

JOHN F. BRUG

Church Fellowship



Working Together
for the Truth

People's
BIBLE
Teachings

The People's Bible Teachings

大众圣经教导

CHURCH FELLOWSHIP

教会团契

Working Together for the Truth

一同为真理作工

作者：John F. Brug 译者：邱良杰

NORTHWESTERN PUBLISHING HOUSE

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Fifth printing, 2005

Fourth printing, 1999

Third printing, 1997

Second printing, 1997

All Scripture quotations, unless otherwise indicated, are taken from the HOLY BIBLE, NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION®. NIV®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of Zondervan Publishing House. All rights reserved.

The “NIV” and “New International Version” trademarks are registered in the United States Patent and Trademark Office by International Bible Society. Use of either trademark requires the permission of International Bible Society.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise—except for brief quotations in reviews, without prior permission from the publisher.

Library of Congress Card 96-67792
Northwestern Publishing House
1250 N. 113th St., Milwaukee, WI 53226-3284
© 1996 by Northwestern Publishing House.
Published 1996

Printed in the United States of America
ISBN-13: 978-0-8100-0595-6
ISBN-10: 0-8100-0595-6

Table of Contents

目录

Editor's Preface	4
编者前言.....	4
Introduction	5
简介	5
1.The Scriptural Basis of the Doctrine of Fellowship	9
1.团契教义的圣经基础	9
Chapter 1 The Biblical Doctrine of the Church.....	9
第1章 教会的圣经教义.....	9
Chapter 2 The Definition of Church Fellowship.....	14
第2章 教会团契的定义.....	14
Chapter 3 A Basic Survey of the Scriptural Doctrine.....	17
第3章 圣经教义的基本查考.....	17
Chapter 4 Agreement in All Doctrines Is Necessary.....	25
第4章 所有教义的一致性是必要的.....	25
Chapter 5 All Ways of Expressing Fellowship are a Unit	36
第5章 所有表达团契的方式是一个整体.....	36
Chapter 6 Preserving and Extending Fellowship.....	41
第6章 保存与拓展团契.....	41
2. The History of the Doctrine of Church Fellowship	48
2. 教会团契教义的历史.....	48
Chapter 7 Fellowship in the Early Church and the	
Church of the Reformation	48
第7章 早期教会和宗教改革时期教会的团契.....	48

Chapter 8 The Split between the Wisconsin and Missouri Synods.....	53
第 8 章 威斯康辛总会与密苏里总会之间的分裂.....	53
Chapter 9 The Split between WELS and the CLC	70
第 9 章 WELS 和 CLC 之间的分裂.....	70
Chapter 10 Working toward the CELC	79
第 10 章 致力于 CELC 的建立.....	79
3. The Applications of the Principles of Church Fellowship	83
3. 教会团契原则的应用	83
Chapter 11 Basic Applications of the Principles	83
第 11 章 原则的基本运用.....	83
Chapter 12 Special Problems and Hard Cases.....	93
第 12 章 特殊问题及疑难案例.....	93
Chapter 13 Special Problems and Hard Cases.....	110
第 13 章 特殊问题及疑难案例.....	110
Chapter 14 Conclusion	128
第 14 章 总结	128
Appendix: WELS Statement on Church Fellowship	131
附录: WELS 关于教会团契的声明.....	131
Endnotes	140
尾注.....	140
For Further Reading	142
深入阅读.....	142
Scripture Index	143
经文索引.....	143
Subject Index	149
主题索引.....	149

Editor's Preface

编者前言

The People's Bible Teachings is a series of books on all of the main doctrinal teachings of the Bible.

大众圣经教导是关于圣经所有主要教义教导的一系列丛书。

Following the pattern set by The People's Bible series, these books are written especially for laypeople. Theological terms, when used, are explained in everyday language so that people can understand them. The authors show how Christian doctrine is drawn directly from clear passages of Scripture and then how those doctrines apply to people's faith and life. Most importantly, these books show how every teaching of Scripture points to Christ, our only Savior.

与大众圣经读本的模式相同，本套丛书特地为平信徒而写，书中所涉及的神学术语，都被解释成人们易于理解的日常用语。作者展示了圣经经文是如何直接得到基督教教义的，并且这些教义怎样应用于人们的信仰和生活中。最重要的是，本套丛书展示了圣经的每一个教导，都指向耶稣基督——我们唯一的救主。

The authors of The People's Bible Teachings are parish pastors and professors who have had years of experience teaching the Bible. They are men of scholarship and practical insight.

大众圣经教导的每一位作者，都是教会牧师和神学教授，他们有多年的教导圣经的经验，并在知识和实践上都拥有深刻的见解。

We take this opportunity to express our gratitude to Professor Leroy Dobberstein of Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary, Mequon, Wisconsin, and Professor Thomas Nass of Martin Luther College, New Ulm, Minnesota, for serving as consultants for this series. Their insights and assistance have been invaluable.

我们在此表达我们对威斯康辛路德宗神学院的勒罗伊·多贝尔施泰因教授和马丁路德大学的托马斯·纳斯教授的感激之情，他们为本套丛书提供了很多宝贵的建议，他们的见解和帮助都是无价的。

We pray that the Lord will use these volumes to help his people grow in their faith, knowledge, and understanding of his saving teachings, which he has revealed to us in the Bible. To God alone be the glory.

我们祈求上帝使用本套丛书，帮助他的子民在真理、知识上成长，更好的理解他拯救的教导，这教导本是在他在圣经中展示给我们的。一切荣耀归于上帝。

Curtis A. Jahn
柯蒂斯·A·姜
Series Editor
丛书主编

Introduction

简介

What doctrine would you identify as the special emphasis of the Wisconsin Synod? If a group of Lutherans were asked that question, we hope they would answer, “The doctrine of justification by grace alone through faith alone, especially the truth that God has declared the sins of the whole world forgiven for Christ’s sake—that is the special emphasis of the Wisconsin Synod!” Like Paul we say, “We are determined to preach nothing ‘except Jesus Christ and him crucified’” (1 Corinthians 2:2). The doctrine of justification by grace alone through faith alone holds first place in our hearts and in our preaching.

你认为哪项教义是威斯康总会所特别强调的教义呢？如果一群路德宗信徒被问到这个问题，我们希望他们会回答说：“唯独因信称义的教义，特别是神已经宣告世人的罪因基督的缘故被赦免的真理，这是威斯康总会所特别所强调的！”像保罗一样，我们说：“因为我曾定了主意，在你们中间不知道别的，只知道耶稣基督并他钉十字架。”（哥林多前书 2:2）。唯独因信称义的教义在我们的心中和讲道中占据首位。

Nevertheless, justification is probably not the doctrine that most people would mention as the WELS’ trademark. Some might mention our emphasis on the inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture as a conspicuous characteristic that distinguishes the Wisconsin Synod from most Lutheran church bodies in the world today. Because of the great importance of the doctrine of inspiration for preserving all other doctrines of Scripture, we do not object to being closely identified with this doctrine. We would, in fact, be satisfied to have the inerrancy of Scripture listed second among the WELS’ doctrinal priorities.

然而，当大部分人提及 WELS（威斯康幸福福音路德总会，即，威斯康辛总会）的标志性教义时，未必就会说出称义这一教义。一些人可能会提到我们强调圣经无误、是神所默示的这一教义，把这一教义作为威斯康辛总会区别于当今世界其它路德宗教会共同体的一项显著特征。因为默示这一教义对于保全圣经其它所有教义而言举足轻重，所以我们并不反对与这一教义紧密联系在一起。事实上，若将圣经无误作为 WELS 的第二重要教义，我们并不异议。

When people list an identifying mark of the Wisconsin Synod, however, the first doctrine that most often comes to their minds is not justification or inspiration, but the doctrine of church fellowship or some aspect of it, such as our practice of closed Communion or our opposition to lodges and scouting. For better or worse, this is the image that many people have of the Wisconsin Synod.

当人们列举威斯康辛总会的标志性教义时，最常浮现在脑海中的第一教义往往不是称义或者默示，而是教会团契或其某个方面，比如我们实行紧密圣餐或者我们反对共济会等地方分会和童子军活动。无论怎样，这就是很多人对于威斯康辛总会的印象。

Although we certainly do not place the doctrine of fellowship ahead of justification or inspiration as some people imagine, we should not be embarrassed by people’s tendency to associate the name WELS with the doctrine of church fellowship. Our doctrine of church fellowship is drawn from Holy Scripture.

Furthermore, it is impossible to retain the other doctrines of Scripture unless we hold on to the scriptural doctrine of fellowship. Failure to practice the biblical principles of church fellowship has been one of the primary causes of the doctrinal deterioration in American and world Lutheranism. We, therefore, need to proclaim this doctrine very boldly.

尽管我们肯定不会像有些人想象的那样，把教会团契的教义放到称义或默示性的教义前面，但是，我们也不会因为人们把 WELS 的名字跟教会团契的教义联系在一起而觉得有何不妥。我们的团契教义源于圣经。此外，除非我们坚持圣经团契教义，我们就无法保留圣经其它教义。无法实践教会团契的圣经原则，已经成为美国及全世界的路德宗教义偏差的一个主要原因。因此，我们需要大胆宣讲这一教义。

In recent history the struggle over this doctrine had a great impact in shaping the character of the Wisconsin Synod. The struggle to preserve this doctrine nearly monopolized the attention of WELS synod conventions for more than a decade, spanning the 1950s. The conflict over this doctrine led to widespread disagreement within our synod, to the resignation of the president of our seminary, and to the loss of pastors and congregations, both to the Missouri Synod, which was more liberal in its practice of church fellowship, and to the Church of the Lutheran Confession (CLC), which was perceived as more strict in its practice.

近代史上，围绕这一教义的挣扎对于威斯康辛总会的特征形成有着重大影响。为持守这一教义所作的挣扎几乎占据了 WELS 总会会议十多年的时间，跨越了 20 世纪 50 年代。关于这一教义的冲突导致了教会内部的众多分歧，导致了我们的神学院院长辞职，以及牧师和会众的流失，无论是对于在教会团契实践上更自由的密苏里总会，还是对于在实践上被认为更严格的路德宗认信教会 (CLC)。

Finally, failure of extended efforts to resolve the disagreement concerning church fellowship led to the end of our working partnership with the Missouri Synod, which had endured for nearly a century, and even to the division of many families. The most traumatic events of this long dispute now lie more than 30 years in the past, but today our position on the doctrine and practice of church fellowship still forms one of the most striking contrasts between the Wisconsin Synod and almost all other Lutherans. Disagreement about this doctrine also stands as an imposing obstacle in the way of any effort toward reestablishing fellowship with the Missouri Synod, in spite of a recent narrowing of the differences between the two synods in such areas as the doctrine of Scripture.

我们在解决教会团契问题上的持续努力最终失败了，这也导致了我们与密苏里总会持续了近一个世纪的合作关系的终结，甚至还导致许多家庭的分裂。这场长期争论中最具伤害性的事件发生在 30 多年前，但今天威斯康辛总会在教会团契的教义和实践上的立场仍然是它与其它几乎所有路德会之间最显著的不同点之一。尽管近年来我们与密苏里总会在圣经教义这些领域的差异正在逐渐缩小，但关于团契教义的分歧仍然是我们与密苏里总会为重建团契共同努力道路上的巨大障碍。

A careful study of the doctrine of church fellowship is needed today primarily for three reasons:

如今，我们仍需认真研究教会团契教义，主要基于以下三个原因：

1. Because the division of the Synodical Conference over the doctrine of church fellowship occurred a generation ago, a review of the decisive events of that struggle is necessary for the new generation, which did not experience this conflict.

1. 因为总会联合会关于团契教义的分歧发生在上一代人当中，对于没有经历过此冲突的新一代人来说，有必要回顾那场斗争的决定性事件。

2. The pain caused by our separation from the Missouri Synod continues to be felt more than 30 years after the break, especially by families and friends who are divided by it. Some are wondering if the time is drawing near when this breach can be healed.

2. 我们与密苏里总会的分裂所造成的痛苦，在会众当中持续了 30 多年，特别是当初因此而分道扬镳的家庭和朋友。有些会众想知道伤口愈合的时机是否近在咫尺。

3. Emotional reactions against our practices concerning church fellowship often arise as a barrier to our outreach efforts and often trouble our own members. The doctrine of church fellowship creates more emotional conflicts than almost any other doctrine in Scripture because it must frequently be applied in the day-to-day life of the church. This doctrine leads us to work with some fellow Christians, but forbids us to work with others. It, therefore, leads to separations in church bodies, in congregations, and in families. This often leads to very emotional encounters and produces intense personal reactions.

3. 对于我们团契教义的实践，人们总是心有抵触，这常常阻碍我们的教会拓展工作，也常常困扰着我们自己的会众。教会团契的教义比几乎其它任何圣经教义都更让我们情感挣扎，因为它必须频繁应用于日常教会生活之中。这一教义引导我们与一些基督徒同伴合作，却阻止我们与其他人合作。因此，它会导致教会共同体、教会以及家庭成员之间的分裂。这通常会让我们情绪浮动尤其剧烈，个人反应也异常激动。

For all of these reasons, a thorough knowledge of the doctrine of church fellowship is important for every Christian. In this book we will study this doctrine according to three main divisions: First, we will study the Scripture passages that set forth the biblical principles governing the practice of church fellowship. The doctrine of fellowship that we believe and practice is not a WELS invention, but a doctrine taught by God in Scripture. Second, we will review the historical debate concerning the doctrine of church fellowship that caught WELS in a crossfire between the Missouri Synod from one side and the CLC from the other. Finally, we will consider some applications of this doctrine in the life of the church. Applying this doctrine in a firm but evangelical manner is a way of showing love for our neighbors and giving a clear testimony to the truth.

综合以上的原因，对每个基督徒而言，全面认识教会团契的教义就显得尤为重要。在这本书中，我们将会从这三个主要方面来研究该教义：首先，我们将学习相关的圣经经文，这些经文阐述了教会团契实践的圣经原则。我们所信和实行的团契教义并非 WELS 的发明，而是上帝在圣经中所教导的教义。其次，我们将回顾有关教会团契教义的历史辩论，这场辩论使 WELS 一方面陷入了与密苏里总会的交锋之中，另一方面又要与 CLC 互相交火。最后，我们将

思考该教义在教会生活中的一些应用。将这一教义以坚定、福音的方式应用，可用以显明我们对邻舍的爱以及为真理作清晰的见证。

We now begin our study where every doctrinal discussion must begin—with a study of the pertinent passages of Scripture.

现在我们开始学习相关的圣经经文——每项教义讨论都必须从这里开始。

PART I

第一部分

THE SCRIPTURAL BASIS OF THE DOCTRINE OF FELLOWSHIP

团契教义的圣经基础

1

第 1 章

The Biblical Doctrine of the Church

教会的圣经教义

Before we can study church fellowship, we must review the basic points of the doctrine of the church.

在我们学习教会团契的教义之前，我们得先来回顾教会教义的基本要点。

The church is believers

教会是信徒的集合

Luther once commented that as a result of the Reformation, every child can now correctly explain the doctrine of the church: The church is the assembly of all people who believe in Christ as their Savior from sin. This is the biblical meaning of the word church. Although we sometimes use the word church in a loose sense as a name for the building in which we worship or as a name for a congregation or a denomination of Christians, in biblical usage the word church always refers to an assembly of people who have faith in Christ, or to the sum total of such believers.

马丁·路德曾经说过，由于宗教改革，每个上帝的儿女现在都可以正确地阐述关于教会的教义了：教会是所有相信耶稣基督将他们从罪恶中拯救出来的百姓的集合。尽管我们有时候我们在非严格意义上使用“教会”一词，把它作为我们敬拜场所的名称，或者某间实体教会的名称，又或某个基督教宗派的名称，然而，圣经总是用来指称相信耶稣基督的信徒的集合，或说这些信徒的总和。

Faith is always the action of an individual. The Holy Spirit uses the gospel to bring men, women, and children to faith, one by one. Even on days of mass conversion, such as Pentecost, each person comes to faith as an individual. All of them must believe for themselves; no one else can believe for them.

信心总是独立个体的动作。圣灵通过福音一个一个地将男女老幼带入信心之中。即使是在许多人一起回转归信的时候，比如五旬节，每个人仍是作为独立的个体进入信心之中的。他们所有人都必须亲自相信基督；没有人可以代替他们相信。

But individual Christians do not remain alone. Everyone who is joined to Christ by faith is also joined to every other believer. “If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus, his Son, purifies us from all sin” (1 John 1:7). Through faith in Christ, believers are adopted as members of the family of God (Galatians 3:26).

但是个体基督徒并不独立存在。因信而与基督联合的每位信徒也是与其他每位信徒联合的。“我们若在光明中行，如同神在光明中，就彼此相交，他儿子耶稣的血也洗净我们一切的罪”（约翰一书 1:7）。藉着对基督的信，信徒们就是天父家中的成员了（加拉太书 3:26）。

The church is one
教会只有一个

Just as many bricks are cemented together to form one building, so many believers are joined together to build one church of God. “As you come to [Christ], the living Stone . . . you also, like living stones, are being built into a spiritual house to be a holy priesthood, offering spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. You are a chosen people, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people belonging to God, that you may declare the praises of him who called you out of darkness into his wonderful light” (1 Peter 2:4,5,9).

就像许多砖头堆砌起来，形成一栋房子，许多信徒也彼此联络，形成神的教会。“主乃活石……你们来到主面前，也就像活石，被建造成为灵宫，作圣洁的祭司，藉着耶稣基督奉献神所悦纳的灵祭。惟有你们是被拣选的族类，是有君尊的祭司，是圣洁的国度，是属神的子民，要叫你们宣扬那召你们出黑暗、入奇妙光明者的美德”（彼得前书 2:4, 5, 9）。

Christians are joined together into one body regardless of their sex, age, wealth, or nationality. Whether they are male or female; young or old; rich or poor; white or black; Lutheran, Baptist, or Catholic, all who truly believe in Jesus as their Savior from sin are members of one family, the holy Christian church. How wonderful to know that there is “one Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all” (Ephesians 4:5,6).

无论性别，年龄，财富或者国籍，基督徒联合成为一个身体。无论他们是男是女，是年轻还是年老，有钱或是贫穷，白皮肤或者黑皮肤，是路德宗，浸信会，或是天主教，所有真正相信耶稣拯救他们脱离罪恶的人都是这个大家庭，也就是圣而公之教会的一员。“一主，一信，一洗，一神，就是众人的父，超乎众人之上，贯乎众人之中，也住在众人之内”，得知此事是多么美好啊！（以弗所书 4:5,6）

Because there is only one way to heaven, namely, faith in Christ, there is only one holy Christian church. All who believe in Jesus Christ as Savior are members of this one church. No unbelievers or hypocrites, however, are members of this church. On judgment day we may find that some people who were lifelong members of a Christian congregation were never members of the holy Christian church because they never had faith. In unusual circumstances believers may have no opportunity to belong to an organized Christian congregation. They are, nevertheless, members of the holy Christian church.

因为只有一条通往天堂的路，那就是相信耶稣基督，因此只有一个圣而公之教会，所有相信耶稣拯救他们脱离罪恶的人都是这个教会的一员。而非信徒或者假冒为善者则都不是这个教会的一员。到审判日，我们可能会发现有些人虽然是某基督教会终生会友，但他们却从来都不属于圣而公之教会，因为他们从未信过。在一些非常情况下，有些信徒可能一直没有机会属于一间有组织的基督教会，但他们却实在是圣而公之教会的一员。

The church is invisible

教会是无形的

We call this one true church the invisible church because only God knows with certainty who its members are. This is because membership in the church is determined solely by the presence or absence of faith in a person's heart, and only God can read the heart (1 Samuel 16:7). We cannot detect the hypocrites and impostors in the church, but God recognizes every member of his church: "God's solid foundation stands firm, sealed with this inscription: 'The Lord knows those who are his'" (2 Timothy 2:19). On judgment day God will separate the true Christians from the pretenders (Matthew 7:21-23; 25:31-46).

我们称这个真正的教会是无形的教会，因为只有上帝确切知道谁是它的成员。这是因为判断教会成员的标准单单是看一个人心里有没有对基督的信心，而只有上帝才能看见人的内心（撒母耳记上 16:7）。我们无法辨别教会里的假冒为善者与骗子，但是神认识教会的每个成员：“神坚固的根基立住了。上面有这印记说：‘主认识谁是他的人’”（提摩太后书 2:19）。末日审判的时候，神将会把他的真信徒从伪装者当中分别出来（马太福音 7:21-23；25:31-46）。

The marks of the church

教会的标志

Although the church is invisible in the sense described above, we can determine where the church is present. Wherever there are believers, the church is present, and there will be believers present wherever the tools that God uses to create saving faith in Christ are being used (Isaiah 55:10,11). Therefore, we can assume that believers are present wherever the truth of the gospel is being preached and people are receiving Baptism and the Lord's Supper as Christ instituted them.

尽管如上所述，教会在某种意义上是无形的，但我们还是能够确定教会的所在。哪里有信徒，哪里就有教会，哪里有一一上帝用以创造那对基督拯救的信心的工具一一得以使用，哪里就有信徒（以赛亚书 55:10, 11）。因此我们可以认为，神的福音在哪里传讲，人在哪里受洗，主的圣餐在哪里设立，哪里就有信徒。

Individual Christians who have been brought to faith by these means of grace will make public confession of the faith that is hidden in their hearts. “It is with your heart that you believe and are justified, and it is with your mouth that you confess and are saved” (Romans 10:10). Wherever we find Christians confessing the faith that has been worked in them by the means of grace, we can assume the presence of true believers, that is, the presence of the church.

每一个基督徒通过施恩具被带入信心之中，他们也会把心里所信的从口里宣告出来。“因为人心里相信，就可以称义；口里承认，就可以得救”（罗马书 10:10）。哪里有公开表达信仰（这信心是通过施恩具运行他们里面而成就的）的基督徒，我们就可以认为，哪里就有真信徒，在那里就有教会的存在。

Christians seek out one another

基督徒会找寻彼此

Because they are God’s children, Christians want to worship God. They want to study God’s Word. They want to proclaim the gospel to others. And they want to do these things with other Christians. Whenever Christians meet other believers who confess the same faith they confess, they want to join together with them in worshiping God and sharing the gospel with others. They want to encourage these fellow Christians and to receive admonition and encouragement from them. They want to partake of the Lord’s Supper together to receive assurance of forgiveness and to express their unity in Christ. They want to pool their talents and their offerings in joint efforts of Christian education and evangelism. They want to pray for each other. They want to enjoy the company of fellow Christians. For all these reasons Christians join together in congregations.

因为基督徒是神的儿女，他们想要敬拜神。他们想要学习神的话语。他们想要给别人传福音。他们想要跟其他基督徒一起做这些事情。每当基督徒遇到其他跟他们有相同信仰的人时，他们就想要联合起来敬拜神，又想要与人分享福音。他们想要跟这些基督徒同伴彼此劝诫，彼此鼓励。他们想要一起参与圣餐以领受赦免的保证，又表达他们在基督里的合一。他们想要贡献自己的恩赐和财物，一同致力于基督教教育以及福音事工。他们想要为彼此祷告，他们想要享受弟兄姐妹的陪伴。出于以上种种，基督徒会聚集在一起。

In doing this they also obey God’s commands: “Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly as you teach and admonish one another with all wisdom, and as you sing psalms, hymns and spiritual songs with gratitude in your hearts to God” (Colossians 3:16) and “Let us consider how we may spur one another on toward love and good deeds. Let us not give up meeting together, as some are in the habit of doing, but let us encourage one another—and all the more as you see the Day approaching” (Hebrews 10:24,25).

在做这些事情时，他们也是在遵行神的诫命：“当用各样的智慧，把基督的道理丰富地存在心里，用诗章、颂词、灵歌，彼此教导，互相劝戒，心被恩感，歌颂神”（歌罗西书 3:16）。“又要彼此相顾，激发爱心，勉励行善。你们不可停止聚会，好像那些停止惯了的人，倒要彼此劝勉。既知道那日子临近，就更当如此”（希伯来书 10:24-25）。

Such local congregations of Christians may join together in larger groupings called synods, denominations, or church bodies. Such larger groups of Christians are often the most efficient form of organization for carrying out such assignments of

the church as training pastors and teachers, supporting missions, and guarding doctrinal purity.

这样的当地基督徒聚会可能会联合起来形成更大的群体，比如总会，宗派，或者教会共同体。这类更大的基督徒团体通常是执行教会任务（比如培训牧师和教师、支持宣教以及保护教义纯正等事工）最有效的组织形式。

We call all such organizations of Christians visible churches because we can identify the members of such groups by their public acceptance of the confession of that church and by their participation in the activities of that church.

我们称所有这样的基督徒团体为有形教会，因为我们能够通过他们公开接受该教会的信条以及他们参与该教会的活动来识别这类团体的成员。

When visible churches teach the Word of God purely, without adding to it or subtracting from it, we call them orthodox churches, that is, churches that teach the straight Word of God. When visible churches do not teach the Word of God purely, but mix false teaching with it, we call them heterodox churches, that is, churches that teach differently than God's Word teaches. We call even such a false-teaching group a church because of the presence of believers in it. If the gospel, which presents Christ's death as the way to salvation, is still being taught in a heterodox church, there will still be believers there, since the gospel has the power to bring people to faith in spite of the error present alongside it. Nevertheless, the false teaching that is tolerated in a heterodox church is always dangerous to people's faith. Christians have a duty to separate themselves from such error in order to protect themselves from it and to warn others against it.

当有形教会纯正地教导神的话语，没有增减，我们称这些教会为正统教会，即教导神纯正话语的教会。当有形教会没有纯正地教导神的话语，而是掺杂了假教导在其中，我们称这些教会为非正统教会，即教导与神的话语所教导的不一致的教会。我们称这样一个持假教导的团体为教会是因为有真信徒参与其中。如果基督的死作为救赎道路的福音仍然在非正统教会里教导，那么在那里就仍会有信徒在其中，因为福音有带给人信心的能力，尽管错误也同时存在于其中。不过，非正统教会所容忍的假教导危及人的信心。基督徒为了保护自己，也为了警示他人，有责任从这种错误中脱离出来。

The biblical doctrine of the church pulls us in two different but complementary directions: we are eager to work together with fellow Christians, but we must avoid working with those who teach and tolerate error.

教会的圣经教义把我们拉向两个不同而互补的方向：我们渴望跟基督徒同伴合作，但是我们必须避免跟那些教导错误又容忍错误的人共事。

We are now ready to turn to the main subject of this book: the doctrine and practice of church fellowship.

我们现在已经准备好转入本书的主题了：教会团契的教义与实践。

第 2 章

The Definition of Church Fellowship

教会团契的定义

Fellowship refers to friendly relationships between people and to activities in which they work together to advance their common goals.

团契是指人之间的友好关系，以及他们协作以推进他们共同目标的活动。

Christian fellowship refers first of all to the spiritual relationship that we have with God through faith in Christ. With John we confess, “Our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son, Jesus Christ” (1 John 1:3). Christian fellowship may also refer to the spiritual ties that we have with all believers as members of the invisible church. Each Sunday we confess, “I believe in . . . the holy Christian Church, the communion [that is, the fellowship] of saints” or, “I believe one holy Christian and Apostolic Church.”

基督徒团契首先指的是藉着对耶稣的信心我们与神之间的属灵关系。我们与约翰一起承认说，“我们将所看见、所听见的传给你们，使你们与我们相交。我们乃是与父并他儿子耶稣基督相交的”（约翰一书 1:3）。基督徒团契可能也指我们与所有作为无形教会成员的信徒之间的属灵纽带。每个主日我们都承认说，“我信……圣而公之教会，我信圣徒相通[即，团契]”或者“我信圣基督与使徒教会”。

We cherish this fellowship with God and all believers as a great blessing. We recognize every baptism performed in the name of the Triune God and according to Christ’s institution as a valid baptism that makes the recipient a child of God. We do not rebaptize people who come to us from another Christian church. We rejoice when people are brought to saving faith also through the evangelism of churches outside our fellowship. We eagerly look forward to the time when we will enjoy the inheritance of heaven with all believers and all divisions in the church will be healed.

我们珍惜与神以及与众信徒的团契关系，将之视为一项极大的祝福。我们视每一次奉三一神的圣名、按基督的设立施行的洗礼都为有效的、使受洗者成为上帝儿女的洗礼。我们不会给从其它基督教会来到我们当中的人进行第二次洗礼。当有人因着我们团契之外的教会所传的福音而拥有得救的信心时，我们也一同喜乐。我们热切盼望与众信徒同享天国基业的那一天，那时，教会所有的分裂都将得到医治。

But when we speak about church fellowship in this book, we are referring to all activities in which Christians join together as members of visible churches. Church fellowship is every expression of faith in which Christians join together because they are united by their acceptance and confession of all of the teachings of Scripture. We are practicing church fellowship whenever we declare that we are united in doctrine with other Christians and whenever we join with them in activities that express such a shared faith in God's Word.

但是，当我们在本书中谈到教会团契时，我们指的是基督徒作为有形教会的成员联合在一起的所有活动。教会团契正是基督徒信心的表达，他们藉这信心联合在一起，而他们联合在一起又是因他们接受并承认圣经的所有教导。当我们宣告我们与其他基督徒在教义上一致时，当我们与他们一起参加——表达这对上帝话语的同一信心的——活动时，我们就是在实践教会团契的教义。

Since we cannot judge the presence or absence of faith in Christ from a person's heart, we must determine whether we can practice church fellowship with an individual by examining his or her confession of faith. If individuals or groups agree with all of the teachings of Scripture, they should practice church fellowship together. If they disagree in doctrine, they should not practice church fellowship with each other.

虽然我们无法判断一个人心里是否真的相信耶稣基督，但通过检验他或她口中的信仰告白，我们必须决定我们是否可以与此人实践教会团契。如果个体或团体承认圣经的所有教导，那么他们就应该在一起实践教会团契。如果他们在教义上有分歧，他们就不应该在共同实践教会团契。

It is important, then, to distinguish three aspects of fellowship: (1) the spiritual fellowship that all believers have with God and with each other through faith in Christ, (2) the doctrinal fellowship that is recognized by a shared confession of the truth, and (3) the fellowship that is expressed by joint activities. These three aspects may be summarized by three words: faith, confession, and action. Faith is worked in us and known with certainty only by God. Judging the existence of this fellowship of faith remains the responsibility of God alone. Although confession and action too are gifts worked in us by God, confession and action can be recognized and carried out by us. We are responsible for judging the confession of all fellow Christians according to Scripture. We are to work together only with those whose confession agrees with all of the truths of Scripture.

因此，从三个层面区分团契尤为重要：(1) 所有信徒藉着对基督的信心，与上帝以及与彼此间的属灵团契；(2) 因对真理的共同信仰告白而彼此认同的教义团契；(3) 通过联合活动所表达的团契。这三个方面可以总结成三个词：信心，认信以及行为。信心在我们当中运行，并且只有神才知道。判断这个团契是否有信心是神的责任。尽管认信和行为是神赐给我们的礼物，认信和行为却可是由我们辨认与执行。我们有责任根据圣经真理去判断所有基督徒同伴的认信。我们只应与那些认信与所有圣经真理一致的人协作。

We will examine the biblical basis for these claims in Chapters 3 and 4 of this book.

在本书的第3章和第4章，我们将为这些声明来查考圣经依据。

Definition of the unit concept of church fellowship

教会团契整体概念的定义

The biblical concept of church fellowship as taught by the Wisconsin Synod has sometimes been called the unit concept of church fellowship. Although this

expression never occurs in Scripture, it is an appropriate name, since the Bible teaches that the practice of church fellowship must be treated as a unit in two different respects.

威斯康辛总会所教导的关于教会团契的圣经概念有时被称为教会团契的整体概念。尽管这个表达没有在经文中出现过，但这名字无不恰当，因为圣经教导的教会团契实践必须视为一个两方面的整体。

First, when the doctrines of Scripture are being discussed to determine if we can practice fellowship with other Christians, these doctrines must be dealt with as an indivisible unit. Since all the teachings of Scripture have been given by God, we have no right to add anything to them nor to subtract anything from them (Deuteronomy 4:2). Therefore, the practice of church fellowship must be based on agreement in all of the doctrines of Scripture. Persistent rejection of even one teaching of Scripture breaks church fellowship between Christians. Some doctrines, such as the doctrines of justification or the means of grace, are more critical for our salvation than others, but we have no right to reject any teaching of Scripture, including its historical statements and its description of creation.

首先，当我们讨论圣经各项教义，决定我们是否可以与其他基督徒团契时，这些教义必须作为一个不可分割的整体对待。既然圣经的所有教导都是神所赐的，那么我们就没有权利将它们增减(申命记 4:2)。因此，教会团契实践必须基于所有圣经教义一致这一基础之上。持续拒绝圣经中的教义，即便只是一项教义，也会破坏基督徒之间的教会团契。有些教义，比如，因信称义或是施恩具的教义，对我们救恩的影响比其它教义更为重大，但我们并没有权利拒绝圣经的任何一项教义，包括圣经的历史性陈述及其对于创造的描述。

This truth is expressed in the WELS theses on fellowship, which say, “A Christian confession of faith is in principle always a confession to the entire Word of God. The denial, alteration, or suppression of any word of God does not stem from faith but from unbelief” (WELS Theses, B, 2, p. 167 of this book).

这一真理在 WELS 关于团契的论点中是这样表述的，“基督徒的信仰告白原则上总是对神全部话语的认信。否认、掺假或压制神的上帝话语都不是出于信心，而是出于不信。”(WELS 论点，B，2，本书第 135 页，定稿页码时需修改)。

Second, the various activities through which we express church fellowship must be dealt with as a unit. Various ways of expressing church fellowship (such as doing mission work together, celebrating the Lord’s Supper together, exchanging pastors, transferring members from one congregation to another, and praying together) are merely different ways of expressing the same fellowship of faith. All forms of church fellowship, therefore, require the same level of doctrinal agreement, namely, agreement in all of the doctrines of Scripture. Partial agreement in doctrine does not permit partial practice of fellowship.

第二，表达教会团契的各项实践活动必须作为一个整体看待。对教会团契的各种不同的表达方式（比如宣教共事，共领圣餐，交换牧师，会友转会，以及联合祷告）只是用不同的方式表达同一信心团契。因此，所有形式的教会团契，都需要相同程度的教义一致，也就是说，在圣经的所有教义上一致。教义上的部分一致并不能使团契的部分实践合理化。

We now turn to a study of the Scripture passages that establish these two principles.

现在我们来研究确立这两个原则的相关经文。

第 3 章

A Basic Survey of the Scriptural Doctrine

圣经教义的基本查考

Any attempt to summarize the scriptural basis for the doctrine of church fellowship is faced with an immediate difficulty. The abundance of the biblical material makes it impossible to begin to cover the topic adequately in a short book. At least half of the letters of the New Testament were written primarily to preserve a fellowship that was in jeopardy. Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and the three letters of John would be prime examples of this category. Several other letters were written to celebrate or strengthen an existing fellowship. Romans and Philippians fall into this category. The pastoral epistles emphasize Paul's directions to young pastors for strengthening and preserving fellowship.

当我们尝试去总结教会团契教义的圣经基础时，我们就会立马会遇到难题。圣经资料的丰富性使得我们不大可能在一本简短的书中充分讨论这个话题。新约中至少有一半的书信是为了保护处于危险之中的团契。加拉太书，哥林多前后书，以及约翰的三封书信都是这一类型的典范。其它几封书信是为了庆祝或坚固现有的团契，罗马书和腓立比书被归为此类。教牧书信则强调了保罗给年轻牧师的、坚固与保存团契的指示。

The biblical doctrine of church fellowship is not based only on a few scattered proof texts, such as Romans 16:17,18, but it is expressed in virtually every letter of the New Testament, as well as in the gospels and the Old Testament. For this reason our study of the scriptural evidence will have to be partial.

教会团契的圣经教义不仅仅基于一些零散的论据文本，例如罗马书 16:17, 18，事实上它在新约的每一卷书信、福音书及旧约中都有涉及。因此我们对圣经证据的研究必定不会是涵盖性的。

John's letters

约翰书信

Two short letters, 2 and 3 John, are the best texts for gaining an overview of the doctrine of church fellowship because they provide a concrete example of the application of the principles of church fellowship to a real-life situation in the New Testament church. John provides us with one of the most beautiful definitions of church fellowship when he states that the goal of his letters is that he and his readers may "work together for the truth" (3 John 8).

约翰两封简短的书信，约翰二书和约翰三书，是我们获得教会团契教义概貌的最佳文本，因为它提供了一个在新约教会真实环境中应用教会团契原则的实例。约翰给了我们对于教会团契的最美好的定义之一，即他说到，他写信的目的是要——他和读他信件的人“一同为真理作工”（约翰三书8）。

This definition of church fellowship is especially important because it shows that church fellowship is first of all a positive concept. Church fellowship is “working together.” The primary goal of the doctrine of church fellowship is to lead us to work together with fellow Christians, not to separate from them. In 2 and 3 John the specific form of working together that is under consideration is joint support of missionaries. John and the readers of his letters worked together by sending out missionaries, by recommending these missionaries and their message to others, by offering these men financial support, and by welcoming them as Christian brothers (2 John 10; 3 John 5,6,8,12).

对于教会团契的定义非常重要，因为它告诉我们，教会团契首先是一个积极的概念。教会团契是“一同作工的”。教会团契教义的主要目标是引领我们与弟兄姐妹一同作工，而不是让我们彼此分裂。约翰二书和三书中所考虑的一同作工的具体形式是对宣教事工的共同支持。约翰和他书信的读者一同作工的方式有：差派宣教士，向他人推荐这些宣教士，向他人传递他们宣讲的信息，给予这些宣教士经济支持，把他们当做基督徒弟兄来接待（约翰二书 10；约翰三书 5, 6, 8, 12）。

Some have ridiculed the WELS position on church fellowship with statements like “The Wisconsin Synod position on church fellowship is simple. They are against it.” Nothing could be further from the truth. We confess with the Scriptures that the practice of church fellowship is first of all something positive: it is “working together.” Faith produces in every Christian the desire to join together with other Christians in worship, prayer, and the Lord’s Supper. Christians will gladly use their varied gifts to support the teaching and evangelizing mission of the church with their offerings and their time. Christians’ energy and concern for church fellowship is focused first of all on finding opportunities to practice fellowship with like-minded Christians. The more we practice a lively, loving fellowship within our congregations and synod, the easier it will be for people to understand the whole doctrine of church fellowship.

一些人嘲笑 WELS 对于教会团契的立场，说：“威斯康辛总会对于教会团契的立场很简单。他们反对教会团契。”这种说法实在离谱。我们承认经文中关于教会团契实践的正面说法：它是“一同为真理作工”。每个信徒心中的信心会生出与其他基督徒联合敬拜、祷告以及领圣餐的渴望。基督徒会乐意使用他们各样的恩赐，献上金钱和时间来支持教会的教导以及传福音的事工。基督徒对教会团契的精力和关爱首先聚焦于找到机会与志同道合的基督徒实践团契。我们越多与我们教会和总会实践活泼有爱的团契，我们就越容易理解教会团契的整个教义。

When we learned to drive a car, we began by learning how to drive well, but a very necessary next step in driver’s training was learning how to avoid crashes. Likewise, when we learn about church fellowship, we begin by learning how to build a strong, loving fellowship with other Christians, but we must also learn how to avoid dangers that will destroy such fellowship.

我们学习驾驶的时候，一般都是从学习如何安全驾驶开始，但是在驾驶培训中非常必要的下一步是学习如何避免出事故。同样的，我们学习教会团契也从

如何与其他基督徒一起建立一个坚固、有爱的团契开始，但我们也必须学习如何避免拆毁这样团契的危险。

How can we identify those Christians with whom we may safely practice fellowship? Since we cannot judge the faith in a person's heart, our outward fellowship with another Christian must be based on whether or not that person's confession agrees with apostolic doctrine. John says, "We are from God, and whoever knows God listens to us; but whoever is not from God does not listen to us. This is how we recognize the Spirit of truth and the spirit of falsehood" (1 John 4:6). Although church fellowship is defined as working together, not every sort of working together is God-pleasing church fellowship. John defines God-pleasing fellowship as "[working] together for the truth" (3 John 8). We, therefore, cannot work together with anyone who departs from the true teachings of Scripture.

我们应该如何分辨那些我们可以与之安全实践团契的基督徒呢？因为我们无法判断一个人里面的信心如何，那我们与其他基督徒的外在团契就必须建立在他或她是否承认使徒教义之上。约翰说，“我们是属神的，认识神的就听从我们；不属神的，就不听从我们。从此我们可以认出真理的灵和谬妄的灵来”（约翰一书 4:6）。尽管教会团契定义为一起作工，但并非每种作工都是神所喜悦的教会团契。神所喜悦的教会团契是“为了真理一同作工”（约翰三书第 8 章）。因此，我们无法与背离圣经真教导的人一同作工。

John has often been called the apostle of love. This is appropriate, but he could better be called the apostle of truth and love. In these two short letters (2 and 3 John), John mentions truth a dozen times. He warns that those who work together with false teachers, either by giving them financial support or by wishing them well, are enemies of the truth. They are guilty of sharing in the false teachers' sin: "Anyone who runs ahead and does not continue in the teaching of Christ does not have God; whoever continues in the teaching has both the Father and the Son. If anyone comes to you and does not bring this teaching, do not take him into your house or welcome him. Anyone who welcomes him shares in his wicked work" (2 John 9-11). Supporters of the truth cannot work together with supporters of falsehood, "for we cannot do anything against the truth, but only for the truth" (2 Corinthians 13:8).

约翰经常被称为“爱的使徒”。这称呼并无不恰当，但最好的称呼应当是“爱和真理的使徒”。在这两封简短的书信中（约翰二书和约翰三书），约翰多次提到了真理。他劝诫我们不要与假教师一同作工，或者给予他们经济支持，或者问他们安，这样做的人都是真理的仇敌。他们因与假教师的罪有份而犯了罪：“凡越过基督的教训不常守着的，就没有神；常守这教训的，就有父又有子。若有人到你们那里，不是传这教训，不要接他到家里，也不要问他的安；因为问他安的，就在他的恶行上有份”（约翰二书 9-11）。真理的支持者与假教导的支持者无法同工，“我们凡事不能敌挡真理，只能扶助真理”（哥林多后书 13:8）。

John, therefore, warns against Diotrephes, the leader of the false teachers, by name so that his readers can avoid him (3 John 9,10). Working together for the truth excludes working together with false teachers and their supporters. Of the false teachers John says, "They went out from us, but they did not really belong to us. For if they had belonged to us, they would have remained with us; but their going showed that none of them belonged to us" (1 John 2:19). John urges his readers and us, "Dear friends, do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits to see whether they are from God, because many false prophets have gone out into the world. They are from the world and therefore speak from the viewpoint of the world, and the world

listens to them. We are from God, and whoever knows God listens to us; but whoever is not from God does not listen to us. This is how we recognize the Spirit of truth and the spirit of falsehood” (1 John 4:1,5,6). Throughout his letters the apostle of love shows himself to be the apostle of truth as well. We need to follow his example by keeping love and truth together.

因此，约翰对丢特腓——假教师的领袖进行了点名警告，这样约翰的读者就能够提防他（约翰三书 9，10）。为真理一同作工不包括与假教师以及他们的支持者同工。约翰是这样描述假教师的，“他们从我们中间出去，却不是属我们的；若是属我们的，就必仍旧与我们同在；他们出去，显明都不是属我们的”（约翰二书 2:19）。约翰力劝他的读者和我们说，“亲爱的弟兄啊，一切的灵，你们不可都信，总要试验那些灵是出于神的不是，因为世上有许多假先知已经出来了。他们是属世界的，所以论世界的事，世人也听从他们。我们是属神的，认识神的就听从我们；不属神的，就不听从我们。从此我们可以认出真理的灵和谬妄的灵来”（约翰一书 4:1,5,6）。从约翰的书信中，我们可以看出他实在也是真理的使徒。我们需要效法他，把爱和真理总是放在一处。

The letters in Revelation 2 and 3

启示录第 2 章和第 3 章中的书信

In his letters to the seven churches, the apostle John (really Christ speaking through him) shows the same concern for separating truth from falsehood that we have seen in John’s earlier letters. These letters to the seven churches beautifully reflect that balance between contending for the truth and acting in love, which Jesus wants to find in his church.

和使徒约翰早期的书信一样，他对七个教会的书信同样显示了他（事实上是基督藉着他说话）对于区分真理与假教导这一问题的关注。对七个教会的书信美妙地展现了为真理战斗与为爱行动之间的平衡，这两个方面是耶稣希望在他的教会中看到的。

Jesus warns the church at Ephesus that it is losing its first love, but he commends it for testing and identifying false apostles and for refusing to tolerate them (Revelation 2:2,3). Jesus rebukes the churches at Pergamum and Thyatira for tolerating false teachers who encourage people to ignore God’s law (Revelation 2:14-16,20,21).

耶稣警告以弗所教会把起初的爱心离弃了，但是也赞许了他们试验并分辨出了假使徒，并没有容忍他们（启示录 2:2,3）。耶稣责备了别迦摩和推雅推喇教会，因为它们容忍了那些鼓励会众忽略上帝律法的假教师（启示录 2:14-16,20,21）。

Today some people claim that the church needs more love and less zeal for doctrinal truth, but neither truth nor love can serve its purpose unless both are kept together. If we really want to help our neighbor, but in ignorance we are telling him falsehoods that will lead him to hell, such “love” is really a deadly device of Satan. If we know the truth, but we proclaim it in an arrogant, self-righteous way, we place a stumbling block in the way of our neighbor. “Love” without knowledge of the truth is misguided zeal that leads souls away from God (Romans 10:1-3). On the other hand, if we know the truth, but we do not have enough love to share it with others, the truth cannot accomplish its purpose. If we know God’s law, but we refuse to correct a neighbor who is caught in error, this is not love but sinful selfishness. If

we know the gospel, but we withhold it from those crushed by the burden of sin, the gospel cannot accomplish its healing purpose.

如今一些人声称教会需要更多的爱，而不必对教义真理保持太多的热忱，但是如果真理和爱不是共同作用的话，那它们哪个都无法达到自身的目的。如果我们真的想要帮助我们的邻舍，但出于无知又告诉了他们将人引入地狱的假教导，那这样的“爱”就真是撒旦致命的诡计了。如果我们懂得真理，但是我们却以高傲、自以为义的方式去传扬真理，那就是把绊脚石放在了邻舍的路上。没有真理知识的“爱”是受误导的热情，让人的灵魂远离神（罗马书 10:1-3）。另一方面，如果我们知道真理，却没有足够的爱去和别人分享，那么真理也不能达成它的目的。如果我们知道神的律法，但是我们拒绝去纠正邻舍的错误，这不是爱，而是带着罪性的自私。如果我们明白福音，但是我们不与那些被罪的重担压垮的人分享，那么福音也无法实现它医治的目的。

We must share the truth in a gentle, tactful way, but to withhold the truth from someone is never love. If one night you saw that your neighbors' house was on fire, but you failed to scream warnings to them because you did not want to disturb their sleep, everyone would call you stupid and uncaring. But when false teaching is placing people's souls in danger of the eternal fires of hell, we are urged to keep quiet about it and to call such silence love. What is more unloving—to fail to warn people against a fire that can destroy their bodies or to fail to warn them against a false doctrine that can destroy their souls? Failure to warn of danger is never love.

我们必须以温柔得体的方式分享真理，而对别人隐瞒真理却也绝不是爱。如果一天晚上你看到你邻舍的房子着火了，但是你却不对他们叫喊警示，因为你不想打扰他们的睡眠，所有人都会说你是个没有爱心的蠢货。但是当假教导正将人的灵魂置于地狱的永火之中，我们却被敦促要保持沉默，又称这种沉默为爱。是不去警告那些大火焚身的人更没有爱心呢？还是不向那些在摧毁人灵魂的假教义发出警告更没有爱心呢？不去警告身处险境的人，永远都称不上爱。

In the Bible love does not refer to a warm feeling about somebody. Love is not liking someone for the way that person happens to be but, rather, doing whatever is necessary to help him or her, even at great cost to ourselves. “God demonstrates his own love for us in this: While we were still sinners, Christ died for us” (Romans 5:8). “This is how we know what love is: Jesus Christ laid down his life for us” (1 John 3:16). We love our neighbors not by having a warm fuzzy feeling about them, but by declaring to them the whole Word of God. “This is how we know that we love the children of God: by loving God and carrying out his commands” (1 John 5:2).

圣经中的爱不是特指对某人的一种温暖的感情。爱并非喜爱某人之所是，而是做任何帮助他或她的事，即使付上我们自身极大的代价。“惟有基督在我们还作罪人的时候为我们死，神的爱就在此向我们显明了”（罗马书 5:8）。

“主为我们舍命，我们从此就知道何为爱，我们也当为弟兄舍命”（约翰一书 3:16）。我们并非通过对我们邻舍的一种温暖舒适的感觉去爱他们，而是通过向他们宣告上帝全部的话语去爱他们。“我们若爱神，又遵守他的诫命，从此就知道我们爱神的儿女”（约翰一书 5:2）。

The church needs to keep truth and love in balance just as much as an airplane needs two wings to fly. If either wing is lost, the plane will crash. If either truth or love is lost, the church cannot carry out its mission. Truth and love are not opposites. They are not rivals. They are partners that dare not be separated.

教会正如需要双翼才能平衡的飞机一样，需要保持真理和爱的平衡。如果其中一个翅膀断了，飞机就会坠毁。如果真理或和爱其中的一样缺失了，教会就

无法实践它的使命了。真理和爱并非对立。它们也不是竞争对手。它们是拆不散的伙伴。

When we are told that we must choose between truth and love, we must remember God's definition of love. Real love is, above all else, that we love all of God's truth: "If you love me, you will obey what I command. And I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Counselor to be with you forever—the Spirit of truth. The world cannot accept him, because it neither sees him nor knows him. But you know him, for he lives with you and will be in you" (John 14:15-17).

当我们被告知我们必须从真理和爱中选择其中之一时，我们必须记住神对爱的定义。真正的爱，首先是我们爱上帝所有的真理：“你们若爱我，就必遵守我的命令。我要求父，父就另外赐给你们一位保惠师，叫他永远与你们同在，就是真理的圣灵，乃世人不能接受的。因为不见他，也不认识他；你们却认识他，因他常与你们同在，也要在你们里面”（约翰福音 14:15-17）。

We must ask frankly whether the reluctance of people today to speak against false teaching is due to greater love for other people or to less love for God's Word. If we love God's truth, we will share all of it with our neighbors, especially when they are in danger of being led astray by false teachers. Telling the truth is the highest expression of love.

我们必须扪心自问，人们如今不愿抵挡假教导是因为对人的爱更大呢？还是因为对上帝话语爱得更少呢？如果我们爱神的真理，我们就会跟我们的邻舍分享所有的真理，特别是当他们正处在被假教导迷惑的危险之中。说出真理是爱的最好表达。

Paul urged young pastor Timothy, "Stay there in Ephesus so that you may command certain men not to teach false doctrines any longer. The goal of this command is love, which comes from a pure heart and a good conscience and a sincere faith" (1 Timothy 1:3,5). The greatest love we can show for people is to guard them against the soul-destroying poison of false doctrine by telling them the truth.

保罗劝勉年轻牧师提摩太说，“我.....曾劝你仍住在以弗所，好嘱咐那几个人不可传异教.....命令的总归就是爱，这爱是从清洁的心和无亏的良心、无伪的信心生出来的”（提摩太前书 1:3,5）。我们对人所能表达的最大的爱心就是告诉他们真理，保守他们的灵魂不被假教导的毒药侵蚀。

Paul's pastoral letters

保罗的牧会信件

Paul's concern for true doctrine shows itself throughout his three pastoral letters to Timothy and Titus. He piles one admonition on another as he urges Timothy to oppose false teachers (1 Timothy 1:3-5). Like John, Paul identifies such false teachers by name so that people can be on the lookout against them (1 Timothy 1:20; 2 Timothy 2:17,18; 4:14). Paul delivers a strong warning against false teachers who will come, bringing doctrines of the devil, such as forbidding marriage and prohibiting certain foods. It is the duty of a good minister to warn against such teachings and the teachers who bring them (1 Timothy 4:1-6).

保罗对真教义的关注贯穿于他写给提摩太和提多的三封教牧书信之中。他用一个又一个的警告劝勉提摩太抵挡假教师（提摩太前书 1:3-5）。就像约翰一样，保罗列出了这些假教师的名字，以便人们可以防备他们（提摩太前书 1:20；提摩太后书 2:17,18；4:14）。保罗严厉地警告会众要防备那些即将到来

的假教师，他们带着魔鬼的教义，比如禁戒婚姻与特定的食物。一个好牧师的职责是向假教导以及带来假教导的教师发出警告（提摩太前书 4:1-6）。

Paul warns that, in spite of the efforts of faithful teachers, false teachers will flourish in the last days. They will be popular because they will tell people what they want to hear, even condoning people's immoral lifestyles (2 Timothy 3:1-9; 4:3,4).

保罗发出警告说，尽管忠心的教师已经付出努力，但末世假教师会兴旺起来。他们会很受欢迎，因为他们会讲人们喜欢听的东西，甚至纵容人不道德的生活方式（提摩太后书 3:1-9； 4:3,4）。

Anyone who teaches differently than the sound words of the Lord Jesus Christ is conceited and knows nothing (1 Timothy 6:3,4). If such false teachers reject the warnings against their teaching, they themselves are to be rejected by those who love God's truth: "Warn a divisive person once, and then warn him a second time. After that, have nothing to do with him" (Titus 3:10).

任何传将跟我们主耶稣基督纯正话语不一致的人，就是自高自大，一无所知（提摩太前书 6:3,4）。如果那些假教师拒绝对于他们教导的警告，他们自身也会被那些爱神真理的人弃绝：“分门结党的人，警戒过一两次，就要弃绝他”（提多书 3:10）。

A faithful minister is to guard both his life and his doctrine so that he may save himself and others (1 Timothy 4:16). To prepare himself to battle such false teachers, God's servant must carefully study the Holy Scriptures so that he can separate truth from error. "Do your best to present yourself to God as one approved, a workman who does not need to be ashamed and who correctly handles the word of truth" (2 Timothy 2:15). "Evil men and impostors will go from bad to worse, deceiving and being deceived. But as for you, continue in what you have learned and have become convinced of, because you know those from whom you learned it, and how from infancy you have known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make you wise for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is God-breathed and is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness, so that the man of God may be thoroughly equipped for every good work" (2 Timothy 3:13-17).

一个忠心的牧师要谨守自己的生活与教义，这样他可救自己，又可救了别人（提摩太前书 4:16）。为预备自己与假教师斗争，神的仆人必须要认真研读圣经，以至于可以分辨真理与错误。“你当竭力在神面前得蒙喜悦，作无愧的工人，按着正意分解真理的道”（提摩太后书 2:15）。“只是作恶的和迷惑人的，必越久越恶，他欺哄人，也被人欺哄。但你所学习的、所确信的，要存在心里，因为你知道是跟谁学的。并且知道你是从小明白圣经，这圣经能使你因信基督耶稣有得救的智慧。圣经都是神所默示的，于教训、督责、使人归正、教导人学义都是有益的，叫属神的人得以完全，预备行各样的善事”（提摩太后书 3:13-17）。

Although God's workmen are to oppose falsehood, they are to avoid disputes that are mere word-battles. Because their primary aim is not to win arguments but to win people, they are to gently instruct those who have fallen into error, in hopes of regaining them for the truth (2 Timothy 2:14-26).

尽管神的工人要反对虚假，但是也要避免无意义的口舌之争。因为他们的主要目标并非赢得辩论，而是要将人得回，他们应当温柔地引导那些陷入错误的人，盼望将重得他们，使他们回到真理之中（提摩太后书 2:14-26）。

Christians are to be careful about whom they put into positions of leadership in the church, lest they become guilty of sponsoring the sins of others (1 Timothy 5:22).

基督徒应当谨慎选择谁来担任教会的领袖职务，以免他们在资助别人犯罪的恶事上有份（提摩太前书 5:22）。

Conclusion

结论

This survey of the letters of John and the pastoral letters of Paul has shown that a concern for doctrinal unity as the basis for the practice of church fellowship is not an incidental matter for the writers of the New Testament, but runs through all their work. The space limitations of this book do not permit us to survey this doctrine throughout all the books of the Bible in the same detail. Therefore, we must limit ourselves to the study of representative passages from other New Testament books. We will focus on passages that address the two questions that are the main disputed issues in connection with this doctrine: (1) Does Scripture require agreement in all doctrines as a basis for the practice of church fellowship? (2) Do some expressions of fellowship, such as joint prayer or cooperation in charitable work, require a lesser degree of doctrinal agreement than sharing the Lord's Supper or exchanging pulpits?

查考约翰书信以及保罗教牧书信之后，我们得知，对于教义合一作为教会团契实践基础这一点的关注，对于新约作者而言并非心血来潮，而是贯穿于他们的工作始终。本书篇幅有限，不足以让我们就这个问题详细彻底地研究整本圣经。因此，我们必须聚焦在新约书卷中具有代表性的段落篇章中。我们集中讨论的段落可以解决关于这一教义的两个主要争议问题：（1）圣经要求我们实践教会团契时在所有教义上都要合一吗？（2）一些团契的表达方式，比如联合祷告或是善工上的合作，与共领圣餐或者交换牧师等事宜相比，在教义上要求的合一会更少些吗？

第 4 章

Agreement in All Doctrines
Is Necessary for Fellowship

所有教义的合一是团契的必要条件

Unity in doctrine not limited to only certain doctrines

教义的合一不仅限于某些特定教义

Nothing in Scripture suggests that the unity of faith that is required for the outward expression of church fellowship is limited to agreement only in the doctrine of justification or a few fundamental doctrines. It is true that many of the doctrinal disputes referred to in the New Testament involved fundamental doctrines. When Paul wrote to the Galatians, he was battling a denial of the doctrine of justification by grace alone, through faith alone. In his epistles John appears to be battling a heresy that denied Jesus' humanity.

圣经中没有经文表明，信心的合一——教会团契的外在表达所必须的条件——仅限于称义的教义或者一些基要教义的合一。的确，新约中提到的许多教义上的争论都涉及到基要教义。当保罗写信给加拉太人时，他是在跟否认唯因恩典称义教义的那些人作斗争。而约翰在他的书信中似乎在与否认耶稣人性的异端作斗争。

At the same time, the New Testament cites many other types of doctrinal error as divisive of fellowship, including denying the resurrection of the body (2 Timothy 2:18), teaching Christians that they could disregard God's commandments since the forgiveness of sins was free (Revelation 2, 3; Jude 3-10; 2 Peter 2:1-3,13-20), forbidding marriage and prohibiting certain foods (1 Timothy 4:3), and quarreling about genealogies and the law (Titus 3:9). This list is comprehensive enough to demonstrate that the apostles' concern for doctrinal purity was not limited to a few key doctrines.

同时，新约列举了很多其它类型引起团契分裂的教义错误，包括否认身体的复活（提摩太后书 2:18），教导基督徒既然罪得赦免白白得来，他们就可以藐视神的诫命（启示录 2, 3；犹大书 3-10；彼得后书 2:1-3, 13-20），禁戒婚姻与特定食物（提摩太前书 4:3），又为家谱与律法争吵（提多书 3:9）。这份清单非常复杂，表明了使徒对于教义纯正性的关注不仅仅局限在一些关键的教义上。

The Bible closes with the solemn warning that a curse rests on anyone who adds anything to the Bible or who subtracts anything from it: "I warn everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book: If anyone adds anything to them, God will add to him the plagues described in this book. And if anyone takes words away

from this book of prophecy, God will take away from him his share in the tree of life and in the holy city, which are described in this book” (Revelation 22:18,19). Since no one has the right to add to or subtract anything from the Bible, we cannot work together with those who reject any teachings of the Bible.

圣经最后以一项严肃的警告结尾，任何人如果想要增加或删除圣经话语必受咒诅：“我向一切听见这书上预言的作见证，若有人在这预言上加添什么，神必将写在这书上的灾祸加在他身上；这书上的预言，若有人删去什么，神必从这书上所写的生命树和圣城，删去他的份”（启示录 22:18, 19）。既然谁都没有资格增删圣经，那么我们也不能与那些反对圣经任何教导的人一同作工。

It is true that, just as some doses of poison are more deadly than others, the loss of certain doctrines, such as the doctrines of justification or the deity of Christ, is more deadly to faith than the loss of other doctrines, such as a correct understanding of the doctrine of the Antichrist. But just as we want no poison in our food, not even the unintentional inclusion of small amounts of cancer-causing substances, so we can tolerate no poison in our spiritual food, that is, the teachings of Scripture that feed our faith. We must separate ourselves from everyone who clings to false teaching in spite of warnings and admonition.

的确，有些剂量的毒药比其它剂量的更加致命，某些教义的亏损，如因信称义或者基督神性等，比起其它教义的亏损，如对敌基督教义的正确理解，更加致命。但是正如我们并不希望自己的饭食里有毒药一样，我们对于属灵粮食里的毒药也是零容忍的，这属灵粮食便是喂养我们信心的圣经教导。我们必须要跟那些不顾警告和劝诫、仍然紧抓假教导不放的人分开。

Adiaphora not divisive of fellowship

中立物不能使团契分裂

Agreement in adiaphora (things that God has neither commanded nor forbidden) and ceremonies is not necessary for fellowship. In Romans 14 Paul says:

团契没有必要在中立物（一些神没有命令也没有禁止的事情）和仪式上合一。保罗在罗马书第 14 章中说到：

Accept him whose faith is weak, without passing judgment on disputable matters. The man who eats everything must not look down on him who does not, and the man who does not eat everything must not condemn the man who does, for God has accepted him. One man considers one day more sacred than another; another man considers every day alike. Each one should be fully convinced in his own mind. He who regards one day as special, does so to the Lord. He who eats meat, eats to the Lord, for he gives thanks to God; and he who abstains, does so to the Lord and gives thanks to God. Therefore let us stop passing judgment on one another. Instead, make up your mind not to put any stumbling block or obstacle in your brother's way. Let us therefore make every effort to do what leads to peace and to mutual edification (verses 1,3,5,6,13,19).

信心软弱的，你们要接纳，但不要辩论所疑惑的事。有人信百物都可吃，但那软弱的，只吃蔬菜。吃的人不可轻看不吃的人，不吃的人不可论断吃的人；因为神已经收纳他了。有人看这日比那日强，有人看日日都是一样，只是各人心里要意见坚定。守日的人是为主守的；吃的人是为主吃的，因他感谢神；不吃的人是为主不吃的，也感谢神。所以我们不可再彼此论断，宁可定意，谁也不给弟兄放下绊脚跌人之物。所以，

我们务要追求和睦的事与彼此建立德行的事（罗马书 14:1,3,5,6,13,19）。

On another occasion Paul said, “Therefore do not let anyone judge you by what you eat or drink, or with regard to a religious festival, a New Moon celebration or a Sabbath day” (Colossians 2:16).

保罗在另一处这样说到，“所以不拘在饮食上，或节期、月朔、安息日，都不可让人论断你们”（歌罗西书 2:16）。

Christians do not have to use the same liturgy or enjoy the same style of worship to be in fellowship with each other. Worship styles in our world mission fields are often quite different than those in an American suburban WELS congregation. Some Christians may baptize by immersion; some may baptize by pouring water on the baby. Christians are not required to have the same system of church government or all of the same forms of ministry. We have a ministry of Lutheran elementary school teachers. Many denominations do not. Christians do not have to follow the same diet or wear the same styles in order to practice fellowship together. Some Christians may choose to abstain from alcoholic beverages; others may use them in moderation. Such differences of opinion and practice are not divisive of church fellowship unless one party insists that its way is the only right way (Galatians 5:1). There is room for much diversity of custom in the church, but nothing in the New Testament offers any basis for excluding any doctrine from the unity needed for fellowship.

基督徒在彼此团契时不必使用相同的礼拜仪式或享受同样的敬拜风格。我们宣教禾场的敬拜风格通常跟美国郊区的 WELS 教会相去甚远。有些基督徒可能会用浸没的方式受洗；有些人会把水浇在婴儿身上进行洗礼。基督徒并不需要相同的教会管理系统，或者相同形式的事工。我们有一个路德宗小学教师的事工，很多宗派却没有。基督徒在团契时也没必要采用同样的饮食习惯或穿衣风格。有些基督徒可能会选择戒掉含有酒精的饮料；而其他基督徒则可能会适量饮用。我们没有必要因为这些不同的见解和实践而分开团契，除非某一派人坚称这是唯一正确的方式（加拉太书 5:1）。教会可以包容各种各样的风俗习惯，但是新约却没有任何经文提供依据表明团契不需要所有教义的合一。

Our Lutheran Confessions state this principle in Article VII of the Augsburg Confession: “For the true unity of the church it is enough to agree concerning the teaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments. It is not necessary that human traditions or rites and ceremonies, instituted by men, should be alike everywhere.”¹ When the Augsburg Confession speaks here of “the teaching of the Gospel,” it is not making a distinction between one teaching of Scripture as opposed to other scriptural teachings. The distinction is between the doctrine of the gospel and human traditions and ceremonies. “The teaching of the Gospel” is used here in a broad sense and refers to every teaching our Lord has revealed to us in Scripture.

我们路德宗的信仰告白在奥斯堡信条第七条款中陈述了这一原则：“为了基督教会的真正合一，在福音的教导和圣礼的施行上达成合一便足够了，并不需要各处遵守同一的、由人制定的传统、礼仪和典礼。”奥斯堡信条所说的“福音的教导”并不是在圣经的某一条教导上与其它属灵教导之间作出区分，而是在福音的所有教义上与人所制定的传统和仪式作出区分。这里“福音的教导”是一种广义上的说法，指的是主基督在圣经中所启示的每一项教导。

Unity in doctrine does not require uniformity in terminology

教义上的合一并不需要术语上的统一

Complete uniformity in the use of doctrinal terminology is not necessary for church fellowship. We should not battle about mere words (2 Timothy 2:14-26). In 2 Thessalonians 2:3, Paul warns against a false teacher called the “man of sin” (KJV) or the “man of lawlessness” (NIV). In 1 John 4:3, John calls this same false teacher the “Antichrist.” Even though they used different names for this false teacher, Paul and John agreed on the doctrine concerning his coming. It, therefore, would not be right to deny fellowship to someone who had the same teaching that we have, but who used different words to express it. It is, however, desirable to agree on common terminology within a church body to avoid confusing people who are receiving instruction.

教会团契并不要求在教义的专业术语上达到完全的统一。我们并不需要过于咬文嚼字（提摩太后书 2:14-26）。在帖撒罗尼迦后书 2:3 中，保罗警告会众要提防那称为“大罪人”和“沉沦之子”的假教师。在约翰一书 4:3 中，约翰称这位假教师为“敌基督”。虽然他们使用了不同的名字来称呼这位假教师，保罗和约翰都认同那项关于他要来的教义。所以，我们没必要拒绝跟我们拥有相同教导、而只是用了不同词汇来表述这些教导的基督徒团契。不过，如果我们能够在同一教会共同体内使用相同术语的话，便可让接受教导的人更清楚我们在说些什么。

Difference of words does not necessarily mean difference of doctrine, but we also need to be alert for the opposite danger. Use of the same words may be intended to hide differences of doctrine. False teachers often try to disguise their false teaching by twisting the meaning of the words that the orthodox church uses to express its teaching. For example, when false teachers call the Bible infallible, they mean that it never fails to accomplish God’s purpose even though it contains many errors. Such a use of infallible is intended to fool orthodox Christians, who use the word to assert that the Bible is entirely without error. Such deception may mislead faithful Christians into thinking that false teachers are proclaimers of the truth who deserve their help and support.

不同词语所表达的教义未必有所不同，但是我们也要对相反的情况保持警惕，即，为了掩盖教义的不同而使用相同的词语。假教师通常会曲解正统教会表述教导时所用词语的含义，以掩饰他们的假教导。比如，当假教师称圣经无误时，他们是再说即使其中包含许多错误，也绝不会阻拦神的旨意成就。这种对于“无误”一词的用法是为了欺哄那些使用该词坚称圣经全然无误的正统基督徒。这样的骗术可能会使忠心的基督徒误以为这些假教师宣讲真理，配得他们的帮助与支持。

For this reason, the church has sometimes found it necessary to insist on specific, unambiguous terminology to “smoke out” false teachers. The need for such clear terminology is one reason that the church has composed creeds and confessions. The false teachers’ refusal to accept these creeds exposes their deception and warns people to avoid them.

因此，教会有时候发现有必要坚持具体而明确的术语来逼假教师现形。需要如此清晰的术语正是教会编写信条与信仰告白的理由之一。如果假教师否认这些信条，那么他们的伪装就暴露了，这也可以警戒会众远离他们。

We should briefly mention that it would also be wrong to divide the church on the basis of loyalty to a particular person (1 Corinthians 1:11-13; 3:21-23) or to refuse fellowship to anyone on the basis of race, sex, or economic status (Galatians 3:28; James 2:1-5).

我们需要简单地提到一点，如果基于对某人的忠心而分裂教会（哥林多前书 1:11-13； 3:21-23）或基于种族、性别、经济地位等因素而不让某人参加团契（加拉太书 3:28； 雅各书 2:1-5），这样的做法都是错误的。

Scripture makes no exceptions on doctrines

圣经教义没有例外

Although agreement in adiaphora, ceremonies, and wording is not necessary for fellowship, complete agreement in doctrine is necessary. The New Testament admonitions to doctrinal unity and its warnings against false doctrine are all-inclusive, general statements that in no way imply there are some scriptural doctrines that can safely be omitted or that there are some false teachings that can safely be tolerated:

尽管基督徒团契并不要求在中立物、仪式及用语上达成一致，但是教义的完全合一却是其必不可少的条件。新约对于教义合一的劝勉以及对假教导的警戒是针对所有教义的一般性陈述，没有迹象表明有些属灵教义可以安全地被忽略，或者有的假教导是可以安全地被容忍：

[Teach] them to obey everything I have commanded you (Matthew 28:20).

凡我所吩咐你们的，都教训他们遵守，我就常与你们同在，直到世界的末了。（马太福音 28:20）

Make every effort to keep the unity of the Spirit through the bond of peace. It was [Christ] who gave some to be apostles, some to be prophets, some to be evangelists, and some to be pastors and teachers, to prepare God's people for works of service, so that the body of Christ may be built up until we all reach unity in the faith and in the knowledge of the Son of God and become mature, attaining to the whole measure of the fullness of Christ. Then we will no longer be infants, tossed back and forth by the waves, and blown here and there by every wind of teaching and by the cunning and craftiness of men in their deceitful scheming. Instead, speaking the truth in love, we will in all things grow up into him who is the Head, that is, Christ (Ephesians 4:3,11-15).

用和平彼此联络，竭力保守圣灵所赐合而为一的心。他所赐的有使徒，有先知，有传福音的，有牧师和教师。为要成全圣徒，各尽其职，建立基督的身体，直等到我们众人在真道上同归于一，认识神的儿子，得以长大成人，满有基督长成的身量，使我们不再作小孩子，中了人的诡计和欺骗的法术，被一切异教之风摇动，飘来飘去，就随从各样的异端。惟用爱心说诚实话，凡事长进，连于元首基督。（以弗所书 4:3,11-15）

I have not hesitated to proclaim to you the whole will of God. Keep watch over yourselves and all the flock of which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers. Be shepherds of the church of God, which he bought with his own blood. I know that after I leave, savage wolves will come in among you and will not spare the flock. Even from your own number men will arise and distort the truth in order to draw away disciples after them. So be on your guard! (Acts 20:27-31).

因为神的旨意，我并没有一样忌讳不传给你们的。圣灵立你们作全群的监督，你们就当为自己谨慎，也为全群谨慎，牧养神的教会，就是他用自己血所买来的。我知道我去之后，必有凶暴的豺狼进入你们中间，不爱惜羊群。就是你们中间，也必有人起来，说悖谬的话，要引诱门徒跟

从他们。所以你们应当警醒，记念我三年之久昼夜不住地流泪，劝诫你们各人。（使徒行传 20:27-31）

I appeal to you, brothers, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that all of you agree with one another so that there may be no divisions among you and that you may be perfectly united in mind and thought (1 Corinthians 1:10).

弟兄们，我藉我们主耶稣基督的名，劝你们都说一样的话。你们中间也不可分党，只要一心一意，彼此相合。（哥林多前书 1:10）

If anyone takes words away from this book of prophecy, God will take away from him his share in the tree of life (Revelation 22:19).

这书上的预言，若有人删去什么，神必从这书上所写的生命树和圣城，删去他的份。（启示录 22:19）

Command certain men not to teach false doctrines any longer nor to devote themselves to myths and endless genealogies (1 Timothy 1:3,4).

好嘱咐那几个人不可传异教，也不可听从荒渺无凭的话语和无穷的家谱。（提摩太前书 1:3,4）

If anyone teaches false doctrines and does not agree to the sound instruction of our Lord Jesus Christ and to godly teaching, he is conceited and understands nothing (1 Timothy 6:3,4).

若有人传异教，不服从我们主耶稣基督纯正的话与那合乎敬虔的道理，他是自高自大，一无所知。（提摩太前书 6:3,4）

If you hold to my teaching, you are really my disciples (John 8:31).

你们若常常遵守我的道，就真是我的门徒。（约翰福音 8:31）

If anyone speaks, he should do it as one speaking the very words of God (1 Peter 4:11).

若有讲道的，要按着神的圣言讲；若有服侍人的，要按着神所赐的力量服侍，叫神在凡事上因耶稣基督得荣耀。原来荣耀、权能都是他的，直到永永远远。阿们！（彼得前书 4:11）

May the God who gives endurance and encouragement give you a spirit of unity among yourselves as you follow Christ Jesus, so that with one heart and mouth you may glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (Romans 15:5).

但愿赐忍耐、安慰的神，叫你们彼此同心，效法基督耶稣，一心一口荣耀神、我们主耶稣基督的父。（罗马书 15:5,6）

None of these passages nor any of the many other similar passages in the New Testament offers even a hint of support for the idea that any doctrine of Scripture can be dispensed with or that any doctrinal error can be accepted as harmless. In Article X of the Formula of Concord, our Lutheran Confessions state, “We believe, teach, and confess that no church should condemn another because it has fewer or more external ceremonies not commanded by God, as long as there is mutual agreement in doctrine and in all its articles.”²

这些经文以及新约中许多其它相似的经文都没有给出任何依据来支撑以下观点：圣经中的教义是可删除的，或者教义上的错误是可以被接受而又无害的。在协同式第十项条款中，我们路德宗的信仰告白是，“我们相信，教导并承

认，教会只要在教义及其所有的条款上达成一致，就不应该因为保留了神所没有吩咐的外部仪式而受谴责。”

Romans 16:17,18

罗马书 16:17, 18

Since Romans 16:17,18 is undoubtedly the passage most often quoted on this topic, we will single it out for special attention: “I urge you, brothers, to watch out for those who cause divisions and put obstacles in your way that are contrary to the teaching you have learned. Keep away from them. For such people are not serving our Lord Christ, but their own appetites. By smooth talk and flattery they deceive the minds of naive people.”

毫无疑问，就该话题而言，罗马书 16:17-18 是被引用最多的经文，我们将之单独列出，请尤其留心：“弟兄们，那些离间你们，叫你们跌倒，背乎所学之道的人，我劝你们要留意躲避他们。因为这样的人不服侍我们的主基督，只服侍自己的肚腹，用花言巧语诱惑那些老实人的心。”

This passage follows immediately after a long expression of church fellowship, the Christian greetings and commendations that Paul extends in Romans 16:1-16. In contrast to the command “greet,” which dominates verses 1-16, Paul introduces a very different command in verse 17—“keep away.” Both commands are addressed to the same people, to Paul’s brothers and sisters in the faith, the members of the congregation at Rome. The two commands, however, govern their relationship with two different groups of people.

这段经文紧随一长段的教会团契表达——即保罗在罗马书 16:1-16 中所详述的基督徒之间的问安命令——之后。保罗在第 17 节中引出了一个与 1-16 节中的“问安”截然相反的命令——“躲避”。这两个命令的受众都是同一拨人，都是对保罗的信徒兄弟姐妹，对罗马教会的会众说的。然而，无论如何，这两个命令都指着他们与两个不同群体的关系。

The Roman Christians were in spiritual fellowship with Paul because they were united with him by their faith in Christ. They were also in church fellowship with Paul since they accepted all of the doctrine that Paul had taught throughout his letter and that he taught in all his mission fields. For this reason Paul is confident that they will want to be taught by him when he passes through Rome and that they will want to support his new mission project in Spain (Romans 15:23,24). He, therefore, urges them to greet all those at Rome who share their common faith. But in verse 17 he warns them to keep away from all those who do not share that faith.

罗马的基督徒与保罗在属灵上团契，因为他们因信基督而彼此合一。他们也与保罗在教会中团契，因为他们接受了保罗通过书信所传达的、以及在他所有宣教禾场所教导的教义。因此，保罗有信心说，当他来罗马的时候，他们乐意听从自己的教导，并且乐意支持他在西班牙的新事工（罗马书 15:23, 24）。他因此敦促会众向那些在罗马与他们同一信仰的人问安。但在第 17 节中，他却劝诫他们要远离那些跟他们信心不合一的人。

He says they should “watch out” for them. Because false teachers disguise themselves, the Roman Christians must continually be on the lookout so that they will not be deceived by the smooth talk of false teachers.

他说他们应当“留意”。因为假教师善于伪装，罗马基督徒必须持续地谨守以至不被假教师的花言巧语欺骗。

Who are the people the Romans are to keep away from? They are described as people who “are causing divisions and setting up traps which cause people to fall

into sin, contrary to the teaching you have learned” (literal translation). The Greek verb rendered “are causing divisions” describes an action that is continuous and habitual. The people to be avoided are not teachers who inadvertently misspeak. They are not naive or uninformed victims who unknowingly follow false doctrine. They are teachers who persist in their false doctrine and their sinful conduct in spite of warnings against it. They are serving “their own appetites”; that is, they are not serving Christ, but their own egos, desires, lusts, intellect, and reason. They may look like servants of Christ to the casual observer, but no one ever serves Christ by any false teaching. Since their man-made teachings appeal to human reason and to sinful desires, the false teachers find willing followers who join in their sin. Both the teachers and their supporters are to be avoided.

罗马基督徒应该远离谁呢？他们是“叫人分裂，设网罗叫人陷在罪里，所教的与你所学的教训相反”的人（字面义）。希腊语动词“叫人分裂”描述的是一种持续性的和惯常性的动作。会众应当躲避的不是偶尔不小心说错的教师，不是无意中跟随了假教导的无知受害者，而是不顾劝诫警告，一味坚持自己假教导与恶行的教师。他们服侍的是“他们自己的肚腹”，意即他们不是服侍基督，而是服侍他们的自我、渴望、贪欲、智识和理性。乍一看上去他们可能很像基督的仆人，但是谁会通过传讲假教导来服侍基督呢？因为他们自己编造出来的教导对于人的理性和罪欲很有诱惑力，所以假教师总能找到一群愿意跟随他们犯罪的人。假教师及他们的支持者都是会众需要躲避的。

There is no indication in the text that Paul is limiting his condemnation to specific false teachers who were present in Rome. He is stating a general principle that has a universal application. When Christians recognize false teachers who continue in their error in spite of admonition, they are to keep away from them; that is, they are to make a clean break from them. “Divisions and . . . traps which cause people to fall into sin” is a phrase broad enough to apply to any false teaching, whether it involves doctrine or morality. “The teaching you have learned” is a comprehensive phrase that includes everything the Roman Christians had been taught by the apostles and their assistants.

文本中没有迹象表明保罗的谴责只限于特指当时在罗马的假教师。他是在陈述一个普遍适用的一般性原则。对于不顾劝诫持续犯错的假教师，基督徒辨认出来之后应当远离他们；意思是，要跟他们彻底决裂。“离间你们……叫你们跌倒”这个表达非常宽泛，可以运用在任何假教导中，无论是牵涉到教义还是道德层面。“所学之道”这个表达比较复杂，它包括了罗马基督徒接受过的使徒及使徒助手的所有教导。

It should be noted in passing that Paul labels the false teachers as people “who cause divisions” in the church. It has always been the style of false teachers to blame the divisions in the church on the true teachers who oppose their false teaching and separate from them. The ungodly king Ahab labeled the prophet Elijah as the “troubler of Israel” (1 Kings 18:17). But Elijah’s denunciation of the wicked idolatry of Ahab and Jezebel was not the cause of the division in Israel. Ahab and Jezebel had divided Israel by installing the worship of Baal alongside the worship of the Lord as it had been taught by Moses (verse 18). Ahab and Jezebel were the real troublemakers of Israel.

顺便提一下，保罗把假教师称为在教会中“离间你们”的人。这也是假教师的套路，他们总是把教会的分裂归咎于那些反对他们假教导、又与他们分开的真教师。邪恶的亚哈王称以利亚为“使以色列遭灾的”（列王纪上 18:17）。但是，使以色列分裂的是亚哈和耶洗别所设立的邪恶的偶像崇拜，而不是以利

亚对他们的公开斥责。亚哈和耶洗别在敬拜耶和华的同时设立了对巴力的崇拜，违背了摩西的教导，从而分裂了以色列。亚哈和耶洗别才是使以色列遭灾的原因。

Luther did not divide the church by steadfastly opposing the false teachings of the pope at Rome. The pope and his adherents had divided the church by introducing new doctrines contrary to the doctrines the apostles had taught. Luther was trying to reunite the church on the basis of a return to apostolic doctrine. False teachers always try to blame the divisions in the church on the true teachers who oppose them and who separate from them, but Scripture places the blame for division in the church where it belongs—on the false teachers who depart from the unity produced by obedience to God's Word.

路德坚定地反对罗马教皇假教导的举动并没有分裂教会。教皇和他的追随者宣扬与使徒教导相反的教义，才是使得教会分裂的原因。路德试图引导教会回到使徒所传讲的教义之上，以至于教会重新合一。假教师总是想要将教会的分裂归咎于那些反对他们假教导、又和他们分开的真教师身上，但是圣经责备的是那些真正离间教会的人——假教师，他们偏离了那因顺服神的话语而生出的合一。

Matthew 7

马太福音第 7 章

We have seen that Scripture commands us to judge the doctrine of all teachers of religion so that we may avoid those whose teaching departs from God's Word. It also warns us not to do this in a harsh or self-righteous spirit. Jesus brings both of these concerns together in the conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount:

我们已经看到，圣经命令我们判断所有宗教教师的教义，以此防备那些偏离上帝话语去教导他人的人。圣经同时也警告我们如此行时切勿尖酸刻薄又自以为义。耶稣在登山宝训得总结陈词中一并谈及了这些考量。

Watch out for false prophets. They come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ferocious wolves. By their fruit you will recognize them. . . . Not everyone who says to me, "Lord, Lord," will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven. Many will say to me on that day, "Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name, and in your name drive out demons and perform many miracles?" Then I will tell them plainly, "I never knew you. Away from me, you evildoers!"(Matthew 7:15,16,21-23).

你们要防备假先知。他们到你们这里来，外面披着羊皮，里面却是残暴的狼。凭着他们的果子，就可以认出他们来。……凡称呼我“主阿，主阿”的人，不能都进天国。惟独遵行我天父旨意的人，才能进去。当那日必有许多人对我说，“主阿，主阿，我们不是奉你的名传道，奉你的名赶鬼，奉你的名行许多异能吗？”我就明明地告诉他们说，我从来不认识你们，你们这些作恶的人，离开我去吧。（马太福音 7:15, 16, 21-23）

False teachers are hard to detect since they disguise themselves as true teachers (2 Corinthians 11:13-15). Therefore, we must study carefully all of God's Word so that we can judge every teacher of religion, as well as every teaching that comes our way,

so that we will be able to avoid that which is contrary to God's Word. The Bereans, who checked Paul's teaching by going to the Scriptures, are a model of such Bible study (Acts 17:11). We must judge every teacher by the fruit he produces, that is, by his teaching.

假教师很难辨别，因为他们会将自己伪装成真教师（哥林多后书 11:13-15）。因此我们必须认真研读神的所有话语，以至我们可以分辨每名宗教教师以及每一项来到我们当中的教导，从而躲避与上帝话语相反之人事物。庇哩亚人通过查考圣经来检验保罗所说的是否为真，他们是此类查经的好榜样（使徒行传 17:11）。我们必须要通过教师所产出的果实——他们的教导——来检验他们。

But in the same chapter in which Jesus commands us to judge teachers, he warns us against self-righteous judging of either the lives or beliefs of others:

然而，在耶稣命令我们判断教师的时候，同时他也警告我们切勿自以为义地去判断他人的生活或是信仰：

Do not judge, or you too will be judged. For in the same way you judge others, you will be judged, and with the measure you use, it will be measured to you. Why do you look at the speck of sawdust in your brother's eye and pay no attention to the plank in your own eye? How can you say to your brother, "Let me take the speck out of your eye," when all the time there is a plank in your own eye? You hypocrite, first take the plank out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to remove the speck from your brother's eye (Matthew 7:1-5).

你们不要论断人，免得你们被论断。因为你们怎样论断人，也必怎样被论断。你们用什么量器量给人，也必用什么量器量给你们。为什么看见你弟兄眼中有刺，却不想自己眼中有梁木呢？你自己眼中有梁木，怎能对你弟兄说，容我去掉你眼中的刺呢？你这假冒为善的人，先去掉自己眼中的梁木，然后才能看得清楚，去掉你弟兄眼中的刺（马太福音 7:1-5）

We must first be judged by God's Word so that we recognize our own sins and errors. Then we will see clearly to warn others against their sin.

我们势必首先要被上帝的话语判断，以至于我们意识到我们自己的罪和错误，随后我们方可看清情况而去警告他人的罪。

Immediately following this command not to judge self-righteously, Jesus uses shocking language as he commands us to separate ourselves from those who cling to error: "Do not give dogs what is sacred; do not throw your pearls to pigs. If you do, they may trample them under their feet, and then turn and tear you to pieces" (Matthew 7:6). We cannot share the means of grace with those who despise God and his Word. We cannot practice fellowship with those who support error or live in immorality. Scripture commands us to make strong judgments, but it warns us to make them with humility and patient love.

紧随“不要自以为义地判断”这一命令其后，耶稣以刺耳的言语命令我们远离那些根本不愿离弃错误的人：“不要把圣物给狗，也不要将你们的珍珠丢在猪前，恐怕它践踏了珍珠，转过来咬你们”（马太福音 7:6）。我们不可向那些藐视上帝及他话语的人分享施恩具。我们不可与那些支持错误或活在不道德

中的人实践团契。圣经命令我们作强硬的判断，与此同时，它也警告我们在谦卑和忍耐的爱中作出判断。

When we separate from false teachers, we are not judging the faith of their hearts, which no human can judge. That judgment we leave to Christ (Matthew 7:23). But we are to judge their teaching and their conduct, which can be judged on the basis of Scripture. From such false teaching and from those who cling to it, we must separate ourselves as Jesus commands (Matthew 7:15).

当我们离开假教师的时候，我们并不是在判断他们里面的信心，判断信心并不是人可以做的事。这样的判断我们留给基督（马太福音 7:23）。然而我们应当判断他们的教导和行为，这些都可以基于圣经被考量。而就那些假教导以及那些坚持这些假教导的人而言，我们必须与他们分离，正如耶稣所命令的那样（马太福音 7:15）。

Jesus' strong opposition to false teachers within the church is not limited to Matthew 7, but is found throughout the gospels (Matthew 15:1-14; 16:5-12; 23:1-36; 24:4-14). When the apostles issued strong warnings to avoid false teachers, they were simply following in their Master's footsteps.

耶稣对于教会内假教师的反对并不仅限于马太福音第 7 章，这样的声音遍布几卷福音书中（马太福音 15:1-14; 16:5-12; 23:1-36; 24:4-14）。当使徒发出严厉警告要求我们远离假教师的时候，他们不过是跟从了他们主的步伐。

第 5 章

All Ways of Expressing Fellowship Are a Unit

所有表达团契的方式是一个整体

Nothing in Scripture suggests that some ways of practicing church fellowship require less agreement in doctrine than others. In the New Testament all expressions of fellowship are treated as a unit. They are all ways of expressing the same oneness of faith.

关于实践教会团契的方式对于教义的要求，圣经没有任何地方表明其中一些方式对于教义的要求要比另一些松散一些。在新约中，团契的所有表达方式被视作一个整体，它们都是表达信心合一的方式。

Various ways of expressing fellowship 表达团契的多样方式

Christians express fellowship with one another when they encourage each other by worshiping together (Hebrews 10:24,25; Colossians 3:16). Quite clearly, sharing the Lord's Supper is an expression of fellowship between the participants: "Is not the cup of thanksgiving for which we give thanks a participation in the blood of Christ? And is not the bread that we break a participation in the body of Christ? Because there is one loaf, we, who are many, are one body, for we all partake of the one loaf" (1 Corinthians 10:16,17). We, therefore, must worship and commune only with Christians with whom we are in doctrinal agreement. We must not invite pastors who do not agree with our doctrine to preach in our churches, nor must our pastors preach in theirs. We must not attend Communion with people who reject any of the teachings of the Bible.

当基督徒通过共同敬拜彼此鼓励的时候，他们是在表达彼此之间的团契关系（希伯来书 10:24, 25；歌罗西书 3:16）。很明显，共领圣餐是参与者对团契关系的一种表达方式：“我们所祝福的杯，岂不是同领基督的血吗？我们所掰开的饼，岂不是同领基督的身体吗？我们虽多，仍是一个饼，一个身体。因为我们都是分受这一个饼”（哥林多前书 10:16, 17）。因此，我们必须只可那些与在教义上我们彼此认同的基督徒共同敬拜及共领圣餐。我们绝不可邀请那些不认同我们教义的牧师在我们的教会中讲道，同样地，我们的牧师也绝不可在他们的教会中讲道。我们绝不可和那些拒绝圣经中任意一项教导的人共领圣餐。

Anyone who provides financial support to a teacher of religion is expressing fellowship with him. This is true whether the teacher is one's own pastor or someone whose work is being done far away. Christians who support a pastor have not entered a business transaction with him, but a mutual sharing of material and spiritual blessings. "Anyone who receives instruction in the word must share all good things with his instructor" (Galatians 6:6). The pastor shares with his congregation the spiritual treasures he has received through his training in the Word. The members in turn share their material treasures with the pastor. Paul says, "If we have sown spiritual seed among you, is it too much if we reap a material harvest from you? . . . The Lord has commanded that those who preach the gospel should receive their living from the gospel" (1 Corinthians 9:11,14).

无论何人，若是对一名宗教教师提供经济上的支持，他就是在表达与他之间的团契。无论这名教师是此人自己的牧师，还是说他在远方工作，此事都是如此。支持牧师的基督徒并非同牧师之间形成了一种生意往来，而是双方物质与属灵祝福的彼此分享。“在道理上受教的，当把一切需用的供给施教的人”（加拉太书 6:6）。牧师向他的会众分享他从神的话语中受训所得的属灵财富，会众相应地向他们的牧师分享他们的物质财富。保罗说到：“我们若把属灵的种子撒在你们中间，就是从你们收割奉养肉身之物，这还算大事吗？ 主也是这样命定，叫传福音的靠着福音养生”（哥林多前书 9:11, 14）。

The Philippians had become partners in Paul's work through the financial support they sent him (Philippians 1:5; 4:15). On the other hand, those who support or encourage false teachers are partners in their evil deeds. "If anyone comes to you and does not bring this teaching, do not take him into your house or welcome him. Anyone who welcomes him shares in his wicked work" (2 John 10,11). Those who support false teachers are accomplices of an evil act just as much as the individual who drives the getaway car for a bank robber or the person who hides a fleeing murderer. Anyone who gives money to a false teacher is certainly not obeying Scripture's command to separate from him.

腓立比人藉着他们递给保罗的经济支持，成了保罗事工上的伙伴（腓立比书 1: 5; 4: 15）。而另一方面，那些支持或鼓励假教师的人也成了他们恶行上的伙伴。“若有人到你们那里，不是传这教训，不要接他到家里，也不要问他的安。因为问他安的，就在他的恶行上有分”（约翰二书 10, 11）。那些支持假教师的人，就好比那些为抢劫犯开逃亡车或是藏匿在逃杀人犯的人一样，他们都是恶行的帮凶。故无论何人，若是向假教师提供经济上的支持，他当然是在违背圣经要求我们远离这类人的命令。

Fellowship may also be expressed by brotherly consultations to resolve doctrinal questions, by joint doctrinal resolutions, by mutual recognition of each other's ministries, and by agreement to divide mission fields (Acts 15:1-32; Galatians 2:1-10). We, therefore, do not participate in doctrinal studies with heterodox churches (except in efforts to eliminate the errors that separate them from us), nor do we cooperate with them in producing instructional materials, nor do we agree to divide responsibility for mission fields with them.

团契同样也可以通过弟兄间协商解决教义问题、联合教义决议、相互承认彼此的事工、同意划分宣教领域这些方式来表达（使徒行传 15:1-32；加拉太书 2:1-10）。因此，我们并不参与非正统教会的教义学习（除非是在尽力消除那些致使他们与我们分离的错误），不会在出版教导性读物一事上同他们合作，也不会同意和他们在宣教领域上划分责任。

Church fellowship may be expressed by a handshake (Galatians 2:9); by a kiss (Romans 16:16); or by the exchange of fraternal greetings, which is so common in Paul's letters (Romans 16:1-16). Fellowship is also expressed by the "letters of recommendation" that are common in the New Testament (Romans 16:1-3; 2 Corinthians 8:16-23; 3 John 12). Present-day practices that are parallel to these biblical customs include the handshake given at an ordination, a confirmation, or a colloquy; the exchange of congratulations and greetings offered at church anniversaries and conventions; and letters of transfer. We, therefore, do not transfer members to heterodox churches, nor do we send heterodox churches congratulations and best wishes for their work.

教会团契也可以通过握手（加拉太书 2:9）、亲吻（罗马书 16:16）、弟兄姐妹间的问候（保罗书信中随处可见，如罗马书 16:16）来表达。团契也可以通过“推荐信”来表达，这在新约中屡见不鲜（罗马书 16:1-3；哥林多后书 8:16-23；约翰三书 12）。当今，和这些圣经传统对应的实践包括牧师按立礼上、坚信礼上、神学研讨会上的握手，教会周年庆和大会上彼此间祝福和问候的交流，以及会友转会信件。因此，我们不会将会友转交给非正统教会，也不会向他们送去祝福或祝愿他们手头的工作顺利。

“Cooperation in externals”

“外在的合作”

Today cooperation in Christian charity work is sometimes regarded as mere “cooperation in externals,” but it was not so regarded in the New Testament. The Macedonians urgently pleaded with Paul for the privilege of sharing in (that is, having fellowship in) the charitable service to the saints in Jerusalem (2 Corinthians 8:4). The goal of this charitable work was not merely to relieve human need, but to join together in glorifying God. “This service that you perform is not only supplying the needs of God's people but is also overflowing in many expressions of thanks to God. Because of the service by which you have proved yourselves, men will praise God for the obedience that accompanies your confession of the gospel of Christ” (2 Corinthians 9:12,13). The spiritual motivation and the fellowship that are an essential part of Christian charity are emphasized throughout 2 Corinthians 8 and 9.

今天，基督徒中间的善工有时仅被视为一种“外在的合作”，然而新约并非如此看待。马其顿人迫切请求保罗让他们可以在服侍耶路撒冷圣徒善工的特权上有份（即，有团契关系）（哥林多后书 8:4）。这项善工的目的不仅仅是解决人的需要，而是一起加入到荣耀神的事上。“因为办这供给的事，不但补圣徒的缺乏，而且叫许多人越发感谢神。他们从这供给的事上得了凭据，知道你们承认基督顺服他的福音，多多地捐钱给他们和众人，便将荣耀归与神”（哥林多后书 9:12, 13）。纵观哥林多后书第 8、第 9 章，就属灵动机以及团契关系作为基督徒善工的一个重要部分这一点，保罗可谓三令五申。

Prayer fellowship

在祷告中团契

There are times when praying for a person is an expression of fellowship with him, for example, when we pray for the success of his ministry (Romans 15:30-32; 2 Corinthians 1:11). There are, of course, other circumstances when praying for a person is not an expression of fellowship, as when Christians pray for the enemies of the church. Praying with a person, however, is always an expression of fellowship.

有时候，为某人祷告也是一种与他之间团契的表达。比如，当我们向神祷告希望他的事工顺利时（罗马书 15: 30-32；哥林多后书 1:11）。当然，在其它情形下，为某人祷告并非团契的表达，比如当基督徒为教会仇敌祷告的时候。然而，和某人一起祷告，总是一种团契的表达。

The dispute concerning the doctrine of prayer fellowship in American Lutheranism centered on the question “May we pray together with people who are not in doctrinal agreement with us?”

在美国路德宗教会中间，对于在祷告中团契这一教义的争论聚焦在以下这个问题之上，“我们可以和那些在教义上和我们不一致的人一起祷告吗？”

The New Testament does not treat prayer fellowship separately from other forms of fellowship. Prayer as an expression of fellowship is simply treated as one element among many others. The early Christians “devoted themselves to the apostles’ teaching and to the fellowship, to the breaking of bread and to prayer” (Acts 2:42). There is, therefore, nothing in Scripture to suggest that prayer should be treated any differently from any other expression of fellowship. Since God-pleasing prayer always flows from faith, every prayer is either an expression of faith (and therefore an act of worship), or it is an abomination. There is no middle ground. If true prayer is always an act of worship, joint prayer calls for the same unity of doctrine as any other act of worship.

对于在祷告中团契和其它形式的团契，新约并没有区别对待。就团契的表达而言，祷告不过是其中一种。早期的基督徒“都恒心遵守使徒的教训，彼此交接，掰饼，祈祷”（使徒行传 2:42）。因此，圣经从未表明祷告应当与其它团契表达方式区别开来。既然上帝喜悦的祷告总是源自信心，那么每次祷告要么是要信心的表达（因此就是一项敬拜活动），要么是可憎之事。这里没有中间地带。如果真正的祷告总是一项敬拜活动，那么联合祷告就像其它敬拜活动一样，同样需要教义一致。

In some ways the issue of joint prayer is similar to the issue of infant baptism. The Bible does not specifically say “baptize babies,” but the unrestricted command “baptize all nations” includes children unless valid scriptural reasons can be cited for excluding them. In the same way, the unrestricted commands to “keep away” from false teachers (Romans 16:17) and to “have nothing to do with [them]” (Titus 3:10) certainly prohibit all expressions of fellowship with them, including prayer. “Have nothing to do with [them]” and “keep away from them” cannot mean “pray with them.” The issue of prayer fellowship will be discussed in more detail in the historical and practical sections of this book.

某些方面，联合祷告这一议题类似于婴儿洗。圣经并未特别提到“婴儿洗”，然而“给万民施洗”这一不受限的命令就把孩童包含在了其中，除非有人摆出有效的圣经理由得以将他们排除在外。同样，“躲避”假教师并“弃绝他”（提多书 3:10）这一不受限的命令（罗马书 16:17）当然禁止与他们表达任何形式的团契，包括一起祷告。“弃绝他”和“躲避”根本无法和“与他们一同祷告”兼容。在本书的历史和实践部分，我们将更深入地讨论在祷告中团契这一议题。

No “levels of fellowship” in Scripture
圣经并不存在“不同级别的团契”

There is no scriptural basis for dividing the various expressions of fellowship into different levels that require different degrees of doctrinal agreement. Different forms of fellowship are simply different ways of expressing one and the same unity of faith.

The only distinction between them is that some of these acts, such as any use of the means of grace and prayer, are by their very nature always expressions of faith, but other acts, such as a handshake, a kiss, or giving to charity, may also be done in a secular context and are, therefore, not always expressions of religious fellowship. It depends on the context in which they are done.

将对于团契的各种表达方式按照对教义认同的不同程度进行划分，这样的做法并没有圣经根据。不同形式的团契不过是表达信心上合一的不同表达方式而已。他们之间的唯一区别在于，其中的一些行为，比如施恩具的使用以及祷告，就他们的本质而言，总是信心的表达，而诸如握手、亲吻、奉献支持善工，也可以世俗的背景下得以操作，因此，并不总是宗教团契的表达。关键取决于这些行为所处的具体情形。

Conclusion

总结

On the basis of the Scripture passages we have studied, it is our conviction that all outward expressions of church fellowship should be practiced only among those who agree in all doctrines of Scripture. Since this principle applies to church bodies, to congregations, and to individuals, it sometimes has been called the principle of confessional fellowship in order to make it clear that its application is not limited to formal relationships between church bodies. However, in this book the term church fellowship, which is more familiar to us, has been retained to describe all relationships between Christians on any level, since all are relationships between members of the church.

基于我们所研读的圣经经文，我们深信，教会团契的所有外在表达，都应当仅在认同所有圣经教义的人中间实践。因为这一原则适用于教会共同体、会众以及个人，所以有时候它被称为认信团契的原则，以此来澄清这一应用并不局限于教会共同体间的正式关系。然而，在本书中，我们仍旧沿用我们所更为熟知的“教会团契”这一术语来描述基督徒中间任何程度的一切关系，因为这一切的关系都是教会会友之间的关系。

It is also our conviction that agreement in all the doctrines of Scripture forms the necessary prerequisite for the joint practice of all expressions of church fellowship, whether altar and pulpit fellowship, joint prayer, or any other expression of fellowship. Unfortunately, this belief has not been shared by the majority of American Lutherans, as we shall see in Part II of this book.

我们深信，对于圣经所有教义的认同，是教会团契所有表达方式联合实践的先决条件，无论它们是祭坛及讲台团契、联合祷告，或是其它任何形式的团契。不幸的是，这一信仰并未得到大部分美国路德宗的认可，正如我们在本书的第二部分中所看到的。

第 6 章

Preserving and Extending Fellowship

保存与拓展团契

There are few joys greater than Christian fellowship. “How good and pleasant it is when brothers live together in unity! It is like precious oil poured on the head, running down on the beard, running down on Aaron’s beard, down upon the collar of his robes. It is as if the dew of Hermon were falling on Mount Zion. For there the LORD bestows his blessing, even life forevermore” (Psalm 133). Christian fellowship is a blessing to celebrate and to cherish.

较基督徒之间的团契，鲜少有比这更让人喜乐的事。“看哪，弟兄和睦同居，是何等的善，何等的美。这好比那贵重的油，浇在亚伦的头上，流到胡须，又流到他的衣襟。又好比黑门的甘露，降在锡安山。因为在那里有耶和华所命定的福，就是永远的生命”（诗篇 133）。基督徒的团契是值得我们庆祝并视为宝贵的福气。

Working to preserve and strengthen fellowship 竭力保存并坚固团契

Working together with those who hold to the truth and turning away from those who persist in error does not exhaust our responsibility for this blessed fellowship. We must also work hard to preserve this fellowship whenever it is threatened by the intrusion of sin and error. “Make every effort to keep the unity of the Spirit through the bond of peace” (Ephesians 4:3).

与持守真理者同工，又远离那些坚持错误的人，这并非我们在这蒙福团契中的全部责任。无论何时我们的团契受到罪和错误的侵扰，我们都必须竭力做工，让这团契得以保存。“用和平彼此联络，竭力保守圣灵所赐合而为一的心”（以弗所书 4: 3）。

We strengthen existing ties of fellowship when our words and deeds display that love for fellow Christians that we feel in our hearts. “Now that you have purified yourselves by obeying the truth so that you have sincere love for your brothers, love one another deeply, from the heart” (1 Peter 1:22).

当我们的言行展现出我们心中所存的、对基督徒同伴的爱时，我们就坚固了这现有的团契关系。“你们既因顺从真理，洁净了自己的心，以致爱弟兄没有虚假，就当从心里彼此切实相爱”（彼得前书 1:22）。

One way of showing this love is by helping our fellow Christians with their bodily needs. “Therefore, as we have opportunity, let us do good to all people, especially to those who belong to the family of believers” (Galatians 6:10). “If anyone has material possessions and sees his brother in need but has no pity on him, how can the love of God be in him? Dear children, let us not love with words or tongue but with actions and in truth. This then is how we know that we belong to the truth, and how we set our hearts at rest in his presence” (1 John 3:17-19). We strive to live so that Jesus’ description will be true of us: “By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another” (John 13:35).

展现这种爱的方式之一就是对于我们基督徒同伴的切身需要提供切实的帮助。“所以有了机会，就当向众人行善。向信徒一家的人更当这样”（加拉太书 6:10）。“凡有世上财物的，看见弟兄穷乏，却塞住怜恤的心，爱神的心怎能存在他里面呢？小子们哪，我们相爱，不要只在言语和舌头上。总要在行为和诚实。从此就知道我们是属真理的，并且我们的心在神面前可以安稳”（约翰一书 3:17-19）。我们竭力如此行，展现出耶稣对我们的说法是真实的：“你们若有彼此相爱的心，众人因此就认出你们是我的门徒了”（约翰福音 13:35）。

We strengthen our ties with fellow believers when we build up the church’s defenses against error. It is the duty of our pastors and teachers to carefully instruct all the members of the congregation in all the truths of God’s Word so that they are strengthened in their ability to detect and oppose false teaching:

当我们筑起教会的堡垒抵御错误时，我们就是在坚固我们和信徒之间的关系。用上帝话语的真理谨慎引导教会所有会众，以至于他们察觉并反对假教导的能力得以长进，对此，牧师和教师责无旁贷。

[Christ] gave some to be apostles, some to be prophets, some to be evangelists, and some to be pastors and teachers, to prepare God’s people for works of service, so that the body of Christ may be built up until we all reach unity in the faith and in the knowledge of the Son of God and become mature, attaining to the whole measure of the fullness of Christ. Then we will no longer be infants, tossed back and forth by the waves, and blown here and there by every wind of teaching and by the cunning and craftiness of men in their deceitful scheming. Instead, speaking the truth in love, we will in all things grow up into him who is the Head, that is, Christ. From him the whole body, joined and held together by every supporting ligament, grows and builds itself up in love, as each part does its work (Ephesians 4:11-16).

他（基督）所赐的有使徒，有先知。有传福音的。有牧师和教师。为要成全圣徒，各尽其职，建立基督的身体。直等到我们众人在真道上同归于一，认识神的儿子，得以长大成人，满有基督长成的身量。使我们不再作小孩子，中了人的诡计，和欺骗的法术，被一切异教之风摇动，飘来飘去，就随从各样的异端。惟用爱心说诚实话，凡事长进，连于元首基督。全身都靠他联络得合式，百节各按各职，照着各体的功用，彼此相助，便叫身体渐渐增长，在爱中建立自己。（以弗所书 4:11-16）。

We strengthen the unity of the church by respecting and supporting faithful teachers of the Word. Paul commanded, “Therefore encourage one another and build each other up, just as in fact you are doing. Now we ask you, brothers, to respect those who work hard among you, who are over you in the Lord and who admonish you. Hold them in the highest regard in love because of their work. Live in peace

with each other” (1 Thessalonians 5:11-13). “The elders who direct the affairs of the church well are worthy of double honor, especially those whose work is preaching and teaching” (1 Timothy 5:17). John said,

尊重、支持那些忠心教导上帝话语的教师，这也是在坚固教会的合一。保罗命令说，“所以你们该彼此劝慰，互相建立，正如你们素常所行的。弟兄们，我们劝你们敬重那在你们中间劳苦的人，就是在主里面治理你们，劝戒你们的。又因他们所作的工，用爱心格外尊重他们，你们也要彼此和睦”（帖撒罗尼迦前书 5:11-13）。“那善于管理教会的长老，当以为配受加倍的敬奉。那劳苦传道教导人的，更当如此”（提摩太前书 5: 17）。约翰则说到，

I have no greater joy than to hear that my children are walking in the truth. Dear friend, you are faithful in what you are doing for the brothers, even though they are strangers to you. They have told the church about your love. You will do well to send them on their way in a manner worthy of God. It was for the sake of the Name that they went out, receiving no help from the pagans. We ought therefore to show hospitality to such men so that we may work together for the truth (3 John 4-8).

我听见我的儿女们按真理而行，我的喜乐就没有比这个大的。亲爱的兄弟阿，凡你向作客旅之弟兄所行的，都是忠心的。他们在教会面前证明了你的爱。你若配得过神，帮助他们往前行，这就好了。因他们是为主的名出外，对于外邦人一无所取。所以我们应该接待这样的人，叫我们与他们一同为真理作工（约翰三书 4-8）。

We preserve fellowship by gently warning a brother or sister who has fallen into error. “The Lord’s servant must not quarrel; instead, he must be kind to everyone, able to teach, not resentful. Those who oppose him he must gently instruct, in the hope that God will grant them repentance leading them to a knowledge of the truth, and that they will come to their senses and escape from the trap of the devil, who has taken them captive to do his will” (2 Timothy 2:24-26).

温柔地警告跌倒犯错的兄弟姐妹，这同样是在保存团契。“然而主的仆人不不可争竞，只要温温和和的待众人，善于教导，存心忍耐，用温柔劝戒那抵挡的人。或者神给他们悔改的心，可以明白真道。叫他们这已经被魔鬼任意掳去的，可以醒悟，脱离他的网罗”（提摩太后书 2:24-26）。

Weak brothers versus persistent errorists

软弱的弟兄 VS 错误坚持者

When we deliver warnings against false teaching, we distinguish weak brothers and sisters who have been victimized by false teachers from the persistent promoters of false doctrine: “‘In the last times there will be scoffers who will follow their own ungodly desires.’ These are the men who divide you, who follow mere natural instincts and do not have the Spirit. Be merciful to those who doubt; snatch others from the fire and save them; to others show mercy, mixed with fear—hating even the clothing stained by corrupted flesh” (Jude 18,19,22,23). Jesus reserved his harshest tone for the false teachers; he sympathized with their victims (Matthew 23). Paul spoke more harshly of the false teachers than of their victims in Galatia and Corinth. Nevertheless, if those who have been taken in by the false teachers continue

to support them even after they have been warned against them, we can no longer consider them to be weak brothers and sisters. We must recognize them as supporters of error and avoid them.

当我们向假教导发出警告时，我们需要把那些受假教师毒害的软弱的弟兄姐妹和那些假教导的坚定提倡者区别开来：“‘末世必有好讥诮的人，随从自己不敬虔的私欲而行。’这就是那些引人结党，属乎血气，没有圣灵的人……有些人存疑心，你们要怜悯他们。有些人你们要从火中抢出来搭救他们。有些人你们要存惧怕的心怜悯他们。连那被情欲沾染的衣服也当厌恶”（犹大书 18, 19, 22, 23）。耶稣将最严厉的话留给了那些假教师，却同情那些受害者（马太福音第 23 章）。同样，相对于加拉太和哥林多的受害者，保罗更为严厉地指责了那里的假教师。然而，那些人若是被警告之后，仍受假教师吸引并坚持支持他们，那我们就不再将他们视为软弱的弟兄姐妹。我们必须将他们视为错误支持者并避而远之。

We remember how patiently Jesus dealt with the weakness of his disciples as he instructed them. Our WELS theses on fellowship emphasize our responsibility to the weak: “Weakness of faith is in itself not a reason for terminating church fellowship, but rather an inducement for practicing it vigorously to help one another in overcoming our individual weaknesses. In precept and example, Scripture abounds with exhortations to pay our full debt of love toward the weak” (WELS Theses, B, 4, p. 168 of this book).

我们记得当耶稣引导他门徒的时候，他是何等耐心地对待他们的软弱。我们的 WELS 论点重视我们对于软弱者的责任：“信心的软弱本身并非终止教会团契关系的理由，反而是一种诱因，促使我们积极实践团契，在克服我们个人软弱的事上互相帮助。或以训诫，或以案例，圣经多处劝勉我们向软弱的人偿还爱的全债”（WELS 论点，B, 4, 本书第 135 页（定稿时页码需修改））。

We turn away from the adherents of false teaching only after they have rejected our admonition: “Warn a divisive person once, and then warn him a second time. After that, have nothing to do with him” (Titus 3:10). The same principle also applies when a fellow believer is persisting in a sin. “If your brother sins against you, go and show him his fault, just between the two of you. If he listens to you, you have won your brother over. But if he will not listen, take one or two others along, so that ‘every matter may be established by the testimony of two or three witnesses.’ If he refuses to listen to them, tell it to the church; and if he refuses to listen even to the church, treat him as you would a pagan or a tax collector” (Matthew 18:15-17).

只有当那些假教导的追随者弃绝我们的责备之后，我们才远避他们：“分门结党的人，警戒过一两次，就要弃绝他”（提多书 3:10）。而当弟兄姐妹坚持某一个罪的时候，这一原则同样适用。“倘若你的弟兄得罪你，你就去趁着只有他和你在一处的时候，指出他的错来。他若听你，你便得了你的弟兄。他若不听，你就另外带一两个人同去，要凭两三个人的口作见证，句句都可定准。若是不听他们，就告诉教会。若是不听教会，就看他像外邦人和税吏一样”（马太福音 18:15-17）。

On the basis of these passages, our WELS theses say, “Persistent adherence to false doctrine and practice calls for termination of church fellowship.” Persistent errorists are those “who in spite of patient admonition persistently adhere to an error in doctrine or practice, demand recognition for their error, and make propaganda for it” (WELS Theses, B, 5 and 5b, p. 169 of this book).

基于这些经文，我们的 WELS 论点如此说到，“对于假教导的持续追随与实践将导致其与教会团契关系的终结。”错误坚持者指的是那些经过耐心劝勉后

仍然坚持教义或实践错误、又要求他人认可其错误并宣扬其错误的人”（WELS 论点, B, 5, 5b, 本书第 137 页（定稿时页码需修改））。

Doctrinal discipline at the congregational level 教会层面上的教义管教

We exercise these principles on a congregational level when the voters assembly practices excommunication and termination of fellowship. We use the term excommunication for the removal of an individual who, in spite of brotherly admonition, refuses to repent of a sin, denies a doctrine that is essential to salvation, or knowingly rejects any teaching of Scripture (WELS Theses, B, 5a, p. 169 of this book). When the congregation excommunicates such a person, it has reached the conclusion that the person's manifest impenitence demonstrates that he or she is an unbeliever who has lost faith and forgiveness.

当投票者集会实行驱逐并终止团契关系的时候，我们就是在教会层面上实践这些原则。而驱逐一词说的是我们将那些——尽管经过弟兄劝勉后却仍拒绝悔改某一项罪、否认对于救恩的某项关键教义、故意拒绝圣经的任何一项教导的人——的教会中移除（WELS 论点, B, 5a, 本书第 136 页码（定稿时页码需修改））。当教会驱逐某人的时候，说明该教会已经得出结论，此人所显示出来的不悔改已经表明，他或她是一名已经丢失信心及赦免的非信徒。

We commonly use a term like termination of fellowship when a congregation must exclude a member because he or she clings to an error in doctrine or practice that does not destroy the foundation of saving faith, and the errorist, in spite of warning, remains convinced that his or her error is, in fact, the teaching of Scripture (WELS Theses B, 5b, p. 169,170 of this book). When the voters assembly excludes such a person from the congregation, it has not concluded that the person has lost saving faith, but that the individual is persistently holding to a false doctrine that makes it impossible to remain in fellowship with him. Such an error is a sin that places faith in jeopardy, but it may be a matter of ignorance and error that has not destroyed saving faith.

他或她紧紧追随某一错误教导或者坚持某一错误实践，但这些错误的教义和实践却尚未其信心的根基，并且尽管已受警告，这位犯错者，却仍坚信他或她的错误实际上正是圣经的教导，针对这类情况，当教会因此移除这名会友时，通常会使用例如“终止团契关系”这一术语（WELS 论点 B, 5b, 本书第 137 页（定稿时页码需修改））。当投票者集会从教会中移除这类人时，该教会并未得出结论认为此人已经失去信心，而是认为此人坚持某种假教导以至于无法和他继续团契关系。这样的错误所犯的罪是将信心置于险境，然而它也许是一种不足以摧毁其信心的无知与错误。

It is also the responsibility of the church council and voters assembly of the congregation to deal with their pastor and other called workers if they fall into error. The congregation must remove them from their office and from their membership in the congregation if they cling to false doctrine. The congregation may seek the advice and assistance of the district officials as they seek to carry out their duty in a scriptural way.

如果教会的牧师及其他受呼召的工人犯了错，教会理事会和投票者集会也有责任处理他们。如果他们坚持错误的教义，教会必须解除他们的职务以及会友资格。当会众寻求以属灵的方式履行他们的职责时，他们可以向该地区的“官方人员”征求意见及协助。

Doctrinal discipline at the district and synodical levels 地区及总会层面的教义管教

According to the system of church government that WELS, its districts, and its congregations have adopted, the responsibility for dealing with congregations and called workers rests with the district president and his assistants. The district president in consultation with his assistants has the authority to suspend from membership in the synod any called workers or congregations who are clinging to error. If the suspended party feels that it has been treated unjustly, it may appeal to the district and synod, following procedures outlined in the synod and district constitution and bylaws.

按照 WELS、其各地区以及其各教会所采纳的教会管理系统，处理教会及其受呼召工人的责任归于地区主席及其助理人员。地区主席与其助理人员协商之后，有权柄中止隶属于总会却坚持错误的任何受呼召工或任何教会的会友资格。如果被中止资格的一方觉得未受公平对待，那么它可以按照总会及地区章程细则中所罗列的步骤向地区及总会提出诉求。

Dealing with those who have been excluded from fellowship 如何对待那些团契中的被移除者

Even when efforts to preserve a fellowship have failed, we are still ready to make every effort to restore the broken fellowship with a lost brother or sister. “In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, we command you, brothers, to keep away from every brother who is idle and does not live according to the teaching you received from us. . . . Brothers, never tire of doing what is right. If anyone does not obey our instruction in this letter, take special note of him. Do not associate with him, in order that he may feel ashamed. Yet do not regard him as an enemy, but warn him as a brother” (2 Thessalonians 3:6,13-15). As the loving father in Jesus’ parable was eager to regain his lost, prodigal son (Luke 15:11-24), so we are eager to regain a lost brother. In fact, our separation from him is part of our attempt to regain him. We hope this drastic warning will bring him to his senses so that he returns to the family of faith.

即便保存团契关系的努力失败时，我们仍当乐意竭力修复与那位迷失的弟兄或姐妹之间破裂的团契关系。“弟兄们，我们奉主耶稣基督的名吩咐你们，凡有弟兄不按规矩而行，不遵守从我们所受的教训，就当远离他. . . . 弟兄们，你们行善不可丧志。若有人不听从我们这信上的话，要记下他，不和他交往，叫他自觉羞愧。但不要以他为仇人，要劝他如弟兄”（帖撒罗尼迦后书 3:6, 13-15）。正如耶稣的比喻中那位迫切重得他那迷失的浪子的慈父（路加福音 15:11-24），我们也迫切重得我们迷失的同伴。事实上，我们远离他，正是我们重得他的一部分尝试。我们盼望这种剧烈的警告可以让他回过神来，以至于他重新回到信徒之家。

The command to separate from members whom we have had to place under discipline does not require us to have no social or business contacts with them of the sort we could have with any person of the world. But both before and after their removal from the congregation, members of the church may have to withdraw from social contacts that could give the impression that they approve of the offender’s sin or dissent from the congregation’s action against it (1 Corinthians 5:9-12). In a given case we should ask, “How can we give a clear testimony against the offender’s impenitence? How can we sound a clear call to repentance?”

命令我们远避那些处于管教之下的成员，并不意味着要求我们从此就和他们不再有任何的社交或生意往来，正如我们对这世界上任何人那样。但是，在他们离开教会之前和之后，教会成员可能不得不退出与该会友的社交接触，因为这些社交接触可能会给人留下这样的印象：他们赞同犯罪者的罪行，或者他们并不同意会众反对犯罪者的行为（哥林多前书 5:9-12）。在某个已给定的情形下，我们应当如此问，“我们如何能给出一个明确的见证来反对犯罪者的不悔改呢？我们怎样才能发出清晰的、呼吁悔改的呼召呢？”

Working to extend fellowship

竭力拓展团契

We also work to create new ties of fellowship whenever we preach the gospel to Christians and non-Christians. “The life appeared; we have seen it and testify to it, and we proclaim to you the eternal life, which was with the Father and has appeared to us. We proclaim to you what we have seen and heard, so that you also may have fellowship with us. And our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son, Jesus Christ” (1 John 1:2,3).

无论何时，当我们向基督徒及非基督徒宣讲福音的时候，我们都是在竭力建立全新的团契关系。“（这生命已经显现出来，我们也看见过，现在又作见证，将原与父同在，且显现与我们那永远的生命，传给你们）。我们将所看见，所听见的，传给你们，使你们与我们相交。我们乃是与父并他儿子耶稣基督相交的”（约翰一书 1:2,3）。

Our spiritual fellowship with God and with all believers is a gift that God has given us. Our outward fellowship with other Christians is likewise a gift, but it is also a responsibility. We must work hard to expand and preserve it, so that we may continue to “work together for the truth” (3 John 8) with all of those who hold to the truth.

我们和上帝、和所有信徒之间的属灵团契是上帝赐予我们的一份礼物。同样，我们和其他基督徒之间的外在团契也是一份礼物，但它同时也是一份责任。我们必须竭力拓展并保存这团契，以至于我们可以持续和所有那些坚持真理的人“一同为真理作工”（约翰三书 8）。

PART II

第二部分

The History of
the Doctrine
of Church Fellowship

教会团契教义的历史

7

第 7 章

Fellowship in the Early Church
and the Church of the Reformation

早期教会和宗教改革时期教会的团契

In the early church
早期教会

In today's ecumenical climate it may seem that the WELS' fellowship and Communion practices are a strange innovation in the church since we are so out of step with the vast majority of the rest of Christendom. A survey of church history, however, reveals that the apostles' command to keep away from false teachers has directed the orthodox church's fellowship practices throughout all periods of its existence. The requirement of complete doctrinal unity as a basis for fellowship is

not a newfangled notion, invented by WELS or the Synodical Conference. This has always been the orthodox church's practice. It is the modern indifference to doctrinal unity that is the departure from the established practice of the church.

在当今普世合一的氛围之下，WELS 对于团契以及圣餐礼的实践看起来就像教会内的某种奇怪发明，因为我们与大部分基督教会是如此地格格不入。然而，对教会历史查考一番后，事实表明，贯穿正统教会所有时期，远避假教师这项使徒命令一直指引着它的团契实践。对于教义完全合一的要求作为团契的基础并非一项由 WELS 或总会联合会发明出来的新概念。这向来就是正统教会的实践。相反，正是由于现代人对于教义合一的漠视才导致教会的这一稳固实践遭到了背弃。

Werner Elert's book *Eucharist and Church Fellowship in the First Four Centuries*³ describes the practice that the early church learned from the apostles. He writes,

维尔纳·埃勒特所著《早期四个世纪的圣餐和教会团契》³ 一书描绘了早期教会从使徒那里领受的教义实践。他写到，

The early church was never in doubt that unity in doctrine is a prerequisite of altar fellowship. No one who taught false doctrine might receive Holy Communion in an orthodox congregation (p. 109).

早期教会从未怀疑教义的合一是祭坛团契的先决条件。没有一个教导假教义的人可以在一间正统教会里领受圣餐（第 109 页）。

There is no period in the early church when the question of the conditions and boundaries of church fellowship was not acute (p. 141).

在早期教会，没有一个时期实践教会团契的条件和界限问题不是尖锐的（第 141 页）。

But did this apply only to the leaders and teachers and not to the laity? We read, 然而，这难道仅限于领袖和教师，而不适用于平信徒吗？我们读到，

Never did the relations between two churches and their bishops provide for permitting the laity to receive the Sacrament while denying the clergy the privilege of officiating in it because church fellowship was somehow incomplete or because the congregations or their bishops were of different confessions or only in partial confessional agreement. There was either complete fellowship or none at all (p. 164).

当由于教会团契在某种程度上是不完整的、或是由于会众或他们的主教认信不同、或他们只是部分认信一致而拒绝神职人员主持圣礼时，他们也并不会因为两所教会和他们的主教之间的关系而提供给那些平信徒领受圣礼的通行证。即，要么是完全的团契，要么就没有团契（第 164 页）。

The modern theory that anybody may be admitted "as a guest" to the Sacrament in a church of a differing confession is unknown in the early church, indeed unthinkable (p. 175).

任何来自不同认信背景的教会都可以被接受为圣礼“宾客”的现代理论，在早期教会闻所未闻，事实上无法想象（第 175 页）。

It appears that our practice of "closed Communion" has a long history. It is the practice to which the inspired apostolic writings have led us. It was also the practice of the early church.

看来我们“紧密圣餐”这一实践有着悠久的历史。这是受默示的使徒所著引导我们的实践。这也是早期教会的实践。

The church of the Reformation 宗教改革时期的教会

Luther took a strong stand against fellowship without complete agreement in all of the doctrines of Scripture. This conviction is expressed especially strongly in his comments on “A little yeast works through the whole batch of dough” (Galatians 5:9). This discussion is found in Luther’s Commentary on Galatians. A few brief quotations are sufficient to represent his view:

路德强烈反对在没有完全认同圣经所有教义情况下的团契。在对“一点面酵能使全团都发起来”（加拉太书 5:9）的圣经注释中他特别强调他对此深信不疑。我们可以在路德对于加拉太书的注释中看到这一论点。对其略微引用就足以呈现他的看法：

We are surely prepared to observe peace and love with all men, provided that they leave the doctrine of faith perfect and sound for us. If we cannot obtain this, it is useless for them to demand love from us. A curse on a love that is observed at the expense of the doctrine of faith! . . . When one [doctrine] is lost all are eventually lost, because they belong together and are held together by a common bond.⁴

我们诚然预备好了与众人和平相爱，前提是他们将那关乎信心的教义完好无损地留给我们。如果我们互相无法达成这点，那么他们从我们这里要求爱心就是徒劳的。以关乎信心的教义为代价而显出的爱心当受咒诅！……当其中一项（教义）丢失的时候，最终所有都将丢失，因为它们属于彼此，同系一条纽带。⁴

With the utmost rigor we demand that all the articles of Christian doctrine, both large and small—although we do not regard any of them as small—be kept pure and certain. This is supremely necessary. For this doctrine is our only light, which illumines and directs us and shows the way to heaven; if it is overthrown in one point, it must be overthrown completely. And when that happens, our love will not be of any use to us. We can be saved without love and concord with the Sacramentarians, but not without pure doctrine and faith. Otherwise we shall be happy to observe love and concord toward those who faithfully agree with us on all the articles of Christian doctrine. In fact, so far as we are concerned, we shall have peace with our enemies; and we shall pray for those who slander our doctrine and persecute us out of ignorance, but not with those who knowingly offend against one or more articles of Christian doctrine and against their conscience.⁵

以最严谨的态度，我们强烈要求基督教教义的所有条款，无论大小——尽管我们没有将其中任意一项视为渺小——都维持其纯正与确定。这尤为必要。因为这教义是我们唯一的光，它照亮、指引又显出那条通往天堂的路；如果它在一点上被颠覆，那么它必将全然被颠覆。此事果若发生，那么我们的爱心将对我们毫无用处。我们可以在对圣餐象征论者没有爱心又不和睦的情况下得救，而在没有纯正教义和信心的情况下，却并非如此。若非如此，我们就会乐意向那些忠心认同我们所有基督教教义的人显示爱心并和睦相处。事实上，就我们而言，我们当与我们的仇敌和平相处；我们当为那些诽谤我们教义、出于无知而迫害我们的人祷告，但向那些故意违背基督教教义中一项或多项条款、违背自己良心的人，我们却不要如此行。⁵

From these statements it is clear that Luther believed that agreement in all doctrine is necessary for church fellowship. He also believed in what we would call “closed Communion.”

从上述这些陈述中，我们清楚看到，路德相信对于所有教义的认同对于实行教会团契是必须的。他同样也相信我们所说的“紧密圣餐”。

Although also the Gospel holds Christians together, the Lord’s Supper does so still more. By attending it every Christian confesses publicly and for himself what he believes. There those who have a different faith part ways, and those meet who have the same faith, whose hope and heart toward the Lord are one. This is also the reason why the Sacrament has been called *communio* in Latin, a communion. And those who do not want to be of the same faith, doctrine, and life, as other Christians are, are called *excommunicatis*, people who are dissimilar in doctrine, words, understanding and life. Therefore these should not be tolerated in the group that has the same understanding; they would divide it and split it up.⁶

尽管福音将基督徒紧系一处，圣餐却又做了更多。通过参与圣餐，每个基督徒都既是公开又是对自己承认了自己的信仰。那些信仰不同的就会分道扬镳，信仰相同的人就会相遇，他们对主的盼望和心都是一样的。这就是为何在拉丁语中这一圣礼被称为 *communio*，即相通之礼。而那些就像其他基督徒那样不想在信心、教义、生命上同一的人，被称为 *excommunicatis*，即在教义、言语、认识和生命上都不同一的人。因此，这些人不应当在那认识一致的团体中被容忍；他们终将撕裂、分散这一团体。⁶

The orthodox teachers who followed Luther held similar views.
跟随路德的正统教师看法相似。

Friedrich Balduin (1575–1627), professor at Wittenberg, wrote,
威登堡大学教授弗里德里希·巴尔杜因（1575 - 1627）如此写到，

We should not confirm errorists in their error, which we do if we take part in their service. For in this way we give them the hope that finally we will come to agreement with them also in the remaining points. They will look upon our participation in their services as a sign that we thereby confess that we have separated from them without cause, since we in action approve of their worship.⁷

我们不应当认可犯错者们的错误，如果我们参与了他们的服侍，这就是一种默认。因为这样我们就给了他们如下希望，即最后我们也将在此问题上和他们达成一致。他们会把我们参加他们的服侍看作一种信号，一种——承认是我们无缘无故地与他们分开了，因为我们在行动上赞同了他们的敬拜——的信号。⁷

Johannes Quenstedt, one of the leading Lutheran theologians of the 17th century, said,

约翰内斯·昆斯泰特，17世纪路德宗重要的神学家之一，如此说到，

An orthodox man should either abstain entirely from the sacred rites of unbelievers and heretics (especially the papists) or if he at one time or another wishes to attend or is required by official duties to attend, let him be careful not to give the appearance of secretly agreeing with them . . . but rather let him in some way, either by words or signs, make clear his disagreement.⁸

一名正统（基督徒）应当要么完全放弃非信徒和异教徒（尤其是教皇党）的“神圣”仪式，要么如果他偶尔会希望参加或因官方职责被要求参加这些仪式的话，这人就要谨慎！不要给人造成一种他私下认同他们的印象。反而，无论是用语言还是用手势，他都应当表明他的不同意见。⁸

The records of the theological faculty at Wittenberg are filled with discussions and opinions that the faculty prepared to assist individuals and congregations with difficult questions concerning church fellowship. Their detailed discussions of such matters as Communion practices, funerals, and the use of non-Lutheran musicians reveal that the orthodox Lutheran church was always very conscientious about a careful application of the principles of church fellowship.

关于威登堡大学神学院准备帮助个体和教会解决有关教会团契的难题，学院的记录中充满了对此各样的讨论和意见。他们对圣餐礼、葬礼和非路德宗音乐家的使用等问题进行了详细讨论，这些讨论表明，正统的路德宗教会一直非常认真地对待关于教会团契原则的谨慎应用。

During doctrinal talks between Lutheran, Reformed, and Catholic theologians held at Thorn, Poland, in 1645, each group held its own separate services before the sessions. Although the Reformed delegation was willing to join with the Catholics in opening and closing prayers since there was nothing offensive about the content of the prayers, the Lutheran delegation led by Johannes Huelsemann and Abraham Calov refused to participate in these joint prayers.⁹

1645年，路德宗、改革宗和天主教神学家在波兰索恩举行教义会谈时，每个团体在会议前都举行了自己的单独敬拜。虽然改革宗代表团愿意与天主教徒一起开始与结束祷告，因为祷告的内容并没有什么冒犯性，但由约翰内斯·休尔斯曼和亚伯拉罕·卡洛夫领导的路德宗代表团拒绝参加这些联合祷告。⁹

The two principles that agreement in all doctrine is necessary for any fellowship and that the main purpose for refraining from fellowship with false teachers is to avoid giving support to error are not new in the church. They have always been maintained by the orthodox church.

在所有教义上一致是实行任何团契的必要条件，不与假教师实践团契的主要目的是避免支持错误，这两条原则在教会中并不新鲜。此二原则一直由正统教会维持。

第 8 章

The Split between
the Wisconsin and Missouri Synods

威斯康辛总会与密苏里总会之间的分裂

In every age the church has faced challenges to specific doctrines. The early church was challenged by attacks against the doctrines of the Trinity and Christ's deity. At the time of the Reformation, Rome's salvation by works and its hierarchical system of church government were the key issues. Today the battle to uphold the inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture is probably the most crucial issue. But the doctrinal controversy that has probably had the greatest emotional impact on the Wisconsin Synod in the 20th century was the long struggle with the Missouri Synod concerning the doctrine of church fellowship.

每个时代教会都会面临那些对于特定教义的挑战。早期教会受到的是关于三位一体以及基督神性教义的挑战。宗教改革时期，罗马教廷因行为称义的教义以及教会管理的等级制度是那时的关键问题。而现如今，坚持圣经由神默示而无误的教义很可能是最为严峻的问题。然而，20 世纪对威斯康辛总会影响最大的教义争议很可能是与密苏里总会之间关于教会团契教义的长期斗争。

Although this book on church fellowship is not intended to be just a history book, we must take a close look at this long battle, since it was the most decisive event in the doctrinal development of our synod, and the issues at the center of this debate are still among the most critical issues confronting confessional Lutheranism today.

尽管这本关于教会团契的书并非只是要写成一本历史书，我们却必须要仔细地来看看这场长期斗争，因为这是我们总会教义发展过程中最为重要的事件，并且，这场争论的核心仍然是今天认信路德宗面临的最关键问题之一。

WELS and the LCMS in fellowship
团契中的 WELS 及 LCMS

For nearly a century, from 1868 until 1961, the Wisconsin Synod and the Missouri Synod were in church fellowship. In addition to enjoying altar and pulpit fellowship, they worked together in educational, charitable, and mission projects. Agreement in the doctrine of church fellowship was a key factor in bringing the two synods together. Disagreement in the doctrine of fellowship was the key factor in breaking them apart.

从 1868 年到 1961 年，在这将近一个世纪的时间内，威斯康辛总会和密苏里总会都处于教会团契之中。除了共享祭坛与讲台团契之后，他们在教育、善工、宣教项目上也都一同作工。对于教会团契教义的认同是将两个总会联结的关键因素，而对于团契教义的分歧则是致使他们分离的关键因素。

The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod was organized in Chicago in 1847. The name Missouri derived from the “home base” of the synod’s founders, a group of Saxon immigrants who had settled in and around St. Louis, Missouri, after fleeing from Germany in order to escape government pressure to compromise their Lutheran convictions.

路德宗教会——密苏里总会，于 1847 成立于芝加哥。密苏里这个名字意思源自（总会奠基人的）“大本营”，他们是一群移民过来定居在密苏里圣路易斯区域的撒克逊人，而他们之所以移民过来是因为要逃避德国政府，该政府向他们施压意图使他们妥协他们的路德宗信仰。

The founder and first leader of the Missouri Synod was C. F. W. Walther, who quickly established himself as the leading spokesman for strong, confessional Lutheranism in America. His clear, firm doctrinal position strengthened confessional Lutheranism in America and, indeed, throughout the world.

密苏里总会的奠基人以及首位领袖是卡尔·费迪南德·威廉·华尔特，他很快就成了美国坚定认信路德宗的主要发言人。他清晰、稳固的教义立场坚固了美国、乃至全世界的认信路德宗。

The Wisconsin Synod was founded in 1850 by congregations in and around Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Under its first president, John Muehlhauser, the Wisconsin Synod represented a mild Lutheranism, committed to Scripture and the gospel, but with less emphasis on a strict Lutheran confession. Under the influence of German mission societies that did not regard the doctrinal differences between Lutherans and Reformed to be a hindrance to Communion fellowship, the Wisconsin Synod tolerated rather lax fellowship practices during its early days.

威斯康辛总会由威斯康辛密尔沃基附近的各教会建立于 1850 年。在第一任主席约翰·穆尔豪瑟的带领下，当时的威斯康辛总会代表了一批温和的路德宗，他们致力于圣经与福音，但却较少强调严格的路德宗信仰告白。在德国差会不把路德宗和改革宗之间的教义区别视为共通团契障碍的影响下，威斯康辛总会早年容忍了相当松懈的团契实践。

Such “union” mission societies in which Lutherans and Reformed worked together had been given impetus by the Prussian Union of 1817, when the king of Prussia had forced Lutherans and Reformed to join together in one church. The Wisconsin Synod’s ties with these societies were very offensive to the Buffalo and Missouri Synods, since many of their members had fled Germany to escape the Prussian Union. Very soon, however, when John Bading became president in 1860 and Adolph Hoenecke emerged as its theological leader, the Wisconsin Synod broke its ties with the unionistic mission societies and embraced a sound, confessional Lutheranism.

此类路德宗与改革宗协作的“联合”差会是由 1817 年成立的普鲁士联盟所推动的，当时普鲁士王强迫路德宗与改革宗并入同一教会。与这些差会有联系的威斯康辛对于水牛城和密苏里总会而言极具冒犯性，因为后者的许多成员本来就是为了躲避普鲁士联盟才逃离了德国。然而，不久之后，约翰·巴丁便于 1860 年担任了当时的总会主席，同时，阿道夫·霍内克则作为神学领袖崭露头角。这时威斯康辛总会便和那些联合差会斩断了联系，拥抱坚实的认信路德宗神学。

Formation of the Synodical Conference 总会联合会的成立

The Missouri Synod did not recognize the Wisconsin Synod as an orthodox synod with whom they could join in fellowship until 1868, after the Wisconsin Synod had developed a sound doctrinal position and practice concerning church fellowship. Once fellowship had been established, the two synods played key roles in founding the Synodical Conference of North America in 1872.

直到 1868 年，在威斯康辛总会形成坚实的教义立场并实践教会团契之后，密苏里总会才开始承认威斯康辛的正统总会身份，并加入到团契之中。团契建立之后，两个总会便开始在 1872 年的北美总会联合会上扮演关键角色。

Throughout the history of the Synodical Conference, both the Wisconsin Synod and the Missouri Synod taught that agreement in all doctrines was necessary for church fellowship. Their shared belief is expressed in Thesis 7 of Walther's "Theses on Open Questions," on the basis of which the Wisconsin Synod and Missouri Synod established fellowship in 1868. It reads,

贯穿整个总会联合会的历史，威斯康辛总会与密苏里总会二者始终教导所有教义的认同对于教会团契是必须的。威斯康辛总会与密苏里总会的共同信仰内容写在华尔特的“关于开放性问题的论点”中，基于这一点，两者于 1868 年建立了团契。文中写到，

No man has the privilege, and to no man may the privilege be granted, to believe and to teach otherwise than God has revealed in his Word, no matter whether it pertains to primary or secondary fundamental articles of faith, to fundamental or nonfundamental doctrines, to matters of faith or of practice, to historical items or other matters subject to the light of reason, to important or seemingly unimportant matters.¹⁰

没有人有特权，也没有人被授予特权，去相信和教导上帝在他的话语中所并未启示之事，无论它是关乎主要的还是次要的信仰条款，基要的还是非基本的教义，信心问题还是实践问题，历史问题还是其它受制于理性之光的问题，重要的还是看似不重要的问题。¹⁰

This position was opposed by the Lutheran church bodies that eventually formed the Lutheran Church in America (LCA) and the American Lutheran Church (ALC). These two churches are now merged into the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA). These churches maintained that agreement in all doctrines is not needed as a basis for the practice of church fellowship. This was also the position of the so-called "moderates" (that is, liberals) who left the Missouri Synod in 1976 to form the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches (AELC), which also is now merged into ELCA. The ELCA maintains that unity of doctrine is not necessary for church fellowship, and it is seeking close ecumenical relationships with other Protestant churches and even with the Roman Catholic Church. It is considering practicing intercommunion with these churches in 1997.

这一立场被一些路德宗教会共同体否认，以至于最终催生了路德宗美国教会（LCA）和美国路德宗教会（ALC）。如今这两间教会已然合并为美国福音路德教会（ELCA）。这些教会仍坚称教会团契的实践并不需要以认同所有的教义为基础。这也是那些于 1976 年离开密苏里总会成立福音路德会联盟（AELC）的所谓“温和派”（即，自由派）的立场。ELCA 坚称教会团契并

不需要教义的合一，而现在它正积极寻求与其它新教教会的普世联合，甚至包括与罗马天主教。1997年，该组织正在考虑与那些教会共领圣餐。

During the early history of the Synodical Conference, the Missouri Synod and the Wisconsin Synod also agreed that unity of doctrine was a prerequisite for all forms of church fellowship, including joint prayer.¹¹ They put this common conviction into practice at the free conferences held during the early 1900s to discuss doctrine with the Ohio and Iowa Synods, which were not in fellowship with the Synodical Conference. At these meetings the Synodical Conference participants, including representatives of the Missouri Synod, objected to joint prayer. Their position is spelled out in Gerhard Friedrich Bente's essay "Why Can't We Establish and Maintain Common Prayer Services with Iowa and Ohio?"¹² The Missouri Synod's abandonment of this position during the 1930s and 1940s was a significant factor in the disagreement that led to the dissolution of the Synodical Conference.

总会联合会的早期，密苏里总会和威斯康辛总会也都认同教义的合一是所有教会团契形式的前提条件，其中包括联合祷告。¹¹ 他们把这一共同信仰付诸实践，在 20 世纪初举行的自由联合会议上与俄亥俄州和爱荷华州总会讨论教义，这两个总会与总会联合会并没有团契。在这些会议中，包括密苏里总会的代表团在内，总会联合会的参与者们反对联合祷告。他们的立场在格哈德·弗里德里希·本特的短文“为何我们不可与俄亥俄州和爱荷华州总会建立并维持共同祷告敬拜？”¹² 密苏里总会在 20 世纪 30 及 40 年代放弃了该立场，这是导致总会联合会解散的重要原因。

Missouri begins to change fellowship doctrine and practice

密苏里开始改变团契教义及实践

A growing difference in the doctrine of church fellowship became apparent already in the 1930s, when the Missouri Synod entered fellowship discussions with the old American Lutheran Church. By 1938 the ALC was ready to declare full fellowship with Missouri in spite of remaining differences in "non-fundamental doctrines," since the ALC was convinced that "it is neither necessary nor possible to agree in all non-fundamental doctrines."¹³ In the same year, the Missouri Synod declared that they sought full doctrinal agreement with the ALC and that more time and effort were needed before fellowship could be established, but they did so in a way that minimized the seriousness of the doctrinal differences that remained between the ALC and Missouri.¹⁴

早在 20 世纪 30 年代，当密苏里总会开始和前美国路德宗教会讨论团契问题的时候，关于教会团契教义意见上的分歧就已初露端倪了。到了 1938 年，虽然 ALC 和密苏里之间在“非基要教义”上仍有不同，但 ALC 准备宣告和密苏里之间的完全团契，因为 ALC 深信“既没有必要也没有可能在所有非基要教义上彼此认同”。¹³ 同年，密苏里总会宣布他们正寻求与 ALC 之间在教义上的完全认同，并且他们声称在团契得以建立之前，他们需要更多的时间与努力，然而他们是以一种弱化 ALC 和密苏里之间教义差异严重性的方式在“努力”。¹⁴

In 1939 the Wisconsin Synod warned that genuine doctrinal agreement between the ALC and Missouri could not be achieved unless both churches adopted a single doctrinal statement that set forth the true doctrines and that rejected in clear, unmistakable terms all of the errors that had created a division between the two

churches. WELS urged the LCMS to suspend fellowship discussions with the ALC since there was no genuine agreement between the Missouri Synod and the ALC.¹⁵ Nevertheless, the Missouri Synod continued to seek agreement with the ALC.

1939年，威斯康辛总会发出警告说，除非ALC与密苏里总会都采用统一的教义声明，将正确的教义阐明，并以明确无误的方式拒绝所有已经导致两个教会分裂的错误，否则两者之间不可能达成真正的教义认同。WELS敦促LCMS暂停与ALC之间关于团契问题的讨论，因为密苏里总会和ALC之间并没有真正的彼此认同。¹⁵然而，密苏里教总会仍执意寻求与ALC之间达成彼此认同。

The issue of prayer fellowship 在祷告中团契的问题

As these negotiations continued, the disagreement between WELS and the LCMS began to focus on prayer fellowship. As stated above, during the early decades of this century the two synods had agreed that there should be no joint prayers with leaders of churches with whom we were not in fellowship. The first stirrings of change occurred already in the mid-1920s.

当这些讨论正如火如荼推进之时，WELS与LCMS之间的分歧逐渐开始聚焦在了“在祷告中团契”这一议题之上。如上所述，20世纪初的几十年里，两个总会一致认为不应当和那些与我们没有团契的教会领袖联合祷告。而转变的第一波浪潮早在20世纪20年代中期就已出现。

An LCMS missionary in India, Adolph Brux, had written a lengthy essay defending his practice of prayer fellowship with missionaries in India who were not in fellowship with the Missouri Synod. Brux claimed that such Bible passages as Romans 16:17,18 did not apply to fellowship between Christians and that prayer fellowship may be practiced with all Christians. His fellow missionaries in India did not agree with his position, and his case was brought before the mission board. Brux was suspended from his call, but the dispute dragged on for many years. In the mid-1930s two Missouri Synod conventions sought to resolve the controversy by allowing Brux to be restored to his position if he withdrew charges of false doctrine against the Missouri Synod. These ambiguous settlement attempts failed because Brux maintained that he had not retracted his views, which were clearly contrary to the previous practice of the Missouri Synod. Brux ultimately resigned from the Missouri Synod. The irony was that within a few years Brux's position was accepted by the LCMS and two leading LCMS theologians who had played a role in the rejection of Brux's position became leaders of the LCMS' shift toward the Brux position.

那时，在印度的一名LCMS名叫阿道夫·布鲁克斯的宣教士已写过一篇长文，为他在印度那些不属于密苏里总会的宣教士一起祷告的做法辩护。布鲁克斯宣称诸如罗马书16:17,18这样的经文并不适用于基督徒之间的团契，并且在祷告中的团契可以在所有基督徒中间实践。他在印度的宣教士伙伴并不认同他的立场，随即他的案例便被递交给了宣教部。布鲁克斯的呼召被中止，然而争论却在之后的许多年内持续拉扯。到了20世纪30年代中期，密苏里总会召开了两次会议，试图通过让布鲁克斯复职来解决这一争论，前提是他撤回对密苏里总会教导假教义的指控。这些模棱两可的和解尝试以失败告终，因为布鲁克斯拒不撤回他的观点，然而，显然他的观点与密苏里总会以前的实践截然相反。布鲁克斯最终辞去了密苏里总会的职务。但具有讽刺意味的是，若干年

后，布鲁克斯的立场终于被 LCMS 接受了，而两名曾在拒绝布鲁克斯立场时发挥作用的重要神学家，成了使 LCMS 风向转至布鲁克斯立场的领军人物。

The erosion of Missouri's position on prayer fellowship became more public after WELS objected to joint prayer between representatives of the LCMS and the ALC during their fellowship negotiations. At first the LCMS reaffirmed its position opposing joint prayer without doctrinal agreement. In 1940 the Missouri Synod declared, "Ordinarily, prayer fellowship involves church fellowship." The ALC responded, "We are convinced that prayer fellowship is wider than church fellowship, but we do not consider this difference as church-divisive."¹⁶

密苏里关于在祷告中团契的立场逐渐败坏，而在 LCMS 和 ALC 的代表在商议团契问题期间进行联合祷告遭到 WELS 的反对之后，这种败坏便逐渐公开显露。起初，LCMS 重申了其反对在没有教义合一情况下联合祷告的立场。1940 年，密苏里总会宣布：“通常情况下，在祷告中团契都会涉及教会团契。” ALC 则回应说：“我们确信在祷告中团契比教会团契更为广泛，但我们不认为这种差异会导致教会分裂。”¹⁶

The 1941 and 1944 conventions of the Missouri Synod declared that no altar, pulpit, or prayer fellowship had been declared with the ALC and that none should be practiced by individuals or congregations of the synod, but the 1944 Missouri Synod convention undermined this resolution when it also resolved that joint prayer at intersynodical conferences does not violate the earlier resolution against joint prayer, provided that such prayer does not imply denial of truth or support of error.¹⁷

1941 年与 1944 年密苏里总会会议宣布，他们与 ALC 之间并未声明任何祭坛、讲坛或是在祷告中的团契，并且总会内的任何个体与教会都不应当与 ALC 实践这些团契。然而，1944 年的密苏里总会却削弱了这一决议，该会议作出决议声称若某种祷告并未意欲否认真理或支持错误，那么在联合总会会议上的联合祷告并不违反早先反对联合祷告的决议¹⁷。

Although the resolution tried to limit the circumstances in which such prayer was allowed, the Missouri Synod had in effect adopted the ALC's position on prayer fellowship by its distinction between "prayer fellowship" and "joint prayer." This was a crucial turning point. Brux's position, which the LCMS had rejected only ten years before, was now the position of the LCMS. Although this resolution was intended to have a limited effect, it was an omen of things to come, and it paved the way for a wholesale erosion of Missouri's fellowship practices.

尽管该决议试图限制允许这类祷告的情况，但密苏里总会实际上通过对于“在祷告中团契”与“联合祷告”作出区分而采纳了 ALC 关于在祷告中团契的立场。这是一个关键转折点。十年前还被 LCMS 拒绝的布鲁克斯的立场，现在却成了 LCMS 的立场。虽然这项决议的目的是带来抑制的果效，但它却是那要来之事的预兆，同时也为密苏里团契实践大规模的败坏铺平了道路。

“A Statement” of the 44 44 位人士的“声明”

“A Statement,” a protest document signed by 44 prominent Missourians in 1945, was an endorsement of the Brux-ALC fellowship principles and gave additional evidence of the change underway in Missouri. It insisted that “fellowship is possible without complete agreement in details of doctrine and practice.”¹⁸ William Arndt and Theodore Graebner, prominent LCMS theologians who had a role in the condemnation of Brux, were among the signers of “A Statement.”

“声明”是一份 1945 年由 44 位显赫的密苏里成员签署的抗议文件，其内容对布鲁克斯-ALC 那些团契原则声表支持，同时它也是密苏里那时正发生改变的额外证据。其内容坚称“在没有对教义和实践的细节完全认可的情况下团契是可能的”。¹⁸ 威廉·阿恩特和西奥多·格雷伯纳，这两位 LCMS 赫赫有名的神学家曾在谴责布鲁克斯的时候发挥了作用，而他们这时却成了“声明”的签署人之一。

Especially ominous was the failure of the LCMS to discipline the signers despite the conviction of LCMS president John Behnken that the statement contained false doctrine. The signers of the statement were permitted to withdraw it from discussion without retracting it. The precedent set by this failure to exercise doctrinal discipline would have detrimental effects in the LCMS in subsequent years.

尽管 LCMS 主席约翰·班肯认定该声明包含假教义，LCMS 却未能管教那些签署人。那份声明的签署人被允许在不再讨论该问题的前提下不需要收回声明。这种未能实施教义管教的先例，将在随后几年里对 LCMS 产生不利影响。

For several years the Missouri Synod wavered between the two views. In 1947 the synod declared it was not ready to enter fellowship with the ALC unless there was doctrinal agreement on the basis of a single clear document. It also issued some rather strong statements against prayer fellowship in situations in which doctrinal agreement had not yet been established. In spite of these declarations, however, worship services and joint church work with groups with whom the Missouri Synod was not in doctrinal agreement were becoming more and more common, and the participants remained undisciplined. Theodore Graebner, a prominent LCMS professor, produced a booklet advocating the position on prayer fellowship formerly advocated by Brux.¹⁹ These mixed signals being sent out from the Missouri Synod made it difficult to determine their true position.

接下去几年内，密苏里总会于这两种观点间摇摆不定。1947 年，总会宣布尚未准备好与 ALC 进入团契关系，除非彼此间有基于一份清晰文件的教义认同。它还发布了一些相当强烈的声明，反对在教义尚未达成一致的情况下在祷告中团契。尽管有这些声明，然而和那些并未在教义上与密苏里总会彼此认同的团体之间共同敬拜并开展教会事工这类情况，变得越发普遍，与此同时，其参与者仍然未受管教。著名的 LCMS 教授西奥多·格雷伯纳，出版了一本小册子，倡导布鲁克斯以前提倡的关于祷告中团契的立场¹⁹。这些从密苏里总会发出的混乱信号使得人们很难确定他们的真实立场究竟为何。

Continuing discussions between Missouri and the ALC

密苏里与 ALC 之间的持续探讨

In 1944 the LCMS and the ALC had produced a joint “Doctrinal Affirmation” designed to be the one document that resolved the remaining doctrinal differences between Missouri and the ALC, but it was unsatisfactory. It was replaced by “The Common Confession” (1949– 1952), but this document too proved unsatisfactory, since it did not specifically deal with the disputed points. Although this document stated that “a full and common obedience to the Holy Scriptures is an indispensable requisite for church fellowship,” it did not show that such agreement really existed between Missouri and the ALC. There was no specific mention of prayer fellowship, and the document stressed that cooperation in proclaiming the gospel “should not be confused or identified with cooperation in externals.”²⁰

1944 年 LCMS 与 ALC 之间共同制定了一份“教义宣言”，旨在解决密苏里和 ALC 之间剩余的教义分歧，但其结果并未让彼此满意。随后它又被“共同认信”（1949-1952 年）取代，然而这份文件也未让人满意，因为它并未对有争议的要点进行针对性处理。虽然这份文件声称“对于圣经完全又共同的顺服是教会团契的必要前提”，但是它却没有表明在密苏里和 ALC 实践确实存在这样的认同。这份文件没有特别提及在祷告中团契，也没有强调宣讲福音时的彼此合作“不应当给人造成困惑或者等同于外在的合作”。²⁰

The 1950 LCMS convention approved a version of “The Common Confession” but took a strong stand against the newer, more lax position on prayer fellowship. It, however, refused to discipline the adherents of this position.

1950 年，LCMS 会议批准了一版“共同认信”，但又强烈反对那花样翻新又更为宽松的关于在祷告中团契的立场。然而，它拒绝管教那些追随以上那种宽松立场的人。

Further fellowship issues between WELS and the LCMS

WELS 与 LCMS 之间更多的问题

By the 1950s WELS had become concerned about other practices of the LCMS that raised doubts about its fellowship principles. The two synods disagreed about the propriety of participating in the government’s military chaplaincy. Missouri Synod pastors served in such positions. Since WELS believed this system entangled the chaplains in compromising fellowship positions, it served its members in the military by sending its own civilian chaplains.

到了 20 世纪 50 年代，WELS 开始担忧 LCMS 的其它一些实践，这些实践让人对其团契原则产生了一些怀疑。对于派驻政府军队牧师是否恰当，两个总会存在意见上的分歧。密苏里总会牧师担任过这样的职务。由于 WELS 认为这种体系会让牧师陷入到妥协团契立场的麻烦之中，所以它就派遣自己的平民牧师去服侍军队中的会友。

In 1944 Missouri had abandoned its opposition to the Boy Scouts, permitting its congregations to sponsor troops. WELS objected to this change since the religious principles of the scouting movement undermine the truth of salvation by grace alone through Christ alone.

1944 年，密苏里已然舍弃了它在童子军问题上的立场，允许其各教会资助童子军中队。WELS 反对密苏里的这一转变，因为童子军运动的宗教原则危害那唯独藉着基督、唯独因着恩典的救恩真理。

“Cooperation in externals” was the loophole that permitted the Missouri Synod to work together with the National Lutheran Council in providing spiritual care for their members in the military and in joint welfare work. Throughout the 1950s many additional examples of loose fellowship practices in the Missouri Synod became apparent.²¹

密苏里用“外在的合作”这种说法钻了空子，和国家路德宗委员会合作，为他们在军队里的会友提供属灵看顾，又共同开展福利工作。贯穿整个 20 世纪 50 年代，密苏里总会松散的团契实践案例不断加增，也越发公开。²¹

Breakup of the Synodical Conference

总会联合会的分裂

The Evangelical Lutheran Synod (ELS), a smaller member synod of the Synodical Conference, declared a suspension of fellowship with Missouri in 1955. The Wisconsin Synod continued to protest what was happening in Missouri and tried to

reach a resolution of the growing differences through discussions of the Joint Union Committees. Throughout the 1950s there was an ongoing exchange of statements and counterstatements. In 1960 an impasse was declared after the LCMS issued the document “The Theology of Fellowship.” Brux regarded this document as a vindication of the position he had advocated three decades earlier. The long process of deterioration had reached its sad conclusion.

总会联合会当中的一名规模较小的成员——福音路德总会，于 1955 年宣布中止与密苏里之间的团契关系。威斯康辛总会则继续抗议在密苏里上演的事情，并试图通过联合联盟委员会的讨论来解决日益扩大的分歧。整个 50 年代，双方不断交换声明和反声明。1960 年，在 LCMS 发表了一份名为“团契神学”的文件后，情况便陷入了僵局。布鲁克斯认为这份文件证明了他 30 年前所主张的立场是正确的。漫长的恶化过程终于到了悲催的结局。

This was the impasse: The Wisconsin Synod position was that there is only complete fellowship or none at all; the same scriptural principles cover every manifestation of a common faith (see WELS Theses, B, pp. 167-170 of this book). The Missouri Synod position was that some expressions of fellowship, such as joint prayer, could be undertaken without full agreement in doctrine. The propriety of joint prayer must be based on a consideration of the situation in which such prayer is offered, the character of the prayer itself, its purpose, and its probable effect on those who unite in the prayer.”²² The Wisconsin Synod broke fellowship with Missouri in 1961, and the Synodical Conference was in effect dissolved in 1963 by the withdrawal of the ELS and the Wisconsin Synod.

僵局如下：威斯康辛总会的立场是要么完全的团契，要么没有任何团契；这一圣经原则涵盖的是一份共同信仰的所有展现内容（见 WELS 论点，B，本书第 134-138 页（定稿时页码需修改））。密苏里总会的立场是，团契的有些表达方式，比如联合祷告，可以在没有教义完全一致的情况下实行。联合祷告的正当性必须基于对这种祷告活动所在的情况、祷告本身的性质、其目的及其对那些在祷告中联合起来的人可能产生的影响而作出考量。²² 威斯康辛总会于 1961 年中止了和密苏里之间的团契，1963 年，由于 ELS 与威斯康辛总会的退出，总会联合会实际上也就解散了。

After the break with WELS, the Missouri Synod continued on its established course. In 1965 it approved membership in the ecumenical Lutheran Council in the USA (LCUSA). In 1967 the LCMS officially made the Brux position its own when it formally adopted a revised version of “The Theology of Fellowship.” In 1969 it declared fellowship with the enlarged ALC. Throughout the 1960s the historical-critical method of studying the Bible, which allows human reason to pass judgment on Scripture, was firmly entrenched in the LCMS seminary at St. Louis. These actions demonstrated that WELS had not been overly pessimistic in its judgment of the LCMS which led to the break in fellowship.

和 WELS 散伙后，密苏里总会继续贯彻它既定的方针。1965 年，它同意加入了美国普世路德宗委员会（LCUSA）的会友身份。1967 年，LCMS 正式采用了“团契神学”修订版，至此，它就在官方层面上纳入了布鲁克斯的立场。1969 年，它宣布了与扩大后的 ALC 之间的团契关系。整个 60 年代，允许人的理性对圣经说三道四的圣经研读法——历史法，最终占领了 LCMS 圣路易斯的神学院。这些举措都证明了 WELS 对于导致团契分裂的 LCMS 的裁决并非过于悲观。

This has been a rather long historical review, but its length should impress upon our minds the period from 1938 to 1961. In one respect this is a very long time. For

almost 25 years the Wisconsin Synod had struggled with the issue of the Missouri Synod's changing doctrine of church fellowship. This interval indicates that WELS had not been hasty in the judgment that led it to break fellowship with the LCMS.

这确实是一段相当长的历史回顾，但它的长度应当使我们记住从 1938 年到 1961 年的这段时期。一方面，这段时间很长。将近 25 年，威斯康辛总会一直与密苏里总会在教会团契教义改变的问题上作斗争。这一时间间隔表明，WELS 并未草率地做出决定来断绝它与 LCMS 之间的团契。

On the other hand, in the long view of church history, 25 years is not a very long time. It took less than a generation for the Missouri Synod to descend from its position as the strongest, clearest voice for confessional Lutheranism in the world to a middle-of-the-road position on fellowship that has created confusion and division in the ranks of confessional Lutheranism. This sad story illustrates the need to listen to the age-old warning "If you think you are standing firm, be careful that you don't fall" (1 Corinthians 10:12).

另一方面，从教会历史的长河来看，25 年并非很长。密苏里总会只花了一代人都不到的时间，就从世界上最坚定、最清晰的认信路德宗立场之声，跌落到了对团契问题上采取温和立场，并且，正是这种温和立场在认信路德宗的行列中造成了混乱与分裂。这一悲剧表明了我们实在需要听从那句古老的警告：“所以自己以为站得稳的，须要谨慎，免得跌倒”（哥林多前书 10：12）。

The divergence remains 分歧仍继续着

Events in the Missouri Synod during the last 30 years, such as the departure of the liberal professors from Concordia Seminary in 1974, the breaking of fellowship between the LCMS and the ALC in 1981, and the unwillingness of Missouri to join in the merger that created the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in 1988, have led some to ask whether the separation between the Missouri Synod and Wisconsin Synod can now be healed. Is the Missouri Synod returning to the position on church fellowship that once was the joint stand of all the synods of the Synodical Conference?

密苏里总会在过去 30 年里发生的一系列事件——如 1974 年协和神学院自由派教授的离职，1981 年 LCMS 和 ALC 之间团契的破裂，以及 1988 年密苏里不愿并入美国福音路德会——都让一些人好奇，密苏里总会和威斯康辛总会之间的分裂是否现在就可以愈合。密苏里总会是否又回到了从前的教会团契立场，即那个总会联合会的所有总会联合认同的立场呢？

To their credit, in discussions with the ALC and LCA, and now with ELCA, the spokesmen of the Missouri Synod have continued to defend the scriptural principle that agreement in all doctrines is necessary for the practice of church fellowship. During a series of LCUSA study conferences between 1972 and 1977 on the unity of the church, the ALC and LCA representatives maintained that Article VII of the Augsburg Confession requires only "unity in the Gospel" as a basis for unity in the church and that "Gospel" is here to be limited to the narrow sense, namely, the promise of the forgiveness of sins. The LCMS representatives correctly maintained that the required "unity in the Gospel" must be understood in the wide sense of all doctrines, as is clearly indicated by the context of Article VII of the Augsburg Confession, which contrasts doctrines with ceremonies, and by the explanation in the Formula of Concord, Solid Declaration, X: 31, which calls for agreement in "doctrine and all its articles."

可圈可点的是，在与 ALC、LCA 以及现在与 ELCA 的讨论中，密苏里总会的发言人已持续捍卫圣经原则，即在所有教义上达成一致是教会团契实践的必要条件。在 1972 年至 1977 年 LCUSA 关于教会合一的一系列研究会议中，ALC 和 LCA 的代表坚持认为，奥格斯堡信条第七条只要求“福音的合一”作为教会合一的基础，而“福音”在这里被限制在狭义上，即罪得赦免的应许。LCMS 的代表正确并坚持认为，其中所要求的“福音的合一”必须在所有教义的广义上被理解，正如奥格斯堡信条第七条的上下文所明确指出的那样，其中将教义与仪式进行了对比，又如协同式第十条 31 中的否定说明所阐明的，其中亦要求在“教义及其所有条款”上达成一致。

The report of a colloquium on “Unity in the Context of Theological Pluralism” provides another example of the approach to fellowship promoted by ELCA and its predecessor bodies. “We do not strive for Lutheran unity only by means of organizational union, although this may come in its own way, but primarily by means of pulpit and altar fellowship, including common witnessing and working. Thus we arrive at this Lutheran fellowship not only by doctrinal discussions and statements, but also by living in fellowship.”²³ According to this view, pulpit and altar fellowship are not a result of doctrinal unity, but a stepping stone toward a vague doctrinal consensus. The practice of fellowship without prior agreement in doctrine is seen as a tool for increasing fellowship ties even though attempts at reaching doctrinal unity have proven futile.

“神学多元化背景下的合一”座谈会报告展现了关于 ELCA 及其前身所倡导的团契模式的又一案例。“我们不只是通过组织上的联合来谋求路德宗的合一，尽管这种情况也可能以它自己的方式出现。我们主要还是通过讲坛和祭坛的团契、包括共同见证与做工来谋求合一。因此，我们不仅通过教义的讨论和声明，也通过活在团契中来实现路德宗的团契”。²³ 据此观点，讲坛和祭坛的团契并非教义一致所带来的结果，而是通往模糊教义共识的垫脚石。没有事先在教义上达成一致的团契实践被当做了增加团契关系的方法，即便当想要达成教义一致的尝试早已被证实为徒劳。

In 1978 the ALC demonstrated the widening gap between itself and Missouri on fellowship matters when it abandoned the long-standing rule “Lutheran altars for Lutherans only” in its new “Statement on Communion Practices.”²⁴ This document, also approved by the LCA, approved open Communion in Lutheran churches and participation by Lutherans at non-Lutheran Communion services, since all Christians are members of one universal church. The ELCA’s present movement toward intercommunion with Episcopalians, other Reformed, and even Roman Catholics are simply further steps in the same process.

1978 年，当 ALC 在其崭新的“关于圣餐实践的声明”²⁴ 中放弃其长久以来“路德宗祭坛只为路德宗预备”的立场时，它就表明了它与密苏里之间的鸿沟已经越来越深。这份同时亦由 LCA 认同的文件，赞成路德宗教会之间的公开圣餐礼以及路德宗参与非路德宗的圣餐礼，因为所有基督徒都是同一个普世教会的成员。当下 ELCA 正积极筹备与圣公会、其它改革宗、甚至罗马天主教之间的圣餐共领，这些也不过是同一进程的步步高升罢了。

The natural outcome of the approach to fellowship advocated by the ELCA is indicated by the “convergence” on the doctrine of justification that Lutheran and Catholic theologians adopted in 1983. The participants discovered enough “unity in the Gospel” between Lutherans and Catholics to recommend fellowship and at least limited sharing of the Lord’s Supper between these two.²⁵ The Lutheran and Catholic representatives agreed that we are saved by grace through faith, but this is

nothing new, since Catholics have always believed this. The problem is that Catholics refuse to accept the scriptural truth that we are saved by faith alone and not by works. The critical difference of doctrine that led to separation at the time of the Reformation still exists, but liberal Catholics and Lutherans are attempting to paper it over with ambiguous agreements.

1983年，路德宗和天主教神学家对于称义教义接受了“交集”，这“交集”正表明了ELCA所倡导的团契模式自然而然所引发的后果。接受这种“交集”的参与者在路德宗和天主教之间发现了足够的“福音合一性”，以至于推崇两者团契，以及两者之间在一定程度上的圣餐共领。²⁵路德宗和天主教的代表认同我们得救是藉着信心、因着恩典，然而这并非什么新鲜事儿，因为天主教一直都相信这些。问题在于天主教拒绝接受我们得救是唯独因信而非因行的圣经真理。宗教改革时期导致分裂的关键教义区别现在仍然存在，然而自由派天主教与路德宗正试图用模棱两可的协议来掩盖它。

To their credit, official Missouri representatives have attempted to disassociate themselves from the extremes of their LCUSA partners in fellowship matters. This testimony has apparently not been without effect, since LCUSA-ELCA Lutherans have occasionally expressed bitterness over Missouri's pointed refusal to practice full altar and pulpit fellowship with them.

可圈可点的是，密苏里的官方代表试图在团契问题上与LCUSA合作伙伴中的极端分子划清界限。这一见证显然不是徒劳的，因为LCUSA-ELCA路德宗偶尔会对密苏里明确拒绝与他们进行全面祭坛与讲坛团契的做法表示不满。

Missouri, however, has not made notable progress toward returning to the scriptural position of requiring agreement in all doctrines of Scripture as the prerequisite for all expressions of church fellowship. LCUSA ceased to exist when the ALC and LCA merged into ELCA in 1988, but the LCMS continues in a limited fellowship relationship with ELCA, which is similar to the relationship that existed under LCUSA. Theologians of the Missouri Synod still join in joint prayer and devotions with theologians of ELCA in spite of the major doctrinal differences that separate them.

然而，密苏里并未在回归圣经的立场（即，要求所有圣经教义的一致作为教会团契所有表达方式的先决条件）上取得显著的进展。1988年，ALC和LCA合并为ELCA后，LCUSA便停止存在，但LCMS仍与ELCA保持一定程度的团契，情况和LCUSA尚存时类似。尽管致使密苏里总会和ELCA分开的主要教义差异还在，他们的神学家仍会一起祷告与灵修。

In 1981 the Missouri Synod's Commission on Theology and Church Relations issued a document called "The Nature and Implications of the Concept of Fellowship." This document maintained that declarations of pulpit and altar fellowship between church bodies that are agreed in doctrine and practice is the proper way of establishing church fellowship. Three other approaches to church fellowship were rejected: (1) the "conciliar model" of church fellowship promoted by the World Council of Churches, in which local churches work toward organizational unity without fixed doctrinal standards for establishing unity; (2) the "reconciled diversity" advocated by the Lutheran World Federation, in which churches practice fellowship despite unresolved doctrinal differences; and (3) "selective fellowship," which has been suggested by many in the Missouri Synod, according to which each local congregation decides which congregations and individuals it wishes to practice fellowship with.

1981年，密苏里总会神学与教会关系委员会发表了一份名为“团契概念的本质与含义”的文件。这份文件仍然宣称教会共同体间基于教义与实践认同的讲坛和祭坛团契是建立教会团契的正确方式。教会团契的另外三种模式被予以拒绝：（1）普世教协所提倡的教会团契“大公模式”，在这种模式下，地方教会在没有用以建立合一的固定教义标准的情况下致力于组织上的合一；（2）路德宗世界联盟所提倡的“和解的多样性”，在这种模式下，教会之间尽管存在未解决的教义分歧，但仍可实践团契；（3）密苏里总会不少人所提议的“选择性团契”，据此建议，每个地方教会都可自行决定要和哪些教会以及个人建立团契。

Unfortunately, this stand is immediately weakened by this statement:
不幸的是，这一立场立刻被以下声明予以弱化：

Through the use of the word “fellowship” almost exclusively to refer to a formal altar and pulpit fellowship relationship established between two church bodies on the basis of agreement in the confession of the faith, some have been given the impression that no fellowship relationship other than the spiritual unity in the body of Christ can or should exist among members of Christian churches not in altar and pulpit fellowship. The fact that the LCMS is closer doctrinally to a church body which at least formally accepts the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions than to those denominations which do not is often obscured by the “all or nothing” approach that frequently accompanies ecclesiastical declarations of altar and pulpit fellowship.²⁶

通过使用“团契”这个词（它几乎专指两个教会共同体在信仰告白一致基础上所建立的、正式的祭坛和讲坛团契关系），这给有些人造成的印象是，除了在基督身体内的属灵合一之外，基督教会的成员之间不可能也不应该存在祭坛和讲坛团契。LCMS在教义上更接近于一个至少正式接受圣经和路德宗信仰告白的教会共同体，而非那些不接受圣经和路德宗信仰告白的宗派，这一事实常常被“全有或全无”的模式所掩盖，并且这种模式通常会伴随着教会的祭坛和讲坛团契宣告。²⁶

This statement is clearly intended to be a public rejection of WELS’ “unit concept” of church fellowship. This statement and the rest of the document advocate the position that although complete doctrinal agreement is needed for formal altar and pulpit fellowship, it is not necessary for other expressions of fellowship such as joint prayer. That this is indeed the intention of the statement is indicated by subsequent actions of the leadership of the Missouri Synod.

这一声明明显旨在公开拒绝 WELS 关于教会团契的“整体概念”。这一声明以及这份文件的剩余部分都倡导以下立场：尽管教义完全认同对于正式的祭坛和讲坛团契是必须的，然而对于团契的其它表达方式，诸如联合祷告，教义完全认同则不是必须的。这则声明的确意在于此，而这一点从密苏里总会领导班子随后的行动就可见一斑。

In response to the decision to form ELCA, President Ralph Bohmann of the LCMS delivered a message to the conventions of the AELC, the ALC, and the LCA. In it Bohmann repeated the Missouri Synod’s position that “fellowship and external unity in the church must be based on agreement in doctrine and all its articles, as well as the right use of the Holy Sacraments” and cited this conviction as the reason that the LCMS would not be entering the new church, nor would it enter official sharing of the Lord’s Supper with it.

为了回应成立 ELCA 的决定，LCMS 主席拉尔夫·博尔曼向 AELC、ALC 和 LCA 的大会传达了一条信息。在信中，博尔曼重申了密苏里总会的立场，

即“教会中的团契和外在一必须基于教义及其所有条款的一致，以及对于圣礼的正确使用”，并且他又引用这一坚定的看法作为 LCMS 不会进入那个新成立的教会、也不会与之正式共领圣餐的原因。

Nevertheless, Bohlmann went on to say, “We in the LC-MS congratulate you on your efforts to form a new church body, and we pray God’s blessing upon you as you carry out the arduous tasks associated with its formation. Whether you are structured in one church body or in several, we look forward to continuing fellowship and cooperation in inter-Lutheran agencies and in other civic and churchly activities and associations.”²⁷ It is hardly appropriate for confessional Lutherans to extend congratulations for the establishment of a new Lutheran church based on the elimination of scriptural inerrancy from its constitution.

然而，博尔曼继续说到，“我们 LCMS 为你们致力于成立新的教会共同体而感到高兴，在你们竭力使之成形的時候，我们也祈求上帝祝福你们。无论你们是在一个或几个教会共同体之中，我们都期待在路德宗共同机构以及其它公民和教会活动及协会内继续团契与合作。”²⁷ 认信路德宗向一间从其章程中消除圣经无误性的新路德宗教会表示祝贺，这绝非恰当。

The official Missouri Synod policy is no altar and pulpit fellowship without doctrinal agreement, but fellowship in “externals.” The LCMS tendency toward artificial distinctions, such as distinguishing between prayer fellowship and joint prayer appears to have gotten worse rather than better, as can be seen in the practice of distinguishing between worship services, which require full fellowship, and convocations or rallies, which do not, even if they include many elements of worship.

密苏里总会的官方政策表明在没有教义认同的情况下就没有祭坛以及讲坛团契，但这团契却只是“外在”的团契。LCMS 对一些问题作人为区分的倾向，例如对在祷告中团契和联合祷告作出区分，看来变得更糟了，而非更好，这也可以从——他们对于需要完全团契的敬拜仪式和不需要完全团契的会议或集会（即便它们包括许多敬拜元素）作了区分——这类实践中看出。

In 1983 the Missouri Synod’s Council of Presidents approved a set of guidelines on joint worship.²⁸ This document requires all members of the Missouri Synod to practice joint worship only with those with whom the LCMS has declared pulpit and altar fellowship. They may, however, participate in joint celebrations, concerts, convocations, rallies, and conferences if there is no sermon or sacrament and the clergy are not dressed in vestments. Among the valid reasons for such events are thanksgiving for the doctrinal heritage of Lutheranism, prayer for greater doctrinal unity, and encouragement of appropriate cooperative efforts in externals. Thanksgiving, prayer, and encouragement are certainly expressions of faith and fellowship. To make matters worse, the document appeals to synod positions and policies, rather than to Scripture. Thus, there is no official evidence that Missouri is ready to deal seriously with the differences on fellowship principles that continue to separate our synods.

1983 年，密苏里总会主席委员会批准了一系列关于联合敬拜的指导方针。²⁸ 这份文件要求密苏里总会的所有会友只可与那些 LCMS 与之宣告讲台与祭坛团契的人实践联合祷告。然而，如果一些庆典、音乐会、会议、集会以及大会中没有讲道或圣礼，并且其中的神职人员若是没有身穿礼服，会友就可以共同参与其中。可参与此类活动的合理借口还有：为路德宗教义产业感恩，为更大教义上的合一祷告，为恰当的外在合作而努力作劝勉。但是，感恩、祷告、劝勉实在都是信心和团契的表达方式。使得情况雪上加霜的是，这份文件居然诉

诸总会立场与政策，而非圣经。因此，我们没有看到任何官方证据表明密苏里已经准备好严肃对待那些导致我们这些总会分裂的团契原则差异。

This fellowship practice of the LCMS has been called levels of fellowship or degrees of fellowship since it does not require complete agreement in all doctrine for all expressions of fellowship, but requires only different levels or degrees of doctrinal agreement for different levels of fellowship activity. President Bohlmann expressed it this way: “Complete agreement on confessional doctrine is neither possible nor necessary for every inter-Christian and inter-denominational action. Expressions of Christian unity should be proportionate to the measure of consensus in confessing the Biblical Gospel we enjoy with the Christians involved. Although this point has seldom been articulated in official synodical documents, it has in fact been practiced by the Missouri Synod for many years.”²⁹ In a video designed to promote the “levels of fellowship” concept in the LCMS, President Bohlmann rejected the Wisconsin Synod position by name.

LCMS 的这一团契实践被称为团契等级或团契程度，因为它并不要求对于所有表达团契的所有教义的完全认同，而只要求对不同等级团契活动的不同等级或程度的教义认同。博尔曼主席如此说到：“关于认信教义的完全认同，对于每个跨教会基督徒以及每次跨宗派的活动而言，既无可能又无必要。对于基督徒合一的表达方式应当与——我们与相关基督徒在共享的圣经福音上认信所达成的共识尺度——相称。尽管这点在总会官方文件中鲜少表明，但事实上密苏里总会却已如此实践多年。”²⁹ 在一段旨在宣传 LCMS “团契等级” 概念的视频中，博尔曼主席提名拒绝了威斯康辛的立场。

To make matters worse, many in Missouri go far beyond the degree of unionistic practices that the official position condones. The widespread practice of open Communion and participation in ecumenical services has gone undisciplined. Some do this knowingly and persistently, in deliberate defiance of their synod’s position, and yet remain undisciplined.

让情况愈发糟糕的是，密苏里许多人的做法远远超出了官方立场所能容忍的联合主义实践程度。参与教派大联合的敬拜仪式又公开共领圣餐的普遍做法早已不受管教。有些人故意坚持为之，故意蔑视他们总会的立场，却还是没有受到管教。

Christians do have a responsibility to admonish weak brothers, but those who publicly defy the synod’s position and declare that their own position is the correct scriptural position can no longer be considered weak brothers. In a fellowship where diversity of doctrine and practice is tolerated and abounds, it becomes impossible to fulfill the duty to correct weak brothers. Where difference of doctrine is tolerated, each position considers itself to be the strong one and all other positions to be the weak ones. The ability to deal scripturally both with weak brothers and with those who prove themselves to be persistent errorists is lost. This is the problem in Missouri today. Until this situation is corrected, it will loom as a huge barrier to any possibility of reestablishing fellowship between our two synods.

基督徒确实有责任劝告软弱的弟兄，然而，那些公开藐视总会立场又宣称他们自己的立场是正确的圣经立场的人就不应当再被视作软弱的弟兄。在一个教义与实践的多样性被容忍又大量存在的团契中，要履行纠正软弱的弟兄这样的责任就变得不可能了。教义的差异性一旦被容忍，每种立场就会自视为强大的立场，而其余立场则会被视为弱小者。这样一来，以圣经的方式对待软弱的弟兄、对待那些自证为错误坚持者的能力就丧失了。这就是现今密苏里的问题。

在这种情况下得到纠正之前，它将仍是矗立于我们两个总会之间阻拦我们重建团契的巨大障碍。

Concerned voices are still speaking out in the Missouri Synod. In 1995, for example, the LCMS convention reaffirmed the synod's opposition to open Communion. Nevertheless, humanly speaking, it does not appear likely that Missouri will soon return to the position on fellowship that we once shared with them in the Synodical Conference, either in theory or in practice. There are as yet no signs that those who practice open Communion will be disciplined.

密苏里总会仍会发出表示担忧的声音。例如，1995年，LCMS大会重新确认了总会反对公开圣餐的立场。然而，从人的角度而言，密苏里貌似不太可能很快回归从前的团契立场，就是从前我们在总会联合会上无论是在理论上还是在实践上所共享的那个立场。目前也还没有迹象表明那些实践公开圣餐的人会受到管教。

Al Barry, the current president of the LCMS, who was elected at least in part because of his conservative position, has spoken in defense of closed Communion. Nevertheless, Barry defends the LCMS distinction between joint prayer and prayer fellowship.

LCMS的现任主席阿尔·巴里之所以当选，至少部分原因是由于他的保守立场，他已为紧密圣餐作出辩护。然而，Barry也为LCMS在“联合祷告与在祷告中团契”两者之间作出区分而作辩护。

Justification for this position is often sought in the fact that the free conferences called by C. F. W. Walther between 1856 and 1859 were opened with prayer although the synods represented at the free conferences were not in doctrinal agreement. This, however, ignores the critical difference between those early inter-Lutheran conferences and later conferences with theologians from ELCA and its predecessor bodies during the early 1900s, the 1930s, the 1960s, and today.

这一立场被合理化通常诉诸以下事件：在1856年和1859年期间由卡尔·费迪南德·威廉·华尔特号召的自由会议中出席的总会尽管并未在教义上合一，却仍以祷告开场。然而，他们却忽略了那些早期路德宗交流会议与后期路德宗交流会议的关键不同，在20世纪初、20世纪30年代、20世纪60年代以及今日的后路德宗交流会议中，都有来自ELCA及其教会共同体前身的神学家。

The conferences during the 1850s were for individuals who were “united in faith” and who accepted Lutheran doctrine as expressed in the Augsburg Confession without reservation. This was a period when confessional Lutherans in America were groping to find each other and when a clear understanding of the practice of fellowship was still being solidified. It was not yet clear that any of the participants in these conferences were persistent errorists. After things were sorted out and the position of the various synods had been clarified, the situation was much different. After it became clear that predecessor synods of the ALC and ELCA, such as the Ohio and Iowa Synods, rejected the doctrinal position of the Synodical Conference, representatives of the Synodical Conference no longer practiced joint prayer with them. The representatives of the ALC in the 1930s and the representatives of ELCA today are spokesmen for synods that have taken a public stand in opposition to the teachings of the Bible. With such there can be no fellowship.

19世纪50年代的会议是为那些“在信心中合一”又毫无保留地接受奥斯堡信条中所阐述的路德宗教义的人而召开的。在这期间，美国的认信路德宗摸索着寻找彼此，对于如何实践团契的清楚理解尚处于被坚固的阶段。那时，大家

都还未确定这些会议中的参与者是否有错误坚持者。但等事情弄清、各总会的立场也清楚之后，情况就大不相同了。在 ALC 和 ELCA 的前身总会，如俄亥俄州和爱荷华州总会拒绝了总会联合会的教义立场之后，总会联合会的代表们就不再与他们实践联合祷告。20 世纪 30 年代 ALC 的代表和今天 ELCA 的代表都是那些公开反对圣经教导的总会发言人。和这类人团契是不可能的。

There has been no interest from the LCMS in recent years in discussing these issues with WELS. This is not necessarily bad, since it may be best for the LCMS to first establish internal agreement on this issue. There is, therefore, at present no reason to be optimistic that this dispute can be resolved in the near future. WELS can only continue to give its testimony and to pray that, through the power of his Word and Spirit, the Lord will restore the agreement in the scriptural principles that the two synods once shared.

近些年来，LCMS 并没有什么兴趣和 WELS 讨论这些问题。这并不一定是坏事，因为对于 LCMS 而言，最好是他们自己对此先达成内部的一致。因此，对于这一争论可以在不久的将来得到解决，我们有理由乐观一些。WELS 只能继续做它自己的见证，并且如此祷告说，藉着他的话语和圣灵的能力，主将重新让这两个总会在曾经共享的圣经原则上达成一致。

Church and ministry and the roles of men and women in the church are two other doctrines that cause unresolved differences between WELS and the LCMS. These issues would also have to be considered as part of any efforts to reestablish doctrinal agreement between the LCMS and WELS as a basis for a restoration of fellowship. There is no indication that these issues can be resolved in the near future.

教会与事工、教会中的男女角色，是导致 WELS 和 LCMS 之间无法解决的差异的另外两个教义。要在 LCMS 与 WELS 之间重建教义认同，那么作为恢复团契的基础，这些问题也不得不看作竭力重建教义认同的一部分。但是并没有任何迹象表明这些问题可以在不久的将来得到解决。

第 9 章

The Split between WELS and the CLC
Concerning Church Fellowship

WELS 与 CLC 就教会团契问题分裂

Although the Wisconsin Synod had been protesting the changes in the Missouri Synod's position on fellowship for nearly 25 years before it broke fellowship with Missouri in 1961, some members of WELS thought the break was made too soon. Another large group, however, was equally convinced that the Wisconsin Synod was tardy in making the break. Some of them were so strongly convinced of this that they left the Wisconsin Synod and started a new church body, the Church of the Lutheran Confession (CLC). The disagreement between WELS and the CLC concerning the application of the doctrine of church fellowship constituted a second test of WELS' convictions concerning this doctrine.

尽管在威斯康辛总会与密苏里总会 1961 年中止团契之前，威斯康辛总会对于密苏里总会在团契立场上的转变抗议了将近 25 年之久，但是 WELS 部分会友仍然认为中止得过于草率。然而，另一个较大规模的团队却同等程度地坚信威斯康辛总会中止得过于迟缓。他们中的其中一些人强烈坚信这点，于是他们就离开威斯康辛总会并成立了一个新的教会共同体，路德宗认信教会（CLC）。WELS 与 CLC 之间在教会团契教义应用上的分歧形成了对于 WELS 深信此教义的又一次试炼。

With hindsight it is easy to argue that the Wisconsin Synod was slow in catching on to what was happening in the Missouri Synod. Couldn't people see that the Missouri Synod had abandoned its old position on fellowship? This, however, was not so clear in the midst of the smoke of battle.

事后诸葛亮当然容易说，对于密苏里总会所发生的事，威斯康辛总会的反应太慢了。难道大家看不出来密苏里总会早已放弃它原先的团契立场了吗？然而，这点在战争的硝烟弥漫中并非清晰可见。

In 1938 when the trouble began to become public, Missouri was regarded as the unquestioned champion of Lutheran orthodoxy in the world. It had been only six years since the LCMS had adopted the Brief Statement, a document that the Wisconsin Synod approved of wholeheartedly. During the next two decades, there were enough zigzags in Missouri's position to leave observers wondering what their real position was. The difficulty was compounded by the fact that the Missouri Synod was a house divided. It is relatively easy to determine the position and

attitude of an individual or a small group, but how does one determine whether a large group scattered throughout the country is made up of weak brothers or persistent errorists? Which of the conflicting views is representative of the group? When is it clear that admonition has been heard and rejected by the erring group? Disagreement concerning these questions led to the departure of the members of the CLC from the Wisconsin Synod during the 1950s.

1938 年，问题开始逐渐显露的时候，密苏里还是世界公认的路德宗正统拥护者。那时自 LCMS 接受“简要声明”（一份受到威斯康辛全力支持的文件）起才不过短短六年时间。接下去的 20 年时间内，密苏里的立场阴晴不定，使得观望者们对于他们的真实立场摸不着头脑。密苏里总会自身的分崩离析使得情况变得更加复杂。确定一名个体或是一个小组的立场和态度相对容易，但是我们又如何去确定一个分散全国各地、由软弱的弟兄或是错误坚持者组成的大规模团体的立场和态度呢？在那些互相矛盾的观点中，到底哪一个代表这个团体的观点呢？什么时候我们可以清楚犯错的团体已经听到劝诫却又拒绝了呢？在这些问题上的分歧最终导致了 20 世纪 50 年代 CLC 会友离开了威斯康辛总会。

By 1952 the prospects of resolving the dispute with Missouri seemed so bleak that WELS delegates at the meeting of the Synodical Conference declared themselves to be in a state of protesting fellowship against the Missouri Synod. The 1953 WELS convention received a recommendation that it declare its fellowship with Missouri at an end. The convention, however, instead accepted the substance of the floor committee report that expressed approval for our delegates' declaration of a protesting fellowship in the previous year and requested that the 1954 meeting of the Synodical Conference devote all its sessions to efforts to prevent the impending break. The 1954 Synodical Conference meeting, however, only demonstrated once more that the conference was very divided. The events of these years demonstrate, however, that the Wisconsin Synod was making every possible effort to prevent the breach.

到了 1952 年，解决和密苏里之间纷争的希望看来越发渺茫，以至于 WELS 代表团在总会联合会的会议上宣布他们正处于反对与密苏里总会团契的状态之中。1953 年，WELS 大会上收到了一项建议，要求宣布结束与密苏里之间的团契关系。然而，大会却接受了会议委员会报告的主要内容，该报告表示同意我们的代表团上一年对于反对团契的宣布，并要求 1954 年总会联合会议将其所有会议内容都用于竭力避免即将到来的分裂。然而，1954 年总会联合会会议只是再一次证明了联合会的分裂。但是，这些年的这些实践恰恰证明威斯康辛总会竭尽了所有可能来努力避免分裂。

The actions of the 1955 WELS convention, which followed this disappointing meeting of the Synodical Conference, became a bone of contention between WELS and the CLC. The ELS had already suspended fellowship with Missouri. Now the 1955 WELS convention was faced with a dilemma. On the one hand, the situation that had produced the strong WELS protest in 1953 had not gotten any better in the meanwhile. If the 1955 WELS convention failed to act, it could undercut the strong testimony that had been given by the 1953 convention. Many delegates feared that WELS would be guilty of the very unionism it was condemning in Missouri if it failed to break fellowship with Missouri immediately.

紧随这次令人失望的总会联合会会议之后的是 1955 年的 WELS 大会，WELS 在这次会议上的举动成了 WELS 与 CLS 之间争论的原因。ELS 早已和密苏里中止团契关系。现在，1955 年的 WELS 大会正面临一个难题。一方

面，1953 年造成 WELS 强烈抗议的情况当时并没有任何好转。如果 1955 年 WELS 大会没有采取任何举措，那么这就有可能削弱 1953 年大会上所做的强硬见证。许多代表害怕如果 WELS 无法与密苏里立刻中止团契关系，就有可能犯密苏里所犯的联合主义的罪，而这正是 WELS 谴责密苏里的问题。

On the other hand, it was difficult for delegates to the 1955 convention to declare decisively that the Missouri Synod had rejected the warning delivered by the 1953 WELS convention, since the Missouri Synod held conventions only every three years and had not met since the WELS protest had been delivered in 1953.

另一方面，对于 1955 年大会的代表团而言，要对密苏里总会下定论认为他们已经拒绝了 1953 年 WELS 大会发出的警告，并非易事，因为密苏里总会三年才举行一次大会，并且自从 1953 年 WELS 发出警告以来，他们还未见面开过大会。

This dilemma led to the much debated 1955 resolutions of WELS. The convention unanimously adopted a preamble that rebuked Missouri's unionism and declared it to be the cause for a break in relations. But then, by a 2-1 vote, it decided to postpone a final vote on breaking fellowship. The convention would recess and would reconvene after hearing from the 1956 Missouri Synod convention. Some 50 delegates formally protested this postponement.

这一难题导致了备受争议的 1955 年 WELS 决议。大会一致通过了一份谴责密苏里联合主义的序言，并宣布这种联合主义是导致彼此分离的原因。但后来，以 2 比 1 的投票结果，委员会决定推迟就中止团契一事的最终投票。大会将休会，并在听取 1956 年密苏里总会大会的反馈之后重新召开会议。对于这一推迟，约有 50 名代表采取了正式抗议。

In 1956 the Missouri Synod declared that the unsatisfactory "Common Confession" would no longer function as a union document between the LCMS and the ALC and expressed its gratitude for WELS' concerns and admonitions. In response to these perceived overtures, the recessed convention of WELS, which reconvened in 1956, again postponed final action and endorsed a meeting of LCMS and WELS representatives with theologians from overseas sister churches who hoped to serve as mediators in a final attempt to resolve the dispute. The 1957 WELS convention was sharply divided on whether an immediate termination of fellowship was called for. The floor committee strongly endorsed a break of fellowship, but after long debate the motion was defeated, 61-77.

1956 年，密苏里总会宣布那份不尽人意的“共同认信”将不再用作 LCMS 和 ALC 之间的联合文件，另外，对于 WELS 的担忧和警告，他们也表达了感激之情。作为对 LCMS 理解提案的回应，休会之后于 1956 年重新召开的 WELS 大会再次推迟了最后行动，并批准了 LCMS 和 WELS 代表与海外姐妹教会的神学家召开会议，这些海外来客希望在解决争端的最后尝试中充当调解人。1957 年 WELS 大会在是否应立即中止团契问题上存在严重分歧。会议委员会强烈支持中止团契，但是经过长时间的辩论之后，该提议以 61 比 77 的投票数被否决。

Many felt this action was a sinful failure to break with persistent errorists. Others were convinced it was patient dealing with weak brothers who had not yet rejected our testimony, since the discussion of fellowship with the representatives of the LCMS had not yet been completed. The opinion prevailed that the work of the new committee established by the four synods of the Synodical Conference had not yet been completed.³⁰

许多人认为这次的举措是一项失败的犯罪——没有与错误坚持者分开。其他人则认为这样对待那些还未拒绝我们见证的软弱弟兄是有耐心的举动，因为和 LCMS 代表团对于团契问题的讨论尚未完全结束。认为由总会联合会四个总会所建立的新委员会的工作尚未结束的观点占了上风。³⁰

We have already seen that WELS finally broke fellowship with Missouri in 1961, after the additional efforts at reconciliation proposed by the 1957 WELS convention failed to resolve the issue.

我们现在已经知道，在 1957 年 WELS 大会上提出的再做努力促进和解的方案没能解决问题之后，WELS 最终于 1961 年结束了和密苏里之间的团契。

WELS' failure to break fellowship in 1955 and 1957, however, became a key factor in the departure of the CLC from WELS. Already in 1953 there had been some departures from WELS as a result of its failure to break fellowship with Missouri. This exodus increased after 1955 and 1957. In 1960 these people, along with others who had departed from the ELS for similar reasons, formed the Church of the Lutheran Confession with about 60 pastors and 9,000 members.

然而，1955 年与 1957 年 WELS 没有能够中止团契却成了 CLC 离开 WELS 的关键因素。早在 1953 年，因为 WELS 没能和密苏里中止团契，就已经有一些人离开了 WELS。1955 年和 1957 年之后，这类出埃及记的上演频次加增了不少。1960 年，这些人和一些因类似理由离开 ELS 的人组建了路德宗认信教会，其中共有 60 名牧师以及 9000 名会友。

WELS did not and does not condemn those who departed from WELS because their consciences did not permit them to remain in fellowship with the Missouri Synod. But after WELS broke fellowship with Missouri, there was hope that the break with the CLC could be mended, since the cause of the division had now been removed. However, all attempts to remove this division over a 30-year period have proved unsuccessful.

WELS 那时没有、现在也没有谴责那些离开 WELS 的人，因为他们的良心不能允许他们继续和密苏里总会团契。但是在 WELS 和密苏里中止团契之后，WELS 和 CLC 之间的分裂就有望被修复，因为分裂的理由现在已被除去。然而，30 余载尝试去除这一分裂的努力最终都没有奏效。

Over the years, the sticking point has been whether there is a difference between WELS and the CLC in the doctrine of fellowship, or whether there is only disagreement about the way WELS had applied the doctrine to the termination of fellowship with the Missouri Synod. In other words, did WELS fail to break fellowship with the Missouri Synod in 1955 and 1957 because it had a faulty doctrine of fellowship, which allowed continued fellowship with persistent errorists, or was the delay due to a difference of opinion about whether the Missouri Synod had heard and rejected our admonition, thereby justifying the conclusion that it was persisting in its error in spite of admonition?

多年来，其中的症结在于：WELS 和 CLC 是否在团契教义上存在分歧，还是说只是在 WELS 应用这一教义来终结和密苏里总会之间团契的方式上存在分歧。换句话说，1955 年、1957 年 WELS 没能与密苏里断绝团契是因团契教义有误，故与错误坚持者继续团契呢？还是说之所以行动耽搁，正是由于对于密苏里总会是否已经听到并拒绝了我们的警告这一点彼此有不同见解才导致的，故此，CLC 可以合理地认为它早先尽管受到警告却仍在坚持错误？

Those who have felt that there was a difference of doctrine between WELS and the CLC have usually pointed in one of two directions in identifying that difference. Some individuals in WELS have identified that difference as a failure on the part of

the CLC to allow for admonition before the termination of fellowship with an erring church. Individuals in the CLC have regularly identified the difference as a willingness on the part of WELS to remain in fellowship with an erring church body, even after it had been identified as persisting in its error.

那些认为 WELS 与 CLC 之间存在教义分歧的人通常指向两个方向中的一个来表明两者的分歧。WELS 中的一些人认为这种分歧在于 CLC 的人在和一个犯错的教会结束团契前并未允许提出警告。CLC 中的一些人则认为分歧在于 WELS 的人即便在一个犯错的教会已被看出还在坚持犯错时，仍然与之坚持团契。

But when representatives of the two church bodies met, the CLC representatives claimed that their church does allow for admonition, and WELS representatives have denied that their synod allows continued fellowship with persistent errorists. As a result, WELS representatives who met with the CLC consistently concluded that there was no doctrinal difference, but a difference of application and differing interpretations of the events of 1955 and 1957.

但是当两个教会共同体的代表团会面的时候，CLC 的代表却宣称他们的教会允许提出警告，WELS 的代表则否认他们的总会允许与错误坚持者继续团契。结果，与 CLC 会面的 WELS 总是得出结论认为两者之间并不存在教义上的差异，只是存在对于教义的不同应用以及对于 1955 年与 1957 年事件的不同诠释而已。

This belief that there was initially no difference of doctrine was supported by the recollection that Professor E. Reim, a prominent founder of the CLC, had continued to practice fellowship with a WELS congregation for two years after his resignation as president of our seminary, an action he surely would not have taken if he had believed there was a difference of doctrine. (A 1973 WELS convention resolution referring to a “doctrinal difference” was an anomaly since it did not accurately reflect the wording of the report submitted by the WELS commission that had met with the CLC.) The CLC, however, has continued to claim that a difference in doctrine divided the two synods.

这种相信最初并没有教义差异的想法得到了一件往事的支持，即，CLC 的杰出创始人埃德蒙·雷姆教授在辞去我们神学院院长一职后的两年时间里，持续地与 WELS 的会众实践团契，如果他相信教义存在差异，那么他肯定不会采取这样的行动（1973 年 WELS 大会决议中提到的“教义差异”是一件反常之事，因为它并未准确反映由 WELS 委员会在与 CLC 会面后所提交的报告的措辞）。然而，CLC 却继续声称是由于教义的差异才导致了两个总会的分裂。

For this reason, the most recent talks between WELS, the ELS, and the CLC, held between 1987 and 1990, focused on the role of admonition in termination of -fellowship with an erring church body. At the outset of the discussions a CLC representative observed that in the years before 1961, there was much confusion and unclarity on all sides. In a joint statement, drafted in April of 1990 after much study and discussion, the representatives of the three churches agreed with the following statement:

因此，1987 年与 1990 年之间，WELS、ELS 和 CLC 之间最新的谈话内容都聚焦在以下问题：在和一个犯错的教会共同体中止团契时提出警告所起到的作用。在这些讨论开始的时候，CLC 的一名代表注意到 1961 年之前的几年时间内，各方都有许多困惑与未澄清之处。经过深入学习讨论之后，在一份 1990 年四月起草的联合声明中，三个总会的代表们就以下声明达成了一致：

Admonition continues until the erring individual or group either repents of its error and turns away from it or until it shows itself to be persistent in its error by adhering to it in its public doctrine and practice, by demanding recognition for it, or by making propaganda for it and trying to persuade others of it.³¹

在犯错的个人或团体要么悔改其错误并从中转离之前，要么在他公开坚持教义和实践错误、要求他人认可其错误、或者宣扬这些错误并尝试说服他人相信以显明他自己是错误坚持者之前，警告都应当持续进行。³¹

Both sides thus agreed on the necessity of admonition before the termination of fellowship. Both parties also accepted the following statement on the limited duration of the admonition:

因此，两边都认同在中止团契之前提出警告的必要性。两边也都接受了关于有限警告期限的声明：

The imperative ekklinate calls for a clean break of fellowship with those who persistently adhere to error. When it has been ascertained that a person or church body is causing divisions and offenses . . . by teaching contrary to Holy Scripture, the directive to avoid is as binding as any word addressed to us by our Savior in his holy Word. Pleading a debt of love dare not serve as an excuse for putting off a break in fellowship with those who have shown themselves to be not weak brethren but persistent errorists. . . . We reject the view that the decision to continue or discontinue admonition and proceed to avoid is to be made on the basis of a subjective human judgment or conjecture about the possible outcome of the admonition. . . . We reject the view that permits the use of human judgment to prolong fellowship with persistent errorists as contrary to the principles of Scripture.³²

躲避这个命令式呼吁我们要和那些坚持遵从错误的人彻底结束团契。当我们确定某人或某教会共同体正通过教导违背圣经的内容造成分裂并引冒犯他人时.....躲避这一命令与我们救主藉他的圣言向我们所说的其它任何话一样具有约束力。以“欠爱的债”为由，并不能作为推迟与那些已经表明自己并非软弱的同伴而是错误坚持者的人结束团契的借口.....我们拒绝以下观点：以——对于警告可能带来的结果作出人的主观判断或猜测——作为基础——而作出是否继续警告还是中止警告并开始躲避的决定.....我们拒绝以下与圣经原则冲突的观点：允许使用人的判断来延长与错误坚持者之间的团契。³²

The subsequent acceptance of this doctrinal statement by the doctrinal committees of all three synods in their 1990 spring meetings led the WELS Commission on Inter-Church Relations to conclude once again that there was no difference of doctrine between WELS and the CLC.

随后，1990年三所总会联合召开的春季会议接受了这一教义声明，于是WELS跨教会关系委员会自然就得出结论再次认为WELS与CLC之间并不存在什么教义差异。

There was, however, a new difficulty to be resolved. Near the end of the meeting that had drafted the joint statement, the CLC representatives proposed an addition to the statement—a preamble that referred to the existence of a doctrinal difference between WELS and the CLC. Since this seemed to contradict the substance of the statement itself, which revealed no doctrinal difference between the synods, this preamble was not acceptable to WELS and the ELS.

然而，又一个新的难题出现了。在这场起草联合声明的会议尾声，CLC 的代表对这项声明提出了一项附加声明——序言须提及 WELS 与 CLC 之间存有教义差异。由于这似乎与声明的主旨互相矛盾，即声明本身表明总会之间根本不存在任何教义差异，于是该序言就没有被 WELS 和 ELS 接受。

To deal with the misgivings raised by the CLC representatives, WELS representatives later suggested a different preamble, which included these words: “This Joint Statement, therefore, when accepted by our three church bodies, supersedes any and every previous statement that might be or might appear to be in conflict with this document. Any and all such conflicting or possibly conflicting statements are herewith disavowed.”³³

为了解决 CLC 代表提出的担忧，WELS 代表之后提议再拟一份序言，其中包含以下内容：“因此，当这份联合声明由我们这三所总会接受的时候，就取代了之前可能或看起来可能与这份文件矛盾的任何声明。同此，任何一份或者所有与之矛盾或看似与之矛盾的声明都被予以了否认。”³³

When our commission asked the CLC what the basis was for their renewed assertion that there is a doctrinal difference between the CLC and WELS, the CLC did not provide a direct answer, but merely provided copies of old documents. The 1992 CLC convention reaffirmed the claim of a doctrinal difference. Following this impasse, the CLC broke off discussions with WELS, and another effort at reconciliation had ended in failure.

当我们的委员会向 CLC 询问他们为何重新主张 CLC 与 WELS 之间存在教义差异时，CLC 并未直接回答，而只是给出了一些旧文件的复印本。1992 年，CLC 大会再次确认了关于教义差异的宣称。陷入这一僵局之后，CLC 就中断了和 WELS 之间的讨论，并且，和好的努力再次以失败告终。

Recently, several documents from CLC sources have attempted to provide a basis for the claim that such a doctrinal difference exists. In response to a request from a CLC congregation that the CLC state clearly what the doctrinal difference with WELS is, the CLC’s 1994 convention adopted the following statements:

最近，来自 CLC 的一些文件已在尝试给出支持存在教义差异这一宣称的理由。CLC 会众要求 CLC 清楚表明他们与 WELS 之间的教义差异，作为回应，1994 年 CLC 大会采纳了以下声明：

Whereas, the WELS, having already “marked” the LC-MS in 1955 as a causer of divisions and offenses nevertheless at its 1959 convention adopted the following principle on the Termination of Church Fellowship: “Termination of church fellowship is called for when you have reached the conviction that admonition is of no further avail and that the erring brother or church body demands recognition of its error” and

鉴于 WELS 早在 1955 年就已将 LCMS “认定”为造成分裂与冒犯他人者，然而却在其 1959 年大会上接受了如下中止教会团契的原则：“当你确信警告不再有用并且犯错的弟兄或者教会共同体需要承认其错误的时候，教会团契就需要中止”，

Whereas, the CLC holds to the scriptural principle set forth in its official publication, “Concerning Church Fellowship,” which says: “We further believe and teach that suspension of an established fellowship is to take place when it has been ascertained that a person or group is causing divisions and offenses through a false position in doctrine or practice” therefore, be it

Resolved, that we let the doctrinal contrast between these two official statements from the respective church bodies stand as our answer to the memorial of Holy Spirit congregation of Albuquerque, NM.³⁴

然而，CLC 坚持其官方出版物中所表明圣经原则，“关于教会团契”，其中说到，“此外，我们相信又教导：当我们确信某人或某团体正藉着虚假的教义或实践造成分裂及冒犯他人时，那么已建立的团契应当此时中止”。因此，决议如下，我们就让这两种出于各自教会共同体的官方声明之间的教义对比，作为留给新墨西哥州阿尔伯克基圣灵教会的纪念而存在下去吧。³⁴

It is as though the CLC-WELS-ELS meetings and agreement of 1987–1990 had never occurred. The WELS position is misrepresented by the detachment of a single sentence from its context, and the CLC statement does not even mention the role of admonition, which was the focal point of the discussions.

这就好像 1987 年-1990 年间的 CLC-WELS-ELS 会议以及彼此间的认同从未发生过似的。WELS 的立场被一句脱离语境的话所歪曲，另外，CLC 的声明甚至都没有提及提出警告所起的作用，而这点也正是所有讨论的焦点才对。

A recent essay by a leader of the CLC summarizes the WELS position in this way: “It is wrong to avoid . . . only when we come to some sort of subjective judgment that admonition will never be heeded (as the WELS and ELS falsely teach) [Emphasis added].”³⁵ This is a distortion of the WELS position. We do maintain that we must determine whether our admonition has been heard and rejected before we break fellowship, but not that we must judge that our admonition will never be heeded.

CLC 某位领袖最近所写的一篇文章对于 WELS 的立场如此总结到：“只有当我们对于提出警告将永远不会被听从作出某种主观的判断时……才躲避，这样的做法是错误的（正如 WELS 与 ELS 虚假教导的）[着重部分由作者标明]。”³⁵ 这是对 WELS 立场的一种曲解。我们确实坚持在我们中止团契之前，我们必须查明我们所提出的警告是否已经被听到并被拒绝，而不是必须对于我们的警告将永远不会被听从作出判断。

A 1994 conference essay by a CLC pastor summarizes the WELS-ELS position as “mark, admonish, and avoid” false teachers.³⁶ We could accept this summary if it is understood to mean: (1) “mark,” that is, “watch out for” false teachers; (2) “admonish” them when you spot them; and (3) “avoid” them if they reject your admonition. The same essay summarizes the CLC position as “mark and avoid,” with no mention of admonition. This seeming revival of the old CLC interpretation of “mark and avoid” gives new credibility to the old opinion that the CLC departs from Scripture by allowing no room for admonition before a break of fellowship. This CLC position seems to be based on a misinterpretation of the Greek word translated “mark” in the King James Version of Romans 16:17. Some CLC writers seem to think this means, “identify false teachers and immediately avoid them.” But in King James English “mark” does not mean “identify” or “brand.” It means “watch out for.” Romans 16:17 does not deal with the role of admonition. This must be determined from other passages.

1994 年大会上的一篇出自 CLC 牧师的的文章将 WELS-ELS 的立场总结为“留心、告诫并躲避”假教师。如果这一总结可理解为——（1）“留意”，也就是“小心”假教师；（2）当你注意到他们的时候“告诫”他们；（3）如果他们拒绝你的警告，那么“躲避”他们——那么我们可以接受这一总结。这篇文

章还将 CLC 的立场总结为“留意并躲避”，其中并未提到警告。这似乎是 CLC 对从前“留意并躲避”的再诠释，这也给——CLC 在中止团契之前没有允许提出警告——这种之前脱离圣经的观点——提供了新的可信度。CLC 的这一立场似乎是基于他们对钦定本罗马书 16:17 中希腊词的错误诠释（和合本将该词译作“留意”，钦定本为“mark”）。一些 CLC 作者似乎认为该词意为“辨认出假教师并立刻躲避他们。”然而在钦定本中，“mark”并不是指“识别”或“冠名”，而是指“留意”。罗马书 16:17 并不是在向我们交待警告所起的作用，关于警告的命令则要从其它经文中查明。

The 1994 CLC essay goes on to state that one basis for the CLC's assertion that WELS has a different doctrine than the CLC is that WELS has never officially adopted the 1990 Joint Statement approved by WELS and CLC representatives. But this happened because the CLC broke off the talks before a mutually acceptable preamble could be added to the document to satisfy their request. When the CLC refused further discussions, there was no reason to present the statement to a WELS convention for adoption since there was no agreement between the synods.³⁷

1994 年，CLC 在它的文章中继续表明，CLC 确定 WELS 与其教义不同的一项理由是，WELS 从未正式采纳 1990 年由 WELS 和 CLC 代表所批准的联合声明。但是，此事之所以发生，正是因为 CLC 在一份可以满足他们要求的、互相都能接受的序言加入到文件内之前就结束了谈话而引起的。当 CLC 拒绝进一步讨论的时候，我们就没有理由将采纳声明递交给 WELS 大会了，因为总会之间并没有达成共识。³⁷

It is sad that the recent talks, which began so promisingly, failed to produce concrete steps toward removing the division between WELS and the CLC on the one hand and the CLC on the other. It is doubly sad that the CLC spokesmen are ignoring the Joint Statement that was accepted by all parties to the negotiations and basing allegations of a doctrinal difference between WELS and the CLC on a caricature of the WELS position that WELS representatives cannot accept as an accurate summary of their view.

最近的这些谈话，起初都有美好愿景，但是最终都没能定出具体的步骤以去除 WELS 和 CLC 这一方与 CLC 另一方之间的分裂，这也着实令人难受。而更令人难受的是，CLC 的发言人无视各方协商后采纳的联合声明，基于对 WELS 立场的荒诞描述，无端指控 WELS 与 CLC 之间存有教义差异，WELS 代表无法接受这些描述是对其看法的正确总结。

第 10 章

Working toward the CELC

致力于 CELC 的建立

The many efforts made by WELS during the 30 years since the break with Missouri to preserve and extend our fellowship throughout the world prove that strict fellowship practices do not lead to isolationism.

自与密苏里分裂 30 年来，WELS 竭力在全世界保存并拓展我们的团契，这也证明严格的团契实践并不会导致孤立主义。

For 30 years the Evangelical Lutheran Confessional Forum has been meeting regularly to preserve and strengthen ties between WELS and the Evangelical Lutheran Synod, which had been our sister synod already in the former Synodical Conference.

30 年来，福音路德会认信论坛经常开展会议，以保存并坚固 WELS 与 ELS 之间的联结，这 ELS 就是我们在前总会联合会的姐妹总会。

From 1964 to 1970 the WELS Commission on Inter-Church Relations sponsored an annual “free conference” to provide individual Lutherans who were concerned about the doctrinal deterioration of their churches with a forum for mutual strengthening so that ultimately they could come to full unity of doctrine and practice.

1964 年至 1970 年期间，WELS 跨教会关系委员会赞助了每年一次的“自由会议”，为那些关注他们教会教义恶化的路德宗个体提供了一个互相坚固的平台，目的是为了让他们最终可以在教义和实践上完全合一。

In 1971 WELS established fellowship with the Federation for Authentic Lutheranism (FAL), a group of congregations that left the LCMS for confessional reasons. In 1975 FAL disbanded, and most of its congregations joined WELS or the ELS.

1971 年，WELS 与正统路德宗联盟（FAL）建立了团契，该联盟由一批教会组成，因认信原因离开了 LCMS。1975 年，FAL 解散，其多数教会要么加入了 WELS，要么加入了 ELS。

In 1995 WELS and the ELS established fellowship with the Lutheran Confessional Synod, which was founded as a place of refuge for congregations leaving ELCA for confessional reasons.

1995 年，WELS 和 ELS 一方与路德宗认信总会这一方建立了团契，该总会因认信原因而建立，是那些离开 ELCA 的教会的避难所。

Overseas, WELS established fellowship in 1974 with the Lutheran Confessional Church (often called the LBK from its Swedish initials), a church formed by dedicated Christians who left the liberal Lutheran state churches of Sweden and Norway for confessional reasons.

海外，1974年，WELS和路德宗认信教会（按瑞典语首字母通常称为LBK）建立了团契，该教会由一批忠心的基督徒组成，他们因认信原因离开了瑞典和挪威的自由派国家教会。

The other fellowship efforts of WELS since 1961 have been directed toward ultimately gathering all the churches throughout the world that are in fellowship with us into an international organization of confessional Lutherans, the Confessional Evangelical Lutheran Conference. But first, there was a significant problem to overcome.

自1961年来，WELS其它关于团契的工作一直致力于最终将全世界所有与我们团契的教会聚集在一起，形成一个认信路德宗的国际组织，即认信福音路德联合会。然而，首先有一个巨大的难题需要克服。

When we broke fellowship with Missouri in 1961, both WELS and the LCMS were in fellowship with many other Lutheran churches throughout the world. Many of them were mission churches of the LCMS; some were WELS missions; at least one was a result of joint WELS-LCMS mission work through the Synodical Conference; some were independent churches. Since WELS and the LCMS were no longer in doctrinal agreement, it would have been a violation of scriptural principles for these churches to stay in fellowship with both the LCMS and WELS. By and large, the mission churches naturally stayed with their mother synod, but prolonged efforts were necessary to clarify the fellowship relations between WELS and several of the independent churches.

1961年，当我们和LCMS中止团契时，WELS和LCMS两者和世界许多其它路德宗教会都有团契关系。其中许多是LCMS的差会教会；而一些则是WELS的差会教会；其中至少一间教会是通过总会联合会WELS-LCMS的联合宣教事工而结出的果子；而有些则是独立的教会。因为WELS和LCMS在教义上不再彼此认同，所以对于这些教会而言，同时与LCMS和WELS保持团契，有背于圣经原则。总的来说，差会教会自然会和他们的母总会站在同一战线，但要澄清WELS和一些独立教会之间的团契关系，也经过了长期的努力。

WELS representatives made long journeys, held many discussions, and exchanged extensive correspondence in their efforts to preserve our fellowship with Lutheran free churches in Germany, France and Belgium, England, Denmark, Finland, and South Africa after those fellowship ties had been placed into jeopardy by the breakup of the Synodical Conference. These efforts ultimately proved unsuccessful, since, with one exception in Germany, these churches chose to remain in fellowship with the LCMS.

在与德国、法国、比利时、英国、丹麦、芬兰和南非的路德宗自由教会之间的团契因总会联合会的解体而陷入危险之后，WELS的代表长途跋涉，多次展开讨论，又交换了大量的信件，以努力保存我们与他们之间的团契。这些努力最终被证明为失败，因为除了德国以外，其它教会都选择了与LCMS继续团契。

WELS' experience in Germany was a mixture of sorrow and joy. In 1972 several of the confessional Lutheran churches in West Germany merged into the Independent Evangelical Lutheran Church, commonly called SELK from its German

initials. In 1973 a meeting in Mequon, Wisconsin, established doctrinal agreement between WELS and SELK representatives, but SELK repudiated the agreement reached by its representatives. This made it impossible for us to establish fellowship with SELK and forced us to suffer the loss of fellowship of one of our mission churches, which joined SELK in 1976.

WELS 在德国的经历可谓悲喜交加。1972 年，西德的几间认信路德宗教会合并为独立福音路德会，按其德语首字母通常称为 SELK。1973 年，在威斯康辛梅库恩举行了一次 WELS 与 SELK 代表之间建立教义认同的会议，然而 SELK 拒绝了其代表达成的共识。这便使得我们无法与 SELK 建立团契，并迫使我们失去了与其中一间差会教会之间的团契，该教会曾于 1976 年加入 SELK。

In East Germany the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church (ELFC), which had been in fellowship with both Missouri and Wisconsin since the 19th century, was largely cut off from developments in the West by the Berlin Wall. When East Germany became more accessible again, it became possible to renew efforts to clarify our fellowship ties with the ELFC. The ELFC was in fellowship with both WELS and the LCMS, but the latter two were not in fellowship with each other, a situation called triangular fellowship. The result of the new discussions was that the ELFC broke its ties with the Missouri Synod and with the European confessional churches that had remained in fellowship with Missouri, and it reestablished a strong active fellowship with WELS. The resolution of this triangular fellowship, which had been long delayed by the Berlin Wall, opened the way for the establishment of the Confessional Evangelical Lutheran Conference, since there were now no more churches in contradictory fellowships with both WELS and the LCMS.

在东德，福音路德自由教会（ELFC）自 19 世纪以来一直与密苏里和威斯康辛团契，但由于柏林墙的缘故，很大程度上它与西德的发展隔绝了。当东德再次被打通后，重新努力澄清我们与 ELFC 之间的团契纽带便成为可能。ELFC 同时与 WELS 和 LCMS 都有团契，但是后两者之间并无团契关系，这种情况被称为三角团契关系。重新开展的讨论所带来的最终结果是：ELFC 中止了和密苏里之间的团契纽带，也中止了和那些继续与密苏里团契的欧洲认信教会，反之，它与 WELS 之间重新建立了稳固又活跃的团契。因为柏林墙的缘故而被长期搁置的这一三角团契关系问题得以解决之后，认信福音路德宗联合会的建立便可开展，因为此时同时与 WELS 和 LCMS 有互为矛盾的团契关系的教会便不复存在了。

In 1993 the Confessional Evangelical Lutheran Conference was founded in Oberwesel, Germany, with 13 member churches from the United States, Germany, Sweden and Norway, Finland, Puerto Rico, Mexico, Australia, Cameroon, Nigeria, Zambia, Malawi, and Japan. We hope that this conference will continue to grow so that it will be a source of strength and encouragement to confessional Lutherans throughout the world.

1993 年，认信福音路德联合会于德国上韦瑟尔成立，共有 13 间成员教会组成，它们分别来自美国、德国、瑞典、挪威、芬兰、波多黎各、墨西哥、澳大利亚、喀麦隆、尼日利亚、赞比亚、马拉维以及日本。我们盼望这间联合会将会继续成长，以至于它可以成为坚固并鼓励全世界认信路德宗的源头。

The WELS Commission on Inter-Church Relations regularly receives inquiries from confessional Lutherans throughout the world. It does everything it can to assist them in developing a sound confessional position and practice.

WELS 跨教会关系委员会常常收到来自全世界认信路德宗的咨询。它将尽其所能协助他们发展坚固的认信立场与实践。

The purpose of this account of the WELS' fellowship efforts during the last 30 years is to demonstrate our willingness to do everything we can to “work together for the truth” with confessional Lutherans throughout the world.

在这里之所以回顾最近 30 年内 WELS 在团契问题上所付出的艰辛，是为了表明我们乐意尽我们所能与全世界的认信路德宗“一同为真理作工”。

PART III
第三部分
THE APPLICATIONS
OF THE PRINCIPLES
OF CHURCH FELLOWSHIP
教会团契原则的应用

11

第 11 章

Basic Applications of the Principles of Church Fellowship

教会团契原则的基本应用

Review of the biblical principles

圣经原则回顾

We will now apply the scriptural principles of church fellowship that we studied in Part I of this book to various situations in the life of the church. Before we consider these applications, however, we must briefly restate the basic principles of church fellowship.

现在我们要把第一部分所学关于教会团契的圣经原则应用于教会生活的各种情况之中。然而，在我们思考这些应用之前，我们必须简短地重新阐述一下教会团契的基本原则。

Christian fellowship refers to the spiritual fellowship that we have with God and with all believers through faith in Christ as our Savior. We cherish these fellowships as a great blessing. But here, when we speak about practicing the principles of church fellowship, we are referring to every activity in which Christians join together with other members of the visible church to give joint expression to their faith.

教会团契指的是，藉着对我们救主基督的信心，我们和上帝以及信徒之间的属灵团契。我们珍惜这些团契，将其视为巨大的祝福。而在这里，当我们谈及实践教会团契的原则时，我们是在说，可见教会中基督徒与其他成员所共同参与的任何一项共同表达他们信仰的活动。

Since we cannot see the faith in people's hearts, we must determine whether we can practice fellowship with an individual or a group by comparing their confession of faith with Scripture. If individuals or groups agree concerning all of the doctrines of Scripture, they should practice church fellowship together. If they do not agree in doctrine, they should not practice church fellowship with each other.

因为我们无法看到人心所信，我们就必须通过将他们的信仰告白与圣经作比较来确定我们是否可以与个人或者团体实践团契。如果个体间或者团体间彼此彼此认同所有圣经教义，那么他们就可以一起实践教会团契。如果他们无法在教义上彼此认同，那么他们也就无法彼此实践教会团契。

The unit concept 整体概念

We have seen that church fellowship must be dealt with as an undivided whole in two different respects. First, when the doctrines of Scripture are being discussed to determine if two groups may practice fellowship together, all doctrine must be dealt with as a unit. Since all the teachings of Scripture have the same divine authority, and we have no right to add anything to them nor to subtract anything from them, the practice of church fellowship must be based on agreement in all of the doctrines of Scripture.

我们已经晓得教会团契必须在两个不同的方面视为一个不可分割的整体。其一，当讨论圣经教义以决定两个团队是否共同实践团契的时候，所有的教义必须作为一个整体来看待。因为圣经的所有教导都带有同样神圣的权柄，我们就没有权利在这上面添加任何东西，也没有任何权利从中删减任何东西。教会团契的实践必须基于对圣经所有教义的认同。

Second, the various activities that may express church fellowship must be dealt with as a unit. Since various ways of expressing church fellowship (such as joint mission work, celebration of the Lord's Supper, exchange of pulpits, transfers of membership, and joint prayer) are merely different ways of expressing the same fellowship of faith, all expressions of church fellowship require the same degree of doctrinal agreement, namely, agreement in all of the doctrines of Scripture.

其二，表达教会团契的各样活动都必须视为一个整体。既然表达教会团契的各种方式（诸如联合宣教事工、圣餐礼、讲坛共享、会友转会以及联合祷告等）都只是表达同一信仰团契的不同表达方式，那么教会团契的所有表达方式就都要求同等程度的教义认同，即，对于圣经所有教义的认同。

Some guidelines in applying the principles 对于应用这些原则的一些指引

Before we consider specific applications of the principles of fellowship, we will consider some general guidelines that should govern our attitude and actions as we wrestle with specific cases.

在我们思考团契原则的一些特定应用之前，我们需要思考一些普遍的指引，在我们设法应对一些特定问题的时候，这些指引应当管治我们的态度与行为。

1. Before we tackle tough cases, we should be sure that all parties in the discussion understand and agree with the scriptural principles as discussed above. We cannot make sound applications without a clear understanding of the principles. This means that we will constantly be studying the principles in Scripture, not simply receiving them by tradition.

1. 在我们应对棘手的问题之前，我们应当确定参与讨论的各方都理解并同意以上讨论的圣经原则。在没有清楚理解这些原则的情况下，我们的应用也是摇摇欲坠。这就意味着我们将持续学习这些圣经原则，而不是简单地通过传统来接受它们。

2. We must be careful that we do not allow difficult cases to establish or modify the principles. We may not let feelings, emotions, or human reason pressure us into a particular application and then reshape our principles to condone our action.

2. 我们必须小心，不要让棘手的问题建立或修改那些原则。我们不可以让感受、情感或者人的理性向我们施压，让我们发明一种特别的应用，随后又重塑我们的原则以容忍我们的行为。

3. We must guard against allowing specific applications or historical precedents to become rigid rules that govern all similar cases. We must evaluate each case in the light of the scriptural principles.

3. 我们必须防范特殊应用或者历史先例成为支配类似情形的僵化规则。我们必须基于圣经原则对每种情况进行评估。

4. We must remember that there are hard cases (cases of casuistry) in which it is difficult to determine which scriptural principle applies. For example, is it still time to warn, or is it now time to avoid? In such cases, like-minded Christians may not reach the same conclusion at the same time. We should be careful not to pass hasty judgment on decisions that fellow Christians have made in such difficult cases. We may not know all the circumstances that led them to their decision. We should patiently listen to their explanations.

4. 我们必须记住，总会有一些疑难案例（存疑案例），针对这些问题，我们很难决定到底要应用哪个圣经原则。比如，要继续提出警告吗，还是现在就躲避呢？在这些情形下，志同道合的基督徒并不一定会同时得出同样的结论。这时候我们需要谨慎，对于基督徒同伴在这类疑难案例中所作的决定不要草率下定论。我们无法得知让他们作决定的所有原委，我们应当耐心聆听他们的解释。

5. When we are faced with such a hard case, we should seek the advice of fellow Christians and explain the reasons for our actions to those who are concerned about them.

5. 当我们面对这类疑难案例的时候，我们应当寻求基督徒伙伴的建议，并向那些关心我们的人解释我们的行动理由。

6. We should recognize that exceptional cases may lead us to depart from our normal practice, but we should be on guard that exceptions are not used to undermine the principles.

6. 我们应当意识到，有些例外会让我们脱离正常实践，但是我们应当小心，例外并不是用来削弱那些原则的。

7. We must constantly balance two responsibilities: to patiently admonish the weak and to promptly separate from those who cling to error. How can we determine if we are dealing with weak brothers and sisters or with persistent adherents of false doctrine? We can determine this only by examining their confession. What do they say? What do they do? Does their confession contradict Scripture? Are they willing to accept instruction and correct their errors? Do they reject correction and hold to their error? Are they making propaganda for their error?

7. 我们必须不断平衡两项责任：耐心警告软弱者，又要立即与那些错误坚持者分开。我们如何晓得我们是在对待软弱的弟兄姐妹，还是在对待假教义的坚定拥护者呢？我们只能通过查看他们的认信才能下定论。他们说了什么？他们

做了什么？他们的认信和圣经矛盾吗？他们乐意接受引导并纠正他们的错误吗？他们拒绝纠正并坚持他们的错误吗？他们宣扬他们的错误吗？

In this process we must guard against two types of judging the heart: We cannot say of the penitent, "I don't believe his retraction. He is a hypocrite." We cannot say of the one who holds to error, "I think he's really sincere. Maybe he'll change his mind someday." We can judge only by the person's confession. If he corrects his error, we may remain in fellowship with him. If he does not, we must separate from him.

在此过程中，我们必须防范两种审判内心的类型：我们不可对懊悔者说，“我不相信他所撤回的，他是名假冒为善者。”我们不可对错误坚持者说，“我认为他是诚恳的人，也许有一天他会改变他的想法。”我们只可通过人的认信来判断。如果他纠正他的错误，那么我们可以继续与他团契。如果没有，我们必须与他分离。

8. We must pray for patience and humility in dealing with the weak. We ask God to free us from pride, impatience, and legalistic tendencies, which may make us unwilling to bear with the weak. But showing love for the weak does not mean that we will be weak in acting against error, even when our action may not be fully understood by those who have a weak understanding of the principles.

8. 对待软弱的弟兄姐妹，我们必须祷告乞求上帝多多加给我们耐心，又让我们谦卑。我们乞求上帝让我们免于骄傲、不耐烦以及律法主义倾向，这些都会使我们不乐意忍受软弱者。然而，对软弱者显明爱心并不意味着我们在抵制错误上软弱，即便我们的行为也许无法得到那些不太理解圣经原则的软弱者的完全理解。

9. We must be careful that our patience in dealing with the weak does not become a source of offense and confusion to other Christians who get the impression that we are condoning the error. We can guard against this by reporting the status of our dealings with the errorist to our brothers and sisters in the faith.

9. 我们必须谨慎，我们对待软弱者的耐心不要成了冒犯其他基督徒又给他们造成困扰的原因，即，给他们造成我们在容忍错误的印象。我们可以通过向我们的弟兄姐妹汇报我们对待犯错者的情况来对此加以防范。

10. We must pray for courage and decisiveness in dealing with the adherents of error. We ask God to take away any timidity or desire for the approval of men, which may make us hesitant to testify clearly against error or may make us willing to yield to false teachers and their followers (Ezekiel 2:3-7; 3:3-8).

10. 对待错误坚持者，我们必须祷告乞求上帝加给我们勇气与决断。我们乞求上帝去除胆怯或是想要得人肯定的欲望，这些可能会使我们在针对错误作见证时犹豫不决，或使我们乐意屈服于假教师及他们的跟随者（以西结书 2:3-7; 3:3-8）。

11. We should be indignant when God's Word is twisted in support of all sorts of false teaching and shameful conduct (Psalm 119:129-144).

11. 当神的话语被曲解而用以支持各类假教导及可耻行径时，我们理当愤慨（诗篇 119:129-144）。

12. When we must refuse to practice fellowship with adherents of false teaching, we should be sure that all parties are aware of the specific commands of God's Word that make it impossible for us to work together with these people. God's doctrine is at stake here, not ours. We express our concern for doctrine each time we pray "hallowed be your name." When we practice the principles of church

fellowship, we are obeying the Second Commandment, which teaches us to honor God's name.

12.当我们必须拒绝与错误坚持者实践团契时，我们应当确认各方都了解那使得我们不可能与这些人一起事工的上帝话语中的特定命令为何。是上帝的教义危在旦夕，而不是我们的。每每我们祷告说“愿人都尊你的名为圣”，我们都是在表达我们对教义的关注。当我们实践教会团契原则的时候，我们就是在顺服第二诫命，该诫命教导我们尊上帝的名为圣洁。

13. We must not regard our responsibility to practice the principles of church fellowship as a burden or a handicap, but as a privilege and an opportunity. Here is an opportunity to show love for God and for our neighbor. Here is an opportunity to suffer for the truth if it is God's will that we do so (1 Peter 4:12-16).

13.我们切不可将我们实践教会团契原则的责任视为负担或障碍，而是特权与机会。这是向上帝以及向我们的邻舍显明爱心的机会。这是为真理忍受患难的机会，如果这是上帝要我们受的（彼得前书 4:12-16）。

14. Above all, remember that these are not our principles of church fellowship; they are God's principles revealed in Holy Scripture. Human judgment cannot determine the principles. They are established by God's Word. But human judgment must evaluate each situation to see which principles apply at a particular moment. As with any application of law and gospel, the proper application of the principles of church fellowship requires lifelong study and practice. We pray that God gives us the willingness and the wisdom to apply these principles faithfully.

14.最重要的是，请记住这些并不是我们的教会团契原则；而是上帝在圣经中所启示的原则。人的判断不能决定那些原则。它们是由神的话语所设立的。然而人的判断必须评估各类情况以定夺在某一特定时刻应当应用哪项原则。正如对于律法与福音的任何应用一样，教会团契原则的恰当应用也需要我们一辈子的学习与实践。我们祷告祈求上帝加给我们乐意的心，又加添我们忠心应用这些原则的智慧。

Applications of the principles

原则的应用

The double line above the preceding subtitle has a very specific purpose. It emphasizes the importance of maintaining a clear distinction between the principles set forth in Scripture and our applications of them. It is important that we not raise our applications to a level of equality with the scriptural principles.

此处标题以上的两天双横线是特意为之。它的目的是为了强调——圣经所提出的原则与我们对它们的应用——这两者之间需保持清晰区分的重要性。我们切不可将我们的应用提升到与圣经原则同样的地位，这点尤为重要。

The ease or difficulty of making an application may vary. Some of our fellowship practices are simply further instances of applications already made in Scripture. For example, Scripture states very clearly that we may not give financial support to false teachers, so we obviously should not give money to heterodox churches.

应用的难易程度可能要视情况而定。我们的一些团契实践不过是圣经中已提到的应用的更多实例而已。比如，圣经明确表明我们不可向假教师提供经济支持，所以，显然我们不可送钱给非正统教会。

In other cases we have no clear precedents in Scripture since we are dealing with institutions or situations that did not exist in New Testament times. For example, Scripture provides us with no specific criteria for determining who can attend our Lutheran elementary schools.

而在另外一些情况下，我们则没有明确的圣经先例，因为我们所面对的是新约时代不存在的制度或情况。例如，圣经没有给我们提供具体的标准来决定谁可以在我们的路德宗教会小学上学。

Sometimes cases are very clear-cut. We obviously cannot let a false teacher preach in our congregations. At other times we are confronted with situations in which two or more biblical principles seem to be in tension. We have a responsibility to deal patiently with the weak person who has fallen into error, but we have an equal responsibility to avoid giving offense to other weak Christians who might be misled by his error.

而有时候情况则一目了然。显然我们不可容让一名假教师在我们的教会讲道。其它时候，我们所面临的情况是，两个或两个以上的圣经原则似乎彼此有些张力。我们有责任耐心对待陷入错误中的软弱者，然而我们同样有责任避免冒犯其他可能被其错误误导的软弱基督徒。

In the following discussion we will begin with more clear-cut applications that are very similar to situations discussed in Scripture. The second part of the discussion considers more difficult cases, which we call cases of casuistry. This part of the discussion is not intended to provide a rule book or a set of legal precedents for dealing with all similar cases in the future. The aim is to provide examples of how to deal with such cases in an evangelical way. In two situations that appear to be quite similar in many respects, there may be enough different circumstances to call for a different action on our part (such as the difference of dealing with a persistent errorist or a weak brother in outwardly similar circumstances). The applications suggested in this study should not be applied mechanically, but evangelically.

在下面的讨论中，我们将从那些与圣经所涉情形极其相似的、更为一目了然的应用开始。讨论的第二部分我们再思考更为棘手的问题，我们称之为存疑案例。这部分讨论的目的并非旨在提供一本规则手册或一套法律先例，以便将来应对所有类似情形。其目的是提供一些在福音下对待此类情形的实例。两种在许多方面都看起来非常相似的情形，却可能有足够多的不同处境需要我们采取不同的行动（例如，在外表相似的境况下区别对待一名错误坚持者以及一名软弱兄弟）。本学习内容所建议的应用不应当机械应用，而是在福音下应用。

Basic applications of the principle:

All expressions of fellowship are a unit

原则的基本应用：

团契的所有表达方式都是一个整体

Joint use of the means of grace

施恩具的联合使用

All Lutherans agree that every joint use of the means of grace is an expression of fellowship. Christians are expressing fellowship whenever they encourage one another by worshiping together (Hebrews 10:24,25; Colossians 3:16). Sharing the Lord's Supper is obviously an expression of fellowship between the participants (1 Corinthians 10:17). Therefore, we are to worship and commune only with Christians with whom we are in doctrinal agreement. We cannot invite pastors who reject

teachings of the Bible to preach in our churches, nor can our pastors preach in heterodox churches. This applies both to regular Sunday services and to special services of every sort. Christians should not attend Communion with congregations or individuals who adhere to false doctrine.

所有路德宗都同意施恩具的每次联合使用都是团契的表达。无论何时基督徒通过共同敬拜彼此鼓励，他们就是在表达他们的团契（希伯来书 10:24,25；歌罗西书 3:16）。共领圣餐显然是对参与者之间团契的表达（哥林多前书 10:17）。因此，我们应当与那些在教义上和我们彼此合一的基督徒共同敬拜并同领圣餐。我们不可邀请那些拒绝圣经教导的牧师来我们的教会讲道，我们也不可非正统教会讲道。这既适用于平时的周日礼拜，也适用于任何一次特殊的礼拜。基督徒不应当与那些坚持假教导的教会或个体共领圣餐。

Financial support

经济支持

Scripture clearly states that anyone providing financial support to a teacher of religion is expressing fellowship with him or her. This is true whether this teacher is one's own pastor or someone whose work is being done elsewhere. The Philippians were partners in Paul's work through the financial support that they sent to him (Philippians 1:5; 4:15). On the other hand, those who support or encourage false teachers are partners in their evil deeds (2 John 11). They are accomplices of an evil act, just as much as the individual who drives the getaway car for a bank robber or who hides a fleeing murderer. We, therefore, may not provide financial support or any other form of assistance to pastors, missionaries, or professors or to any form of church organization that persists in false teaching in spite of admonition.

圣经明确表明，无论何人向一名宗教教师提供经济支持，他就是在表达与她或她之间的团契。无论这名教师是否是此人自己的牧师，还是说这名教师在别处事工。腓立比人递给保罗经济支持，他们就是保罗事工上的伙伴（腓立比书 1:5；4:15）。另一方面，那些支持或鼓励假教师的人则是他们恶行上的同伙（约翰二书 11）。那些支持假教师的人，就好比那些为抢劫犯开逃亡车或是藏匿在逃杀人犯的人一样，他们都是恶行的帮凶。故此，我们不可向已经受到警告却仍然坚持假教导的牧师、宣教士、教授或者任何形式的教会组织提供经济支持或任何其它形式的支持。

Recognition of another's ministry

对于他人事工的认可

Fellowship is expressed by mutual consultations to resolve doctrinal questions and by agreeing to divide mission fields (Acts 15; Galatians 2:1-10). We, therefore, do not participate in religious studies and consultations with heterodox churches (except in efforts to eliminate the errors that separate them from us), nor do we agree to divide mission responsibilities with them.

团契可以通过互相协商解决教义难题以及彼此同意如何区分禾场来表达（使徒行传第 15 章；加拉太书 2:1-10）。因此，我们不参与非正统教会的宗教学习及协商（除非是在尽力消除那些致使他们与我们分离的错误），我们也不会同意和他们划分禾场责任。

Church fellowship is expressed by the exchange of fraternal greetings. Such greetings may be expressed by a handshake (Galatians 2:9); by a kiss (Romans 16:16); and by the exchange of fraternal greetings, which is so common in Paul's letters (Romans 16:1-16). Fellowship is also expressed by the "letters of

recommendation” that are common in the New Testament (Romans 16:1-3; 2 Corinthians 8:16-23; 3 John 12).

教会团契可以通过弟兄姐妹间的问候来表达。这种问候可以通过握手表达（加拉太书 2:9）；可以通过亲吻表达（罗马书 16:16）；也可以通过保罗书信中常见的弟兄姐妹间的问候来表达（罗马书 16:1-16）。团契也可以通过“推荐信”来表达，这在新约中也是屡见不鲜（罗马书 16:1-3；哥林多后书 8:16-23；约翰三书 12）。

Present-day practices that are parallel to these biblical customs are the handshake of recognition and welcome given at an ordination, a confirmation, or the acceptance of a new pastor into our synod; the exchange of greetings and commendations offered at church anniversaries or conventions; the granting of letters of transfer to another congregation; and the recommendation of pastors and teachers to other churches. We, therefore, do not transfer members to heterodox churches, nor do we convey congratulations and best wishes to the conventions of such church bodies. Our representatives may attend conventions or meetings of churches with whom we are not in fellowship (such as the LCMS) as observers, in order to obtain accurate, firsthand information about what is happening in those bodies, but they do not participate in worship, prayers, or discussions, nor do they deliver official greetings to such meetings. (Obviously there are many exchanges of greetings that are not an expression of church fellowship, such as a social greeting when meeting an acquaintance.)

当今和这些圣经习俗对应的是认可性的握手、按立欢迎仪式、坚信礼、接受一名新的牧师进入我们总会；教会周年庆或大会上的彼此问候与表彰；会友转至另一所教会的认可信件；推荐牧师和教师服侍另一间教会。因此，我们不会把会友转至非正统教会，我们也不会向这类教会共同体传达我们的祝贺以及美好的祝福。我们的代表也许可以作为旁观者参加那些与我们没有团契关系的教会（比如 LCMS）所举办的大会或会议，为的是获得关于那些教会共同体中所发生之事精确、第一手的信息，但他们不会参与他们的敬拜、祷告或者讨论，他们也不会在这类会议中传达正式的问候（很明显，很多问候并非教会团契的表达，诸如我们遇到熟人时的社交问候）。

Charity work

善工

Today cooperation in Christian charity is sometimes regarded as mere “cooperation in externals,” but it was not so regarded in the New Testament. The Macedonians urgently pleaded with Paul for the privilege of sharing in (that is, having fellowship in) the charitable service to the saints in Jerusalem (2 Corinthians 8:4). The goal of this charitable work was not merely to relieve human need, but to glorify God together. “This service that you perform is not only supplying the needs of God’s people but is also overflowing in many expressions of thanks to God. Because of the service by which you have proved yourselves, men will praise God for the obedience that accompanies your confession of the gospel of Christ” (2 Corinthians 9:12,13). The spiritual motivation and the fellowship that are an essential part of Christian charitable work are emphasized throughout 2 Corinthians 8 and 9.

今天，在基督徒善工上的彼此合作有时被视为不过是“外在的合作”，然而新约却并非如此看待。马其顿人迫切请求保罗让他们可以在服侍耶路撒冷圣徒善工的特权上有份（即，有团契关系）（哥林多后书 8:4）。这项善工的目的不仅仅是解决人的需要，而是一起加入到荣耀神的事上。“因为办这供给的

事，不但补圣徒的缺乏，而且叫许多人越发感谢神。他们从这供给的事上得了凭据，知道你们承认基督顺服他的福音，多多地捐钱给他们和众人，便将荣耀归与神”（哥林多后书 9:12,13）。纵观哥林多后书第 8 第 9 章，就属灵动机以及团契关系作为基督徒善工的一个重要部分这一点，保罗可谓三令五申。

We, therefore, do not join with heterodox churches in charitable work nor in the operation of charitable institutions. When the Synodical Conference was dissolved, arrangements were made for an orderly dissolution of shared charitable work. (It is, of course, possible to do charitable work outside of the framework of religious fellowship, as is done in many secular charities.)

因此，我们不参与非正统教会的善工，也不参与他们慈善机构的运作。当总会联合会解散的时候我们就已作出安排有序地解散曾共同参与的慈善工作（当然，在宗教团契的框架之外做慈善工作也是有可能的，正如许多世俗慈善机构所做的那样）。

Prayer

祷告

Prayer is always an act of worship. We cannot say, “This prayer is simply an act of friendship or sociability.” Prayer is always a religious act. All prayer, therefore, should be offered in accordance with the biblical principles of fellowship.

祷告从来就是一项敬拜活动。我们不可说，“这种祷告不过是友谊或者社交之举。”祷告从来都是一项宗教活动。因此，所有的祷告，都应当在符合圣经团契原则的情况下进行。

There are times when praying for a person is an expression of fellowship with him, for example, when praying for the success of an individual’s ministry (Romans 15:30-32; 2 Corinthians 1:11) or in Jesus’ high priestly prayer (John 17). There are, of course, many other circumstances when praying for a person is not an expression of fellowship, as when Christians pray for the enemies of the church or when we pray for the government (1 Timothy 2:1,2). Our prayer for false teachers should be that God will lead them back to the truth.

有时候，为着某人祷告也是一种与他之间团契的表达。比如，当我们向神祷告希望他的事工顺利（罗马书 15: 30-32；哥林多后书 1:11）或是耶稣大祭司的祷告（约翰福音第 17 章）。当然，许多其它情形下，为某人祷告并非团契关系的表达，比如当基督徒为教会仇敌祷告的时候或是当我们为政府祷告的时候（提摩太前书 2:1, 2）。我们为假教师的祷告应当是希望上帝将他带回真理之中。

Praying in the presence of a person is not the same as praying with a person. Paul had no hesitance to pray in the presence of heathen on board the ship (Act 27:35), but he did not join their heathen prayers nor ask them to join in his. Simultaneous silent prayer within a group that is not united in doctrine is not an expression of prayer fellowship.

在某人面前祷告，和某人一起祷告，这两件事并非同一件事。在船上，保罗毫不犹豫地异教徒面前祷告（使徒行传 27:35），然而他并未加入到异教徒的祷告之中，也未要求他们加入到他的祷告之中。在一个团体中并未在教义上认同的同步默祷并非在祷告中团契的表达。

Praying with a person, however, is always an act of joint worship and therefore an act of fellowship. The disagreement between the Wisconsin and Missouri Synods concerning the doctrine of fellowship discussed in Part II of this book centered on

the propriety of praying with people with whom we are not in doctrinal agreement, particularly with the leaders of heterodox Lutheran churches.

然而，和某人共同祷告，从来就是一项联合敬拜活动，因此也是一项团契活动。本书第二部分所讨论的威斯康辛和密苏里总会之间关于团契教义的分歧聚焦在这一问题之上，即与那些与我们教义不一致者之间共同祷告是否合宜，尤其是与那些非正统路德宗教会的领袖们。

There is little specific treatment of the subject of prayer fellowship in the New Testament. As we saw earlier, prayer is simply treated as one expression of fellowship among many others. The early Christians “devoted themselves to the apostles’ teaching and to the fellowship, to the breaking of bread and to prayer” (Acts 2:42). However, nothing in Scripture suggests that prayer should be treated any differently from any other expression of fellowship. Since God-pleasing prayer always flows from faith, every prayer is either an expression of faith (and therefore an act of worship), or it is an abomination. There is no middle ground. If true prayer is always an act of worship, joint prayer calls for the same unity of doctrine as any other act of worship. “Have nothing to do with them” and “keep away from them” cannot mean “pray with them.” We, therefore, do not pray with Christians who are adherents of false doctrine.

新约所涉关于在祷告中团契这一主题的针对性讨论甚少。正如我们早先所见，祷告正如其它形式的团契表达一样，只当视为其中一种。早期基督徒“恒心遵守使徒的教训，彼此交接，掰饼，祈祷”（使徒行传 2:42）。然而，圣经没有任何一处表明上述经文中的祈祷当与其它任何形式的团契表达区别对待。既然上帝所喜悦的祷告皆源自信心，那么所有的祷告要么是信心的表达（所以是一项敬拜活动），要么是可憎之事。这里没有中间地带。如果真正的祷告总是一项敬拜活动，那么联合祷告就像其它敬拜活动一样，同样需要教义上的一致。“弃绝他”和“躲避”根本无法和“与他们一同祷告”兼容。因此，我们不和那些假教义的拥护者一起祷告。

第 12 章

Dealing with Special Problems
and Hard Cases特殊问题及疑难案例
Part 1: Situations Dealing
with Our Own Services

第一部分：我们自己礼拜中的情况处理

Remember the purpose of the principles
of church fellowship
请记住教会团契原则的目的

When we find ourselves struggling with a particularly difficult decision concerning the application of the principles of church fellowship, it is often helpful to remember the purpose of the principles of church fellowship. The principles are not ends in themselves. God gave them for the good of people's souls. When you are wrestling with a hard case, weigh each course of action available to you by honestly evaluating whether it will promote or work against one of the basic goals of the scriptural principles of fellowship:

当我们发现自己正挣扎于为着教会团契原则的应用做一个尤其困难的决定时，记得教会团契原则的目的往往大有裨益。原则本身并非终点。上帝为着人的灵魂赐下这些原则。当你挣扎于某个疑难案例时，请通过评估你能采取的每种行动是否会促进或者违背团契圣经原则的某个基本目标，来诚实地衡量这些行动：

1. Love leads us to warn the adherent of false teaching against his errors in the hope that he can be won to repentance (Matthew 18:15; 1 Timothy 1:3-5; 2 Timothy 2:25,26; Titus 3:10).

1. 爱引导我们针对假教导拥护者的错误提出警告，并盼望他可以被得回悔改（马太福音 18:15；提摩太前书 1:3-5；提摩太后书 2:25,26；提多书 3:10）。

2. Love leads us to warn others against the errorist, so that they do not fall victim to his false teaching (1 Timothy 4:1-6; 2 Timothy 4:2-5; Titus 1:10-14). We have a special responsibility toward those weak in the faith (Jude 22,23).

2. 爱引导我们警告他人防备犯错者，免得他们落入对方的假教导（提摩太前书 4:1-6；提摩太后书 4:2-5；提多书 1:10-14）。我们对于那些信心软弱者负有特殊的责任（犹大书 22，23）。

3. We must avoid even the appearance of going along with error, even in matters that are adiaphora (Galatians 2:3). If a false teacher teaches falsely about an adiaphoron, we will not go along with him even though the matter in question is an adiaphoron.

3. 我们甚至必须避免让自己看起来像是在拥护错误，即便只是在中立物上（加拉太书 2:3）。若是某位假教师错误地教导中立物，就算所教之事本身是中立物，我们也不会赞同他。

4. We must separate from false teachers to protect ourselves from the dangerous poison of error, which is a threat to our souls (Galatians 5:9; 2 Timothy 2:17).

4. 我们必须躲避假教师，保护我们自己免受错误的毒害，这些错误威胁着我们灵魂的安危（加拉太书 5:9；提摩太后书 2:17）。

In hard cases we should ask ourselves, “How can I best give a clear testimony against error to the false teacher, to his adherents, and to everyone else who observes my action? How can I best win them for the truth?”

面对疑难案例，我们应当自问，“我如何才能向假教师、向他的跟随者、向每个观察我行为举止的人做最清晰的见证来反对错误呢？我如何才能得回他们，以至于他们也进入真理之中呢？”

Some difficult areas

一些困难领域

Closed Communion

紧密圣餐

WELS Pastors normally give Communion only to members of their congregations and visitors from WELS congregations and from synods in fellowship with WELS. Very rarely, unusual situations may arise that permit an exception to this regular practice. For example, a WELS member's mother who belongs to the Missouri Synod visits her daughter and suddenly becomes critically ill. She is hospitalized, and no LCMS pastor is available to minister to her. As she faces death, the WELS pastor who visits her in the hospital at her daughter's request could commune her since her immediate spiritual needs would be the paramount concern.

WELS 牧师通常只会给他们教会的会友、来自 WELS 各教会的访客以及来自和 WELS 有团契关系的其它总会访客分发圣餐。极少数不寻常的情况下，可能会允许例外。比如，一位 WELS 会友的母亲，她属于密苏里总会，在她拜访她女儿期间突然重病。她住进了医院，此时没有 LCMS 的牧师可以向她分发圣餐。在她临死的时候，应她女儿请求去医院拜访她的 WELS 牧师可以向这位母亲分发圣餐，因为她眼前的属灵需要是首要问题。

The private setting in which the action occurs lessens the likelihood of the offense that would be caused by such an action in a public worship service. Naturally, the normal requirements for being properly prepared to receive the Lord's Supper would apply. We could never, for example, commune someone who does not recognize the presence of Christ's body and blood, for he or she would be eating and drinking to his or her own judgment.

这种行为发生在私下，降低了这种行为在公开礼拜仪式中冒犯他人的可能性。自然，恰当预备领受圣餐的通常要求也需满足。例如，我们永远不能和一名无法辨别基督的身体和宝血的人共领圣餐，因为这样他或她就是在吃喝自己的罪了。

In asking whether it is possible to justify such exceptions to our normal practice, we may consider Jesus' evaluation of a similar "hard case," which permitted an exception to a ceremonial law God had given to Israel (Mark 2:27). The rule governing the situation was clear: non-priests were not allowed to eat the consecrated bread from the tabernacle (Leviticus 24:9). Yet Jesus did not condemn the priests or David for allowing David's men to eat the sacred bread in an emergency situation (1 Samuel 21:1-6). Furthermore, Jesus stated that even the law against work on the Sabbath permitted exceptions for the priests offering sacrifices or for anyone helping individuals or even animals in distress. The Pharisees' mistake was that they had forgotten that "the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath" (Mark 2:27). We shouldn't forget that fellowship principles were made for man; man wasn't made for fellowship principles. If we remember that God desires "mercy, not sacrifice," we won't condemn the innocent (Matthew 12:7).

若问这类例外对于我们一般的实践是否合理，我们可以思考耶稣对于一桩与之类似的“疑难案例”的评估，对于上帝赐给以色列的仪式律而言，此事准许了一次例外（马可福音 2:27）。这类情况的规矩是清楚的：非祭司人员不可吃会幕中的陈设饼（利未记 24:9）。然而耶稣并未谴责祭司或大卫允许大卫的手下在紧急情况下吃了陈设饼（撒母耳记上 21:1-6）。此外，耶稣甚至表明安息日禁止作工的律法允许祭司献祭或者任何人伸手帮助遭难的个人甚或动物这类例外。法利赛人的错误在于他们忘了“安息日是为人设立的，人不是为安息日设立的”（马可福音 2:27）。我们不应当忘记团契原则是为人设立的，人却不是为团契原则而设立的。如果我们记得上帝“喜爱怜恤，不喜爱祭祀”，我们就不将无罪当有罪了（马太福音 12:7）。

Some Lutheran writers of unquestioned orthodoxy say that the Lord's Supper is never enough of an emergency to allow for an exception to the rule, since the Lord's Supper is not an absolute need for salvation. But David's men would probably not have starved in one day, and the people who came to be healed on the Sabbath could have waited till Sunday. Jesus, nevertheless, does not condemn the exceptions that were made in order to help them.

一些正统路德宗作者称，圣餐从来都不会紧急到可以允许规则的例外，因为圣餐并非救恩的绝对需要。然而，大卫的手下可能不会在一天内饿死，那些在安息日来求医治的人也许也可以等到周日。但是，耶稣却没有谴责那些为了帮助他们而作出的例外举动。

We should, however, be very careful that exceptions do not undermine the principle or the normal practice, which still stands. Exceptions will normally occur only in cases in which we can establish that the person is properly prepared to receive the Lord's Supper but there is not time to fully explore the issues raised by the person's affiliation with a heterodox Lutheran church, or the person has lost the mental capacity to understand those issues.

然而，我们又当谨慎，例外并不削弱原则或一般实践，这些仍然有效。例外通常只会出现在以下情况：我们可以确定该人已恰当预备好领受圣餐，但没有时间充分探讨因该人与非正统路德宗的关系所引起的问题，或者该人已经丧失了理解这些问题的心智能力。

Cases in which a person, for convenience' sake, wants to attend Communion both in a WELS congregation and in an ELCA or LCMS congregation, such as when Midwesterners spend the winter in the Sun Belt or when students are away at school, are not emergency situations. In such circumstances we owe the people a clear testimony that they cannot keep one foot in each camp. Since attendance at the Lord's Supper is not often an emergency need, exceptional cases will be very rare.

有时某人只是为图方便，想要同时参加 WELS 教会一方与 ELCA 或 LCMS 教会另一方的圣餐礼，比如中西部的人在西南部过冬，又或学生离家在校这类非紧急情况。在这些情况下，我们需要向人作出明确的见证，以表明他们不可脚踏两只船。因为领圣餐通常并非紧急需要，所以例外的情况极为罕见。

When members of another Lutheran synod that is not in fellowship with WELS are visiting services in a WELS church because they are disturbed by the liberalism in their church and they are considering becoming members of WELS for confessional reasons, we will encourage them to regard themselves as communicant members of their present church until they have given their testimony against the false teaching of that church, their testimony is not accepted, and they are, therefore, compelled to leave. If they are leaving their previous church for confessional reasons, they will understand and appreciate our careful stewardship of the Lord's Supper, and they will realize that they cannot be on both sides of the fence at the same time.

如果与 WELS 并无团契关系的另一个路德宗总会会友由于被他们教会的自由主义所困扰，正考虑因认信的原因要成为 WELS 的会友，那么，直到他们对他们教会的假教导作了见证，但他们的见证却不被接受而被迫离开之前，我们都会鼓励他们把自己看作是现在教会的圣餐参与者。如果他们是出于认信的原因而离开原来的教会，他们就会理解并感激我们对圣餐的谨慎看管，他们也会意识到他们无法脚踏两只船。

In determining cases of Communion fellowship, we must consider everything the Bible tells us about the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians 10 and 11. This is the Lord's Supper, not ours. His directions determine our practice. To attend the Lord's Supper in our churches, a person must: (1) believe in Christ so he can remember and proclaim his death, (2) recognize the presence of Christ's true body and blood so that he does not bring judgment upon himself by his eating and drinking, (3) be able to examine himself, and (4) be repentant for all his sins. In addition, he must be united with us in doctrine so we can truly be "one body" as we eat and drink together (1 Corinthians 10:17).

在裁定圣餐团契这一问题上，我们必须思考圣经哥林多前书第 10 章与第 11 章中所涉关于圣餐的内容。这是主的圣餐，而不是我们的。他的指引决定我们如何实践。若要在我们教会领受圣餐，此人必须：（1）相信基督，所以他纪念又表明他的死，（2）分辨基督真身体、真宝血的临在，这样就不是吃喝自己的罪，（3）可以省察自己，并（4）懊悔他所有的罪。另外，他必须在教义上与我们合一，这样，当我们一起吃喝的时候我们才真是“一个身体”（哥林多前书 10:17）。

We call the Lord's Supper Communion because three communions or fellowships are involved: communion with God through faith; the communion of the body and blood of Christ with the elements of the bread and wine; and the communion of faith, that is, the fellowship between all of those who attend together. To participate in Communion in a God-pleasing way, an individual must understand and participate

in all three of these communions. Those who participate without such understanding bring judgment rather than blessing upon themselves.

我们把圣餐称为圣相通礼，是因为其中有三种相通或说团契：藉信与上帝相通；基督的身体和宝血，与酒和饼相通；信徒之间的相通，即，其中所有参与者之间的团契。若要按神所喜悦的方式参与圣餐礼，此人就必须理解并参与所有这三种相通。那些并未如此了解的若是参加，就是让审判落到自己头上，而非祝福。

We do not allow our own children to attend the Lord's Supper until they have been carefully instructed and examined so that they may receive the Sacrament as a blessing. We ask our own members to announce for Communion and to prepare themselves to attend. We owe the same love and concern to those from outside. We exclude people who have not been instructed in our churches from attending Communion with us not in order to harm them, but to help and protect them.

在我们的孩子受到认真教导与检查以确认可以领受圣礼的祝福之前，我们不会允许他们参与圣餐。我们要求我们自己的会友参加圣餐之前公开宣布，并预备领受。我们对外部人员当给予同样的爱与关怀。我们不让那些没有在我们的教会受教导的人与我们一起领圣餐，并非为了伤害他们，而是为了帮助和保护他们。

To permit people to attend the Lord's Supper without proper knowledge and preparation is as irresponsible as it would be for a doctor to dump all of the medicine out on his waiting room table and to tell the patients to help themselves. A pastor, as a doctor of the soul, is as responsible for careful diagnosis and instruction of his patients as a doctor of the body is to his. If people attend the Lord's Supper at our churches without receiving instructions in our teachings, this would be as reckless as signing a contract they have never read or joining an organization without knowing what it stands for. Love requires us to exercise careful stewardship of the Lord's Supper.

让人在没有适当知识与准备的情况下领圣餐，就像医生把他所有的药品放在会客厅桌上让病人自取其用一样不负责任。作为一名灵魂的医生，牧师有责任对他的病人仔细诊断与指导，就像身体的医生对他的病人一样。如果让人在没有接受我们教导的情况下就在我们教会领圣餐，其鲁莽程度堪比让人在没有阅读合同的情况下就下笔签名，或是让人在不知道某组织立场的情况下就让他加入其中。爱要求我们谨慎管理圣餐。

Today we cannot assume that even those coming from other Lutheran churches have received thorough preparation for the Lord's Supper or sound instruction in the teachings of God's Word. For this reason also we cannot practice Communion that is open to all Lutherans. Love requires us to practice the Lord's Supper within the close circle of our own fellowship.

现如今，我们甚至无法假定那些来自其它路德宗教会的人对于圣餐都已领受充分的预备，也无法假定他们在上帝话语的教导上已经接受稳固的指导。因此我们也不可开放式地和所有路德宗共领圣餐。爱要求我们在我们自己团契的紧密圈子内领受圣餐。

Because our practice of closed Communion can become a very emotional issue for those whom we ask not to attend the Lord's Supper and for our own members when we ask their friends or family not to attend, it is important that our congregations do everything they can to promote an understanding of the loving goals of our practice and to prevent misunderstanding and offense. Among the ways in which we can do this are the following:

对于我们没有允许参加圣餐的人，对于我们的会友（因我们没有允许他们的朋友或家人参加），由于我们紧密圣餐的实践可能成为一个让人异常情绪化的问题，所以我们的会众需要尽力帮助他们了解我们的实践是出于爱，并尽力防止引起误解与冒犯他人，这点尤为重要。为此我们可以做的有以下这些：

1. We should provide ongoing instruction in the meaning of the Lord's Supper so that members understand why we treat it so carefully.

1. 我们应当不断教导圣餐的相关意义，以至于会友可以理解我们为何如此谨慎看待这一问题。

2. We should train the members of the congregation to inform visitors whom they bring with them about our Communion practices in advance so visitors are not surprised to find they cannot receive the Lord's Supper in our congregations.

2. 我们应当训练教会的会友向他们带来的访客提前告知我们的圣餐实践，以至于他们对于无法在我们教会领圣餐一事并不会感到惊讶。

3. We should make announcements in the bulletin and before Communion so that visitors understand the loving concerns that lie behind our practice. Such announcements must be carefully and clearly worded, since visitors may not understand such terms as "in fellowship with the teachings of this church" or "properly prepared to receive the Lord's Supper."

3. 我们应当在公告中及圣餐前都发布声明，以至于访客理解我们实践背后出于爱的目的。这类声明必须言语谨慎、措辞清晰，因为访客也许并不能理解“与该教会的教导有团契关系”或者“恰当预备领受圣餐”这类术语。

4. The pastor or trained greeters can be available before the service to provide a brief explanation to visitors. They may offer to explain our practice more fully later or may provide visitors with a tract that explains our practice.

4. 牧师或训练有素的接待可以在礼拜开始前向访客做简短解释。之后也许可以更完整地解释我们的实践或提供访客一本解释我们实践的小册子。

What should the pastor do when someone he does not recognize appears at the altar? Should he commune the person or pass him by? If our Communion practice has been explained in advance as suggested above, the pastor need not accuse himself of irresponsible administration of the Sacrament if he distributes the elements to someone he does not recognize. In such cases the responsibility rests with the communicant. Visitors from sister congregations should announce to the pastor before the service to spare him from this dilemma. The pastor will make an effort to speak to any unknown communicant after the service to clarify the situation. If a person appears at the altar who the pastor knows has been warned not to attend, the pastor will not commune him.

若是有牧师不认识的人来到祭坛前，那么牧师应如何应对呢？他是应当给此人分发圣餐呢？还是应当略过他呢？如果我们的圣餐实践已经按上述建议提前作了解释，那么如果牧师将酒饼分发给了他认识的人，就不必控告自己管理圣礼不力了。这类情况的责任在于领圣餐者。从姐妹教会来的访客应当在礼拜前通知牧师，以免牧师处于两难境地。礼拜后牧师则需尽力与任何一名未识领圣餐者交谈以澄清问题。如果有人已被牧师警告不能领圣餐，那么若是他出现在祭坛前，牧师则不会让他参与。

In obedience to God's Word we stand in reverence and awe before the Sacrament of Christ's body and blood, given and shed for us. As congregations and pastors, we will want to administer and use this Sacrament as he directs so that the bonds of fellowship within our congregations will be strengthened. We will carefully warn everyone against improper reception of this sacrament and make every effort to

reach out to others to win them to faith and repentance and to prepare them for a beneficial reception of the Lord's Supper.

因顺服神的话语，我们以敬畏的心站在圣礼之前，这圣礼乃是为我们舍的基督身体和为我们流的基督宝血的圣礼。作为会众与牧师，我们想要按着他的旨意管理并使用圣礼，以至于我们教会内团契的纽带得到坚固。我们会小心警告每个人勿以不恰当的方式领受这一圣礼，竭力拓展事工以得回他人，携带他们进入信心与悔改之中，预备他们有益领受圣餐。

Funerals

葬礼

Our regular practice is that WELS pastors conduct a Christian funeral only for people who are members of our fellowship, since the funeral includes a recognition of the deceased's Christian confession and life. This means we normally bury only members of our own congregations. However, exceptional circumstances may arise.

对此，我们的一般实践是，WELS 的牧师只为我们团契的会友举行基督徒葬礼，因为葬礼包括对于去世基督徒的认信与生活的认可。这就意味着我们通常只埋葬我们自己教会的会友。然而，可能会有例外情况。

It may happen that a WELS pastor was ministering to a nonmember during his or her last illness. In response to the pastor's presentation of the gospel, that individual confessed faith in Christ. After the person's death, the pastor learns the deceased had been a nominal member of the Masonic Lodge. Normally our churches would not conduct a Christian funeral for such a person, since the religious beliefs and practices of the Masonic Lodge contradict the Bible. But in this case, the deceased had not had a chance to "set his house in order." On the basis of the person's confession of faith, the pastor who had served him could conduct the funeral, but to avoid confusion or offense he would explain the circumstances to his church council and/or congregation, and he would not allow the Masons to have any role in the Christian funeral.

一名 WELS 的牧师可能会服侍一名奄奄一息的非会友（他或她）。在牧师宣讲福音之后，此人便表明了他信基督。此人死后，牧师了解到这名死者曾经是共济会的成员。通常我们的教会不会为这类人举办基督徒葬礼，因为共济会的宗教信仰与实践都与圣经相抵触。然而，此类情形下，死者尚未有机会“安排他的各项事宜”。基于此人的信仰告白，曾服侍他的这位牧师可以为他举办葬礼。但是为避免造成困惑或冒犯他人，牧师需要向他的教会理事会或会众解释清楚当前的状况，另外，他不可允许共济会成员在基督徒的葬礼中承担任何工作。

Sometimes military representatives or representatives of veterans groups will seek to address the mourners after the committal of a veteran. There is no problem with this if they simply present the family with a flag or offer a few words of appreciation for the veteran's service. But occasionally military chaplains will make remarks that are inappropriate and in some cases even unscriptural. The family and pastor should try to prevent this by respectfully informing the military representatives that the deceased's own pastor is conducting the funeral and that if they wish to speak, they should confine themselves to an expression of gratitude on behalf of the military. If such chaplains push themselves on the family by insisting on speaking after the service has ended, the responsibility for their remarks rests with them, not with the pastor or family.

有时候，退伍老兵下葬后，军队代表或退伍老兵代表想要为逝者致悼词。如果他们只是向家属献上一面旗帜，或是对该老兵的服侍说几句感谢的话，这并无伤大雅。但偶尔，军队牧师也会发表不恰当的言论，在某些情况下甚至违反圣经。家属和牧师应当设法防止这种情况的发生，恭敬地通知军方代表，死者自己的牧师将主持葬礼，并且，如果他们想发言，他们应当限于代表军方表达感激之情。如果这些牧师向死者家属施压，坚持自己要在礼拜结束后讲话，那么他们发言的责任就在于他们自己，而不是死者的牧师或者家人。

Because the death of a loved one is a very emotional situation, it is important that pastors and congregations regularly remind their members of our funeral practices and of the reasons for them so that people do not first learn about them in the stressful situation of trying to arrange a funeral for a loved one. Pastors should also make every effort to evangelize the unchurched relatives of their members while they are still alive, when speaking the gospel to them can still do some good.

亲人去世是一件让人异常情绪化的事件，所以牧师和会众会定期提醒他们的会友我们举办葬礼的惯例和原因，这样人们就不会在挠头为亲人办葬礼的压力下才第一次了解这些事，这点尤为重要。牧师也应该尽一切努力，趁会友的那些尚未进入教会的亲属们还在世就为向他们传福音，那时向他们传福音还算有益处。

Participation in our services by nonmembers

非会友参加我们的礼拜

If it is a violation of the scriptural principles of fellowship for us to participate in the services of heterodox churches, why do we allow members of heterodox churches or even unbelievers to be present during our services and to participate in the hymns and prayers?

如果我们参与非正统教会的礼拜不合乎团契的圣经原则，那我们为何还允许非正统教会的会友甚至是非信徒出席我们的礼拜、参加赞美和祷告呢？

It is wrong for us to participate in prayers, hymns, or creeds in any worship setting that supports error or grants equal rights to truth and error, such as the services of a heterodox church or an ecumenical service. Our services, however, are not such a compromised setting, since no rights or recognition are being given to error. Visitors of another faith who are present are not providing their own input to our services; they are receiving our doctrine. These are our services, not joint services. Visitors are not receiving the impression that there are no doctrinal differences that separate them from us. The fact that they cannot attend Communion in our churches gives them a clear testimony that they are not in fellowship with our congregations.

我们确实不可参与任何支持错误或无视真理与错误区别的敬拜仪式，诸如非正统教会或是普世联合的敬拜仪式，无论是祷告、赞美或是信经诵读。然而，我们的敬拜仪式并非这类妥协让步的仪式，因为其中没有给予错误的权利或认可。信仰不同的访客出席我们的敬拜，无法向我们的敬拜仪式输入他们自己的东西；他们是在接受我们的教义。这些礼拜是我们的礼拜，而非联合礼拜。我们给访客的印象并非我们与他们之间不存在教义差异而有分别。他们无法参加我们教会圣餐礼这一事实向他们作了清楚的见证——即，他们和我们的教会并无团契。

We admittedly do have a stricter practice concerning participation in the Lord's Supper than we do for joining in the hymns of the congregation. Part of the reason for this relates to fellowship concerns: coming forward to the Lord's Supper is a

very visible confession of fellowship with the other communicants. This is one reason we treat the Lord's Supper with special care.

不可否认，与参与教会赞美相比，我们在圣餐上的实践确实更为严格。我们这么做的部分原因是出于团契的考虑：来到圣餐台前是与其他领餐者团契的可见信仰告白。这是我们特别对待圣餐的理由之一。

There is, however, an additional reason for closed Communion, that is, our responsibility to be sure that all communicants are properly instructed and prepared so that they do not partake of the Sacrament to their own harm, as discussed above. We cannot assume such preparation on the part of people who are not of our fellowship. We, therefore, must not allow them to attend the Lord's Supper, so that they do not bring judgment upon themselves by their attendance (1 Corinthians 11:29).

然而，紧密圣餐还有另外一个理由。即，我们有责任确认所有领餐者受到了恰当教导与预备，以至于他们不是在参与侵害他们自己的圣礼，正如我们之前讨论的。我们无法假定那些与我们没有团契之人接受了这样的预备。因此，我们不准他们参与圣餐，这样做是为了不让他们进来吃喝他们自己的罪（哥林多前书 11:29）。

Even in the early church, nonmembers were not excluded from the common service, but only from the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Our general practice has been this: We do object to our members joining in the services of the heterodox because this gives the appearance of supporting false teaching; we do not have the same objection to prospects or visitors appearing to give assent to our services, which do not promote false doctrine.

即便是在早期教会，非会友并未不被允许参加普通敬拜仪式，而只是不可参加圣餐礼。我们通常的实践如下：我们确实反对我们的会友参加非正统教会的礼拜，因为这让他们看起来是在支持假教导；我们却不反对那些并未在我们的礼拜推销假教导、看起来赞同我们礼拜的潜在未来会友或访客。

If visitors do choose to participate in hymns or other elements of our services, their participation may imply an acceptance of what is being taught. So visitors of another faith who recognize this can, and often do, refrain from participating in the liturgy and hymns when they are present in our services to witness an event such as a baptism. The choice is theirs—to participate in worship that is offered on the basis of our confession or to refrain from participation since they are unsure of our position.

如果访客确实选择加入赞美或者我们礼拜的其它环节，那么他们的参与也许恰恰表明了他们接受我们的教导。因此，意识到这点的、信仰不同的访客在我们的礼拜中见证洗礼等事件时，他们可以并且通常会避免参与礼拜仪式和赞美。选择权仍在他们手中——是参与基于我们认信的敬拜，还是因为他们不确定我们的立场而不参与。

Other involvement in worship

其他人员加入敬拜

The involvement of choir members, organists, choir directors, soloists, etc., in worship seems to fall into a category between receiving the Lord's Supper and singing hymns. Their involvement in worship does not require proper spiritual preparation in the same way as participating in the Lord's Supper does, but they are a more visible, public testimony of fellowship than sitting in the pew and joining in the hymns. We urge members to join the choir as a way of expressing their faith and

serving the Lord. We want our church musicians to be committed ministers of music, who are able to make more than a mechanical contribution to the worship of the church. Church musicians are public representatives of the church, with a prominent public role. They, therefore, should be members of the congregation or its fellowship.

唱诗班、风琴演奏者、唱诗班指挥、独奏者等加入敬拜，这类问题似乎介于领受圣餐与唱赞美诗之间。他们加入到敬拜中，并不需要像领圣餐那样的恰当属灵预备，然而比起坐在凳子上以及加入到赞美中的那些人而言，他们是团契更为可见、更为公开的见证。我们力劝会友加入唱诗班，以表达他们的信心并服侍主。我们希望我们的教会乐师是忠心的乐师，他们能够为教会敬拜所作的并不仅仅是机械的贡献。教会乐师是教会的公共代表，是重要的公开角色。因此，他们应该是教会会友或其团契会友。

A secondary, practical consideration is the effect our practice may have on wavering or indecisive prospects. If we allow people who are not yet ready to make a commitment to membership to participate in the ministries of the congregation as if they were members, we may be encouraging them to continue their indecision. Withholding the privileges of membership will make it clear to them that they cannot continue to straddle the fence, but must make a decision. To permit them to make a commitment to serve the church before they are even committed to joining it is to put the cart before the horse. There might, however, be exceptional circumstances in which a committed person could be permitted to join the congregation or to serve it in special ways before completing all of the lessons of a membership class. Such cases would be dealt with on an individual basis.

第二点实际考量是，我们的实践可能会对摇摆不定或优柔寡断的潜在未来会友产生影响。如果我们允许那些尚未准备好承诺成为会友的人像会友一样参与教会的事工，我们可能是在鼓励他们继续犹豫不决。保留会友的特权会使他们清楚地看到，他们不能继续骑墙观望，而是必须作出决定。在他们尚未愿意承诺加入教会之前就允许他们承诺服侍教会，这是本末倒置的做法。然而，在特殊的情况下，愿意承诺者可能会在所有会友课程完成之前就被允许加入教会或以特殊的方式服侍教会。这类情形当个别对待。

In real life, however, disputes that arise concerning the musical participation of nonmembers in our services are rarely due to the presence of such sincere seekers, who are coming to the congregation to receive instruction in the truth. Problems are much more often due to one of two causes. First, someone has concluded that the congregation does not have adequate musicians among its members and must seek elsewhere for competent organists and directors. Such musicians may be hired with the rationale that they are just mechanics pushing the keys and collecting their pay. If all parties share this understanding of the job, perhaps it can be argued that this practice is no different than hiring a janitor, but is it really true that enhancing worship is as mechanical a function as sweeping the church floor? It is hard to understand how anyone could find much joy or satisfaction in such an arrangement. In such cases, it would be wise for the congregation to stop and ask itself, "Are we reaching outside our fellowship for musicians to fill our musical needs or our musical wants? Will our services be a better testimony to our faith if we gladly serve the Lord with the best talents he has given us or if we hire the best talents available, even if it means going outside our faith?" If the Lord has not given us anyone who can sing or direct, maybe it is not yet time for us to have a choir. (The rapid

development of high-quality computerized music will soon diminish the perceived need to look to outside sources for musicianship.)

然而，现实中，关于非会友在我们礼拜中参加音乐事工的争论很少基于这些来教会接受真理的教导、认真寻求真理者的存在而做各方面的考量。问题更多是基于以下两者之一。第一，有人得出结论，认为教会会友中没有足够的乐师，必须从别处寻找有能力的管风琴手和音乐指挥。雇佣这些音乐家的理由可能是，他们只是机械按键收工资的匠人。如果各方对这项工作都有这样的理解，也许可以说，这种做法与雇佣一名保安并无多少不同，但是，为敬拜润色果真如打扫教堂地板一般机械吗？很难理解怎么会有人在如此安排中得到喜乐或满足。在这种情况下，明智的做法是让会众停下来问问自己，“我们是否要在团契之外寻找音乐家来满足我们对音乐的需求呢？”我们乐意用上帝所赐给我们的最佳人才来侍奉他，还是我们雇佣即便是和我们信仰不同的最佳人才，我们的哪种服侍可以更好地见证我们的信仰呢？”如果主还没有给我们一个会唱歌或会指挥的人，也许我们还没有到成立唱诗班的时候（高质量计算机化音乐的快速发展将很快减少人们认为需要从外部来源寻求音乐能人的必要性）。

The second major source of conflict is the desire of members to have nonmembers participate in wedding services and the like. Here again we can ask the same questions as above: “Do we want this person to participate to meet musical needs or musical wants? Will the wedding service be a better testimony to our faith if we use the talents God has provided within our fellowship of faith or if we place our desire for musical beauty ahead of giving an unambiguous testimony to the truth?” If the reason for wanting nonmembers to participate in the service is not musical quality, but personal friendship, a second factor comes into play. Is there an unwillingness to give a clear and honest testimony to friends and relatives concerning the doctrinal differences that divide us? Is it really love for our friends to allow them to hold the impression that the doctrinal differences that divide us are not that important? If there are doctrinal differences separating us from those who desire to participate in the wedding, love requires that we give a clear testimony to them of the seriousness of the doctrinal differences that prevent them from taking a visible, active role in a service of the church.

争论的第二个主要原因是会友想要非会友参加婚礼等仪式。再一次，我们可以问我们自己如上同样的问题：“我们意欲此人加入是为满足音乐需求吗？我们使用上帝所赐给我们同一信仰团契内的人才，还是我们用音乐的美感来牺牲对真理做清晰的见证呢？”如果想要非会友参加仪式的理由并非音乐质量，而是个人的友谊，那么第二个问题就来了。我们是否不愿意就教义的分歧向亲朋好友作清楚而诚实的见证呢？给我们的朋友留下印象，让他们认为那使我们分开的教义差异并不那么重要，这真的是爱吗？如果确实存在使我们与那些渴望参与婚礼仪式的人分开的教义差异，那么爱要求我们向他们清楚地作见证，教义上的差异是一个严肃的问题，这种差异阻碍了他们在教会的服侍中发挥可见的积极作用。

We can help our members and their friends understand the reasons for our position if we give regular, clear instruction on the nature of a church wedding. What happens in a church wedding? The Word of God is proclaimed, we pray, we praise God, and people declare that they intend to obey God’s will. A church wedding is, therefore, no different from any other worship service, except that God’s Word and our worship are applied very directly to the marriage of two people.

如果我们对于教会婚礼的本质定期作清晰的教导，那我们则可以帮助我们的会友以及他们的朋友理解我们的立场。教会婚礼有哪些事呢？上帝的话语得以

宣讲，我们祷告，我们赞美神，人们宣告他们愿意顺服神的旨意。因此，教会婚礼和其它的敬拜仪式并没有什么不同，除了神的话语以及我们的敬拜直接应用在了两个人的婚姻之上。

Scripture teaches us that only people who agree with the teachings of the church should lead its services. Wouldn't it be strange if we invited someone who did not agree with our beliefs to speak a message from God's Word to us? Isn't it just as strange to invite such a person to sing a message from God's Word or to remind us of such a message by playing the melodies that bring it to our minds? For this reason, our practice is that we do not permit people from outside our fellowship to serve as organists and soloists during services of our churches.

圣经教导我们只有认同教会教导的人可以带领教会的各种仪式。如果我们邀请不认同我们信仰的人来为我们传讲上帝话语的信息，这岂不是件奇怪之事？那么，邀请这类人过来唱出上帝话语的信息，或通过演奏旋律来提醒我们上帝话语中的信息，这不也一样奇怪吗？因此，我们的实践是，我们不允许我们团契外的人在我们教会的仪式中担任风琴演奏者以及独奏者。

The practice of allowing such participation in a wedding by nonmembers before the invocation or after the benediction, which a few congregations apparently have adopted, is not to be recommended because it too easily becomes a way of evading the issue. Is it valid to claim that the music immediately before and after the service is not part of the worship? If the music has been well-chosen, the organist has begun our worship of God even before any members of the wedding party have entered the church. The second problem is that such a practice can easily give the impression that we are more concerned to uphold the letter of an arbitrary law than we are to fulfill the evangelical purpose of our fellowship practice, which is to give a clear testimony against false teaching. Is it really love for friends and family to let them think that the doctrinal differences that divide us are not that harmful and that practicing the biblical principles of church fellowship is a burden we seek to evade?

一些教会显然已经采用了在仪式开始祷告前或仪式结束祝福后允许非会友参与婚礼举办的做法，但我们不建议这样做，因为这太容易成为一种逃避问题的方法。在礼拜前后的音乐不是敬拜的一部分，这种说法行得通吗？如果音乐是精心挑选的，那么甚至在婚礼参加人员进入教堂之前，风琴手就已经开始了我们对上帝的敬拜。第二个问题是，这样的做法很容易给人造成以下印象：我们更关心维系某条专横律法的字面义，而非成就我们团契实践的福音目的——即作明确反对假教导的见证。让朋友和亲人认为那使我们分开的教义差异并没有那么有害、认为实践教会团契的圣经原则是一种我们想要逃避的负担，这真的是对他们的爱吗？

When pastors give careful, loving, and ongoing instruction about the biblical principles of church fellowship, it is less likely that these problems will have to be dealt with at emotional occasions such as weddings and funerals, when there is great pressure to compromise to avoid conflict. It must be granted, however, that our principles and practices of fellowship will remain offensive to many people, just as many other parts of God's Word are.

当牧师就教会团契的圣经原则问题作细心、有爱和持续的教导时，这些问题就不太可能在诸如婚礼和葬礼这类容易让人情绪化的场合下处理，在这些场合中人往往受到的压力巨大，会作出妥协以避免冲突。然而，我们必须承认，我们的团契原则和实践仍然会冒犯许多人，正如上帝话语的许多其它部分一样。

Children's services and school choirs

孩童服侍及学校唱诗班

Many of our congregations do not exclude children of nonmembers from singing in church on such occasions as a service following the completion of vacation Bible school. Can we justify this discrepancy from our practice concerning church musicians that we have just discussed? It is normally clear to everyone that the children are simply presenting what they have been taught in class. They are not independent preachers, who adhere to a message different from that of the congregation. They are learners receiving instruction from the congregation. If a situation arose in which Baptist parents said, “We think it’s great that our children can come to your vacation Bible school each summer and sing in your service even though we disagree with your doctrine of Baptism,” we would not let their children participate, since we would have to give a clear testimony against their error.

我们许多会众并不排斥非会友的孩子在假期圣经学校结束后的教堂礼拜中唱歌。回顾我们刚刚讨论的关于教会乐师的实践，那么现在我们还要为这种不一致性辩解吗？通常每个人都很清楚，孩子们只是把他们在课堂上所学到的东西呈现出来。他们并非那些坚持不同于会众所接受信息的独立传道人，他们是接受会众教导的学习者。如果有浸信会的家长说：“虽然我们不同意你的洗礼教义，但我们认为我们的孩子每年夏天都能来你的假期圣经学校，在你的礼拜中唱歌，这就很好。”我们不会让他们的孩子参加，因为对于他们的错误，我们必须作出明确的见证。

The aim of the principles of church fellowship is not to prevent people from hearing, accepting, and proclaiming the truth. It is to give a clear testimony against false teaching. If we remember that, we will generally have a good idea of the action we should take in a given case.

教会团契原则的目的并非不叫人们听见、领受并宣讲真理，而是对于假教导作清晰的见证。如果我们记住这点，我们通常就会在特定的情况下采取合宜的行动。

Similar questions arise about the activities of nonmember students in our elementary schools, high schools, and colleges. Should these students participate in chapel services, choral presentations, and the like? Here the root of the problem often lies partly in unclarity concerning the enrollment policy. Are the nonmembers in our schools evangelism prospects, that is, willing learners whom we are instructing with the hope of winning them for our fellowship? If so, they can participate in the school’s activities in the same ways in which visitors participate in congregational worship, as discussed earlier.

我们的小学、高中以及大学的非会友学生活动也有着同样的问题。这些学生应该参加小教堂礼拜、合唱演出等活动吗？这里问题的根源往往部分在于招生政策的不明确。我们学校里的非会友是否是听福音后潜在的未来会友呢？也就是说，他们是那些乐意学习的孩子吗？并在受我们教导后有希望被得回并加入我们的团契吗？如前所述，如果是这样，他们则可以参与学校的活动，就像访客参与教会敬拜一样。

If, on the other hand, these students and their parents are Christians who hold doctrinal convictions that are not in agreement with our position, who intend to maintain their present fellowship, but who are willing to pay for the services of our school for the perceived educational benefits, we should not treat them as if they were in fellowship with us, for then we are sending confusing, mixed signals. We should also honestly examine our reasons for permitting their enrollment in our school under such circumstances. Are we trying to win them away from their

heterodox churches? Are we providing them with educational services for a fee as a way to increase the income of our school? If we are simply providing them with educational services for a fee, we might do well to ask ourselves if this is a valid function of our Christian schools.

如果是另一种情况，即，这些学生和家長是持有不同于我们教义立场的基督徒，他们想要维持他们目前的团契，但他们愿意为我们学校的服務付费，以获得所谓的教育利益，那么我们就不应把他们当作与我们有团契关系，因为这样我们就发出了让人感到困惑的、混淆视听的信号。我们也应当诚实地检查我们允许这类基督徒报名进入我们学校的动机。我们是要将他们从非正统教会中得回吗？还是说我们提供他们教育服务是为了挣取学费以增加我们学校的进账呢？如果我们只是为他们提供教育以挣取学费的话，我们应当扪心自问，这是我们基督教学校的正确功用吗？

In short, we should treat nonmember students in the same way that we treat other visitors to a congregation. If they are mission prospects being instructed in the truth, they can participate in the regular instructional program and worship, but they should not take a leading role in worship or serve as public representatives of the school, as, for example, touring choirs do. Since our main concern in the practice of church fellowship is clear public testimony to the truth, there is some difference between in-house chapel services on the one hand and public concerts or tours to congregations on the other, but even in-house events should give a clear testimony to all students and parents, members and nonmembers alike.

简而言之，我们对待非会友学生就当像我们对待其他教会访客一样。如果他们听福音后受真理教导的潜在未来会友，那么他们可以参加常规的教导课程和敬拜，但是他们不应当在敬拜中担任领袖角色，或是担任学校的公开代表，比如，巡回唱诗班。因为我们教会团契实践的主要目的是对真理做清晰公开的见证，所以内部小教堂礼拜这类事与公开音乐会或教会巡演另一类事略有区别。然而，即便是内部小教堂礼拜这类事，我们也应当向所有学生和家長、会友和非会友作出同样清晰的见证。

The same general practice would be applicable to elementary schools, high schools, and colleges. Our seminary is in a different situation because it exists for the sole purpose of preparing pastors for churches of our confessional fellowship. In very exceptional cases a student who was coming to us for confessional reasons might be admitted before he had joined a WELS congregation. But he could not represent the seminary or the church in public, even in such roles as practice teaching, until he had taken a clear confessional position by means of his church membership. In such cases of transfer to our seminary for confessional reasons, it is normal that the questions of the student's membership and confessional stand are resolved before enrollment. We do not accept students from outside our fellowship who are looking for a general theological training.

这种常规实践对于小学、高中以及大学都同样适用。我们神学院由于它为我们的认信团契教会预备牧师的独特存在目的，就另当别论。在极其罕见的情况下，学生来我们学院是出于认信的原因，这类人可能在加入 WELS 教会之前就被允许进入学院学习。然而，在他用他的教会会友身份采取明确的认信立场之前，即使是在实践教学等角色中，他也不能公开代表学院或者教会。由于认信原因而转学至我们神学院，这类情况下学生的会友身份和认信立场等问题通常会在入学前得到解决。我们不接受团契以外寻求一般神学训练的学生。

Baptismal sponsors and witnesses

洗礼引领人与见证人

Baptismal sponsors, that is, those who promise to help raise a child in the true teachings of the Bible, must be members of our fellowship. Those who merely witness that the baptism was performed need not be of our fellowship. If sponsors are being used, we should instruct prospective parents of the value and importance of choosing sponsors who qualify to be a positive Christian influence on the child, especially if the parents die. The new baptismal order in Christian Worship, which emphasizes the responsibility of the congregation and parents and de-emphasizes the role of sponsors and witnesses, will probably reduce problems with this issue.

洗礼引领人，即，那些承诺以圣经真教导抚养孩童的人，他们必须是我们团契的会友。那些只是见证洗礼施行的人不一定属于我们团契。如果要使用引领人，我们应当引导未来的父母认识到——选择那些有资格对孩子产生积极基督教影响的引领人——价值和重要性，尤其是当那些父母可能不幸离世的时候。《基督徒敬拜》中新的洗礼次序，强调会众与父母的责任，而不再强调引领人和见证人的角色，这可能会减少这类情况的发生。

No confessional role is involved in being witnesses to a wedding, so the principles of fellowship do not come into play in choosing members of a wedding party.

作为婚礼的见证人，这一角色并不涉及认信，所以团契的原则在选择婚礼的参与者上并不起作用。

Receiving funds from outside the church

从外部教会获得经济支持

The church sometimes receives funds from outside its membership. These may be offerings given by visitors, or they may be gifts or grants offered by foundations, corporations, or the government. In some cases the gifts are offered spontaneously by the giver. In other cases the church might seek these grants or make formal application for gifts that have been offered. How does the reception of such gifts relate to the principles of church fellowship?

教会有时候会从教会外部的非会友那里接受经济支持。这些可能是访客的奉献，也可能是基金会、公司或政府的奉献或赠款。某些情况下，奉献是由奉献者自发提供的。其它情况下，教会可能会寻求这些赠款或对已提供的奉献提出正式申请。这类奉献的接受与教会团契原则有何挂钩呢？

First, concerning gifts from individuals: We need not reject offerings made by visitors, but we should be very careful that nonmembers are not receiving a faulty impression concerning the motivation for Christian giving. If there is a self-righteous motive for the gift, we must warn the person against such giving and may have to reject the gift to make the point clearly. For example, if an excommunicated person offered a large gift to the congregation, that had disciplined him, in order to express his attitude “I am not good enough for you, but I bet my money is,” the congregation should reject the gift to make it clear “what [we] want is not your possessions but you” (2 Corinthians 12:14). If it is not clear what the nonmembers’ motivations for such gifts are, the solution is simple—ask them. We cannot let desire to receive a gift stand in the way of a clear testimony to the giver.

首先，关于个人的奉献：我们不必拒绝访客的奉献，但我们应当非常小心，不要让非会友对基督徒奉献的动机产生错误的印象。如果奉献有自以为义的动机，我们必须警告这个人不要这样做，我们也可能不得不拒绝奉献，以清楚地表明这一点。例如，如果一个被逐出教会的人向教会献上一大笔奉献金，以表达他的态度，“我是配不上你们，但我敢肯定，我的钱肯定配得上你们”，会

众应当拒绝这类奉献，以表明“[我们]想要的并非你们的财产，而是你们”（哥林多后书 12:14）。如果不清楚非会友给这些奉献的动机是什么，那么解决问题的办法很简单——问他们。我们不能让想要接受这些奉献的欲望阻碍我们向奉献者作清楚的见证。

If foundations or corporations are involved, the situation often becomes murkier. There is the least problem when corporations simply offer to match charitable contributions of their employees or customers, who assume personal responsibility for where the gift goes and for how it is used. For example, an investment in a mutual fund may carry with it the offer to match, up to a certain limit, a gift the investor makes to a church college. These matching gifts are an extra return on the investment, an incentive to hold that investment. Neither the investor nor the school have any religious fellowship with the company.

如果有基金会或公司的卷入，情况通常会变得黑布隆冬。如果企业给的只是与员工或客户的慈善捐款相匹配的金额，那问题就不大了，因为员工或客户对捐款的去向和用途承担个人责任。例如，在共同基金的投资中，投资者可能会在一定限度内提供与教会学院相当的奉献。这些配对奉献是投资的额外回报，是对持有那份投资的激励。投资者和学校都与该公司没有任何宗教关系。

But what if the corporation takes upon itself the responsibility to determine where the grants go? They then must certainly accept a measure of responsibility for how those funds are used. Further problems arise if the group promotes itself as a religious association that is joining in the work of the church. Are the gifts advertised as a spiritual service offered by the corporation and its members? These practices would raise valid concerns about the propriety of receiving funds from such corporations or foundations.

然而，如果公司自己承担起决定赠款去向的责任呢？然后，它们当然必须对如何使用这些资金承担一定程度的责任。如果该组织将自己宣传为一个加入教会工作的宗教协会，进一步的问题就会出现。这些奉献是否被宣传为该公司及其成员所提供的属灵服侍呢？这些做法会引起人们——对于从这些公司或基金会接受资助是否恰当的——担忧。

Most of the concern and controversy about this issue in WELS has involved grants received from two Lutheran fraternal insurance companies, Aid Association for Lutherans (AAL) and Lutheran Brotherhood.

WELS 大多数关于这个问题的担忧和争议都涉及到两家路德宗兄弟保险公司的资助，即路德宗援助协会（AAL）和路德宗兄弟会。

There was little problem before 1961, when AAL served only members of the Synodical Conference and Lutheran Brotherhood served members of other Lutheran churches. After the dissolution of the Synodical Conference, however, AAL decided to serve Lutherans from all Lutheran bodies. This raised problems since AAL bylaws implied fellowship between its members. In 1973, as a result of this unclarity, the WELS Conference of Presidents declared a moratorium on applying for grants from AAL. Subsequently, AAL changed its bylaws to remove the implications of fellowship. The moratorium was then lifted. In 1979 the WELS convention accepted a lengthy report on this issue.³⁸ The report concluded that receiving grants from such corporations does not in itself imply fellowship with the corporations nor with the other organizations that receive grants from them. However, the report also warned that vigilance is necessary lest such grants undermine Christian stewardship or give the impression of unity and fellowship where they do not, in fact, exist. The

report also expressed concern that company advertising or publicity sometimes gave the impression of fellowship, contrary to the explicit statements of the bylaws.

1961 年之前，还几乎没出什么幺蛾子，当时 AAL 只为总会联合会的会友提供服务，而路德宗兄弟会则为其它的路德教会会友提供服务。然而，总会联合会解散后，AAL 决定为所有路德宗教会共同体提供服务。这就引起了一些麻烦，因为 AAL 章程影射着其成员之间的团契关系。1973 年，由于这种不明确，WELS 主席联合会宣布暂停向 AAL 申请赠款。随后，AAL 修改了章程，去除了其中的团契意味。暂停申请赠款随后便被解除。1979 年，WELS 大会接受了一份对此问题的长篇报告，该报告的结论是，从这些公司获得赠款本身并不意味着与这些公司或与从这些公司获得赠款的其它组织有团契关系。然而，报告也警告说，有必要保持警醒，以免这样的资助削弱了基督徒的管家职责，或者给人留下一一种彼此联合及团契的印象，而实际上这种联合及团契并不存在。报告还对该公司的广告或宣传有时给人造成一种团契的印象表示关切，这样的做法与公司章程的明文规定自相矛盾。

The 1979 report also concluded that Lutheran Brotherhood's statement of purpose implied a spiritual fellowship between its members and that WELS, therefore, should not seek grants from Lutheran Brotherhood. The Lutheran Brotherhood statements were later changed, and WELS institutions have received grants from them since then. In both cases WELS went on record as being ready to give up gifts that carried with them an implication of fellowship where none existed.

1979 年的报告还得出结论，路德宗兄弟会的宗旨声明影射其成员与 WELS 之间有属灵团契关系，因此，WELS 就不应当寻求路德宗兄弟会的资助。路德宗兄弟会的声明随后被修改，从那时起，WELS 的团体就从他们那里得到了资助。在这两件事上，WELS 都曾公开表态准备放弃接受奉献，因为这些奉献都影射一种实际并不存在的团契关系。

Conclusion

总结

In all of these situations our chief concern is “How can we give the clearest testimony to the truth, both to the weak and to the strong, to the errorists and to the adherents of the truth?”

在所有这些情形下，我们最关心的是，“我们如何才能为真理作最清晰的见证呢？无论是向软弱的还是向刚强的，向犯错者还是向真理的追随者。”

第 13 章

Dealing with Special Problems
and Hard Cases

特殊问题及疑难案例

Part 2: Working with Others

第二部分：与他人同工

Attending services of heterodox churches
参加非正统教会的礼拜

We should worship only with those with whom we are in agreement in doctrine. A person may be present at services of heterodox churches for reasons other than worship, for example, to attend the wedding or funeral of a relative or friend or to observe the worship of that church body in order to obtain correct information about it. But in such cases the observer should not participate in the worship, rites, or prayers of the heterodox group.

我们应当只和那些和我们在教义上合一的人一同敬拜。但是有人可能出于一些原因而参加非正统教会的礼拜而非敬拜，比如，参加亲戚朋友的婚礼或葬礼，或者观察某个教会共同体的敬拜为要获得与之相关的确切信息。但是，在这些情况下，观察者不应当参加非正统团体的敬拜、仪式或是祷告。

1 Corinthians 8:10 (“If anyone with a weak conscience sees you . . . eating in an idol’s temple, won’t he be emboldened to eat what has been sacrificed to idols?”) may simply be a rhetorical question referring to something that should never happen, but it may refer to a real situation in which a Christian was invited by friends or family to attend a festive meal in one of the rooms at a heathen temple that served a function similar to our rented banquet halls. There would not necessarily be anything wrong with such attendance, as long as it did not lead weak Christians to sin against their consciences by eating meat sacrificed to idols. But 1 Corinthians 10:14-21 states very specifically that Christians are not to participate in any meals that are rites honoring an idol.

哥林多前书 8:10（“若有人见你.....在偶像的庙里坐席，这人的良心若是软弱，岂不大胆去吃那祭偶像之物吗？”）可能只是一个反问句，指的是不应该发生的事情，但它也可能指某种真实的情况，一个基督徒被朋友或家人邀请去异教徒寺庙的一个房间参加节日聚餐，这个房间的功能类似于我们租来的宴会厅。这样的出席不一定有什么错，只要它没有导致软弱的基督徒因吃祭偶像的肉而犯违背良心的罪。但哥林多前书 10:14-21 却明确指出，基督徒不可参加任何崇拜偶像仪式的聚餐。

On his return to his homeland after he had been healed of his leprosy by Elisha, Naaman's duties as an official of the Syrian government required him to enter heathen temples in the company of the king. When the king, who was leaning on Naaman's arm, bowed to the idol, Naaman had to bow too, but his bowing was not worship of the idol Rimmon. Elisha told him, "Go in peace." Naaman made a clear confession of his new faith by sacrificing only to the Lord on soil he had brought with him from Israel (2 Kings 5:15-19).

乃缦的麻风病被以利沙治好，他回到家乡，作为叙利亚政府的官员，他的职责要求他陪伴国王进入异教徒的寺庙。当王扶着乃缦的膀臂向偶像跪拜的时候，乃缦也不得不跪拜，但他跪拜并不是在敬拜偶像临门。以利沙对他说：“平平安安地回去吧。”乃缦在他从以色列带来的土地上只向耶和华献祭，清楚展示了他全新的信仰（列王记下 5:15-19）。

When we find ourselves in circumstances similar to Naaman's, we should do whatever is necessary to give a clear testimony. We should not join in the prayers of heterodox churches. We normally would not fold our hands or bow our heads as if praying. We would not kneel or cross ourselves during prayers to Mary or the saints. There might be other circumstances in which one could stand during the prayers without giving a confusing signal to the worshipers. It would depend in part on whether the visitor and his or her purpose for being there were known to the worshipers. A person would do whatever would convey the message of polite nonparticipation.

当我们发现自己处于与乃缦相似的情境时，我们应当做一切可做的事以作出清楚的见证。我们不应加入非正统教会的祷告。在那里，我们通常不会双手合十或是低下我们的头，好像我们在祷告似的。在别人向圣母玛利亚或圣徒祷告的时候，我们不会下跪或是划十字。也许在其它的情况下，一个人也可以在祷告期间站着而不会给敬拜者带去混乱的信号。这在一定程度上都取决于敬拜者是否知道访客、他或她来这里的目的。人可尽其所能礼貌地表示不加入其中的意愿。

Attending schools with a religious affiliation

就读有宗教背景的学校

Sometimes WELS members may wish to attend schools that have some sort of religious affiliation. Does this involve them in religious fellowship with the churches that sponsor the schools?

有时，WELS 的会友可能希望就读有某种宗教背景的学校。这是否会使他们牵涉与那些赞助该学校的教会之间的宗教团契呢？

Sometimes the school may be a university or college—like Marquette, St. Olaf's, or one of the Concordias—that has a religious affiliation but accepts all students into its academic programs on a “pay-for-services” basis. Many WELS members attend such colleges. We may not be happy with these choices in cases in which the

students could attend one of our WELS colleges, but there is not necessarily any fellowship involved. Attendance at chapel services and participation in worship would, however, involve fellowship and should be avoided. Taking a religion class would not necessarily involve fellowship, but could be a danger to a person's faith, just as many classes in a secular university might be.

有时候这所学校可能是一所大学或者学院，比如圣奥拉夫马凯特大学，或者协和的某所大学，这些学校有宗教背景，但也以“付费服务”的方式接受所有学生进入其学术课程。WELS 许多会友在这类学院求学。学生可以在 WELS 某所学院上学的情形下而选择去别的学校，我们对此可能会有所不满，然而，这其中未必就会牵涉到团契。但是，参与小教堂礼拜以及敬拜会牵涉团契问题，应当远避。参加宗教课程未必就会牵涉到团契，然而这也可能危及个人信仰，正如世俗大学的许多课程所具有的影响一样。

Sometimes in areas where there are no WELS schools and the public schools are undesirable, WELS parents may wish to have their children attend a Christian high school or elementary school. They sometimes feel that they are faced with a choice between two evils, a public school that promotes unchristian values or a religious school that may entangle them in unscriptural fellowship. This is admittedly a very difficult situation. It may well be that neither option is God-pleasing. Maybe home schooling, a prep school, or even moving are options.

有时候，一些地方没有 WELS 学校，公办学校又不太合需，WELS 的家长就可能希望他们的孩子就读基督教高中或者小学。有时候，他们觉得他们不得不在两种邪恶之间作出抉择，一方是倡导非基督教价值观的公办学校，另一方则是恐将他们陷于非圣经团契的宗教学校。诚然，这是让人挠头的疑难案例。很可能这两种选择都不讨上帝的喜悦。也许在家教育、预备学校，甚至搬家都可能是更好的选择。

But let us suppose that the only viable options are public school or religious school. What then? We must distinguish between situations that may confront us with temptation or danger to our faith and situations that require us to sin. God may well require us to face temptation and defeat it. He does not require us to sin. Let us look at the two options in this light.

然而，让我们假定，现在唯一的选择要么是公办学校，要么是宗教学校。那该如何呢？我们必须对以下不同情况作出区分：这种情况会让我们面对诱惑或者危害我们信心吗？还是说，这种情况会让我们犯罪呢？上帝很可能会让我们面对诱惑并将之击溃，但他却不会让我们去犯罪。让我们以这样的眼光看待这两个选项。

No public school forces students to believe in humanism, evolution, and anti-Christian morality (safe sex, abortion), but the required curriculum may force them to be exposed to teachers and materials that advocate such views. Being exposed to such views may be a danger, but it is not in itself a sin. It may, in fact, be an opportunity to testify against such views. The students and their parents do not have to accept or practice these views. They should oppose their inclusion in the school curriculum and seek to be excused from exposure to them.

公办学校并不会强迫学生相信人本主义、进化论以及反基督教的道德观（安全性行为，堕胎），但是那些必修课可能会迫使他们接触倡导这类观点的老师及教材。接触这些观点可能会带来危险，但此事本身并非罪。事实上，这也许是为反对这些观点作见证的机会。学生和他们的家长未必要接受或实践这些观点。他们应当反对将这些内容纳入学校课程，并试图不去接触这些内容。

In a non-Lutheran religious school, the children may also be endangered by exposure to unbiblical teaching. Such subtle false doctrine may be more dangerous to faith than the more crass and obvious errors present in some public schools. Usually children attending a private religious school have waived any right to oppose or contradict the teachings of that school. If the school, as a condition of attendance, requires children to participate in worship that violates the biblical principles of fellowship, this does not merely expose the children to danger. It also requires them to sin. This a parent cannot accept or allow.

在一所非路德宗宗教学校，孩子可能也会受到非圣经教导的侵害。比起一些公办学校简单粗暴的错误，这类微妙的假教导可能会对信心造成更大的危害。通常，就读私立宗教学校的孩子无权反对或反驳该学校的教导。如果作为入学条件，学校要求孩子们参加违背圣经团契原则的敬拜，这不仅使孩子们面临危险，也是在让他们犯罪。这是父母不能接受或允许的。

Limited to the choices described above, I would use the public school, but would carefully seek accurate information about what was being taught, speak against those classes that present unscriptural material, seek relief from them where possible, and teach my children the truth that opposes those teachings.

在上述选择的限制下，我会选择公办学校，但我会仔细考察关于该学校所教导内容的准确信息，反对那些展示非圣经材料的课程，尽可能向他们诉求表明不参与其中，并教导我的孩子与这些教导相反的真理。

Difficult situations such as this are sometimes a matter of judgment. Two sets of Christian parents in very similar environments may come to different conclusions. In such situations we should be cautious about judging the decisions made by others. Doubtful cases are not a place to exercise church discipline. When confronted with such a dilemma ourselves, we should become fully informed, discuss our situation with a few trusted Christian friends, and make the best decision we can, trusting the Lord's promise "[God] will not let you be tempted beyond what you can bear. . . . He will also provide a way out so that you can stand up under it" (1 Corinthians 10:13).

这类困境有时需要作出判断。在非常相似的情境下，两对基督徒父母可能会得出不同的结论。在这种情况下，我们应当谨慎判断他人所作的决定。有疑惑的情形并不需要教会管教的介入。当我们自己面对这类困境时，我们应当对情况作充分了解，与一些值得信赖的基督徒朋友探讨我们的处境，相信主的应许：“[神]必不叫你们受试探过于所能受的.....（他会）给你开一条出路，叫你们能忍受得住”（哥林多前书 10:13），尽我们可能作出最佳决策。

Working for religious institutions 为宗教机构效力

Our members are sometimes employed by churches, religious schools, or institutions affiliated with a church. Many of these jobs, such as janitorial or secretarial work and food service jobs, usually involve no religious fellowship. Our churches and schools sometimes employ nonmembers in such positions. Civil rights laws requiring nondiscrimination in hiring may also come into play in some of these cases.

我们的会友有时候会受雇于有宗教背景的教会、学校或者机构。其中许多工作，诸如管理或秘书类工作，食物供应类工作，通常不会牵涉宗教团契。我们的教会和学校有时候也会雇佣非会友担任这些职位。要求不歧视雇佣的民法法在这些情况中也起着一些作用。

Other jobs, such as teaching or musical leadership, may involve a worker in the religious ministry of the church or may require participation in worship. Accepting such a job would then involve a compromise of fellowship principles.

其它工作，诸如教导或音乐带领，则可能会牵涉教会的宗教事工或要求参加敬拜。接受这样的工作会涉及团契原则的妥协。

Other cases may be unclear, such as some teaching or coaching positions. In such cases a person should examine each situation on its own merits or demerits. How does the employer define the job? What are the requirements of the job? We cannot necessarily assume that the requirements of the position are the same as they would be for a similar position in our churches.

其它一些情况可能不太明朗，比如一些教导或辅导职位。这些情况下，个人当依据自己的优缺点进行评估。雇主是如何定义这份工作的呢？这份工作的要求有哪些呢？我们不能想当然地以为这个职位的要求和我们教会中类似职位的要求是一样的。

Ambiguous situations are sometimes a matter of judgment. Two Christians in very similar circumstances may come to different conclusions. As stated earlier, in such situations we should be cautious about judging the decisions made by others. Doubtful cases are not a wise place to exercise church discipline.

情况不明朗时需要作出判断。两个基督徒在相似境况下可能得出不同的结论。正如前述，这些情况下，我们应当谨慎判断别人所作的决定。对存疑情形施行教会管教，并非智慧之举。

Public testimony and conferences with heterodox churches 向非正统教会作公开见证以及 与非正统教会之间的会议

We should always be ready to give clear testimony to the truth whenever we have the opportunity, even to groups and individuals who oppose the truth. Paul was ready to testify and to defend the truth even in heathen temples and hostile synagogues, but he never compromised the truth to gain a hearing, and he withdrew from those who rejected his testimony.

无论何时，一有机会我们就当为真理作出清晰的见证，甚至是向那些反对真理的团体及个人。保罗，即便是在异教徒的庙宇或是恨他入骨的会堂，总是预备好了为真理作见证并竭力为之争辩，然而他既未曾妥协真理以收获听众，也未曾因那些弃绝他见证的人而退缩。

Examples of situations in which we might have the same opportunity to witness to the truth are (1) “free conferences” with individual Lutherans who have a genuine interest in becoming informed about doctrinal differences between their synods and ours; (2) doctrinal discussions, outside the framework of fellowship, with church bodies not in fellowship with us; or (3) presentations of our beliefs to a non-Christian group.

类似情况下我们同样有机会为真理作见证的例子有（1）与个别路德宗之间的“自由会议”，这些人可能真心想要了解他们总会和我们总会之间的教义差异；（2）在团契框架之外，与那些和我们没有团契关系的教会共同体之间的教义讨论；（3）向非基督徒团体表明我们的信仰。

In a free conference, individuals who believe that they may be agreed in doctrine or that they may be able to reach agreement in doctrine meet to discuss those doctrines that appear to be points of difference separating their respective church

bodies. They do not represent their church bodies. Our goal in attending such meetings with confessional Lutherans from other synods with whom we are not in fellowship is to encourage individuals in those synods to make a clear confession of the doctrines of Scripture to their own church bodies and to separate from those church bodies if their testimony is not accepted.

自由会议上，那些相信他们可以在教义上达成一致或他们可能在教义上达成一致的个体聚在一起讨论一些教义，这些教义似乎是导致他们各自教会共同体分裂的不同观点。他们不代表他们的教会共同体。我们和来自其它总会的、与我们没有团契关系的认信路德宗一起参加这类会议的目的是鼓励那些参加会议的个体向他们自己的教会共同体就圣经教义作出清晰的认信，如果他们的见证不被接受，那么他们就当远离那些教会共同体。

The ultimate aim of free conferences is to help confessional Lutherans in heterodox fellowships find like-minded Christians so that they will separate themselves from those unionistic fellowships and seek the fellowship of an orthodox church. Such free conferences may begin with silent prayer, which acknowledges that each participant is a Christian sincerely seeking the truth, but that unity in that truth has not been reached yet.

自由会议的最终目的是帮助在非正统团契的认信路德宗找到志同道合的基督徒，以至于他们可以远离那些推崇联合主义的团契，并且寻求正统教会的团契。这样的自由会议可以以默祷开始，这样的默祷表明每位参与者都是一名真心寻求真理的基督徒，而在真理中的那种合一目前尚未达成。

WELS is always ready to meet with representatives of churches with whom we are not in fellowship, such as the LCMS or the CLC, anytime they desire to discuss the differences that separate us, as long as such meetings are progressing toward reaching a scriptural resolution of the dispute and are not seeking a compromise between truth and error. Such discussions should begin with a study of the Scripture passages dealing with the doctrines that have been the cause of the division and should lead to one joint doctrinal statement clearly resolving the past difference on the basis of Scripture. The WELS Commission on Inter-Church Relations would not participate in meetings that were merely being used to give an impression of cooperation and agreement between the church bodies and were not making a concerted effort to remove doctrinal differences.

无论何时，若是那些和我们没有团契关系的教会代表，比如 LCMS 或 CLC 的代表，想要和我们讨论那些导致我们分裂的差异，只要这样的会议旨在就争论达成合乎圣经的解决方案，也不是在真理和错误之间寻求某种妥协，那么 WELS 总是乐意和他们会面。这样的讨论应该从研究那些引起分裂的教义经文开始，还应该达成一项共同教义声明，基于圣经澄清过去的分歧。WELS 跨教会关系委员会并不会参加那些仅仅是为了给人留下一一种教会共同体之间合作共识的印象、而非真正共同竭力消除教义分歧的会议。

I once was invited to present the topic “Who is Jesus?” to a large group of Muslims with a Muslim debater opposing my view. No one on either side of the divide had the impression that either I or the Muslim speaker was watering down his position or seeking a compromise between the two positions. As a result of this debate, members of the local mosque invited me to come and discuss Christianity and Islam with them. I continued to do so until the leadership of the mosque threw me out for raising interest in Christ there. We should not hesitate to make use of such opportunities to testify to the truth, as Paul did in Acts 19:8-10.

有一次我应邀向一大群穆斯林做演讲，题目是“耶稣是谁？”，我的对手是一名穆斯林辩手，他反对我的观点。分歧的双方无人认为我或穆斯林发言人在淡化各自的立场，或在两种立场之间寻求妥协。这场辩论的结果是，当地清真寺的成员邀请我去和他们探讨一下基督教和伊斯兰教。在清真寺的领导把我赶出去之前，我得以一直在那里和他们探讨，而他们的领导层之所以将我赶出是因为那里的人对基督更感兴趣了。我们应该毫不犹豫地使用这样的机会为真理作见证，就像保罗在使徒行传 19:8-10 中所做的那样。

We obviously would not participate in joint worship or prayers in any of the situations described in the preceding paragraphs.

在上述几段文字中所描述的任何一种情况下，显然我们不会参加联合敬拜或祷告。

Since our twofold goal is giving testimony to the truth and avoiding any support for error, our general principle is that we are willing to give a clear testimony to a heterodox church or a heathen religion “on their turf” anytime we have the opportunity to do so, but we refrain from giving heterodox or heathen teachers an opportunity to make propaganda for their teachings among Christian people. Sometimes the situation is not clear-cut, and one must weigh the benefits of the opportunity to witness against the possibility of causing confusion or offense. There is a certain amount of danger of offense in any situation in which you are offered an opportunity to “take turns” with heterodox teachers or unbelievers, but at times one may be able to make a clear confession even in such circumstances.

由于我们的两大目标是为真理作见证以及避免给错误任何支持，那么我们的一般原则就是，我们乐意一有机会就“在他们的地盘上”向非正统教会及异教作清晰的见证，但我们不愿给非正统教会或异教教师任何机会在基督徒中间为他们的教导打广告。有时候情况并不是很明朗，我们必须权衡利弊，因我们虽有机会作见证，却可能让人困惑或冒犯他人。你若有机会和非正统教师或非信徒“来回纠缠”，无论在何样的情况下，都可能有冒犯他人的危险，但是，有时候，我们也可能在这些境况下作出清晰的认信。

When I was a home-mission pastor, each week the local newspaper in our small town ran a short sermon written by one of the local pastors. For convenience, the schedule for these sermons was set up by the local ministerial association. One day the editor of the paper called me in and said that she knew that because of my principles of fellowship (with which she did not agree) I did not participate in the local ministerial association, but she felt that the community should be exposed to my views, and that she, therefore, wanted to set up a schedule for me to provide sermons for the paper. She offered to do this directly with me so that I could write for the paper without going through the ministerial association. Our church was notorious enough in town for its “intolerance and narrow-mindedness” that I didn’t have much concern that anyone would think I was joining with the other members of the local ministerial association, so I accepted the offer.

当我还是一名国内布道牧师的时候，每周我们小镇的当地报纸都会刊登一篇由一名当地牧师所写的讲道。为方便起见，这些布道的时间表是由当地的牧师协会制定的。有一天，报社的编辑把我叫进去，说她知道我由于自己的团契原则（她并不同意）没有参加当地的牧师协会，但她觉得整个社区应该接了解我的观点，因此她想为我安排一个时间表，让我为报社写讲道。她提出直接同我合作，这样我就可以为报纸写讲道而不需要经过牧师协会。我们的教会在镇上以“狭隘小气”而臭名昭著，所以我并不太担心别人会以为我要是这么做了就是加入了当地牧师协会和其他成员混在一起，因此我接受了这个提议。

I was once invited by a district pastors conference of the LCMS to appear on a program with representatives of the LCMS and ELCA in which we would present our respective views about the critical issues confronting American Lutheranism. Certainly this situation provided both the opportunity to testify and the possibility of misunderstanding and offense. I would have been happy if this “opportunity” had never come my way since such situations can be very tense, but I did not refuse the invitation outright. I wrote back to the program committee and told them that if I came, I could not participate in worship or prayer, and I provided them with an outline of what I would have to say about the doctrinal issues that separate the LCMS from ELCA, and WELS from ELCA and the LCMS. I offered them the opportunity to “uninvite” me. They said they wanted me to come anyway, so I attended and made my presentation. I received the impression that it was a worthwhile effort that gave encouragement to the confessional pastors who were present.

我曾受 LCMS 地区牧师会议的邀请，与 LCMS 和 ELCA 的代表一起参加一个节目，在节目中，我们需要就美国路德宗面临的关键问题发表各自的观点。当然，这种情况既提供了作见证的机会，也有造成误解和冒犯他人的可能性。如果这个“机会”从未出现在我眼前，我的日子就过得很舒坦，因为这种情况可能会让人血压上升。但我并没有直接拒绝邀请，我给节目委员会写了回信，告诉他们如果我来了，我不会参加敬拜或祷告，我给他们拟了一份大纲，用以说明我必须澄清的教义问题，而正是这些教义问题将 LCMS 与 ELCA 区分开来，又将 WELS 与他们二者区分开来。我给了他们“取消邀请”的机会，但他们说无论如何都要我去，所以我参加并做了演讲。节目给我的印象是，给在场的认信牧师不少鼓励，这样的事值得辛苦为之。

If you as a pastor or layperson find yourself confronted with such ambiguous opportunities, carefully weigh the situation using these questions: (1) What can I do to give a clear presentation of the truth to those who need to hear it? (2) How can I avoid the impression of compromise with error? Then seek the advice of some wise fellow Christians. If you feel that you are in over your head, do not hesitate to ask fellow Christians to help you or even to take your place in giving testimony to the group. Prayerfully decide on your course of action. Explain the reason for your action to your congregation and other fellow Christians if this will help prevent misunderstanding and offense. Give your testimony. Leave the results up to God. Don't agonize too much over whether you can prevent anyone from taking offense and criticizing you. Jesus was not deterred by the fact that both his friends and foes often disapproved of the places and people he chose to receive his testimony to the truth (Luke 7:34,35; John 4:27).

无论你是牧师还是平信徒，如果这种让人挠头的机会摆在你的面前，请用以下问题仔细权衡：（1）我可以做些什么去向那些需要听到真理的人清晰地展现真理呢？（2）我怎样才能避免给人造成与错误妥协的印象呢？然后，请寻求一些有智慧的基督徒同伴的建议。如果你感到力不从心，不要犹豫，请其他基督徒帮助你，甚至代替你向那些人作见证。多多祷告，再决定你的行动方针。若是向会众及其他基督徒解释你行动的原因有助于防范造成误解和冒犯他人，那你还是要开口解释。请作你的见证，把结果交给上帝吧。不必纠结于你能否阻止别人感到冒犯并批评你。耶稣的朋友和仇敌就经常不赞成他所拣选的、接受他为真理所作见证的地方和人，然而耶稣也未曾气馁（路加福音 7:34,35；约翰福音 4:27）。

If you find yourself suspecting that brothers or sisters made the wrong decision in such a hard case, talk to them about it, and give them the benefit of the doubt. If you feel that they were clearly in the wrong, you have an obligation to demonstrate this on the basis of Scripture, not your own feelings.

如果你怀疑弟兄姐妹在这类疑难案例中做了错误的决定，那就去和他们谈话，且先假定他们是无辜的。如果你觉得他们显然是错的，那么你就有责任基于圣经而不是基于你自己的感受把事情说出来。

When we are presented with an opportunity to give a clear testimony and to win people for the truth, we should give a greater priority to the opportunity to win those in error than to the possibility that someone somewhere might take offense that we spoke there. For those who are caught in error, the opportunity to hear and heed our testimony might be a matter of spiritual life or death. We must exert every possible effort to bring even one lost sheep back to the fold.

当我们有机会作清晰的见证并为真理得回人心时，我们就应该优先考虑得回那些犯错者的机会，而不是考虑我们的发言可能在哪里冒犯某人的可能性。对那些陷在错误中的人而言，听见又留意我们所作见证的机会可能是一个关乎他们属灵生死的问题。我们必须尽一切努力，哪怕只是找回一头迷失的羊。

In situations that do not provide the opportunity to testify against error, such as meetings that are designed to promote sharing and exchange of information about “externals” between church bodies that are not in fellowship, I would be more concerned about avoiding offense and even the appearance of accommodation with error. I would try to be careful not to leave the other participants with the impression that the doctrinal differences that divide us are not such a big deal after all. Such opportunities, however, should not be rejected out of hand since they may provide the chance for a more substantial presentation of the truth at least to some individuals.

在没有机会针对错误作见证的情况下，比如那些旨在促进非团契教会团体之间分享和交换“外在”信息的会议，我更关心的是如何避免冒犯他人，即使我在其中看起来有一丝是在对错误妥协，我也得非常谨慎。我会尽量小心，不要给其他与会者造成这样的印象：让我们产生分歧的教义差异事实上并无大碍。然而，我们不应立即拒绝这类机会，因为它们可能至少向某些人提供了更充分介绍真相的机会。

Family and friends

亲人朋友

The principles that govern our practice of fellowship with individuals are no different from the principles that govern our public relationships with groups of Christians. We are to warn all who are holding false doctrine against that false doctrine. If they cling to that doctrine in spite of our admonition, we must not practice fellowship with them. It makes no difference if they are family or friends. We cannot place family ties and friendship ahead of our loyalty to God and his truth (Matthew 10:32-39; 12:46-49).

我们与个人团契的原则，和我们与基督徒团体公开关系的原则并没有什么不同。我们要警告一切坚持假教义者勿要再坚持。如果他们不顾我们的警告而坚持那样的教义，我们就绝不可与他们团契。无论他们是亲人还是朋友，都没有区别。我们不可把家庭关系与友谊放在我们对上帝及他真理的忠诚之前（马太福音 10:32-39；12:46-49）。

The one practical difference between the two situations, however, is that when religious fellowship with family or friends involves only private actions that will not give public offense, we may consider not only the public confession they make through their church membership, but also their private, personal confession.

然而，就实践而言，这两种情况之间的一个区别是，当与亲人或朋友的宗教团契只涉及不会公开冒犯他人的私人行为时，我们不仅可以考虑他们通过教会会友身份的公开认信，也可以考虑他们私下的个人认信。

It is the public confession of their church that governs our public fellowship relationships with our family or friends. If they are members of a heterodox church, we must base our public relationship with them on the public confession and practice of their church. In other words, we should not participate in the services of that church with them, although there may be occasions when we attend services there, as discussed earlier. As a testimony of love we must warn them against the false teachings of their church by refusing to participate in its worship.

影响我们与家人或朋友公开团契关系的是他们教会的公开认信。如果他们是非正统教会的成员，我们必须把我们与他们的公开关系建立在他们教会的公开认信与实践上。换句话说，我们不应该和他们一起参加那个教会的礼拜（尽管我们在一些情况下可能会参加那里的礼拜，就像前面讨论的那样）。作为爱的见证，我们必须通过拒绝参加这所教会的礼拜来警告他们不要接受他们教会的假教导。

In our private relationships with them, we may also consider their personal confession. For example, if they are dissenting members of a heterodox Lutheran church, who object to its false teaching and are fighting against it, we may recognize them as one in faith with us in our private relationships with them. We will encourage them to battle for the truth, but we will also warn them that they must leave that false church if their admonition is rejected. The private confession of faith they make to us and the public confession they are making by their church membership are in contradiction, and they must take steps to bring them into harmony.

在我们与他们的私人关系中，我们也可以考虑他们的个人认信。例如，如果他们是非正统路德宗教会中对其教导持异议的会友，他们反对其假教义，并与之斗争，我们可能会在与他们的私人关系中将他们视为与我们有共同信仰的人。我们会鼓励他们为真理而战，但我们也会警告他们，如果他们对教会的劝勉被拒绝，他们就必须离开那个假教会。他们私下对我们的认信和他们作为教会会友所作的公开认信是矛盾的，他们必须逐步采取措施解决此事。

If they are unaware of the unscriptural beliefs or practices of their church and, thus, are not knowingly adherents of false doctrine, we will urge them to become accurately informed about the teachings and activities of their church, which they are supporting by their offerings. Here too they should take steps to remove the compromise from their confession.

如果他们不知道他们的教会有不符合圣经的信仰或实践，那么他们就并非故意坚持错误者，我们将敦促他们准确地了解他们通过奉献来支持的教会教导及实践。同样，他们也应该逐步采取措施，在他们的认信中去除妥协。

If their private confession, however, reveals that they are aware of the false teaching of their church and defend it, we should not practice religious fellowship with them even in our private relationships. We must warn them strongly that their adherence to false doctrine is a barrier preventing fellowship between us and them,

and, more importantly, their adherence to false doctrine threatens their relationship with God.

然而，如果他们私下的认信表明他们已经意识到了教会的假教导却为之辩护，我们就不应该与他们实践宗教团契，即便是在我们的私人关系中。我们必须强烈地警告他们，他们坚持错假教义必将阻碍我们与他们团契，更重要的是，他们坚持假教义威胁着他们与神的关系。

How should we put these principles into practice? First, let us consider our actions in our own home. There is no reason for a Christian family to abandon prayer and family devotions when others are present with them at the table. This is no different than having guests with us at church. The host may proceed with prayer or a devotion as normal. We have no more reluctance to have our prayers heard by others than Paul did on his voyage to Rome (Acts 27:35). Our prayer may be a good testimony and example to them. We may, however, feel that we should not force our guests to be a “captive audience” to prayers or devotions that they do not approve of, but this is a question of manners and tact, not an issue of fellowship. We must consider whether this is a good opportunity to expose them to the Word or whether imposing our worship on them without their consent will create resentment and a backlash against hearing the Word.

我们应该怎样把这些原则付诸实践呢？首先，让我们思考一下我们在自己家中的行为。一个基督徒家庭没有理由因为有他人与他们共餐而丢弃祷告以及家庭灵修。这和我们在教会里邀请客人并没有什么不同。主人可以像往常一样以祷告或者灵修开始。让别人听到我们的祷告，对我们而言并无什么不乐意，就像保罗在去罗马的路上一样（使徒行传 27:35）。我们的祷告对他们而言可能是一个很好的见证与榜样。然而，我们可能会觉得我们不应强迫我们的客人勉强去听那些他们所不赞成的祷告或灵修，但这关乎礼貌与得体，却不关乎团契问题。我们必须思考，这是一个让他们接触上帝话语的好机会吗？还是说在他们不同意的情况下把我们的敬拜强加于他们身上会引起他们的怨恨以及对上帝话语的抵制呢？

When we are guests at the table of a person who is not of our faith, and he speaks his prayer in our presence, we will permit him to do so without disturbing him, even if we cannot join him in his prayer. We should not, however, join together in the prayers of adherents of false doctrine, either by asking them to lead our family in prayer or by joining together with their prayer.

当我们与一个与我们信仰不同的人同席时，如果他在我们面前祷告，即使我们不能和他一起祷告，我们也会允许他这样做而不去打扰他。无论如何，我们都不应该与那些坚持假教义的信徒一起祷告，无论是请他们带领我们的家庭祷告，还是加入到他们的祷告行列之中。

The same principles would apply to a member of a WELS church in a religiously mixed marriage. If one spouse is a non-Christian, the Christian partner may pray for and in the presence of the non-Christian husband or wife. Obviously, they cannot pray together. If the other spouse is a member of a heterodox church and ridicules or rejects the beliefs of our member, joint prayer is hardly possible. If the other spouse's membership in a heterodox church is seen as a matter of weakness in understanding, joint prayer may be possible in the privacy of the home. The Christian partner in a mixed marriage will try to win the other by a good example of piety and patience (1 Peter 3:1-7). Situations in mixed marriages may vary greatly, and Christian spouses will be concerned not to do anything that is spiritually

harmful to their partner. Much love, tact, and truthfulness is needed in such a situation.

同样的原则也适用于宗教混合婚姻下的 WELS 教会会友。如果配偶一方是非基督徒，基督徒一方可以在非基督徒（丈夫或妻子）面前为对方祷告。显然，他们不能一起祷告。如果另一方是一名非正统教会会友，嘲笑或拒绝我们会友的信仰，共同祷告几乎是不可能的。如果另一方的非正统教会会友身份是出于知识上的软弱，那么共同祷告有可能在家中私下进行。在混合婚姻中的基督徒会试图通过虔诚与耐心的好榜样得回另一方（彼得前书 3:1-7）。不同的混合婚姻情况可能大相径庭。基督徒配偶会小心不要做任何有害对方属灵的事情，这样的情况往往需要更有爱心、更加得体、更为真诚。

We should also mention that a lack of unity in religion is not a valid scriptural reason for divorce. "If any brother has a wife who is not a believer and she is willing to live with him, he must not divorce her. And if a woman has a husband who is not a believer and he is willing to live with her, she must not divorce him (1 Corinthians 7:12,13).

我们还应当提醒一点，宗教上的不合一并非离婚的正当理由。“倘若某弟兄有不信的妻子，妻子也情愿和他同住，他就不要离弃妻子。妻子有不信的丈夫，丈夫也情愿和她同住，她就不要离弃丈夫”（哥林多前书 7:12,13）。

Civic religious ceremonies

公民宗教仪式

Scripture teaches that people should not join together in worship and prayer unless they agree in doctrine. We therefore should not participate in any religious activity that gives equal status to truth and error.

圣经教导说，若非教义上合一，否则人就不应当在敬拜和祷告中联合。因此，我们不应参与任何同等对待真理与错误的宗教活动。

At civic religious ceremonies in the United States, such as opening prayers at sessions of government or other civic events, all denominations and even non-Christian religions are given equal status, as when the duty of leading the service or providing an opening prayer is rotated among various clergypersons. Such a practice is very confusing to those who are weak in their understanding. Such a practice gives the impression that all religions are more or less interchangeable and equally pleasing to God.

在美国的公民宗教仪式中，例如政府会议或其它公民活动上的开始祷告，所有教派甚至非基督教都被赋予了平等地位，而带领仪式或作开始祷告的职责则由不同的神职人员轮流担任。这样的做法会给那些知识软弱的人带来极大的困扰。因为这样的做法给人的印象是，所有的宗教或多或少都是互通的，都同样讨上帝的喜悦。

I was once asked to conduct a baccalaureate service for the local public high school together with the liberal Lutheran pastor, who had driven some of the members of his congregation into my congregation by his false teaching. What impression would it have given to the members of both congregations and to people in the community if we would have conducted such a service together? It would have appeared that the dispute that led my members to leave his congregation was nothing but a personality conflict, rather than an act of confession compelled by a difference in doctrine. In the minds of many it would have confirmed the all-too-

common view that it really does not matter what you believe, since all religions are basically the same and can cooperate.

有一次，我受邀与一名自由派路德宗牧师一起为当地的公立高中毕业班致辞，他的一些教友被他的假教导逼到了我的教会。如果我们一起参加这样的仪式，会给两个会众的会友及社区群众留下什么样的印象呢？那样的话，看上去导致我的会友离开他教会的争论不过是人与人之间的冲突，而不是教义上的分歧所迫使的认信行为。在许多人的心中，这种做法就加固了一种非常普遍的观点，那就是你相信什么并不重要，因为所有的宗教基本上都是一样的，大家都可以彼此合作。

Such a false impression can easily be given even when the adherents of opposing views do not participate in the same service, but take turns in successive services. Love requires us to give a clear testimony against religious indifference which treats truth and falsehood as equals.

即便持相反观点的人不参加同一个仪式而是轮流参加，这样的做法仍然容易给人留下以上印象。爱要求我们作出明确的见证，反对宗教对真理和错误一视同仁的冷漠态度。

Pastors of many denominations do not believe that agreement in doctrine is necessary for joint prayer and worship, so they see no problem in worshiping with people who hold unscriptural views. Others may feel that they can participate in such arrangements as a testimony to their own view, without giving the impression that they are granting equal recognition to error, but such a distinction will seldom be clear to the general public. Our pastors, therefore, should not participate in such civic services and devotions.

许多宗派的牧师不相信在教义上达成一致是联合祷告与联合敬拜的必要条件，所以他们认为与那些持非圣经观点的人一起敬拜并无大碍。其他人则可能认为他们可以参与这类活动可以为他们自己的观点作见证，并不会给人留下他们也认可错误的印象，但是一般民众几乎无法看清这种区别。因此，我们的牧师不应该参与这样的公民仪式与祷告。

Just as a person may occasionally be present at services of a heterodox church for reasons other than to join in the worship, a member of our church may be present on civic occasions that are opened with unionistic prayers. For example, a member of Congress might be present when legislative sessions begin with prayer. He or she, however, should not join in such prayers or assist in setting them up, but should use his or her influence to eliminate prayers that are intended to unite people of various faiths in worship without agreement in doctrine.

就像一个人偶尔会因其它原因出席非正统教会的礼拜仪式一样，我们教会的会友也可能会出席以联合祷告开始的公民仪式。例如，当立法会议以祷告开始时，国会议员就可能在场。然而，他或她不应该参加这样的祷告或协助推动这类祷告，反要用他或她的影响力来剔除——那些旨在联合不同信仰的人在教义不一致的情况下一起敬拜的——祷告。

This problem will be most common in countries that have a state religion. Naaman appears to have been thinking of such a civic occasion when he asked Elisha to pardon his presence at heathen prayers (2 Kings 5:17-19). As an aide to the king of Syria, his civic responsibilities often required him to be present for heathen rites, to rise and kneel when everyone else did, but he would not join in that worship. Elisha does not condemn him for his request.

这个问题在有国教的国家最为普遍。当异教徒祷告时，乃幔在场，乃幔请求以利沙赦免他。他当时所想到的似乎就是这类公民仪式（列王记下 5:17-

19)。作为叙利亚国王的助手，出席异教徒的仪式是他的公民责任，当其他人起立和下跪时，他也要在场，但他并不会参加那种敬拜。当乃缦请求以利沙时，以利沙并未给他定罪。

Participation in political action groups and social groups that have a religious perspective

参加带宗教观点的政治行动团体与社会团体

Can WELS members belong to political action groups that are formed to preserve, protect, and promote traditional “Judeo-Christian values” through education, legal defense, lobbying, and related activities, and that represent the concerns of men and women who believe in these values? Such groups are organized to fund and implement political action that is aimed at influencing government policy on such issues as taxation, abortion, education, and homosexuals in the military.

WELS 的会友可以加入以下类别的政治活动团体吗？这类团体的成立目的是通过教育、法律辩护、游说及相关活动来保存、保护、促进传统“犹太基督徒价值观”，同时这些团体又代表了相信这种价值观的男男女女。组织构建这些团体的目的是为了资助和实施——旨在影响政府在税收、堕胎、教育和军队同性恋等问题上的政策的——政治行动。

Christians, of course, should not belong to any organization that requires them to accept principles or teachings that are contrary to the Bible. Nor should they join in prayer and worship with groups or individuals who hold teachings contrary to the Bible. They should not offer financial support to them. The Masonic Lodge and Shriners would be examples of such organizations.

基督徒当然不应该加入任何要求他们接受与圣经相悖的原则或教导的组织。他们也不应该与坚持违背圣经教义的团体或个人一起祷告及敬拜。他们不应该向他们提供任何经济支持。共济会和圣地兄弟会就是这类组织的例子。

The task of drawing clear lines may become more difficult when the organization in question is not a religious organization and has no religious requirements, but it does have some religious activities or motivations attached to it. In such cases a number of considerations may help Christians decide to what degree, if any, they may be involved.

当所讨论的组织不是宗教组织，也没有宗教要求，但它确实有一些宗教活动或动机时，划定明确界线的任务可能会变得更加困难。在这种情况下，如果要参加的话，一些考量点可能会帮助基督徒决定他们可能参与的程度。

For the sake of obtaining information, Christians can buy books or subscribe to periodicals even from groups whose philosophy they reject and which they would not join. For example, our synodical libraries subscribe to many periodicals that are published by groups our students and professors could not join. The subscription price is a payment for goods received.

为了获取相关信息，基督徒甚至可以从一些团体那里购买书籍或订阅期刊，即使是从那些基督徒并不认同其哲学、也不愿加入的团体那里。例如，我们的教会图书馆订阅了许多期刊，这些期刊是由那些我们的学生和教授不能加入的团体出版的。订阅的价格就是对所收到货物的付款。

A similar situation may exist with groups such as the YMCA. This organization has a Christian mission, and full membership involves religious activity. But the organization recognizes a different level of “membership” at which the participants simply become users of the athletic facilities in exchange for a certain payment.

Such payment for the use of the facilities would not involve a person in the religious fellowship of the group.

类似的情况也可能存在于基督教青年会这类团体中。这个组织有一项基督教的使命，正式会友会参加宗教活动。但该组织承认另一种不同级别的“会友身份”，即参与者只需支付一定费用即可成为其设施的使用者。这类付费使用设施的事并不要求个人加入该团体的宗教团契。

As citizens, WELS members may participate in political action groups that try to influence legislation and government policies in order to promote moral standards that will protect their neighbors' property and lives. For example, members of WELS Lutherans for Life might also be members of a nonreligious right-to-life group in which they join with people of other faiths or of no faith at all in efforts to influence government policy concerning abortion and euthanasia. In the WELS' own right-to-life organization, changing people's hearts through God's law and gospel should be the primary goal and method. In the secular group changing people's minds through education and changing their conduct through civil law would be the goals.

作为公民，WELS 的会友可以参加政治行动团体，尝试影响立法和政府政策以促进道德标准，以至于保护他们邻舍的财产和生命。例如，WELS 终生路德宗（Lutherans for Life）的会友也可能是一名非宗教生命权组织的成员，他们与拥有不同信仰的人或根本没有信仰的人一同尽力，以影响政府关于堕胎及安乐死的政策。在 WELS 自己的生命权组织中，通过神的律法和福音来改变人心应当是首要的目标与方法。在世俗团体中，通过教育改变人们的想法，通过民事法律改变人们的行为则应当是他们的目标。

A problem arises when such organizations begin to blur the line between religious groups and nonsectarian political action groups by introducing prayer or other religious activities into their program. (The same problem can arise in groups as different as the local garden club, an ethnic society, or a business organization.) If such activities are an essential activity of the group and are prominent in its program, members of our churches should not join the group or participate in its activities. If the objectionable activity is incidental to the purpose and program of the group (such as prayer at the opening of the meeting of the garden club), Christians should refrain from participating in that activity and should express their objections to the practice, but they may participate in the regular, secular functions of the group.

当一些组织通过把祷告或其它宗教活动引入他们的活动开始模糊宗教团体和无宗派政治行动团体之间的界限时，问题就出现了（同样的问题也可能出现在迥然不同的团体中，比如当地花园俱乐部、民族社团或商业组织）。如果这些活动是该团体的基本活动，并且在其中尤为突出，我们教会的会友就不应该加入该团体或参与其活动。如果那些令人反感的活动与该团体的目的和计划无关（例如花园俱乐部会议开始前的祷告），那么基督徒应该避免参与该活动，并表达他们对这种做法的反对意见，但他们可以参加团体的常规世俗流程。

An additional problem with many political action groups that are under heavy Reformed or Catholic influence is that they often confuse the responsibility of the church and its members (that is, changing people's conduct by first changing their hearts with the gospel) with the responsibility of the state and its citizens (that is, changing people's conduct by enforcing beneficial laws). Many of these groups believe that efforts to change society by lobbying and legislation are a direct part of the mission of the church.

许多受到改革宗或天主教严重影响的政治行动团体的另一个问题是，他们经常将教会及其会友的责任（即，先用福音改变人心而改变人的行为）与国家及其公民的责任（即，强制实施有益的法律以改变人的行为）混为一谈。这些团体中的许多人认为，通过游说和立法去努力改变社会是教会使命的直接组成部分。

Christians should be clear on the distinction between what they do as church members (for example, preaching the Sixth Commandment to lead people to repentance) and what they do as citizens (for example, seeking laws against various forms of sexual immorality as a protection to individuals and society). If you are a member of a group that seems to be confusing the roles of church and state, try to get the group refocused on the proper goals. If the confusion is deeply embedded in the group's program and philosophy, discontinue your membership in the group.

基督徒应该清楚区分他们作为教会会友当做的事（例如，宣讲第六诫命以引导人们悔改）以及他们作为公民当做的事（例如，诉诸法律以反对各种形式的性不道德行为，以保护个人与社会）。如果你所在的团体似乎混淆了教会和国家的角色，试着让这个团体重新关注正确的目标。如果这种困惑深深植根于该组织的计划与理念之中，那就请你中止你在该组织的会友身份。

A third problem arises when such groups see themselves as an ecumenical leaven for bringing diverse churches together without agreement in doctrine, as in the statement of a pro-life leader, "The Lord is using unborn babies to unify his Church."³⁹ If this is an aim of the group, we should not participate, even if its activities are otherwise commendable. This is often a factor in the growing cooperation between Catholic and Evangelical social action groups.

当一些团体认为自己是不顾教义一致而将不同的教会聚集在一起的联合主义酵母时，第三个问题就出现了。比如一位反堕胎领袖曾宣称，“上帝正使用未出生的婴儿来联合他的教会。”³⁹ 如果这是这个组织的目的，即使它的活动在其它方面可圈可点，我们也不应该参加。这通常是天主教和福音派社会行动团体之间合作日益增加的一个因素。

In all of these situations, we should distinguish practices and attitudes that are inherent in the group's philosophy and program from occasional aberrations that are the views or actions only of isolated individuals.

在所有这些情况下，我们都应该区分清楚什么是扎根在团体哲学和活动中的实践与态度，什么只是代表个别观点或行动的偶发性反常。

In short, don't join any organization without inquiring about its beliefs and practices. If either its beliefs or practices conflict with the Bible, don't join unless the group is willing to remove the offensive practices. If incidental violations of biblical principles arise, object to them and do not participate in them. If, subsequent to joining, you find that membership is involving you in beliefs or practices contrary to Scripture or if activities involved in membership trouble your conscience, quit.

简而言之，请不要在不了解其信仰和实践的情况下加入任何组织。如果该组织的信仰或行为与圣经相冲突，那么就请你不要加入，除非该组织愿意剔除这些冒犯性的实践。如果偶有出现违反圣经原则的情况，那么就请反对它们，且不要参与其中。如果在加入之后，你发现你的信仰或实践违背了圣经，或者该团体的会友活动让你良心感到不安，那就退出吧。

Political action by church groups
教会团体参与政治行动

As stated above, it is not the duty of the church to lobby the government for laws that enforce Christian conduct. The church may petition the government when laws are being considered that would interfere with the mission of the church, such as laws that would take away the religious freedom of Christian schools. In such cases, representatives of our schools have joined in lobbying efforts with other groups who share our concerns in the area, such as the LCMS and the Catholic Church. Such activities do not involve joint prayer and worship, but defense of civil rights.

如前所述，游说政府制定强制基督徒做事的法律，此绝非教会的职责。当法律看起来干涉教会使命时，教会可以向政府请愿，例如那些会剥夺基督教学校宗教自由的法律。在这种情况下，我们学校的代表与其它和我们同样关注该领域的团体，如 LCMS 和天主教会，都加入了游说活动。这些活动不涉及联合祷告与敬拜，不过旨在捍卫公民权利而已。

Outside speakers at our events

我们活动上的外来发言人

Various WELS organizations or schools may invite lecturers from outside our fellowship to present information to their group. This does not involve fellowship if no worship or religious instruction are involved, but only the giving of information. In situations that might create unclarity, such as a series of public lectures presented at a seminary or college of our fellowship, it is wise to make a specific announcement that these lectures are being presented outside the framework of fellowship. This is regularly done at the Bethany Reformation Lectures. If you think that the lecturer might have a misconception of his or her role, speak to the person in advance.

不同的 WELS 组织或学校可能会邀请我们团契以外的讲师向他们的团体介绍一些信息。如果没有敬拜或宗教教导，而只是提供一些信息，这就不牵涉团契问题。在可能带来混淆的情况下，例如在我们团契的神学院或学院举行的一系列公开讲座，明智的做法是清楚表明这些讲座是在团契的框架之外举行的。伯大尼宗教改革讲座中就经常采取这种做法。如果你认为演讲者可能对于他自己或她自己的角色有所误解，那就请你提前和他或她谈好。

The same principles apply to academic associations, such as church history or archaeology societies.

同样的原则也适用于学术协会，如教会历史学会或考古学会。

Publications

出版

We have not regarded every instance of publication, sales, or advertising of an author's materials as an expression of fellowship with him or her. Northwestern Publishing House has sold and published numerous works of non-WELS authors, and it has given another publishing house rights to reprint and distribute The People's Bible commentary series. Both of these actions are intended to promote the widest possible distribution of sound Lutheran material.

我们不认为每一次出版、销售或宣传作者材料的例子都是与他或她之间团契的表达。西北出版社已经出售和出版了许多非 WELS 作家的作品，并授予了另一家出版社重印和发行大众圣经注释系列的权利。这两项行动都是旨在尽可能广泛地传播路德宗的声音。

On the other hand, cooperative efforts to develop religious materials require unity in doctrine. If doctrinal agreement does not exist between the authors and editors

who are working on a project, certain parts of the books may be incompatible with the convictions of some of the participants. Even when each author is made responsible for his own material, the impression of fellowship with false teaching can readily be given. For this reason, our seminary faculty recently declined an invitation from outside our fellowship to participate in a project to develop a series of Bible commentaries for pastors.

另一方面，合作开发宗教材料需要教义上的统一。如果某个项目的作者和编辑之间教义上不合一，那么书中的某些部分则可能与其中一些参与者的观点不相容。即使每个作者只需要为自己的材料负责，也很容易给人造成与假教导团契的印象。出于这个原因，我们神学院的教员最近拒绝了一项团契以外邀请为牧师编写一系列圣经注释的项目。

In the case of The People's Bible series, we are taking advantage of an opportunity to have our materials reach a larger audience, which will benefit from their scriptural presentation. In the case of the Bible commentary series for pastors, we were concerned not to have our names attached to a project in which doctrinal positions might be presented that are not in agreement with Scripture on such issues as church fellowship, church and ministry, and the Antichrist. Neither case necessarily involves fellowship, but the effect and the likely impression is different in the two cases.

就大众圣经系列而言，我们正在利用这个机会，让我们的材料接触到更多的受众，他们将从其圣经呈现中受益。而就为牧师预备的圣经注释系列而言，我们担心我们的名字会被印在某个项目上，而这个项目可能会提出与圣经不一致的教义立场，比如教会团契，教会和事工，以及敌基督。这两种情况都不一定牵涉团契，但两种情况带来的效果和可能给人造成的印象却是不同的。

WELS scholars have provided input and evaluations during the process of preparing new Bible translations, such as the New International Version, since the goal of such projects is to provide an unbiased translation for all Christians, which will not be slanted toward doctrinal interpretations of particular denominations. In such projects, we do not participate in worship or prayer with translators with whom we are not in fellowship.

WELS 的学者们在新的圣经译本（类似新国际版）的准备过程中提供了意见与评估，这类项目的目标是为所有基督徒提供公正的翻译，而非偏向特定教派的教义解释。在这类计划中，我们并不会和那些不与我们团契的译者一起敬拜或祷告。

If we sell materials that contain doctrinal errors, we should provide warnings about their content for those who may not be equipped to detect the errors.

如果我们出售含有教义错误的材料，我们应该向那些也许没有能力发现错误的人提供对于相关内容的警示。

第 14 章

Conclusion

总结

In 1 Timothy 1, immediately after telling Timothy to oppose false teachers, Paul says, “The goal of this command is love, which comes from a pure heart and a good conscience and a sincere faith” (verse 5). We dare not lose sight of the reason that we practice the biblical principles of church fellowship: The goal of this command is love—love for the errorists, love for their victims, love for anyone who is threatened by false teachings, and love for God and his truth.

在提摩太前书第 1 章中，保罗在劝勉提摩太反对假教师之后立刻说到，“但命令的总归就是爱。这爱是从清洁的心，和无亏的良心，无伪的信心，生出来的”（第 5 节）。我们断不敢忽视我们实践圣经教会团契原则的原因：这条命令的总归是爱——爱犯错者，爱受他们伤害者，爱受假教导威胁者，爱上帝以及他的真理。

To withhold the truth from someone who needs it, to silently go along with error—this can never be love. To be silent in the presence of error, which sweeps people away to hell, makes us as guilty—no, more guilty—as the person who silently stands by and watches a fire burn up a house and its sleeping inhabitants. Love requires me to cry out; love requires me to warn. To be silent because I don’t want to offend anyone, because I don’t want to be labeled intolerant, because I love the praise of men more than the praise of God—this is not love; this is selfishness. Let us never be guilty of sleeping on duty like unfaithful watchmen. We must sound a clear warning against all false teaching. We must work together for the truth. We can do nothing against the truth. These two principles direct us in all the decisions we must make concerning the practice of church fellowship.

对需要真相的人隐瞒真相，沉默不言，容忍错误——这绝不是爱。错误会把人带入地狱，在错误面前保持沉默，这种做法就像——一个人静静地站在一旁，目睹大火烧毁房屋以及其中酣睡的住户——那样有罪，不，更有罪。爱要求我大声呼喊；爱要求我发出警告。因为我不想冒犯任何人、因为我不想被贴上不宽容的标签、因为我爱人的赞美胜过神的赞美而保持沉默——这并不是爱；这是自私。让我们永远不要像不忠的守夜人那样在执勤时呼呼大睡。我们必须对一切假教导发出明确的警告。我们必须一同为真理作工，我们也不能做

任何违背真理的事。这两个原则指导着我们在实践教会团契时所作的所有决定。

We must, of course, always be on guard against pride and a self-righteous attitude. We must guard against tactlessness and against inconsistencies that will cause people to lose confidence in our judgment. Even as we speak strongly against the errors of false teachers, we will deal patiently with their victims as we try to gain them for the truth (Jude 12,22). But we must not let a recognition of our own imperfection intimidate us into a neglect of our God-given duty to warn against error. Acceptance of our duty to warn against error must always be paralleled by a willingness to listen to warnings and admonition when we need them. If we first pull the plank out of our own eye, we will see clearly to pluck the speck of sawdust out of our brother's eye (Matthew 7:5).

当然，我们必须时刻警惕骄傲与自以为义的态度。我们必须谨防不得体与自相矛盾，以免使人们对我们的判断失去信心。即使我们强烈反对假教师的错误，但是当我们将为真理得回那些受害者时，我们也会耐心地对待这些受害者（犹大书 12,22）。但是，我们不能因为知道自己的不完美就害怕而忽视上帝赋予我们警告错误的责任。在接受对错误提出警告这一责任的同时，我们必须在需要聆听警告和劝勉的时候乐意聆听。如果我们先去掉自己眼中的梁木，那么我们的眼睛便得明亮，随后又可去掉弟兄眼中的刺（马太福音 7:5）。

If we keep our eyes focused on the blessed purposes for the principles of church fellowship—to testify to the truth and to warn against error—we will not dread the task of applying these principles to all areas of our lives as Christians. We will recognize that this is just one more way we can serve our neighbors in love as we work together for the truth.

如果我们的眼目定睛在教会团契原则有福的目的之上——即，为真理作见证，向错误发出警告——我们就不会害怕把这些原则应用在我们基督徒生活的各个领域之中了。我们会意识到，这不过是另一种当我们一同为真理作工时我们在爱中服侍我们邻舍的方式而已。

The principles of church fellowship are not a handicap but a blessing. WELS right now is enjoying the benefits of the scriptural principles that our past and present leaders have fought for. We are reaping the harvest of doctrinal unity that they planted and cultivated. Although we will always face doctrinal problems as long as the world continues, we enjoy as a gift from the Lord a degree of peace, harmony, and unity of purpose that is not found elsewhere in the large bodies of American Lutheranism.

教会团契的原则并非障碍而是祝福。WELS 现在正享受着我们去及现在的领袖们竭力维护的圣经原则所带来的益处。我们正在收获他们种下又培育的教义合一的果实。尽管只要这个世界继续运转，我们总要面对教义问题，但我们享受着从主而来的某种程度的平安、和谐以及目标一致，这是在其它大型美国路德宗教会共同体中所无法找到的。

We too seldom stop to marvel at this blessing and to kneel and thank God for it. We are provided with a steady stream of sound Christian literature like The People's Bible. When we call a pastor, we can have a very high degree of confidence that he will teach the same sound doctrine as the pastor who departed. When we or our children move to another area of the country, we can feel optimistic that the WELS congregations there have the same doctrinal position as the congregation we are leaving. The biblical principles of church fellowship that we have studied are one of the main tools the Lord has used to provide us with such blessings.

我们很少停下来对这份祝福感到惊奇，并因此而跪下感谢神。我们有一系列稳固的基督教文学，如大众圣经。当我们呼召一名牧师时，我们可以非常确信他会教导与那位离世的牧师同样纯正的教义。当我们或我们的孩子搬到这个国家的另一地区时，我们可以乐观地以为那边的 WELS 教会与我们离开的教会有着相同的教义立场。我们所学习的教会团契圣经原则，是神用来赐给我们这些祝福的主要工具之一。

If we want to continue to enjoy such blessings, we must continue to practice church discipline in a loving, evangelical way. When doctrinal disagreement arises in our midst (as it surely will), we must study the issue in Scripture, identify and warn against false teaching, and separate from anyone who clings to it. Only in this way can the unity we enjoy be preserved.

如果我们想继续享受这样的祝福，我们必须继续以爱和福音的方式实行教会管教。当教义上的分歧在我们中间出现时（这是肯定会发生的），我们必须在圣经中研究该问题，识别假教导，并对之发出警告，又要与任何坚持这些教导的人分开。只有这样，我们所享有的合一才能得到保存。

God has given us rich blessings through the principles of church fellowship. This doctrine is not an embarrassment. It is the way God establishes and preserves this blessed fellowship we share. We pray that God may always keep us faithful in the practice of this doctrine, so that we may hold on to the treasures of the gospel which he has entrusted to us.

神借着教会团契的原则赐给我们丰富的祝福。这一教义并不让人感到尴尬。这是上帝建立并保守我们所享有的有福团契的方式。我们祈求上帝在这教导上可以总是保守我们有忠心，好叫我们持守他所托付我们的福音之宝。

Appendix

附录

WELS Statement on Church Fellowship (1970)

WELS 关于教会团契的声明

(1970)

Preamble

序言

Church fellowship is a term that has been used to designate both a status and an activity. Both usages lie very close together, and one flows out of the other. The two usages follow the general dogmatic distinction of *in actu primo et actu secundo*.

教会团契这一术语既被用以表明状态，又被用以表明活动。这两种用法非常接近，一种用法由另一种用法衍生而来。这两种用法遵循第一事实与第二事实（*in actu primo et actu secundo*）的一般教义区分。

Church fellowship can be defined as the status in which individuals or groups, on the basis of a common confession of faith, have mutually recognized one another as Christian brethren and now consider it God-pleasing to express, manifest, and demonstrate their common faith jointly.

教会团契可定义为这样一种状态，即，个人或团体在同一认信的基础上，相互承认彼此是基督徒同伴，又以为共同表达、显明并展示他们的共同信仰乃是神所喜悦之事这样的一种状态。

Church fellowship can also be defined as the activity which includes every joint expression, manifestation, and demonstration of the common faith in which Christians (individuals or groups), on the basis of their confession, find themselves to be united with one another. (Mutual recognition of one another as Christian brethren is itself one such “joint expression” of common faith in which Christians on the basis of their confession find themselves to be united with one another.)

教会团契也可定义为一种活动，即，信仰相同的基督徒（个人或团体）在他们认信的基础上发现自己与他在信仰上彼此合一，而他们对这信仰共同的表达、显明并展示的活动就是教会团契。（互相承认彼此是基督徒同伴，此事本身就是共同信仰的一种“联合表达”，信仰相同的基督徒在他们认信的基础上发现他们彼此合一。）

For very practical reasons, we have preferred to treat church fellowship in our Theses as a term designating an activity since the inter-synodical tensions have to do

more with church fellowship as an activity than as a status. Both as a status and as an activity, church fellowship needs to be distinguished from the spiritual fellowship of faith in the holy Christian church (Una Sancta) which it is meant to reflect but with which it cannot simply be identified. For in the case of hypocrites, who have not yet been revealed, church fellowship is still called for, though the fellowship in the holy Christian church (Una Sancta fellowship) is actually not existing. On the other hand, people may in God's sight be united in the fellowship in the holy Christian church (Una Sancta fellowship) and yet not have warrant to practice church fellowship here on earth.

出于非常实际的原因，我们更倾向于在我们的论点中将教会团契视为一种表示活动的术语，因为总会间的紧张关系更多是由于教会团契这种活动，而非状态。无论是作为一种状态还是作为一种活动，教会团契都需要与圣而公之教会（Una Sancta）中信徒的属灵团契区分开来，它是要反映圣而公之教会的样子，但它并不简单地就等同于圣而公之教会。因为假冒为善的人还没未显露出来，教会团契就仍为我们所需要，尽管圣而公之教会团契（Una Sancta fellowship）现在并不存在。另一方面，在神的眼中，人可以在圣而公之教会（Una Sancta fellowship）中团契合一，但还未在地上实行教会团契。

We also felt that our definition of church fellowship was general enough to include both proper and improper practice of church fellowship, for the definition itself does not specify what constitutes an adequate confession on the basis of which individuals or groups may properly find themselves united in a common faith. For is there not in all church fellowship the assumption present that an adequate confession exists? Our presentation under the points of B sets forth what constitutes a proper confession, the marks of the church (notae purae), on the basis of which Christians may properly find themselves united in a common faith.

同时我们也认为，我们对教会团契的定义足够广泛，它包括正确与不正确的教会团契实践，因为其定义本身并未具体说明什么条件才构成充分的认信，并在此基础上，个人或团体可以正确地发现他们自己联合于一个共同信仰。因为在所有的教会团契中，不都有一个假设存在充分认信的前提吗？我们在 B 点下的陈述，阐明了什么才是正确的认信，即教会的标志（notae purae），在此基础上，基督徒可以正确地发现他们自己联合于一个共同的信仰之中。

The Theses

论点

Church fellowship is every joint expression, manifestation, and demonstration of the common faith in which Christians on the basis of their confession find themselves to be united with one another.

信仰相同的基督徒（个人或团体）在他们认信的基础上发现他们自己与他在信仰上彼此合一，而他们对这信仰共同的表达、显明并展示的活动就是教会团契

A. How Scripture leads us to this concept of church fellowship.

A. 圣经如何引导我们认识教会团契的这一概念

1. Through faith in Christ, the Holy Spirit unites us with our God and Savior.
Galatians 3:26; 4:6; 1 John 3:1.

1. 藉着对基督的信心，圣灵将我们联于我们的上帝和我们的救主。加拉太书 3:26; 4:6; 约翰一书 3:1。
2. This Spirit-wrought faith at the same time unites us in an intimate bond with all other believers. 1 John 1:3; Ephesians 4:4-6; John 17:20,21. Compare also the many striking metaphors emphasizing the unity of the church, e.g., the body of Christ, the temple of God.
2. 与此同时，这圣灵作成的信心又将我们与所有其他信徒亲密地联合在一起。约翰一书 1:3; 以弗所书 4:4-6; 约翰福音 17:20,21。请对比圣经多处强调教会合一的那些比喻，比如，基督的身体，神的圣殿。
3. Faith as spiritual life invariably expresses itself in activity which is spiritual in nature, yet outwardly manifest, e.g., in the use of the means of grace, in prayer, in praise and worship, in appreciative use of the “gifts” of the Lord to the church, in Christian testimony, in furthering the cause of the gospel, and in deeds of Christian love. John 8:47; Galatians 4:6; Ephesians 4:11-14; Acts 4:20; 2 Corinthians 4:13; 1 Peter 2:9; Galatians 2:9; 5:6.
3. 作为属灵生命的信心，总是在本质属灵的活动中的自我表达，然而却以外在的方式显明出来，例如，在使用施恩具时，在祷告时，在赞美和敬拜时，以感谢的心使用主给教会的“恩赐”时，在基督徒作见证时，在推进福音事工中，在基督徒爱的行为中。约翰福音 8:47; 加拉太书 4:6; 以弗所书 4:11-14; 使徒行传 4:20; 哥林多后书 4:13; 彼得前书 2:9; 加拉太书 2:9; 5:6。
4. It is God the Holy Ghost who leads us to express and manifest in activity the faith which he works and sustains in our hearts through the gospel. Galatians 4:6; John 15:26,27; John 7:38,39; Acts 1:8; Ephesians 2:10.
4. 是神的圣灵带领我们在行为中表达和显明他通过福音在我们心中所作成并维持的信心。加拉太书 4:6; 约翰福音 15:26,27; 约翰福音 7:38,39; 使徒行传 1:8; 以弗所书 2:10。
5. Through the bond of faith in which he unites us with all Christians, the Holy Spirit also leads us to express and manifest our faith jointly with fellow Christians according to opportunity: as smaller and larger groups, Acts 1:14,15; 2:41-47; Galatians 2:9; as congregations with other congregations, Acts 15; 1 Thessalonians 4:9,10; 2 Corinthians 8:1,2,18,19; 2 Corinthians 9:2.
5. 圣灵藉着信心的纽带将我们与所有基督徒联在一起，圣灵也引导我们在合适的时机和其他基督徒——作为或大或小的团体，使徒行传 1:14,15; 2:41-47; 加拉太书 2:9; 作为会众与其他会众，使徒行传第 15 章; 帖撒罗尼迦前书 4:9,10; 哥林多后书 8:1,2,18,19; 哥林多后书 9:2——一同表达并显明我们的信心。

(Before God every activity of our faith is at the same time fellowship activity in the communion of saints. 1 Corinthians 12; Ephesians 4:1-16; Romans 12:1-8; 2 Timothy 2:19.)

(在神面前，出于我们信心的每一个活动，同时也是圣徒相通中的团契活动。哥林多前书第 12 章；以弗所书 4:1-16；罗马书 12:1-8；提摩太后书 2:19。)

6. We may classify these joint expressions of faith in various ways according to the particular realm of activity in which they occur, e.g., pulpit fellowship; altar fellowship; prayer fellowship; fellowship in worship; fellowship in church work, in missions, in Christian education, and in Christian charity. Yet insofar as they are joint expressions of faith, they are all essentially one and the same thing and are all properly covered by a common designation, namely, church fellowship. Church fellowship should therefore be treated as a unit concept, covering every joint expression, manifestation, and demonstration of a common faith. Hence, Scripture can give the general admonition “avoid them” when church fellowship is to cease (Ro 16:17). Hence, Scripture sees an expression of church fellowship also in giving the right hand of fellowship (Gal 2:9) and in greeting one another with the fraternal kiss (Ro 16:16); on the other hand, it points out that a withholding of church fellowship may also be indicated by not extending a fraternal welcome to errorists and by not bidding them Godspeed (2 Jn 10,11; cf. 3 Jn 5-8).
6. 我们可以根据这些联合的信仰表达方式所发生的特定领域来分门别类，例如，讲坛团契；祭坛团契；在祷告中团契；在敬拜中团契；在教会事工、宣教事工、基督教教育和基督教善工中团契。然而，就它们是信仰的联合表达而言，它们本质上都是同一件事，并且都被正确地包含在一个共同的名称当中，即教会团契。因此，教会团契应被视为一个整体概念，涵盖共同信仰的每一次联合表达、显明以及展示。因此，当教会团契应当中止时，圣经给出的一般警告是“躲避他们”（罗马书 16:17）。因此，圣经也将右手相交（加拉太书 2:9）与弟兄姐妹间亲吻问安（罗马书 16:16）视为教会团契的表达方式；另一方面，圣经也指出，不向犯错者表达弟兄姐妹间的问安，不向他们祝好，也可以表明教会团契的中止（约翰二书 10,11；参约翰三书 5-8）。

B. What principles Scripture teaches for the exercise of such church fellowship.

B. 圣经教导我们实行这种教会团契的原则是什么。

1. In selecting specific individuals or groups for a joint expression of faith, we can do this only on the basis of their confession. It would be presumptuous on our part to attempt to recognize Christians on the basis of the personal faith in their hearts. 2 Timothy 2:19; Romans 10:10; 1 John 4:1-3; 1 Samuel 16:7.
1. 在选择特定的个体或群体联合表达信仰时，我们只能基于他们的认信而行。如果我们试图根据基督徒内在的个人信心来识别他们，那就太过放肆了。提摩太后书 2:19；罗马书 10:10；约翰一书 4:1-3；撒母耳记上 16:7。
2. A Christian confession of faith is in principle always a confession to the entire Word of God. The denial, adulteration, or suppression of any word of

God does not stem from faith but from unbelief. John 8:31; Matthew 5:19; 1 Peter 4:11; Jeremiah 23:28,31; Deuteronomy 4:2; Revelation 22:18,19. We recognize and acknowledge as Christian brethren those who profess faith in Christ as their Savior and with this profession embrace and accept his entire Word. Compare Walther's "Theses on Open Questions," Thesis 7: "No man has the privilege, and to no man may the privilege be granted, to believe and to teach otherwise than God has revealed in his Word, no matter whether it pertains to primary or secondary fundamental articles of faith, to fundamental or nonfundamental doctrines, to matters of faith or of practice, to historical items or other matters subject to the light of reason, to important or seemingly unimportant matters."

2. 基督徒的信仰告白原则上总是对神全部话语的认信。否认、掺假或压制任何神的话语都不是出于信心，而是出于不信。约翰福音 8:31；马太福音 5:19；彼得前书 4:11；耶利米书 23:28,31；申命记 4:2；启示 22:18,19。我们知道并承认那些公开表明相信基督是他们救主并以此信仰欢然接受他全部话语的基督徒为我们的基督徒同伴。请对比华尔特“关于开放性问题的论点”中的论点 7：“没有人有特权，也没有人被授予特权，去相信和教导上帝在他的话语中所并未启示之事，无论它是关乎主要的还是次要的信仰条款，基要的还是非基本的教义，信心问题还是实践问题，历史问题还是其它受制于理性之光的问题，重要的还是看似不重要的问题。”
3. Actually, however, the faith of Christians and its manifestations are marked by many imperfections, either in the grasp and understanding of Scriptural truths, or in the matter of turning these truths to full account in their lives. We are all weak in one way or another. Philippians 3:12; Ephesians 4:14; Ephesians 3:16-18; 1 Thessalonians 5:14; Hebrews 5:12; 1 Peter 2:2. Compare Walther's Thesis 5: "The church militant must indeed aim at and strive for absolute unity of faith and doctrine, but it never will attain a higher degree of unity than a fundamental one." (Cf. Thesis 10.)
3. 然而，实际上，基督徒的信心及其展现皆有许多不足之处，要么是在对圣经真理的把握和理解之上，要么是在生活中充分实践这些真理之上。我们都有这样或那样的软弱。腓立比书第 3 章；以弗所书 4:14；以弗所书 3:16-18；帖撒罗尼迦前书 5:14；希伯来书 5:12；彼得前书 2:2。请对比华尔特的论点 5：“征战的教会确实必须以信仰和教义的绝对合一为目标，并竭力追求，但它永远不会达到比基要合一更高的合一程度。”（参论点 10）
4. Weakness of faith is in itself not a reason for terminating church fellowship, but rather an inducement for practicing it vigorously to help one another in overcoming our individual weaknesses. In precept and example, Scripture abounds with exhortations to pay our full debt of love toward the weak.
4. 信心的软弱本身并非终止教会团契关系的理由，反而是一种诱因，促使我们积极实践团契，在克服我们个人软弱的事上互相帮助。或以训诫，或以案例，圣经多处劝勉我们向软弱的人偿还爱的全债。

- a. General exhortations. Galatians 6:1-3; Ephesians 4:1-16; Matthew 18:15-17.
 - a. 一般的劝勉。加拉太书 6:1-3；以弗所书 4:1-16；马太福音 18:15-17。
 - b. Weakness in laying hold of God's promises in a firm trust. Matthew 6:25-34.
 - b. 在抓住神的应许上软弱，信心不坚定。马太福音 6:25-34。
 - c. Weakness with reference to adiaphora in enjoying fully the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. Romans 14; 1 Corinthians 8 and 9. The public confession of any church must on the basis of Scripture establish, however, which things are adiaphora, so that it may be evident who are the weak and who are the strong. Romans 14:17-23; 1 Corinthians 6:12; 10:23,24.
 - c. 在对待中立物上软弱，无法完全自由地享受中立物，但在这些事上基督已使我们得自由。罗马书第 14 章；哥林多前书第 8 章和第 9 章。然而，任何教会的公开认信都必须基于圣经去确认哪些事情是中立物，以便显明谁是软弱的，谁是坚固的。罗马书 14:17-23；哥林多前书 6:12；10:23,24。
 - d. Weakness in understanding God's truth, and involvement in error. Acts 1:6; Galatians (Judaizing error); Colossians (Jewish-Gnostic error); 1 Corinthians 15; 1 Thessalonians 4:10-12,14; 2 Thessalonians 3:6,14,15; Acts 15:5,6,22,25. Note how in all these cases, Paul patiently built up the weak faith of these Christians with the gospel to give them strength to overcome the error that had affected them. Compare Walther's Theses 2, 3, 4, and 8.
 - d. 在理解上帝真理上的软弱，并加入到错误之中。使徒行传 1:6；加拉太书（犹太主义错误）；歌罗西书（犹太-诺斯底主义错误）；哥林多前书第 15 章；帖撒罗尼迦前书 4:10-12,14；帖撒罗尼迦后书 3:6,14,15；使徒行传 15:5,6,22,25。请注意，在所有这些案例中，保罗如何以福音耐心加固这些基督徒软弱的信心，而这福音又使他们有力量克服曾经影响他们的错误。对比华尔特的论点 2、3、4 和 8。
5. Persistent adherence to false doctrine and practice calls for termination of church fellowship.
5. 对于坚持假教义及假实践者，要中止和他们教会团契。
- a. We cannot continue to recognize and treat anyone as a Christian brother who in spite of all brotherly admonition impenitently clings to a sin. His and our own spiritual welfare calls for termination of church fellowship (excommunication). Matthew 18:17; 1 Corinthians 5:1-6.
 - a. 任何一个不顾所有兄弟姐妹的劝告而死死抓住罪不放的，我们都不可继续承认并视其为基督徒同伴。为着他和我们自己的属灵益处，教会团契必须终止（逐出教会）。马太福音 18:17；哥林多前书 5:1-6。

- b. We can no longer recognize and treat as Christian brethren those who in spite of patient admonition persistently adhere to an error in doctrine or practice, demand recognition for their error, and make propaganda for it. Galatians 1:8,9; 5:9; Matthew 7:15-19; 16:6; 2 Timothy 2:17-19; 2 John 9-11; Romans 16:17,18. If the error does not overthrow the foundation of saving faith, the termination of fellowship is not to be construed as an excommunication. Moreover, an excommunication can only apply to an individual, not to a congregation or larger church group. The “avoid them” of Romans 16:17,18 excludes any contact that would be an acknowledgment and manifestation of church fellowship; it calls for a cessation of every further joint expression of faith. (Cf. 1 Corinthians 5:9-11. Compare Walther’s Theses 9 and 10.)
- b. 那些经过耐心劝勉后仍然坚持教义或实践错误、要求他人认可其错误并宣扬其错误的人，我们不再称其为、也不再视其为基督徒同伴。加拉太书 1:8,9；马太福音 7:15-19；16:6；提摩太后书 2:17-19；约翰二书 9-11；罗马书 16:17,18。如果错误没有摧毁其信心根基，中止团契不应被诠释为逐出教会。此外，逐出教会只适用于个人，而不适用于教会或更大的教会团体。罗马书 16:17,18 的“躲避他们”排除了任何可能承认及展现教会团契的联络；它要求停止一切进一步的联合信仰表达（参哥林多前书 5:9-11，请对比华尔特的论点 9、10）。
- c. Those who practice church fellowship with persistent errorists are partakers of their evil deeds. 2 John 11.
- c. 凡与错误坚持者实践教会团契的，就是在他们的恶行上有分。约翰二书 11。

From all of this, we see that in the matter of the outward expression of Christian fellowship, the exercise of church fellowship, particularly two Christian principles need to direct us, the great debt of love which the Lord would have us pay to the weak brother, and his clear injunction (also flowing out of love) to avoid those who adhere to false doctrine and practice and all who make themselves partakers of their evil deeds. Conscientious recognition of both principles will lead to an evangelical practice also in facing many difficult situations that confront us, situations which properly lie in the field of casuistry.

从上述所有内容中，我们看到，在基督徒团契的外在表达——即教会团契的实践——这一问题上，我们尤其需要两个基督徒原则来指引我们，主让我们向软弱的同伴偿还我们所欠他们爱的巨债，他又明确禁止（亦是出于爱）我们躲避那些坚持假教义和假实践的人以及所有在他们恶行上有份的人。真诚地承认这两项原则会让我们在面对许多困境、许多存疑领域的问题时仍以福音行动。

On the basis of the foregoing, we find it to be an untenable position

基于上述内容，我们晓得以下这些立场无法立足

- A. To distinguish between joint prayer which is acknowledged to be an expression of church fellowship and an occasional joint prayer which purports to be something short of church fellowship;
- A. 在某种被视为教会团契表达的联合祷告与某种声称弱于教会团契的偶发性联合祷告之间作出区分；

B. To designate certain nonfundamental doctrines as not being divisive of church fellowship in their very nature;

B. 标明某些非基要教义在本质上并不会造成教会团契的分裂；

C. To envision fellowship relations (in a congregation, in a church body, in a church federation, in a church agency, in a cooperative church activity) like so many steps of a ladder, each requiring a gradually increasing or decreasing measure of unity in doctrine and practice.

C. 设想（在会众、教会团体、教会联盟、教会代理机构、教会合作活动中的）团契关系就像梯子上的许多台阶，每一种关系都需要在教义和实践上逐渐增加或减少合一的程度。

*Full attention needs to be given in this statement to the limiting terms: “insofar” and “joint.” The “insofar” is to point out that it is indeed only in their function as joint expressions of faith that the use of the means of grace and such other things mentioned as Christian prayer, Christian education, and Christian charity all lie on the same plane. In other respects the means of grace and their use are indeed unique. Only through the means of grace, the gospel in Word and Sacrament, does the Holy Spirit awaken, nourish, and sustain faith. Again, only the right use of Word and Sacrament are the true marks of the church, the marks by which the Lord points us to those with whom he would have us express our faith jointly.

*请充分注意本声明中的限制性术语：“就.....而言”和“联合”。这里所说的“就.....而言”，乃是要指出，确实只有在它们作为信仰联合表达的功能上，施恩具的使用才与我们所提到的基督徒祷告、基督教教育、基督教善工等在同一层面上。而在其它方面，施恩具及其使用确实是独一无二的。只有借着施恩具，即圣道和圣礼中的福音，圣灵才能唤起、滋养并维持信心。我再说，只有圣道和圣礼的正确使用才是教会的真正标志，藉着这些标志，主指引我们与他人联合表达我们的信仰。

For anything to be a “joint” expression of faith presupposes that those involved are really expressing their faith together. This distinguishes a joint expression of faith from individual expressions of faith which happen to be made at the same time and at the same place. Certain things like the celebration of the Lord’s Supper, the proclamation of the gospel, and also prayer, are by their very nature expressions of faith and are an abomination in God’s sight when not intended to be that. When done together, they are therefore invariably joint expressions of faith. Other things like giving a greeting, a kiss, a handshake, and extending hospitality or physical help to others are in themselves not of necessity expressions of Christian faith. Hence, doing these things together with others does not necessarily make them joint expressions of faith, even though a Christian will for his own person also thereby be expressing his faith (cf. 1 Co 10:31). These things done together with others become joint expressions of faith only when those involved intend them to be that, understand them in this way, and want them to be understood thus, as in the case of the apostolic collection for the poor Christians at Jerusalem, the fraternal kiss of the apostolic church, and our handshake at ordination and confirmation.

因为任何“联合”信仰表达的前提是，参与其中的人确实在共同表达他们的信仰。这将联合信仰表达与碰巧同时同地个体的信仰表达区分开来。某些事情，比如庆祝圣餐，宣讲福音，还有祷告，本质上是信仰的表达，在上帝看来，如果不是如此，那便是可憎之事。因此，当一起做这些事情时，它们就总是联合信仰表达。其它的事情，如问候、亲吻、握手、热情款待或物质帮助，本身并不是基督教信仰的必须表达方式。因此，与他人一起做这些事并不一定会使他们联合表达信仰，即便基督徒为自己的缘故也会这样表达他的信仰（参哥林多前书 10:31）。当和其他人一起做这些事情时，只有当参与者打算让这些事成为信仰的联合表达，又以这种方式理解它们，并希望这些事也如此被理解时，这些事才能成为信仰的联合表达，就像使徒为耶路撒冷贫穷的基督徒筹集奉献，使徒教会同伴间的亲吻，以及我们在按立礼和坚信礼时的握手一样。

Endnotes

尾注

- 1Augsburg Confession, Article VII:2, *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, translated and edited by Theodore G. Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), p. 32.
- 2Formula of Concord, Epitome, Article X: 7, Tappert, p. 493.
- 3Werner Elert, *Eucharist and Church Fellowship in the First Four Centuries* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966).
- 4Martin Luther, *Luther's Works*, edited by Jaroslav Pelikan, American Edition (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1964), Vol. 27, p. 38.
- 5Luther's Works, Vol. 27, p. 41.
- 6Martin Luther, *What Luther Says: An Anthology*, compiled by Ewald M. Plass, 3 vols. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959), p. 812.
- 7Friedrich Balduin, *Tract on Cases of Conscience*, II, 6,7.
- 8Quoted in Adolf Hoenecke, *Ev. Luth. Dogmatik*, Vol. 3 (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1909), p. 441.
- 9The relevance of the actions at Thorn to 20th century disputes about prayer fellowship was considered both in the WELS pamphlet "Fellowship Then and Now" (pp. 29,30) and in the LCMS' "Theology of Fellowship" (pp. 18,19,22). The LCMS presentation minimizes the significance of the Lutherans' refusal to have joint prayers with the Catholics and Reformed, but it was the Missouri Synod's *Der Lutheraner* that first used the example of Thorn to justify the Synodical Conference's refusal to hold joint prayers with the Ohio and Iowa Synods early in the 20th century (Vol. 64, No. 7, 1908, p. 111). Accounts of this incident are given in Herzog's *Realencyclopädie*, 1862 edition, Vol. 16, p. 105, and in the 1907 edition, Vol. 19, pp. 747,748.
- 10Thesis 7 of Walther's "Theses on Open Questions." Quoted in "WELS Statement on Church Fellowship." See page 167 in this book.
- 11See the tract "Fellowship Then and Now," which can be found in *Essays on Church Fellowship*, edited by Curtis A. Jahn (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1996), pp. 349-378.
- 12Bente delivered his essay in 1904 and had it published in *Lehre und Wehre*, 1905, pp. 97-115. An English translation of the essay may be found in the Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library Essay File, No. 124.
- 13Richard C. Wolf, *Documents of Lutheran Unity in America* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), p. 401.
- 14Wolf, p. 399.
- 15Wolf, pp. 402,403.
- 16Both quotes are from Wolf, p. 406.
- 17Wolf, pp. 428,429.
- 18"A Statement," reproduced in *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly*, Vol. 43, No. 4 (November, 1970), pp. 150-152. It can also be found in *Moving Frontiers*, edited by Carl S. Meyer (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1964), pp. 422,423.

- 19Theodore Graebner, Prayer Fellowship (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1946).
- 20Wolf, pp. 424-426.
- 21See the WELS pamphlet “Entrenched Unionistic Practices,” authorized by the Commission on Doctrinal Matters, Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod, 1961.
- 22See “Theology of Fellowship,” Synodical Conference Proceedings, 1960, p. 45.
- 23“Unity in the Context of Theological Pluralism,” cited in Forum Letter, Vol. 1, No. 8 (1972), p. 5.
- 24“Statement on Communion Practices,” Lutheran Standard, October 16, 1979, p. 40.
- 25“Justification By Faith,” Origins, Vol. 13, No. 17 (October 6, 1983), pp. 277-304.
- 26“The Nature and Implications of the Concept of Fellowship,” Commission on Theology and Church Relations, The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, 1981, p. 43.
- 27Lutheran Witness, October, 1982, p. 34.
- 28Lutheran Witness, May 2, 1983, p. 4.
- 29Quoted in Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Fall, 1988, p. 267.
- 30WELS Proceedings, 1957, p. 144. Proceedings of the Northern Wisconsin District, 1956, p. 61.
- 31WELS Book of Reports and Memorials (BORAM), 1993, p. 236.
- 32BORAM, pp. 236,237.
- 33BORAM, p. 240.
- 34For the full resolution, see CLC Proceedings, 1994, pp. 66,67.
- 35John Lau, “We Recommit Ourselves to Hold Fast to Sound Doctrine,” Journal of Theology, 1994, p. 32.
- 36Michael Wilke, “What’s Going On among the ‘Conservative’ Lutherans—Part II,” West Central Pastoral Conference, Good Shepherd Lutheran Church, September 20-22, 1994, p. 3.
- 37Readers who want more information and the complete text of the joint statement should read the WELS Book of Reports and Memorials, 1993, pp. 232-241 and the CLC Journal of Theology, 1994, pp. 31-34.
- 38WELS Proceedings, 1979, pp. 49-65.
- 39Focus on the Family—Citizen, June 18, 1990, p. 2.

For Further Reading

深入阅读

- Brug, John, Edward Fredrich, and Armin Schuetze. WELS and Other Lutherans. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1995.
- Fredrich, Edward C. The Wisconsin Synod Lutherans. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1992, especially pp. 37-61, 198-208, the history of our relations with the LCMS and the CLC.
- Jahn, Curtis A., editor. Essays on Church Fellowship. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1996. A reprint of important exegetical and doctrinal essays, pertaining especially to the debate between WELS and the LCMS. Includes "Fellowship Then and Now," mentioned in this book.
- Lawrenz, Carl. "The Scriptural Principles Concerning Church Fellowship," in Our Great Heritage, Vol. 3. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1991.
- Wolf, Richard C. Documents of Lutheran Unity In America. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966. This book contains most of the original documents concerning inter-Lutheran relationships in America before 1966.

Scripture Index

经文索引

Leviticus

24:9—119

Deuteronomy

4:2—21,167

1 Samuel

16:7—15,167

21:1-6—119

1 Kings

18:17—42

18:18—42

2 Kings

5:15-19—138

5:17-19—151

Psalms

119:129-144—109

133—51

Isaiah

55:10,11—15

Jeremiah

23:28,31—167

Ezekiel

2:3-7—109

3:3-8—109

Matthew

5:19—167

6:25-34—168

7:1-5—44

7:5—160

7:6—44

7:15—44

7:15-19—169

7:15,16,21-23—43

7:21-23—15

7:23—44

10:32-39—147
12:7—119
12:46-49—147
15:1-14—44
16:5-12—44
16:6—169
18:15—118
18:15-17—55,168
18:17—169
23—54
23:1-36—44
24:4-14—44
25:31-46—15
28:20—38

Mark

2:27—119

Luke

7:34,35—146
15:11-24—57

John

4:27—146
7:38,39—165
8:31—39,167
8:47—165
13:35—52
14:15-17—29
15:26,27—165
17—114
17:20,21—165

Acts

1:6—169
1:8—165
1:14,15—166
2:41-47—166
2:42—49,115
4:20—165
15—112,166
15:1-32—47
15:5,6,22,25—169
17:11—43
19:8-10—144
20:27-31—38
27:35—114,149

Romans

5:8—28
10:1-3—27
10:10—16,167
12:1-8—166
14—168

14:1,3,5,6,13,19—35
14:17-23—168
15:5—39
15:23,24—40
15:30-32—48,114
16:1-3—47,112
16:1-16—40,47,112
16:16—47,112,166
16:17—40,49,96,166
16:17,18—24,40,72,169,
170

1 Corinthians

1:10—39
1:11-13—37
2:2—7
3:21-23—37
5:1-6—169
5:9-11—170
5:9-12—58
6:12—168
7:12,13—150
8:10—137
8,9—168
9:11,14—46
10:12—77
10:13—141
10:14-21—138
10:16,17—46
10:17—111,121
10:23,24—168
10:31—171
10,11—121
11:29—126
12—166
15—169

2 Corinthians

1:11—48,114
4:13—165
8:1,2,18,19—166
8:4—48,113
8:16-23—47,112
8,9—114
9:2—166
9:12,13—48,114
11:13-15—43
12:14—134
13:8—26

Galatians

1:8,9—169
2:1-10—47,112

2:3—118
2:9—47,112,165,166
3:26—14,165
3:28—37
4:6—165
5:1—36
5:6—165
5:9—63,118,169
6:1-3—168
6:6—46
6:10—52

Ephesians

2:10—165
3:16-18—168
4:1-16—166,168
4:3—52
4:3,11-15—38
4:4-6—165
4:5,6—14
4:11-14—165
4:11-16—53
4:14—168

Philippians

1:5—46,112
3:12—168
4:15—46,112

Colossians

2:16—35
3:16—17,45,111

1 Thessalonians

4:9,10—166
4:10-12,14—169
5:11-13—53
5:14—168

2 Thessalonians

2:3—36
3:6,13-15—57
3:6,14,15—169

1 Timothy

1:3,4—39
1:3-5—29,118
1:5—159
1:20—29
2:1,2—114
4:1-6—30,118
4:3—34
4:16—30

5:17—53
5:22—31
6:3,4—30,39

2 Timothy

2:14-26—31,36
2:15—30
2:17—118
2:17,18—29
2:17-19—169
2:18—34
2:19—15,166,167
2:24-26—54
2:25,26—118
3:1-9—30
3:13-17—30
4:2-5—118
4:3,4—30
4:14—29

Titus

1:10-14—118
3:9—34
3:10—30,49,55,118

Hebrews

5:12—168
10:24,25—17,45,111

James

2:1-5—37

1 Peter

1:22—52
2:2—168
2:4,5,9—14
2:9—165
3:1-7—149
4:11—39,167
4:12-16—109

2 Peter

2:1-3,13-20—34

1 John

1:2,3—58
1:3—19,165
1:7—14
2:19—26
3:1—165
3:16—28
3:17-19—52
4:1-3—167
4:1,5,6—27
4:3—36

4:6—25
5:2—28

2 John

9-11—26,169
10—24
10,11—46,166
11—112,170

3 John

4-8—53
5-8—166
5,6,8,12—24
8—24,25,58
9,10—26
12—47,112

Jude

3-10—34
12,22—160
18,19,22,23—54
22,23—118

Revelation

2:2,3—27
2:14-16,20,21—27
2,3—34
22:18,19—34,167
22:19—39

Subject Index

主题索引

- Abortion 140,152,153
- Adiaphoron (-a) 35,38,118, 168
- Admonition 93,95,96
- Aid Association for Lutherans (AAL) 135
- American Lutheran Church (ALC) 70-75,77-80,82,85
- Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches (AELC) 70,82

- Baccalaureate 150
- Baptism 16,20,35,49,127,131, 133
- Baptismal sponsors 133
- Baptist 14,131

- Catholic 14,65,70,79,80,154, 155
- Ceremonies 35,36,38,39,78, 150
- Charity 47-49,113,114,166, 171
- Choir 127,129,131,132
- Church 13
 - Biblical doctrine of 13
 - Discipline 55-57,141,142, 161
 - Invisible church 15
 - Marks of 15
 - Visible church 17
 - Heterodox church 17
 - Orthodox church 17
- Church of the Lutheran Confession (CLC) 8,10, 87,88,90-92,94-97
- Clubs 153
- Colloquy 47
- Communion 62,65,120-123, 126
 - Close(d) Communion 7, 62,64,85,118,122,126
 - Intercommunion 70,79
 - Open Communion 79,84
 - See also Lord's Supper
- Conferences 73,78,83,145
 - Free conference 85,99, 145
- Confessional Evangelical Lutheran Conference (CELC) 100,102
- Confessions
 - Augsburg Confession 36, 78,85
 - Common Confession 75
 - Formula of Concord 39, 78
 - Lutheran Confessions, the 81
- Confirmation 47,113
- Conventions 8,47,72,73,82, 89,113
- Convocations 82,83

Cooperation in externals 47,76,113

Devotions 80,148,149,151

Diotrephes 26

Divorce 150

Emergency situations 119,120

Employment by heterodox 141

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) 70, 78-80,82,85,100,120,145

Evangelical Lutheran Free Church (ELFC) 101

Evangelical Lutheran Synod (ELS) 76,77,89,91,92,94-97,99,100

Excommunication 55,56,64, 134,169

Fellowship

Definition of 19-22,24, 105,164

Goals of principles of 118

God-pleasing 25

Guidelines for 106-110

Levels of 49,50,83

Luther's view of 63,64

Prayer 48,49,70-72,114, 115,148

Selective 81

Unit concept of 21,81

Financial support 24,26,46, 110,112,134,152

Friends 147

Fundamental doctrines 33,70, 167

Funerals 65,124,125,130,137

Impenitence 56,58

Independent Evangelical Lutheran Church (SELK) 101

Insurance 135

Lectures 155,156

Outside speakers 155

Lord's Supper 45,64,111,120-122,126

See also Communion

Lutheran Brotherhood 135

Lutheran Church in America (LCA) 70,78-80,82

Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod (LCMS) 8-10,67-91,95,100-102,113,119,

120,143,145,155

Lutheran Confessional Church (LBK) 100

Lutheran Council in the USA (LCUSA) 77,78,80

Marriage 30,34,129

Mixed marriage 149

Masonic Lodge 7,124,152

Musicians 65,127-129,131

Naaman 138,151

Nonfundamental doctrines 70,71,167

Ordination 47,113

Organists 127,130

Persistent errorists 54-56,84
Political action groups 152-154
Prussian Union 69

Rallies 82,83
Reformed 65,69,79,154

School

 Attendance 139,140
 Enrollment 131-133

Scouts 7,75

Shriners 152

Soloists 127,130

“Statement” of the 44
 73,74

Synodical Conference 61,69-71,76,78,84,85,89,90,99-101,114,135

“Theology of Fellowship” (LCMS) 76

Transfers 113

Weak brothers 54

Weddings 129,130,133

Worship services 131,132, 137-139

YMCA 153