1. 2. "Although among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession there has as yet been no public, vexatious, and widespread controversy concerning the eternal election of the children of God, yet after this article has been the subject of very troublesome controversy in other places, and something of it has been aroused among our own as well, and the theologians have not all spoken in the

same way: therefore, by means of divine grace, in order to prevent disunity and separation among our descendants in the future, as far as it is up to us to prevent **<page 12>** in such matters, we have wanted to place its explanation here, so that everyone may know what our unanimous doctrine, faith, and confession of this article is. Furthermore, the doctrine of this article, when it is derived from and according to the example of the divine Word, cannot and should not be considered useless or unnecessary, much less annoying or harmful, because the Holy Scripture of the article is not found in one place alone, approximately thinks about it, but in many places acts and pursues it thoroughly. Thus, one must not omit or reject the teaching of the divine Word because of misuse or misunderstanding. Rather, precisely for this reason, to avert all misuse and misunderstanding, the correct understanding should and must be explained on the basis of Scripture. Accordingly, the simple summary [**p 55**] and content of the doctrine of this article rests on the following points:"

To this Dr. Walther remarked the following: The first two paragraphs contain nothing that could be a question among us. Perhaps it would be good, however, if we confessed as a whole that we thank, praise and glorify God that He has impelled our orthodox fathers to speak out about this doctrine for the sake of their "descendants". For they expressly say that while all the other articles were drawn up because a dispute had arisen in the Lutheran Church, they had no need to draw up a special article on the election of grace, for no public angry dispute had arisen among them, but only elsewhere. They are referring to the Calvinists. And, they say, it is beginning to smolder (*gliscere*) a little among our people, so that if a false spirit were to blow in, a fire could start. That is why they want to speak out about it. So we thank God that our dear fathers were already thinking of us back then. Now, after 300 years, we enjoy the great grace of having such a means of restoring unity among us on this point as well. For I do not doubt for a moment that this will happen.

We need not stop at these first two paragraphs, because we are all agreed on them. We do not want to discuss the doctrine of the election of grace thoroughly from all sides, but we have come together to heal the wounds that the devil has inflicted on us. That is why we only want to dwell on the points where there is a difference of doctrine.

The General Pastoral Conference then expressed its overall thanks to God, who through our dear fathers has ensured that we already have the right doctrine in our confession, even in this controversial article.

After the conference had thus recognized that there was no difference in the understanding of the first two paragraphs, it decided to take §§ 3-5 together, since they relate to each other like a prefix and a suffix. These paragraphs read as follows:

> 3. 4. "First, the difference between the eternal foreknowledge of God and the eternal election of his children to eternal blessedness is to be diligently noted. Then *praescientia vel praevisio*, i.e. that God sees and knows everything before it happens, which is called the providence of God, is over all creatures, good and evil, namely, that he sees and knows everything beforehand, what is or will be, what happens or will happen, whether good or evil, because before God all things, past or future, are unseen and present. As it is written in Matthew 10[:29]: "Do you not buy two sparrows for a penny? nor do any of them fall to the ground without your Father. And Psalm 139[:16]: Your eyes saw me when I was yet unprepared, and all the days were written in your book that were to come, and there was none of them [p 56]. Again, Isaiah 37:28: I know thy going out and thy coming in, and thy rebellion against me.
>
> 5. "But the eternal election of God *vel pradestinatio*, i.e., God's decree of salvation, is not especially for the pious and the wicked, but only for the children of God, who were chosen and ordained to eternal life before the foundation of the world was laid, as Paul says in Eph. 1: He has chosen us in Christ Jesus and ordained us to adoption."

Dr. Walther commented: "As to the third and fourth paragraphs, we are all agreed that what the Scriptures call election is not a mere foreknowledge on the part of God, not a mere foreknowledge of what is to come. The reason is indicated by the Formula of Concord: "Then *praescientia vel praevisio*, that is, that God foreknows and knows all things before they come to pass, which is called the providence of God over all creatures, good and evil". God foreknows all the destinies of men, the pious and the wicked, he knows every detail. But God's eternal election is not merely such foreknowledge; and the reason given for it is that the election of grace "is only for the children of God, who were chosen and ordained to eternal life before the foundation of the world was laid." I cannot now recognize it in any other way than that here it is most clearly proven that the Formula of Concord only speaks of the so-called election in the narrower sense. For as soon as I speak of election in the broader sense, it is impossible to say that it refers "not especially to the pious and the wicked, but only to <pages 14> the children of God, who were chosen and ordained to eternal life before the foundation of the world was laid". This is my first reason why I am most sincerely convinced that the Formula of Concord speaks of none other than so-called election in the narrow sense. For such an election in the broader sense, according to which those who are not saved are also to be understood by it, is denied in the very words of the Confession quoted. In general, the difference between a twofold election is completely foreign to the Formula of Concord. Only one election of grace is mentioned here.

Professor Stellhorn replied: "The fact that the Formula of Concord does not specifically say that the word "election of grace" can be taken in a different sense can never be proof that this is not possible and has not occurred. And if one distinguishes between election of grace in the narrower and broader sense, this does not by any means result in a twofold election of grace or two kinds of election of grace. Rather, it is the same as speaking of repentance in the narrower and broader sense. Nor are they two repentances. [p 57] Or as one speaks of sanctification in the narrower and broader sense. Nor are these two sanctifications. Or how one speaks of one Prussia, Austria, China in the

narrower and broader sense. Nor are there two Prussias, etc. Such an objection would therefore not be valid at all. But I think, concludes the speaker, that it is not fruitful to speak of it here if one does not take the passage (§§ 13-24) where the concept of the election of grace is developed *ex professo*. We can quite well admit everything we have read here (§§ 3-5); but of course we understand it somewhat differently from the other part.

Dr. Walther: I am firmly convinced that you are living in a delusion. You can now and never again sign § 5 if you say: There is an election of grace in the broader and narrower sense. If you were to sign this § 5, then we could shake hands. But if you sign this paragraph and you stick to your distinction, you are mistaken and wrong.

Pastor Allwardt: Section 5 shows incontrovertibly that we are talking here about the election of the children of God who are truly saved; and as far as persons are concerned, it is impossible to speak of election in the narrower or broader sense. But the question here is: When we speak here of election, and then say that election works this or that, does it mean the act of election, as the dogmatists have used the word, or does it mean everything else that is necessary to bring about the election of grace? In other words, is salvation, conversion, etc., all this included? Now, I believe, we are not far apart on this question; for it has already been conceded in our journals that in §§ 13-24 a complete **<pages 15>** definition of election is given, so that calling, conversion, justification, etc., are included in the concept of election. The difficulty will now be whether these other acts are also included. The eight points (§§ 15-22) are included, we say; and then this is not election in the strict sense, but other acts are included, the result of which is election in the strict sense. Now I would like the brethren not always to reproach us as if we taught two elections. There is only one election, that of the children of God to eternal life; but there is more involved in saving them than the determination: God has decided to to save them.

Prof. Stellhorn: The fact that there is election in the narrower and broader sense is as old as the doctrine of repentance and sanctification in the broader and narrower sense; that is, at least 300 years old. This distinction is not meant to imply that election in the narrower sense is something different from election in the broader sense. If one takes the *term* in the broader sense, I always mean what the *term* in the narrower sense means. Just as when I speak of China in the broad sense, China in the narrow sense is of course also included. Thus, when I speak of the election in the broad sense, the election in the narrow and narrowest sense is always included. If I speak of the election of grace in the wider sense, [**p 58**] I must include the decision: He who believes to the end shall be saved. If, then, I take this decision: He that believeth, etc., and the other of the election of grace in the narrowest sense, this constitutes the election of grace in the broadest sense. And if I add the resolutions that precede it in the Formula of Concord, namely those 8 points; if I add all these resolutions to the resolution that constitutes the election of grace in the narrowest sense, then this is the election of grace in the broadest sense. And it is our conviction that the Formula of Concord needs this expression in the broadest sense. One must take the terms as they are. — If I summarize everything briefly, I say with the dogmatists: The election of grace comprises two parts. The first part is the determination of the general way of salvation: the *ordinatio mediorum* [“designation of means”], or *praedestinatio mediorum* [“predestination of means”]. The second part is the particular election of certain specific persons: the *presdestinatio personorum* [“predestination of persons”] or *praedestinatio electorum* [“predestination of the elect”]. These two points together constitute election in the broadest sense. I say this to show that I subscribe to § 5 with a clear conscience. I do not say, however, that the first provision, *ordinatio mediorum* [“designation of means”], does not also apply to the elect children of God; but

I do say that eternal election does not apply to the wicked according to its second part, but only to the pious. But if I am asked how I can subscribe to this paragraph, I remind you of the doctrine of Christ's person. We <PAGE 16> also say many things about the whole person, but we do not say that they also apply to both natures. As for example: Christ was born of the Virgin Mary. I do not want to say this about His divine nature, and yet I say it about the whole person. So again: I say: I subscribe to § 5 with the best conscience, because I make this distinction, that one and the same election of grace consists of two parts: of the *ordinatio mediorum* and the *ordinatio electorum*. The Formula of Concord speaks here only of the election of grace, not of different elections of grace.

Dr. Walther: It doesn't help. You can't get out of this paragraph for all eternity. It is pure deception. When the Formula of Concord speaks of the election of grace, which "does not apply especially to the pious and the wicked, but only to the children of God who are chosen and ordained to eternal life," you cannot subscribe to this, or you must abandon your whole deduction. You say that the doctrine of the person of Christ can also be done in this way. But from this great mystery of the union of the Godhead and humanity one must not draw any conclusions about other relationships. And it is not true that before the Formula of Concord this distinction was made between election by grace in the broader and narrower sense. But our dear Luther made the distinction between sanctification in the narrower and wider sense as early as 1529. But it does not matter whether the dogmatists made this distinction. They do not speak of the [p 59] election of grace, of which the Formula of Concord speaks, but they speak of something quite different. I am convinced that if you will only realize that we are only dealing here with the election of the children of God who are really saved, you will fall in with the truth, and then we will be together again. Just take a closer look; I would have to deny my reason, indeed that I only understand German at all, if I did not want to see that we are talking here about the election of grace in the narrower sense. And this runs through the whole Formula of Concord.

Here the speaker asked the opponent (Pastor Allwardt): Whether he believed that those who are lost also belong under election? and received the answer, "Indeed, in so far as they are men who are to be saved; but not in so far as they are reprobates. Dr. Walther then declared that it was very gratifying that he admitted the latter; but in the other he was still mistaken.

Pastor Allwardt: We agree that § 5 says that election is only for those who are truly saved. But these people must be redeemed, called, and so on. And this is all God's work alone, as is election. These people must be in God's hands from beginning to end, God must lift and carry them.

And when the Formula of Concord uses the word "election", it includes this. Therefore the difference between us consists only in this: whether the determination of the means (*ordinatio mediorum*) flows from the determination of the persons (*ordinatio personarum*), or vice versa: whether the determination of the persons flows from the determination of the means.

Dr. Walther: That is precisely what we claim. You deny that the election of grace is at the same time a determination to call me and so on. (which is in the 8 points). This all belongs in it; but they don't want that; rather, they want it this way: Man may see how he becomes pious, and then the good Lord says: now you are chosen.

The meeting was then adjourned with the Lord's prayer spoken by the moderator. J. Fackler, Secr.

Second meeting.

Wednesday afternoon, September 29.

After the opening of the meeting, the discussion, which had been interrupted by the noon hour, was resumed.

Pastor Brauer, referring back to what had been said of the election in the wider, narrower, and narrowest sense, said, "Of this the [p 60] Formula of Concord knows nothing. § 5 says what the election is. There is no mention of election in this or that sense. He who makes that distinction must also, by signing the Formula of Concord, say that he so distinguishes. He does not believe the literal meaning of the Formula of Concord. He glosses over it.

Pastor Hochstetter: The concept of election cannot coincide with all people, if one does not want to confuse the concepts. Just look at the Formula of Concord. It does not speak of a general decree of God, but of persons in the particular [*Concreten*]. In this it is consistent. It always refers to persons.

Prof. Stellhorn: There is a difference between election by grace in the broader and narrower sense. There is such a thing. People talk like that. The only question is: In what sense does the Formula of Concord speak of election by grace? Since the election of grace is spoken of in this way, I must, when I have the Formula of Concord before me, see in what sense it speaks of the election of grace. One also speaks of repentance and sanctification in two senses, in a broader and narrower sense. Just as where this word occurs we must examine in what sense it is to be taken, so it is here too. And the Formula of Concord itself says in what sense it understands the word election of grace. It says this quite clearly in what is contained in §§ 13-24. Here it is taught, as § 23 summarizes, that the counsel, purpose [*Fürsatz*] and <pages 18> decree of God also consists in the preparation of salvation in general; but certainly not only in this, but also in the selection of certain persons who will certainly be saved. The well-known 8 points first indicate the means of salvation, then they indicate the persons whom God wants to lead to heaven on this general path of salvation.

Dr. Walther: What is said about the *ordinatio mediorum* (the ordinance of the means of salvation) does not belong here. Just look at § 5. Here the Formula of Concord lays the foundation for the doctrine of the election of grace. It says of election that it only applies to the elect children of God. So what gives the opponents the right to insert their view into this paragraph? If one used to say that one could speak, for example, of Austria in the broader and narrower sense, then that is true; but if it is said: Only the Germans belong to Austria, then we are talking about the narrower Reich. Thus we can also speak

of the election of grace in the wider and narrower sense, indeed, we must do so under certain circumstances; but since the Formula of Concord says that the eternal election of God is only for the children of God, it only speaks of the election of grace in the narrower sense when it speaks of the election of grace. [p 61]

Pastor Fick: Holy Scripture, too, does not contain a single passage that should be understood as if it were speaking of election in the broader and narrower sense. It always speaks of election in the so-called narrowest sense, in relation to certain persons.

Pastor Allwardt: §§ 3-8 obviously do not give a definition of election. Here only the two words *praescientia* ["foreknowledge"] and *praedestinatio* ["predestination"] are compared with each other, and the comparison is made on two sides: 1) with regard to persons; 2) with regard to things. Chemnitz also argues that *the decretum electionis* includes the *decretum redemptionis*.

Prof. Stellhorn: What the Formula of Concord understands by election can only be seen from the part that wants to indicate *ex professo* what is to be understood by it. This is done in §§ 13-24. It is not necessary to start from § 5 and then give a definition, but to begin with § 13. Why should the word "election" not also be understood to include the *ordinatio mediorum*, since the whole is otherwise synecdochically named after only one part? The Formula of Concord itself says that the *ordinatio mediorum* is also included in the election of grace. — It says in § 24: "All this is according to Scripture in the doctrine of" etc. Surely election by grace in the strictest sense cannot be meant here. This obviously refers back to § 15 and the others. It is expressly stated in § 24 "understood", not: This must also be taken into account. Further down it says: "God's decree for salvation". Cf. on this § 23: "And God has in such <page 19> his counsel" etc., namely in the counsel which is synonymous with election of grace in the sense of the Formula of Concord. So he has also prepared salvation in this counsel of his. And consequently, this preparation of salvation is the first part of election of grace; but of course, it is not the only part. In his "*Examen*" Chemnitz describes the election of grace in such a way that he cites the well-known four decrees as "summ". He says not a word about specific persons, about the particular election of specific persons. — In another passage these eight points are mentioned and then it is said: All this must be understood under the election of grace. The persons are also mentioned , but only in the second place. Thus we see that the *ordinatio mediorum* forms the main part of election in the sense of the Formula of Concord. § 5 does not show what the Formula of Concord understands by the election of grace. It only shows [p 62] how far it extends. § 8 then speaks of the election of God as the cause of our salvation. § 9 teaches that eternal election should not be investigated in the secret counsel of God, for such a procedure leads to wrong thoughts. Then follow §§ 10, 11, 12, which indicate the consequences of investigating election in the secret counsel of God. Finally, in § 13 *ex professo*, we are told what is meant by election by grace. This follows from the words: "If one wants to speak with fruit about the election of grace, then one must summarize the whole doctrine of the principle, etc.", as is done in the eight points that conclude with the words: "All this", etc.

Dr. Walther: This does not agree with § 5, which says that the election is for the pious children of God alone. And since this is not true, we cannot accept it. Secondly, it is not the case that the first and principal part of the election of grace in the sense of the Formula of Concord is the *ordinatio mediorum*. The opposite is the case. After the eight points have been enumerated, the Latin text says: "*Et quidem*" etc. If one has presented something and then says: "And indeed", one wants to say: This would be misunderstood if one did not add this. For example, if one says: Our vacant congregations must have preachers, and adds: "and indeed" orthodox preachers, one wants to say: The main thing is not that they get preachers — there are many ventriloquists who only harm the

congregations — but that they get orthodox preachers. This is what the Formula of Concord says: Of course God wants to lead men to salvation by this way; but here the main thing is that God wants to bring his elect to heaven by this way. For in the Latin text *"suorum"* is added to the word "beatitude". The eight points therefore deal with what God wants to do for his own. — Chemnitz had good reason to speak of the election of grace as stated above. The matter is this. In his <page 20> "*Examen*" he also comes to the papists' doctrine that one cannot be certain of his salvation. Chemnitz refutes this. Here he comes to the objection that at least one cannot be certain of his salvation because there is an eternal mysterious election, and now shows at certain points in the doctrine of the election of grace that this does not at all hinder the certainty of salvation. — We must remain simple-minded about the Formula of Concord. Nor must we allow ourselves to be led away from the Formula of Concord by the arguments of later theologians, who are not heretics, but whose disputes are not a commentary on the Formula of Concord. [p 63]

Rector Schick: It must be pointed out with all seriousness that one should not confuse the terms with one another. For election is something else, something else that on which election is based , and something else the way in which God wants to lead his elect to their appointed goal.

Pastor Große: If the distinction of election into a wider and narrower one were correct, one would have to say that the believers of the age are also elected, which surely no one will claim.

Dr. Walther: A synecdoche, as was said earlier, cannot be assumed here. A synecdoche is absolutely impossible where the word "only" occurs. I can say something about a thing that only applies to part of the thing. But as soon as I use the word "only", that's the end of the synecdoche. For example, I can say: Here is a wheat field, even though there are also weeds. But then I cannot say: Here is only wheat. If you look closely at the eight points, this is the result: No. 1. indicates the reason on which the election rests. Nos. 2 ff. show the way in which the elect become partakers of the salvation they have acquired. The ground of election is the reconciliation accomplished and already effected through Christ, because we are elected in Christ, which is why this is also spoken of in the past. Point 1 says: "be reconciled", "have merited". And now there is no mention of those who perish, but of those who attain salvation. That is why it even says in the 8th point: "That he may finally attain them" etc. Indeed, further down are the words: "And God... also decreed that he would preserve them in the way now reported..."

Prof. Crämer: In the eight points it is thus said: God brings out what he has decided about the elect. And this also excludes the distinction of predestination into a broader and narrower one. It is always one and the same election of which the Formula of Concord speaks.

Prof. Stellhorn: The right understanding of what the Formula of Concord teaches about election by grace can, I repeat, only be obtained <page 21> from the passages where it states what it means by it. Now she expressly says in § 24: "All this is ... understood" etc. This is also how § 5 is to be understood. If I take the detailed definition given in §§ 13-24 and proceed from it, [p 64] I see from it how the words § 5: "extend to" (Latin: *"pertinet ad"*) are to be understood. We also speak of one and the same predestination; but this has two objects according to the Formula of Concord: a material one, to which the *media salutis* belong, and a personal one; § 5 speaks of the direct personal object of predestination, §§ 13-24 of the direct material object. The "and indeed" in § 23 is intended to give a more detailed explanation. It is intended to show that the first and principal part of election in the sense of the Formula of Concord is *ordinatio mediorum*. It should also be noted here that it is not the Latin but the German text that is the original. When the German reads: "not only in general prepared for salvation", this

does not mean that it only refers to the preparation for salvation of the elect. The way of salvation is intended for all. This can also be seen from the sayings that follow later in § 65, where it is said that in these sayings the eternal election of God in Christ is revealed. And these sayings, e.g: "So God loved the world" etc., contain nothing other than the general way of salvation. If, therefore, the revelation of the general way of salvation is the revelation of God's eternal election in Christ, then election itself, as an act of God, must consist, if not exclusively, at least in the main part, in the determination and definition of the general way of salvation, or in what those eight points indicate (p. 707. §§ 15-22) and what is described and summarized in § 23 in the words: "prepared in general for salvation". As Chemnitz has done in the "*Enchiridion*", the rsprodatio can be included here quite well, as § 40 shows. See especially the Latin text: *"ita in eodem suo consilio*" etc. — As far as contemporary believers are concerned, it should be noted: The Formula of Concord distinguishes a revealed part of election and an unrevealed part. The revealed part is the *ordinatio mediorum*, the unrevealed part is the election of persons. Only the first part concerns us. We should not concern ourselves with the second. If only the first part concerns us, then, according to the Formula of Concord, the chosen ones for us humans must be those who are on the path to salvation, the believers. Since the believers of the time are also on the path to salvation as long as they believe, we humans must count them among the elect. After all, there is no infallible certainty of election. I do not know whether I am also chosen in the strictest sense. I should believe and hope so.

Pastor Weseloh: Too much emphasis is placed on the *ordinatio mediorum* being the main part of the election of grace. [**p 65**] If this were the case, the most important part of the election of grace would be omitted in **<page 22>** the *Epitome*, where the eight points are not given!

Pastor Brömer: There is no reason to emphasize the "suorum" in § 23 as has been done above. The Latin text of the Formula of Concord only explains the German. But if that little word were so important, it would be a significant defect that it is omitted in the German.

A stranger (to the secretary): Opponents do not distinguish between a thing and the way in which it is revealed. Something else is the election, something else how the election is revealed. When I speak of the spirit of man, I must say that it is revealed through the body, through speech. Yet the body is not a part of the spirit. When I say of God: He reveals Himself through the Word, this does not mean that the Word is a part of God. Thus the Formula of Concord wants to distinguish between the secret counsel of God and the means by which this counsel is revealed. And here the Formula of Concord states that God reveals this secret counsel, as indicated in the eight points.

Dr. Walther: The "*suorum*" is not unimportant. In the translation it was thought that there might be people like now. It was inserted for the sake of our opponents. God's gracious providence has thus put a stop to them. We cannot now say: The eight points speak of things in contrast to the persons, of whom we will speak below. Rather, one must say: The eight points speak of the persons just as much as they speak of the things in what follows. — As far as the revelation of God's secret counsel is concerned, of which the Formula of Concord speaks, it speaks of whether it is revealed to me. It can only be revealed to me when I enter into the Gospel. Then I can recognize that I am one of the elect. If I know that I believe in Christ, then I should also believe that I am chosen. Only in this way will God reveal it to me, for Christ alone is the book of life. — However, the *reprobatio* can also be taken into account when dealing with the election of grace. It also occurs in the Formula of Concord. But here it is important that it is omitted. This has been done so that when we read the eight points, we think only of the elect. — It is questionable when people talk about the believers of the age in this way, as happened

earlier. Not a single orthodox theologian has claimed that the time-believers are also elect.

Pastor Allwardt: I must point out the following. In § 13 it is said that if one wants to speak of eternal election etc., one should not speculate about the hidden providence of God. So there is such an unfathomable providence. But we cannot speak of it, but <page 23> we should accustom ourselves to speak of it as it is revealed through the Word. There we are directed to the gospel. For example, if someone asks in temptation: Am I elect? I should say to him: [p 66] We cannot speak of this now. I have to talk to him about salvation. I can prove to him that he is redeemed. Then I must come to the means of faith: the gospel and the sacraments. I cannot tell him that he is specially called. I must point him to the general calling, emphasize the generality of it. Thus the Formula of Concord wants to tell me: If we want to speak of election, we must speak of the principle, counsel, will, and so on. But this does not refer to the elect alone, but to the human race. Now come the eight points, the first of which emphasizes God's counsel just as much as the others all do. From this it is clear that the resolution of salvation is also to be sought in the purpose and counsel of God.

Pastor Fick: Concerning the definition of election by grace given above, as if it were the decree of the means and the predestination of persons, it should be pointed out that no passage in the Formula of Concord admits of such a definition. §§ 13 and 14 is only to say how the doctrine of election of grace is to be fruitfully practiced, namely, that all these pieces, as in the eight points, are to be preached. But this is by no means intended to define a new part of predestination, namely, the designation of means. —

After it had been decided that the next morning Pastor Gross of Buffalo should give an exact formulation of the state of the matter hitherto discussed, the conference adjourned with the Lord's prayer. J. G. Nützel, Secretary.

Third session.

Thursday morning, September 30.

After the reading and approval of the detailed minutes of the first meeting, Mr. P. Achenbach was elected chaplain and Pastor O. Hanser was elected second chairman. Mr. Groß then presented the brief presentation and comparison of both sides' positions on § 5 of the 11th article of the Formula of Concord that he had requested. Although most of the brethren accepted the first part of this summary as a correct statement of their convictions, it was found, when it was desired to proceed to the discussion of the second part of the summary, that a large number of brethren on both sides considered such statements premature, and by [p 67] withdrawing the statement of one side, the explanation offered by the other was rendered superfluous. Adjourned with the Lord's prayer. A. Krafft, Secr.

Fourth Session.

Thursday afternoon, September 30.

The fourth session was opened with liturgical service. After the minutes of the second session had been read out and adopted with the necessary correction, the question was raised as to whether it should not first of all be determined what we now wanted to talk about. In the previous meeting, we had already gone far beyond § 5, where we were actually still standing, by adding §§ 20-22. Since we have now reached the section §§ 13-24, it would be best to continue our discussion from there. We could leave § 5 in suspension if it were first explained that we are all agreed that it does not deal with a two-part election, but with election in the narrower sense, i.e. with no other election than that of the children of God. This point could be returned to later.

It was countered that this motion was not consistent with the course adopted by the conference of reading through the 11th Article piece by piece, but that it took us away from the actual matter at issue. One should not go beyond § 5 until the opponents also confess that the election of grace is for the children of God alone, and that all others who are not saved are excluded from this election.

From the other side it was said that it was astonishing that they were repeatedly asked to explain how they stood on this § 5. They acknowledged what was stated therein, namely that these words deal with particular election, and it was again repeated that in their conviction the Formula of Concord emphasized not only the one comparison, but also the other, as already recorded.

It was then said (Prof. Lange): The position of the opponents would therefore be this: § 5 is not to be understood correctly if one does not add what is contained in other paragraphs. Because we leave § 5 as it is, without explaining it by subsequent ones, we did not, in their judgment, have the correct understanding of it. The reason why we always insist that a clear explanation be given on this point is that we find it so difficult to understand what the opposing brethren tell us about the election. It is said-at one time-that election by grace is primarily the dispensation of the means of grace, which [p 68] are intended for all men. This is election in the broader sense. Then it is said that election includes the persons who are saved. This is election in the narrower sense. These are obviously two different elections. If two terms have different <page 25> meanings, it is a sign that we are talking about two different things. The election in the narrower sense is not the election in the wider sense, and the election in the wider sense is not the election in the narrower sense. And yet these two elections should not be two, but only one, whose parts they only form. The first part has as its object only things, the second part only persons. So far, of course, nothing stands in the way of their unification into one concept, namely if the things of the first part are only to be expressed by the persons of the second part in the one concept. Now, however, they introduce the whole human race into this part as the persons belonging to the things of the first part and call it the further election of grace, because it already includes the persons of the second part. Nevertheless, they add the second part as a special one to the first, although it has already been brought into the concept by the first part; so that the one concept now consists of only one part, the first, that is, not of parts at all, but the so-called first is the election of grace itself; now again this first part is not to be the election of grace itself, but only a part to which the so-called second part must be added. Now the brethren should consider the following. When they present to us a matter concerning divine doctrine, so that we may recognize it as divine truth, they must also present it in such a form that we may understand it. To

divine revelation we take reason captive under the obedience of Christ; but we cannot satisfy ourselves with any human explanation in which the generally recognized laws of logic are set aside. It is striking that the opponents, when they begin to explain the Formula of Concord, proceed so artificially that it is impossible to understand what they are trying to say. Should the Formula of Concord be written in such a confusing way that one cannot understand the individual sentences without always anticipating them? A necessary characteristic of a book is that it can claim that what precedes explains what follows, and not vice versa, that one must first read further in order to understand what precedes. Only a confusionist proceeds in such a way that he presents a matter quite unclearly and thinks: Later I can say it more clearly! — Our Formula of Concord probably had its reason for putting what is contained in § 5 first and then proceeding — not first to give a definition, but a detailed description of the election of grace: it put the Principium first (and that is the important thing, that this Principium, this fundamental truth, was put first) and then it built the further exposition on it.

The opposing party replied that they were heartily sorry if they had not spoken in such a way that they could be understood; they also wanted to assume that the fault lay with them; but they <page 26> were of the opinion that they had spoken [p 69] clearly enough and unmistakably. It was incomprehensible to them how one could think that they considered the ordinance of the means (*ordinatio mediorum*) to be predestination in general. They also referred to the relevant synodal reports and the publications of the Synod, in which it was said that the often discussed 8 points in the Formula of Concord did not specify what belonged to election, and yet on the part of the representatives of the contested doctrine it was claimed by one that the same (8 points) contained the description and precise definition of election by grace, while the other contradicted this statement. This was followed by a further exposition of the doctrine of election of grace in the broader and narrower sense, as found in previous minutes.

With reference to the statement in question, it was replied: When it was pointed out that not only on ropes of our opponents different sounding definitions had been given, but also in our publications such were to be found as, for example, that the 8 propositions belonged to election and that they did not belong to it, one must wonder that otherwise astute people do not (so to say) see with half an eye what is so child's play to recognize. When it is said that they do not belong, the strict definition of election is meant. If it is said: They belong, then the detailed description of the election of grace is meant. — Then one wonders why we desire to hear a precise explanation of the term "election" in § 5. But it should be pointed out to the dear brethren that we are quite innocent if we have to return again and again to § 5, because according to their account it must appear as if § 8 speaks of election in a completely different sense from § 5. And that is the *status controversiae*. We say: There is no other sense in which the election is spoken of. We would not have penetrated any further into the brethren if they had not spoken from the outset of a different meaning of election. Now it is not unreasonable for us to ask: What opinion do you have? If they want to be fair and just, they must admit that § 5 speaks for us. They themselves say: We do not blame you if you ask us until we admit to you what we mean. — The confession places this parapheme at the top, where it belongs. After all, everything in the dispute depends on it, and it must therefore be understood according to its clear wording. —

The motion was again put forward that § 5, which had been left at the third session, should be passed over for the time being and that §§ 13-24 should be discussed. On the basis of the quite correct principle that the Formula of Concord is to be explained from and by itself if it is to be understood correctly, the course of the <page 27> proceedings had been arranged from the outset in such a way that sentence by sentence should be

taken in turn, and this provision should also be carried out. However, if one now wanted to adhere to § 5, the only question that could be considered was over whom the election extended. If, however, a declaration were to be insisted upon as to what the election was, then one would have to go further and consider the specified paragraphs. When this question had been decided, [p 70] then one could return to § 5. This motion was also supported by a conference member from the other side. For, it was said, although the brethren who do not agree with the doctrine set forth and justified in our publications have already clearly expressed in the course of the discussion what they understand by predestination, they should nevertheless now be given the opportunity to give their explanation following the paragraphs referred to, especially since they refer to §§ 15-22 as containing, according to their conviction, the strict definition of election by grace.

Objection: In discussing § 5, one side has already emphasized several times that in the Formula of Concord the word "election" is never taken in the sense that it includes everything that is usually understood by a so-called election in the broader sense. The other part, on the other hand, maintains that the Formula of Concord uses the word "election" in the broader and narrower sense: — the eternal election of God refers not only to the persons, but also to the means of salvation. But if election also includes the determination of the means of salvation, then pure Calvinism emerges. The fifth paragraph clearly states that election extends only to the persons who are ordained to eternal life. But if we include the means, we say that the order of the means also extends only to the children of God. If we take the words of § 5 as they read, we recognize that they speak of what is called election in the narrower sense; we learn what the 11th article of the Formula of Concord understands by election. In the following paragraphs it is then shown what it does, and then in the eight sentences it is explained how the election is carried out.

In response to what had been said, it was conceded that § 5 obviously makes no mention of the *ordinatio mediorum salutis*. But, it was said, this sentence of the Formula of Concord was not to be taken alone, but § 8 had to be taken in addition; both belonged together. In § 5. not everything was said about the election; it had to be connected with § 8; both taken together emphasized the two sides of one and the same thing.

This was contradicted and it was pointed out that § 5 is not merely a comparison, as is claimed, but deals with the fact that the eternal election of God extends only to the children of God. <pages 28> Section 8 then shows what the election of grace is a cause of, namely salvation. The following sections then show how predestination should be spoken of correctly and with fruit. It is well to note that the Formula of Concord holds this course, because otherwise one would be tempted to form the difficult idea that an examination was held at election, in which blind faith was blindly applied without any further distinction.

Dir. Krauß: A definition of election to grace is by no means given in § 5; this only follows in §§ 15-23. There we are dealing with such a definition, as the opening words of § 24 clearly show: "According to Scripture [p 71], all this is comprehended in the doctrine of God's eternal election to sonship and eternal blessedness, and should also be understood by it and never excluded, nor omitted, when one speaks of God's intercession." In other words, this is the full definition of election. §§ 5-8 is only a comparison, and §§ 9-12 are only a warning against a harmful and dangerous use of a false concept of election. I therefore say: However, § 5 speaks of election in the narrower sense. That is what I understand it to mean. But I urge you not to go on and on about §§ 5 and 8, but to move on to §§ 15-23; otherwise we will not have made any progress in four weeks. —

It was then decided, for the love of the opponents, to abandon the adopted order of the meeting and to continue the discussion with §§ 13 and ff.

Adjourned with the Lord's prayer. G. Runkel, Secr.

Fifth meeting.

Friday morning, October 1.

After the 5th session had opened with the usual liturgical service, the minutes of the 3rd session were read out and adopted with the proposed amendments. The meeting then proceeded to discuss §§ 13-24 in accordance with the resolution passed at the 4th meeting. Before proceeding further, however, someone pointed out that the editor of a newspaper was present and taking notes. The chairman therefore drew attention to the decision that our meeting was not public in the sense that someone was allowed to publish what was said here before the conference itself did so. The proposal was then made that, in order to avoid unnecessarily prolonging the proceedings, it should be decided that the debate should be conducted mainly by those who have dealt with the matter in depth on both sides. Therefore, Dr. Walther should mainly take the floor on one side.

Dr. Walther then declared that it would be neither biblical nor ecclesiastical to let him speak alone. In Acts. 15 we read that at that Council of Apostles each one had the right to speak. He also drew attention to the fact that blasphemous, slanderous, unworthy things were constantly being written out into the world: Walther alone is the Master and we should only have one Master, Christ! Therefore, if one wanted to make him the representative of the conference, one would only strengthen the people who say this, as if this shameful slander were true. This should not be done, precisely because it would be neither ecclesiastical nor biblical.

The author of the above proposal explained that he had not meant his proposal in such a way that Dr. Walther on the one side alone should have the right to speak, but [p 72] that he had meant that he should speak only primarily and provisionally, so that clarity would come into the proceedings, for he had dealt with the matter most thoroughly.

Since the brothers on the other side had stated in § 5 that they could only express themselves in detail about their position on the doctrine of election by grace if §§ 13-24 were also included, it was now decided:

That the brethren on the other side should first be permitted to present their view of what is now in order in context, so that no one may interfere with them, no one may disturb them until they have finished; and that their opponents should then be given the same opportunity to present their point of view.

Professor Stellhorn then began to explain his position on the matter as follows: I will first, as far as I can, try very briefly to state our position on §§ 13-24. The "our" might sound immodest, but I hope that the other brothers will agree with me. In the main, this has often happened. First of all, I will only state our view in general terms and not go into the most specific details, so that no time is lost in refuting all possible objections. The discussion of the details can come later. — Let us summarize it thus: §§ 13, 14 is the introduction, § 24 is the conclusion; and §§ 15-23 contains a detailed definition of election by grace. With this we agree with *Lehre und Wehre*; for Pastor Stöckhardt has asserted just this in this journal, and this journal is edited by the whole college of teachers in St. Louis. So we say: If a definition of a definition is given here, however detailed it may be, there must be nothing in it which does not belong to the concept of election by grace in the sense in which the Formula of Concord speaks of it. From §§ 15-22 the first part of election is given, of which the <page 30> Formula of Concord speaks. We say: The Formula of Concord speaks of an election which consists of two main parts; it does not speak merely of election in the narrower sense, which is nothing else than the particular election of certain persons who are infallibly saved; but the Formula of Concord here speaks of election in the wider sense. And now when I speak of this election in the wider sense, that which constitutes election in the narrower sense must also be included; that is self-evident. The second half of § 23 deals with particular election, with the election of persons who will be infallibly saved. The 8 points, on the other hand, deal only with the first part of election by grace, or with what Hutter, for example, calls *ordinatio mediorum*, i.e. the determination of the general way of salvation. Thus predestination in the sense of the Formula of Concord [p 73] determines two things in advance ("in advance", because God has done it in eternity): The first is contained in §§ 15-22, which are the means of salvation, the way to salvation. The good God, who well knew that men would fall, and who on the one hand had to condemn them according to his holiness and justice, and on the other hand wanted to save them according to his love and mercy — so the good God made a way so that men could be saved, and in §§

15-22 these very means of salvation are mentioned, this way is indicated. Unfortunately, this way is not followed by all people, as is also stated in the 8 points; nevertheless, it is the way for all people, and as the way for all people it is considered here. It says in § 17: "That God with his Holy Spirit, through the Word, when it is preached, heard and considered, may be powerful and active in us, converting hearts to true repentance and keeping them in the right faith". This already indicates that not all people follow this general path to salvation. The first two points, §§ 15 and 16, are still quite general. There is no difference between people. God has redeemed the whole human race. The benefits of Christ are there for all people in Word and Sacrament. But in point 3 (§ 17) people are divided. Some are those who hear and contemplate the Word when it is preached; thus the Holy Spirit only wants to work in those who allow themselves to be brought to true repentance, insofar as the unregenerate person is able to do so. So there are already two parts. Point 4 (§ 18) again makes a distinction between those who allow themselves to be brought to repentance and accept Christ through true faith — whom God wants to justify, accept into grace, adoption and inheritance of eternal life — and the others who do not. And in point 5 it says: "that he would also sanctify in love those who are thus justified". Now we only have those on the general path to salvation who have come to faith. **<page 31>** According to point 6, God wants to protect and preserve them against all enemies despite their weakness. And now point 7 shows that even these do not all remain on the path to salvation. There will also be a separation among them. For it says: "that he would also strengthen and increase in them the good work he has begun, and preserve them to the end, if they keep God's word, pray diligently, abide in God's goodness, and faithfully use the gifts they have received". So one part keeps to God's word, prays diligently, uses the gifts they have received faithfully — of course they can only do this by God's grace and power, this is as natural to the Formula of Concord as it is to us -, the other part does not do this and falls away again . So there is another divorce. The latter are the temporal believers, the former are those who are called the elect for short; and that is why it is said in point 8 "That he will finally make those whom he has chosen, called and justified eternally blessed and glorious in eternal life". The temporal believers are thus left behind; the others are "made eternally blessed and glorious". [**p 74**] Here the word "erwählet" comes in. In the *Enchiridion* of Dr. Chemnitz this word "chosen" does not appear. This expression "chosen" is used here because at this (8) station, so to speak, only those are still on the general path of salvation who are truly chosen and will infallibly be saved on this general path of salvation. However, even if the number of those who are finally saved becomes smaller and smaller through the fault of men, it is and remains the general way of salvation, and as such it comes into consideration here. Apart from other passages of the Formula of Concord, we find this expressed quite clearly in § 23. There it says: "And in such His counsel, counsel and decree God has not only prepared salvation in general". This is a summary of the eight points. So the Formula of Concord tells us that the eight points belong to the "counsel, judgment and decree". But we should not think that because these eight points are characterized as the main part of election and ordinance, that they are the only parts of the election of grace. No, God has done more: "but has also considered in grace all and every person of the elect who are to be saved through Christ, has elected them to salvation, and has also ordained them," etc. It says here: *"salutem suorum"*; this *suorum* is added in the same sense in which §§ 3, 4, 7 say that the general salvation is not granted to all through the guilt of men. Finally, because only "his own" attain the blessedness intended for all, the *suorum* is there. It is not in the German. If it were necessary, it would also be in German. But Chemnitz, who corrected the erroneous Latin translation, left it there because it can be understood correctly. It is the blessedness of his own who

finally attain it. From point 7 onwards are the <page 32> stations where only the elect remain. And in what follows we are told that we would be mistaken if we were to regard this main part (the 8 points) as the only thing; no, God has not only done what is stated in §§ 15-22, "but has also considered in grace all and every person of the elect who are to be saved through Christ, and has called them to salvation" and so on. The latter is therefore election by grace in the narrowest sense, the particular election of certain individual persons for the infallible attainment of salvation. It must be preceded by the determination of the general way of salvation. If God had foreseen that all men could be brought to salvation, there would never have been an election. But this must not be taken to mean that people can see how they become pious, etc., and then God will decide to save them. No, God does not say: This is the general way of salvation, now let men also walk on it; but the second part of the election of grace is the judicial application of the determination of the general will of salvation based on God's foreknowledge. But to what extent does God need to decide this? one might ask. I answer: It is similar here to God's rule in nature. God has ordered the whole of nature with all its forces, and yet [p 75] one must not think that God now sits, as it were, in the grandfather's chair and lets everything take its course according to the natural order once established. No, everything that happens in nature, when it flashes, thunders 2c, that is an act of God. And it is similar here. I also recall an analogy, the doctrine of twofold justification. In contrast to recent theologians, we all teach that there is an objective justification, which happened through Christ's resurrection. God has declared that all people are now justified, free from sin, and whoever accepts this objective justification in faith is also subjectively justified. You could also ask: Why subjective justification? This is also a special judicial act of God, whereby he himself judicially applies objective justification to the individual who believes. I take a similar view of particular election: it is the judicial application of the determination of the general will of salvation. In § 23 it says: "he also decrees that he will bring, help, promote, strengthen and preserve them in the way now reported, by his grace, gifts and effects". Here, then, is the provision that the good Lord really wants to make the elect blessed on that general path of salvation in spite of all enemies and their own weakness. These 8 points thus occur twice in the doctrine of election of grace according to the Formula of Concord: firstly, according to § 23, first half, as the determination of the general way of salvation, which determination forms the first part <pages 33> of election of grace in the sense of the Formula of Concord; secondly, as the way by which God really leads the elect to salvation. He wants to lead everyone in this way, but through the fault of most people he cannot. That says everything. — I also note in § 24: "According to Scripture, all this is understood in the doctrine of God's eternal election to adoption and eternal salvation", etc. This word "all" proves that in the election of grace, as the Formula of Concord speaks of it, everything that precedes it is comprehended. It seems strange to me if by this "all" only the second half of § 23 is to be understood. No, everything that precedes, from § 14 onwards, "all this is understood according to Scripture in the doctrine of God's eternal election to adoption and eternal blessedness". "All these things" should not be mentioned merely in passing, nor should they also be mentioned, but "all these things" form the election and should never be excluded. "According to Scripture" it says, so according to the Formula of Concord, Scripture includes "all these things". Our opponents always put what is in the middle of § 23 first. We must leave the pieces in the order in which they appear in the Formula of Concord. The Formula of Concord takes the 8 pieces first and then comes what is in § 23.*) [p 76]

After Prof. Stellhorn had finished this lengthy presentation of his position on the question at hand, the other brothers were invited to speak if they shared this position in

whole or in part and wished to point out aspects of their views that had not yet been emphasized. Pastor Allwardt then remarked

Pastor Allwardt: He would like to add something concerning the purpose and connection of these 8 points with § 23. Earlier, in §§ 9-12, it is said that if the election of grace is only understood as such a pattern: this one is to be saved, that one damned, this produces strange, dangerous thoughts, which thoughts are then also given in more detail, as: who knows whether I am saved, whether I persevere, etc.? But all doctrine is wrong which does not serve to comfort and admonish; therefore every exposition of the election of grace which withers the comfort of the gospel is false and wrong from the outset. Now the purpose of the exposition of this doctrine in the Formula of Concord is to preserve consolation, therefore it is said in § 13 that if one wishes to commemorate with profit and fruit the doctrine of election, one must not speculate on the mere secret hidden providence of God, but must summarize the whole doctrine of the promise given in Christ. Now comes the confession of the position of God's general council of grace in election.

---

*) Up to this point Mr. Pastor J. Fackler took the minutes. The other part of this protocol is from the pen of Pastor A. Krafft.

<Page 34> To make the point clear, imagine a Reformed person asking us: Do you also believe in election? We answer: Yes. He goes on to ask: Is this election unchangeable? We answer: Yes. He goes on to ask: If you also believe in an unchangeable election, how do you differ from us? We can answer such a one: When we speak of election, we assume that God has redeemed the whole world in Christ, calls the whole world, and offers salvation to all men by the call. However, as the following 6 points show, people are divided as soon as the Word reaches them. Many reject the Word from the outset through Satan's malice. This is a fact, even if we do not ask now: Where does this come from? Others hear the Word but are annoyed by it the more they grasp it with the natural mind, as far as this is possible. Others, preserved by grace and mercy, remain in the faith. The Confession thus wants to show how the number of people who allow themselves to be led along the path of salvation gradually becomes smaller and smaller until only those who are truly saved remain, but these are those who are destined by God for salvation and no others. Here then is an exposition of the doctrine of election, the consolation of which is based on the general counsel of grace, on the Gospel, not on the doctrine of particular election. The great number of those who remain excluded from salvation are so only because they have despised all that could save them. [p 77]

Some of the brethren (namely, Pastors Ernst, Rohe, Diemer, and Kunz) here expressed their agreement with the doctrine expounded by the previous speakers, at least in substance, while two others (Director Krauß and Pastor T. Körner) expressly remarked that they did not at all wish to have the general counsel of salvation regarded as the main thing, as the main part of election itself, for this was undoubtedly the *election* of persons.

Director Krauß expressed himself thus: To be brief: I essentially agree with the remarks of Prof. Stellhorn; with the difference, however, that in the doctrine of predestination I do not regard the *ordinatio mediorum* or the determination of the means, but rather the determination of the persons of the elect as the main thing; thus not the first, but the second part, the election "in the narrower sense."

After it had been repeatedly asked whether any of the opponents wished to speak, and no one responded, indeed the wish had been expressed from this side itself that the others should now also be given the floor in order to present their differing doctrine in context from all sides, this was raised to a resolution.

Pastor M. Große then explained: Our position is that <page 35> we consider the eight points to be an integral part of the election of grace insofar as what is said in them refers to the elect, but only insofar as it belongs to this doctrine. To say that the *media salutis* is election in the wider sense, even if it includes the election of persons in the narrower sense, is not to be approved; it is only one election, and that is what, if we want to use the term, we call narrower election. It is impossible to declare the believers in time to be the elect, as is the case in that view. We do not deny the universality of salvation, of the call, of the means of grace. No one can say with reason that we abandon the consolation that lies in this universality of salvation; but if we ask what election is in the sense of the Formula of Concord, it is the destiny of individual persons for whom God has given Christ, as for the whole world, in order to lead them to salvation by the orderly way of salvation. We are therefore only speaking here of the way of salvation in relation to the true children of God; *ad vitam aeternam consequendam*, as the Confession says.

Furthermore, Dr. Walther remarked: "One of the brethren among the opponents has just claimed for himself some of the things that speak for us. The purpose of the presentation of the doctrine of election by grace in the Formula of Concord is obviously to prevent the damage that had previously been caused by the fact that election was only ever presented as a test, as if God had only decided: This one shall go to heaven and that one to hell. [p 78] Of course, it would be a very dangerous doctrine if the election of

grace were nothing else. The Formula of Concord itself says so. An ungodly man might think: "If I am elect, I shall be saved, I may do as I please; but the believing, sorrowful souls would say with this doctrine: "I am now a believer: "I am now in the faith and therefore also in God's grace; but who knows! will I also remain steadfast? am I also chosen? I fear, when I look upon my flesh and blood, when I look upon the world, that I shall fall and perish. Thus the faithful children of God are robbed of all consolation by a doctrine according to which election is to be merely a test, like the selection of those who are to go to war as soldiers. Chemnitz, on the other hand, has provided us with a real masterpiece in his exposition of the Formula of Concord, in which he shows how only this is truly biblical if the doctrine of election is always based on the redemption of the whole world, the determination of the path of salvation. God gives us everything we need to prepare and persevere on this path; but of course God has not only said what a person must do in order to be saved, but has also chosen certain people from eternity and ordained that they enter heaven and salvation by this path, but only by this path. When someone hears this teaching, he can neither, if he is godless, be strengthened in his certainty, nor, if he is a believer, be shaken in his faith, hope and <page 36> confidence. According to this teaching, everyone sees that if I believe in Jesus Christ, I am also on the path by which God leads the elect to eternal life; therefore I may and should believe that I am chosen. But a person can only believe this as long as he remains on this path; for there is no other way in which God truly saves the elect than the way in which he wants to lead the whole world to salvation. That is why there is no teaching that calls for more than this: Stay on the narrow way? This teaching is no comfort to a carnally secure person, for his conscience tells him: "If only those are chosen who walk on the path marked out for the whole world to salvation, who keep themselves by faith in Christ, then I will not be saved, for I am not walking on this path. Such a person must think: How often have I been invited, how often have I been offered the grace of God, how often have I been frightened by the law, enticed by the gospel, but I have thrown everything, everything into the redoubt; no one but I am guilty if I am condemned. After this argument it is clear that only those who keep the general promise and walk in the orderly way of salvation can believe that they are chosen. We cannot be certain of our election in any other way than *a posteriori*, after entering this path of salvation; no one can think *a priori*: "Well, God has chosen me, so I must be saved. Who has looked into God's council chamber? No mortal can. Christ is the book of life; so if you want to know whether you are chosen, just hold on to Him, and then do not doubt, you will be saved. If you doubt this in temptation, it is only the weakness of your faith; but this doubt is not a good thing, but rather is punished by God in His Word. (¶) The other side actually has no election of grace at all, only the doctrine of justification. They say: If one goes this way, then we call him elect; but this is not election, while the Formula of Concord § 23 [p 79] expressly does not speak of the preparation of salvation in the common, but of those persons who are to be saved through Christ, who are elected and ordained. We therefore believe from the heart, not that God first sees how man will behave and has chosen him on the basis of what he has previously seen in him, but conversely, that God has chosen, but at the same time has also chosen him to walk in the way of salvation and has provided what belongs to it. It is expressly called "choosing, decreeing"; and he does not choose because men have or will have what he himself must first give them and work in them. Before the foundation of the world was laid, from eternity he has chosen us, but how? Just as the Confession says "*eo modo quem recitavimus*", in the way described therein, only in the way indicated. Now one usually says: That is a terrible doctrine! God has chosen certain people <pages 37> and decided to give them the faith. Isn't that biased against the others? Oh no. These are not chosen because they willfully resist, while

those are only saved for two reasons: First, by God's mercy, and secondly, for the sake of the most holy merit of Jesus Christ. These are the only two causes; whoever adds faith to this should not say that he has the doctrine of the Formula of Concord, for it only states these two causes of election. Therefore, if the opponents do not teach arch-Pelagian faith, which we do not want to impute to them, they must admit that we do not teach absolute election when we teach that God himself must give and do everything for our salvation. But what have they gained with their doctrinal presentation? Nothing. Can it not again be called partial by someone according to reason, that He gives faith to one and not to another? Yes, they answer, He cannot give it to the one who resists. So, then, is the non-resistance of some the cause of their election?

As to the expression "election by grace in the broad sense," I have no objection, continued Speaker, if it be used for the sake of doctrine; but the Bible knows nothing of it, nor does the Confession. Yes, we say Who speaks, it would be nothing more than what is meant in § 23, where the doctrine is wrong, mutilated and imperfectly stated. It is a necessary part of the doctrine of election that God determines the way of salvation by which he will lead his elect to eternal life; therefore it is wrong of certain dogmatists to speak of election by grace in the narrower sense with the assertion that the Formula of Concord speaks of election in the broader sense. As far as the expression "election of means" is concerned, I must say that Scripture nowhere speaks of this, nor does the Confession; it is also a strange expression; a means is not an elect person. But of course one cannot speak of the elect without speaking of the means; for that would be just as if someone wanted to present the doctrine of reconciliation and only wanted to say that Christ lived and suffered and died. That would not be the doctrine of reconciliation, for if I want to expound it, I must show how God created man innocent in his image, how he fell into original [**p 80**] and actual sin through the fall; I must show how God is holy and therefore angry with sin, and that therefore he who lies in sin cannot please him unless there is satisfaction. The doctrine of the law must be introduced before we come to the actual act of reconciliation. This is also the case here. The doctrinal exposition must first begin with how God redeemed the whole world, for it is wrong to say that it is only in the mind of God. This is not what the Formula of Concord wants to say: This is the result of God's thoughts, but: This is how it should be taught.

Not like this: there are a number of people who God has decided shall be damned, and there are a number who shall be saved, and that has been decided once and for all. Those who belong to one number remain in it, and those who belong to the other number also remain in it. That would be quite wrong. That would be to present the election of grace as an arbitrary election. Presented in this way, the doctrine would have to produce despair or certainty. No, the general counsel of salvation must come first; whoever did not consider this would not rightly share the word. Who knows where we would have ended up without this presentation of doctrine in the Formula of Concord! Through it our church has been preserved from Calvinism. What we teach is not an absolute election, but a conditional one. The conditions are: the grace of God, the merit of Christ and faith; but these are conditions which we do not fulfill, but which God Himself fulfills in us and for us. Now he who says that man fulfills them teaches what we do not want to say of the opponents, Pelagian. But they should not always do us an injustice and ascribe to us an absolute election when we say that God has decided that the elect will certainly attain to salvation. Election is not just a mere decree: "whoever believes will be saved," but rather the 8 points only show how God, who earnestly desires and works for the salvation of all, really leads the elect to salvation in the same way that he wanted to save all. That he does this in every single one of the elect is clearly stated in § 23: "He has also all and every person of the elect" and so on. Consider the expressions, e.g: "ordered". What God ordered must happen; if it were merely stated: He wills to do it, it would be something else; for he wills to do it to the whole world and yet it does not happen. (Reference was made here to a quotation from Balthasar Meisner, given in a note in the October issue of *Lehre und Wehre*, p. 293). If God intends something, he will bring it about; if he only wills something and does not intend it, it may not happen. — How the Formula of Concord understands the doctrine of election is also clear from §§ 45-47, where the consolation is drawn from God's intercession for the faithful that it is not only God's good pleasure to save them, but that he has also purposed it for himself and will therefore really lead it out. Note also the expressions used in the Latin edition of the Formula of Concord: *"elegit, decrevit*," ["*He has chosen, decreed*"] etc., which leave no doubt as to the meaning of the confession, and the Scripture passage [**p 81**] § 47 used for consolation. St. Paul says in Rom. 8: "Those who are called according to his purpose." By this he teaches that God has purposed to bring the faithful to salvation (for of course we are speaking only of those who are in the faith), and from this such a one, according to the confession, should draw the conclusion <page 39>: Who will separate me from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus? etc. Not, as our dear brethren who oppose us say, is this only attached in such a way that there is an election of persons, but precisely this is the main thing for the sake of which the former points stand in the confession. Only through an *aequivocatio* ["*equivocation*"] can one speak of election in another way. This is the election that God brings certain persons onto the path of salvation, wants to preserve them on it, even if with interruption, and finally makes them infallibly saved. Therefore faith is not to be introduced here as the cause; for that is the point, whether I can also be certain of my salvation. My faith does not make me certain of this, for I must know whether I will remain in the faith, for if not, I will ultimately perish. Whoever is serious, then, does not speculate with reason, but will know whether he can happily lie down on his deathbed today or tomorrow, believing: I am chosen, I am not afraid of the world, my flesh, the devil; I am in God's ears and beg him to keep his promise to me, so he will not let me fall into unbelief and sin or false teaching. But whoever is not in the true faith, it is not God who has revealed to him in his word, but the devil, that he is

chosen. It is also certain that the true believer always walks in the narrow way with fear and trembling, as God's word demands, precisely because he knows himself to be a chosen child of God by faith. Least of all is the doctrine of the opponents of election the pure one, since this is supposed to happen on the basis of foreknowledge or be a judicial verdict. A judge is just, looks at man as he is according to his law, and determines accordingly; this would lead to the fact that it would no longer be an election by grace at all. That would be just as if I were to show someone the way and say: Now go, and you shall reach your destination and attain this and that, and then say afterwards: See, I have chosen you for this, as one might well say if I were to carry him to his destination myself. It is only He Himself, the faithful God, who has chosen us and carries us, as He says: "You have not chosen me, but I have chosen you that you may bear fruit and that your fruit may remain."

This lengthy presentation of the doctrine of election was followed by an exposition of it by Pastor Stöckhardt. He said the following: "There are several points for the sake of which it is necessary for me to justify myself in particular, although I completely agree with the previous speaker in all essentials. I will adhere strictly to § 13-24 of the Formula of Concord. One thing must be borne in mind. The first form of the Formula of Concord is without these 8 points, the Swabian formula does not have them, and they are also missing in the *Epitome*. From this it follows that the essential <page 40> features of the election of grace must also be found apart from them, otherwise in the confession itself. God has chosen certain persons to [p 82] sonship and blessedness. This concept fits everything that is taught about election in §§ 5, 8, and 23 and elsewhere in the Confession. Now it only remains to be seen whether this concept of election is not also to be found in the 8 points. Chemnitz added these points later, but nothing else can be said with them than what already belonged to the concept of election according to the Confession before these 8 points became a part of it. Thus the same definition remains. What is the content of the confession in §§ 13-24? It says that one must not speak only of the secret counsel of God: Such and such a one shall be saved. This implies that there is indeed a secret counsel of God, which we should not exclude altogether, but of which we should not speak alone and exclusively, but rather see how Scripture speaks of election. Thus the Formula of Concord also points above all to Scripture. The passages Eph. 6, Rom. 8 and Matt. 22 are cited and serve as a kind of heading for everything that follows. Now the passages cited, especially Romans 8, only speak of the elect, so the following can also only speak of the calling, justification, sanctification, etc. of the elect; for Romans 8 does not deal with God's general counsel of grace over all men, but with what God does for the elect. These elect are of course called in the same way as others, but these others are not mentioned here. Chemnitz already proves this in the introduction to the 8 points in his "*Enchiridion*", in which he gives a sort of superscription to them. It reads: "On the redemption of the human race, on the calling, justification, etc. of the elect." — The biblical passages referred to above already indicate the points in the Formula of Concord that are important in the election. Eph. 1 shows that it is done in Christ. Romans 8 describes the way in which election comes to its goal. Matthew 22, also quoted in the Confession, shows how the elect are called in the same way as others who are not saved. It is important to note that these points are not parallel. According to the revealed teaching of Scripture, God has chosen certain persons. He has chosen these persons in Christ and has decided to lead them to glory through calling, justification and sanctification. The Formula of Concord, however, does not quantify these points, in which this is explained in more detail, as if each of them stood in an equal relationship to election. The first point is intended to express in a somewhat freer way what is expressed in Eph. 1 by "in Christ"; for in Him alone, the Savior of the whole human race, life is also

merited for the elect. This point is, of course, <page 41> in a different relation to election than the other points in which it is explained how God calls, justifies, sanctifies and finally glorifies those chosen in Christ. It must not be overlooked that point 8 expressly speaks of those whom he has chosen, just as the Formula of Concord always recapitulates [p 83] what has been said before proceeding further, and then adds something further. Now here in the eighth point everything that has been said before is recapitulated in summa, before the last conclusion is made; but just from point 2, which deals with the calling, *eligit* [“He has chosen”] stands before "called and justified", and thus it is clearly shown which persons alone are spoken of here. This is followed by § 23, where the emphasis is not only on general salvation, but also on the final salvation of the individual persons of the elect. From this the faithful should now draw comfort , which is why here in § 23 what has hitherto been taught about the whole multitude of the elect is carefully applied to individual persons. — After this doctrinal exposition, we arrive at a unified concept of election that applies to all passages of the Confession. There is nothing ambiguous in this concept; only in one sense is the word "election" to be taken, only the faithful children of God belong in it, for whom election is a cause of their salvation and of what happens in time to create it, and what belongs to it. This is a beautiful unity, a concept that needs no other help.

At the end of his presentation, Pastor Stöckhardt pointed out how not only the introduction in Chemnitz's "*Enchiridion*" speaks for this presentation, but also the expression "eternal church" used by him in the second point, where he speaks of the calling, by which he clearly shows that he is dealing with the calling in relation to the elect, for these are precisely the eternal church.

Dr. Walther pointed out that instead of the expression used, that election by grace is the cause of salvation, it would be better, indeed the only correct one, to say that election by grace is a cause; for of course, as the opponents understand election, they must say that election is the cause, for they understand nothing more by it than the doctrine of the way to salvation, the order of salvation or grace, or whatever one may call it; but the Formula of Concord, and we with it, can only say, from its concept of election: one cause, namely, among other causes, as there are: Christ, God's grace, the Word, baptism, the Lord's Supper, which are also among the causes that the elect are preserved to the end.

Adjourned with the Lord's prayer.

A. Krafft, Secr.

Sixth Session.

Friday afternoon, October 1.

After the meeting was opened, and the minutes in question read and adopted, [p 84]

Pastor Allwardt: "We must guard against the imputation, as if, when we speak of election in the wider and narrower sense, we meant to say that the Formula of Concord speaks of election by grace in one way and then in another. When we say: in the broader sense, we want to show what was necessary to be able to elect certain people, that the Formula of Concord speaks of the election of grace in such a broad sense that the eight points are included.

Professor Lange: I did not impute anything to the opponents, I only asked for a more detailed explanation, I asked that the opponents would state their case in such a way that it would be possible to gain a clear insight into their view.

Professor Stellhorn: In the presentation of our view, as it was given yesterday by the opponents, one assumes that in our view the persons are not always the same. But that is not what we say. We teach: The predetermined persons are always the same, and they are only predetermined by the second part of the election. The first does not predetermine anything. Those eight points do not predetermine persons. We are wronged by this representation. We repeat: The first part of election does not predetermine persons, but only the means, the way of salvation. When we once said that the believers in time are to be counted among the elect as long as they believe, we only wanted to indicate what we humans should consider them to be, not what they are like in God's eyes. We have never said that the temporal believers belong to the people who are indicated as predestined in §§ 13-24. It only speaks of those who are truly saved.

Dr. Walther: That is precisely why we should not speak of the temporal believers being chosen before men. Such talk only creates confusion. The believers in time are not the chosen ones. The question of whether people should consider them to be so in love is not part of the doctrine of election by grace. It is true, of course, that the apostles considered all those in whom the marks of faith were found to be elect according to love; but this has nothing to do with the doctrine of election by grace.

Professor Stellhorn: That's exactly what I meant.

Dr. Walther: But it is quite superfluous to say that we must regard the believers of the age as the elect. That's not the question. The <page 43> question is: Who is an elect? If I am not mistaken, Professor Stellhorn has just answered the question of whether the believers in time are to be regarded as the elect in the interpretation of one of the eight points: Yes, in a certain sense. If you only say: The believers in time are not the elect, then we are satisfied.

Professor Stellhorn: I didn't want to say anything else.

Pastor Brauer: As the opponents interpret the first point, the time-believers are the elect. As the opponents present this point, it refers to all people, including believers in time. So they are the elect, but only according to the first part.

Professor Crämer: Of course you can talk like that, because you say that the first part only deals with the means of salvation. Salvation, justification, concerns all who believe, whether they believe temporarily or persistently. [p 85]

Pastor Köstering: Since the objectionable statement has been withdrawn, we can be satisfied.

Pastor Moll contradicted this.

Pastor Allwardt said, referring back to Pastor Brauer's statement that, in the opinion of the opponents, the narrower term of election is contained in the broader term: But surely not by the first part. When I speak of the election in the broader sense and say that the election in the narrower sense is also meant, that does not mean that the second part lies in the first.

Professor Pieper: We have strayed from the point. It concerns Professor Lange's statement yesterday regarding the presentation of the election of grace as given by the opponents. Professor Lange claimed that the statements of the dear brothers on the election of grace could not be united in one concept. That is why they are illogical. I feel the same way. I cannot unify what they have said either. On the one hand it is said: Election is the *ordinatio mediorum* [“designation of means”] for all, and on the other: Election is the determination of individuals. Here, in order to be able to think of an electoral act, an auxiliary line is missing. This was named this morning. It is the *praevisio fidei*, the anticipation of faith. Only when this is added can these two sentences be joined together.

Pastor Moll: I don't know how to understand that. Pastor Allwardt stands up and says that he considers the believers in time to be chosen. And now he says: "They belong to the elect, if and as long as they believe. —

After it had been decided that the President had the power, where necessary, to suspend the ordinary parliamentary rules, so that the individual opponents could see each other, said

Professor Stellhorn: Professor Pieper is quite right. It has never occurred to me to break down the bridge between the two parts. I do not deny that it belongs there. I am holding on to this bridge.

Professor Pieper: In my opinion, this auxiliary line was necessary in order to understand that you only teach One election. Because this necessary line was missing, it was an unreasonable demand that we should believe that you taught only one election.

Pastor Moll: I want to complete the debate I interrupted earlier. What I have to say relates to the fact that the opponents have spoken of a two-part election: an election in the broader sense, to which these eight points belong, as they say, and an election in the narrower sense, to which the truly elect belong. This is now being contradicted. The opponents say they do not want this. They always teach one and the same election. I do not know what the opponents mean. [p 86]

Pastor Allwardt: That's not the point at all. Pastor Moll said that I had said here privately that I consider the believers in time to be elect. The point is this. I had said that I thought what Professor Stellhorn had said with regard to the temporary believers was right. He was talking about whether we can consider believers in time to be elect according to love. In response, I said: That's right. It is two different things whether I say that the time-believers are elect, which we deny, or whether I say that we should regard them as elect according to love, which we maintain. —

(NOTE: 46 Middle — G. Stoeckhardt ref *Essays and Papers* p. 263 " Justification ")

It was then decided to continue where the proceedings had left off this morning.

Dr. Walther: I want to mention something important to me. This morning it was said that there is a similarity between justification and election. For all men are objectively justified, as the scholars say, i.e. God has redeemed the whole world in Christ and therefore declared it righteous; but if a man wants to be saved, he must also be subjectively justified, i.e. he must now also grasp this righteousness by faith: it is similar with election. To this I say: From this I can conclude nothing other than that Prof. Stellhorn has either no election of grace at all or a general election of grace. And the latter is actually the case in the first instance. For the whole world is objectively justified. But if I want to be saved, there must also be subjective justification, i.e. the grasping of the righteousness which God has granted to the whole world through the resurrection of Jesus Christ. What kind of doctrine of election by grace would that be? All people would be chosen objectively. But if they were to be saved, they would have to grasp this election!

(Note: G. Stoeckhardt reference : *Essays and Papers*, page 263 or Central District, 1894 page 23)

Prof. Stellhorn: The point of comparison has not been noted. I did not mean to say that the determination of the general way of salvation and predestination in the narrowest sense, the particular election of certain persons who are infallibly saved, behave like subjective and objective justification. I wanted to counter the objection: If predestination is to be regarded as you understand it, then it is a very simple conclusion from the determination of salvation. What need is there for a special determination? I said: It is similar here to subjective and objective justification. One could also say: If all people are objectively justified, what need is there for subjective justification? It is similar here. I did not mean to say this: just as objective justification refers to all men and subjective justification to individuals, so it is with election that election in the broadest sense extends to all. Election in the broadest sense always refers to the same people.

Dr. Walther: It is questionable to compare the two. I think you can, but you shouldn't be able to. Since you say that election is nothing other than the judicial *applicatio* of the general order of salvation and grace, it follows that you basically understand nothing other than this by predestination: God wills that all men [**p 87**] be called by the Word, brought to faith, and saved by faith, and then it is added that God declares all who believe to be elected.

Prof. Stellhorn: I am not talking about objective and subjective predestination. I just wanted to show that it is not a contradiction to assume that there is a special act of God: Predestination in the narrowest sense, nevertheless, that election already results from the determination of the general way of salvation.

Dr. Walther: That does not fit here, because you describe the same state in which the one who is later chosen by God according to the concept finds himself beforehand. For your teaching is this: Whoever has grasped and attained salvation through faith, God then says to him: You are my chosen one. That is a huge contradiction. That has already happened, of which you say: This is the election of grace. I already have it. It is already attributed to me and by God Himself; because as soon as I believe, God grants me my salvation.

Prof. Stellhorn: I could just as well say that with regard to subjective justification: If a person receives forgiveness of sins through faith, then he has it. What need is there then for a judicial act?

Dr. Walther: Not at all. When I speak of objective justification, I only mean to say that all men have acquired righteousness, <pages 46> but not that they have it imputed to them; but if I believe in Christ, I have righteousness and salvation. It has already been promised to me. So that you can also speak of the election of grace, you say: Then God's judicial act is added. You want to justify yourself to yourself.

Prof. Stellhorn: I don't think so. Surely if God had not revealed to us that there is subjective justification, then we might think that subjective justification is not necessary. We might well think so: If the individual appropriates objective righteousness through faith, he is righteous. What need is there then for a special judicial act on the part of God?

Dr. Walther: That is not true at all, that if I have acquired objective righteousness through faith, a new act would be added. The act is done. Through faith I already have righteousness. God does not have to grant it to me afterwards.

Prof. Stellhorn: I must confess: Then I did not know what subjective justification is. I always thought that subjective justification was a special judicial act of God.

Dr. Walther: Objective justification is nothing more than the *acquisitio* of *justitia* or the acquisition of righteousness, and the gift from God is also there. But what good is the gift if I do not take it? Faith must be added to this. When God says: Your sins are forgiven (and this is what God said to all people through the resurrection of Jesus Christ), everyone can see that this does not help me if I do not believe and accept it. It is given to me, but if I do not grasp it, I do not have it. [**p 88**]

Prof. Stellhorn: I admit all that. But I do mean, and have always meant, that subjective justification is a judicial act of God, which conceptually follows the gift of faith and the grasping of the merit of Christ through faith.

Dr. Walther: But not temporally. The two coincide. As soon as I believe, I have what faith grasps. Why? Because God has judicially granted it to me through his Word. For the sake of the simple-minded, however, justification is compared to a process; but the individual acts of the process are not taken into consideration here. As soon as I believe, God has judicially forgiven my sins. The Word is the hand of God that gives the gift, faith is my hand that receives what God's hand gives me. That is why your definition of predestination is questionable to me.

Prof. Stellhorn: I still can't see the point. I have proved what I wanted to prove, namely, that what appears to be a simple conclusion from a previous **<pages 47>** decision of God must be applied to the individual by a special act.

Dr. Walther: How can I know that? I must abide by this: God has said it. I am not waiting for a new judicial act of God. God has said it in advance: Whoever believes in Christ shall have forgiveness of sins. You would like to have something to save your definition. I believe that there is no analogy to be sought here with justification. For if I am saved by faith, God has already actually done what you say he has yet to do. That cannot possibly be predestination.

Prof. Stellhorn: I can only find the analogy given.

Dr. Walther: I am not accusing you of false doctrine as soon as you say: My point of comparison was a different one. No, I am now attacking your definition of predestination. It is nothing when you say that it consists in the fact that if a person believes to the end, God will now perform a special judicial act towards me, and that is predestination. No, if I believe to the end, then I do not need a new decision. I already have the old decision. That saves me. That's why your predestination is something superfluous, something of which there is nothing in the Bible or in the Confession.

Pastor Beyer: Can it be called an election at all when it is said: The good Lord first sees people as those whom he has made believers, and now he chooses them by an act of judgment?

Pastor Allwardt: It was already said yesterday that we do not teach election by grace. That is the point I wanted to make. We teach an election.

Dr. Walther: I dispute that. You don't teach election. Nothing comes out of your presentation but the doctrine of justification. This so-called judicial decision has already been made. If it is given again, it will be the same as what has already happened before. Of course, I readily admit that God forgives the sins of Christians every day; but this is not a new judgment, but the same thing that has already happened before.

Pastor Allwardt: Our confession says: "God has decreed that he will save no one except those who believe in Christ". Now I see that as a rule according to which God wants to save people.

Dr. Walther: I do not acknowledge it, if you make this the rule of election. [**p. 89**]

Pastor Allwardt: I regard this as a general rule according to which God has determined to save men. It does not say what the persons are. The difference is **<pages 48>** therefore this: We believe that God has chosen according to a certain rule, not

according to an absolute will that is unknowable to us. He has decided to save only those whom he would bring to faith in time through the gospel. The chosen persons are those who would believe, and the real election is mediated by foreknowledge, that is, God has known from eternity which persons would believe, and he has chosen precisely these persons from the others, ordaining them to eternal life. These are chosen not for the sake of faith, but for the sake of Christ. The gospel is preached to all. God truly wants all to come to faith through it. He wants to be powerful through his Word. Our confession denies that God allows something to be added to the Word in some people in order to make it effective . It is through the Word that one comes to the Father. The Holy Spirit is with this word. He wants to bring all to faith through his word. This is his will from eternity. But God has foreseen from eternity what will happen in time. Our Confession says: "Many harden their hearts". So God cannot convert them. He cannot bring them to faith. He has not chosen them. He has chosen only those whose faith he foresaw before the foundation of the world, that is, only those who are justified by faith.

Dr. Walther: You have not satisfied me. You have not given me any insight into Professor Stellhorn's definition. When you say that God foreknows which people will have saving faith, therefore he will save them, he has decided that, — that is nothing more than God keeping his promise. For he has promised in the Gospel that whoever believes in Christ will be saved. That he keeps and foreknows this is not an election. This is faithfulness and truthfulness on God's part.

Pastor Allwardt: I am pleased that this is being said. However, we teach election. We say: Election is that God takes out those whose faith he foreknew, according to the Word of Scripture: The Lord knows those who are his [2 Tim. 2:19]. But we deny that election by grace is something more, that is, that man is granted a grace which we do not have in the gospel. Whoever has the gospel has everything, including election. Election by grace is not supposed to make the gospel effective.

Pastor Frederking: I have declared my support for the opponents. Therefore I must say a few words. I also explained right away that I interpret the 5th and also the 8th paragraph without any interpretation of the election of persons. When it is said that this election is the cause of salvation, I certainly believe that God has from eternity taken these very persons into his hand and that, if he had not done so, they would never come to faith and remain in it. **<page 49>** So when Scripture speaks of the election of grace, it wants to present this act of God to us in such a way that God has thought of these persons from eternity and has taken them into his special protection and protection. [**p 90**]

Pastor Herzer: I wanted to point out that one should not jump from one point to another. Let us stay with the question. The question is whether the definition of election by grace given by the opponents is correct?

Pastor Zorn: I just wanted to say this very briefly: that is where we stand. Professor Stellhorn did not answer, Pastor Allwardt did. It saddened me that he did not simply say: That is my position, but that he imputed to us a quite abominable doctrine, namely that we taught that there must still be a special power added to the calling, because we speak of predestination in the way we have done so far.

Prof. Stellhorn: According to the rule established earlier, wouldn't it be time for Pastor Allwardt to explain himself?

Dr. Walther: Pastor Allwardt should be allowed to respond to Pastor Zorn's speech.

Pastor Allwardt: I cannot explain Pastor Zorn's reproach. Dr. Walther had said that our teaching was nothing more than God fulfilling his promise, and I had said that God had foreseen which ones would believe and that he had chosen them. I did not deserve the reproach.

Pastor Beyer: Do you believe, Pastor Allwardt, that we teach an absolute election of grace?

Pastor Allwardt: I said: I do not know how one could escape this assumption if one did not assume that God foresaw the success of his word. Do not the brethren on the other hand teach that certain persons come to faith as a result of predestination? Must not then that special power be added, namely, to the word?

After some personal explanations had been made, we returned to the actual point.

Dr. Walther: I still maintain: Let me know whether Professor Stellhorn's definition is not basically nothing other than the general conclusion of grace, when he defines election by grace as the judicial *applicatio* of the general way of salvation based on God's foreknowledge. If this is predestination, I know of no difference between justification and election by grace.

Prof. Stellhorn: If I understand Dr. Walther correctly, his objection is this: In our view of election by grace, a special judicial act of God is not necessary; for in our view **<page 50>** it would already follow as a simple conclusion from the foregoing. I have already said before that this is not so, even if it seems so. It is exactly the same as with the two justifications. In the case of objective justification it might also seem as if subjective justification as a special judicial act of God were superfluous. One could say: If it is really true that God has justified people objectively, why is subjective justification as a special judicial act of God still necessary? And yet there is [**p 91**] such a special judicial act of God. This is precisely the case here. And only in this is the analogy. Just as there is subjective justification in spite of objective justification, so it is here. It would seem that if God has ordained such a way of salvation, no special act on God's part would be necessary so that he could have left it at that. But it only seems so, for predestination in the narrowest sense then consists in God judicially applying the provisions of the general way of salvation to the individual.

Prof. Crämer: The long and short of it is this: Since God foresaw that these and those would believe in Christ, he chose them.

Pastor Fick: According to Professor Stellhorn's definition, election by grace is nothing more than a mere foreknowledge of God. It actually completely abolishes election by grace in its specific sense. What has been said of the judicial act of God, which is supposed to consist in the election of those who have remained in the faith, is without Scriptural foundation, plucked out of the air, and does not agree with the Formula of Concord.

Pastor Buszin: It is now almost 25 years since I came to faith through the Gospel. But I have not yet heard the subjective judgment of God. What is this judgment?

Dr. Walther: We are not talking here about a subjective judgment, but about a special judicial act of God in subjective justification. I say that objective justification is just as much an act of God's judgment as subjective justification. Through the resurrection of Jesus Christ, God has pronounced a judicial verdict; but the world has not recognized it. As soon as I accept the justification granted to me in faith, I have it. I ask: How can this be called an election when it is taught that God foresaw that certain people would remain in the faith until the end, and now, having foreseen this, he has decided: They shall be saved. If the election is to be nothing more than that God remains with his decree: All who believe to the end shall be saved, then there is no election. Thus no one is chosen. The most that can be said is that God does not revoke it.

Pastor Rohe then read out the definition of Wandalinus contained in the Synodical Report of 1877 and remarked "that it is called excellent there, he professes it".

Dr. Walther: Then you are one of us. There is not a word here about God choosing on the basis of foreseen faith. We are not such fools as to say that those are chosen whom he foresaw would not believe. In this we are no different. We declare faith to be just as necessary as you do. There is no other way to salvation, no other order of grace, no other counsel of salvation. But this is what we say: It is not on account of what God foreknew in man that he chose him, because our Confession declares that [p 92] there are only two causes of election, namely, the mercy of God and the merit of Christ. This definition is delicious, especially for schools. The schoolteacher would be a fool to initiate little children into the mysteries of election by grace. He should only describe the elect and they say: The elect are those who believe to the end. But anyone who says that they are chosen because they believe is not teaching Lutheranism. Our old theologians, especially Luther, and also those who declare the opponents to be their guarantors, have always said: If one teaches: For the sake of faith they are chosen, then that is synergism and Pelagianism. When Huber once accused Hunnius of teaching that people are chosen for the sake of faith, Hunnius replied: No, I don't teach that. That would be obvious Pelagianism.

Pastor Rohe: But you have to hold on to the "*intuitu fidei*". That's what matters to me. When I say: *intuitu fidei*, I do not mean to say: for the sake of their faith, but I mean to say: for the sake of Christ who was grasped by their faith, not for the sake of Christ who hung on the cross without having been grasped by faith.

Dr. Walther: I am saved for the sake of Christ taken by faith. But where does it say that we are elect for his sake? Where does the definition read above say *"intuitu fidei*"? It says: "foreseen". God foresees everything. God also foresees believers as such.

Pastor Rohe: *"intuitu fidei*" is included in this word. It should be said: God had decided to make all those people blessed of whom he foresaw that they would believe to the end.

Dr. Walther: Only the objects are described here, but not the reason. The passage only shows that God foresaw this and that no others were chosen but those of whom he foresaw this. <page 52> You know: We have never taught otherwise. We already explained 30 years ago: If one says: God has chosen those of whom he foresaw that they would believe until the end, then that is correct. But as soon as you say: He chose them because he foresaw that they would believe until the end, that is wrong. The *"intuitu fidei*" is an unfortunate expression. It is easy to think of a motive. There is no other motive here than the two mentioned in the Confession. —

Adjourned with the Lord's prayer. J. G. Nützel, Secr.

[p 93]

Seventh Session.

Saturday morning, October 2.

The meeting began with a liturgical service, after which the minutes of the sixth meeting were read out and adopted after the necessary improvements. After this

Dr. Walther took the floor and said: "We have not yet come to the end of our assessment of the definition of "election by grace" presented to us. As you know, it was as follows: Election is a judicial application of the universal way of salvation based on the foresight of God. I readily admit that this definition is very reasonable; but it is not confessional, it is quite contrary to the confession. Indeed, I say that even the theologians of the seventeenth century, who adopted the second trope, would not subscribe to this definition; but little or nothing depends on the latter, but everything on the former. For we only want to confess the doctrine of election by grace, which we find in our Confession. I consider 1. the statement of the reason to be contrary to the Confession, when it says: "one founded on the foresight of God". For reason is nothing other than cause, as, for example, Baier defines "reason" as follows, not with regard to the doctrine of election of grace, but in general: *) [*) *Compendium theol*. pos. I, 29] "Reason is the cause why that which is justified is or can be." But the Confession says the opposite, that the foreknowledge of God is the basis of election. Thus we read in the *Epitome* p. 557. §§ 20. 21: "Again, that not only the mercy of God and the most holy merit of Christ, but also in us, is a cause of the election of God, for the sake of which God has chosen us to eternal life", and it is even added that the confession refers to the three preceding errors: "Which are all blasphemous and frightful erroneous doctrines, whereby Christians are deprived of all comfort which they have in the holy Gospel and use of the holy <page 53> sacraments, and on account of which should not be tolerated in the churches of God." Thus the Confession not only says here that the mercy of God and the most holy merit of Christ alone, and nothing else, are the reason and cause of election, but it also gives the reason why we Lutherans recognize these two causes alone. The reason is because otherwise Christians cannot take comfort in the election of grace. For if election by grace is merely that God foreknew something in us and was thereby moved to choose us, how can we take comfort in it? For he [p 94] alone knows it, we do not know it. Then that helps us nothing. For we can always think: God knows beforehand, perhaps he knows that I will be damned, or even if he knows that I will be saved, I do not know. So this way of teaching takes away all the comfort that lies in the election of grace. — Take p. 724, § 91, where it says: "Therefore, if the doctrine of the gracious election of God is taught in such a way that troubled Christians cannot be comforted by it, but are caused to despair by it, or the impenitent are strengthened in their willfulness, then it is undoubtedly certain and true that this doctrine is not practiced according to the Word and will of God, but according to the reason and instigation of the wicked devil." We can see from Luther that in his time people usually came into great, terrible temptations because of this, Luther himself to the point of true mortal wrestling, because they only ever thought: God knows beforehand how it will be with me, so my fate is determined. If he knows in advance that I will be lost, no one else can, least of all I myself, so I must despair. Many have really despaired, and Luther was on the verge of despair. When he had such challenged people, he said: "Yes, of course you have to admit that God knows everything in advance, including who will be saved and who will not. But it is the devil who leads you to cling to it. This foreknowledge is not revealed to you in the Word. Stick to the Word and don't worry about God's foreknowledge. God has directed you to the Word if you want to know

whether you are an elect person. He did not say: Ask me (about once in the evening in prayer), I will tell you then, because I know it in advance. — There are enough testimonies about this in our synodal reports, but I don't want to go into them now, because we must rather stick to the confessional writings, which are our common principle. If two people who argue with each other have no common principle, nothing but the greatest confusion can follow. They do not understand each other, and if they do understand each other, they will often fall into the error of *petitio principii*, i.e. they present propositions to be proved as propositions of proof. No one will understand me as imputing such folly to dear Prof. Stellhorn. It is merely a general remark. **<Page 54>** We must first agree on this: What is election by grace? Then let us judge each other by it. For if we do not agree on what election of grace is, then it is in vain that we discuss the other things. For each of us then judges the other details according to a different principle. To show that it is contrary to confession to make the foreknowledge of God the ground and cause of election, I cite another passage, p. 723, § 88, where it says: "Therefore it is false and unjust (*cum verbo Dei pugnat*) when it is taught that not only the mercy of God and the most holy merit of Christ alone, but also in us, is a cause of God's election, for the sake of which God has chosen us to eternal life. [**p 95**] For not only before we did anything good, but also before we were born, he chose us in Christ, yes, before the foundation of the world was laid, and that God's favor might be according to election, it was said to him, not by merit of works, but by grace of the caller, thus: The greater shall serve the lesser. As it is written: I loved Jacob, but I hated Esau. Romans 9:[11—13]; also Genesis 25[:23]; Malachi l:[2-3]." But I do not only attack the fact that in the definition given it is said that election is based on the foreknowledge of God, but also the description of the nature of election, when it is said that it is a judicial application of the general way of salvation. According to our confession it is rather a cause of salvation, an ordinance to salvation, a bringing to eternal life, a making partaker of salvation, *participem facere*. Compare p. 705. § 8: "But the eternal election of God not only sees and knows beforehand the salvation of the elect, but is also a cause by the gracious will and pleasure of God in Christ Jesus, so that our salvation, and that which belongs to it, creates, works, helps and promotes; on which also our salvation is so founded that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, as it is written: My sheep shall no man pluck out of my hand. And again, As many as were ordained to eternal life believed." So it is by no means a mere application of the way of salvation, but rather that by which God brings us onto the way of salvation, keeps us on it and introduces us to glory. It brings us there, for it does not merely mean: "that which works our salvation" etc., but also: "that which belongs to it". Here we are not talking about acquisition. Rather, it must be said of the acquisition that it is the reason for election. — It is said to have happened out of the gracious pleasure of Jesus Christ, i.e., on the basis of the acquisition of salvation, election is now the cause of our salvation and all that belongs to it — of course, faith belongs to it above all, if I want to attain salvation; hence the passage is also quoted at the end, Acts 13:48, of which several passages refer. 13, 48, of which several **<page 55>** theologians who teach the 2nd trope have said that it does not belong here at all, that it does not deal with the election of grace (e.g. Quenstedt). Balthasar Meisner, on the other hand, says that it does belong here, since our confession also mentions it. So they do not agree with each other. Therefore I say: The definition presented is not confessional, but contrary to the confession; for it says that the application of the way of salvation is only a judicial act of God, not a creating, working, promoting, helping one. Only a judicial one, i.e. only after what is to happen in man has happened, does God intervene and pronounce the judicial judgment: He shall be saved. According to this definition, the election of grace has nothing to do with the creation of salvation itself; rather, this definition presupposes

the creation of salvation, i.e. conversion. — [**p 96**] We also compare page 708, § 23, where it says: "And in his counsel, counsel and decree God has not only prepared (*procuravit*) salvation in general, but has also considered all and every person of the elect who are to be saved through Christ in grace, has chosen them for salvation, and has also decreed that he will bring, help, promote, strengthen and preserve them in the way now reported, by his grace, gifts and effects." This sentence begins with the words: "And indeed" (*et quidem*) to indicate: The most important thing is to recognize and hold that election is not a mere application, but a decree, a *decretum*, based on a *propositum* [declaration], which is certainly to be done, as our dear brothers on the other side — to their credit — have already admitted; indeed, here we are talking about those who will infallibly be saved. But the dear brethren may consider whether, if they make this confession sincerely, they will be able to maintain their position any longer. Oh, if only the good Lord would give them light on this! But Luther says that the hour is not always there — God has appointed a time and an hour for everyone, when he will bring him to the light. Let us pray, let us sigh to God day and night, that he will not leave our dear brothers in their opposition to us; for we all stand on one foundation, praise God! but they believe we stand on a false one. I am convinced that when they see that we are standing on the ground of our Confession, they will join hands with us again. For I do not accuse them to be dishonest or disingenuousness [*Unlauterkeit*] at all; may God mercifully protect me from such judgment of the heart. But they cannot recognize it. We, on the other hand, cannot recognize that they are right, and are definitely convinced that we are standing on the confession. — A second reason why the description of the nature of election is not in accordance with the confession is that, according to our confession, election by grace serves especially to ensure that, when we stand in the faith, we do not lose the faith, but keep it to the end, while the **<page** 56**>** application presupposes that man has not lost the faith, but perseveres in it to the end. But the fact that, according to our Confession, the precious, saving election of grace helps us to remain in the faith until the end, is above all the consolation. It does not consist in our being saved by faith; then it would be the same consolation that we find in God's Word, in the Gospel, in Christ's merit, in short, in all means of salvation and grace. We are asking here about the special consolation that lies precisely in this teaching. It consists in the fact that a poor sinner (who is deeply distressed about his sin, but because he believes in his Lord Jesus and wants to remain with him, nothing wants to be separated from him, relying solely on his mercy and on nothing in himself) says to himself: He who has chosen you will also see to it that you remain in grace and do not lose faith. — Listen, for example, to p. 714, §§ 45-47, where it says: "This doctrine also gives the beautiful and glorious consolation that God is so concerned about the conversion, righteousness and salvation of every Christian, and so faithfully intends it, that before the foundation of the world [**p 97**] was laid, he took counsel about it and ordained in his decree how he would bring me to it and preserve me in it. Again, that he had so well and surely willed to preserve my salvation, because it might easily be lost through the weakness and wickedness of our flesh out of remote hands, or be snatched and taken from it by the cunning and violence of the devil and the world, that he has decreed this in his eternal purpose, which cannot be filed or overthrown, and has committed it to the almighty hand of our Savior Jesus Christ, from which no one can snatch us, John 10[:28], hence Paul also says in Romans 8[:28, 39]: "Because we have been called according to the purpose of God, who will separate us from the love of God in Christ?" So the Formula of Concord is talking here about a person who is already in the faith and is now afraid of it: Yes, I stand in faith, have forgiveness of sins and therefore eternal life, but will I not lose it? How wicked and wanton is my flesh, how deep the corruption of my heart, how tempting the world, how

cunning the devil! will I endure to the end? Then says our dear Formula of Concord: Look, there you have a consolation, that is the election of grace. God has thus taken your salvation completely out of your hands and has taken it into his own hands. — In particular it is emphasized here (§ 46): that the Father has decreed my salvation in his eternal purpose, which cannot be lacking or overthrown, and has placed it in the almighty hand (the second person of the Holy Trinity) of our Savior Jesus Christ to preserve it, from which no one can snatch us. John 10[:28]. — But when God, as it says here, sets his mind on something, namely our salvation, he also accomplishes it. We may set ourselves many things, but we **<pages 57>** do not carry them out. We already heard yesterday: God wants a lot from man, and yet man does not do it. But when God sets his mind to something, he carries it out, and all the devils in hell cannot stop him. Now I ask: Does this definition not take away this consolation? If election by grace is nothing more than a judicial application of the way of salvation to the elect, then the consolation mentioned in §§ 46 and 47 is lost. — I have already pointed out on another occasion that the Latin text in § 47 expresses itself even more sharply: "*Ideo Paulus certitudinem beatitudinis nostrae* ***super fundamentum propositi divini*** *exstruit, cum ex eo, quod secundum propositum Dei vocati sumus, colligit, nemin nos posse separare a dilectione Dei, quae est in Christo Jesu, Domino nostro*." I.e.: "Therefore Paul builds the certainty of our salvation on the foundation of the divine purpose, when he concludes from the fact that we are called according to the purpose of God that no one can separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." It is therefore quite wrong to say (but I do not impute this to Prof. Stellhorn): Yes, God certainly wants to do what is necessary on his side, but we must also do our part, and in this we should bear in mind that we have the devil, the world and the flesh around and about us. On the contrary, the Formula of Concord says that the election of grace comforts us against the temptations of the devil, the world and the flesh. [**p 98**] Note also p. 724. § 90. In the foregoing it was said: "Likewise, this doctrine gives no one cause either for faint-heartedness or for an impudent, wild life, if people are taught that they should seek eternal election in Christ and His holy Gospel, as in the Book of Life, which excludes no penitent sinner, but calls all poor, afflicted and sorrowful sinners to repentance and knowledge of their sins and to faith in Christ, and promises the Holy Spirit for cleansing and renewal, and thus gives the most lasting comfort to afflicted, afflicted people" (now comes the word to which I refer:) "that they may know that their salvation is not in their own hands: otherwise they would lose it much more easily than Adam and Eve did in paradise, even every hour and moment; but in the gracious election of God, which he has revealed to us in Christ, out of whose hand no man shall pluck us, John 10[:28]; 2 Timothy 2[:19]" Consider well! Here it is claimed and taught that we are much more certain of our salvation than Adam and Eve were in their state of innocence. They could fall, we too, that is true. But whoever is elect, God will certainly bring him to salvation. It is impossible for an elect person to be damned. As our dear Savior expressly says, “false prophets will come in the last days, performing signs and wonders and "many deceivers," so that, if **<page 58>** it were possible, even the elect be deceived into error. Thus, the fact that we are chosen makes us so much more certain of our salvation than Adam and Eve, whereas otherwise we would have to lose it much more easily than Adam and Eve did in paradise, indeed every hour and moment. So we know for certain that we are to be saved and we will be saved. As terrible as this sounds to many people's ears, it is the sun-brightly revealed teaching of the divine Word, to which our Confession also professes in § 90: We would be lost if it were not for the election of grace, if the good God had not taken our salvation into his hands. Pastor Allwardt also confessed this: God has taken it into his hand and he does everything. That made me very happy, so he certainly recognizes a real election of grace. But I cannot

wonder enough how Prof. Stellhorn's definition can satisfy him under these circumstances. But that does not belong here. — Furthermore, the definition of the nature of election by grace, as given by Prof. Stellhorn, is quite contrary to what our Confession of the certainty of the cross asserts in the doctrine of election by grace. For our confession teaches that the election of grace gives the certainty in the cross that it will serve us for the best. The Confession does this in the strongest possible way. p. 714. §§ 48 and 49: "This doctrine also gives glorious consolation in the cross and temptations, namely, that God in his counsel before the time of the world considered and determined that he would help us in all our troubles, grant patience, give comfort, work hope, and procure such an outcome that it may be blessed for us. Moreover, as Paul comfortingly states in Romans 8[:28-29, 35, 38-39], that God in his providence decreed before the world began by what cross and [**p 99**] suffering he would make each of his elect conform to the image of his Son, and that each one's cross should and must serve for the best, because they are called according to his purpose, Paul concludes that neither tribulation nor fear, neither death nor life, etc., can separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus." Consider how important it is to be comforted in the cross and in trials; for when do we need it more than there? As soon as things go badly for me, my old Adam or the devil says: There you have it, God is not your friend; if you were a righteous child of God, God would deal with you quite differently; see, this is already the beginning of what awaits you in eternity, there will be something quite different. — But when I have the doctrine of the election of grace and take comfort in it, I say: It is written: "All things must be for the good of those who love God, who are called according to purpose." Our Confession says, and so do the vast majority of 17th century theologians (though others do not): the words, "which are called according to the purpose," mean as much as "on the basis of election by grace." Cf. § 48 **<page 59>** Oh, what a comfort that is! In what terrible distress we are now, that we are often tempted to despair and despair! But this should comfort us: God wants to provide a blessed end. "Romans 8 says that God in his providence decreed before the time of the world by means of the cross and suffering," etc. Here we have the explanation of our confession in Romans 8:28, that therefore the cross should and must serve each of the elect for their good, because they are called according to the purpose, which is nothing other than because they are chosen. — And finally, that definition does not agree with the doctrine of the church, which connects our confession with the doctrine of election by grace. This is extremely important. Thus we read p. 715, § 50: "This article also gives a glorious testimony that the church of God will be and remain against all the gates of hell, and also teaches which is the true church of God, that we may not be offended at the great reputation of false churches, Rom. 9." So that the church cannot perish, says our confession, is based on the fact that God has made an eternal order to make his elect eternally blessed. If this order were not made by God, if this counsel were not taken, we might think: There may be a time when God's Word is still preached, but no one accepts it, or even if they do accept it, they do not persevere; and if then at a certain time there is no one who stands in the faith, the church has perished. But, says our Confession, for the sake of the election of grace this is impossible; by it the Church is set upon a rock, so that even the gates of hell cannot prevail against it. So much is enough for the time being.

Prof. Stellhorn then stood up and replied: "As this lecture (Dr. Walther's) was very long and covered many points, I must apologize in advance if I do not speak as coherently as I might otherwise. I would first like to respond to [**p 100**] something that came up yesterday but was not refuted. The objection was raised yesterday that, according to our doctrine, election by grace is a mere foreknowledge of God. We have repeatedly denied this before. By my very definition I have shown that "election" is more

to me than mere foreknowledge; for a judicial application is not mere foreknowledge. — Then we were told that what we call this could not be called an election at all. It seems to be assumed that an election implies that the person who chooses has not made a rule according to which he elects, otherwise I could not understand this objection. If, for example, a commander who is about to undertake an important enterprise needs only a few soldiers, not a whole regiment, if he chooses, this does not exclude the possibility that he has laid down for himself the rule according to which he will do so. He <pages 60> will choose those whom he knows in advance to be bold and prudent. (Please note that this is only a point of comparison.) — For the other, it was thought that no election was possible or necessary here because, according to my definition, there is a self-evident consequence of a previous decision by God, and therefore there is no special election. I already referred to the analogy of justification yesterday and must stick to it. It proves that what is already a self-evident consequence of a decision of God can nevertheless be established by a special decision. This is obviously the case with subjective justification, which is a special act of God that follows the concept of the gift of faith. Although it could be said to be a simple, self-evident consequence, subjective justification is an independent act of God. I take *praedestinatio* as judicial application in the narrowest sense, speaking only of the second part, not of predestination as a whole, and here I say: This predestination, insofar as it is nothing but the particular election of individual persons, is also a simple, self-evident consequence of the order of salvation and yet also a special act of God's will. The only difference between justification and predestination is that in the case of subjective justification this judicial act takes place in time. Whereas the judicial application of the general order of salvation in predestination takes place in eternity. — I would like to bring in another analogy, namely reprobation. This is also a special decree of God and yet one can also say of it what one says of predestination. For just as this is nothing other than the result of God's decree: "He who believes will be saved", so that is the result of the other conclusion: "He who does not believe will be damned"; and yet reprobation is not a mere letting go, but a special judicial act of God. (Please note again the one point of comparison.) This is clearly shown by § 40, where it says: "That he will harden, reject and condemn those who are called by the Word, if they reject the word and resist the Holy Spirit, who wants to be powerful and work in them through the word, and persist in it; in Latin: "*In **eodem suo** consilio decrevit . . . **velit** ... et **secundum has rationes**. . . esse*." The Formula of Concord thus takes here the reverse side of election, namely the rejection necessarily connected [**p 101**] with it. As well as reprobation is a judicial act of God, so well is predestination in the narrowest sense a special judicial act of God. I wanted to say this in advance in relation to what was noted yesterday. — Now to what I have been attacked about today. First, the provision of my definition was attacked, which says that predestination is based on *praevisio*. **<page 61>** Dr. Walther has declared that “basis” equals “cause”; in my opinion this is not so. I understand "basis" here only as an explanatory reason. The *praevisio* explains to me why God did not choose all people despite the general way of salvation. The reason is only God's mercy and Christ's merit; I do not accept other moving causes. But that *praevisio* is really the explanatory basis, we see clearly from §§ 34-43 (was read out; here special attention was drawn to the fact that in these §§ it is a question of explaining how it is that, while many are called, only a few are chosen: *Secundum has rationes* = according to these reasons). Some cannot be brought to believe and this is due to their willful resistance. So even if the Formula of Concord does not have the expression “in view of faith” ["*intuitu fidei*"], the matter does. This whole passage therefore wants to say that the fact that among the many who are called not many but few are chosen is not due to a secret will of God, but to the fact that not every man can be an elect person, no matter

how he may behave towards the Word of God, but that God has made a certain order and only those who find themselves in it can be elect. Now if it is the case that, while God has made such an order, only very few people allow themselves to be inserted into this order, and the election is already an eternally fixed, finalized one, then God's foreknowledge must necessarily come into play, not as a motive, but as an explanation. This is my conviction entirely. — Page 557 § 20 was cited, and it was said that in my definition of the election of grace these words would not come into their own. But when it is said that there is no cause in us, it only means something which we have by nature, or at least can give, not something which God gives us and which is then in us, namely faith or Christ apprehended by faith. It was also cited p. 724 §§ 89 and 90 and the consolation that the doctrine of election of grace gives was pointed out. I accept this entirely. If this doctrine of the Formula of Concord, if in it §§ 34-43 are treated correctly, is consoling, otherwise not. The point, the consolation flowing from it, is a main reason for me to stand as I do. For me it is not a matter of the mind, but of the heart. Here I must point out that the sentence has been rejected as incorrect: "Those who are not chosen are not chosen because they willfully resist." But I have three sources to prove that this is correct. The first is, with your permission, Dr. Walther himself. He had it printed in his *Postil* and preached that those who are not chosen are not chosen because God could not have chosen them.

Dr. Walther: I still believe that today; I do not agree with those who deny it. [p 102]

Prof. Stellhorn: Furthermore, I cite a passage from Luther to prove that only the persistent unbelief of those who are not elect has forced God not to elect them. It is found in *Der Lutheraner* 1880, p. 52, column 3 f. and is taken from a letter of the year 1545, so that it cannot be said that Luther later changed his mind: "And because they were foreknown as those who would fall, they were not predestined. But they would have been predestined if they had turned back and remained in holiness and truth." This is a contradictory contrast to the rejection of the above sentence. Thirdly, I have as my source §§ 34-43 of our Formula of Concord, where it is expressly stated that God has not chosen most men because they willfully resist, either when it comes to working or maintaining the faith."

In response to Pastor Stöckhardt's interposed question: Where exactly is this actually said in the Formula of Concord, Prof. Stellhorn continues:

The proof is to be found in §§ 40-42, where § 41 cites Matthew 22, where I agree with Pastor Stöckhardt in what he says, but not in what he conceals. Of course I do not want to impute anything to him. This passage also has the sense: thus it appears that many are called, but few are chosen; but from the context it is clear that the real and closest sense is: thus it comes to pass that etc. This is my reply to the objection that my definition is not correct in so far as predestination is judicial application, etc. I did not have this definition in writing when I gave it, so it is possible that there might be expressions in it which I would have to retract; if it were so, which I do not yet see, I would do so. — Dr. Walther now bases himself on the expression "judicial application" and says that it is contrary to the doctrine of the Confession, according to which election by grace is a cause of salvation, etc. As to the word "judicial," I should have said at once that I take it in the sense in which our elders call the *voluntas consequens* a *voluntas judicialis*. Our theologians from Hunnius onwards distinguish a twofold will in God: *voluntas antecedens* and *consequens*. Gerhard in particular makes this distinction very clear. I may be permitted to read it aloud, since I would have to say the same thing: Gerhard (loc. VIII. *de electione et reprobatione*, c. IV. § LXXIX. ed. cotta tom. IV. pg. 169; ed. Preuss p. 61): "But this distinction (between *voluntas antecedens* and *consequens*) does not distinguish the will of God in and for itself, which in God is one and indivisible, but its double relation. <Page 63> The *voluntas antecedens* (the antecedent will) concerns the means of salvation as they are determined by God and offered to all. *The voluntas consequens* is the same means, but insofar as they are accepted or rejected by man . The antecedent will is so called because it precedes the consideration of human obedience or disobedience: it is that simply gracious will of God which is equally over all. The subsequent will (*voluntas consequens*) is so called because it is preceded by the consideration of human (faith) obedience or disobedience; it indicates definitely [p 103] how the same will relates to men who actually follow the order of salvation and to those who do not." — So, when I said: judicial application, I could just as well have said: "the one based on the *voluntas consequens*". This definition, in so far as it says that predestination in the strictest sense is done *intuitu fidei*, is said to contradict the doctrine of the Formula of Concord, where it says, p. 705. § 8, that it is a cause of salvation. I accept that election is a cause of our salvation. But I refer this to the first part, to those eight points, although I also admit for myself (as not all on our side do) that election is also in a certain sense a cause of salvation according to the second part, inasmuch as in this election according to p. 708. § 23 the decree is already included that God now also wants to strengthen and preserve the elect "in the way as now reported" ....

Thus election by grace in the wider sense is a cause of salvation according to its first and in a certain sense also according to its second part. In this respect at least I cannot see that my definition abolishes this doctrine of the Formula of Concord. Acts 13:48. is cited; several of our elders say that this passage does not belong here. I believe it does belong here. But it does not say there: as many were ordained [*verordnet*], but: as many were ordered [*geordnet*], and this decree is precisely that contained in the eight points. I also refer the words "prepared in common" to the first eight points. That God has at the same time decreed that the elect should really be led in this way, is the application of what has already been said in the first half. — Furthermore, my definition is intended to contradict the fact that the Formula of Concord teaches that preservation in faith is also a consequence of election. The Formula of Concord, p. 708, § 21, says: "That he would also strengthen and increase in them the good work which he has begun, and preserve them to the end, if they keep God's Word, pray diligently, abide in God's goodness, and faithfully use the gifts they have received." This is a definition of the first part of the way of salvation. Of course, if predestination is application, then this is also applied to them. So it also follows according to my definition that the elect are now also preserved in faith as a result of <page 64> election. — It is further stated p. 714, § 45, "that the good God has so well and surely willed to preserve my salvation". I heartily subscribe to this. Namely, he has done this by determining just such a way of salvation as he has done, one in which he alone wants to do everything. He has found just such a way; but of course he does not want to force me to salvation, my willful resistance can oppose him at any point. Of course, I could not resist his omnipotence. It says: "how" "*quomodo*", not "that" he wills it. So he has determined the manner, and this is precisely the first part of the election of grace in the sense of the Formula of Concord. — Now this is our consolation, that the good God (in the first part) has determined such a way by which he wants to do everything. If it were not so, I would not have the slightest consolation. The consolation that follows from the particular election, from the act of God that he has decided to bring certain persons to salvation [p 104], can, in my firm conviction, only be a conditional one. The consolation can only be of the same kind as the certainty. I know with absolute certainty that the first part of the election of grace is there for me, which is why the consolation to which I must ultimately return again and again is a very firm one that can withstand the temptation. The Formula of Concord knows nothing of anything other than such a consolation that remains in the face of temptation — and what do I do with it? Attention was also drawn to p. 714. §§ 45-47, especially § 47.

Dr. Walther: § 46 is just as important to me.

Prof. Stellhorn: I take this as § 45, that the consolation for me lies in the fact that the good Lord has created such a way of salvation. The consolation from the second part of the election of grace is only a conditional one, which helps me nothing when I come into temptation. Sections 89 and 90 were also mentioned. These paragraphs speak of the consolation that follows from the doctrine of election of grace. The consolation is that election is an eternal election in Christ. Nothing is evidently given there but the content of the general way of salvation, the decisions contained in the first part of election by grace. And of course these provisions are also applied to the elect. Consequently, one cannot say that, according to my teaching, election by grace has no consolation for the elect. It is said in § 90 that this election by grace is revealed to us in Christ. On this I compare p. 717, § 65, where it says: "Accordingly, this eternal election of God is to be considered in Christ and not outside or without Christ. For in Christ, as the holy apostle Paul testifies, we are chosen" etc. In § 67 it also says: "This is the will of the Father" and so on. It is said that God's election is revealed in these sayings. Now if the eternal election is revealed by the fact that the general way of salvation <page 65> is revealed,

then the election must consist, in the main, in the fact that the general way of salvation has been established. — It was also said: My definition argues against the doctrine of the Formula of Concord, that election of grace gives certainty in the cross. But if the election of grace in the strictest sense is nothing else than the judicial application of the first part to the elect, and if it is said p. 708. § 20: "That God would protect them even in their great weakness against the devil, the world and the flesh, and would govern and guide them in his ways, when they stumble, raise them up again, comfort and preserve them in the cross and temptation", then obviously I cannot be reproached that my doctrine does not give certainty in the cross. This does not exclude my definition, but rather includes it. — Finally, it has been remarked that my definition is at variance with p. 715. § 50: "This article also gives a glorious testimony that the Church of God" etc. That always... church will always be on earth is founded in the first part, where just such a way of salvation is established as it is, according to which God does everything, and in the application to the elect. Consequently, the doctrine that there will always be and remain a Christian church remains firm. [**p 105]**

After the President had called attention to the fact that all present must enter their names in the respective lists, the meeting adjourned with the Lord's prayer.

W. Krauß, secretary.

Eighth meeting.

Monday morning, October 4.

The meeting began with the usual service. After the minutes of the meeting of last Saturday morning had been read, Director Krauß asked to speak on a personal matter.

Director Krauß took the floor to make a personal statement: "I have come to the conclusion, through repeated consideration of the reasons given in Dr. Walther's speech [just read] and through further discussion in Addison, that my previous position is untenable. Holy Scripture teaches, and the Formula of Concord says, that the election of grace is really "a cause of our salvation and all that pertains to it. I must say I have been looking at this article of the Formula of Concord quite wrongly. I am glad that I now recognize this error, thank God for it and pray that He may bring my brothers of the opposition to the same realization in the course of these days. I still have a few things to say about certain expressions, e.g. the "passing by of God", but now that the main stumbling block for me has been removed, I can feel this until the course of the negotiations leads to it.

Dr. Walther: I just wanted to make a few comments on the anti-criticism [of Prof. Stellhorn] and will stick to what seems to be of particular importance. What I do not consider important, or what can easily be applied to another matter, I will pass over for the time being. I am sending this explanation in advance so that there is no reason to attack me as if I had wanted to avoid one or the other argument. First you say: "We have been told that what we call an election is not an election at all", and then you want to prove that it is an election by saying: "It is part of the election that God has made a rule." To this I make this remark: No man can deny that God has acted according to a rule. God does not act arbitrarily. But God has revealed nothing to us in His Word but that He has judged according to His mercy and according to the most holy merit of Christ. Whoever now insinuates another rule, we reject. For that is then a rule that a creature wants to impose on Him, and no creature should dare to do that. So what you say is not true at all; it is not a decision; nor is it proof against the reasons that have been put to you.

Prof. Stellhorn: I gladly admit, as I have repeatedly confessed, that the cause which moved God to destine men to salvation is only his mercy and the most holy merit of Christ. There are no other causes [**p 106**] that have moved Him to do this. But another question is this: according to what rule did He act? The rule need not be a cause! The rule, according to my conviction, is according to God's Word and the Confession of our Church: Christ taken in faith. Where God saw Him, He chose man, where He did not see Him, He left man. When it is said that faith is the rule, the most holy merit of Christ is not excluded, but rather comes into its own. If I want to converse with the fathers, I must say that election took place in Christ who was grasped by faith, and our Confession says the same. Where God has seen a man in Christ, He has chosen him. Whom He has not seen in Christ, He has not chosen. The consequence is rejection. So when I say that faith is the rule according to which election took place, this is only, as the elders also explain, a shortened expression for "Christ grasped in faith", which is synonymous with "*intuitu fidei*", or "in view of faith". If it is a question of a rule according to which God has chosen, then this can only be faith grasping the merit of Christ. The merit of Christ is there for all; if the election had taken place "in Christ", without regard to faith, then God could have elected all men, whereas Dr. Walther himself declared that it was so <pages 67> that God could not have elected all. Man must first allow himself to be given the merit of Christ.

Dr. Walther: We will come back later to the "allowing oneself to be given" and show what a terrible doctrine this connection leads to. — They make faith into a cause. For, if faith is the rule, then God has allowed Himself to be guided by it, and that is "cause". You may deny that you suppose three causes of election: God's mercy, Christ's merit, and faith, but you are only afraid to say it that way.

Pastor Allwardt: It is the same with justification. Who would say that there are three causes of justification? We say that we are justified by God's mercy and through the merit of Christ, but that the merit of Christ must be grasped by faith; but we do not make faith a cause of justification. Neither do we make faith a cause of election when we say that faith is the rule by which election is effected. Holy Scripture also never contrasts grace and faith, but always one's own merit and grace, as Romans 4:16, for example, shows that grace and faith are not opposed: "Therefore righteousness must come by faith, that it may be by grace". Precisely when we say: by faith alone, we confess that it is by grace alone.

Dr. Walther: The fact that grace and faith go together in justification, but not in election, is due to the fact that we do not grasp the election of grace by faith, as we grasp

righteousness by faith. The righteousness of Christ belongs to the whole world and therefore we can and should grasp it by faith. Election, however, does not concern the whole world, but extends only to the children of God. If I am chosen, then I am chosen, even if I do not yet believe. Our opponents would like to include faith where the cause is concerned. If they said: We are chosen by faith, that [**p 107**] could be heard even better (if they wanted to say: God has ordained us to bring us to faith and to keep us in it), even though it is not an ecclesiastical way of speaking.

Pastor Allwardt: If it is conceded that faith is not a work on the part of man, but only the hand that grasps the offered salvation, then this proves that we do not make the election dependent on our works. God has seen beforehand who can be given faith, and He has ordained them to salvation.

Dr. Walther: As soon as you allow faith to be the cause on the part of man, you make it a work. If faith has been considered in the election, the cause is not in God alone, and faith is made a work, a merit. **<Page 68>** Otherwise the "*intuitu fidei*" has no meaning at all. If one wants to hold on to this "*intuitu fidei*", despite the fact that it is admitted that faith is not a work of man, but solely a gift and effect of God, one would have to assume that God has chosen those to whom he has given faith for the sake of this gift of his. I will not say: Because I gave this man 100 thalers yesterday, that moves me to give him 1000 thalers today! What a conclusion that would be! Only that can be given as a reason if there is such a worthiness in him that moves me to do him a new kindness. But it cannot be a reason because I have already done him something good before.

Pastor Allwardt: This principle would nullify the doctrine of justification. The reason for justification is that another work has already been done before, the work of redemption through Christ. The order in which I am justified is that I come to faith, through which I acquire justification. This is the order that God has revealed in his Word. But in this revealed order God also says that unbelief is the cause of condemnation.

Dr. Walther: Yes, that's just it. You want to build a bridge over this abyss [between unbelief as cause of condemnation and faith as cause of justification]. You do not want to surrender in a childlike manner to the testimonies of Holy Scripture, but want to insert faith in order to be able to explain the mystery of which God's Word is silent. For your thought is this: the difference must lie in man. If it did not lie in man, then there would be an absolute election. So Scripture may speak as it pleases, and the Church may confess what it pleases, but you remain in your false position, into which you have allowed yourself to be forced by the so-called "reason for explanation".

Pastor Allwardt: I understood the definition of election by grace in the same way as Professor Stellhorn explained it: election by grace is mediated by the foreknowledge of faith.

Dr. Walther: My dear brother, you are astute enough to know that you cannot and must not speak in this way if you consider election to be the judicial application of the provisions of the general way of salvation to individuals based on foreknowledge. If election is based on the foreknowledge of faith, then faith cannot be the basis of explanation. There are *fallacies* (*fallacia aequivoca*) that are made by interpreting an ambiguous word according to expediency. You cannot speak like this without making such a fallacy. Everyone knows that "being founded on" is not synonymous with "ground of explanation", but [**p 108**] indicates the foundation on which something stands. If you say: The words "the application founded on foresight," etc., indicate the ground of explanation, how the election **<page 69>** is conveyed, this appears only as a concealment of your position. But if it is to be your explanation, you must have a different conception of the business of faith.

Pastor Brömer: I am also firmly convinced that one cannot do anything with the "*intuitu fidei"* if one maintains that faith alone is a gift of God's grace.

Dr. Walther: There's no question about it: the "*intuitu fidei*" doesn't help you at all. If you do not make faith an act of man himself, then it has no meaning at all. But if you allow faith to be God's gift alone, then you must also admit that God has not only decided to save the faithful, but has also decided to give faith to those who will be saved. You must not forget that what God does in time, He has already decided from eternity. So if I come to faith through God's grace in time, God must have decided from eternity to bring me to faith. Therefore our Confession also says in the article "*De libero arbitrio*": Whom God has determined to convert, He draws; "*trahit Deus hominem, quem convertere decrevit*". F C Art II, Mueller 603. [FC SD 116]

Professor Stellhorn: When we were asked at that time to give our view of §§ 13-22, I was not prepared to speak in such a way that I could say now: I want to insist on every word and live and die by it. For I had not expected that an argument would be desired at that time. If I had used an expression that was not correct, I had already declared that I would take it back if it were proved to be incorrect. I then also explained that there was nothing wrong with the definition given. When Dr. Walther said on Saturday that the words "the application founded on the providence of God," etc., must designate a reason or cause, I did not have long to think how I should explain myself more clearly. I had no intention of disguising my position.

Dr. Walther: Don't think that I wanted to accuse you of dishonesty. When I attacked you for your statement and spoke of concealment, I do not mean that you intended to speak in such a way that we should not understand you, but that you were concealing your position from yourself. If the election is based on foreseen faith, then faith is a cause of it. If faith is presented as a cause of election, then the clear synergism is pronounced. You cannot get out of this embarrassment.

Professor Stellhorn: I consider faith to be the reason [*ratio*], not the cause [*causa*] of election. It is clear to me that *praevisio* could not be a reason **<pages 70>** for explaining God; but it is easy to explain that it is a reason for explaining for us. I did not want to say anything else, but I could not immediately find the right expression. [**p 109**]

Dr. Walther: He who desires the right, but has been somewhat distracted by his intellect, is always at a loss (because he wants the right) to find the right word. It is the same with you. You do not want to teach synergistically and that is good. But you have now moved a little to one side and are trying to assert your position without having to speak synergistically, and now you can't find the right word. Nor will you succeed. He who has the right will also find the right expression! How theologians of the 17th century struggled to explain the "*intuitu fidei*" before they succeeded! One put this in, the other something else. They then said: Even if you are not in it, just accept the "*intuitu fidei*". They wanted to oppose the Calvinists with great power and thought they could not overcome them better than by saying: First comes faith, then comes election. This was a radical cure, in which the theologians nevertheless came up short; there still remained questions to which they could not answer their opponents. We can answer the Calvinists, you cannot. Then you argue against the claim that you had no election. Then I say: you have not convinced me that you have an election. For according to your definition (now quite apart from the "being justified") your so-called election of grace is nothing other than the doctrine of justification, except that you accept that it has already been decided in eternity. But it does not follow from this that this is now also the election of grace. The fact that something is determined from eternity does not make it an election of grace. Where is the term "election" in your definition?

Pastor Allwardt: We believe that God has chosen, marked and inscribed in the Book of Life all those persons from the mass of human beings who will be saved, and that these and no others will be saved. We believe that God must do everything to bring these people to the point where He washes them clean with Christ's blood, calls them through the Holy Spirit, brings them to faith and keeps them in it. So we believe in an eternal election, an infallible election by grace, just as you do. The difference is that you put election before faith as one of its fruits, but we let election follow faith — in the Spirit of God, so to speak. I do not understand how one can find justification in this and say that we have no election. It is truly a great thing that God distinguishes between the pious and the hypocrites. He recognizes His own from the whole mass of people and puts the seal of faith on them. I mean, that <page 71> is election! The Old Testament seldom speaks of election, but it speaks much of God testing hearts and kidneys, and of His eyes seeing after faith; it extols it as a glorious attribute of God that He has found out all who believe in Him.

Dr. Walther: No, my dear brother, it is not so! God, you say, must of course do everything that we may believe and be saved. But the question is not whether God must do everything. Rather, the question is whether He has decreed that everything should be done for His elect so that they may certainly be saved. Have you [p 110] admitted that God must not only do all things to the elect in order that they may come to faith, but that He has also ordained them to be infallibly saved in this way?

Professor Stellhorn: Yes!

Dr. Walther: Then I don't understand how you can put faith before election!

Professor Stellhorn: That's what I've always said. I place faith twice, because the merit of Christ is to be placed twice: once before election, as the cause of election, then after election, as the means to make the elect saveed. *) [*) Professor Stellhorn explains that these words do not refer to faith, but to the merit of Christ]. Before faith, Christ's merit is of no use to me. If it were possible for Christ to profit me without faith, faith would not be necessary. This is true with the Formula of Concord.

Dr. Walther: Christ benefits us all before faith. For Christ's sake we come to faith, for Christ's sake the gospel is preached to us, for Christ's sake we are chosen. It is terrible talk to say that Christ is of no use to us before faith.

Professor Stellhorn: My opinion is this: Christ is of no use to me for the real attainment of salvation without faith.

Dr. Walther: Yes, I cannot attain salvation without faith in Christ.

Professor Stellhorn: So God could not decide to choose me without seeing Christ in me.

Dr. Walther: A terrible doctrine! No, God could not choose me without at the same time implanting Christ in me. But that is what we believe: when He chose me, He implanted me in Christ, inscribed me in the book of life. **) [**) This is what Pastor Runkel recorded. The following from this session is from the pen of Pastor Krafft]. We know from <page 72> experience how many consciences have been confused by such an assertion that Christ is of no use as long as he is not grasped by faith. This is a dangerous assertion, a terrible argument, capable of eliminating Christ if everything is placed in faith; thereby Christ loses the validity that is then attributed to faith.

Professor Stellhorn: But I think it is a fundamental error to separate Christ and faith. These are correlatives. Christ cannot be separated from faith and faith cannot be separated from Christ; therefore, when one speaks of faith, Christ is not to be included separately and appears, as it were, to have grown together with it. I am not looking at faith as a virtue: in this respect it does not come into consideration in predestination; but

the basic error is that Christ and faith, grace and faith are juxtaposed as if grace were excluded by the expression "*intuitu fidei*".

Professor Pieper: We do not do this by contrasting Christ and faith and tearing them apart; rather, we say that God would not have chosen in Christ if he had not at the same time, in one and the same decision of election, also decided to give faith. We teach: To the decision of election belongs also the decree to unite us to Christ by faith, and indeed [**p 111**] this is one decree. The objection made shows that we have not been properly understood.

Pastor Allwardt: But the question is whether God has chosen in the order of grace. Since it is said that we are elected in Christ, but also that faith does not come into consideration in the act of election, this means nothing other than separating Christ and faith.

Professor Pieper: I repeat: we are obviously not understood correctly. When we say that faith follows election, we say this only with regard to faith in time, not insofar as it is included in the decision of election.

Pastor Allwardt: The question here is not whether faith is to be placed at the same time as election, but whether, when one speaks of faith, it conceptually precedes or follows election?

Following Pastor Körner's explanation of how he had hitherto understood the expression "*intuitu fidei*" on the basis of the passage in the *Epitome*, page 556, § 13, and as a result of his expressed desire to obtain greater clarity about the passage mentioned, Dr. Walther remarked

Dr. Walther: Because God wills to save no one except in Christ, therefore he has not chosen absolutely for salvation, but also for the means of it, for the effects of the means of salvation, for **<page 73>** faith, for sanctification, and for preservation in faith. It says in this passage that God will save no one except those who believe in his Son, but not that he will elect no one except those who believe in him. No Christian teacher will deny that we are saved only through faith in Christ; but where does it say in Scripture and in the Confession that we are chosen for the sake of faith, or that faith is foreseen? He who speaks thus and says that this is the teaching of the divine word and of the confessions, first glosses over such things in the Bible and in the symbolic books. If a Christian simply reads the confession, he needs no commentary to understand it in this article. It is all the more conspicuous when one always has to start with commentaries if one wants to prove to others that one agrees with them. It's a nasty thing when you always have to make connections that aren't there and introduce additions. In the last-mentioned passage there is no mention of an election *intuitu fidei*.

Here Dr. Walther referred to Chemnitz's conduct: he knew that the Pelagians all had the "*intuitu fidei*" and that Augustine openly opposed them. Why does he not say that Augustine had gone too far here? Why does he not rather say: We want to take the "*intuitu fidei*" into the Confession? Be careful not to confuse the general counsel of salvation with election. This is where understanding usually fails. It must be borne in mind that the Formula of Concord teaches: If you want to teach the election of grace correctly, first teach the perfect redemption, the way to salvation, then you will come to the conclusion that God has decided to bring a number of people to faith on the basis of the general redemption and to lead them to heaven by the same way in which he would like to lead all people there. There is no other way for us to be certain that we are chosen than in Christ; therefore, if we find ourselves in this, in faith in him, we should consider ourselves chosen. Not by searching in a secret council, [**p 112**] but by this way alone do we become certain of election. This passage therefore proves that election to salvation is at the same time election to the way of salvation.

Prof. Stellhorn argued: In § 65 it is not our election that is mentioned, but election in general. This eternal election is not to be considered apart from Christ, but in Christ. So we are not talking here about my personal election, but about election in general; of this it is said that it is revealed in the preached Word, and as a testimony only such passages are cited, such as "For God so loved the world" etc., which contain nothing but the general way of salvation; therefore the establishment of the general <page 74> way of salvation is to be regarded as the most important part of election. I fully agree with this, that God saves no one except in Christ, and that he has therefore chosen in Christ. But it is the same with faith. Election is made in view of faith, that is, in Christ, in view of the Christ we have received by faith. How is it then that one of the main authors of the Formula of Concord, Andreae, in a colloquy with the Calvinists [See the 2017 CPH book *Lutheranism vs. Calvinism: The Classic Debate at the Colloquy of Montbiliard 1586*], reproached Beza for regarding faith as *causa*, and said exactly what we teach, whereby we also regard faith as a gift of God. One cannot imagine that the most zealous, most faithful teachers should not have raised their voices against this and testified: That is wrong, you are in error, there is nothing about it in this article!

Dr. Walther replied to these historical remarks: "A correction is necessary here. Andreae did not say in the Colloquium that we are chosen because we believe, but rather: after Beza gave his speech and held this against the Lutherans in it, Andreae did not quite reject him. Andreae was no Chemnitz. Chemnitz, to whom Andreae always adhered and from whom he was humble enough to learn, was dead. He should have said in response to Beza's reproach: We did not say that as it is expressed here; instead he leaves it as it is and tries to justify it, — not as if the matter had really been so; for Beza had only added it when he published the Colloquium. Andreae gives Beza a good blow, but it would have been better if he had said: "Just look in the Colloquium, that's not what we said."

Dr. Walther added the following to this historical remark: He who proves too much proves nothing; but he who refers to the passage mentioned proves too much. Because the opponents will not subscribe to that "because". One looks in vain for such talk in Chemnitz, Kirchner, Selnecker; one does not find them. The latter says downright that it is wrong to say that we are chosen because God foreknew faith. Kirchner, however, although by no means a Chemnitz, walks entirely in his footsteps; his "*Enchiridion*" is a true book of gold.

Dr. Walther pointed out, however, that it was certainly better not to refer to authorities now, which would not get you anywhere. [**p 113**]

Pastor Stöckhardt remarked: "We have been attacked by written rebuttals to the article in *Lehre und Wehre*, where we say that we are called to faith. I must explain here that this means nothing other than that God at the same time decided to give us faith with the election. The position of the opponents has now changed inasmuch as they no longer necessarily reject this proposition. **<Page 75>** Just as "elect to faith" has no other meaning than that God has decided to lead the elect to salvation and to give them faith. But the difference is still there, that they still say: God foreknew faith; so they presuppose faith twice. Is this not a contradiction? First, certain persons are seen by God in Christ, that is, in the opinion of the opponents, they are seen in faith; then follows the decision to give them faith. What does "to believe" mean? Nothing other than: to obedience, to filiation. Did God then choose those whom he already saw as believers, justified by faith, and then decide to bring them on the path to faith and justification? Either the one or the other.

Pastor Allwardt, on the other hand, declared that he still stood just as before. In the 8 points, the Formula of Concord sets out the order of grace, after which it says: God has not only prepared salvation in general, but has also ordained all and every person in the

way just indicated. God has not only ordained the means of grace for the whole world and the decree of salvation is a general one, but he also knew the individual persons who would attain to salvation in that order. The speaker (Pastor Allwardt) still rejects the term "elected to faith" if it is understood to mean an ordering that distinguishes between two persons. This doctrine takes away all consolation; no one knows whether he is chosen if there is a selection of individual persons on the part of God; he therefore cannot admit this.

Prof. Pieper: The other side has repeatedly said that the 8 points contain a precise definition of election. But the very election that it alone considers to be the right one necessarily includes the anticipation of faith. Is it not now extremely peculiar that the Formula of Concord has omitted precisely that which, according to the opponent's view, is quite essential to make the concept complete? I repeat: without the concept of foresight [*praevisio*], I consider what the brothers say about election to be quite incomprehensible. Election, according to that side, has two parts: the first part is the election of means, the second that of persons; in order to unite these two parts into a whole, one necessarily needs the foreknowledge of faith. And it is precisely this middle link that would be left out, which is absolutely necessary to understand the whole? In order to find their opinion in §§ 15-23, the brethren must, after the words: "God has not only prepared salvation in general, but has also" in § 23, insert the words: "having foreseen that these particular persons would enter the general way of salvation and persevere in it", and only then can they continue with the words of the Confession: **<page 76>** "all and every person of the elect," etc. — I will also refer to § 8. There it says: "But the eternal election of God foresees and foreknows not alone beforehand the salvation of the elect," etc. [**p 114**] What the effects etc. are, is further explained in § 45. There are mentioned: conversion and justification. If these are a consequence of election, then the anticipation of faith no longer makes sense. But there can be no question of election in the broader sense, and of the so-called first part, of the 8 points, in this passage; salvation in Christ is already presupposed here. It says explicitly: "in Christ Jesus"; thus we are talking about the good pleasure of God, which is based on Christ, which has the redemption of Christ as its foundation. Thus it follows that we can only speak here of election in the so-called narrower sense, of which it is testified that one consequence is conversion and justification.

One of the opponents (Prof. Stellhorn) objected to the fact that he had intended to base his proof only on the 8 points, but rather on § 23. In this paragraph the expression is used: "*clementer praescivit*"; in German it is given with the words: "*in Gnaden bedacht*" ("in grace considered"). Now it cannot be denied that there is more in this German word "bedacht" than in the Latin "*praescire*". But if the translation with this word by Chemnitz could be left here, then it follows that the term *praescire*, to know beforehand, must also be included here in German. In the text, the words: "considered in grace" are followed by the words: "elected to salvation"; thus the context shows here how, according to the Confession, foreknowledge precedes election, and this is also the teaching of the dogmatists. The same speaker said that from § 3, where foreseeing [*praevisio]* and foreknowledge [*praescientia]* are strictly distinguished from predestination [*praedestinatio]* and it is said that the latter only denotes foreknowledge, and from § 9, where *praevisio* is also used in this way and is described as a part of election, though not the only part, one can see that in the "*praescivit*" in § 23 one may find that meaning of the word, foreknowledge. In § 9 foreseeing [p*raevisio]* and selection [*delectus]* are distinguished and in § 23 they are introduced in the correct order: first the general counsel of salvation, then *praevisio*, then *delectus*.

Adjournment with the Lord's prayer.

A. Krafft, Secr.

Ninth meeting.

Monday afternoon, October 4.

The proceedings were opened with a liturgical service. The minutes of the Friday afternoon session were read out and adopted after correction. After Director Krauß had been appointed secretary for this session, the debate was continued. [p 115]

Prof. Stellhorn: Prof. Pieper drew attention to p. 705, § 8, according to which election is "a cause that creates, works, helps, and promotes our salvation and all that belongs to it." From this it is to be proved that redemption does not belong to the election of which the Formula of Concord treats, but that redemption is presupposed. Now it is clear to me from the outset that this expression, even if I could not explain it to myself in a sufficient way, cannot argue against § 15, where the redemption and reconciliation of the human race is expressly mentioned as one, as the first of the parts that belong to the counsel and counsel of God and, according to the Formula of Concord, are synonymous with election by grace. But also according to the whole content of the Formula of Concord, where it says in § 67 that election is revealed in the passages: "Repent" etc., "This is the will of" etc., I must believe that it is precisely the determination of the general way of salvation and therefore also redemption that makes up the most important part of the counsel of election. — I explain it thus: If God had not been pleased with Christ, He would not have decided to make Him the Savior of mankind. According to Scripture and the Formula of Concord, the election took place "in Christ", i.e. in Christ, insofar as He is grasped in faith; not only insofar as He is there for all. For if Christ should have been the reason for election only insofar as He is there for all, then God could have elected all men contrary to the clear teaching of the Formula of Concord. And if He could have done this and yet did not, the reason would have been in His will, again contrary to the Formula of Concord, according to which foreseen unbelief prevents God from electing the vast majority of people. Consequently, He cannot have seen those whom He chose in stubborn unbelief, but must have seen them in faith. When God passed the judgment of rejection, He saw that He saw stubborn unbelief. Where this was the case, He pronounced it; if He had seen it everywhere, He could not have chosen anyone. And that He did not choose where He saw stubborn unbelief is the teaching of the Formula of Concord. — So where God does not see, He chooses.

Prof. Pieper: I would like to briefly address individual points. First of all, Prof. Stellhorn referred to the “in grace considered” [*clementer praescivit*] <page 78> in § 23 for the “foreseeing of faith” [*praevisio fidei]*. But the "considered in grace" is thus rendered in such a way that *praevisio* cannot be an act of divine omniscience; rather, an act of will is described here, God's good pleasure. This is clear from the addition “mercifully” [*clementer*]. For "foreknow in grace" makes no sense at all. What Chemnitz meant by this is even clearer in the "*Enchiridion*", where it says: "considered according to his gracious purpose." This rules out any possibility of merely thinking of divine omniscience. One must therefore refer “mercifully foreknown” [*clementer praescivit*] to an act of will, to the gracious pleasure of God. — [p 116] Then Prof. Stellhorn cites §§ 3 [English says § 4, not 3] and 5, where foreknowledge [*praescientia]* and predestination [*praedestinatio]* are contrasted. Now this is true: there *praescientia* is nothing other than divine omniscience; but the Formula of Concord also uses *praescientia* in other ways where no such juxtaposition takes place; e.g. § 13 it occurs in the series of expressions used for "predestination". There *praescientia* and *electio* are interchanged. From this it follows that *praescientia* is not only used of omniscience in the Formula of Concord, and

the "*clementer*" proves it completely. Then Prof. Stellhorn has referred to § 9 for the "*intuitu fidei*", where it says: "This same eternal election . . previously foreseen (*praeviderit*) . . . should be condemned." This thought is further elaborated in § 54: "So there is no doubt about it... he points us to it." If Prof. Stellhorn bases his opinion that the Formula of Concord teaches a "foreseeing of faith" [*praevisio fidei]* on these statements, he proves far too much. For of the *praevisio fidei*, of which the Formula of Concord here deals, it wants to have the eyes completely removed; and Prof. Stellhorn makes it a reason for explanation. But the Formula of Concord here means a completely different foreseeing [*praevidere*]. It obviously wants to say: The good God has not published a catalog of the elect, He has one, but He has not published it. He wants you to go to the Gospel, there you will find your names and become certain of your election. — Furthermore, when it says in § 8: "The eternal election of God . . . is promoted", this does not fit your concept of the so-called "election in the broader sense". For you say: "Election, insofar as it is *ordinatio mediorum*, creates above all the redemption of the human race. That is the first point among the eight. But here it is not said that this election creates salvation, but that election is a favor of God, based on the redemption that has taken place in Christ Jesus, which now creates salvation, i.e., which causes the salvation acquired by Christ to be given to the individual persons in time. — I would also like to comment on some general remarks made by Prof. Stellhorn. He concludes: If God has rejected in regard to unbelief, **<page 79>** He must also have chosen in regard to faith. This does not follow. One only has to start from the correct anthropological proposition, which our Formula of Concord also places in the middle, namely that man can do nothing for his salvation, but everything for his damnation. Thus, if, without going into the *sedes doctrinae*, one were to construct the doctrine of election by grace from other correctly understood doctrinal articles, one could arrive at the following article: In His election God saw nothing good in man, because after sin there is nothing good in man at all, no principle by which he can work good; but He did foresee everything in him that can work damnation, for man is exceedingly active for evil. So again, from the fact that God foreknew unbelief in those who are condemned, it does not follow that He also [**p 117**] foreknew faith in those whom He elected. Because this is so, the old dogmatists had to constantly defend themselves against synergism. When someone hears the sentence: "election in view of faith, condemnation in view of unbelief", he will certainly come to the conclusion that just as there is power in man to unbelieve, so also to believe. They always had to defend themselves against this.

Pastor Zorn: I just wanted to make a comment: Prof. Stellhorn referred to § 65 and said that this paragraph does not speak of the election of individual persons, but of the determination of the order of salvation. As proof, he argues that this election is revealed by the words: "This is my dear Son" etc. But this is quite wrong, § 65 says that this eternal election is an election in Christ. Now if election is the ordering of salvation, how can it be considered that Christ is ordered in Christ? — Furthermore, the fact that Eph. 1 "elected in Christ" deals with the individual elect has always been shown. This is the second reason why Prof. Stellhorn is wrong. But as far as the election of individual persons is concerned, the individual believer's election is only revealed in the gospel; but we cannot fathom whether others are elected.

Pastor Allwardt: The fact remains that, while we have lost righteousness and should be damned and lost together, God on the other hand has accepted some by grace and that He has not done so without a costly ransom; and just as for those who do not believe, their unbelief is the reason for their rejection, so on the other hand for the believers it is Christ who compensates for all the damage. — I am very satisfied that Prof. Pieper referred to the "*Enchiridion*". This says in the 8th point: "that God will save those whom

he has called and justified, if (== when) they persevere to the end... will be saved and glorified in eternal life." (Frank, *Theologie der Concordienformel*. IV, 335.) The <page 80> other points also have this "da" and "wenn". Chemnitz did not speak here of what God wants to do for the elect alone. It says in § 18 that "God will accept all those who accept Christ in true repentance". In the "*Enchiridion*" it is expressly added: "those who do not do this, He will condemn." — The *Enchiridion* does not allow what is said in the 8 points to refer only to the elect. — I do not understand how we can tremble at the charge synergism with us? If God pours out the same grace that He gives to the elect on the whole human race, and we say: "My election is only necessary because the vast majority willfully resist", then that does not mean that we decide for ourselves. Of course, the *Enchiridion* is not binding for us, but the Formula of Concord. But I am firmly convinced that Chemnitz did not take a different position in the latter than in the former. The "where" they adhere to God's Word in § 21 and the "all those" in § 18 cannot be explained by the fact that we are talking here about the way that God leads the elect.

Prof. Pieper: We agree that the 8 points speak of the general way of salvation. But you say: It comes into consideration here insofar as all are to walk it; [p 118] we say: insofar as the elect are to walk it and no others. The introduction proves that the latter is correct. It is expressly stated in § 13 that "the ordinance of the children of God unto eternal life" is to be spoken of. — Furthermore, I say: If the following 8 points did not contain the conditional "if" and "where", I could not remain certain of my election. Of course, that is precisely what offends you. I still have flesh and blood on me; and if God did not call out to me: "If you remain, pray diligently" etc., I would lose the certainty of my election and fall into carnal security. It is therefore necessary to speak in this way because the chosen one is just such a person, of the same substance as the others. And because the elect are led the same way as the others, the way of salvation must also be described for them in the same way as for the others. How will an elect person know that he is redeemed if he is not told that all mankind is redeemed? How will he know that God is gracious to him if he does not hear that God earnestly wants to call all? So the universal way of salvation must be described if the way that the elect walk is to be described.

Pastor Allwardt: I am not saying that we are not talking about the elect, but: not only about them. This does not satisfy us at all, that God wanted to prevent faith by this condition, as if there were another way for the elect than for other people. It is an eternal decree that is spoken of here. And in this God is said to have decreed: "I will keep my elect in the faith", and should add the condition: "if they keep my word"!

Dr. Walther: The "*Enchiridion*" was quoted by Prof. Pieper because in the "*Enchiridion*", from which § 23 is taken, it is said that God has "by gracious providence intended eternal salvation and what is necessary for it" for the elect; not because he wanted to prove the doctrine from it; that would be wrong, because we have already forbidden that. The execution had a completely different reason. The "*Enchiridion*" was originally written in German by Chemnitz and translated into Latin by Zanner as early as 1574, and this translation has been retained in the Latin translation of the Formula of Concord to the extent that the text is taken from the "*Enchiridion*". That is why the "mercifully foreknew" [*clementer praescivit*] has been included, even though Prof. Pieper has already excellently demonstrated that you can do nothing with it for your cause; you cannot refer to it at all. We can clearly see that these 8 points have been completely revised. The decree of condemnation, which was there, is omitted in the Formula of Concord. Chemnitz must undoubtedly have had important reasons for deleting all this, and so he did not speak as hypothetically in the Formula of Concord as he did in the handbook. But let him be what he will. You should not want to interpret the Formula of Concord for us from the "*Enchiridion*". If it's about the expression, it's something else. Frank himself said this in Erlangen: "Admittedly, the "to mercifully foreknow" [*clementer praescire*] would not be a very precise, accurate expression in Latin, but it was taken from the Latin ***)** [*) Zanner's — note by the recorder], and so one would have to stick to the German in the main. — [**p 119**] It is nonsense to say: I have kindly foreknew this. What man of sound mind will say thus: I foreknew this quite kindly! Foreknowledge is an activity of the intellect, being kind is an activity of the will. The "*clementer*" takes away what you want to construct from the *praescivit*. Ah, dear brother, if only you would look at things a little more simply and be afraid to construe! That does great harm. But I am not your schoolmaster. — But now I would like to comment on what has already been said about man having the power to resist but not the power to accept. When it is said that since man can hinder conversion, he must also have the power to accept it, our old theologians absolutely condemned this as a shameful, godless, Pelagian doctrine. If one construes the possibility of accepting grace from the possibility of throwing it away, this is quite wrong. For this does not follow at all, because evil is in us, but God must first give good into us. — But here, of course, Prof. Stellhorn has, in my opinion, made it very questionable **<page 82>** by quoting §§ 34-43. He wants to prove from this that God must have chosen on the basis of his presupposition of faith. How does he seek to prove this? By showing that our Formula of Concord says: "Man is not chosen because he resists"; therefore, he leads us to conclude, there must also be a cause in man, or something similar, call it an explanatory reason or whatever you like, on the other side. This would be as dangerous a doctrine as that in the *locus* of conversion. Now it is true that Prof. Stellhorn has referred chiefly to § 40, p. 712, where there is some appearance of his assertion, but truly only an appearance, as I shall presently show. There it says: "As God has decreed in his counsel ..., so he has also ...", whereby the attention is to be directed to "the elect" in the first clause. It is quite obvious that in all these paragraphs it is not intended to show why people are chosen — not a word of it — but why people are not elect. That is a big difference! God has revealed to us why people are not elect, despite the fact that God wants all people to be helped, despite the fact that the good shepherd calls all the world to himself. They just did not want to. That is the cause. But not so with election; there the cause lies only in God, not in man. — Now it has been pointed out that the two are being contrasted here. But that is a mistake. It does not say: Just as God wants to elect those who are called, enlightened and converted, who are justified and saved

through true faith in Christ, so he wants to condemn those who resist. That is not what it says; on the contrary, it first speaks of those who are chosen. It is not said under what conditions God wants to elect people, but something is said about the elect. What then? "But as God in his counsel ... the elect." So the gracious counsel that God has taken with regard to the elect is mentioned. But nothing is said about what moved God to do this, only that it is implied: "in his counsel." But of those it is said: If they resist, God rejects them and condemns them. So that was the passage that has some semblance. But now show me a single word in §§ 34-43, where something is said about why [emphasis is missing in English] the elect [**p 120**] are elect. Show me, it is not there. On the contrary, I say, he who concludes that, because men are rejected for unbelief's sake, others are elect for their faith's sake, makes himself suspect of the most horrible synergism, which of course I do not wish to attribute to Prof. Stellhorn. But he may now show us how he escapes this suspicion by proving from these paragraphs that God has chosen a certain number of people in foreknowledge of faith!

Prof. Stellhorn: I reply to Prof. Pieper to what he said about the use of foreknow [*praescire]* and foreknowledge [*praescientia]*. I have admitted that § 23 the word "considered" does not denote merely an act of omniscience. But just as it stands with πρόγνωσις, so also with *praescire*. Both signify an act of knowledge and omniscience, and signify it first and foremost; indeed, they can nowhere have such a meaning that that first meaning would be excluded and would not rather remain the primary meaning. Another meaning can be added. — With regard to what Dr. Walther has said, I still believe that in p. 711, §§ 34-41, not only the reason is given why few are elected, but also the rule by which God elects. For I think that it cannot be that it says: Few are elect because most resist — if I do not take "foreseeing" [*praevisio]* as an aid. Then it wouldn't fit at all. For how could that be a cause of the fact that few are chosen because most resist ! The *praevisio* is only for us an explanation for the fact that the good God, who even swore that he wanted to save all people, could only choose a few people. But that is why the content of foreseeing [*praevisio]* can still be a mystery to us. It is only a reason for explanation. The persons who have been foreseen are a mystery to us. — Paragraphs 54-71 are still undoubted proof to me that I am right in assuming that in §§ 34-43 the rule was also given according to which God proceeded in the election. For there it says (after the question has been dealt with as to how it is that only a few are chosen): "And in this respect the mystery is revealed to us" etc. It is stated in §§ 52 ff. that there are, however, mysteries in the doctrine of election by grace. And now I ask: If the rule according to which God has chosen were hidden from us, should it not be the first mystery to be given? I am convinced that each of the opponents would say that the main secret is that we do not know by what rule God has proceeded. For that would be the secret of all secrets. — This is indeed an argument from silence [*e silentio*], but a very important one. If I misunderstood the Formula of Concord in that it also wants to say in §§ 34-43 according to which rule God proceeded in the election, then the main secret would have to be that we do not know the rule. — Prof. Pieper wanted to say earlier that the "*intuitu fidei*" would be overturned by the fact that man can do nothing for his salvation. But faith is not something that man does, is not a work of man, does not come into consideration as a work of man, but merely as a gift of God, as a receiving hand that is necessary [**p 121**] in order to become partaker of the merit of Christ, as a receiving hand that only God can give **<page 84>** and preserve. — I say with our elders: Election has taken place *intuitu fidei*, non-election *intuitu incredulitatis*. But faith and unbelief are of course not the same, for faith is a work of God, unbelief a work of man. But I am convinced that the rule according to which one chooses and leaves must be the same. If I choose some according to a certain rule, others are left behind according to the same rule. I cannot say: I have one rule, according to which I choose, and I have another, according to which I do not choose. — It should follow from § 13 that the election of the Formula of Concord cannot be an election in the broader sense. According to the Formula of Concord, however, this election also includes the election of the general way of salvation; for one can also speak of an election of means. Of course, it is not the means that are to bring salvation, but it is precisely these means that God has predestined. And I am convinced that the particular election of persons must be based on this universal way of salvation if it is to be comforting. The second part of the selection must really be an application of the way of salvation to the individual. Only then can we be comforted if the election of persons is nothing other than the application of the general way of salvation mediated by God's foreknowledge. In the position of our opponents, election is not really related to the universal way of salvation, but goes alongside it as something special, separated from it

by a great gulf. There are two orders of God: a universal way of salvation and a particular election. The latter is ultimately the way. In that doctrine, God did not take the order of salvation into consideration, that he would have made it the norm of his election. The actual attainment of salvation therefore ultimately and exclusively depends on particular election. For you, nothing depends on general grace, everything depends on the election of grace. If I am on the path to salvation and am not chosen, I cannot be saved, no matter how diligently I listen to God's Word, pray and so on, as the Synodical Report says. And yet, whether I am chosen or not, I should know from the general will of salvation, from which election is separated by a great gulf. How, then, can I take comfort from the general will of salvation in my election? How from the general way of salvation, which is not what matters after all? How can a troubled person console himself, since this consolation is not sufficient for those in trials? One must go back to the universal way and will of salvation. That is precisely my innermost reason why I am against your teaching. It destroys the consolation that flows from the general will to salvation.

Dr. Walther: This juxtaposition of the election of grace and the universal way of salvation is pure imagination on the part of the professor. We do not do that at all. On the contrary, we include the order of salvation **<page 85>** and say: He who has not come to faith or who has fallen away again cannot count himself among the elect. On the other hand, he who has come to faith, stands in sanctification, is patient in the cross, prays diligently, uses all the means of grace faithfully, [**p 122**] he alone can believe that he is elect. Thus our doctrine of election of grace says: If you are to be saved, God wants to bring you to salvation by the way of the order of salvation alone. So what kind of talk is that, accusing us of ripping this teaching apart! On the contrary: our opponents tear it apart. They only speak of the universal way of salvation and then, as lost as the limping messenger, come their election of grace, which is not an election at all. No, we take it together, you tear it apart. At least I cannot see the slightest proof that, according to our doctrine, the universal will to salvation and election are torn apart. If you say: "The foreseeing [*praevisio]* is obviously to be included according to the Formula of Concord"; then I say: Yes, as far as the rejected are concerned. But if you then say: "God has taken the rule or norm of election from the order of salvation", how do you know that? Does that mean — and no doubt this is your opinion — that the good Lord sees whether we submit ourselves to His order; if we submit ourselves to sanctification, then He has said: I will now also elect these good people? No; the norm — says the Formula of Concord clearly — is God's mercy and the most glorious merit of Christ. We will not be dissuaded from this clear Confession. We have now celebrated the 300th anniversary of the Formula of Concord; we want to celebrate it above all by sticking to it and not allowing ourselves to be glossed over, no matter how beautifully, reasonably and comfortingly you present it. Show us in our Confession that faith must also be included!

Pastor Meier: It wouldn't do any good if we knew what the secret rule is. After all, we are not the electing ones, but the elect. But it is of much use to us that we know the rule by which we are to be saved; it has been revealed to us.

Dr. Walther then referred to Luther's Preface to the Epistle to the Romans, which says that it is comforting for the afflicted to know that God, according to his mercy, has chosen a certain number for salvation, and then continues: "We do not know what rule God has followed. But we certainly do know why God did not choose certain people. They cannot say on the last day: "How can I be accused of being damned, God did not choose me!" No, God will say to everyone: "I would have granted it to you — this is also what our Formula of Concord says. — **Nor have I passed you by**, but I have often moved you, often called you [Also quoted in Hochstetter's *History* **here**.]; indeed, you

may <pages 86> have been a believer for a time, but have let the devil, the world and your flesh lead you away from the faith again. The fault is yours that you are going to hell." — But the believers will not say: "Yes, if only you" (the damned) "had believed as we did, we did not resist, we allowed ourselves to be converted and you were and remained unbelievers." No, such words will not be found in the mouths of the elect in eternity. Rather, for all eternity, the elect will not be able to praise God enough for having brought them out of the mud, wretched worms of sin who should have gone to hell. They will leave it to the dear God to justify themselves that the others are all cast down to hell. [p 123]

Pastor Stöckhardt: With regard to the 8 points, I will calmly admit that there is a certain difficulty for our natural mind in the "so" and "but" and "if". I understand how doubts and misgivings can arise. Pastor Allwardt thinks that because these particles are there, it proves that the 8 points cannot be about the path that the elect should take, because they must be infallibly saved. Now, there is a reference in the Formula of Concord where there is irrefutably a statement made about the elect, when the words "if" and "but" appear in a sentence. In § 40, the preliminary clause deals with the elect — I believe this cannot be interpreted in any other way. Then a brief linguistic remark about the foreknowing [*praescire]*. I think it goes to the point of proving that to foreknow [*clementer praescire]* is linguistically impossible, if it only means to foresee. I cannot think by that: "to foresee with goodness." But this alternation of *praescire* and *praedestinare* is found even more often in the old dogmatists. Just one passage. [Read from *Lehre und Wehre*, 1880, p. 131; a dictum of Osiander.] There *praescire* is irrefutably used for *praedestinare*. The ancients often translated quite literally; so here the προίγνω with *praescire*. — I would like to add one more thing for Prof. Stellhorn: there is indeed a foreseeing [*praevisio]* of faith and blessedness; but that is not the point here, that such a foreseeing [*praevisio]* is admitted, so that the prescience is placed in a certain relation to election. We only say that prescience does not precede predestination, but coincides with it in one act.

Pastor Brand: Prof. Stellhorn quoted a passage from the Synodical Report: "No matter how diligently you listen to God's Word" etc. .... We do not say that. It says in the Synodal Report: The afflicted think this way. Afterwards, however, it is shown how Luther thanks such a reference to the general medicine of the Word.

President Beyer: That is one of the quotations in a certain paper that are then attributed to us.

Pastor Allwardt: The passage just read is there in such a way that it is approved.

The President: Shall we now enter into it?

The congregation: No.

Pastor Allwardt: Pastor Stöckhardt says that the words "foresee" and "electing" are used *promiscuously*. And that is true. You can see that in more places than those mentioned. But since election also involves foreknowledge, these words are sometimes used for this and sometimes for that, as is often the case elsewhere. But it does not follow from this that each word loses its actual meaning. If “foreknowing” [*versehen*] stands for "electing"[*erwählen*], it does not follow that “foreknowing” = “electing,”, but that the two belong together. In §§ 24 and 27 "foreknowing" and "electing" stand, the former before the latter. From this it follows irrefutably that "foreknowing" and "electing" are different things, and [p 124] that election is not placed before foreknowledge. In Chemnitz this very order is often found: provided, chosen, decreed.

Dr. Walther: I wanted to draw your attention to the important passage where the Lord says to the godless: "I have never known you." What does that mean? Is the Savior saying: I don't even know that you have lived, I have never known anything about you; therefore go away from Me? No. Everyone will say that Christ wants to say: I have never known you for My own. So also Balthasar Meisner says that "to know" is the same as "to recognize". As for the fact that "foreknowledge" and "election" stand side by side, this only proves that they are not homonyms, but synonyms. That is, they are 2 words that have one common meaning, but each has its secondary meaning. Hence the Formula of Concord itself speaks of the election of the predestined. So it says one thing about the other, the election of the predestined, although both express the same act of God; but in the one expression a special, a different moment is emphasized than in the other term.

Prof. Pieper: I would like to briefly point out that these conditional clauses do not contradict the assumption that a passage in which they occur can refer to the elect. Let me give an example of this. The apostle Paul says: "I am sure that neither death nor life" etc. The apostle thus says — and this is probably conceded by all — that he is quite sure of his election; and yet the same apostle says in another passage: "Lest after preaching to others I myself should be condemned." Now this seems to contradict itself. I admit that it is <pages 88> difficult for our minds to convey this apparent contradiction, how both can be in the heart of a Christian at the same time. The doctrine of the election of grace is an extremely delicate thing. You cannot get away with mere dogmatic formulas. The same man who is certain of his election and salvation says in another respect, if he still has flesh in him: I must fight that I may not be rejected. Just as it is in the heart of one man that he is quite sure of his salvation and yet accomplishes it with fear and trembling. And I think that here we are struck by the observation of a difference, namely the difference between the Law and the Gospel. Whoever does not distinguish between Law and Gospel in this case will spoil all possible scriptural statements, both those dealing with certainty and those dealing with the admonition to fight. He who does not distinguish here between Law and Gospel stirs up a general mash of exhortations to certainty and fear; there is half fear, half certainty, i.e. no certainty at all. The biblical passages which demand that a man should be completely certain of his salvation, must be held fast in their entirety; and whoever does not want to comply with such a demand should know that he is committing a sin for which he must be forgiven. On the other hand, it remains perfectly true that the same man must work out his salvation with fear and trembling, as long as he still has

flesh, the old Adam, in him, who is certainly not to be comforted with the Gospel. But the new man is. For him the doctrine of the election of grace is the sweetest gospel. Thus both [**p 125**] scriptural statements remain completely valid. If one lives in both doctrines properly, one will see that both harmonize.

Pastor Rohe [CPH English has Roth, not Rohe. Why?]: I cannot rhyme the present doctrine of our opponents with the former doctrine of our own Synod. I will merely read a few quotations. [Reads *Lehre und Wehre* I. Sihler's Theses. II, 324. 354. essay by Fürbringer].

Dr. Walther: One sees from this that at that time we still tolerated the 2nd doctrinal trope among us.

Prof. Crämer: But not anymore.

Pastor Mees asks for 2 minutes to read out a quotation. Namely *Lehre und Wehre* II, 321 [O. Fürbringer] and adds: I therefore believe that the opponents cannot make so much capital out of this essay.

Pastor Allwardt: It is unjust that you do not give the quotation in full. Just read on!

Pastor Mees: I was only given 2 minutes.

Dr. Walther: By saying: "We tolerated it then", I do not mean: "But not any more"; but: **<page 89>** That was not actually the voice of our synod, but the private voice of Dr. Sihler and Pastor Fürbringer. It was not mine, as I am the editor, employed as such by the Synod, and also a teacher of dogmatics — anyone who says that is lying. —

Adjournment with the Lord's prayer. — W. Krauß, Secr.

Tenth session.

Tuesday morning, October 5.

This meeting also began with the usual service, after which the minutes of the eighth meeting were read out and adopted with some improvements. As the discussion then continued, the following spoke first

Prof. Schaller: I would like to ask whether I may be permitted to say something that does not directly concern the arguments contained in the minutes, but which concerns the matter and for which there may be no further opportunity for discussion later?

After receiving approval, the speaker continued: "It has been proven with irrefutable arguments that our dear brothers do not stand on the basis of the Formula of Concord with their assertions. To the reasons already given I would like to add one more, which is not taken from the matter itself, but from the outward appearance, from the presentation of the Formula of Concord, from the outward form, of which I believe that our dear brethren do not quite understand it, and that the obscure and seemingly confused in their statements has its remote cause in the fact that they do not follow the natural order of the Formula of Concord at all, but make for themselves an artificial order — If I have understood Prof. Stellhorn correctly, his assertion is this: The 11th [**p 126**] article of the Formula of Concord deals only with the election of grace in a wider sense; so that the same includes in itself the determination or establishment of the general way of salvation, the means [*ordinatio mediorum]*, and on the other hand the determination or particular election of those who are infallibly saved. Accordingly, §§ 13-22 deal with election according to its first part, §§ 23. 24 deal with election according to its second part. The first part or *ordinatio mediorum* is the main part, the second part only an appendix, so to speak, of which it is best to speak correctly, because it contains a mystery that remains inscrutable to us. It is the same with this, namely with the doctrine of the Formula of Concord of election of grace, as with other things and other concepts that can be taken partly in a broader and partly in a narrower sense, such as the doctrine of sanctification.

So it is with the doctrine of the election of grace in the Formula of Concord, or with the doctrine of the election of grace in general, as with the doctrine of <page 90> sanctification. — Now let us take a closer look at the analogy given by Prof. Stellhorn himself. Let us assume the case that we have a book from ancient times; it is about On Sanctification. The author begins this book with the words: "Although there is no dispute among ourselves about sanctification, for the sake of our descendants we also want to give precise instruction on this doctrine. He says: Sanctification and justification are to be well distinguished. Sanctification and justification must not be confused with one another, for justification is only for the repentant, whereas sanctification is only for the justified. And this sanctification is the renewal of life, the new obedience, the improvement of life. If we want to speak of sanctification correctly, we must also take into account what precedes sanctification, the path that man must take in order to reach sanctification; and that path is this: "I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ my Lord or come to him, but the Holy Spirit has called me through the gospel and enlightened me with his gifts." This must necessarily be taken to mean "sanctified in the right faith". Now what would our dear brethren say if someone came and took the book and said: The whole book is about sanctification in a broader sense? It says right at the beginning: Sanctification is only about the justified; but this is only a mere comparison, for justification and sanctification are only to be compared. So that has nothing to do with what the book is actually about. It is a mere comparison. The actual definition is given in the whole complex: "I believe that I am not sanctified by my own reason ... sanctified in the right faith." That is the definition. This must be taken together. Sanctification, then, consists of two parts. The first part is: "I believe that I am not by my own reason.... enlightened." That is the main part. The other part is, so to speak, only an appendage when it goes on to say: "sanctified in the right faith". Not much could be said about the latter, it was a dark point, one preferred to wallow in it. So the whole book deals only with the first main part, with sanctification in the broader sense. [p 127] What would our dear brethren say if a man were to interpret such a book on sanctification in this way? They would say: It is all wrong, mixed up, turned upside down! This book is about sanctification in the narrower sense; for at the top is the sentence: Sanctification is only for the justified! — I would like to add another analogy to this one. As is well known, the older theologians rightly said: The examples draw [*Exempla trahunt*]. Let us imagine this: A great lord had a castle whose purpose was to house all the cripples and the lame and the wretched in the land, and they would come in, but not all of them. <Page 91> What is the cause of their not all coming in shall not now be touched upon. So the castle stands there; it has this stated purpose and now a description is given. A book is written about this glorious castle, into which all the poor, crippled, lame and wretched are to be accepted. Then the writer says: "If I am to describe the castle correctly, I must also say where it is situated, must indicate the ground on which it stands, must also speak of the garden that encloses it, of the path by which one can get to the castle. What would you say if someone came along and said: 'The book is about the castle in the broader sense, because it also describes the path, the garden, the land;' it obviously refers to the castle in the broader sense, and so there are two parts to this castle: one part is the garden, the path, etc. This is the main part, the castle. That is the main part, the castle of the way, etc.; and the other is the castle in the narrower sense? What would our dear brothers say to such an explanation? And yet they quite literally do the same with the Formula of Concord. I cannot think of it in any other way than that the dear brethren have seen a spectre which has called itself the "Missourian doctrine" and has said: "I am the Missourian doctrine of the unconditional counsel, of an unconditional

election of grace, be terrified of me"; and then they were also terrified, and this spectre has so blinded their eyes that they no longer understand us and the Formula of Concord.

Pastor Allwardt: You can see again from this that parables often seem to represent a thing exactly, but that they often contain a deception. It is the same here with these parables.

Prof. Schaller remarked on this rejection (which motivated Pastor Allwardt to begin in more detail: it was not his intention to provoke a debate about these parables): To whom the matter itself has not become clear through these parables, which are not supposed to be proofs but only explanations, I do not want to argue with him.

Dr. Walther then went on to answer Prof. Stellhorn's statements: We have now arrived at Prof. Stellhorn's words that foresight [*praevisio*] is the ground of explanation for eternal election. He then refers to §§ 34-43 and points out that the purpose of these paragraphs is to explain how it is that, while many are called, only a few are chosen. *Et secundum has rationes intelligendum est etc*. He explains this as follows: Some cannot be brought to believe, and this is precisely because of their willful resistance. [**p 128**] Even if the Formula of Concord does not have the expression "*intuitu fidei*", it still has the point. — It has already been pointed out that this is not the right way to investigate why a person is elect: one must first investigate **<page 92>** why others are not chosen. In the doctrine of conversion it is declared by our theologians, without exception, to be a very great error to say that the reason for the difference between some being converted and others not being converted lies in man. This is decisively rejected as a serious synergistic error. All theologians, both earlier and later, say that the reason that one is not converted lies in man, but that he is converted lies in God alone. And Melanchthon is very seriously attacked for saying that the fact that one person believes and another does not must lie in man. This gave rise to the synergistic controversy in the 16th century, which was continued by the Helmstaedters in the 17th century. I must say that what Prof. Stellhorn says makes me very concerned that the real point of contention between us lies in the doctrine of conversion. If we agree on the doctrine of conversion, then our dispute over the doctrine of election of grace will soon be over. For our dear brethren on the other side are utterly unable to understand that the good Lord should have elected a number of people and seen nothing in them. That seems unthinkable to them. For they are immediately reminded of Calvin's shameful absolute doctrine. But if that is what Calvin teaches, then the Lutheran doctrine of election of grace is Calvinistic, then all the teachers of the Lutheran Church were Calvinists. We must leave this chasm. Of course, we cannot understand it, no human being can say it, no creature can say it, unless God reveals it directly and extraordinarily. And that is why I find it so alarming that Prof. Stellhorn says: The reason for explanation lies in faith. No, that is not a reason for explanation, even if you say: Yes, it is because God has seen before: Such and such will believe. That would only be explained if man could give himself faith. But because man cannot give faith to himself, but God has decided in eternity to give him faith, it cannot be a reason for explanation. You know as well as I do that Chemnitz, Andreae and Kirchner exclaim in the Apology of the Formula of Concord: "O what a depth" and so on. "Who has recognized the mind of the Lord" and so on. They want to put the mystery into it that God knew all this beforehand, while we do not know it. Of course, this is also a mystery, certainly an incomprehensible mystery. For our reason says: If God foresees our actions, we must be compelled to do what he foreknows; if God knows, it must happen. This is indeed a mystery, but it is not the mystery of the election of grace. The mystery of the election of grace is rather this, as the aforementioned always say: When one comes to the question why the dear God does not work in all men in the same way (the Apology of the Formula of Concord uses this **<page 93>** expression twice), i.e., works in the same way,

when one comes to the question why the dear God, for example, gave repentance and faith to Peter but not to Judas, why so few come to faith and millions do not, while God would be able to give faith to all: then one must say: "Oh, the depth" and so on. But our dear brethren will not admit this; for Prof. Stellhorn expressly says: "Faith is the ground of explanation. [**p 129**] If this is so, then faith must be a work of man. If we now take the "*intuitu fidei*" in this way, it cannot, if interpreted according to its literal meaning, be understood otherwise than as follows: In faith there is a causality of election, as for example in the Epistle to the Hebrews it says that Moses regarded the reproach of Christ as greater riches than the treasures of Egypt, because he saw the reward. It is also said that the reward was one of the driving, moving causes for him to deny everything. It is the same when we say here: *intuitu fidei*, where faith is a causality, which the dear brothers themselves do not want. So why do we not prefer to abandon this expression? We are not bound to the terminology of the 17th century! No, we only need to go into the symbolic books and we can get the *phrases* and the manner of speaking [*modus loquendi]* out of there. Chemnitz was clear enough and he knew the history of dogma well enough if he had considered it advisable to include the "*intuitu fidei*" and to say: We are chosen in view of faith. But even in the "*Enchiridion*" he says: Faith follows, not precedes, so he deliberately omitted that expression in the Formula of Concord because he rejects it. And now consider what § 88 says: "Therefore it is wrong and unjust when it is taught that not only the mercy of God and the most holy merit of Christ, but also **in us** is a cause of God's election, for the sake of which God has chosen us to eternal life. Then not only before we did anything good, but also before we were born, he chose us in Christ, yes, before the foundation of the world was laid, and so that God's favor might be according to election, it was said to him... the greater shall serve the lesser." Notice this "in us". No distinction is made. The dear brethren have said that there is a difference between what man has by nature or can work by his own natural powers, and what God works in man through his Holy Spirit, and that the former is rejected here, but not what man receives through grace. But this is a gloss. It says that apart from God's mercy and Christ's merit, absolutely nothing moved him to elect us to eternal life. Therefore the dogmatists of the 17th century expressly say: Not only what man can do by virtue of free will [*liberum arbitrium]* is to be excluded here, but **<pages 94>** also what is wrought by grace. They have not gone as far as our dear opponents. I beg you! If a Gerhard, a Quenstedt and others had received the definition of election by grace that has been presented to us, they would have thrown up their hands in disbelief. — The Formula of Concord goes on to say: "Then", i.e. "not only before we have done something good" and so on. Consider the way in which the Formula of Concord concludes here. It does not only say: "not only before we have done anything good", for that would of course prove nothing; no, it goes on to say: "but also before we are born", etc., and thus our confession testifies that nothing that is in man in time, whether it be good by nature, which is not at all present, or whether it be good by grace, may be set beside the mercy of God and the merit of Christ. Otherwise it would be a quite absurd proof. When it [**p 130**] says: Even before we were born, we were chosen in Christ; therefore only the mercy of God and the eternal merit of Christ — the latter was already there before God from eternity, which is why it is said: The Lamb was slain from eternity — can be named as the cause of election; so it says: Everything that happened later by men, whether natural or supernatural, does not belong here. — Oh, dear brothers, think about this. I don't want to school you, but as a brother I want to draw your attention to it: take a good look at the passage, and I am convinced that if you do so, this passage will gradually convince you in your conscience. — It says further in Prof. Stellhorn's speech: "Pg. 557, § 20 was quoted and it was said that in my definition of the election of grace these words would not come into their own. But when

it says that there is no cause in us, it only means something that we already have by nature or at least can give us, not something that God gives us and which is then in us, namely faith or Christ grasped in faith." I rejoice with all my heart that this is testified to, in that the dear brothers thus renounce a synergistic use of "*intuitu fidei*". But that it is confessional, in line with the Confessions, is not proven. On the contrary, it argues against the Confession, and on the other hand it is likely to benefit the synergists. For when you say: Here it is certainly said of the mercy of God and of the merit of Christ; but faith cannot be excluded, for God works it — it is clear from this that you also want faith to be regarded as a third cause; otherwise you would have to say: We do not speak of this at all, that faith is to be coordinated with those two causes. When one speaks of faith, that is quite a different point; it is a matter of the way. But if the brothers only count it as the way, they gain nothing. For we believe this with all our hearts, it is a **<page 95>** main thing for us, that God also chooses man to come to heaven by this way, that God brings him on this way, keeps him on it and finally brings him to the goal of glorification. And this is precisely what our dear brethren consider so alarming, that we do not merely say that God has not only chosen us to salvation, but that we confess it: God has also chosen to faith, to justification, to sanctification, to patience in the cross, and finally to perseverance to the end. — Prof. Stellhorn goes on to say: "The proof is to be found in §§ 40-42, where in § 41 Matthew 22 is cited. I agree with Pastor Stöckhardt in what he says, but not in what he conceals. Of course I do not want to impute anything to him. This passage also has the meaning: "Thus it is shown that many are called, but few are chosen"; but from the context it is clear that the actual and closest meaning is: "Thus it comes to pass that" and so on. Here we have the same error, that what is said of the non-elect is applied to the elect: because it is because many are lost, because they disbelieve, it must be because few are chosen, because they believe. What is this other than the "because", the "on account of", the "cause"? Do not take it amiss that I keep repeating this. But you can see from this that, although you wholeheartedly harp on synergism, [**p 131**] you nevertheless have such expressions in which synergism is included, so that everyone who is not in your circle of influence understands it. It is the same with honest people who accept an error: if they want to defend it, they must use something that is not true. The truth is only one, therefore truth follows from truth and untruth from untruth. I therefore agree with Pastor Stöckhardt in *Lehre und Wehre*, where he refers to the parable of the great supper, which concludes with the words: "For many are called, but few are chosen." This is meant to say: Behold, thus it is shown who are the elect, and who are the non-elect. The elect come to the Lord's Supper and enjoy it; the non-elect despise it. But now Prof. Stellhorn says: That is not enough. Let it be concealed that "therefore it is so"; had they not gone, they would have been excluded from the Lord's Supper; but they went, and therefore it came to pass that they were elect. I do not admit that. If I want to have comfort, I should not want to investigate the secret will of God, but look at the revealed will of God, the gospel, Christ, and if I do that, if I hear the gospel, believe in Christ, repent, pray, etc., then I should not doubt in the least that I am elect. Indeed, if I do not now believe that I am an elect person, then I do not consider God to be true. For God has described the elect in his Word in this way. It says: One should **<pages 96>** watch and pray, and God will certainly answer such prayer; and even if someone falls from the faith, he has not ceased to be an elect person if he was one before; but either he was not elect at all or he remains so, and God will see to it that he comes to faith again. But woe to him who says: "If it is so that one is chosen to eternal salvation, well then, I will do as I please; I despise God's Word, live in sin, etc.; such a one draws God's grace on willfulness, he is a wicked, godless man and will see in that day where his godlessness has brought him. That is why the dogmatists of the 17th century, with very

few exceptions (the Württembergers), reject the doctrine that God would have chosen all men. I do not reject it, but these dogmatists do. Olearius, in his continuation of Carpzov's isagoge, writes in answer to the question: whether the Württemberg theologian Thummius is right when he teaches that God intended to elect all men: That is not right, he says, but it is Huberianism. — The dogmatists speak of consequent and antecedent will [*voluntas consequens* and *antecedens]*. But these are scholastic expressions which give us no certainty, least of all can they refute my doctrine. Let us not be misled by these scholastic expressions, for they contain a slightly confusing distinction of God's will. God has only one will and not two. The dogmatists also admit this, but that is why they have to use artificial arguments so that God remains a simple being with only one will according to their definition. — Prof. Stellhorn goes on to say: "This definition is said to contradict the Formula of Concord, inasmuch as the latter says: Election is a cause of salvation. I accept that election is a cause of our salvation. But I refer this to the first part, to those 8 points, although I also admit for my own part that election is also in a certain sense a cause of salvation according to the second part, inasmuch as in [**p 132**] this election according to p. 708. § 23 the decree is already included that God will now also choose the elect in the way as now reported . . . will strengthen and preserve them. Thus election by grace in the wider sense is a cause of salvation according to its first and in a certain sense also according to its second part." — Quite so. But then election must also be a cause of that which belongs to the attainment of salvation. So it must be a cause of repentance, conversion, faith, rebirth, sanctification, perseverance to the end. I was very pleased that Prof. Stellhorn admits this, and have often wondered how the dear brethren believe they can escape the words of § 23. These words cannot be repeated often enough: "And in such His counsel, counsel and decree, God has not only prepared salvation in general, but has also considered all and every person of the elect, who are to be saved through **<pages 97>** Christ, in grace, chosen for salvation, and also ordained that He would bring, help, promote, strengthen and preserve them in this way, as now reported, by His grace, gifts and effect." "Not only in general blessedness prepared", it says here. The word "not" is the antithesis and not the word "blessedness". "Also decreed"; this is therefore a "decree" of God; it is not merely made possible for the elect, but God has decided in his counsel that they shall be saved, and that in this way. — Because we say "in this way", there is no danger in our doctrine other than the general danger that wicked people will take grace at random. But we cannot avoid this danger. — When Prof. Stellhorn says: "In this respect at least I cannot see that my definition abolishes this doctrine of the Formula of Concord. Acts 13:48 is quoted; several of our elders say that this passage does not belong here. I believe it belongs here," so I am glad that he shows a bridge where we can come together. It says in that passage Acts 13:48: οσοι ήσαν τεταγμένοι εις ζωήν αιώνων [as many as were appointed to life eternal]. The pluperfect tense shows that this "decree" is to refer to eternity: "who had been ordained to eternal life." That is what we want: God had already ordained them to salvation from eternity. But if we want to say that this "decree" refers to time — which is not possible because of the pluperfect — what sense would this passage have? According to this assumption, "being ordained to eternal life" would then mean nothing other than: being in such a condition that one can enter into eternal life, and this passage would then say: as many became believers as were believers. That makes no sense. No, "to be ordered into eternal life" can mean nothing other than: to be in the order in which one must be if one wants to attain eternal life. That is why I believe that this passage is a compelling passage which clearly shows that faith is also one of the objects of election [*electio]*. And if we read the passages in our Confession impartially, we can come to no other conclusion. § 8: "But the eternal election of God not only sees and knows beforehand the salvation of the elect, but

is also a cause by the gracious will and good pleasure of God in Christ Jesus, so that our salvation, and what belongs to it, creates, works, helps and promotes; on which also our salvation [**p 133**] is founded, so that the gates of hell shall not be able to prevail against it, as it is written: My sheep no one will snatch out of my hand. And again: And as many as were ordained to eternal life believed." What kind of biblical proof would this be if the Formula of Concord had not meant to say: Election is also a cause **<page 98>** of faith when it quotes the passage: "And as many as were ordained to eternal life believed"? This can only have been added here as evidence because the Formula of Concord teaches that faith also flows from the election of grace. — I am convinced that I do not need to read out the following points, because I need only ask every reader to see what I have said. This is not a reply to my reasons. So read it and you will see that Prof. Stellhorn has not answered me in a way that could be taken as a refutation. But I don't want that to be said to Prof. Stellhorn's disadvantage. It is true that I had spoken for quite a long time. He couldn't possibly be aware of everything. But that's why I don't need to repeat it. It would be a nuisance to listen to it again and again. There is only one thing I would like to point out again, namely § 46: "Again, that he has willed to keep my salvation both sure and certain, because it could easily be lost from our hands through the weakness and wickedness of our flesh, or snatched and taken from us by the cunning and violence of the devil and the world, that he has ordained this in his eternal purpose, which cannot be filed or overthrown, and has placed it in the almighty hand of our Savior Jesus Christ, from which no one can snatch us, John 10[:28], hence Paul also says in Romans 8:28: "Because we are called according to the purpose of God, who then will separate us from the love of God in Christ?" Prof. Stellhorn says: He also teaches that constancy (in faith) has its cause in the election of grace, "only of course he does not want to force me to salvation, my willful resistance can oppose him at any point"; but this does not meet the point I was talking about. I was not talking about the possibility of remaining in the faith; that is expressed in the words of Prof. Stellhorn. Here in §§ 45-47 we are not speaking of the possibility, but of the reality, of the certainty and unshakeableness, of the impossibility of the one who is chosen losing faith in such a way that he would have none immediately before death. That is what it says. This is the consolation that election by grace gives me, that I may not ultimately [*finaliter]* lose faith, that election by grace tells me: Not only has God generally taken counsel to bring all men who are to be saved to this goal by a certain way of grace, but there are also a number of people whom God has ordained according to his purpose, who should and must remain in the faith, or even if they once fall from it, they should only lose it for a time and finally they should be saved. That is what matters. If you do not admit this to us, you cannot confess these §§ 45-47 with us. For here we are talking about those who are already in the faith, and now **<page 99>** the question is whether they also remain in the faith? The confession says: Yes, God has "placed it in the almighty hand of our Savior Jesus Christ", there he "preserves" their salvation, nothing on earth and in hell can take away the salvation of the elect, [**p 134**] for "because we are called according to the purpose of God, who will separate us" and so on. What God has set before Himself cannot be thwarted. — Further mention should be made of the fact that Prof. Stellhorn says in § 45 that the consolation lies in this: "That God has determined just such a way of salvation as He has done, one in which He alone wants to do everything. He has found just such a way, but of course he does not want to force me to salvation. … Of course I could not resist his omnipotence. It says: 'how', '*quomodo*', not 'that' he wants it." — The consolation should therefore lie in the fact that God has created a way of salvation by which everyone can be saved. But this is not the election of grace. This is based on a πρόθσις, on a resolution that cannot be overturned. — Prof. Stellhorn says: "Consolation is only conditional. Consolation can only be of the same

kind as certainty. I know with absolute certainty that the first part of the election of grace is there for me, which is why the consolation to which I must ultimately return again and again is a very firm one that stands firm in the face of temptation; the Formula of Concord knows nothing of anything other than such a consolation that remains in the face of temptation. And what do I do with it?" To this I say: I need consolation precisely in temptation, but not outside of it. When there is no temptation, one thinks: This is easy; the flesh is easy to overcome, it should not deceive me; the world should not outwit me; the devil should not gain the upper hand. But in the temptation all that falls away. When I know that I can count myself among the elect, then I can be calm and confident. Then I say: No matter how much the enemies of my soul rage and rage, I am not afraid, for my salvation is in God's hands. If it were in my own hands, I would despair, but you, God, save me, I can do nothing about it. — That gives true comfort. — Read also § 33: "We should be concerned with this revealed will of God, follow it and make every effort to do it, because the Holy Spirit, through the word by which he calls us, gives us grace, power and ability to do so, and do not search the abyss of God's hidden providence, as written in Luc. 13, where someone asks: "Lord, do you think that few will be saved?" Christ answers: "Strive to enter through the narrow gate. Thus Luther says: "Follow the epistle to the Romans in its order, and first be concerned with Christ and his gospel, that you may recognize your sin and his grace, and then contend with sin, as Paul teaches from the first to the eighth chapter" (and now Luther does not say: **<page 100>** “You have had enough of this”; rather, he continues:) "After that, when you come into temptation under the cross and suffering in the 8th chapter, providence will teach you in the 9th, 10th and 11th chapters how comforting predestination this is" etc. So far be it from Luther saying: In temptation the doctrine of election of grace does not help, but otherwise it does; on the contrary, Luther says: Then is the right time in which election of grace must enter, when one comes into severe temptation. — We see this also from the second article of the Formula of Concord (*Sol. decl. art.* II. § 47), where it says: "Other fainthearted hearts may also fall into heavy thoughts and [**p 135**] doubts as to whether God has chosen them, and through the Holy Spirit also wants to work his gifts in them, because they do not feel a strong burning faith and heartfelt obedience, but vain weakness, fear and misery." So this is also a serious temptation when someone falls into doubt as to whether he is chosen by God . But if he grasps this teaching correctly, he will be torn from all fear when he is convinced of it: Yes, indeed, you are chosen. — Mention is also made of the consolation that one draws from the election of grace in temptation, in § 57 of the same II. Article: "But if a man will not hear the preaching, nor read the word of God, but despises the word and the church of God, and so dies and perishes in his sins: he can neither be comforted by God's eternal election, nor obtain his mercy; for Christ, in whom we are elected, offers his grace to all men in the word and holy sacraments, and earnestly desires that they should hear it, and has promised that where two or three are gathered together in his name, and handle his holy word, he will be in the midst of them." — And now just one more thing. — Dear Prof. Stellhorn says: "If the eternal election of God has been revealed by the fact that the universal way of salvation has been revealed, then the election must consist, in the main, in the fact that the universal way of salvation has been established." This changes the whole doctrine of election by grace, if that is the main part. I admit wholeheartedly that we must know the doctrine of the way of salvation before we understand the doctrine of election by grace, for one can be and remain a true Christian and yet not have learned anything about election by grace. One can be a true Christian and die blessed and yet have doubted the election of grace until his death. That is not the reason for justifying faith. Election by grace is not revealed to us for this purpose, but as a consolation. But I can not have many consolations and yet remain in faith and persevere

in faith. How many ungodly preachers there are, and how many preachers of weak knowledge, who hold people so exceedingly short in consolation! Think of the Methodists, the Reformed, the United [*Unirten*]! Oh, how little comfort flows there, and yet we believe that people are saved there too. **<page 101>** No, the Christian does not necessarily have to have all the comfort that flows from the Scriptures, from the Gospel, and he can still be and remain a Christian, and so it can and does happen that millions know nothing of the election of grace and yet are the best Christians, they do not despair in temptation. From this it is clear that the doctrine of the election of grace is not a doctrine without which one could not come to faith or remain in faith. But the doctrine of the way of salvation is therefore not the main part of the doctrine of the election of grace. For I believe that this is the main part that constitutes the essence of a matter. So what is the essence, the quality [*proprium]* of the election of grace? Is it not the universal way of salvation? What makes the doctrine the doctrine of election by grace is nothing other than that God has elected, ordained a number of people to salvation. It has come a long way if, as soon as one speaks in this way, one makes big eyes and says: Now he says again that certain people are elected and must be saved! [**p 136**] Terrible teaching! But that is the teaching of the Holy Spirit! With these words it is written in the Bible: We were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, and it is not possible for the elect to be deceived until the end. So there is no need to be alarmed, for it is the revelation of the all-merciful and gracious God, who wants all people to be helped. — So Prof. Stellhorn has not accepted my evidence, and we see: Only the doctrine of the Formula of Concord of election gives true consolation in the cross. Now Prof. Stellhorn could prove that he can also comfort in his own way. But this is not the specific consolation which the doctrine of election of grace gives; for it always makes it dependent on faith, and we make it dependent on the merit of Christ and on the all-mercy of God. I remind you of § 30 in the Formula of Concord, where it says: "Therefore the elect are thus described in John 10:27-28: My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me, and I give them eternal life. And Eph. 1:11: "Those who have been ordered unto the inheritance according to the purpose, who hear the gospel, believe in Christ, pray and give thanks, are sanctified in love, have hope, patience and comfort in the cross Rom. 8:25, and even though all these things are very weak in them, they still hunger and thirst for righteousness Matt. 5:6." — I draw attention here to the Latin "*perseverant in spe*": they persevere in hope; these are the elect, for whom the cross should and must serve for the best.

The debate was then declared closed and it was resolved to discuss ways and means of reaching an agreement later this afternoon. The chairman asked that the dear brothers not leave before the end of the next meeting (in the afternoon), and then the meeting was adjourned with the Lord's prayer. J. Fackler, Secr.

Eleventh meeting.

Tuesday afternoon, October 5.

The floor was first given to a member of the conference to make a remark. This was to the effect that in the 1850s, when a member wrote the article for our Synod from which two passages were read out yesterday, he had often come to him. He knew that at that time he had tried to harmonize the two doctrinal tropes, which he had been prompted to do by a heresy that was going around in Wisconsin at that time, and which claimed that we had fallen away from Luther's teaching in the articles on conversion and election of grace, and even more so from the dogmatists of the 17th century. Nevertheless, that member, as he had had occasion to learn, had already at that time held more to the so-called first doctrinal trope, but later completely; as he had expressly told the brethren [p 137] traveling to this conference that they should not come home to him with the "*intuitu fidei*".

In order to gain time for the necessary proceedings, proposals were now made concerning the protocols that had not yet been submitted to the conference for revision and approval. One proposal was to send them to the faculties in St. Louis and Fort Wayne for review; the other proposal, which was finally adopted, was to appoint a committee of three to remain here and to whom the minutes in question should be submitted by the secretaries for revision. It was decided that one of these committee members would be Pastor Allwardt, the other Prof. Pieper, who would jointly elect the third member.

The following resolutions were also passed: 1) That the proceedings of this conference be sent to print and that this be done without alteration in the manner in which the minutes were read and accepted here; 2) That Pastor J. T. Große of Addison, as editor, prepare the minutes for printing.

The report should also contain a list of all present conference members and a list of the names of the guests.

The proposal to publish the minutes gave rise to a lengthy discussion before it was adopted. It was first noted that it would not be surprising if different opinions were expressed on the matter. Since our proceedings had not yet been concluded, we could only offer the public fragments at this time; on the other hand, there were some who could not be present and who in any case wished to have the contents of our minutes made accessible to them. Admittedly, if the sad doctrinal differences were already favorably resolved here [this sentence fragment missing in the CPH translation.], then it would be best if nothing <pages 103> were printed. Some conference members initially spoke out against publication. The view was expressed that there were other and better means of obtaining clarity about this doctrine than the doctrinal negotiations of this conference. Some emphasized that publication had its disadvantages; it was better to stay within the four walls: everything could be ready and prepared for printing, but this itself could be delayed until it was absolutely necessary; one should bear in mind that the matter would then go out into the world from the narrowest circle through the book trade. From another side, the complete publication of the minutes was declared to be absolutely necessary from the outset. It was emphasized that the dispute was already known in all parts of the world, that we were being portrayed everywhere as Calvinist teachers, that the opposing writings were being sent to our congregations, and that they now also had an interest in reading in black and white what our pastoral conference had negotiated. If the report appeared publicly, we could say to all those who had become or would like to become wavering because of the attacks on our doctrine: "Look, this and that which the

opponents accuse us of teaching is not true, this is what Dr. Walther teaches, this is what the Missouri Synod teaches. One conference member pointed out how important the publication was for this reason, because in the course of the controversy one would no doubt sometimes be forced to refer to these minutes, but many things would escape the memory, and so it could well happen that later, for example, when this doctrine was discussed at special conferences, some people would think that the opponent had said something like this or that, without it being so. More and more [**p. 138**] members spoke unanimously in favor of printing the negotiations, even if the reasons for this were different. One conference member emphasized the great benefit of having the opportunity to refresh the gradually fading memory of these negotiations later at home; printing was also necessary so that it would not be difficult later to resume and continue the negotiations where we had left off. Another member of the conference reminded us that, since the opponents had already written publicly against us and our doctrine had been proclaimed false, un-Lutheran, even Calvinistic, a public testimony from our side had also become necessary. Another member argued that some of our preachers were forced by circumstances to teach this doctrine in the congregations more than usual, but that it was precisely these negotiations that provided a valuable basis; for the light of pure doctrine on the points in question was all the more to be granted to the congregations, as times could come when we would no longer enjoy such gifts as we do now. [i.e. when Walther and Pieper are gone!] It was also pointed out that, however, if we did not publish anything, the reproach was to be feared that we would shy away from it, **<page 104>** whereas all mistrust would be duly countered by the publication of the proceedings. It was also testified that some conference members who had not been able to attend had expressed the heartfelt wish that by publishing the negotiations they would also be able to participate in the blessing of the same.

The proposal to print the proceedings, but to give copies only to the professors and members of the ministry, was rejected as deviating from our principles, and reference was also made to our practice in earlier doctrinal disputes.

When asked by a brother how the brothers of the opposition felt about the proposal of publication, one of them (Prof. Stellhorn) explained: I am quite happy for the minutes to be printed verbatim; and another (Pastor Allwardt): Me too, I would not insist on it if the brethren on that side did not wish it to be printed. For my part, however, I would prefer the minutes to be printed.

Dr. Walther replied: "It seems to me to be quite dangerous not to print the proceedings. It would look as if we were shying away from the light, especially if we wanted to print them and make them accessible only to the Ministry. It is certain that one would weep with tears of blood that we must now trouble our simple-minded Christians with negotiations on this difficult doctrine. But those who have already dragged the matter before the public have to answer for this before God. I am, I declare, innocent that it has come to this. But since things are as they are, and since it is a fact that often the more ignorant some listeners are, the quicker they are to pass judgment, it is all the more necessary that we bear witness to them.

The decision to publish the minutes was then taken unanimously.

It was then decided that the doctrinal negotiations for this conference should be regarded as closed, and the proposal was made that we should now discuss the ways and means of restoring unity later, by the grace of God.

The essential discussions at this conference are contained in the following: One member of the conference pointed out that it had already been suggested several times before that [**p 139**] we must first know how the opponents now stood; for if they still declared us to be Calvinists, whatever we did would be in vain; only if we saw that they

no longer stood that way, and there was hope of reaching agreement with them through further negotiations, could we discuss ways and means. The opponents should be induced to speak out. Of course, another member remarked <pages 105> that what had just been said could only refer to those who had made the accusation public. The main issue at stake, it was further noted, was whether our brothers on the other side considered us to be enemies or brothers. If we are brothers in their eyes, they must realize that if a dispute has arisen among us, it should also be settled among us; for when one first appears before the great public, the latter judges that he no longer finds justice among his brothers. If one considers this and holds the behavior of our brothers against it, the path they have taken is deplorable. As long as someone is open to instruction, one must not run out into the street and shout: Look, this is how it is with this and that. Read what Dr. Luther writes in the Large Catechism on the 8th commandment about those who go out into public. It would be nice if a householder ran out into the street to complain to the neighbors about his servant, what a terrible person he was. He would have to hear: "You fool, what's it to us? Why don't you tell him yourself?" Now it is a question of whether the brothers are of such a mind that they do not want to leave our fellowship in order to bombard our house from the outside, but whether they live in the hope that we will finally come to an agreement. The first way to do this, however, is to come together and discuss the matter from all sides. If we finally cannot come to clarity with the Formula of Concord, then let us go to the Scriptures together. But if we were to decide now to meet again next summer, and in the meantime those who want to be brothers were to write publicly against us, then everyone would thank us for coming; on the contrary, they would rightly regard them as enemies, not as brothers. — From various sides the brothers in question were encouraged to speak out about their position, that they should at least confess that they had not given up hope of regaining unity with us, and that they wanted to refrain from writing publicly against us. They might still think that they had the truth and that we would finally have to face them, that there was no harm in that, that we thought so too; but they had to remember that it was a peaceful struggle for the truth between brothers. They were ready for a truce, during which the issues could be discussed in conferences and synods, but not fought in public.

One of the brethren from the opposition explained that from the beginning, when he recognized the doctrine that was now being taught publicly about the election, he had regarded it as an aberration, but had never considered the Missouri Synod to be his enemy, as could be seen from his essays. Thus he still stood, thus he had always stood; he hoped that they would finally come to an agreement, <page 106>not only in general, but also in phrasebus; he hoped that when the negotiations were printed, everything would be better considered and examined by both sides, and that on the basis of what had been negotiated, the thread could be found on which to tie up again, after the matter had been discussed in smaller circles, in which way more could be done. However, [p 140] the speaker continued, I did not necessarily want to promise not to write any more, as I do not know whether I will be able to keep it. To the request of a brother, that he might consider that so long as he wrote publicly against us, he was thereby acting as an enemy towards us, indeed, committing a kind of suicide, and might therefore say whether he would not sheathe his sword and no longer appear in public until he had taken more worthy steps; — he replied by first testifying how difficult it had become for him to take up the pen against the Synod, his spiritual mother, but then continued with the words: "I cannot complain to my conscience, I will watch and if I find it necessary again, I will write. I beg you not to ask for more." To a question directly aimed at this, the same brother replied: "For now I will not write, I will see what comes of it." [Either Stellhorn or Allwardt, and more was written!]

It was very much desired that Pastor Allwardt would also speak openly and honestly about the motives that had prompted him to appear in public. Before he spoke about this, the following discussions took place: If one said that one could not promise to refrain from writing publicly against us, then the truce was only a conditional one. So far we had borne all slander, all suspicions, all insults calmly, now it was time to declare that we would regard as an enemy anyone who again appeared in public against us as has happened. Who could think that this could happen in a fellowship in which doctrinal discipline prevails! If we wanted war, we should have it. Up to now, we had not kept silent out of cowardice, not because we did not know how to defend ourselves, but out of love; but if we were forced to do so, our opponents would be surprised at our language and how we would then have to publicly characterize our enemies. This should only be noted so that later, if we should be forced to publicly expose our opponents due to renewed attacks in the newspapers and suspicions in the congregations, we could not be told that we had spoken so peacefully at the end of this conference as if there were a contradiction. The speaker pointed out how this side had so anxiously avoided even mentioning names, but had had to experience and lament with pain and sighs and tears how they had tried to fill even church members with suspicion against us. In many extremely heartfelt words, the same venerable member of the conference testified how <page 107> much misery, distress and heartache this public appearance of brethren had caused him, how he had experienced more sorrow and grief in the last nine months than ever in his whole life, so that it would probably still be his death; But as long as he can hold the pen, as long as he is able to wait for his ministry, he will not become a traitor to the truth and to our churches by continuing to watch; the glory of God and the salvation of the churches are most important to him. If it remains among us in a fraternal circle, we can fight well, because one is not yet our enemy because he thinks differently and is in error; but if one goes out into the public and misleads our churches, we must be on the plan and would then ask for no man's honor. We accept the conditional promise that we will no longer write publicly as long as our conscience suffers, but we must immediately note that [p 141] we will not tolerate anyone who is a member of our Synod writing against us in foreign journals. It had already happened, that hostile journals had rejected articles from our side, while they were happy to accept articles against us. [As Pelikan was accepted by an opposition German paper against his “Missouri Synod”!]

Another conference member pointed out how the editors of our journals had refused to accept an article against our opponents because, as he had been told, they did not want to act hostilely towards them; he demanded its publication if they continued to write against us in the future. He had indeed sensed from the essays of a brother among the opponents that he did not want to create bitterness; but if the latter had referred to how he had taken up the pen with much worry, he should rather look at the many tears and sighs that had been caused by his public appearance, at the terrible annoyance caused by it, without having been able to prove his doctrine so far.

One member of the conference remarked that he wanted to give a reason which had probably induced the opponents to want to promote their doctrine in their own paper. The editors of our journals do not accept those articles. But now consider the demand that lies in doing so. The editors of the "Lutheraner" and the "Lehre und Wehre" are supposed to take up precisely the opposite of the doctrine they represent, thus making these papers a playground for truth and error; this is only noted to explain how those brothers came to write in other papers, which also gladly accept such rebuttals. "But," continued the same speaker, "the question is: Was this really the only way left to them? Could their Christian love really have found nothing else to get to the Western District? The only right way would have been to sue the Western District at the general Synod <page 108> and let it

decide; from which, if necessary, they could have turned to another body, the Synodical Conference, if they thought we were wrong. — The synods united in the Synodical Conference have agreed not to attack each other publicly, but always to discuss matters in their own house first. Now it was certainly against love that they did not take this path, but founded their own paper to write against us." — One member remarked that this also meant that, just as no one among us should be given the right to write against us in public, no one should throw the dispute into the congregations, which the synodical officials should also see to and, if necessary, intervene.

A member of the conference remarked: "To whom it may seem harsh that we say to the opponents: Only if you are publicly silent can we continue to deal with you, consider the offense, the shame, the disgrace that has already been brought upon the Synod, and how some who were on their way to come to us are kept from doing so. There you have, said the enemies, especially in Germany, the orthodox Missouri Synod! We know how difficult this doctrine is, how it takes a struggle to go the way in this mystery, as God shows us in his Word; we know how we live in the last afflicted time and [p 142] how many Christians are plunged into trouble because of this controversy. Look at all this! How could we now put up with the continuation of the harm? For the sake of the souls entrusted to us, for whom we must give an account, we must demand a promise that you will be publicly silent."

Another member of the conference declared that he also stood as one of the opponents professed. The latter considered our doctrine to be false and erroneous, whereas he considered the doctrine of the latter to be false and erroneous; nevertheless, he could no more give up hope of an eventual agreement than the former. He considered the public appearance of the brothers to be a sin, but for the time being one should not press the other's conscience to make more definite promises, but should confidently make further arrangements to settle the dispute, as he could well imagine himself in the other's position.

Then a member of the conference took the floor and pointed out that the relationship of a preacher to his synod was similar to that of a church member to his congregation. As long as such a person was a member of the congregation and not unjustly excluded from the congregation, he should not malign the congregation in the eyes of those outside. If he did so, he would be subject to church discipline, whether what he said was true or not. Of course, he continued, he should not be forced; that would not help at all; the opponents would not keep it. But if they think that their conscience does not permit them to promise that they will no longer publicly oppose us, <page 109> we declare: If you do so, you should also know what to expect, that we cannot then deal with you otherwise than as with enemies. God demands from us the churches entrusted to us, and we cannot stand quietly by and watch them being destroyed. Our opponents cannot take offense when we speak out against them. If they believe they have to write against us, we do not take offense, but we cannot tolerate this from them if they want to be members of the Synod.

A member of the opposition then declared: "That he would have preferred not to go into the reproach made to him that he had not proceeded in the right way, as he had so far let this reproach pass quietly; but since it was urged so strongly, he was compelled to respond to it. He had to explain that he had indeed written to the General President, but had waited in vain all summer for further steps. He had also discussed a sentence with the brethren at a conference which he had noticed in one of their own reports, without attacking the Western Report of 1877. He expressly referred to these private ways. He had not written anything from the beginning and had declared at that conference that he wanted to wait another 5 to 10 years. But then came the Western Report of 1879, which

made him believe that the matter had reached such a stage that he could no longer wait with a clear conscience." So much for Pastor Allwardt.

The Honorable General Praeses Pastor Schwan testified that this brother had sent him a paper in which he raised some objections to the doctrine of election by grace in the Synodal Report of the Western District, which paper he had sent with his consent to the St. Louis faculty for further negotiations. [p 143] But if Pastor Allwardt had been so eager for private negotiations, let him explain why he did not accept the opportunity offered to him and another person to discuss the matter with an old member of the Synod, Pres. Fürbringer, before the time of the Colloquium in Columbus, but turned it down, since it could be expected that he had a good prejudice against him as someone who was friendly to him?

Pastor Allwardt replied: "Since Mr. Schwan did not know where Prof. Schmidt was at the moment, he sent me an invitation to a private meeting between Pres. Fürbringer and Prof. Schmidt, which was to take place before the colloquium and which I could attend if I wished. I was to send it to Prof. Schmidt. I did so immediately. But so much time had been lost by the detour which the invitation had taken that Prof. Schmidt declared he could no longer travel to Michigan before <pages 110> the Synodical Conference. As far as I remember, I was not asked to travel alone.

Mr. Schwan then remarked, with reference to the time, that his invitation to Frankenmuth had been made at the end of June, about the 26th ***)** [*) The exact date is June 30th], but that the conference in Columbus had not been held until the middle of July, and asked the brother, with reference to the contents of that letter, whether he had only invited that other person through him, or not rather expressly himself?

Pastor Allwardt explained that he did not want to deny the latter if it was claimed that he had only said that he could no longer remember it.

When the Honorable President then stated that he had indeed invited both of them, Pastor Allwardt argued that the time had been very short and that he had not considered that he alone could do anything. He had waited the whole summer for something to happen, until the synodal report of the Western District came, which attacked them so harshly, even with clear references to individuals. This direct reference was the cause of the public appearance.

With regard to this public appearance and the publication of the opposing paper, it was remarked that it could be refuted as an untruth by evidence, black on white, if someone wanted to claim that only the Report of 1879 had been the cause of the public attack and the publication of a special paper or had made these steps necessary; a letter had been written much earlier in which that other person had already solemnly stated that he considered it his duty to now appear publicly against us.

Pastor Allwardt replied that what had been said did not apply to him because he had nothing to do with it. In fact, he had not first been made aware of it by someone else, but had come to the dissent through his own examination of the Western Report. Before he knew that Prof. Schmidt was also taking offense at the report, he had brought the matter to the district president, and while they were discussing it, Pastor Koren had entered and said that Prof. Schmidt had also found errors in the report. [p 144]

President Schwan remarked that what was being rejected here had not been claimed at all, that he had not been meant by the above; one was far from wanting to be a heartfelt critic and judge his convictions. But let us examine ourselves very carefully to see whether the motives for his appearance were really entirely peaceful. Our heart is a strange thing, often sees terrible things, <pages 111> considers it our duty to do this and that, and often deceives ourselves about the motives of our actions. Let us ask ourselves whether we have done all we can to our brothers before we treat them as enemies. That is

easily done. But what terrible consequences it sometimes has, what an impression it makes that often cannot be erased! Let the opponents recognize what they have done and consider that God admonishes in his words that today, when I hear his voice, we should not harden our hearts; they are also asked to consider that something of this voice is now ringing in their ears.

Some remarks were made about the Western District Report of 1879. How little there was in it that could be referred to personally! Only a little bit is touched in it, as if with the very tip of a finger, something of which the speaker knew that the brother in question had said it. No one, except those who were already familiar with the matter, knew who was meant. So he would have had no reason to be so sensitively touched. However, another person was rejected more decisively in the report, but most of the brothers, even in the Western District, did not even know who was meant. They did not want to name that person now, they did not want to expose his shame, as he had tried to undermine our Synod and gain a following. Letters had been flying around like in an intelligence office [*Intelligenz-Comptoir]*. If the person concerned wanted to complain, he had no reason to do so, for no one who had not known beforehand could have known that he was meant. It is mere pretense when he refers to the report of 1879; on the contrary, this was evidently his greatest pleasure and he considered it very favorable for himself to do so, although he was not named at all, while he had already acted in the most hostile manner beforehand; this could be proven, if one wished, with witnesses from our midst. "Our dear brother Allwardt," continued the same speaker, "has been too sensitive and has read between the lines and thought: In the end he means me. I hope that you will never fall into temptation and remorse over the terrible anger you have caused, over the unspeakable damage that has been done to our Synod, our literature, our good name. You have destroyed with a savage hand the great blessing that God has placed on our work. But it is not my intention to deal with the past; I only wanted you to consider whether your conscience does not permit you to make the desired pledge unconditionally."

Several members of the conference declared that they felt compelled in conscience to regard and treat as an enemy, rather than a brother, any of the gentlemen opponents who continued to speak out against us in public writings.

It was pointed out by a member of the conference that **<page 112>** any action which disturbed the peace was already excluded by the hand of peace which we now offered; after all, [**p 145**] even Zwingli had promised in the Colloquium at Marburg not to write against Luther any more, how should not a member of our Synod, who had been treated so kindly for weeks, act fraternally as long as he himself had to admit that there was still a prospect of restoring unity!

The conference now decided to allow a guest, Pastor Sieker, to speak. After he had testified that he was not moved to speak by the desire to intervene without being called, but only by the misery and distress of the church, which had been on his heart for months and was seeking expression, he pointed out in a lengthy speech how impossible it was that the brethren concerned could have fully considered the terrible damage they had caused. Thousands of Lutheran Christians throughout the world were looking to the Missouri Synod; many had taken from it the doctrinal gifts which God had given them; many, after long resistance to the truth, had overcome by their testimony, had accepted the truth, among whom, however, many were still little grounded in knowledge and not yet firm in confidence against those from whose hands they had taken the gifts. What an impression, said the speaker, the accusation of crypto-Calvinism made by the Synod must make in these circles! What a powerful weapon had been placed in Satan's hand! How many hearts had been moved to sighs and tears as a result! He knows how, through the struggle, through the faithfulness, through the gifts of the Missouri Synod, hearts in some

circles have begun to turn to it with confidence, and now we must see how those who have begun to gain confidence are alienated from us, and those who oppose us partly out of envy, partly out of bitter anger, rejoice. This appearance out of the Synod (as those who are closer to such circles would know) would cut off the possibility of convincing them. Must they not think that the Missouri Synod has come so far that an honest conscience can no longer endure, that an oppressed conscience may no longer bear witness in the circle of the brethren, that one must leave it in order to save one's conscience? With heartfelt words, the speaker asked that the brethren in question should consider this for the sake of God's honor and the salvation of souls and not rest until they had also publicly declared that they had acted unjustly, even shamefully; for they would never succeed in proving that the Missouri Synod treats witnesses with injustice. How could they justify their actions before God, so that the hearts of many, whom he could name as his own, would be consumed with sorrow, not only today, but already since the publication of that paper, because there was the danger that even the whole work of the Synodical Conference would be destroyed. **<Page 113>** You have done this, concluded the speaker, and we others, who must see it, accuse you of it, and of the groaning of so many souls, not only in this circle. That is what I wanted to tell you.

After this address, a member of the conference (namely, Pastor T. Körner) declared that he had been completely convinced by the debates this morning, and that he was withdrawing from the side of those who had hitherto opposed the public teaching of the Synod. [**p 146**]

Several brethren testified that they had no knowledge that any member of the Conference had been attacked by the debates in the Western District Synod, and that the public appearance of such a member could not have been necessary.

It was noted that there was a proposal to discuss the relationship to the members of the Synod who henceforth appear in public papers against us; it should be self-evident that those who do so cannot be in true spiritual unity with us; It was quite incomprehensible to the speakers how a man could think he was a brother of a brother and at the same time publicly insult and accuse his brothers; but as it was in the daytime, it was necessary to say so; the officials must know whether they had the approval of the conference for their actions. — For my part, concluded the speaker, I declare in advance that I take it for granted that someone who publicly attacks us in foreign newspapers or arouses opposition in congregations cannot be an official of the Synod, a teacher at our institutions or a pastor within the Synod.

One conference member replied to a comment made above that if a brother felt attacked by the Western District Report, he had the duty to ask whether he was meant, since no name was mentioned. He had also told Pastor Allwardt this and asked him not to write publicly. He had advised him to go to St. Louis and consult with Dr. Walther there, and had even declared himself willing to go with him, but this had been rejected; so had another suggestion: to bring it before the Northwestern District Synod, which was close by and would certainly, if convinced, join with him and act with the Western District Synod. This much he wished to insert, that it might be seen that he had done his duty. He must also say, however, that after we had told Pastor Allwardt that we still considered him a brother and wanted to act in a closer circle with him, we would have considered it a contradiction if we had said: But we cannot promise that we will not write publicly against you. The brethren would like to consider whether it is not a contradiction to be in synodical fellowship with someone and at the same time want to attack him publicly.

Pastor Allwardt replied: It was true that President Strasen had admonished him; but it was also true that President Strasen had always admitted that in the Western Report they were meant by their contradiction and that the Western District had done wrong to attack the matter in this way.

Another member of the conference drew attention to two things, namely, firstly, that here in America one had of course often had to experience that preachers, and the best ones, wrote against their synod because they were in a synod where neither doctrinal nor life discipline was in vogue, where other steps would have been of no avail; but those who have now written against us have also declared that Missouri is an irreformable body; if one wants to tell the truth, one must go out. In so doing they would have committed a terrible sin, even if it had been done in ignorance. On the other hand, it should be noted that Pastor Allwardt would not have violated his conscience if he had said that he no longer wanted to write against us in public newspapers. It goes without saying that if I finally cannot keep such a [p 147] promise because it would be against God, I cannot be reproached for it; but to say in advance that one wants to act against one as a brother, and at the same time that one cannot promise not to attack him publicly, that is a contradiction. Of course, the opponents should not then promise this; their conscience would then have to forbid it if they could say that we were shameful, wicked heretics; how could such a promise violate their conscience, since they certainly did not want to say that about us!

As a result of the above, Pastor Allwardt explained that he had not appeared in public because he had felt offended by personal attacks, but for the sake of the cause; for he had feared that this doctrine, which he had considered and still considered false, would take root deeper and deeper. He went on to say: As to the promise, I did not express myself as if I did not give one; rather I said clearly that my intention was not to write at first, thus wishing to say what the previous speaker had just said; whereupon he declared that he was, however, shaken by the statements he had heard, in the certainty that he had already necessarily had to appear publicly without having taken any more steps privately beforehand, although he still had to record that the Western District had first made the mistake of attacking the matter in this way.

A member of the conference asked him if he had known that new arrangements had been made in Columbus for a colloquy at a later date; and when the reply was made: Yes, he had learned this; but when the report of 1879 had come, he had considered it as if the Western District had anticipated and thwarted the matter; — he pointed out <page 115> that the brother, though he had, in his opinion, waited long in vain, yet could see from that that action was intended, and therefore should not have appeared publicly out of love. It was also pointed out, that one should not hold it against the Western District when it speaks of opponents, for theses written by the editor of the *Altes und Neues* had been circulating long before, a number of which had circulated in the Synod, indeed, through that one's fault it had come about that even church members had known that there were opponents of that Synodical Report. Thus a reference to the opposition had become necessary.

For a better understanding, it was also noted: "The fact that we discussed this doctrine in 1879 was due to the fact that we were not finished in 1877. At that time we came to this subject through the discussion of the topic that had begun at the Western District Synod and had continued for many years: "That only through the doctrine of the Evangelical-Lutheran Church is glory given to God." Thus, the presentation of the Lutheran doctrine of election by grace was also intended to show how the Lutheran

church gives glory to God alone in this article. But since the doctrine we presented was suspected and party members were sought to be recruited everywhere, we cannot be blamed for going into more detail. When people walk around the city with a fuse in their hands to light it, you don't want to tell them to go quietly and let them do their work. After these words the same speaker most earnestly exhorted the brother, [**p 148**] who had himself confessed that he was inwardly shaken by what he had heard, that he should not let the occasion pass without recognizing his wrong. — He then went on to show what a terrible, most wicked sort of theologians the Crypto-Calvinists had been, what a shameful suspicion had thus been cast upon us, and concluded with urgent pleas of love to repent. He now felt something of what Luther had felt when Zwingli stood up to him; but if the brethren gave in, we would not be angry, even if the stone they had thrown continued to roll and what had been spoiled could not be made good.

The conference passed the resolution that we would no longer regard any of the opponents who spoke out publicly against us as brothers, but as enemies. The conference contented itself with this public testimony without forcing the opponents to make any further specific promises. However, it was pointed out that this resolution did not only refer to the letter in a certain paper.

Resolved: A general pastoral conference is to be held again next year. Time and duration: Three days immediately before the Synod of Delegates. Place: Fort Wayne, if the congregations **<page 116>** there give us a friendly welcome, which the chairman of the conference will ask them to do in advance on their behalf, and only in case of emergency shall the conference be called to another place.

Finally, the conference expressed its thanks to all the local congregations for their kind hospitality, and in particular to Pastor Wagner for his efforts, whereupon the conference adjourned after a heartfelt prayer by the chairman until, God willing, next year.

A. Krafft, Secr.