

1930

THE SOCIAL DOCTRINE OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE PRESENT¹

by

Hermann Sasse

From "The Lonely Way 1927-1939, Vol. 1" copyright 2001 Concordia Publishing House. Reproduced with permission. All Rights Reserved. No part of this material may be stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of Concordia Publishing House. For ordering information, please contact CPH at 800-325-3040 or visit CPH at www.cph.org

Translated by Matthew C. Harrison

Together with Robert G. Bugbee, Lowell C. Green,
Gerald S. Krispin, Maurice E. Schild, and John R. Stephenson

With historical introductions and a biographical sketch

By Ronald R. Feuerhahn

In this essay Sasse describes the theology of the "two regimens" (more commonly called "two kingdoms") of the state and the church. His essay reveals an area of Sasse's ministry of which many are unaware. In April 1928 he was called to be pastor at St. Marienkirche, Berlin, and *Sozialpfarrer in Innere-mission* ("social pastor in inner mission"). Note therefore his reference to those involved in the "social work of the church." He held this position until he left to be assistant Professor at Erlangen in 1933. This essay was originally published in the *Kirchlich-soziale Blätter* in 1930. It was reprinted in the same year as a brochure by the Wichern Press, named after the "father of inner missions," Johann Hinrich Wichern (1808—1881).

Sasse addresses the widespread misunderstanding of the kingdom of God. He speaks of attempts to "ecclesiasticize" or "Christianize" the world which would eventually result in the "secularization" of Christendom. Later social scientists and historians would describe this as the "politicization" of Christianity.²

Huss number 053b

Hopf number 028



In view of the many Reformation anniversaries which we have celebrated since the 400th anniversary of the Reformation commemorated during the war in 1917, and which find their consummation this summer [1930] with the commemoration of the Augsburg Confession, one might well ask whether we have now had enough of looking back to the past, whether we have heard enough speeches and read enough anniversary articles. But we must not forget that all these celebrations are more than a mere look into the past. Perhaps one day the beginning of a new epoch in the history of German Protestantism will be dated from the cry "Back to Luther!",

“Back to the Reformation!”, which rang through the last decade.³ Every new epoch in the spiritual history of the West has begun with the cry “Back to...” The greatest example of this is the Reformation itself. In the form of a “return” we people of a historically distinct culture experience ever and again the dawn of a new age. “Back to the Reformation” is not meant as a romantic attempt to repeat the unrepeatable, but as a great self-defining experience [*Selbstbesinnung*] for the Evangelical [Lutheran] Church, according to her deepest essence and her special task. It is a self-definition which we all hope will mean for her the dawning of a new day.

The reconsideration of the Reformation is necessary for no one more than those who wrestle with modern questions having to do with the social work of the church. How much uncertainty, how much lack of clarity rules in our ranks regarding what is properly the task of the church in view of the social problems of our day! There can be absolutely no doubt that this uncertainty is the reason the voice of our church is so little heard today. Terrible neglect in the past is avenging itself now. But here it must not be forgotten that this is the fate of all Christian churches of our time. The great ecumenical conferences of recent years, especially the World Conference at Stockholm,⁴ have proven this to be the case. This applies also to the Roman Catholic Church in which there is clarity regarding socio-ethical principles, but in which the greatest diversity rules regarding the present application of those principles.

In what follows we desire to briefly present the great, fundamental concepts of the Sixteenth [“Civil Government”] and Twenty-eighth [“The Power of Bishops”] articles of the Augsburg Confession and the corresponding passages of the Apology, regarding state and society. And we will make a few comments about the significance of this old social doctrine for the present, as far as is possible in the space permitted.⁵

Part 1

The Augustana was composed at a time when the modern notion of the state did not yet exist. The Latin word *status*, which originally meant “station” (It was used in this sense by Thomas Aquinas) from which later the German word “*Staat*” was derived, is used occasionally by the Apology (e.g. *leges de statu civili*, “law in the realm of civil government”).⁶ The Augustana speaks once of the *forma rei publicae* [sic],⁷ “the form of the notion of the state”, which the German text renders, *weltliche Händel*.⁸ Otherwise the Latin expressions *res publica*⁹ and *civitas*¹⁰ (which ecclesiastical language borrowed from Cicero and Augustin), which we are accustomed to call “state”, are not used. Our confession speaks much more of *res civiles*¹¹ [the civil realm], *ordinationes civiles*¹² [civil orders], *magistratus*¹³ [magistrate]; in the German text, of *Polizei*¹⁴ [authorities], *weltlichem Regiment*¹⁵ [secular government], *weltlicher Gewalt*¹⁶ [secular power], *Obrigkeith*¹⁷ [governing authority]. The teaching of the Augustana regarding the state is the doctrine of the governing authority [*Obrigkeith*] and the civil orders [*bürgerlichen Ordnungen*]¹⁸ established with the governing authority and maintained by it.

The governing authority [*Obrigkeith*] and the orders established with it (e.g. the stations [*Stände*]) are, according to articles Sixteen and Twenty-eight, good works and gifts from God. They are willed by God and given to His creation. The task of the governing authority is

described as the protection of men against injustice and power, and the maintenance of justice and peace. Thus the power of the sword is given to the governing authority:

“The governing authority protects the body and external possessions against open injustice and rules men with the sword and with corporal punishment in order to guard civil righteousness and peace.”¹⁹

It has claim to respect and obedience. The requirement to be obedient to its commands and laws ceases when it commands something which can only be done with sin. Then the apostolic word applies: “One must obey God rather than men” [Acts 5:29].

The Augustana presupposes the existence of ordered governing authorities and does not directly answer the question of who is to be acknowledged as the proper authority in dubious cases. Is every political power which “has authority over us”, to be viewed as a “governing authority”? The reformers would sharply contradict this explanation of Romans 13, so widespread today. Paul speaks in that passage of the “super-ordinated power”, that is, of the legal authorities. The Augustana introduces this concept of the *legitima ordinatio* [AC XVI 1] in order to distinguish the governing authority from unordered powers. Just what the marks of the *legitimae ordinationes*, the “legal orders” are—which according to article XVI alone must be acknowledged as good gifts of God—our confession gives no direct answer. We will treat this omission momentarily.

The office of the governing authority exists not only within Christendom. It belongs to God’s created order, that is, to the order which God gave His fallen creation, and it stands independent from the religious confession of men who exercise it. No matter which peoples Christians live among, they must acknowledge the current legal authorities, “be they pagan or Christian”, as governing authorities established by God, and be obedient to the applicable laws (Apology XVI 2-3 [54-55]). Also in the non-Christian world—the reformers had in view the example of the Turks—there is a legal order [*Rechtordnung*], in which the original knowledge of all men lives on as an eternal norm for what is just. Everywhere on earth there are stations in which men live according to some legal order. Everywhere there is—even if sin has blunted it—a consciousness of right and wrong. If this “natural understanding of the just” (in which form it may appear alongside of the “positive right” [*positiven Recht*]) did not exist, then humanity would not last long. In the Apology these orders are compared to the order of nature by which the world is maintained, such as the exchange of winter and summer [Ap XVI 6 (58)].

This acknowledgment of the governing authority as a universal created order reflects exactly the doctrine of the New Testament. The church at the time of the Apostles had acknowledged the Roman Government as the governing authority established by God, in so far as it fulfilled the functions of a governing authority, in so far as it was the shield of justice and peace. The church rendered it obedience so far as it could do so without sin and as long as the pagan authorities remained within their proper legal sphere. But when the governing authority transgressed its lawful limits, as happened in the cult of Caesar, and demanded not only rule over the body, but also over the soul, there the saying applied: “One must obey God rather than men” [Acts 5:29]. Thus the struggle between Christ and Caesar broke out, as reflected in the Revelation of St. John. It is not Caesar who was the enemy of Christ, but Caesar the god [*Divus*

Caesar], who placed himself in the throne of God. The Doctrine of our confession directly reflects these thoughts of Holy Scripture.

But if the governing authority, remaining within its limits, is part of God's order of creation, if the state also essentially belongs to the order of creation and not to the order of salvation, *then there can be no Christian state*. Indeed, the bearers of the governing office may be Christian. From them may be demanded a special consciousness of the nature of their office and a special measure of performance of duty, but their duties are the same which all governing authorities on earth have. There is as little possibility of a Christian state as there is of Christian agriculture and Christian technology. The harsh "*we condemn*" [*damnant*] of the Augustana would strike the later Lutheran advocates of the doctrine of the Christian state as much as Roman Christianity and the *Schwärmer* if it could have foreseen this later falsification of Evangelical [Lutheran] doctrine. God's word provides no state law. In the Apology (16,15) Karlstadt²⁰ is called "dumb and foolish" because he taught "that one should establish city and territorial government according to the law of Moses" (Ap XVI 3 [55]) And it is expressly stated that the Gospel offers no new law for secular government (*leges de statu civili*) [Ap XVI 3 and 6 (55 and 58)] and that Christ did not command his apostles to change the civil order (*mutare statum civilem*) [Ap XVI 7 (59)]. There is no Christian order for society, for that would be an attempt to make sin disappear from the world, that love would take the place of law, in other words, that the kingdom of God would have come in glory. But as the order of nature—one half of the created order—will cease to exist in God's new creation in the new heaven and the new earth ("there will be no more death" Rev. 21:4; "there will be no more night" 21:25,), so the secular order of law [*Rechts*]*—the other half of the created order—will cease to exist at the last judgment, to which all legal order [Rechtsordnung] aims. Therefore, in the Augustana the article on secular government is immediately followed by the article on the return of Christ to judgment, a correspondence which is elucidated by the Fourteenth Schwabach Article:*²¹

"Thus (in the meantime), until the Lord comes for judgment and all power and rule cease to be, secular government [*weltliche Obrigkeit*] and rule are to be honored and obeyed as a station [*Stand*] ordered by God, to protect the godly and punish the evil."

Just what "a glorious, great office" the office of governing authority is has, in the history of Christianity, never been so described as in "this high, necessary article" of the Augustana (Apology XVI [13] 65). Now next to the office of secular government is placed the spiritual office; next to the state, the church, and each is alike delimited from the other.

"We make a distinction between both these forms of regiment and official authority and call them both the highest gifts of God on earth [to be held] in honor" [AC XXVIII 18].

Everything depends on the proper distinctions.

"Thus the two governments [*Regemente*] the spiritual and the secular, should not be confused and mixed together. For the spiritual power has its command to preach the Gospel and administer the Sacraments. It should not become an office

foreign and contrary to its nature. It should not enthrone and remove kings; should not do away with secular law and obedience; should not prescribe laws for secular power and secular affairs (*non praescribat leges magistratibus de forma rei publicae*), as Christ said: ‘My Kingdom is not of this world.’” [AC XXVIII 12-14, quoting John 18:36]

While the secular authority has been given the power of the sword, the spiritual authority has no other power than that of the Gospel. While the secular authority insures justice and peace and so is concerned about temporal life and temporal goods; [the Augustana] says of the church: “The authority of the church or bishops gives eternal goods and is exercised alone through the preaching office” [AC XXVIII 10]. The preaching office here also includes the special preaching of the gospel in Absolution and the administration of the Sacraments, and by “eternal goods” is meant “the eternal righteousness of the heart,” “the Holy Spirit” and “eternal life.”

The separation of the secular and the spiritual, of the state and the church, which is expressed here, serves “for the consolation of consciences” [AC XXVIII 4].

Christians can with good conscience

“bear civil office, sit as judges, judge matters by the Imperial and other existing laws, award just punishments, engage in just wars, serve as soldiers, make legal contracts, hold property, make oaths when required by the magistrates, marry a wife” [AC XVI 2].²²

Condemned then are “the Anabaptists who forbid these civil offices (*civilia officia*) to Christians” and “those who do not place evangelical perfection in the fear of God and in faith, but in forsaking civil offices” [AC XVI 3-4].²³ They are condemned because they have a false understanding of the Gospel. For the Gospel

“does not destroy the State or the family (*politicam aut oeconomiam*), but very much requires that they be preserved (*conservare*) as ordinances of God, and that charity be practiced in such ordinances.” [AC XVI 4-5].²⁴

Christ’s command to love remains in full effect. Every act of private revenge and violence is thus forbidden.

“Public redress (*vindicta publica*), which is made through the office of the magistrate, is not advised against, but is commanded, and is a work of God, according to Paul [Rom. 13:1 ff]. Now the different kinds of public redress are legal decisions, capital punishment, wars, military service.” [AP XVI 7 (59)].²⁵

It is precisely for the sake of love that the Christian must also carry out these duties within the bounds of his office, “and in such offices demonstrate Christian love and justice, good works, each according to his calling” [AC XVI 5, German text]. In so far as he performs his duty within the orders of creation he serves the kingdom of Christ. For the secular and the spiritual are indeed to be dearly distinguished and must not be mixed one with the other, but as good gifts of

God, as true orders given by God, they belong together, just as creation and redemption belong together as works of God. The orders of nature and law, through which God maintains his fallen world, are the presupposition for redemption and the order of redemption for the church and the kingdom of God.

Part 2

Four centuries separate us from the memorable day on which the great Reformation confession was read before the Imperial Diet at Augsburg [June 25, 1530]. Four centuries of secular and ecclesiastical history! State and societal circumstances are completely different in our day. None of the government authorities which took part in that Imperial Diet exist yet today. The legal system [*Recht*] of that time belongs as much to the past as the social structure and domestic arrangements of Germany then. Under these circumstances, what significance can the social doctrine of the Augustana still have today? Can the modern man, who is accustomed to think of social questions in entirely different categories still understand at all what the Augustana has to say regarding these questions without some sort of intense study? Here consider the four hundred years of rich and magnificent ecclesiastical history which have dissolved into the past since the Reformation. Today Christendom looks back on experiences which were not yet in view at the time of Luther. In view of this experience can the old Lutheran social doctrine still be maintained? Furthermore, this ecclesiastical history has lead to a remarkable result. Precisely that social doctrine which the Augustana condemned because it represented a falsification of the Gospel—the doctrine of Roman Catholicism and Fanaticism—has today won an enormous power over souls. Indeed, in the judgment of many, it has snatched the victory from the Lutheran doctrine. Still, we assert that the social doctrine of the Augustana possesses great significance for the present, and indeed, not only for the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Germany and for Lutheranism in general. It is our view that it still has something to say to all of Christendom.

The basic concept of the Lutheran social doctrine is the clear *separation of the world and the kingdom of God* in the sense of Christ's words: "My kingdom is not of this world" [John 18:36]. Thus Lutheranism is opposed to any attempt to draw the kingdom of God into this world,²⁶ be it the attempt of the Roman Church *to ecclesiasticize the world*, or the attempt of fanaticism and Protestantism influenced by fanaticism, *to Christianize the world*. The Roman Church too, knows of the difference between the world and the kingdom of God, and in its doctrine of natural law it speaks of state and government authority very often in a manner similar to old Lutheranism, which to a great extent took over Roman ecclesiastical traditions. But because the Roman Church asserted that the lordship of Christ—and that means for it the lordship of the Papal Church—over all areas of life, because it subordinated the state to the church, the apparent ecclesiasticizing of the world became, in reality, a secularization of the church. That is the great doctrine of medieval Europe. If at some time the Roman Church faces a situation when it once again makes the gigantic attempt, and perhaps in greater measure, at a world lead by the church, the result would likely be more successful than was the case at the close of the Middle Ages. It should never be forgotten that the terrible secularization of modern culture, this shocking spectacle of a humanity determined to strip off the last bonds of an eternal norm, is *not* a consequence of the Reformation—otherwise this phenomenon would be limited to the Protestant world. It is rather a reaction against the Middle Ages. In asserting this we do not desire to absolve Protestantism of the deep guilt it bears in this regard. For the attempts of fanaticism—and the influence of fanaticism stretches through all Protestant churches—to Christianize the world, lead to precisely the same result with a *secularization of Christendom*.

Here one need only consider the consequences of the heresy of the Christian state in Germany, or the heresy of the “Social Gospel” in the Anglican world, where the Sermon on the Mount, consequently the Gospel, becomes the basic law of social life of humanity, and thereby “the world is changed into the kingdom of God”. But in truth, the kingdom of God has become the world.

Why do both attempts (which despite their distinctiveness still mean basically the same thing) end in this way? Because both overlook the abysmal reality of sin in the world. Because both great systems of socio-ethical thought still believe in the *goodness* of man, even if they only believe there is a remnant of good in the un-redeemed man. In both systems what the hymn states is impossible: “Even in the best of lives *our* deeds are useless!” [*Es ist doch unser Tun umsonst auch in dem besten Leben!*]²⁷ The divine order of the world, the natural order just as much as the legal order [*Rechtsordnung*] is the order which God gave to His fallen creation. Because of sin, law, state, government authority, and the sword are present. And only when sin is done away with, when [our] redemption has been completed in the new creation will the order of this world cease. Only when God has completed the last judgment will there be no more law [*Recht*]. The Christian, however, stands in this world bound to its orders as true orders of God, and yet in faith in Christ he is already a member of the kingdom of God. What to the modern man appears as a contradictory morality, as an unallowable compromise between official and private morality—when for instance the Christian in his vocation [*Amt*] must use the sword, yet must not do so as a private man—this is only an expression of the eschatological tension in which all Christian lives exist according to the New Testament. We are in the world and yet not of the world; sinners and at the same time righteous; we are redeemed, but “what we shall be has not yet been revealed” [1 John 3:2]. He who would resolve this tension—perhaps by the famous “either-or” of so-called “radical Christianity”—ought ask himself whether or not in his attempt is hidden a secret faith in man. And he ought know that he has put an end [*auföst*] to the message of the New Testament, since he places a rational morality in the place of the Gospel of the forgiveness of sins. The Reformers were concerned with the pure doctrine of the Gospel when they formulated the social doctrine of the [Augsburg] Confession, and as certainly as the Gospel applies to the world today, so certain is it that the Lutheran social doctrine also has something to say to the present.

To be sure, it will only have something to say to our time if it doesn't merely exist in old books which no one but theologians read. It must be preached to present day humanity in modern language and in living discourse with the vital questions of our day. But for this to happen it is necessary that it be thought through anew and *reformulated in the spirit of our Confession*. It is one of the most serious omissions of the past that our Evangelical [Lutheran] Church has failed to do this until very recently. A host of problems are arising. The problem of [private] *property*, for instance, which has completely changed in the world of modern capitalism. What does the modern man who assembles various securities of various form, perhaps from diverse countries, have in common with the farmer or a craftsman at the time of Luther? To conclude we shall briefly enter into two other problems, because here lie particularly acute omissions in the doctrine of the Augustana.

The first is *the question of the state*. What is meant by “legal government authority” [*rechtmässigen Obrigkeit*]? We are separated from the time of the Reformation by a long

history, in the course of which all the governing authorities of that time have tumbled by revolution and been replaced by new powers.²⁸ Can such powers be *legitima ordinatio*? [“legal orders”] If so, how? There can be no doubt that every revolt against the legal governing authority is a grievous sin according to Lutheran doctrine. It can happen that governing authorities are overthrown because of grievous guilt, that the revolution comes as the judgment of God upon them. But the insurgent never has legal right [*niemals... im Recht*]. He can be the instrument of divine wrath, but his rebellion remains guilt. As God does His “alien work” in the midst of war, so may He also allow the outbreak of human sin in revolution in order to fulfill His angry judgment. Anarchy follows revolution. From anarchy a new power arises, and the question is whether such new power can be a legally constituted governing authority [*rechtmässige Obrigkeit*]. We must answer this question in the affirmative. For as far back in history as we are able to see, every governing authority once arose from anarchy. *Legitima ordinatio* is not only that governing authority which can trace its legitimacy back through an ancient past by letters of investiture and deeds, rather every political power may become the “governing authority”. How can this happen? Doubtless, not by the acknowledgement of men through a national assembly or a vote of the people. The assertion “The power of the state arises from the people” is false according to Lutheran doctrine, if it would be more than a formal description of the proceedings in a modern state, by which a government is formed. The power of the state proceeds from God. One last reminder of this lives on in the religious formulas and forms with which modern peoples still surround the state and civil life. Any political power which has arisen out of anarchy may become a God-given governing authority, if it fulfills the tasks of the office of governing authority. This task is the assurance of peace and the maintenance of law through external power, the symbol of which is the sword. The governing authority is a “Servant of God, the avenger for those who do evil.” [Rom 13:4] Legal governing authority is distinguished from religious power in that it not only (as does the latter) possesses power [*Macht*] but uses its power in the service of law. Both belong to the essence of the state; Power and law [*Macht und das Recht*]. A governing authority which bears the sword in vain, which no longer has the fortitude to decisively punish the law-breaker, is in the process of burying itself [*gräbt sich selbst das Grab*]. A state which removes the concepts “right” and “wrong” from jurisprudence, and replaces them with “useful” and “injurious”, “healthy” and “ill”, “socially valuable” and “socially inferior”, [a state] which in the place of the principal of remuneration places the principal of inoculation [*Unschädlichmachung*] a state which in its civil law dissolves marriage and family, ceases to be a constitutional state and thus the governing authority. A governing authority which knowingly or unknowingly makes the interests of social position or class the norm for the formation and definition of law, or which allows the norms of the law to be dictated by the so-called “legal consciousness” of the time, sinks to the level of raw power. This danger exists now—and this is not addressed by the Augustana—for all governing authorities, and shall for all time. It exists especially in the modern democratic forms of government and in the dictatorship. For the result of the secularization process of the last century has been that the consciousness of eternal legal norms which are not determined by man, has nearly perished. But where this consciousness ceases to exist, there God-given power is changed into demonic power, resulting in its ruin among peoples and states. But wherever on earth a governing authority—irrespective of which form—is conscious of a [civil] righteousness independent of its will, exercises the power of its office, upholds the law and guards the peace, there it is “God’s good gift”, there it is “by the grace of God.”

The task of the church over against the governing authorities is an especially difficult responsibility. It must guard itself against any illusion of a “Christian state” and must limit itself.

We cannot enter here into other questions very closely tied to the problem of the state, such as the question of the “*Volk*” and “*Volkstum*”,²⁹ which scarcely existed at the time of the Augustana, and the question of international law. Regarding the latter we simply note that for the Lutheran Church the important problem of international agreement and so-called “world peace” exist only as a question of a new international law, and can never be discussed under the title “Peace on Earth”. For international law has nothing to do with the gospel.

The second problem which finds no sufficient solution in the Augustana is the question how *the church* can maintain its independence, without the influence of secular power. The lack of an answer to this question is the reason that the secular authority has been able, with the tolerance and indeed the praise of theologians, to do what the Augustana so energetically forbids, namely, the “the forcible entrance into a foreign office” that is, that of the spiritual power. There is, in other words, no doctrine of church government or organization. To be sure, according to Lutheran doctrine, in contrast to Roman and Calvinist doctrine, [ecclesiastical] organization does not belong to the essence of the church. But because of this truth the fact that the question of ecclesiastical *order* was entirely neglected later has had bitter consequences. For the Augustana, to be sure, the old church organization still subsists in the episcopal office—at least in theory—understood of course in the evangelical sense as the spiritual office in general, or the office of the word and the sacraments. Thus it could treat this question lightly. But in the time which followed the lack of a fully formed doctrine of the order of the church had great consequence for the Evangelical [Lutheran] Church of Germany and for world Lutheranism. The Augustana was the first Christian confession which gave a dogmatic definition of the church. But how the church of Christ, constituted by the pure preaching of the gospel and the pure sacramental presence of Christ, the church as the communion of saints, that is, [the communion] of justified sinners, who in this world live as sinful men and are subject to the created order of the fallen world and who as the justified are members simultaneously of the kingdom of God and stand under its orders, how this church as an empirical reality of this world should step forth as a visible reality [*in Erscheinung*], this question our confession does not answer. The fact that German Protestantism in the last two centuries has so often been found wanting in the area of social questions no doubt is due to this omission. For only when the church itself is a living and ordered fellowship [*Gemeinschaft*] may it give a living and real answer to the great questions of human communal life [*Gemeinschaftsleben*].

NOTES

1. This essay is a translation of “Die Soziallehren der Augsburgerischen Konfession und ihre Bedeutung für die Gegenwart,” which appeared in two parts in *Kirchlich-soziale Blätter* 33.5/6 (May/June 1930): 65-69, and 33.9/10 (September/October 1930): 105-9. RF
2. Edward Norman, *Christianity and the World Order* (The B.B.C. Rcith Lectures, 1978; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 2. RF
3. This is a reference to the so-called “Luther Renaissance,” which was prominent in the 1920s. RF

4. The 1925 Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work determined to set forth “the Christian way of life as the world’s greatest need.” Under the slogan “doctrine divides, service unites,” it endeavored to avoid issues of doctrine and address social and political issues instead. RF
5. We cannot here enter into the present theological discussion regarding the problem before us. The reader is directed to the writings of Althaus, Brunstäd, Gogarten, Hirsch, Holl, Joachimsen, von Tilling, Troeltsch, and Wünsch. Of the older literature, particularly noteworthy are the collected essays of A. E. C. Vilmar in “Kirche und Welt,” vol. 1, 1873. A particularly noteworthy contribution to our theme is the writing by Paul Althaus, just now appearing, “Der Geist der Lutherische Ethik im Augsburgischen Bekenntnis.” HS
6. Ap XVI 3(55), 6 (58); *BS*, 308.3 (55) and 308.6 (58); *Triglotta*, 330.55 and 330.58; see Tappert, *BC*, 223.3 (“laws about the civil estate”) and 223.6. Note on the numbering of the paragraphs: In the original, Article XVI was a continuation of Article XV. Paragraph 1 of Article XVI is numbered 53 in the original. The paragraph numbers in the *BS* and *Triglotta* reflect this. RF
7. Here and elsewhere there are slight discrepancies between the text Sasse quotes (perhaps from memory) and the *BS* and/or *Triglotta*. RF
8. AC XXVIII 13. RF
9. See, for example, LC, Eighth Commandment, 258. RF
10. Ap VI 69; *Triglotta*, 302.69. RF
11. AC XVI 1. RF
12. Ap XVI 1 (53). RF
13. Ap XVI 1 (53), 7 (59), and 12 (64). RF
14. AC XVI 1. RF
15. AC XVI 1. RF
16. AC XXVIII 13. RF
17. AC XVI 1, 2, 6, and 7, and XXVIII 13. RF
18. Cf. LC, Lord Prayer, Fourth Petition, 73. RF
19. Cf. AC XXVIII 11. RF
20. Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt (ca. 1480—1541) was a colleague of Luther at the University of Wittenberg. He at first embraced the Reformation but soon “forced the issue.” For instance he rejected Baptism and the Lord’s Supper as sacraments (*Lutheran Cyclopedia*, 439). RF
21. The seventeen articles were written by Luther between July 25 and September 14, 1529, and were presented at Schwabach on October 16. They were to be considered in the discussion about a political federation with the Swiss. This document is considered to be one of sources for the Augsburg Confession. An English translation can be found in M. Reu, *The Augsburg Confession: A Collection of Sources with an Historical Introduction* (Chicago: Wartburg, 1930), part 2, pp. 40-44. RF

22. The English translation is based on that found in the *Triglotta* (p. 51). MH
23. The English translation is that of the *Triglotta* (p. 51). MH
24. The English translation is that of the *Triglotta* (p. 51). MH
25. The English translation is that of the *Triglotta* (p. 331). MH
26. Sasse was aware of such attempts especially by the Ecumenical Movement as expressed, for example, in the first "Letter Missive" of the Council of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America in 1908, the World Mission Council of Edinburgh in 1910, and at the Stockholm 1925 Conference on Life and Work. RF
27. From *Aus tiefer Not*, Luther's metrical paraphrase of Psalm 130, stanza 2 (1523). RF
28. For instance, the 1918 revolution in Germany, which effectively brought to an end the "Constantinian Era" of church and state relations. RF
29. Given the wide range of meaning possible for *Volk*, it has been left in its original; usually it is translated as "nation" or "people." *Volkstum* is very rare and has the meaning of "nationality" or "national characteristics." RF