



LOGIA

A JOURNAL OF LUTHERAN THEOLOGY

WITTEBERGA,
GLORIOSA DEI CIVITAS,
SEDES ET ARX VERÆ DOCTRINÆ CATHOLICÆ, SE-
PTEMVIRATVS SAXONICI METROPOLIS, ACADEMIARVM IN EVROPA
CLARISSIMA, ET POSTREMI MILLENARII LOCVS
LONGE SANCTISS:



WITTENBERG AND/OR CONSTANTINOPLE

REFORMATION 2000

VOLUME IX, NUMBER 4

εἰ τις λαλεῖ, ὡς λόγια Θεοῦ

LOGIA is a journal of Lutheran theology. As such it publishes articles on exegetical, historical, systematic, and liturgical theology that promote the orthodox theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. We cling to God's divinely instituted marks of the church: the gospel, preached purely in all its articles, and the sacraments, administered according to Christ's institution. This name expresses what this journal wants to be. In Greek, ΛΟΓΙΑ functions either as an adjective meaning "eloquent," "learned," or "cultured," or as a plural noun meaning "divine revelations," "words," or "messages." The word is found in 1 Peter 4:11, Acts 7:38, and Romans 3:2. Its compound forms include ὁμολογία (confession), ἀπολογία (defense), and ἀναλογία (right relationship). Each of these concepts and all of them together express the purpose and method of this journal. LOGIA considers itself a *free conference in print* and is committed to providing an independent theological forum normed by the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions. At the heart of our journal we want our readers to find a love for the sacred Scriptures as the very Word of God, not merely as rule and norm, but especially as Spirit, truth, and life which reveals Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life—Jesus Christ our Lord. Therefore, we confess the church, without apology and without rancor, only with a sincere and fervent love for the precious Bride of Christ, the holy Christian church, "the mother that begets and bears every Christian through the Word of God," as Martin Luther says in the Large Catechism (LC II, 42). We are animated by the conviction that the Evangelical Church of the Augsburg Confession represents the true expression of the church which we confess as one, holy, catholic, and apostolic.

LOGIA (ISSN #1064-0398) is published quarterly by the Luther Academy, 9228 Lavant Drive, Crestwood, MO 63126. Non-profit postage paid (permit #4) at Cresbard, SD and additional mailing offices.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to LOGIA, 15825, 373rd Ave., Northville, SD 57465.

Editorial Department: 314 Pearl St., Mankato, MN 56001. Unsolicited material is welcomed but cannot be returned unless accompanied by sufficient return postage. All submissions must be accompanied by a 300 word or less abstract of the article.

Book Review Department: 5007-7 Truemper Way, Fort Wayne, IN 46835. All books received will be listed.

Correspondence Department: 314 Pearl St., Mankato, MN 56001. Letters selected for publication are subject to editorial modification, must be typed or computer printed, and must contain the writer's name and complete address.

Logia Forum: 2313 S. Hanna St., Fort Wayne, IN 46803-2477.

Subscription & Advertising Department: 15825, 373rd Ave., Northville, SD 57465. Advertising rates and specifications are available upon request.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION: U.S.A.: one year (four issues), \$22; two years (eight issues), \$40. **Canada and Mexico:** one year surface, \$25; one year air, \$32. **Overseas:** one year air, \$42; one year surface, \$29. All funds in U.S. currency only.

Copyright © 2000. The Luther Academy. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced without written permission.

COVER ART

This view of Wittenberg shows (left to right) the Castle Church, the city church, the college, Philipp Melanchthon's house and the Black Cloister, which was Martin Luther's house. It is from about 1558 and was printed by the Cranach workshop.

The title reads in Latin: "Wittenberg—glorious city of God, seat and citadel of the true catholic doctrine, chartered Saxon metropolis, most glorious of European schools, and by far the most holy place of the last millennium."

The cover art is provided by the Reverend Mark Loest, Assistant Director for Reference and Museum at Concordia Historical Institute.

LOGIA is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database, published by the
American Theological Library Association,
250 S. Wacker Drive, 16th floor, Chicago, IL 60606,
E-mail: atla@atla.com ~ WWW: <http://www.atla.com/>

FREQUENTLY USED ABBREVIATIONS

- AC [CA] Augsburg Confession
AE *Luther's Works*, American Edition
Ap Apology of the Augsburg Confession
Ep Epitome of the Formula of Concord
FC Formula of Concord
LC Large Catechism
LW *Lutheran Worship*
SA Smalcald Articles
SBH *Service Book and Hymnal*
SC Small Catechism
SD Solid Declaration of the Formula of Concord
SL St. Louis Edition of Luther's Works
Tappert *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. Trans. and ed. Theodore G. Tappert
Triglotta *Concordia Triglotta*
TLH *The Lutheran Hymnal*
Tr Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope
WA *Luthers Werke*, Weimarer Ausgabe [Weimar Edition]

CONTACT US YOUR FAVORITE WAY

- Phone ▲ 605-887-3145
E-mail ▲ logia2@nvc.net
SECURE Website ▲ www.logia.org
Mail ▲ 15825, 373rd Ave., Northville, SD 57465

LOGIA

A JOURNAL OF LUTHERAN THEOLOGY

REFORMATION 2000

VOLUME IX, NUMBER 4

CONTENTS

CORRESPONDENCE 3

ARTICLES

Abraham Calov on Eastern Orthodoxy
Matthew Harrison 5

Justification and Deification in the Dialogue between the Tübingen Theologians and Patriarch Jeremias II
Richard Stuckwisch 17

Luther and Cajetan on the Sacrifice of the Mass
Michael J. Tori 29

Killing to Make Alive Again: Cruciform Proclamation in the Writings of Gerhard O. Forde
David R. Liefeld 37

Was Bo Giertz a Pietist?: Bishop Giertz and the Order of Grace
Eric R. Andrae 43

REVIEWS 51

REVIEW ESSAY: *Ordnungen der Allmacht. Paul Althaus der Jüngere über die Ordnungen.*
By Walther Mann. Review by Lowell Green

Christology. By Hans Schwarz. Review by Paul Strawn

The Paul Quest. By Ben Witherington III. Review by Paul L. Maier

The Wauwatosha Theology. Edited by Curtis Jahn. Review by Mark F. Bartling

Jesus—The Miracle Worker. By Graham H. Twelftree. Review by Paul L. Maier

The Design of God's Love: Overcoming Violence in Our Lives. Edited by Jeanie W. Reese. Review by Daryl Gehlbach

BRIEFLY NOTED

LOGIA FORUM 61

First Contact • Institutionalized Pursuits • Reformation Parenting
When Orthodox Isn't Orthodox • Four Chief Paradigms • The Sign of the Cross
Marking the Distinction • Welcome Words • On Infant Communion
Luther and Aesop • He Remains Faithful

ALSO THIS ISSUE

A Call for Manuscripts 4
Inklings by Jim Wilson 68

CORRESPONDENCE



To the editors:

✦ The Trinity 2000 issue of *LOGIA* (vol. 9, no. 3) contained letters from Dr. Jeffrey Gibbs and Rev. Al Loeschman, both of which were critical of Thomas Von Hagel's article from *LOGIA* 8, no. 3 (Trinity 1999), "A Eucharistic Interpretation of the Synoptic Apocalypse." I found the article thought-provoking and quite worthwhile, even if I did not agree with it in every detail. Yet my reason for responding here does not have to do with the debate over the exegesis of Matthew 24 and its synoptic equivalents. In fact, I have had occasion to hear Dr. Gibbs give his own exegesis of the passage, which I found fascinating and likely correct in its salient features, though I remain unconvinced by much of his criticism of Professor Von Hagel.

What I found particularly disturbing was Pastor Loeschman's complaint, which dealt not so much with exegesis as with theology. I must take strong issue with his contention that in the sacrament Christ "personally is apart from the elements he serves." Loeschman declares that it was only the Reformed "perception" and not Lutheran doctrine itself that held "that Jesus was offering the real presence of himself personally in the bread and wine."

Oh? Pastor Loeschman would do well to read his Lutheran Confessions more carefully. Does he truly mean to suggest that Jesus is *not* personally present in the bread and wine? Evidently so, for Loeschman makes the outlandish claim that the phrase "Christ is present with his body and blood" (FC SD VII, 122) "does not mean that [Christ] is 'in' his body and blood." Let him read also in the Formula of Concord that in the

Sacrament there is "a firm bond of union of Christians with Christ, their Head, and with one another" (FC SD VII, 44); or again, that "Christ is and remains to all eternity God and man in one *undivided* person" (FC Ep VIII, 18). The Formula cites Luther in this regard:

That which is, indeed, an attribute of only one nature is ascribed not to that nature alone, as separate, but to the entire *person*, which is at the same time God and man (whether it is called God or man). . . .

Scripture, on account of the personal union, ascribes also to divinity everything that happens to the humanity, and vice versa. . . .

For although the one part (to speak thus), namely, the divinity, does not suffer, yet the person, which is God, suffers in the other part, namely, in His humanity; for in truth God's Son has been crucified for us, that is, the person which is God (FC SD, VIII, 36, 41-42).

Amazingly, Loeschman *does* cite Article VII of the Formula in support of his contention that Christ is not personally in the elements, yet he woefully misunderstands the very passage he cites, namely, the Formula's rejection of the teaching "that the elements or the visible species or forms of the consecrated bread and wine must be adored. However, no one, unless he be an Arian heretic, can and will deny that Christ Himself, true God and man, who is truly and essentially present in the Supper, should be adored in spirit and in truth in the true use of the same, as also in all other places" (FC SD VII, 126). By some mental gymnastics, Loeschman

comes up with this remarkable contention, which he claims he has found here, that the *sacrament* must not be adored; but since *Christ* must be adored, therefore Christ is not personally in the sacrament, only his body and blood are there. A more careful reading will reveal that it is not the visible but the invisible which is *herein* to be adored; a still more careful reading must have us wondering whether the Arian heresy is indeed alive and well among us.

As soon as I read Loeschman's contention that Christ is personally "apart" from his body and blood, I thought I also heard Luther roll over in his grave. Luther's treatise on *The Blessed Sacrament of the Body of Christ* declares in no uncertain terms that "On the one hand we partake of Christ and all saints; on the other hand we permit all Christians to be partakers of us" (AE, 31: 67). I thought then of the ire of Luther against the sacramentarians, who tried to divorce Christ personally from his body, to which Luther would categorically respond, "No Christ like that for me!" Who knows what sort of Christ Loeschman has in mind when he speaks of a Christ who is *not* substantively and locally present where his body *is* substantively and locally present. Where is this Christ? Only up in heaven, evidently, where the *extra Calvinisticum* also planted him, but not here among us in the flesh! Indeed, I have never heard of such a Christ! Calvin may have placed his divinity beyond the reaches of his body and blood, but Loeschman here places his body and blood beyond the reach of his divinity! Amazing.

Loeschman's feeble attempt to enlist the support of Herman Sasse must also be addressed. As the quotation in question itself clearly shows, Sasse is arguing

against Rudolf Otto's denial of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the supper when he rejects Otto's contention that "This is my body" means "nothing more than 'This is I myself.'" He is certainly not arguing that "This is my body" means *less* than "This is I myself."

No wonder the sacrament is held in such low regard among us!

*Burnell Eckardt
Kewanee, Illinois*

✦ In the Eastertide 2000 issue, *LOGIA* 9, no. 2, David P. Scaer writes that "Pietismus" is a German word in the neuter gender, "das Pietismus," which renders "Pietismus Redivivus" grammatically incorrect. As a native German speaker I would like to correct this erroneous statement. "Pietismus" is in fact a German word in the masculine gender, "der Pietismus"; Ritschl continuously uses this masculine noun correctly in his "Geschichte des Pietismus." The correct grammatical form of the issue's title is therefore the original version, "Pietismus Redivivus."

*Karl E. Böhmer
Pierre, South Dakota*

✦ A book review by the undersigned published in *LOGIA* 8, no. 4 (Reformation 1999), apparently ruffled the sensitivities of some with whom I am in fellowship. Therefore it has become necessary for me to make the following points: (1) The book review does not make, and does not need to be understood as making, "accusations" against any present-day seminary. (2) I understood the context of *LOGIA*'s pages to be a legitimate form of professional dialogue. The intent of the book review was to promote a critical appropriation of the doctrinal heritage Lutherans have received and not to "criticize publicly" anyone's doctrine, matters of tone and wording notwithstanding. (3) According to Thesis 9g of the ELS Statement on the Lord's Supper, one may hold other opinions about when the Real Presence begins in the celebration of the Supper than the one expressed in my review, so long as the real presence of Christ's body and blood are confessed. I affirm the right of others to their differing opinions in the most meaningful way that I know—by communing with them.

*Daniel Metzger
Mankato, Minnesota*

LOGIA CORRESPONDENCE AND COLLOQUIUM FRATRUM

We encourage our readers to respond to the material they find in LOGIA—whether it be in the articles, book reviews, or letters of other readers. While we cannot print everything that is sent, we hope that our Colloquium Fratrum section will allow for longer response/counter-response exchanges, whereas our Correspondence section is a place for shorter "Letters to the Editors."

If you wish to respond to something in an issue of LOGIA, please do so soon after you receive an issue. Since LOGIA is a quarterly periodical, we are often meeting deadlines for the subsequent issue about the time you receive your current issue. Getting your responses in early will help keep them timely. Send your Correspondence contributions to LOGIA Correspondence, 314 Pearl Street, Mankato, MN 56001, or your Colloquium Fratrum contributions to LOGIA Editorial Department, 314 Pearl Street, Mankato, MN 56001.

A CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

The editors of *LOGIA* hereby request manuscripts, book reviews, and forum material for the following issues and themes:

ISSUE	THEME	DEADLINE
Holy Trinity 2001	Symposium on the Ministry	January 1, 2001
Reformation 2001	Wittenberg and Rome	April 1, 2001
Epiphany 2002	A Symposium on Prayer & Fellowship	July 1, 2001
Eastertide 2002	Lutheran Education	October 1, 2001

Send all submissions to the appropriate editors and addresses as listed on the inside back cover. Please include IBM or Macintosh diskette with manuscript whenever possible. (Specify word processing program and version used.) Submit all articles to the Coordinating Editor: Erling T. Teigen • 314 Pearl St. • Mankato, MN • 56001 • or 74022.2447@compuserve.com • All submissions must be accompanied by an abstract of the article, 300 words or less. Please write for style sheet.

Abraham Calov on Eastern Orthodoxy

MATTHEW HARRISON



AS CONFESSIONAL LUTHERANS SEEK to understand their present ecumenical context, they inevitably encounter Eastern Orthodoxy. Can the great seventeenth-century Lutheran theologian Abraham Calov assist them as they seek to understand the eastern churches? The purpose of this article is twofold: to present the historical context of a critique of Eastern Orthodoxy by one of Lutheran orthodoxy's greatest theologians, and to examine Calov's critique in order to determine what in his critique is of continuing significance for confessional Lutherans.

Much of Calov's critique is not transferable to our time. Yet two abiding circumstances hold forth the possibility of at least some continuing relevance of Calov's work. First, Eastern Orthodoxy recognizes the dogmatic supremacy of the seven ecumenical councils. Therefore its primary confessional authorities have remained constant from Calov's day to our own. Second, there remains in confessional Lutheran circles an appreciation of the theology of the seventeenth-century Lutheran fathers because of their essential faithfulness to biblical and confessional Lutheran theology.

Of course, circumstances today are markedly different from those of Calov's time, commonly known for its intense polemics. It would be much more difficult for Lutherans today to exploit Roman and eastern mutual antagonisms or other inter-confessional antipathies. One need only read the pages of the papal encyclical *Ut Unum Sint* on the history of and desire for continuing dialogue between Rome and Constantinople. There one recognizes on the Roman side¹ sentiments vastly different from the days of Calov. There is now a very deep and charitable longing for the healing of the divide of 1054 within both communions.² The attempts at dialogue began in earnest in the wake of Vatican II and its decree *Unitas Redintegratio*.³ At the end of Vatican II on December 7, 1965, the mutual excommunications of 1054 were "erased from memory" in both Rome and Constantinople simultaneously.⁴

THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF CALOV'S ASSESSMENT

In what is surely the most significant dogmatics text of the second phase⁵ of post-Reformation Lutheran orthodoxy, the *Systema Locorum Theologicorum*,⁶ Abraham Calov (1612–1686) took up the topic of the Greek faith and church (*Graecorum Fide et Ecclesia*) in his locus "On the Church" (*De Ecclesia*).⁷ It was necessary to give

the Greek church special attention for several reasons, stated Calov. First, there were many churches in the East that adhered to the faith of the Greek church, including in large measure also Russian churches. Second, what was confirmed under the Roman Antichrist in the schism and separation from the Latin church (1054 A.D.) ought not to be passed over. Third, recent theologians of the stripe of George Calixt (1586–1656)—and other "innovators" (*novatores*)—were "peddling" consensus with the Greeks. These three ecclesiological concerns necessitated the treatment, but it was the third, Calixtine "innovators" and their innovative ecclesiology, that drove Calov into this topic.

The Calixtine "innovators" to whom Calov referred were his opponents in the so-called syncretistic controversy, a grave crisis in ecclesiological understanding within Lutheranism. This long and intense affair began in earnest in 1645 when King Ladislaus IV of Poland called for a conference of theologians at Thorn (the *Colloquium caritativum*) to discuss intra-Protestant and Roman Catholic relationships.⁸ At the time, Calov was the pastor of Holy Trinity Church and rector of the *gymnasium* at Danzig. Calov's maneuvering prevented the participation of Georg Calixt of Helmstedt as a delegate on the Lutheran side.⁹ Calixt proceeded to act as counsel for the Reformed in the discussions, only further aggravating the orthodox Lutheran party. The syncretistic controversy ensued.

The situation in German lands was ripe for contention. The Reformed claimed to be adherents of the Augsburg Confession for the sake of the religious legitimacy granted by the Peace of Westphalia. The Elector of Brandenburg-Prussia and other princes were Reformed, and the Dukes of Braunschweig were moderating Lutherans.¹⁰ Thus the "innovators" were a religious and political threat to the Elector of Saxony and the strict Lutherans of Saxony, Prussia, and elsewhere. Intrigue and antagonisms were intense, resulting in many polemical books.¹¹ The debate lulled briefly in 1656 with the death of George Calixt, but soon resumed, only to fizzle with Calov's death (1686)¹² and the rise of new theological circumstances. Though Calov and his compatriots won several significant battles, the advent of pietism soon guaranteed the diminishing influence of the orthodox party on all fronts, including the ecumenical front. Spener, after all, asserted that the differences between the orthodox and syncretistic parties were not of an essential nature.¹³

The syncretists, essentially Melancthonian humanists, asserted a conditional (*quatenus*) subscription to the Confessions,¹⁴ and desired a greater unity within Christendom, along with greater

MATTHEW HARRISON, a contributing editor for *LOGIA*, is pastor of Zion Lutheran Church, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

freedom in investigating issues of theology.¹⁵ Calov was deeply troubled by ecumenical erosions among Lutherans and by the lack of confessional unity. To combat this disturbing trend, he prepared a confession of faith and worked to have it adopted by

Calov asserted that the Lutheran Church is the church of the pure doctrine of the gospel, and therefore is the true catholic church.

Lutheran churches as an addendum to the Book of Concord. The attempt at consensus succeeded only in Saxon lands. We mention this *Consensus Repetitus Fidei Vere Lutheranae* in this context because in it we note what is surely the reason Calov felt compelled to treat Eastern Orthodoxy in his *Systema Locorum Theologicorum*. Under point 1 of “On the Church” (*De Ecclesia*), the *Consensus* stated:

We confess and teach that the true church is principally a society of faith and the Holy Spirit in hearts. Which [church] nevertheless has external marks so that it can be recognized, namely, the pure doctrine of the gospel and administration of the sacraments. Wherefore, the church is properly the pillar of truth; it retains the pure gospel, as Paul said, the foundation, that is, the true knowledge of Christ and faith. But since the adversaries, the Papists and Calvinists, overthrow this foundation, it appears that they, as such, are not the true church, nor are they to be regarded as members of the true church. We reject those who teach: “Not only the Lutherans and Greeks belong to the Christian church,¹⁶ but also the Papists and Calvinists;¹⁷ and that is to be regarded as the dogma of the church regarding which the Greeks, Lutherans, Papists, and Calvinists agree. If, however, one of these teaches something on its own, it is, if not clearly false, certainly suspect of error.” Thus D[octo]r] George Calixt teaches.¹⁸

Calov quoted Calixt at length to demonstrate Calixt’s ecumenical views regarding the nature of the church. For Calixt, the church consisted of “four great parts”: Greeks, Papists, Lutherans, and Calvinists. All four, asserted Calixt, approve of and confess the Apostles’ and Nicene Creeds, as well as the Constantinopolitan, Ephesian, and Chalcedonian Creeds. Therefore “We are able and ought confidently, and without fear of error, to accept these symbols.”¹⁹ The Greeks alone, however, teach that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and not the Son. Only the Papists confess the primacy and infallibility of the pope, communion under one kind, private masses without communicants, purgatory, and other similar things. The Calvinists stand alone in denying the presence and true eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord’s Supper. Some Lutherans stand alone and depart from the other three parts of Christianity, and their own brothers in the

faith, in the belief and doctrine of the ubiquity of the human nature of Christ.²⁰ “Therefore, in whatever dogma one part stands alone, and against the other three together, that, if not plainly false, is at least suspect of novelty and error.”²¹ In the wake of the Thirty Years’ War, Calixt increasingly asserted the sufficiency of the ecumenical creeds (particularly the Apostles’ Creed) for unity and unhistorically dismissed later doctrinal disagreement as finally unessential.²² Calov, of course, contested this “consensual” view of Christianity on the grounds that the ancient creeds were not understood similarly by the “four great parts” in his day, nor did the Apostles’ Creed contain all necessary articles of faith.²³ Calov responded with barbs from Luther in the Smalcald Articles²⁴ and from the Preface to the Formula of Concord. Calov asserted that the Lutheran Church is the church of the pure doctrine of the gospel, and therefore is the true catholic church.²⁵

This was the Lutheran context of Calov’s consideration of Eastern Orthodoxy in his *Systema Locorum Theologicorum*. Three decades previous to Calov’s *Systema*, Johann Gerhard had seen no need of such an extensive treatment of, or even a specific chapter on, “The Faith and Church of the Greeks” in his great *Locis Theologicis* (1610–1623).²⁶ By the time of George Calixt and Abraham Calov, the religious climate was altogether different.²⁷

CALOV’S ASSESSMENT

In what follows, we shall proceed according to Calov’s own outline, dealing with his four basic questions, offering contextual and critical comments where appropriate.

*Calov’s First Question:
Are the Greek and Roman Churches in Agreement?*

First, it is important to understand the status of Roman-Orthodox relationships at the time Calov wrote. The mutual excommunications of 1054 were followed by a series of tragic events. The crusaders sacked Constantinople in 1204 during the fourth crusade. The Second Council of Lyons (1274) and the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–1439) could not heal the breach. Four hundred years of “hostile silence” followed.²⁸ In the wake of Renaissance and Reformation challenges, and also amidst growing nationalism, the Roman Catholic Church became strongly centralized, “vigorously emphasizing uniformity and obedience to the authority of the papacy as essential for authentic ecclesial life.”²⁹ Rome had long ceased to view the Eastern Church as a “sister church,” but saw her rather as a schismatic church that must “return” to Roman obedience.³⁰ Rome developed and vigorously followed a missionary policy with the goal of infiltrating eastern churches, allowing them to retain eastern traditions and liturgical rites, but bringing them into communion with Rome. These churches became known as “Uniate” or “Eastern Rite Catholic” churches.³¹ This policy of “uniatism” rarely succeeded in bringing whole churches into communion with Rome. Instead, it split existing national churches and created intense hostilities on all sides. Both churches finally began to re-baptize amidst a flurry of sustained polemics.³² Simply put, there was already plenty of polemical fodder in his day for Calov to use in his attempt to prove eastern-Roman disagreement.

This was the state of Orthodox-Roman Catholic relations at the time of Calov’s critique. Even up to our own time this “uniatism”

(along with understandings of papal primacy) has remained the major issue in the dialogue between Rome and Constantinople. The fall of communism has now brought uniaticism to the fore with great intensity. This is because capitulatory Orthodox leaders, in many cases, had encouraged communist regimes to dissolve Eastern Rite Catholic churches into Orthodox churches after World War II.³³

In light of the syncretists' desire to assert similarity between the great confessions of the faith, Calov was compelled to treat several questions. First, to what extent is the Greek Church in agreement or disagreement with the Roman Catholic Church?³⁴ Calov noted that Hugo Grotius had asserted the Greek and Roman Churches could easily be reconciled.³⁵ Grotius argued that they had the same view regarding sacraments and had agreeable dogmas, such that even after the schism, the Archbishop of Thessalonica wrote to Pope Hadrian that both had the same faith.³⁶ These assertions are "easily refuted," stated Calov. The two churches are in disagreement regarding "rituals." First, the Greeks insist on threefold immersion at baptism and reprove the Latins for their single immersion.³⁷ Second, the Greeks administer chrismation (which was the counterpart of the medieval Western rite of confirmation) immediately after baptism. Third, the Greeks assert the necessity of leavened bread for the Eucharist. Fourth, the Greeks mix water with the cup before and after the consecration. Fifth, the Greeks give the Eucharist under one kind to infants.

The two churches are also in disagreement regarding dogmas. Calov outlined many doctrines in which the Greek churches agreed with Lutheran criticisms of Rome. The Greeks

assert with us that there is one norm in controversies of faith and religion, and only the Holy Spirit is infallible, who speaks in Holy Scripture.³⁸ . . . They acknowledge that the Holy Eucharist is to be distributed to the laity under both species They regard the Lord's Supper not as a expiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead, but as a sacrament They reject the solitary private mass of the Roman Church, done for gain They by no means suspend the efficacy of the sacraments on the basis of the intention or worthiness of the ministers They not only do not believe in, but also reject [the idea of] the fire of purgatory, where the souls of the faithful are, after this life, cleansed from the filth of venial sins They do not institute prayers for the freeing of souls. They do not approve of indulgences to pay for sins They deny that marriage is simply to be forbidden to priests and ministers of the church They do not prostitute carvings for religious worship They allow the sacred ecclesiastical [dealings] to be administered in the vernacular. They say that it is necessary for prayers that he who prays understands the prayers, and thus that they take place in a known language They regard the repeated prayers of the rosary as mere beating of words (*battologia*) They deny the use of expiatory water (*aquam lustralem*) for the purging of sin, or to drive away the devil They reject the merits of good works.³⁹

Though in some respects Calov's critique is only of historical significance, he certainly proved his opponents wrong when they claimed Rome and the Orthodox could easily be reconciled. The

two churches would only begin their dialogue three hundred years after Calov's era. In the 1969 "An Agreed Statement on the Church," the U.S. Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation had to state that, regarding hierarchy in the church, "Our two traditions are not easily harmonized."⁴⁰ Given the centuries intervening, this is quite a damning indictment of Grotius's "easy reconciliation"!

Calov certainly proved his opponents wrong when they claimed Rome and the Orthodox could easily be reconciled.

Recent Papal encyclicals on Eastern Orthodoxy and the Roman Catholic-Orthodox dialogues might lead one to conclude that a diversity of rites will not be the most serious challenge to reunion. Calov specifically mentioned five rites that separated the two churches. The first issue was baptism, whether it should be applied by trifold or single immersion. In 1987 this did not merit mention by the Joint International Commission under "differences concerning baptism." The commission mitigated other baptismal differences, for example, immersion versus aspersion and baptism by a deacon, by reference to the Council of Constantinople (879-880). That Council "determined that each see would retain the ancient usages of its tradition: the Church of Rome preserving its own usages, the Church of Constantinople its own, and the thrones of the East doing the same."⁴¹ The second issue was chrismation (confirmation in the Roman church). In 1987 the Commission issued a joint statement that left free the age at which chrismation is administered, but it does require that the historic order—baptism, chrismation, Eucharist—be maintained in all circumstances.⁴² The third issue was the bread in the Eucharist, whether it should be leavened or unleavened. According to recent dialogue literature, this is regarded as a church-dividing issue only by a very few.⁴³ The fourth issue was the use of water in the cup, before or after the consecration. This issue is not mentioned in the dialogue documents.⁴⁴ The fifth issue was infant communion. Notable here is that Calov mentions this under rites and not dogmas. Again, modern dialogue documents indicate that the matter of infant communion is not a seriously divisive issue between the two communions.⁴⁵

Had Calov overplayed this disagreement in rites? I think not. True, after the period of Kurillos (Cyril) Loukaris (1572-1638), there was much greater Roman influence in the East, but Calov had access to plenty of Catholic-Orthodox polemical material.⁴⁶ Nor would one have to look long to find modern polemical material on these ritual matters in conservative Roman or Eastern circles. However, the tenor of the modern dialogue and the present commitment of the papacy and the ecumenical patriarch to reunion render these issues less than significant impediments to church fellowship. Thus the ritual disagreement seems largely of only historical significance.

What Calov described as "the principle dissensus" remains so to this day, and recent dialogue documents evidence this fact. The

modern dialogues note that “[t]he particular form of primacy among the churches exercised by the bishops of Rome has been and remains the chief point of dispute between the Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches, and their chief obstacle to full ecclesial communion with each other.”⁴⁷ While the Orthodox are presently willing to accept a “primacy of honor” for the bishop of Rome, “they cannot accept an understanding of the role of the primate which excludes the collegiality and interdependence of the whole body of bishops, and in consequence continue to reject the formulation of papal primacy found in Vatican I’s constitution *Pastor Aeternus*.”⁴⁸

Jeremias’s response to the Lutherans, despite its many positive aspects, is full of synergism and repeated confusion of law and gospel.

The remaining “points of doctrine” regarding which Calov asserted disagreement between the East and Rome are of mixed significance. Private mass and communion under one kind are not mentioned in the dialogue documents that I have viewed, presumably because Rome now grants both kinds and because the private mass is not so prevalent as it was in the seventeenth century. Calov said that the Greeks “assert with us that there is one norm in controversies of faith and religion; and only the Holy Spirit is infallible, who speaks in Holy Scripture.”⁴⁹ Here Calov seems to me to be glossing over the issue. Is the “one norm” the Holy Spirit or Holy Scripture? The Orthodox would agree with the former, but not limit the authoritative working of the Spirit to the latter. So also Rome. The problem of Scripture and tradition remains a chief sticking point in Lutheran-Orthodox dialogue to this day.⁵⁰ On the Lord’s Supper as an expiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, the 1969 “An Agreed Statement on the Holy Eucharist,” from the U.S. Catholic-Orthodox Consultation, notes that “The Eucharistic sacrifice involves the active presence of Christ, the High Priest, acting through the Christian community, drawing it into his saving worship. Through celebration of the Eucharist the redemptive blessings are bestowed on the living and the dead for whom intercession is made.”⁵¹ Finally, what of Calov’s assertion that the Greeks reject the merit of good works? Calov apparently contradicted himself under his “Fourteen Points” in this matter.⁵² Calov wrote there, “To faith as the unique aspect (*proprium*) of righteousness, the Greeks add also the merit of works, especially almsgiving.” In fact, the Tübingen exchange with Patriarch Jeremias of Constantinople is most painful on precisely this point. The development of theology in the East, absent western juridical language and thought, never came to plumb the depth of meaning in St. Paul. Jeremias’s response to the Lutherans, despite its many positive aspects, is full of synergism and repeated confusion of law and gospel.⁵³

While we may quibble with Calov’s assessment of the Orthodox-Roman disagreement, he certainly was correct in his final analysis that the two communions were in essential disagreement on fundamental issues, especially the chief issue mentioned by Calov, the nature of authority in the church. Calov’s attempt to emphasize the sacramental difference between the two communions is both less successful and less important for us today. Furthermore, Grotius is at least partially vindicated in that the modern Eastern-Roman dialogue began with issues where agreement was most possible, namely, the dogma of the Eucharist, producing a document that proclaimed “remarkable and fundamental agreement” on numerous points.⁵⁴

***Calov’s Second Question:
Are the Greek and Reformed Churches in Agreement?***

The second question Calov treated was whether or not the Greeks at that time were in some sense in agreement with the Calvinist faith.⁵⁵ Calov noted several Reformed theologians who had asserted as much, including Johannes Crocius (1590–1657),⁵⁶ Johann Hornbeck, and the Anglican Bishop of Durham, Thomas Morton (1564–1659).

These Reformed theologians had good reason to make such assertions. The Reformed had, for a time, a sympathetic friend in the Patriarch of Constantinople himself, as Calov admitted. Kurillos (Cyril) Loukaris (1572–1638) was Patriarch of Constantinople from 1620 to 1638. According to his own account, Cyril became a convert to Protestantism after a period of three years of study, most likely around 1611. He was familiar with the works of Arminius and expressed his sympathy with the latter’s doctrines of the Holy Spirit, Baptism, and the Eucharist. The final stage of his life was begun when the Calvinist Antoine Leger of Piedmont came to reside in Constantinople, sent by the clergy of Geneva in 1628. Cyril published his “Confession of the Christian Faith” in 1629, which has been described as Calvinism cloaked in the language of Eastern Orthodoxy.⁵⁷

Calov asserted that a great dissent between the Reformed and the East may be easily proved if:

- (1) The Eastern Church never accepted the absolute decree of predestination of the Calvinists; (2) It was not tainted with [Calvinism’s views] of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper; (3) Nor did it dream of the specter of Zwinglian representations and figures.⁵⁸

Calov proved these points only after alleging dubious machinations of the Calvinists among the curia in Constantinople. He noted the comments of one Arsenius Hieromonachus, a Greek who questioned the legitimacy of Cyril’s election to the Patriarchate. “But, above all,” asserted Calov, “here it is to be observed that the Confession of Cyril Lucarius was condemned and reproved by a Greek synod.”⁵⁹ That indeed was true! Synods at Constantinople (1638) and Jassy (1642) condemned both Cyril’s confession and the patriarch himself.⁶⁰ The synod of Jerusalem (1672) condemned the confession and sought to contest Cyril’s authorship, but did not personally condemn Cyril.⁶¹ Calov closed the section by stating, “All these things abundantly demonstrate that the boasting of consensus of the East with the Reformed is

vain.”⁶² The tide had moved decidedly against the Reformed in their relations with the East, but their influence had been enormous in the case of Cyril. This fact Calov clearly downplayed in light of his polemical goals.

The question of Reformed dogmatic influence on Eastern Orthodoxy today is probably moot, at least with respect to the issues involved in the Cyril affair. Today one would look for Reformed influences on Orthodoxy as a result of nearly a century of participation in the ecumenical movement. But that question lies beyond the scope of this article.

Calov's Third Question:

Are the Greeks and Lutherans in Agreement?

The third question Calov attempted to answer was “whether or not the Greeks are coming to agreement with our faith.” The “syncretists” Marco Antonio de Dominis (1560–1624),⁶³ George Cassander (1513–1566), Calixt, and their followers claimed that such agreement had already been achieved.⁶⁴ To provide his own answer to this question, Calov had to strike a careful balance. The Lutheran Confessions had referred positively to the “Greek Church” and the “East” in numerous passages.⁶⁵ Such references were not wholesale endorsements of the Eastern churches, but rather a polemical use against Rome of specific dogmas and rites that the reformers and the Eastern churches—both ancient and modern—held in common. But the ecumenical situation had changed in one hundred years. In light of Calixt’s ecumenical plans, Calov now found it necessary to make a clear and detailed delineation of the differences between Lutheranism and Eastern Orthodoxy.

Calov was convinced that there is nothing that so advances the glory of God and is more useful to the church than “mutual confession in the foundation of the faith, and those things to be believed.”⁶⁶ Yet Calov was also convinced that this confession must be “integral” and “pure.” Calov asserted that “the doctrine of faith is one integral whole” (*fides una est copulativa*).⁶⁷ Calov impressed upon his readers his strong desire for peace in the church.⁶⁸ He said that it was this very desire which drove “our people” over a century ago to “receive Demetrius of Constantinople with joy.”

Deacon Demetrios Mysos was sent by the Patriarch of Constantinople, Joasaph II (1555–1565), to meet the leaders of Lutheranism and study their teaching. He spent six months as Melancthon’s guest in Wittenberg in 1558. Calov notes that the Augustana was translated into Greek and sent to the Greek Church, but it apparently was never received in Constantinople.⁶⁹ Calov mentioned also the work of Hans von Ungnad (Johann Ungnad von Weissenwolf, 1493–1564), army general and councilor to Ferdinand I, who according to Calov gave a translation of the Augustana to the “Prince of the Georgians” and propagated the “true gospel” among the Saracenes, through Iberia and Albania to the Caspian Sea.⁷⁰ Finally, Calov made reference to the Tübingen theologians “moved by this most sweet cause,” namely, to work against negative reports of them among those in Constantinople and to spread the “odor of Christ”⁷¹ in the East. In this interchange, noted Calov, the *Compendium Theologiae* of Jacob Heerbrand, translated by Martin Crusius into Greek, was sent via Stephen Gerlach (1546–1612) to Constantinople.⁷² When Ungnad was sent for the second time to Constantinople as ambassador of

Kaiser Maximilian II in 1573, he took along in his retinue the twenty-six-year-old Tübingen-trained theologian Stephen Gerlach. The Tübingen theologians knew through Chytraeus of the Greeks’ opposition to the papacy on several points, and they sent letters and theological literature (most significantly, the Augustana translated into Greek) with Gerlach to Patriarch Jeremias.⁷³ An interchange ensued. This entire exchange is available to English readers in *Augsburg and Constantinople*, by George Mastrantonis, along with a brief but helpful introduction.⁷⁴ Calov made extensive use of the documents of this interchange in his evaluation of Eastern Orthodoxy.

He affirmed that many of the errors among the Greeks do not overturn the foundation of the faith.

In the *Systema Locorum Theologicorum* Calov proceeded to state that all the pious can note with joy that

in the Greek Church the Prophetic and Apostolic writings are regarded as precious, and that they alone are accepted for the norm and rule; that two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, as regarding their substance, are dispensed integrally, and not mutilated; that the Apostles Creed and its articles are preserved; that they recognize six ecumenical councils; and that the chief articles of the faith are for the most part set forth with sufficient skill; that they also urge diligence in good works.

The Württemberg theologians, noted Calov, thus joyfully testified that there was an indubitable consensus on many points. “We certainly rejoice,” they said (Response I, p. 7), “when we read that the Greeks hold to the universal grace of God, the universal redemption of Christ, which dogma is the basis and foundation of saving faith.” And so Calov could write, “Thus we are not unaware that Christ has claimed many for his own in the East through the word and sacrament,” and not only infants via baptism, but also adults who adhere to the word in simplicity. And he affirmed that many of the errors among the Greeks do not overturn the foundation of the faith. Thus Calov asserted that just as “we are confident not a few Christians are gathered under the papacy” from what of the Christian and catholic church is found there, “so also among the Greeks we may hope so much the more, as the Greeks accede all the more to the heavenly truth.”⁷⁵ Calov referred to Basil the Great⁷⁶ and Chrysostom⁷⁷ to show that this light of truth (the doctrine of *sola fide*) is found also among the Greek fathers.

After noting several other such examples, Calov said:

Many traces of orthodoxy may be adduced from the confessions of the Greeks, and these are perhaps the chief [examples]. What therefore remains but that the Greek churches be

admitted into our communion? Here, nevertheless, it must be confessed that many things are lacking, for confession must be whole and pure through all parts of the faith. Faith is one complete whole [*una copulativa*]. When one part of the faith is overturned, one fundamental dogma, one article of the system of those things to be believed, it is a material heresy; if it is obstinately held, it is a formal heresy. Every heresy is worthy of the anathema, nor are any such heresies to be tolerated in the church without just punishment. No heresy is consistent with faith. Where there is heresy, there communion in the faith, there spiritual unity, there ecclesiastical concord do not obtain.⁷⁸

Yet, said Calov, the church invisible is hidden where there is the visible assembly (*coetus*) if only the marks of the church are present. For the Antichrist himself is seated in the temple of God.⁷⁹ It is thus certain that in the Greek Church God has gathered to himself a great number of people.⁸⁰ By way of critique at this point, we merely note that Calov was well aware of the extant literature regarding Eastern Orthodoxy, and seems to treat it with due care. Earlier in his locus on the church,⁸¹ Calov explained his use of “invisibility” (*invisibilitas*) as an “attribute of the church.” The church possesses, according to Calov, these four attributes: (1) unity, (2) holiness in doctrine and life, (3) invisibility, (4) perdurability. We note that these are attributes of the church and not its marks! Furthermore, Calov carefully defined this “invisibility” and so anchored the location of the church in the marks. The church is “invisible: because it is possible to state that the church is often hidden (*inconspicua*) just as the moon in the period of the new moon, yes indeed, just as the moon is completely invisible during total eclipse.”

Calov's Fourth Question:

What are the Chief Errors of the Modern Greek Church?

Calov finished his treatment of the Greek Church by asking, “What then are the chief errors of the modern (around 1650) Greeks?”⁸² In the following Fourteen Points, he set forth the alleged errors with little comment, often referring to the Tübingen-Constantinople exchange. The original documents of this exchange are titled *Acta et Scripta Theologorum Wirtembergensium, et Patriarchae Constantinopolitani D, Hieremieae*.⁸³ These documents are referred to by Calov by the Patriarch's name, Jeremias. Calov's page references and other citations are retained in the following translation⁸⁴ of Calov's Fourteen Points, with the publisher's numbering error retained.

They [the errors of the Greek Orthodox] are generally these:

- I. The denial of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son.
- II. The real differentiation of divine operations and properties from the substance of God. See Petavius⁸⁵ 1. 1. *Theol. dogm.* 1. 1. ch. 12.
- III. The seven Ecumenical Councils and the Greek Fathers Naziansus, Basil the Great, and Chrysostom wrote by impulse of the Holy Spirit, according to Patriarch Jeremias. Response to Tuebingen, p. 56. And John rules that the church gathered in synod cannot err, which Cyril Berroh and Parthenius opine and decide with the

denunciation of the anathema.

- IV. To faith as the unique aspect (*proprium*) of righteousness they add also the merit of works, especially almsgiving, by witness of Jeremias, p. 90.
- VI. [*sic*] They strongly defend seven sacraments, Response II of Jeremias, p. 239. Nevertheless those five, beyond Baptism and the Sacred Supper, they refer to the institution only of the church.
- VII. They vehemently extol the monastic life as perfect and angelic, Response I, p. 136, 238. . . . They even place monastic consecration among the sacraments, and equate it with baptism. See Allat[ius]⁸⁶ P.C. 3, 16, and para. 9 to the end of the chapter
- VIII. They give the election of ministers solely to the bishops, to the exclusion of the magistrate and the consensus of the people, in Jeremias, p. 105 ff.
- IX. They strongly urge auricular confession, or the specific enumeration of sins. See Jeremias, Response, p. 87, 130.
- X. They approve transubstantiation. See Jeremias, Response, p. 86, 100, 102, 240. And they ascribe the power for the change of substance more to the prayers and the descent of the Holy Spirit than to the words and syllables of the consecration. Allat[ius]. *Concord.* 3,27 ff.⁸⁷
- XI. They strongly defend the freedom of the will in spiritual matters. Whence they assert that no one is “by nature” evil, all have a will, and they contend that John the Baptist, the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, along with the Mother of God [Theotokos] were immune from mortal sin. See Response of Patriarch Jeremias, p. 224, likewise pp. 96, 113, 367, etc. *Aurel. Peruf. Ad A.C.* p. 553, 621, 717, 971, 1123 etc.
- XII. They commit idolatry, and this in many places. Jeremias, Patriarch, writes, Response I, p. 128: “It is impious and alien to the Church of Christ and those who are his, not incidentally to adore the holy images, the veneration of which transcends to the prototype, which adoration of images the bishop is held to profess, when he is inaugurated, as witness,” *Eucholl[ogion]*,⁸⁸ p. 28, 309, and Goar *ibid.* Here bread worship and wine worship are committed not only after the consecration, but when the gifts are first sent to the altar for consecration. For when the people see the pontiff, priests and deacons, approaching the altar with a great procession, some bow, others fall to their knees, and as if Christ were present, with the cry of the converted thief they compel [the priests]: “Lord, Remember me when you come into your kingdom.” And they respond to them: “It is remembered”; which Goar notes in the *Euchologion*, p. 131, n. 110, and Allatius *de Miss. Prae Sanct.* Para. 7 ff. Arcudius 3, a., chs. 19–25, did not doubt that this proved idolatry. They also point out cross-worship and they are favorable regarding the efficacy of the cross, and they deny that those are heretics who affirm that the wood of the cross of Christ has been preserved up to our own time. See Jeremias, Response, p. 254. Allat[ius], *Epist. De lign. S. Cruc.*, p. 224. *Euchologion* and Christoph. *Angl.* etc. Similar are also superstitions in saint worship and angel worship, when saints and angels

are attended with religious worship. See Iren[aeus], p. 109 f., 127 f. And they believe that by invocations directed to them, demons are driven away, death is put to flight, temptations are removed, etc., p. 243. Ir[enaeus], p. 58, 95, 111. Add also *leipsolatreia* [?] with the same, Jeremias, p. 243. And they are particularly given to worship of Mary, concerning which Simon Wageneroecius in *Picta Mariana Graecor. ex 20. divinor. officior. Tomis*. They even offer to Mary a consecrated particle of the body of Christ. See Goar, *Euchologion* p. 119, n. 41. *Arcudius* 3, 8, in *Euchologion* p. 855 . . . There is also found on p. 871 a confession of sins to Mary, etc.

- XIII. There is no strict censure of second and third marriages, regarding which Goar [states] in *Euchologion*, p. 401, “The Greek Church has nowhere condemned as sin . . .” For Michael Glycas, cited by Allatius P.C. 3.18.8 calls the third marriage [illegible Greek orthography], and he approves. Conc. 1.7.,chs. 28, 29, the statement of Gregory regarding the fourth marriage, that namely they are living as swine, etc.
- XIV. They add also soul sleep, or according to Vossius, the sleep of souls . . . The proponents of which Bellarminus, *lib. 1, de Beatit. c. 1.* does not hesitate to list among the heretics. Gretserus repeats this opinion of M[ark] of Ephesus:⁸⁹ “We do not state that the saints have obtained the kingdom prepared for them, nor that sinners are already destroyed in Gehenna; but that both remain in expectation of the lot which awaits them. And this has to do with the future time, after the resurrection to judgment.” See Allatius, *Epist. Ad Boim*, from para. 26 to 41.
- XIV. [sic] We add also the rash definition of the future advent of the Lord after 7000 years. Allatius himself censures this, *de Libb. Eccles. P. 141*, and he teaches that this time, according to the calculation of the Greeks, has now elapsed. Compare his *Dissert. De hebd. Graecor. Para. 29.*
- XV. The mutability of hell, which they define not as bodily misery, but only as the privation of God and the affliction and consumption of souls through the vexation of the conscience, not only by Christ in his descent to hell.

A BRIEF CRITIQUE OF THE FOURTEEN POINTS

We must keep in mind that this article deals only with a subtopic of the locus on the church in Calov’s *Systema Locorum Theologicorum*. Nevertheless, we would have expected Calov to demonstrate more rigor than he does in setting forth disagreement between Lutherans and Orthodox on the nature of authority in the church, specifically the relationship of Scripture and tradition. Calov’s statement, “in the Greek Church the Prophetic and Apostolic writings are regarded as precious, and that they alone are accepted for the norm and rule,”⁹⁰ is inadequate, if not outright misleading. The nature of the authority of doctrinal statements beyond Scripture, particularly those of the seven ecumenical councils, and the fact that Lutherans accept at least some of those doctrinal statements as authoritative—for example, the Nicene Creed—surely merited at least a few brief comments! Nor does a quick perusal of the locus on Scripture⁹¹ reveal a reference to the Eastern Church. Calov touches upon this

issue, but only indirectly, under the “Fourteen Points” above. The fourteen points are evidently the “material heresies,” which preclude communion with the Eastern Church. Calov’s assessment of “errors” held by the Eastern Church is in fact so brief under the fourteen points that it is of limited significance for us today.

At the outset of this essay, however, we did say that one of our goals was to note what of Calov’s critique of the Eastern Church was of continuing relevance for confessional Lutherans. It is important to note, in this regard, that though Calov treats these matters briefly, he by no means deals with sectarian and unimportant issues, nor issues simply limited to the alleged narrow confines of the seventeenth century. This is evidenced by the results of the modern—albeit liberal—Lutheran-Orthodox dialogue. Risto Saarinen has provided an extensive evaluation of Lutheran-Orthodox dialogue from 1959–1994.⁹² He lists four significant areas under “Achievements and Remaining Tasks”: (1) Scripture and tradition, (2) Soteriology, (3) Sacraments, (4) Ecclesiology (including Ordained Ministry). When we compare this to Calov, each of his fourteen points raises issues of the authority of Scripture and tradition.⁹³ Calov’s points III (faith as the unique aspect [*proprium*] of righteousness) and XI (freedom of the will) highlight exactly the soteriological issues that remain problematic in modern Lutheran-Orthodox dialogue, namely, imputation versus theosis.⁹⁴ Calov’s points VI (seven sacraments), VII (monastic consecration), VIII (authority of bishops), IX (auricular confession), and X (transubstantiation) all focus on sacramentology. Calov’s points VI, VIII, and X are noted by Saarinen as specific challenges in the modern dialogues.⁹⁵ Issues of ecclesiology in the Fourteen Points are addressed under points I (authority of synods), VIII (authority of bishops), and XII (b) (nature of the office-bearer as somehow the iconic bearer of Christ),⁹⁶ all issues which continue to challenge dialogue teams. The Fourteen Points, while limited, do clearly set forth those issues that remain modern obstacles to Lutheran-Orthodox unity today.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing has given us a context in which to understand the relationship of seventeenth-century Lutheran orthodoxy with the Eastern Church. The early Lutherans looked east for confirmation of their position on numerous points, over against Rome. The ecumenical goals of the Helmstedt school under George Calixt forced Calov and others to alter and intensify the Lutheran critique of the Eastern Church. The Cyril Loukarius period of Reformed influence on the Eastern Church also required Calov’s critical attention with respect to the Reformed churches. Finally, the Tübingen-Constantinople interchange of the previous century provided Calov with significant insight into the life of the Eastern Church.

Calov’s evaluation is marked by a deep Lutheran commitment to the marks of the church, whole and undefiled, with a traditionally Lutheran and biblical generosity in seeing the church also outside of Lutheranism, and particularly in eastern Christianity. Calov’s enumeration of “Greek” errors is both intelligible and certainly justified at several points, including justification, transubstantiation, authority of councils, free will, number of sacraments, and the *Filioque*. Calov’s critique was further justified in light of the hard rejection of protestantism *in toto* by the Eastern Church, which was taking place even as Calov wrote the *Systema Locorum*

Theologicorum. This rejection culminated in the seventeenth century in the *Confession of Dositheus* (1672), the definitive response of Eastern Orthodoxy to the reformation churches in the wake of its own internal struggles, particularly with Calvinism.

Calov's brief treatment of Eastern Orthodoxy is to a great extent only of historical significance for us today, due in large part to its brevity. Calov does, however, provide us with a glimpse into the ecumenical and ecclesiastical concerns of seventeenth-

century orthodox Lutheranism. Given the fact that Calov highlighted issues that have continued to challenge Lutheran-Orthodox discussion down to our own day, we think it only fair to claim that Calov, on this issue, was no mere narrow controversialist; he was a biblical and confessional Lutheran. As we encounter the East today, we do well to note what one of our sainted fathers in the faith wrote as he faced Eastern Orthodoxy over three centuries ago. LOGIA

NOTES

1. The Orthodox side is vastly more complicated, various national churches taking a range of opinions regarding dialogue with Rome. The Ecumenical Patriarch is very favorably disposed toward dialogue but does not have the authority in his communion that is enjoyed by the Roman Pontiff, nor does the eastern communion have any ecumenical directives that are authoritative in the sense of Vatican pronouncements.

2. See E. Stormon, ed., *Ecumenical Documents III, Toward the Healing of Schism, the Sees of Rome and Constantinople: Public Statement and Correspondence between the Holy See and the Ecumenical Patriarchate 1958-1984*, trans. E. Stormon (New York: Paulist Press, 1987).

3. Walter Abbott, ed., *The Documents of Vatican II* (Piscataway, NJ: New Century Publishers, 1966), 341-366.

4. "For centuries we lived this life of 'sister churches,' and together held Ecumenical Councils which guarded the deposit of faith against all corruption. And now, after a long period of division and mutual misunderstanding, the Lord is enabling us to discover ourselves as 'sister churches' once more, in spite of the obstacles, which were once raised between us. If today, on the threshold of the third millennium, we are seeking the reestablishment of full communion, it is for the accomplishment of this reality that we must work and it is to this reality that we must refer." *The Encyclicals of John Paul II* (Huntington: Our Sunday Visitor Publishing Division, 1996), 949. On the revocation of the excommunications and for a very helpful but also very concise history of the problem of Roman and Eastern Orthodox relations, see Father Ronald Roberson, CSP, "The Catholic-Orthodox Dialogue Today," *Origins* 28, no. 30 (January 14, 1999), 526 ff.

5. The period of Lutheran orthodoxy lasted from the Formula of Concord roughly to David Hollaz (ca. 1710) as its last great proponent before the inundation of Pietism and Rationalism. "More than by any other feature of its thought, Orthodoxy's 'second wave' distinguished itself overtly from preceding generations through its methodology. Theologians such as Calov concerned themselves with building a theological 'system,' a notion previously non-existent. The task required methodological innovation, and was advanced by the adoption of the so-called 'analytic method,' a new procedure for organizing theological subject matter." Ken Appold, *Abraham Calov's Doctrine of Vocation in Its Systematic Context* (Tuebingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 14. On the specifics of Calov's use of the analytic method, see Appold, 42 ff.

6. Abraham Calov, *Systema Locorum Theologicorum* (Wittenberg, 1655-1677).

7. Calov, *Systema*, VIII, chapter 5, 199 ff.

8. Many of the documents and counter-documents of Thorn are available in Calov's *Historia Syncretistica, Das ist: Christliches wolgegruendetes Bedencken ueber den Lieben Kirchen=Frieden und Christliche Einigkeit In der heilsamen Lehre der Himmlischen Wahrheit. In Dreyen Buechern verfasst Von D. Abraham Calovio . . . MDCLXXII*.

9. Calov complained about Calixt's inclination "ad tepiditatem Philippicam." Hermann Schuessler, *Georg Calixt, Theologie und Kirchenpolitik: Eine Studie Zur Oekumenizitaet Des Lutherthums* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1961), 124.

10. Wallmann notes that the two greatest influences on Calixt were Anglican theologians and Melancthonian humanism. At Helmstedt Johannes Caselius, according to Wallmann the last great humanist of the sixteenth century, had taught since 1589. Cornelius Martini also taught at Helmstedt, brought about a revival of philosophical metaphysics, and pushed this discipline into questions hitherto reserved for theology. All the elements of Calixt's theology were present at Helmstedt in the final decade of the sixteenth century. See Johannes Wallmann, *Der Theologie begriff bei Johann Gerhard und Georg Calixt* (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1961), 86.

11. See the helpful though slanted (pro-Union) account, "Syncretism, Syncretistic Controversies" by Tschackert in *The New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, ed. S. M. MacCauley Jackson (New York: Funk and Wagnells, 1911), 11: 218-223.

12. See Otto Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus, IV Band, Orthodoxie und Synkretismus in der altprotestantischen Theologie* (Goettingen: Vondenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1927), 425.

13. Wallmann, 89.

14. Ritschl, 435.

15. See Wallmann, 113-114. Wallman suggests four points that differentiated the theology of Calixt and Lutheran Orthodoxy regarding the nature of theology and faith: (1) Calixt advocated a separation of theology and faith, each as two different spheres of Lutheran theology. (2) Calixt was first to make a sharp differentiation between theology and the proclamation of the preaching office. (3) Calixt viewed theology as a natural pursuit, not a God-given habitus obtained by *oratio, meditatio et tentatio*. (4) Calixt asserted that theology was not necessary for believers, but only for church leaders. Thus a wedge was driven between scholarly theological study and faith. In this Calixt was the forerunner of Semler and Schleiermacher. Wallman, 95.

16. This admission regarding the Greeks is certainly notable and significant in light of the critique in Calov's *Systema Locorum Theologicorum*.

17. Calov evidently refers here to Papists and Calvinists as such. For, as we shall note later, in the spirit of the Preface to the Book of Concord, he readily granted the presence of Christians also in the Roman communion.

18. The original reads: "Profitemur & docemus, Ecclesiam veram principaliter esse societatem fidei & Spiritus S. in cordibus. Quae tamen habet externas notas, ut agnosci possit, videlicet puram Evangelii Doctrinam, & administrationem Sacramentorum, consentaneam Evangelio Christi. Quare Ecclesia proprie est columna veritatis, retinetque purum Evangelium, &, ut Paulus inquit, fundamentum, hoc est, veram Christi cognitionem, & fidem. Cumque Adversarii, Pontificii & Calviniani, fundamentum istud evertant, apparet, eos, qua tales, veram Ecclesiam non esse, nect proveris Ecclesiae membris esse habendos. Rejicimus eos, qui docent: Ad Ecclesiam Christianam pertinere non tantum Lutheranos & Graecos, sed Pontificios etiam, & Calvinianos; idque pro dogmate Ecclesiae vero esse habendum, in quo Graeci, Lutherani, Pontificii, ac Calviniani consentiant: Si autem una pars eorum seorsim aliquid doceat, id si non falsum plane, saltem de errore admodum suspectum esse. Ita docet D. Georgius Calixtus." The title of this work reads: *I.N.J. Consensus Reptitius Fidei Vere Lutheranae: In illis Doctrinae capitibus, Quae: Contra puram, & invariata Augustanam Confessionem, aliosque libros symbolicos, in Formula Concordiae comprehensos, scriptis publicis iimipugnant D. Georgus Calixtus, Professor Helmstadiensis, eiusdemque complices. In gratiam Eorum, qui distantiam D. Calixti, Rintelensium, & aliorum Novatorum a fide Lutherana in Synopsi intueri discipiunt, Ob praesentem Ecclesiae necessitatem, seorsim editus. Anno [1666]. Wittebergae, Typis Johannis Borckardi.*

19. *Consensus*, 76.

20. *Ibid.*

21. Calixt in *Consensus*, 76.

22. See Wallmann, 87-88. Hermann Sasse criticizes this alleged *consensus quinquesaecularis* (a term never approved by Calixt) as so much romanticism, ever advocated by Anglicans. "This idea goes back to the Christian humanists whose program for a reform of the church as well as for the restoration of the unity lost in the Reformation was the return *ad fontes*, to the church of the New Testament and the early Fathers as the sources of pure Christianity. It had been cultivated in the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by the Latitudinarians in England, the Arminians in Holland and the Syncretists of the school of

Helmstedt in Germany.” As Sasse points out, the church was seriously divided through much of the creedal forming era (third through fifth centuries); “The Future Reunited Church” and “The Ancient Undivided Church” in *The Springfielder* 28, no. 2 (Summer 1963): 8 ff.

23. At the conclusion to the prolegomena in volume 1 of the *Systema*, Calov launched into a 300-plus-page “Consideration of the New Theology of the Helmstedt . . . Syncretists.” After a brief “adumbration” of the views of this “new theology,” Calov takes up the question “Concerning the Apostles’ Creed, as to whether it explicitly contains all things that must be believed.” He answers in the negative under 14 points, among which is point 7, “It does not set forth justification.” *Systema*, I, 902 ff.

24. S.A. III, XII, “Nequaquam lagimur ipsis (Papists) quod sint Ecclesia, quia revera non sunt Ecclesia.” *Consensus*, 79.

25. Profitemur & docemus, quod, sicut Catholicus olim habebatur, qui uni Ecclesiae particulari, quae in universo illo corpore erat, adhaerebat, (quomodo Heironymus, & Augustinus Catholicum dicunt eum, qui cum Romana Ecclesia, tunc temporis pura, communicabat) ita vere catholici sint, & ad Ecclesiam Catholicam pertineant, qui de pura Evangelii doctrina consentiunt, & habent eundem Christum, eundem Spiritum sanctum, eadem Sacramenta, quales absq; dubio sunt, qui libris Symbolicis Ecclesiae, Lutheranae adstipulantur; licet per universum terrarum orbem inveniantur dispersi. *Consensus*, 78.

26. Gerhard does, to be sure, make frequent reference to the “*Graeca ecclesia*” in matters of ecclesiology and church rites *inter alia*. See *Io. Gerhardi Theologici Jenensis Locorum Theologicorum, xx Tomis Comprehensorum . . . Tubingae, Sumtibus Io. Georgii Cottae. MDCCCLXXXVII*, vols. XI, 277, 222, 296; XII, 191, 339, x (*transsubstantiationis*), 256 et passim. It was the editor Cotta who added a lengthy footnote in Gerhard’s *Loci*, regarding the “Greek Church.” x, 256 ff.

27. Calixt had expressed his views of the significance of Christianity of the first five centuries in 1628 in his *Apparatus theologicus*. Johann Gerhard had acknowledged the church of the first five centuries as the true church, while clearly noting, however, that a mixing of human traditions and opinions with apostolic dogma had begun in this period. Ritschl notes that Calixt ignored this course of doctrinal development in the ancient church and “uncritically idealized” the ancient church. Otto Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus, IV Orthodoxie und Synkretismus in der altprotestantischen Theologie* (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1927), 399–400.

28. Roberson, “The Catholic-Orthodox Dialogue Today,” *Origins*, CNS Documentary Service 28, no. 30 (January 14, 1999): 526.

29. *Ibid.*, 527.

30. *Ibid.* See also John Borelli and John H. Erickson, eds., *The Quest for Unity: Orthodox and Catholics in Dialogue. Documents of the Joint International Commission and Official Dialogues in the United States 1965–1995* (St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press and United States Catholic Conference, 1996), 14.

31. The first Uniate church was that of Brest in 1595–96. See *The Quest for Unity*, 15.

32. See *The Quest for Unity*, 15.

33. See Roberson, 528. See also part 4 of *The Quest for Unity*, 159 ff., “New Challenges to Orthodox-Catholic Dialogue: Recent Changes in Eastern Europe and the Present Search for Full Communion.”

34. Calov, *Systema*, VIII: 209 ff.

35. “Latinos cum Graecis facile posse conciliari,” *Systema*, VIII: 209.

36. Calov, *Systema*, VIII: 210.

37. Calov references the Tuebingen-Constantinople exchange: Quoad trinum immersionem in Baptismo, quam prorsu necessariam faciunt Graci, reprobata una Latinorum immersionem, uti Resp. 1. Ad Tubing. Jeremiae Patriarchae Constantinop. P. 63 & Resp. p. II, p. 238 videre est, ubi haec leguntur: Nos trinis immersionibus baptizamus, Latini vero una tantum, quod non recte fit: oportet enim tres personas in una Dietate praedicari. *Systema*, VIII: 210.

38. Calov would apparently contradict himself on this issue in the Fourteen points, noted later in this article.

39. Calov, *Systema*, VIII: 211–212.

40. See *The Quest for Unity*, 85.

41. Bari Document, 1987, in *The Quest for Unity*, 104. cf. Mansi xvii, 489 B.

42. *The Quest for Unity*, 101 ff.

43. See *The Quest for Unity*, 11.

44. See no.1 above and Constantinople, 879–880.

45. See *The Quest for Unity*, 70.

46. See Curt Georgi, *Die Confessio Dosithei* (Muenchen: Velag Earnst Reinhardt,

1940), 18 ff. Georgi notes three areas that provided increased Roman influence in the East: (1) The Jesuits and the *congregatio pro propaganda fide*, (2) Union-friendly Greeks, (3) Anti-union Greeks anxious to consolidate Orthodox dogma against Reformed influences under Cyril played into the hands of pro-Roman forces.

47. “An Agreed Statement on Conciliarity and Primacy in the Church” in *The Quest for Unity*, 154.

48. See *Quest for Unity*, 155.

49. Calov, *Systema*, VIII: 211. Calov appears to contradict himself on this point in the Fourteen Points noted later in this article. See point III of the Fourteen Points in the body of the essay.

50. Risto Saarinen, who chronicles modern union Lutheran dialogue with Eastern churches, lists the problem of Scripture and tradition as topic one under “Achievements and Remaining Tasks.” He notes there the problematic statement produced by the Joint Working Group between the Vatican and the WCC in which the Orthodox state, “the Orthodox tradition refers to the fullness of truth, the totality of the revelation of God. The revealed divine truths constitute an indivisible unity, the coherent apostolic tradition. This holy tradition, on which the church bases its unity, represents the entire content of the divinely revealed faith. There is no distinction between principal and secondary truth, between essential and non-essential doctrines.” *Faith and Holiness: Lutheran-Orthodox Dialogue 1959–1994* (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 235.

51. See *Quest for Unity*, 45. Also in Calov’s day eastern documents defined the sacrament as sacrifice for the living and the dead. See Georgi, *Die Confessio Dosithei: Geschichte, Inhalt und Bedeutung* (Muenchen: Verlag Earnst Reinhardt, 1940), 77. See also *The Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church* (1643), in *The Creeds of Christendom*, ed. Philipp Schaff (New York: Harper & Bros.), 2: 385c. See also George Mastrantonis, *A New-Style Catechism on the Eastern Orthodox Faith for Adults* (St. Louis: Logos Mission), 128–129.

52. See point IV of the Fourteen Points in the body of this article.

53. George Mastrantonis, *Augsburg and Constantinople: The Correspondence between the Tuebingen Theologians and Patriarch Jeremiah II of Constantinople on the Augsburg Confession*, trans. George Mastrantonis (Brookline, MA.: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982), 60, 92 et passim.

54. An Agreed Statement on the Holy Eucharist, U.S. Theological Consultation, 1969, in *The Quest For Unity*, 17, 45 ff.

55. Calov, *Systema*, VIII: 218 ff.

56. Crocius served the Elector of Brandenburg for two years and was appointed by him as a professor of theology at Marburg. He had much to do with the Hessian church defecting to the Reformed faith. Calov quotes his chief anti-Roman Catholic work, *Anti Becanus* (Cassel, 1643).

57. Phillip Meyer, “Cyril Lucar,” in *The New Shaff-Herzog*, 3: 335.

58. Calov, *Systema*, VIII: 219.

59. *Ibid.*, 221.

60. Georgi, 16.

61. See Georgi, 28. The Jerusalem synod asserted: “We believe a man to be not simply justified through faith alone, but through faith which worketh through love, that is to say, through faith and works. But [the notion] that faith fulfilling the function of a hand layeth hold on the righteousness which is in Christ, and applieth it to us for salvation, we know to be far from all Orthodoxy. For faith so understood would be possible in all, and so none could miss salvation, which is obviously false.” See *The Confession of Dositheus*, Decree XIII, in *Creeds of the Churches*, ed. John Leith (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1982), 496.

62. Calov, *Systema*, VIII: 222.

63. Dominis was a liberal Roman Catholic Jesuit who joined the Anglican Church for a time (1617), but returned to Rome in 1622. Ritschl notes Dominis’s influence on Calixt, *Dogmengeschichte* 4: 398 ff. Cassander was likewise a mediating Roman Catholic. Ritschl suggests that it was through reading Dominis that Calixt learned of the work of Cassander. *Dogmengeschichte* 4: 399.

64. Calov, *Systema*, 222.

65. AC xxvi,43; Ap vii,43 (ceremonies); Tr 14, 15, 16; SA II, IV, 4 (papal authority); Ap x, 2; SD VII, 11 (bodily presence of Christ in the sacrament); Ap xxii, 4 (both kinds); Ap xxiv, 6 (Greeks have no private masses); Ap xxiv, 88 (sacrifice of the mass); Ap xxiv, 93 (Masses for the dead). A quick look at the Lutheran Confessions reveals not one negative statement that uses the word “Greek” or “East” regarding Eastern Orthodoxy. Then there are, of course, numerous positive references to the ancient Eastern fathers.

66. Calov, *Systema*, VIII: 222.

67. “Confessio enim entegra esse debet, ac per omnia fidei capita sincera: Fides

una est copulativa,” in Calov, *Systema*, VIII: 226.

68. “Maledicti ergo contentiosi, maledicti omnes, qui pacem impediunt,” in Calov, *Systema*, VIII: 222–223.

69. See George Mastrantonis, *Augsburg and Constantinople*, 9.

70. Ungnad “sponsored translation of the Bible, AC, and some of M. Luther’s writings into Slovene, Serbo-Croatian, and Turkish and paid for their distribution.” See “Ungnad von Weissenwolf, Johann,” in *Lutheran Cyclopaedia* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1975), 782; Calov, *Systema*, VIII: 223.

71. Calov, *Systema*, VIII: 223.

72. *Ibid.* It is noteworthy that Calov makes no mention, while recounting these contacts of Lutheranism with the Eastern Orthodox, of David Chytraeus (1530–1600), who traveled behind Turkish lines and surveyed the churches in the east. Upon his return to Rostock in October of 1569, Chytraeus delivered lectures on the state of the church in the East. See *Oratio Davidis Chytraei, habita in Academia Rostochiensis, cum post reditum ex Austria ad Chronici lectionem reverteretur. In qua de statu Ecclesiarum hoc tempore in Graecia, Asia, Austria Ungaria, Boemia etc narrationes verae et cognitae non iniucundae exponuntur* (Rostock, 1569). Another edition was published in 1582 in Wittenberg. See Ernst Benz, *Die Ostkirche Im Lichte Der Protestantischen Geschichtsschreibung von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart* (Freiburg/Muenich: Verlag Karl Alber, 1952), 21 ff., 399.

73. Benz (*Die Ostkirche*, 24 ff.) provides numerous excerpts from Gerlach’s *Tage-buch*, which recounts his experiences in Constantinople and elsewhere. Gerlach became thoroughly disillusioned about any possibility of rapprochement with the Greeks, as the following citation demonstrates: “In Summa sie sind fast in allen Stuechen Papistisch/ aussgenommen vom Ausgang dess Heiligen Geistes/ vom gesaeurten Brodt/ vom Fegfeuer/ und dass der Papst nich Christi Statthalter sey. Auch/ ob sie gestehen/ dass der Mensch allein durch den Glauben gerecht werde/ gruenden sie sich doch auch/ auss Einfalt und Unwissenheit/ auff die gute Wercke. Und ist bey Ihnen einmahl beschlossen/ dass sie von den Schlessen der Concilien und Vaeter nicht das Geringste weichen: sondern die Anruffen der Heiligen/ die Fuerbitte fuer die Todten und andere ihre Irrthumme steiff und feste behalten wollen/ weil diese von GOTT erleuchtet gewesen/ und nicht haben irren koennen” (27).

74. George Mastrantonis, *Augsburg and Constantinople*. One will note the confusion in Mastrantonis’s otherwise very helpful translation, of Wittenberg for Wuerttemberg, the latter being the home of Andraea and Tuebingen University (see vi). For an extensive treatment of the history and theology of the interchange, see Dorothea Wendebourg’s *Reformation und Orthodoxy: Der oekumenische Briefwechsel zwischen der Leitung der Wuerttembergischen Kirche und Patriarch Jeremias II von Konstantionopel in den Jahren 1573–1581* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986). Note especially the correspondence quoted by Wendebourg regarding the “shock” in Wuerttemberg at the response of Jeremias to their initial contact. They met the same sobering disappointment that Gerlach faced as they discovered “the fundamental differences between the Greeks at the Lutherans” (84). Crusius wrote to Osiander (4/24/1576): “Vaeh, quantum in iis, quae Graeci . . . habent, errorum est! Nescivi tot antehoc” (84). In this day when in the LCMS catholic, creedal and liturgical continuity is being abandoned by many, and romantic siren sounds emanate from the East, this book *needs* to be translated and published by Concordia Publishing House.

75. Calov, *Systema*, VIII: 224, 225.

76. Calov quotes Basil: “sola autem fide in Christum iustificatum,” in *Concion. De humilit.* A more detailed citation is not given by Calov.

77. Calov quotes Chrysostom: “Sola fide per se salvum fecit latronem,” in *De fide & lege*. More detailed citation is not given by Calov. Calov also notes such statements by Chrysostom in his Romans Homilies, VII, VIII, IX.

78. Calov, *Systema*, VIII: 226–227.

79. Calov writes “Ideo ubi Anti-Christus ibi etiam Ecclesia,” in *Systema*, VIII: 227.

80. *Ibid.*

81. Calov, *Systema*, VIII: 262–263.

82. Calov, *Systema*, VIII: 231.

83. The complete title reads *Acta et Scripta Theologorum Wirtembergensium, et Patriarchae Constantinopolitani D, Hieremiae: quae utriq; ab Anno M.D. LXXXI, de Augustana Confessione inter se miserunt: Craece & Latine ab iisdem Theologis edita. Wirtembergae In Officina H. Johannis Cratonis, Anno M.D.LXXXIII.*

84. Because Mastrantonis provides references to the original in his translation of the Tuebingen exchange, it is very easy to make use of the English in checking Calov’s references to “Jeremias.”

85. Dionysius Petavius (1583–1652) was a French Jesuit of vast learning. He wrote in the areas of classical philology, chronology and history, polemics, and the history of dogma.

86. Leo Allatius, or Leone Alacci (1586–1669), was one of the most distinguished pupils of the Greek College founding in Rome in 1577 by Gregory XIII, specifically to provide scholars to advance the Roman Catholic cause among Greeks.

87. Note a modern Orthodox catechism: “These words of Christ [the *verba*] do not mean ‘my body’ is present in the Bread, and ‘my blood’ is present in the Wine. In reality the Elements of Bread and Wine become in substance the very body and very blood of Christ. These words of Christ signify the actual ‘change’ of the elements rather than the co-existence of visible and invisible parts.” In George Mastrantonis, *A New Style Catechism on the Eastern Orthodox Faith for Adults* (St. Louis: Logos Mission, 1969), 124. Modern eastern churches continue to teach transubstantiation, such that it has proved a point of contention in ecumenical dialogue with liberal Lutherans. “The EKD-Russian dialogue also affirms the real presence of Christ but has difficulties to express it with a common terminology since the Russians insist that Orthodox theology teaches the transubstantiation of the eucharistic elements. The same is true concerning the Finnish-Russian dialogue.” Saarinen, 252.

88. “*Euchologion*: A name which in Greek signifies any collection of prayers, but is most usually applied to the Great *Euchologion* or prayer-book of the Eastern Church, which contains the rites for all the principal ecclesiastical functions . . . It has been preserved in a number of manuscripts. The first printed edition was that of 1526.” *New Shaff-Herzog*, 4: 199.

89. Mark of Ephesus (Eugenicus; ca. 1391–1445). Monk, metropolitan of Ephesus. Most of his works oppose doctrines of the Latin Church and 1439 resolutions of the Council of Florence.

90. Calov, *Systema*, VIII: 224.

91. *Ibid.*, I, III.

92. Saarinen.

93. A statement by Saarinen points out the limited success of the dialogues in this area: “The modern Lutheran-Orthodox dialogues have become aware of the complex interplay between Scripture and Tradition. They have distinguished between various shades of meaning of ‘tradition.’ As a result of this awareness Lutherans have been able to ascribe some authority to the ecumenical councils, whereas Orthodox on their part have admitted that all ecclesial authority is given by one foundational source of revelation, Jesus Christ” (237).

94. Several red flags arise, as Saarinen describes the intra-Lutheran debate on Mannermaa’s claim that Luther’s view of the presence of Christ “in the faith of the Christian means a real participation in divine life and is thus parallel to the Orthodox view of theosis” (240). Saarinen makes the claim that the Lutheran “paradigm of faith” (with emphasis upon justification by faith alone) has been “enriched” by the Orthodox “paradigm of holiness.” He writes: “‘Holiness’ in this expression stands for the sanative process of Christians, their way leading to theosis or glorification.” He also notes that Lutheran “openness” to the paradigm of holiness has also occurred in the dialogues with Rome and Methodism (243).

95. Transubstantiation proved a point of difficulty in the EKD-Russian dialogue, as the Russian Church teaches transubstantiation of the elements. The Bulgarian Church, however, in a dialogue document explicitly rejects transubstantiation, Saarinen, 252. The concept of sacrifice with respect to the sacrament of the altar, the Lutheran *extra usum*, the canonical nature of Lutheran baptism, among other things, all remain problematic, Saarinen, 255 ff.

96. A position Calov appears to explicitly reject in the Fourteen Points, namely, point XII.

Justification and Deification

in the Dialogue between the Tübingen Theologians

and Patriarch Jeremias II

RICHARD STUCKWISCH



DIALOGUES BETWEEN LUTHERANS and the Eastern Orthodox Church are nothing new; they began as early as the sixteenth century. It was already then, in the twilight of the Reformation, that the Church of the Augsburg Confession began reaching out the hand of tentative fellowship to the Church of the Ecumenical Councils. After all, the papacy was not the only show in town; Christendom had not been a monolithic body since long before the *Ninety-Five Theses*. And if Wittenberg could not be reconciled to Rome or united with Geneva, there yet remained Constantinople. The Lutherans and the Orthodox were both considered schismatic by Rome, and if nothing else, “condemnation from the same source gave the evangelicals and the Eastern Orthodox a certain feeling of kinship.”¹ Significantly, the leading participants in the sixteenth-century dialogue included Jakob Andreae, the Chancellor of the University of Tübingen in the duchy of Württemberg, and Patriarch Jeremias II of Constantinople.²

The dialogue between Tübingen and Constantinople was especially significant for a number of reasons. To begin with, it was the first attempt at dialogue between the Lutheran West and the Orthodox East. Second, the theological discussion was both forthright and detailed, while at the same time transcending “the polemical and vituperative exchange of ideas which characterizes most Protestant and Roman Catholic writings of this period.”³ Furthermore, in addition to Andreae himself—a major contributor to the Formula of Concord—the dialogue also included the participation of several other prominent Lutherans.⁴ “With the assistance of a broad circle of theologians, the Lutheran responses which follow [the first reply of Jeremias] transcend the level of private correspondence over doctrinal issues and approach the status of a confession of faith of the Church of Württemberg.”⁵

[The dialogue] reminds English-speaking Lutherans that the sixteenth-century church of the Augsburg Confession was self-consciously “catholic,” that is, that it was indeed scriptural, but also sacramental, historical, conciliar, and patristic. It is also significant that Jacob Andreae was a moving force behind this correspondence at the same time as he was working vigorously to achieve consensus within the Lutheran church, culminating in the adoption of the Formula of Concord (1577).⁶

Finally, the dialogue is significant because a certain “symbolical” status has been given to the replies of the Patriarch. His answers to the Lutherans “are considered the last Byzantine patristic presentation of the Eastern Orthodox Church to be succeeded by the scholastic method.”⁷

HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE DIALOGUE

Early Lutheran Interest in the Greek Orthodox Church

The Lutheran reformers were certainly aware of the Orthodox churches, and they had some knowledge of Orthodox teachings on the basis of the eastern church fathers, but they were largely ignorant of the prevailing situation in the Greek Church of their day “because of the conquest of Greece and surrounding countries by the Ottoman Empire from 1453 with the fall of the Byzantine Empire.”⁸ Nevertheless, on the basis of what they did know, “a common opposition to what they regarded as papal pretensions led the Protestant Reformers to make use of eastern Christianity for propaganda and polemics.”⁹ One striking example of such tactics is provided by Luther’s debate with Eck at Leipzig in 1519.

After Luther pointed out that the Greek Church had never recognized any papal supremacy, Eck responded that the Greek Church was not only schismatic but, by rejecting the Roman primacy, had made itself heretical; the Greeks had “severed themselves from the Church and from the Christian faith itself.” Such a radical claim was simply too much for Luther, who shot back in typical fashion “that the thousands of martyrs and saints from the Greek Church even to the present day obviously refute that calumny.”¹⁰

A year later, Luther “declared that ‘Muscovites, White Russians, Greeks, Bohemians, and many other great lands in the world . . . believe as we do, baptize as we do, preach as we do, live as we do.’”¹¹

Melanchthon likewise was interested in the Greek Church. Nevertheless, that which “had been only a polemical intuition in Luther became a more substantial ecumenical overture in his colleague, Philip Melanchthon.”¹² The humanist Melanchthon was uniquely suited for such ventures on account of his love for and knowledge of the Greek patristic tradition. In many of his writings, including the Augsburg Confession and especially its Apology, as

RICHARD STUCKWISCH is pastor of Emmaus Lutheran Church, South Bend, Indiana.

well as in his *Loci Communes*, Melanchthon was a master of citations from the church fathers: Irenaeus, Cyprian, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazienzen, John Chrysostom, Theodoret, Jerome, Augustine, Cyril, Epiphanius, as well as others.

Melanchthon's reverence for the Fathers, his knowledge of the councils and church history, his cry *ad fontes!* are manifestations of a universal *Leitmotif* in all his writings: his conviction that the Church of the Reformation is not an innovation, a distortion, or a sect—but, on the contrary, it is a return to and a direct continuation of the life and beliefs of the ancient, undivided Church. The nod of the Eastern Church to this affirmation would have been a sensational victory.¹³

The opportunity came for Melanchthon to approach the eastern church when he received into his home in the summer of 1559 a Serbian deacon from the Patriarchate of Constantinople. This deacon, Demetrios Myros, remained for about six months with Melanchthon in Wittenberg, where he learned firsthand information about the Reformation and the Lutheran Church. He, in turn, was able to acquaint Melanchthon with the piety and ethos of the Orthodox Church.

The Genesis of the Augustana Graeca

It was during the stay of Demetrios as the house-guest of Melanchthon that the Greek version of the Augsburg Confession, the *Augustana Graeca*, was produced. It was published that same year (1559) in Basel, under the name of Paul Dolscius; in the preface, likewise, Dolscius writes of *his* motivation for making the translation. Nevertheless, the true author was almost certainly Melanchthon himself, who by that point might well have wanted to avoid any publicity of further “ecumenical” efforts. He had already raised suspicions by his irenic relations and compromises with both Roman Catholics and Calvinists. In any case, the *Augustana Graeca* is rightly called a “version” and not a “translation” of the Augsburg Confession, since it is a radical paraphrasing and in some places a thorough reworking of the official

The Augustana Graeca is rightly called a “version” and not a “translation” of the Augsburg Confession.

Confession. Only Melanchthon himself, the original author of the Augsburg Confession, who had written numerous editions over the years, would have dared to produce such a loose rendering of the document in Greek. Dolscius, therefore, betrays the camouflage when he writes in his preface about “the strict accuracy of his translation”(!), a lie that any first-year student of Greek would readily have detected. Martin Crusius, the leading humanist at Tübingen, certainly knew the truth, and at one point he indi-

cates that, while the *Augustana Graeca* was edited under the name of Dolscius, it was actually composed by Philip Melanchthon.¹⁴

Apparently, the explicit purpose of Melanchthon's rendition of the *Augustana* in Greek was to establish a theological contact with the Patriarch of Constantinople, Josaph II. Melanchthon sent the *Augustana Graeca* and a cover letter for the Patriarch with Demetrius when the Serbian deacon left Wittenberg. These were “dispatched to the patriarch of Constantinople with the hope expressed by Melanchthon . . . that [the *Augustana Graeca*] would be found to be in conformity with ‘the Holy Scriptures, both prophetic and apostolic, and the dogmatic canons of the holy councils and the doctrine of your fathers.’”¹⁵

The efforts of Melanchthon proved fruitless, since the Patriarch either never received the documents or simply decided not to respond, which in itself was typical of Byzantine diplomacy.

The Beginning of the Dialogue between Tübingen and Constantinople

Fifteen years after Melanchthon's failed attempt to approach the Patriarch of Constantinople, the course of history permitted a successful second attempt, this time by the theologians of the University of Tübingen. The opportunity for this second attempt was not the visit of a deacon from Constantinople, but the presence of a Lutheran ambassador of the Holy Roman Emperor, Maximilian II, in Constantinople.

Ambassador David Ungnad, who served as ambassador from 1572–1578, was “a pious Lutheran who had studied law at the University of Tübingen.” Thus, when he decided to send for a Lutheran chaplain for the embassy in Constantinople, he turned to his *alma mater*. “The Tübingen faculty perceived the possible ecumenical importance of the imperial embassy and its chaplain,” and so they sent Stephen Gerlach, “one of their most promising recent graduates.”¹⁶

When Gerlach was commissioned as court preacher and dispatched to the imperial embassy in Constantinople on April 8, 1573, he was given three documents: a letter of recommendation from Andreae and a letter of friendly greetings from [Martin] Crusius [professor of classical languages at Tübingen], plus the content of a sermon on the Good Shepherd which had been preached by Andreae on the previous Sunday.¹⁷

Gerlach arrived in Constantinople in August 1573, and for the next five years he played a pivotal role in the correspondence between the Lutherans of Tübingen and the Patriarchate of Constantinople. “Accompanied by an Italian physician, Dr. Manlius, Gerlach greeted the patriarch and spoke to him through the interpreter Joannes Zygomalas. He presented the letters and the sermon on the Good Shepherd, and wished him well and kissed his hand.”¹⁸ Though Gerlach's first impressions of the Greek Church were not altogether positive, the Lutherans continued to demonstrate a reverential awe for the office and person of the patriarch throughout the correspondence.

Gerlach indicated to his mentors at the University of Tübingen that the time was ripe for approaching the Greek Church. The

interpreter, Joannes Zygomalas, along with his son, Theodosios, the Patriarch's secretary and head of the patriarchal school, "were eager for closer churchly, and especially political, ties with the Protestants."¹⁹

Jeremias implies that the overall content of the Lutherans' faith is defective.

Despite these advances, the Lutherans still heard nothing from Jeremias, who was in the midst of a nine-month pastoral visitation, and who was occupied with various internal concerns. Thus, in a third attempt at establishing contact, the Tübingen theologians decided to send Melancthon's *Augustana Graeca*.

It remains a mystery . . . why this particular version was sent to the patriarch The 1559 *Augustana Graeca* has many rewordings and elaborations in order to make the Reformation more understandable to heirs of the Eastern Christian tradition. Why did they elect to send this *variatis-sima versio*, especially at this particularly crucial moment of Lutheran doctrinal history? A phenomenal Greek scholar like Crusius could have rendered a new and literal translation easily and quickly.²⁰

Whatever the reason, the document was sent in September 1574, with the stated purpose that the Patriarch be given a chance to see what the Lutheran religion is and to refute the accusations made by its adversaries among the easterners.

In the meantime, Jeremias had finally replied to the two Andreae sermons in a personal letter that arrived in January 1575. He apologized for his tardiness, and he indicated that he basically agreed with the theology contained in the sermons. "However, he is more concerned about what is not said than what is said, and he implies that the overall content of the Lutherans' faith is defective." Those who would follow the Good Shepherd must adhere to the holy tradition of the church: the written and unwritten teaching of the apostles, the fathers, and the ecumenical councils. Whoever wishes to belong to the kingdom of God must listen to the truth of this tradition, and not to "the strange voice of innovators." These remarks already introduced the issue of "continuity in orthodox doctrine vs. innovation and doctrinal error" that pervaded the entire future correspondence.²¹ Yet, despite the coolness and reproof of the Patriarch's first personal letter, the dialogue was marked from start to finish by a polite and friendly spirit.

In March 1575, Andreae and Crusius wrote to thank the Patriarch for his response to the two sermons. They protested that they were not innovators; indeed, they preserved the ancient faith, as they trusted that Jeremias would find in his examination of the

Augustana Graeca. Thus they requested again that he respond with his opinion of the Confession, which Gerlach finally presented to the Patriarch in May of that year.

Jeremias read the first five chapters of the *Augustana Graeca* and he proceeded to discuss with Gerlach Christ's death for original sin and for actual sins, righteousness by faith without good works, and the question of satisfaction, purgatory, the procession of the Holy Spirit, and the use of unleavened bread. Jeremias determined to provide, according to the request of the Germans, an article-by-article reply to the Augsburg Confession.²²

The Patriarch directed Gerlach to obtain five additional copies of the *Augustana*, which arrived in August 1575. These were distributed to the patriarchal advisors: "Metropolitan Metrophanes of Berrhoes, Gabriel Severus, Hierodeacon Symeon Kavasilas, Theodosius Zygomalas, and Michael Katakouzenos."²³

The first doctrinal response of Jeremias to the Lutherans of Tübingen was completed in April 1576, "when it was read aloud before the Greek theologians assembled at the Panaghia Monastery." It was delivered to the German embassy in Constantinople on May 15, and it arrived at the University of Tübingen on June 18. The response treated all of the articles of the Lutheran Confession, except for the article on papal primacy. The cover letter from the Patriarch once again advised his "spiritual sons," the "most wise Germans," to abandon innovation and accept the truth of the Orthodox Church.²⁴

The ancient Church of the East had aligned itself with the Church of Rome in rejecting the Lutheran faith as an "innovation." The only recourse of the Württemberg theologians was to present a fuller explanation of their faith and thereby to reject the detested label of innovation. Engels has aptly characterized this change of posture as a movement "from seeking union to apologetic."²⁵

The Lutherans were polite in their response and thanked the Patriarch for his sincere evaluation of the *Augustana Graeca*. In support of their doctrine, they insisted on Scripture as the only norm for theology, in opposition to the use of human reason, the Fathers, and the Councils.

When Gerlach perceived that the correspondence was at an impasse, he determined to take an alternative step toward rapprochement. Together with Crusius, he decided to offer Jeremias a Greek translation of Heerbrand's *Compendium Theologiae* as a fuller explanation of the Lutheran faith. Translated by Crusius, it was sent in October 1577, "along with private letters from German divines, a gospel set in Greek verse by H. D. Chytraeus of Rostock, and three clocks as gifts to Jeremias."²⁶ The cover letter describes the *Compendium* as containing not only the differences between the Lutherans and Rome, but also the main points of Christian doctrine described for the present day. This attempt did not work, however, as the Patriarch failed to respond; he indicated to his secretary, Theodosios, that the *Compendium* was basically taken from Thomas Aquinas.

At the turn of the year a new ambassador and a new court preacher arrived in Constantinople. Joachim von Sintzendorff replaced David Ungnad, and Salomon Schweigger replaced Stephen Gerlach. Like Gerlach, Schweigger was a young alumnus of the theological school of the University of Tübingen, and he carried on the same style and diplomacy of his predecessor.²⁷

Though the Patriarch essentially ignored the Greek translation of Heerbrand's *Compendium*, he did answer the Lutheran response to his evaluation of the *Augustana*. This time, he restricted the discussion to the key points of disagreement: "The Procession of the Holy Spirit, Free Will, Justification by Faith and Good Works, the Sacraments, the Invocation of Saints, and Monastic Life."²⁸ Although he continued to urge the Lutherans to unite themselves to the Orthodox Church, the tone of his response was less optimistic.

The Lutheran response is dated "the feast of St. John the Baptist, June 24, 1580." The theologians restricted their response to the same six points that Jeremias had addressed, and though their cordiality remained, they concluded with a prominent "amen" and presented their comments as a public confession of the faith. "It is signed by many faculty members and prominent neighboring pastors."²⁹ No longer did the Lutherans anticipate unity with the Patriarch; now it was a matter of defending their theology and justifying their teachings.

The third response of Jeremias brought an end to the dialogue. "He renews . . . the accusation of heresy and innovation. Furthermore, he introduces the slander that the Lutherans are influenced by Judaism because they prefer the Hebrew text of the Old Testament."³⁰ He concluded with a request that the Tübingen theologians write no more to him about theological matters, but if they did wish to correspond, to restrict their contact to one of friendship. It was clear that the Lutherans and the Eastern Orthodox were at theological loggerheads, but many scholars believe that he ended the correspondence primarily for political reasons.

The Lutherans, undaunted, felt compelled to write to Jeremias, once more vindicating their position. Influenced, nonetheless, by the conclusion of his last letter, their Third Response, dated December, 1581, is addressed not only to Jeremias but also to his advisors While professing that they "abhor strife," they summarize their doctrinal positions and reject the accusation that they are heretics, schismatics, and Hebrews.³¹

So ended the sixteenth-century dialogue.

Ironically, the Lutheran publication of the entire correspondence, in parallel Greek and Latin, in the *Acta et Scripta Theologorum Wirtembergensium et Patriarchae Constantinopolitani D. Hieremiae* (Wittenberg, 1584), was prompted by the interference of Roman Catholics who were able to obtain a copy of the Patriarch's first response (in which he is critical of many of the uniquely Reformation-based doctrines and principles). The Roman Catholic polemicists tried to embarrass the Lutherans by claiming that they had sought support for their views from the Patriarch, and that he had shot them down. The

Lutherans published the correspondence to refute these allegations, to demonstrate that they were not at all in doubt as to their doctrine, and to show that as far as they were concerned, the dialogues had only served to indicate the superiority of their Lutheran position.

A BRIEF THEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF THE DIALOGUE

Methodology and the Issue of Authority

Unquestioning loyalty to the fathers of the church was a common attribute of eastern theologians. Everyone acknowledged that just as God himself is changeless, so also is the truth of salvation changeless. This truth was generally understood as the *story* as well as the *means* of deification.³² The word of God and the mysteries of the church *each* communicate both *knowledge* of this divine truth *and deification itself*. Knowledge and deification are thus closely tied together, and orthodoxy as such is a matter of soteriological importance. Doctrine is divinely revealed and changeless; heretics are "innovators."

To those who were faithful, there could be no distinction within the tradition between those things that were primary and those that were secondary, between what was to be respected more and what less; for the doctrine had come from the fathers and was to be revered. This was the ancient and changeless faith of the church.³³

The reference here to a "tradition" that "was to be revered" raises the ever-present first task of theology, namely, to identify the norms of doctrine. Particularly in the East, these norms were identified with Scripture, the fathers of the church, and the ecumenical councils, in that order, but standing in a special relationship to each other. Everyone recognized that Scripture is unique-

Since even the heretics appealed to the Scriptures, it is necessary to understand them according to an orthodox interpretation.

ly the source of divine revelation; but since even the heretics appealed to the Scriptures, it is necessary to understand them according to an orthodox interpretation. This interpretation is spiritual, symbolic, sacramental, and typological, and it was provided by the fathers of the church. The fathers differ from the apostles by degree but not by kind; they are the "lampstand of the church" from which the "lamp of Scripture" is able to shine.³⁴ Thus the fathers are the norm of traditional doctrine and the standard of orthodoxy. Of course, not all of the fathers spoke in the same manner or even on the same topics; other ancient theologians simply were not orthodox. Thus the ecumenical councils

provide the medium of doctrinal illumination. They articulate properly the consensus of the fathers in their various interpretations of Scripture.

One can readily imagine how this eastern understanding of “holy tradition” might be received by Lutheran sensibilities. And in fact, the issue of “Scripture versus tradition” is often cited as a main point of contention in the dialogue of the sixteenth century. The Lutheran insistence on *sola Scriptura* had already been met with the principle of “two sources” of doctrine—Scripture plus tradition—by the Council of Trent. What the Lutherans of Tübingen heard from Constantinople sounded very much the same. Nevertheless, the fundamental issue was not a matter of deciding between Scripture *or* tradition; it was a question of authority, and of the relative weight allotted to Scripture *and* tradition.

The methodological approach of both the Lutherans and Patriarch Jeremias was essentially the same: arguments from Scripture, coupled with citations from the church fathers. The key difference was the insistence of the Lutherans that Scripture alone is *determinative* and that the Fathers are a secondary witness, whereas for Jeremias the fathers are by all means necessary for the proper use of Scripture.

Points of Agreement

In spite of their differences in approaching the source of authority in theology, there were many beliefs held in common by Patriarch Jeremias and the Lutherans of Tübingen, including some of the most vital beliefs of the Christian faith. For example, they basically agreed on the following: The truth and inspiration of the Scriptures; the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; original sin and its inheritance by all men; the source of evil in creatures and not in God; the two natures of Christ hypostatically united in a single person; Jesus Christ as head of the church; the Second Coming of Christ in the final judgment; the doctrine of eschatology, including a future life of either endless reward or endless punishment; the distribution of the Eucharist to the faithful under both kinds; and the rejection of papal abuses, including the sale of indulgences, the distribution of excess grace from the saints, purgatory, and the obligatory celibacy of the clergy. The discussion of each of these topics was limited to only a few lines. It should be noted, however, that as for the agreement concerning original sin, there is no doubt that some misunderstanding was involved, which allowed each side to see its own position in what had been said.

Key Points of Disagreement

While the points of agreement were discussed very briefly, the points of disagreement quickly became the entire focus of the dialogue. “Innovation” was a recurring theme throughout the correspondence, recalling the discussion of Scripture and holy tradition. Jeremias repeatedly accused the Lutherans of innovation, on account of their attitude toward tradition, and the Lutherans continued to argue that they were not at all “innovative,” since they derived their theology from Scripture alone. In terms of the amount of space devoted to any single topic, the *filioque* dominated the discussion. Regrettably, neither side employed any substantially new argumentation. The debate was basically a rehash of the old East-West polemics on the procession of the Holy Spirit. The discussion of free will and the controversy over the relationship of

justification and good works are the points of disagreement most important for our purposes here. Unfortunately, disagreement over the sacraments took place primarily on a superficial level (enumeration of sacraments and the like) and did not lead to any extensive treatment of their theological substance. This lack of sacramental discussion, it would seem, clouded and obscured the discussion of free will, justification, and good works. Other points of disagreement were the invocation of saints and monasticism.

JUSTIFICATION AND DEIFICATION IN THE DIALOGUE

The Augustana Graeca

It is significant that Melancthon’s Greek *variata* was given the imprimatur of Andreae and his fellow theologians at Tübingen. In spite of its various “modifications” to the *invariata*, the *Augustana Graeca* became something more than a private rendition of the Lutheran faith by Melancthon; it, too, assumed the character of a public confession. Since it was sent to Jeremias at the very time that Andreae was developing the Formula of Concord, there should be no question as to the care with which he would have dealt with such a document.

Original Sin

Article II, the article on original sin, is notably expanded as compared to the *invariata*. It defines “original sin” as fundamentally being “without fear of God, without trust in Him” (AG II).³⁵ But this original sin is also described at length in terms that are clearly used either to clarify the Lutheran doctrine for eastern sensibilities or actually to accommodate the Eastern Orthodox notion of sin: terms such as *disorder, worthlessness, wretchedness, deprivation, deficiency, blindness, ignorance, obscuring, overshadowing, distortion, and corruption*.³⁶

God is not to blame for sin, since human nature was created good. That is to say, sin is not “natural”; it is the result of man’s fall, “a corruption of the unchangeable and uninterrupted obedience, and of the undisguised and unmixed and an unsurpassed love of God, and of things similar to these impressed by God on the untarnished human nature before the fall” (AG II). Thus again in Article XIX the *Augustana Graeca* confesses,

Concerning the cause of sin, it is taught that, although God creates and preserves the things of nature, yet the cause of sin is certainly the will of the wicked and the despisers of God, that of the devil and the impious, who, without God assisting him, of his own will turns away from Him.

The “original sin” of Adam’s fall is inherited through father and mother, so that “every man by nature is born a child of the wrath of God, subject to and under the power of eternal death” (AG II). Furthermore, this “inherited sin” is truly sin and liability, worthy of eternal condemnation. Thus the *Augustana Graeca* goes on to say that the Son of God was sacrificed, not only for the sins “done by men in transgressing the law,” but also “for the ancient transgression and the calling to account of the human race” (AG III).

On account of original sin, man is unable by his own powers to fulfill the law of God. Thus the Pelagians and others like them are

condemned, who “deny that wretchedness and worthlessness from birth is sin,” and who “contend and say that man by his own powers of the soul can fulfill the law of God and be justified before Him” (AG II). Thus also, the necessity of baptism, whereby men are born again through the Holy Spirit, “who sets aright, consoles, and vivifies them, who also shields them against the devil and the power of sin” (AG III).

Justification

Article IV, which concerns justification, begins by repeating the description of original sin and its consequences, confessing that “all men, as it has been foreordained, have clothed themselves with the unhealthy and unclean nature, and they became sinners from their father and mother.”

The *Augustana Graeca* uses the word *gospel* in the broad sense: for example, the “gospel” is said to “argue sin,” require repentance, and teach forgiveness and justification. In Article V,

Christ instituted the ministry of the gospel, which proclaims repentance and the remission of sins. The universal preaching of both: for it has argued all sins of all men, and it promises their remission to all who believe.

Even so, the forgiveness and justification taught by the gospel are given freely as a gift for Christ’s sake, and not through the good works of men.

If therefore the gospel demands repentance, still that the remission of sins might be certain, it teaches us that it is brought to us freely and as a gift, that is, not through the worthiness of our good deed nor through our previous or subsequent right actions (AG IV).

Instead of our good works, the good works of Christ are applied to us for justification, as in the opening sentence of Article IV: “In order that we might attain to the good deeds of Christ, that is, the remission of sins and justification and eternal life, Christ instituted the preaching of the gospel, through which the munificences of the redeemer are applied to us.” Thus Christ alone deserves all the credit. Wherefore, “he who trusts that he earns grace by his own right actions is heedless of and overlooks the redemption and munificence of Christ the Savior, and it is evident that he seeks some way to God by human works without Christ” (AG XX).

The salvation of Christ is thus received through faith alone, apart from works. The nature of such faith, however, is not simply historical knowledge of the gospel, but trust and assent to the promises of Christ. In fact, the entire goal and purpose of the gospel-history and its narrative is the gift of forgiveness and eternal life, which are received by a confident trust. This purpose of the gospel is underscored again in Article XX:

The expression “faith” signifies not only history, such as might be found in the ungodly and in the devil, but in addition to the knowledge of history it also signifies the accomplishment of history, namely this article, the remission of sins, that clearly through Christ we have grace and righteousness, being set free from the condemnation of sins.

The promise of the gospel is given to “those who learn by inquiry about Christ” through the historical narrative (AG IV). But in order to receive its gifts, the one who hears must trust and believe that the promise and history belong also to him.

Thus through the word of God, and the Sacraments, the Holy Spirit is present to men and works within those who hearken to and care for the gospel teaching and who use the fellowship of the Sacraments and who encourage themselves by faith (AG V).

All of these promises—justification, forgiveness, and eternal life—would be uncertain if they depended upon man, and would therefore not allow the “heart-stricken [to] rely on the promise and believe without ambiguity and without doubt” (AG IV). This argument that the gospel must be able to soothe troubled consciences is common in Reformation polemics.

Free Will

In Article XVIII, which deals with free will, not only is man unable, on account of original sin, to do good works and earn his salvation; neither is he able on his own to turn toward God in faith. He is “altogether unable to make earnest and blameless the interior impulses and dispositions of the intellect and heart, such as the fear of God, firm and unswerving trust in Him, purity, and forbearance or patience, and the rest.” Of course, it is true that man has a certain “freedom of the will” in matters subject to human reason, and is therefore able to refrain from externally wicked acts and to perform outwardly good deeds. But apart from the Holy Spirit, man is unable to set his heart right and to fear, love, and trust God. Thus, rejected once again are “the Pelagians and all others who say that without the Holy Spirit and grace we are able by our natural powers alone to love God above all things and to keep his commandments” (AG XVIII).

Good Works

Article XX, the article on good works, is actually an opportunity to treat once again the matters of justification and faith before discussing good works—a procedure that highlights the Lutheran insistence that faith precedes the doing of good works.

Already in Article VI, “Of New Obedience,” the Lutherans encourage good works and teach that they are necessary: “Faith needs to be not ineffective and fruitless, but especially operative and productive.” This necessity is repeated again in Article XX. Yet the *Augustana Graeca* makes clear that good works are done, not to earn God’s mercy and forgiveness, but rather out of faith and for the sake of God’s will and commandment.

It is necessary for us to do good works, not that we might be confident that we will earn grace by them, but on account of the will of God. For the remission of sins and peace of conscience is obtained by faith alone. Since the Holy Spirit is given us by faith, hearts are renewed by Him, and they are disposed to do good, as Ambrose also says that faith is the mother of good free choice and of just action (AG XX).

The believers ought to complete the good works which have been enjoined by God, on account of the will and command of God; but not that by them [good works] they might have confidence that they are deemed worthy of righteousness before God, for the remission of sins and righteousness is apprehended by faith (AG vi).

By their very definition, good works consist in doing those things that God has commanded, and not in foolish traditions and superstitious works. Thus the Lutherans have produced many writings on the Decalogue, “setting forth in them whatever works might be acceptable to God, and how in each one’s calling, so to speak, anyone might be able to be well-pleasing to Him,” as opposed to “spending time with teaching foolery about certain childish and unnecessary works; such as certain stated feasts, stated fasts, brotherhoods, pilgrimages, service of the saints, the monastic life, and others like these” (AG xx).

In any case, apart from faith and without the Holy Spirit it is impossible to do any truly good works, and all efforts to do so fail (regardless of appearances).

Without the Holy Spirit, human powers are full of godless passions and desires, and alone they fall very short of accomplishing the things good and pleasing to God; but they are subject to the devil, who becomes master and exercises authority over them, and who drives men taken captive by him to various sins and to false opinions about God, and to manifest lawless and evil deeds. . . . For without faith human nature can in no way do the works either of the first or of the second commandments of the Decalogue. Without faith no one calls upon God, no one expects anything from Him, no one patiently carries the cross, but he seeks aid and help from men and he trusts in them. So therefore in the absence of faith and trust in God, all fleshly desires and human considerations reign in the heart (AG xx).

From the one who has faith, however, good works flow as the result and evidence of faith, wrought in him by the Holy Spirit. As confessed already in Article v:

Being encouraged by faith and being set free from the troubles and travails of sin by the Holy Spirit, who is begotten and introduced in our hearts along with the other virtues, truly we know the compassionate and philanthropic [God] and the mercy of God, and we love and fear Him, producing by the Spirit trust, eager expectance of the help of God, invocation of Him alone, and other [virtues] similar to these.

Yet even the regenerate man who does good works does not rely on his works but always on Christ alone. For “it is necessary that we always cleave to the Mediator and Redeemer, and believe that God is gracious to us and that we are accounted just by Him, not that we fulfill the law, but we understand that God is propitiated to us through Christ, through Him and this promise” (AG xx). The Lutheran position is summarized in the conclusion to Article xx:

Without faith good works would not be pleasing to God, but the heart should have peace towards God before, having trusted and considering that God assists us and is gracious to us, and accounts us just, not because of the worthiness of the things done by us, but because of grace through Christ. This then is befitting Christians, and it echoes in our churches—the teaching about good works.

Excursus on “Sin and Righteousness” in Eastern Orthodoxy

Just as a brief description of deification has already been provided, so must some preliminary comments now be made regarding the view of sin and righteousness in Orthodox theology. The eastern understanding of these concepts is intimately related to the doctrine of deification, and it represents a decisive factor in the response of Jeremias to the *Augustana Graeca*. Much of the ensuing argument between the Lutherans and the Patriarch involved their divergent use of key words related to salvation: words denoting *the danger from which* and *the safety to which* salvation occurs. In Eastern Orthodox theology,

Sin entered the world because the mind of man had been beguiled by Satan, who was jealous of the special relationship which man was destined to have with God. The sin of Adam was a personal act of his own free will that deprived him of the means of fulfilling his destiny, which was to overcome, by virtue of his personal relationship with the logos, the mortality of his human nature. Satan by his trickery gave death its fundamentally unnatural and unjust rule over mankind.³⁷

Thus for Eastern Orthodoxy, “original sin” is not a universal guilt of all mankind, inherited from Adam, but “the bondage of the human race to death.” The sin of any individual is never the consequence of human nature, which remains the good creation of God; rather, sin is always the expression of personal choice, just as it was for Adam and Eve. “It is not transmitted by natural means from one generation to the next, but re-emerges afresh in each child of Adam. No one inherits the guilt of his ancestors; each man or woman is responsible only for the acts of his own free will.” Yet it is recognized that all men sin, for though there is no universal *guilt* inherited from Adam, there is a universal propensity for sin as a result of the fall. “The sin of Adam introduced the reign of death into the world, and it is this evil dominion which now causes all men to sin.” Romans 5:12 is interpreted accordingly: “By one man sin came into the world, and by sin death, *because of which* all have sinned.” In other words, all men sin *because* all men are subject to death.³⁸

Now, as already indicated, the eastern church understands deification as the goal of human life. The Incarnation of the Son of God was a necessary prerequisite for this deification, even apart from sin. Sin did make the crucifixion necessary, but not as a means of “exacting a just retribution in the punishment of the only one worthy to make the sacrifice.” The cross vanquished not sin but *death*,

thereby making it possible for man to return to the state of Adam and renew his progress towards deification, secure in the knowledge that Christ had gone before, and that he had sent the Holy Spirit, who in the life-giving “drug” of the sacrament applies Christ’s victory to the Church.

Thus eastern theologians typically do not think in the judicial categories of justification. Righteousness is understood in terms of “sanctification and the final re-creation of all things in Christ.” There is no emphasis on a “mathematical point” of conversion but on a continuing process of renewal. The superiority of Christian faith over the Jewish observance of the law is the superiority of Christian righteousness made possible by the incarnation, life, death, and resurrection of Christ. Thus the righteousness of a Christian exceeds the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees “in degree more than in kind,” and a life of good works is necessary for salvation. Such a life, however, is the “fruit of grace” and a “righteousness by faith,” since it is possible only through the sacrament of holy baptism, through which the individual participates in the “life-giving power of the risen Christ.” Apart from baptism, there is no righteousness at all, and the so-called good works of the heathen are a mere delusion.³⁹

Whereas for Lutherans salvation is primarily a matter of *justification*, whereby a man is made right with God, for the Eastern Orthodox salvation denotes the participation of man in the divine nature. Lutherans are one with the Roman Catholics in the western tradition of being concerned primarily with the danger *from which* man is saved, namely, from sin, death, and the power of the devil. The eastern church is far more focused on the life *for which* man is saved, that is, for deification. Good works, in this eastern perspective, do not “save” a man in the sense of justifying him, but they are an aspect of salvation inasmuch as they are part and parcel with living the divine life. Lutherans typically speak of the decisive movement from unbelief to faith, from condemnation to justification. The Orthodox are far more concerned with “preaching to the baptized” and addressing the spiritual growth of one who is already a believer. Their focus is not so much “on the ‘how’ of salvation as on the ‘content’ of salvation.”⁴⁰

The First Exchange

The First Response of Jeremias to the *Augustana Graeca*

In his first response to the Lutherans, Patriarch Jeremias provided an article-by-article commentary on the *Augustana Graeca*. He found many points of essential agreement, but also a number of points of significant disagreement. Thus he urged the scholars of Tübingen to leave behind their innovations and to accept the doctrine of the Eastern Orthodox Church. In his opening remarks he wrote, “Would that you might be of like mind with our Church of Christ, so that if truly and with all your hearts you do [good] works, great joy will be in heaven and on earth, for the unity of each others church, which we hope will be for the glory of Christ.”⁴¹

Jeremias agreed with the *Augustana Graeca* that man has free will on the natural plane. He further agreed that on the spiritual plane no one is able to be saved without *first* having the help of God; thus, he was not a Pelagianist. Nevertheless, the Patriarch was adamant that grace saves those who are *willing* and does not violate man’s free will. Thus, even though everything depends on God, it still depends on us and him: ours is the choosing and willing, God’s, the completing and perfecting.

A key question is whether Jeremias made these remarks about regenerate man with respect to the process of deification or about the actual event of conversion. There is a certain amount of ambi-

guity in his remarks, which is not helped by the fact that much of what he wrote is given in the form of lengthy patristic citations. It would have been helpful (on the part of both sides in the dialogue) if the sacraments, and especially baptism, had been discussed in the context of justification and deification.

In his comments on justification and related matters, Jeremias agreed that, while good works should be done, man should not rely on them. He also affirmed the temporal priority of faith, which must precede the doing of good works. At the same time, he insisted that faith must produce good works, and he objected to the cry of “faith alone.”⁴² God promises to save man if he hears him and does good works. As such, faith without works and works without faith are both rejected. The lack of good works should not be excused by an appeal to human weakness; for God in his grace and mercy overlooks what is lacking in those who repent and who strive for the good. Man cooperates with this grace of God.

The Patriarch strongly exhorted that man must live a life worthy of his calling (suggesting that he does have the regenerate in mind), and he scolded the Lutherans for dismissing the monastic life and other such traditions of the Church.

The First Response of the Tübingen Theologians to Jeremias

The issue of a supposed free will was a controversy among the Lutherans of the sixteenth century. The controversy had its roots in the fifth-century debate between Augustine and Pelagius, which made a significant impact upon the entire western church. Among the Lutherans, Melancthon and his followers (dubbed the Philippists) had started to include a place for human will in conversion. This Lutheran controversy was addressed in the Formula of Concord, Article II, and so was fresh in the minds of the Tübingen theologians. It was precisely in this context that the Lutherans began their dialogue with Jeremias II. Thus they probably could not help but interpret the comments of Jeremias regarding free will as referring to conversion, since that was the battle concerning free will that was just ending within the Lutheran Church. Consequently, in their response the Lutherans emphasize that unregenerate man is totally depraved, dead in his sin, and therefore incapable of choosing or willing on the spiritual plane. The Lutherans strongly affirmed divine monergism in conversion. It is true that after conversion, man can and does choose the good; yet, he does so weakly and only by the continued activity of God working in him to will and to do.

To understand the Lutheran response to the necessity of good works, three distinguishing features of the Lutheran doctrine of Justification, which crystallized at the time of the Formula of Concord, are important to keep in mind. First, justification by grace is received through a faith that is not merely historical knowledge but fundamentally a confident trust in and assent to the promises of God. Second, justification is God’s forensic declaration of righteousness, which is thereby imputed not infused. And third, justification is a one-time divine act that must be distinguished from sanctification.

The Lutherans conceded to Jeremias that “virtue” (not justification or salvation) is pursued by the doing of good works.⁴³ They also agreed that good works should be done and do follow true faith. But they repeatedly emphasized that justification occurs freely by God’s grace alone, excluding all works. They insist that to make works necessary for salvation would cause forgiveness and

eternal life to be uncertain (thus returning again to the popular argument that was also presented in the *Augustana Graeca*). Consequently, works make no contribution to the *cause* of salvation. Though good works ought to be done and will be rewarded, they must not impair the all-sufficient work and merit of Christ.

The Second Exchange

The Second Response of Jeremias

The Patriarch clearly heard the Lutherans denying free will, and so he responded with a *catena* of patristic quotations to “prove” that man is able to choose for good or evil. For Jeremias, this argument was really a corollary to saying that God’s creation is good and that man is the cause of sin and evil. Man’s reason and free will stem from the fact that he is made in the image and likeness of God. Nevertheless, Jeremias still implied that grace *precedes* the doing of good, “for without grace we can do nothing whatsoever,”

Thus an infused rather than an imputed righteousness is considered to make man right with God.

even though man is not coerced by grace.⁴⁴

Jeremias asserted that the doers of “the spiritual law” will be saved; that is, those who keep the commandments and do good works animated by faith with the assistance of divine grace.⁴⁵ In fact, the distinction between the believer and the unbeliever (not between two types of believer) is to be found precisely in the bearing of the fruits of the Spirit. Thus an infused rather than an imputed righteousness is considered to make man right with God.

The Second Response of the Tübingen Theologians

The Tübingen theologians agreed with Jeremias that man is not forced or coerced into conversion. Likewise, they readily agreed that the virtues issue from God and not exclusively from man’s efforts and struggles. And they again affirmed that man’s moral responsibility is consequent upon his will when choosing evil.

Nevertheless, the Lutherans again restated and emphasized at some length the inability of man to choose good prior to conversion and the necessity of divine monergism for conversion. Again, man has no choice for good until after his conversion, and even then man remains weak and imperfect in choosing and doing good. Thus in summary:

That which moves our hearts not to scorn the divine threatening is from God. For us to believe in the gospel is from God. To delight in the law of God, when we have already returned to the Lord, is from God. To do some good work is from God.⁴⁶

With respect to justification and related issues, the Lutherans added little in their second response to their previous arguments, but they did clarify the relationship between Paul and James. They

maintained that man is not justified by keeping the spiritual law; indeed, it is impossible to keep the spiritual law because it demands absolute perfection, whereas man cannot even keep the first and greatest commandment, “to fear, love, and trust in God above all things.” But the theologians of Tübingen agreed that faith without works is not true faith, and that good works are done by faith for the glory of God and not for vainglory. Thus they taught that good works flow from man’s prior reconciliation to God by grace through faith for Christ’s sake; in other words, we love only because He first loved us.

The Third Exchange

The Third and Final Response of Jeremias

Jeremias began his third response by returning to his argument for free will from the image of God in man. He indicated that evil is genuinely foreign to human nature, which God created and declared to be “good.”⁴⁷ Unfortunately, in making this argument, the Patriarch seems to have backed himself into a truly Pelagianistic corner, going so far as to say at one point that nothing after the fall prevents man from turning aside from evil. Yet, he ended by asserting the need for God’s help, thus ultimately repudiating outright Pelagianism.

The third and final response of Patriarch Jeremias is relatively short, and it includes nothing on justification per se. It concludes with a request that theological dialogue cease.

Therefore, we request that from henceforth you do not cause us more grief, nor write to us on the same subject if you should wish to treat these luminaries and theologians in a different manner [than the Orthodox Church]. You honor and exalt [the Fathers] in words, but you reject them in deeds. For you try to prove our weapons which are their holy and divine discourses as unsuitable. And it is with these documents that we would have to write and contradict you. Thus, as for you, please release us from these cares. Therefore, going about your own ways, write no longer concerning dogmas; but if you do, write only for friendship’s sake. Farewell.⁴⁸

The Third Response of the Tübingen Theologians

In their final response, the Lutherans provided a summary position already in their salutation:

We entreat the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that the Greek Churches, with the assistance of the Holy Spirit and under the diligence, wakefulness, and faithful care of Your Holiness [Jeremias], will tend most salvifically the Holy gospel of Christ, so that they acknowledge the Chief Shepherd Christ as their only Savior and publicly express their thanksgiving toward Jesus Christ by good works, which He has ordered so that having honorably finished the course of the present life and having kept the faith, they will receive the righteous crown of everlasting life. May it be so.⁴⁹

The Lutherans expressed their amazement at the importance Jeremias attached to human reason and free will, and they were

blunt in their assessment of those who taught as Jeremias had (especially in his most recent response). They wrote,

They who compare the powers of man, which were acquired after the Fall, with those powers which existed before the Fall of Adam, are of the same opinion as we: It is as if a man who has reached the lowest point of poverty might strive to become very rich from the great riches he had in the past. But many such powers, which existed before the Fall, truly possess the daily experience; and for this power some boast with such big words, who either do not comprehend sufficiently what great perfection the Law of God demands from us, or they do not sufficiently recognize their own natural corruption and weakness.⁵⁰

In conclusion, the Lutherans repeated their own assertion on the basis of Scripture that man is unable to do good (prior to conversion), and to make this point they returned to an argument from the Hebrew text of Genesis.

OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

As for the debate, if one must speak of winners and losers, then Tübingen won the contest. The Lutherans certainly thought so, as they demonstrated by publishing the entire correspondence in response to the slanderous attacks of the Roman Catholics. After all, they had been sharpening their polemical skills through years of controversy, first with Rome, then with Zurich and Geneva, and finally among themselves. They were also better equipped theologically than their competition, which was languishing under the yoke of the Ottoman Turks. The Lutherans knew their Hebrew and the Hebrew Scriptures, they had access to the church fathers of both east and west and could readily work with both Greek and Latin, and they had the momentum of the reformation still behind them. Furthermore, they presented Jeremias with a different set of questions than the orthodox East had faced in its own development.

Justification and deification are fundamentally different ways of defining salvation.

If the correspondence between Tübingen and Constantinople is treated as a debate, however, it is clear that the participants were not abiding by the same set of rules. Though both the Lutherans and the Eastern Orthodox presented their argumentation from Scripture and patristic sources, their criteria for truth differed. For Andreae and his fellow theologians, the clear word of God was the last word on every issue they discussed. For Jeremias and his advisers, the word of God was not clear, and therefore should not be used, apart from the exposition of the fathers. Each team played according to its own game

plan. Thus it is questionable whether any true debate occurred. And if so, it could easily be argued that each side won on the basis of its own criteria.

As for the dialogue, there was clearly a difference of belief and confession. The several points of disagreement represented significant obstacles to rapprochement. The relationship between Scripture and Holy Tradition presented such a hurdle from the outset. The procession of the Holy Spirit added to the correspondence a long-standing controversy between east and west. And we have seen in particular the pervasive discrepancy in the two sides' understandings of free will, justification, and good works. In addition, even many of those areas that were passed over as points of agreement, for instance, original sin, the precise nature of the church and ministry, or the substantial meaning of the sacraments, were actually dissimilar in some key respects. At the same time, alongside these real differences, the Lutherans and the Orthodox were each talking past each other out of a certain ignorance of the other's unique theological perspective.

Justification and deification are fundamentally different ways of defining *salvation*, which result in equally fundamental differences in the way one speaks about the roles of human will, faith, and good works in relation to that salvation. Without a doubt, those differences were a major factor in the sixteenth-century dialogue between the Tübingen theologians and Patriarch Jeremias.

Indeed, the entire correspondence reveals that there was misunderstanding as well as discord over the doctrine of justification. This encumbrance envelops the topic of justification as well as the intimately related questions of grace, free will, and synergism. When, for example, the patriarch is constantly stressing the value of good works for *salvation* [i.e., as *Theosis*], the Lutherans are protecting *justification* from any intrusion of good works. Hence the Greeks see the Germans as denigrating works and free will, while [Lutherans] characterize the Greek position as a "naïve synergism."⁵¹

So then, is there any hope of success in current and future dialogue between Lutherans and the Eastern Orthodox? Yes—depending on one's measure of success, but only by first coming to grips with the radically different traditions of East and West, and ultimately—while maintaining the integrity of confession on both sides—by seeking common ground and starting from the shared christological heritage.⁵² Working from this common foundation, the person and work of Christ must be brought to bear upon both justification and deification (1 Cor 1:30). Christ is the one who has taken our life to be his own, by his obedience has satisfied the law and made us righteous before God, and who has granted to us that we should receive his life to be our own in his kingdom. Christ alone has saved us from our enemies of sin, death and the devil; Christ alone has saved us for participation in the divine nature (2 Pet 1:3-4). Thus salvation must be understood christologically in *all* its aspects. For it remains the case that any and all theology—and so also any dialogue—that wishes to be *Christian* in any true sense must finally answer above all else the questions of who Christ is and what Christ has done. LOGIA

NOTES

1. Berthold F. Korte, "Early Lutheran Relations with the Eastern Orthodox," *Lutheran Quarterly* 9 (February 1957): 53.
2. Jeremias II (1536–1595), the Patriarch of Constantinople, "distinguished himself primarily as an able administrator and a zealous pastor." He served as Patriarch "within the vortex of intrigues at Constantinople and under the humiliating dependence of Moslem potentates during the darkest days of the Turkish Captivity," and for his stalwart performance he has earned the reputation as "probably the greatest and most famous patriarch since 1453." He is best known, however, for his involvement in three specific contacts with the church outside his own patriarchate: "(1) his relationship with the Lutherans at Tübingen; (2) his opposition to the Roman Catholic Church, particularly his rejection of the Gregorian calendar; and (3) his role in the creation of the Patriarchate of Moscow." Although he likely delegated to his court theologians the compilation of patristic sources and the actual composition of his replies to Tübingen, Jeremias is rightly considered their author, since "he gave his advice and his approbation to the correspondence by virtue of his office as patriarch." Wayne James Jorgenson, *The Augustana Graeca and the Correspondence between the Tübingen Lutherans and Patriarch Jeremias* (Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1979), 259–260.
3. Jorgenson, 2–3.
4. The Lutheran pastors and professors of Tübingen who each signed at least one of the doctrinal letters to Jeremias are as follows: Martin Crusius, Lukas Osiander, Jakob Andreae, Jakob Heerbrand, Eberhard Bidembach, Johannes Mageirus, Theodore Sneppf, Stephan Gerlach, Johannes Brent, Gulielmus Holderer, and Johannes Schoppf. "Andreae, of course, was the principal theologian at Tübingen. Osiander collaborated with him, and these two may be considered the main compositors. Crusius translated their Latin drafts into Greek." *Ibid.*, 91–92.
5. *Ibid.*, 130.
6. David Jay Webber, "Augsburg and Constantinople: Review Essay," *Lutheran Quarterly* 5 (Spring 1991): 99.
7. George Mastrantonis, *Augsburg and Constantinople: The Correspondence between the Tübingen Theologians and Patriarch Jeremiah II of Constantinople on the Augsburg Confession* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982), 17.
8. Mastrantonis 9–10.
9. Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600–1700)*, vol. 2, *The Christian Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), 281.
10. Jorgenson, 8.
11. Pelikan, 281.
12. *Ibid.*, 281.
13. Jorgenson, 16.
14. Georges Florovsky, "The Greek Version of the Augsburg Confession," *Lutheran World* 2 (September 1959): 153.
15. Pelikan, 281.
16. Jorgenson, 58.
17. *Ibid.*, 62–63.
18. *Ibid.*, 65.
19. *Ibid.*, 66.
20. *Ibid.*, 68.
21. *Ibid.*, 71–72.
22. *Ibid.*, 74.
23. *Ibid.*, 74–75.
24. *Ibid.*, 75.
25. *Ibid.*, 76.
26. *Ibid.*, 78–79.
27. *Ibid.*, 79.
28. *Ibid.*, 81.
29. *Ibid.*, 81–82.
30. *Ibid.*, 83.
31. *Ibid.*, 84.

32. In the history of Byzantine theology, deification was consistently understood as the goal of man, a "natural destiny" that is reached only through the grace of God. As such, it is the "exaltation of nature, not its destruction or alteration." This goal of deification is the process of becoming "as much as possible like and in union with God"—a "participation through grace in that which surrounds the nature of God." It was realized perfectly and fully in the incarnation of the Son of God, in whom "generic" human nature was deified. This nature of man had been established in the creation for communion with God, but it was "darkened by its existential condition subsequent to Adam's sin." Deification is the restoration of the intended communion between God and man, beginning with the human life and death of Christ. Thus deification describes the eastern understanding of salvation in Christ. It lies behind the Christology of Athanasius, the Cappadocian Fathers, Cyril of Alexandria, John of Damascus, and others. "God became man, that man might become divine." *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* (1991), s.v. "Theosis."
33. Pelikan, 16.
34. *Ibid.*, 18.
35. English citations from the *Augustana Graeca* [hereafter abbreviated, AG] are taken from Jorgenson's translation, provided as Appendix III in his dissertation.
36. "The Orthodox speak of sin as 'fallenness.' Humanity strayed from the path of communion with God and now finds itself in a 'fallen state.' This state is defined in terms of morality (since there is no authentic life apart from God) and distorted priorities, not by expressions such as 'natural corruption' or 'inherited guilt' as among Lutherans." *Salvation in Christ: A Lutheran-Orthodox Dialogue*, ed. John Meyendorff and Robert Tobias (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1992), 28.
37. Gerald Bray, "Justification and the Eastern Orthodox Church," in *Here We Stand: Justification by Faith Today*, ed. J. I. Packer (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1986): 104–105.
38. Bray, 105.
39. *Ibid.*, 106–107.
40. *Salvation in Christ*, 14.
41. Mastrantonis 30–31.
42. Compare the following from the Formula of Concord:
As Luther writes in his Preface to the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, "Faith is a divine work in us that transforms us and begets us anew from God, kills the Old Adam, makes us entirely different people in heart, spirit, mind, and all our powers, and brings the Holy Spirit with it. Oh, faith is a living, busy, active, mighty thing, so that it is impossible for it not to be constantly doing what is good. Likewise, faith does not ask if good works are to be done, but before one can ask, faith has already done them and is constantly active. Whoever does not perform such good works is a faithless man, blindly tapping around in search of faith and good works without knowing what either faith or good works are" (FC SD IV, 10–11; Tappert, 552–553).
43. Mastrantonis, 109.
44. *Ibid.*, 175.
45. *Ibid.*, 178.
46. *Ibid.*, 248.
47. *Ibid.*, 303.
48. *Ibid.*, 306.
49. *Ibid.*, 308.
50. *Ibid.*, 310.
51. Jorgenson, 164.
52. Consider, for example, that the classic Lutheran treatment of Christology by Martin Chemnitz, *The Two Natures of Christ*, draws extensively from the eastern church fathers, especially from St. Cyril of Alexandria and St. John of Damascus. Yet it is certain that for these ancient authors, their Christology could not possibly be separated from their soteriology—which would have to be described in terms of deification.

Luther and Cajetan on the Sacrifice of the Mass

MICHAEL J. TORI



THE REFORMER MARTIN LUTHER and the Dominican theologian best known as Cardinal Cajetan (Thomas de Vio of Gaeta, Kingdom of Naples) had only one set of historic meetings, and that was early in Luther's movement away from Rome. In the days immediately following the Imperial Diet at Augsburg, Cajetan attempted the task of bringing Luther back under the authority of Rome (October 12–14, 1518). As the papal legate of Leo X, Cajetan had sought to encourage Luther to recant his recently published theories on indulgences and the primacy of faith concerning the sacrament of penance. Cajetan's later controversies with Luther, however, would center on the Eucharist.

Prior to Luther's arrival in Augsburg, Cajetan had begun a thorough study of two Lutheran works (*Explanations of the Ninety-five Theses* and the *Sermo de poenitentia*).¹ Cajetan had hoped to establish a paternal-filial tone to the debate, as Luther himself would testify later in *Proceedings at Augsburg*:

Here [Augsburg] I was received by the most reverend lord cardinal legate both graciously and with almost too much respect, for he is a man who is in all respects different from those extremely harsh bloodhounds who track down monks among us He stated that he did not wish to argue with me, but to settle the matter peacefully and in a fatherly fashion (AE, 31: 261).

Yet as the frustrations mounted at this meeting, and the immediate issues remained unresolved, Luther would come to compare his time with Cajetan as a latter-day rendition of Jesus' trial before the high priest Caiaphas (AE, 31: 260).

The mutual respect that the two controversialists initially showed soon disintegrated into reformation-era polemics. While the topic of the mass as sacrifice was not a focus of the talks at Augsburg, it was not far removed from Luther's theme of the centrality of faith as the hallmark of the Christian life. Eventually, both Luther and Cajetan would move beyond the points made at Augsburg as concerns about the nature of the mass moved into the forefront. The two men never crossed paths again, but they quite articulately crossed pens over the debate of the sacrament of the altar.

The progression of Luther's thought led him to view the concept of a "sacrificial" mass as the epitome of medieval abuses on the part of the Church of Rome. James McCue, writing four centuries later for the Lutheran-Roman Catholic Dialogue series, writes, "Indeed, there are few things which Luther finds more offensive than the Roman understanding of the mass, and the fundamental distortion against which he protests is the idea that the mass is a sacrifice."²

The Roman Catholic defense of the sacrifice of the mass was second in controversialist treatment only to the defense of the papacy at this time.³ For his part, Cajetan was no less adamant in supporting the mass's sacrificial character than Luther was in his opposition to it.

The central purpose of this article is to trace, historically and theologically, the development of both Luther's and Cajetan's understanding of the mass in this context. Each theologian is treated separately better to follow the transition of thought on the topic. Furthermore, the investigation of the writings can be done inclusive of both the respective Lutheran and Roman Catholic "canonization" of these ideas (as established in the Lutheran Book of Concord, which was completed in 1580, and the Roman Catholic Council of Trent, whose teachings were officially promulgated in 1563). The theological developments of both men represent the cornerstones of these official statements of faith in the two communions.

LUTHER'S THOUGHT AND WRITINGS

Carl Wisloff considers the possibility that Luther's first recorded reaction against the mass as sacrifice may be found in his 1519 *Sermon on the Lord's Supper*. Luther here states:

For it has not been instituted for his sake, that it may please God, but rather for our sakes, that we may use it rightly It will do nothing but harm everywhere if it is only *opus operatum*; it must become *opus operantis* . . . it is not enough that the sacrament simply takes place; it must also be used in faith.⁴

Wisloff mitigates the assumption that this section of the sermon is specifically directed against the sacrifice of the mass by pointing out that such a position can only be substantiated against the background of Luther's later criticism.⁵

That Luther applies the traditional scholastic terms of the mass's operation indicates that he is still theologically tied into the

MICHAEL J. TORI is Assistant Professor of Religious Studies at Marist College, Poughkeepsie, New York.

traditional sacrificial character of the mass in 1519, although his understanding may be nuanced by his earlier recorded reactions against scholasticism. As far as the above passage from *The Sermon on The Lord's Supper* is concerned, it quite likely represents Luther's desire to stress the *opus operantis* (focusing on a working faith) side of the sacramental understanding over (though not necessarily against) that of the *opus operatum* (which focused on a faithless work).⁶

What Luther does can most likely be seen as a correction and realignment of the priorities of the mass back towards its faith-oriented role in the church.

This distinction is elaborated by Luther in the third part of his trilogy on the sacraments; that is, his scholarly treatment of the Eucharist in *The Blessed Sacrament of the Holy and True Body of Christ, and the Brotherhoods* (1519). He focuses on the sacrament as the communion of saints and a work of faith, while drawing attention to the misunderstandings that have arisen around its essential features. He does not here condemn the sacrificial character of the mass, but early signs of the disproportionate emphasis on the *opus operatum* are assailed by Luther:

There are many who regardless of this change of love and faith rely upon the fact that the Mass is, as they say, *opus gratum opere operato*, that is, a work which of itself pleases God, even though they who perform it do not please him . . . I grant everyone [the right to] his opinion, but such fables do not please me. . . . For it was not instituted for its own sake, that it might please God, but for our sake, that we might use it right, exercise our faith by it, and through it become pleasing to God. . . . so it is not enough that the sacrament be merely completed (that is, *opus operatum*); it must also be used in faith (that is *opus operantis*). And we must take care lest with such dangerous interpretations the sacrament's power and virtue be lost on us, and faith perish utterly through the false security of the [outwardly] completed sacrament (AE, 35: 63).

What Luther does can most likely be seen as a correction and realignment of the priorities of the mass back towards its faith-oriented role in the church. He in essence downplays the *opus operatum* to the point where it intentionally undermines the sacrificial character of the mass. Luther stresses the communal faith experience at the expense of the sacerdotal experience. When Luther continues with the statement that "Christ on the cross was also a completed work which was well pleasing to God" (AE, 35: 63), he is well on his way to developing his theology against the mass as sacrifice.

Luther's subsequent scholarly work on the Eucharist, *The Treatise on the New Testament, That Is, the Holy Mass* (1520), represents a decisive break from the mass as sacrifice and supplants it with the more biblical image of the Lord's supper as a new testament of God's love towards his church. Luther begins the second part of the treatise (which concerns the abuses of the mass) with the exclamatory remark, "But see what they have made of the mass!" (AE, 35:90).

Luther's concerns here include (1) the inability of the laity to understand the words of God's promise in the mass if they are not spoken in the vernacular (or if spoken "secretly" by the priest); (2) the loss of the idea of the mass as "testament" and as a "feast for the soul"; and (3) that a false presumptuous trust in works replaces faith and the promise of God. He summarizes,

Now if we have properly understood what has been said above, namely, that the mass is nothing else than a testament and sacrament in which God makes a pledge to us and gives us grace and mercy, I think it is not fitting that we should make a good work or merit out of it. For a testament is not *beneficium acceptum, sed datum*.⁷

Once the mass has been eliminated as a "work," it is only a short step for Luther to point out that there is now no way to consider it as a *sacrificial* work offered by priests.⁸ He writes, "Now since almost everyone has made out of the mass a sacrifice which they offer to God—which, without doubt, is the third and very worst abuse—we must clearly distinguish between what we offer and what we do not offer in the mass" (AE, 35: 94).

Luther argues that the offerings of the sacramental rite are limited to those of collections of food or money and prayer during which God is thanked and the food is blessed. Outside of these offerings (which he traces to Old Testament traditions as well as Acts 4:34–35, 1 Timothy 4:4–5, and 1 Corinthians 11:21, 33), Luther sees "nothing left in the mass to give it the name sacrifice" (AE, 35:97).

Luther does not abandon the concept of sacrifice *in toto*. His primary concern is to point out that Christians are not offering Christ. He will make the argument, however, that there is participation in *some* form of sacrifice. But what form does this sacrifice take? There is another sacrifice that, Luther argues, belongs preeminently (though not exclusively) to the mass: believers are joined together in Christ's unique sacrifice, and Christ then offers Christians to God on the merits of his death. Luther writes:

From these words [particular passages concerning sacrifice in Hebrews and Romans] we learn that we do not offer Christ as a sacrifice, but that Christ offers us. And in this way it is permissible, yes profitable, to call the mass a sacrifice; not on its own account, but because we offer ourselves as a sacrifice along with Christ. That is, we lay ourselves on Christ by a firm faith in his testament and do not otherwise appear before God with our prayer, praise, and sacrifice except through Christ and his mediation If the mass were so understood and for this reason were called a sacrifice, it would be well. Not that we offer the sacrament,

but that by our praise, prayer, and sacrifice we move him and give him occasion to offer himself for us in heaven and ourselves with him . . . Few understand the mass in this way. For they suppose that only the priest offers the mass as sacrifice before God (AE, 35: 99–100).

Luther clearly does not mean that this is the only time Christ intercedes for believers. Rather, the sacramental participation of the whole church represents a special moment for the community to unite its sacrifice to join the communal sacrifice with the incessant sacrifice of Christ (who is “a priest forever”) in heaven. The implications of this led Luther to his doctrine of the priesthood of all believers, in which “Each and all are, therefore, equally spiritual priests before God,” and in which “Faith alone is the true priestly office” (AE, 35: 101).

Every true Christian really ought to know that in the New Testament there is no outward, visible priest, except those whom the devil has exalted and set up through human lies.

The year 1520 also saw the publication of Luther’s most vitriolic (and perhaps best remembered) attack against the church in Rome concerning the sacraments in general and against the sacrament of the altar in particular. Of the three abuses he focuses on in *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church*—the withholding of the cup, the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the mass as sacrifice—it is the last of these that he calls “by far the most wicked.”⁹

These are not entirely new themes. Rather, these familiar themes are stated with a new forcefulness that is not only more direct and more comprehensive of the abuses associated with the mass, but that also seeks to reform the entire Roman sacramental system. The attack was so severe that even they who had supported his earlier work (such as Erasmus, Staupitz, and Henry VIII) could not continue to abide Luther’s new approach.¹⁰

The treatise elaborates on the mass as “Christ’s testament, which he left behind him at his death to be distributed among his believers.”¹¹ This testament, as his followers were by then aware, must be accessed by faith alone, for “where there is the Word of the promising God, there must necessarily be the faith of the accepting man.”¹²

While the first part of *The Babylonian Captivity*’s polemic against the Roman understanding of the mass focuses on its abuse as a work, the second section centers on its abuse as sacrifice (or what Luther calls “the second stumbling block”). Luther directly confronts (by his own admission) the long-established tradition of the church practiced throughout the world, its canon and liturgy, and the sayings of the holy fathers. Luther confronts all this authority with that of Christ’s institution of the sacrament. He

writes, “Over against all these things, firmly entrenched as they are, we must resolutely set the words and example of Christ,” and that not doing so risks losing “the whole gospel and its comfort.”¹³

An interesting and significant theological development occurs here, however. Luther is no longer content to use the language of the scholastics as to the efficacy of the sacrament as a work. He no longer attempts a realignment of the *opus operatum* and the *opus operantis*. According to Luther the Roman church “invented the distinction between the *opus operatum* and the *opus operantis*, so as to be free to live wicked lives themselves and yet benefit other men.” This idea builds on Luther’s theory that, if the only thing that a priest is actually “offering” at the mass is prayer, then the spiritual condition of the presider does in fact make a difference to God (since “God does not listen to sinners”). Nevertheless, he points out that such an offering of prayer is not to be confused with the erroneous idea of a priestly offering of a sacrifice of Christ. For while the “prayers of sacrifice” ascend from the people (through the priest), the real relevance of the sacrament is that testament (or promise) that descends from God to man.¹⁴

In late 1521 Luther published *The Misuse of the Mass* aimed directly at the Roman mass. This work (for the most part, a German translation of his *De abroganda missa privata Martini Lutheri sententia*) brings the polemics to a new level by proclaiming that the Roman sacrifice is in opposition to the unique sacrifice of Christ as well as in opposition to the sole mediative role of Christ—a deceit which leads to many idolatrous and perverse beliefs.¹⁵ In some of the most polemical and direct language that Luther had utilized up to that time, he writes:

How infamously has Satan betrayed himself, against his will, in that through the pope in this beginning [the decretals of Gregory IX] he has told the truth, namely that he wished to change Christ’s priesthood as well as his law . . . so that now the pope and no longer Christ is the priest . . . Every true Christian really ought to know that in the New Testament there is no outward, visible priest, except those whom the devil has exalted and set up through human lies. We have only one single priest, Christ, who has sacrificed himself for us and all of us with him . . . This is a spiritual priesthood, held in common by all Christians, through which we are all priests with Christ. . . . we need no priest or mediator other than Christ (AE, 36: 138).

After a discourse against the inefficacy of the Roman priesthood as it was then understood, Luther applied his pen once again toward a proper understanding of what constitutes Christian sacrifice. The true sacrifice is when men sacrifice of themselves—to “put themselves to death and offer themselves to God as a holy sacrifice” (AE, 36:145). Luther builds on his earlier and more limited exposition of “sacrifice” as prayer. This is in contrast to the Roman sacrificial notion, about which Luther queries, “Tell us, you priests of Baal: Where is it written [in Scripture], that the mass is a sacrifice. . . . Do you not hear? Christ has sacrificed himself once [Heb 7:27; 9:25–26]; henceforth, he will not be sacrificed by anyone else” (AE, 36:146–147). The resulting position is that only two genuine forms of sacrifice may be found in the New Testament: that of the cross, and that of praise (AE, 36: 162).

The second part of the treatise continues to separate the idea of “promise” from that of “sacrifice” (“for sacrifice and promise are further apart than sunrise and sunset”). The promise is the body of Christ and his blood for the forgiveness of sins, and this is due to Christ’s single sacrifice on the cross which is received by the Christian only in faith (not by any work or offering of sacrifice on our part) (AE, 36: 169 ff).

Luther, by his own admission, has not worked out all of the fine points to be considered in the new liturgy, but he does “repudiate everything that smacks of sacrifice.”

To further emphasize his polemical position, Luther concludes this work with a clearly drawn-out chart comparing “The Ten Commandments of God” against “The Ten Commandments of the Pope,” paralleled by “The Priesthood of Christ” against “The Priesthood of the Pope” (AE, 36: 218–219). This literary device is, in one sense at least, comparable to the summary methodology of the anathemas found in the conciliar canons of Trent (although with a sardonic tone to it). Needless, to say, the Roman church appears as badly in this summary as the Protestants appear in the Tridentine writings.

In the next significant writing against the mass as sacrifice, *An Order of Mass and Communion for the Church at Wittenberg* (1523), Luther looks for a middle ground of worship between the two extremes of the radicals and the defenders of the status quo. In what would later prove to be a moderating voice in Reformation thought, Luther maintains that the mass should be cleansed, not abrogated.¹⁶ “It is not now nor ever has been our intention to abolish the liturgical service of God completely,” Luther writes, “But rather to purify the one that is now in use from the wretched accretions which corrupt it and to point out an evangelical use.”¹⁷

The *Order for Mass* is not a scholarly theological work against the papacy, nor is it comparable in tone to the earlier works. Rather, it is a pastoral work intended for the practice of liturgy in Luther’s own parish. In one sense, despite the polemical overtones, Luther appears to have no taste for fighting papists in 1523. His concern at this time seems to be aimed at the establishment of temporal, educational, and ecclesiastical authority in the reformed churches of Germany.¹⁸

Nonetheless, Luther leaves no room for misunderstanding concerning the accretions: “What I am speaking of is the [Roman] canon, that abominable concoction drawn from everyone’s sewer and cesspool. The mass becomes a sacrifice.”¹⁹ An exasperated Luther expresses no desire to get into the fray again, however. He only desires to keep such perceived abuses out of the purified mass:

[But] who can even name the causes for which the mass was made a sacrifice? . . . in this book we are not going to prove

again that the mass is neither sacrifice nor a good work—we have amply demonstrated that elsewhere. We do accept it as a sacrament, a testament, the blessing (as in Latin), the *Eucharist* (as in Greek), the Table of the Lord, the Lord’s Supper, the Lord’s Memorial, communion, or by whatever evangelical name you please, so long as it is not polluted by the name of sacrifice or work.²⁰

Luther, by his own admission, has not worked out all of the fine points to be considered in the new liturgy, but he does “repudiate everything that smacks of sacrifice.” Those things to be repudiated include an omission of the *complenda* (or final collect) “because it sounds too much like sacrifice.” He adds that those points of disagreement which are not necessary to the sacrament itself can also be dispensed with since, “All that matters is that the Words of Institution should be kept intact and that everything should be done by faith.”²¹

The remainder of Luther’s writings on the subject of the sacrifice of the mass do not present any further theological development. Rather, even treatises that deal specifically with the nature of the sacrament, such as the *Confession Concerning Christ’s Supper* (1528), are really personal reflections of a more mature Luther rather than writings of a polemical nature. True enough, he does define the mass as “the greatest of all abominations” when it is “preached or sold as a sacrifice or good work.” Yet this rhetoric is used primarily as a means of introducing the justification for expressing his concerns against monastic and religious foundations.²²

Later works of Luther’s that concern the sacrifice of the mass are an enshrinement of earlier ideas rather than a development of them. The Lutheran Book of Concord, the Small Catechism (1529), the Large Catechism (1529), and the Smalcald Articles (1537) make statements that serve to reinforce the theological progress made in the more polemical treatises.

The Small Catechism stays away from the term *sacrifice* (perhaps to avoid confusion among the less literate pastorate and laity). The focus is clearly on the words of institution and the faith response of the recipient:

What is the benefit of such eating and drinking?

Answer: We are told in the words “for you” and “for the forgiveness of sins.” By these words the forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation are given to us in the sacrament, for where there is forgiveness of sins, there is also life and salvation.

How can bodily eating and drinking produce such great effects?

Answer: The eating and drinking do not in themselves produce them, but the words “for you” and “for the forgiveness of sins.” . . . and he who believes these words has what they say and declare: the forgiveness of sins.²³

In this short summary, Luther has incorporated all the basic themes addressed in his previous works on the sacrament: the sacrament as the promise and testament of God, the centrality of the words of institution, and the role of faith as the sole means of the sacrament’s efficacy in the life of the Christian. All the polemics against priesthood, works, and sacrifice can be seen as but a means to bring Luther to these few simple instructions.

The Large Catechism is an elaboration on the themes of the smaller version, and no part of it focuses specifically on the mass as sacrifice. Additional issues here include a defense of the real presence, the proper reception of the sacrament, and the frequency of reception.²⁴

The Smalcald Articles represent the final major treatment of the mass as sacrifice for Luther. Three major points are elaborated in the section of the articles that concerns the sacrament (Part II, Article II). These include (1) reasons why the Roman understanding of the mass should be abandoned, (2) Luther's realization that his differences with Rome over the mass would be the decisive issue at the impending council,²⁵ and finally (3) a treatment of the abuses which result from a misunderstanding of the mass.

After introducing the mass once again as "the most horrible abomination" when seen as a sacrifice or work, Luther offers five reasons for its discontinuance: (1) it is a purely human invention; (2) the mass is unnecessary and can be omitted without sin and danger;²⁶ (3) the sacrament can be better understood, and operate in a more blessed manner, apart from the "fictitious" manner in which it functions under Rome's auspices; (4) "unspeakable abuses" (such as the buying and selling of masses) would be curbed without the Roman mass; and (5) it is a human work whereby men try to justify themselves, in direct contradiction to the "fundamental article" of Christ's mediation.²⁷

He thus considers the division to be "eternal," and states that the institution of the papacy itself would fall if the mass were to be eliminated.

In recognizing the mass as "the decisive issue" between the two communions, Luther sagely acknowledges, "Even if it were possible for the papists to make concessions to us in all other articles, it would not be possible for them to yield on this article."²⁸ He thus considers the division to be "eternal," and states that the institution of the papacy itself would fall if the mass were to be eliminated.

Finally, Luther lists the abuses that have resulted from the mass as a work and sacrifice. These include (1) a preoccupation with purgatory (an "illusion of the devil") as being contrary to "the fundamental article" that Christ alone saves souls; (2) apparitions of departed souls demanding masses; (3) pilgrimages of idolatry; (4) the rise of fraternities of prayer, works of piety, and special masses on the part of either monasteries or groups of clergymen; (5) relics, and the claim that, like the mass, they effect the forgiveness of sin; and (6) the "precious indulgences" granted to the living and the dead, by which "the pope sells the merits of Christ, and by which the first article is contradicted ("the merits of Christ are obtained by grace, through faith, without our work or pennies.")²⁹

In summary, the theological development against the mass as sacrifice can be seen as moving through three distinct stages. First,

there is the attempt to realign the disproportionate understanding of the mass in the scholastic terms of *opus operatum* and *opus operantis* (*The Sermon on the Lord's Supper* and *The Blessed Sacrament of the Holy and True Body and Blood of Christ*). Second, there is the polemical and theological necessity of discrediting the idea of offering in terms of a sacrificing priesthood (especially in *The Babylonian Captivity* and *The Misuse of the Mass*). Third, and finally, there is the replacement of the discarded Roman idea of the sacrament as a work, with that of the Lutheran concept of promise and testament assented to by faith, (which is apparent in all the theological works on the topic following *The Sermon on the Lord's Supper*). It should be noted that there is considerable overlap in the development of these themes, and that these themes are not limited to any specific work or specific period.

CAJETAN'S THOUGHT AND WRITINGS

Cajetan's first treatment of the mass as sacrifice took place years before his confrontation with Martin Luther. In 1510, Cajetan wrote a treatise in classic scholastic disputation format in response to Scottish nominalist trends (and "the common error of many"). Such theological trends had proclaimed that the *ex opere operato* effect of the mass is necessarily limited, since it is less than the effects of the sacrifice of Christ on the cross. In his work on the subject, Cajetan holds to the Thomistic teaching that the effects of the sacrifice of the mass are as unlimited as those of the cross.³⁰ This position continued to be the dominant understanding of Roman Catholics.

In a distinction not unfamiliar to the early works of Luther, Cajetan maintains two parts of the mass as contributing to the efficacy of the sacrament: sacrifice and prayer. He writes:

Certain distinctions are necessary when discussing the question [of the mass as sacrifice]. First we note that the mass has two parts, sacrifice and prayer, of which the sacrifice is the foremost part. Likewise, the effect of both these parts of the mass is of several kinds, namely, merit, intercession, and satisfaction. Furthermore, there are two kinds of efficacy of the sacrament. First is that efficacy which depends only on the administration of the sacrament (*ex opere operato*). Second is the efficacy the priest and participant bring with them to the sacrament (*ex opere operantis*).³¹

After concluding that the sacramental aspect of the mass is only efficacious for those who receive it, Cajetan goes on to discuss the sacrificial aspect in some detail.

Cajetan distinguishes the sacramental aspects into the administration and its reception by the participant. The former represents unlimited merits, intercession, and satisfaction because it is infinite, just as the merit of Christ's passion "is even more acceptable to God than all the sinners of the world."³² The Dominican made an important clarification at this point: while the effect of Christ crucified is of infinite sufficiency, it is not of infinite or equal efficacy for each individual. The result is that "when the sacrifice of the mass is considered dependent on its administration alone, it has an infinite power," since it is not being applied to particular individuals, but for the sins of all humankind. It is a continuation of Christ's eternal sacrifice for all.

When, however, the mass is considered in terms of its application to individuals, its “effect is finite” (that is, limited). This is so because the degree of satisfaction (or merits and intercession, for that matter) “depends on the devotion of those who offer it or those for whom it is offered.”³³ Cajetan here is reacting to the same nominalist abuses of the medieval concept of *operato* and *operantis* that Luther struggled with in his first writings on the mass. Cajetan is already addressing those authors (such as d’Ailly and his disciple Gabriel Biel) who caused such consternation for Luther. It can be argued that Luther, in his reaction against scholastic definitions concerning the mass, was reacting to controversial errors of nominalism, and not to the more sound doctrines of Aquinas and the *via antiqua*.³⁴

He argues that the operative act of the sacrament then is not the recognition of a memorial, but the acting out or continued participation in the act itself.

Cajetan’s position is really not that far removed from the earlier realignment of the scholastic categories mentioned above by Luther. In fact, Cajetan’s assertion “To the degree that one has devotion for the sacrifice, satisfaction is applied to him out of the infinite power of the mass” bears a notable resemblance to Luther’s primacy of faith in the efficacy of the sacrament. In one view, both Cajetan and Luther can be seen as fighting the same battle in their earliest writings on the sacrifice of the mass, and this is because each was fighting the same opponent—the Pelagian-influenced nominalism of the *via moderna* (which had come to the continent from its stronghold in the English isles).³⁵

Cajetan’s next major discussion of the sacrifice of the mass did not take place for another fifteen years. At Pope Clement VII’s request, the Cardinal prepared an apologetic tool for a legate to Zurich to instruct Zwingli’s followers on proper eucharistic theology, *Errors in a Booklet on the Lord’s Supper—Instruction for the Nuntio* (1525).³⁶ Not surprisingly, the offer for instruction was refused. Cajetan’s writing was a reaction against the ideas found in Zwingli’s *De vera et falsa religione commentarius*, published earlier that year.

Cajetan addresses twelve errors. The ninth of these is specifically concerned with the Eucharist as sacrifice. This text is a refutation of Zwinglian suppositions, and not those of Luther, but Cajetan could just as well be confronting arguments made by members of the German reform movement. As did Luther, the Zwinglians invoked Hebrews (chapters 9 and 10) to argue that the cross was a single and sufficient sacrifice, and that no other sacrifice is required for the redemption of souls.

Cajetan responds to the Swiss position by arguing that “it judges that the sacrifice of the altar is a different sacrifice from the sacrifice offered on the cross.” He then goes on to invoke the now-familiar Roman formula that there is only one sacrifice, although

there is a difference in the manner of offering. “Then it was offered corporeally, but now it is offered spiritually.” Cajetan teaches that the spiritual offering does not render the original form of the sacrifice as insufficient (“which we profess as one and all-sufficient for all eternity”). Nor is Cajetan saying that a merely spiritual body is offered on the altar, but rather that “the natural body of Christ is offered in a spiritual oblation in the sacrifice of the altar.”³⁷

As to the argument that the sacrifice of the mass is not found in Scripture, Cajetan’s rejoinders from the Pauline corpus (especially 1 Corinthians 11) strive to argue the opposite. He states that Paul, in handing down that which was given to him by the Lord, is supporting both the institution of sacrament and sacrifice (a “sharing of the body and blood of Christ”). He also offers evidence from James, the martyrs, and church councils (particularly Constantinople I). He concludes by saying that “even if nothing were written, still sufficient witness that this sacrifice was instituted by Christ and handed on by the Apostles is found in the continuous tradition, not just in one part of the world, but of the universal church spread over the whole world.”³⁸ In this way, he argues, the sacrifice of the mass cannot be considered as an institution of the pope, the Latin Church, or the Eastern (Greek) Church.

At this time in his career, and for the next several years, Cajetan turned his attention to other areas—specifically, an intense study of Scripture (and a revision of his own exegetical methods), as well as his commentary on the *Summa Theologiae* of Aquinas. By 1531, however, Cajetan once again confronted criticism of the mass as sacrifice. This time his treatise *The Sacrifice of the Mass and its Rites—Against the Lutherans* is directly aimed at Lutheran teachings, and most likely was a reaction against his recent reading of the Augsburg Confession of 1530. He wrote to Clement VII, “Recently, a Lutheran writing was given me, which, although it affirms the true body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, denies the sacrifice of the mass.”³⁹

Reflecting his new exegetical approach, Cajetan approaches the topic almost exclusively from Scripture. He begins his treatise with an overview of points of agreement and difference. Theologians in both groups agree that the mass can be called a “commemorative sacrifice” since the true body and blood are received in commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross. Nevertheless, two Lutheran “denials” are specifically pointed out: (1) a denial that this real body and blood of Christ are offered to God on the altar, and (2) a denial that there is a victim or sacrifice for the expiation of sins (for either the living or the dead) present on the altar. Both denials, he states, are based on the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Cajetan counters with Christ’s institution of the memorial as sacrifice in Luke 22 and 1 Corinthians 11. Of utmost importance to Cajetan’s argument is the action verb “do,” as in “do this in memory of me” (thus anticipating the subsequent arguments based on the Greek text). He argues that the operative act of the sacrament then is not the recognition of a memorial, but the acting out or continued participation in the act itself. And that act is characterized not simply as the making present of Christ for believers, but doing this in the same manner that Christ did himself—broken and offered to God on our behalf.

Cajetan next addresses three specific but closely related Lutheran concerns: (1) the question of repeating the “singular” sacrifice indicated in Hebrews, (2) the complete sufficiency of the single sacrifice, and (3) that all sins have been destroyed (expiated) by the grace of the new covenant, thereby eliminating the need for another offering for sins. Cajetan’s response here is to reiterate the idea of the “oneness” of the single sacrifice of the cross being the same as that which is “offered derivatively each day by the same Christ through the ministers in his Church.”⁴⁰ In language that will later be reflected in the Council of Trent’s decree on the mass, Cajetan writes:

As the new covenant has a bloody offering, so it has an unbloody offering. We confess that Jesus Christ was the bloody offering offered once on the altar of the cross for the sins of the whole world. We also confess that the unbloody offering was instituted by Christ, that is, his body and blood under the form of bread and wine, as described in the Scripture passages treated above. But the bloody offering and the unbloody offering are not two offerings, but one and the same. . . . But the way in which this identical victim is offered is different.⁴¹

Referring the argument back to Hebrews 9:25, Cajetan then distinguishes between merely *repeating* a sacrifice and that of repeating the one sacrifice *in the manner and form* which Jesus instituted for his church. The “repeating” of sacrifice condemned in Hebrews is therefore explained as a reference to the inadequacy of old covenantal offerings, not to the continuance of the one perfect sacrifice of Christ offered daily in the mass.⁴² It is not a sacrifice repeated, but *the* sacrifice continued.

Referring the argument back to Hebrews 9:25, Cajetan then distinguishes between merely repeating a sacrifice and that of repeating the one sacrifice in the manner and form which Jesus instituted for his church.

In 1531, Cajetan also wrote a brief but optimistic tract (entitled *Guidelines for Concessions to the Lutherans*) in which he seeks to convince Rome of how to incorporate the goals of the reformers with the teachings of the Roman church. In this treatise Cajetan should merit the title of reformer for the laudable goals that he sets out. Despite the fact that they were rejected by the Roman Curia,⁴³ the list of concessions seeks to outline a distinction between those laws and practices that are clearly of divine institution and those that are of ecclesiastical origin. This is a schema very similar to that eventually adopted at Vatican Council II (*traditio* versus *traditiones*).

Perhaps Cajetan could go no further than he had in his refutation of the Lutheran conception of the mass. After all, he had invoked patristic sources, referenced earlier councils, and even gone so far as to revise his entire exegetical style in order better to argue from Scripture and thus meet on a level playing field. Subsequently, the Dominican cardinal no longer attempted to deal with the issue, and relegated it as one that was not open to concession. Therefore, his last two polemical works against the Lutherans (*Four Lutheran Errors* [1531], and *Faith and Works—Against the Lutherans* [1532]) do not treat the issue of the mass as sacrifice. This is not to say that he does not use the language of sacrifice in his arguments,⁴⁴ but rather that the item is clearly not one of concession or even worthy of controversy in his view. It is simply treated as an accepted reality of Roman Catholic teaching.

In summary, it is worth noting that the Tridentine decree on the mass as sacrifice incorporates not only the themes and language expressed by Cajetan, but also utilizes Cajetan’s earlier emphasis on proper devotion for the reception of the sacrament. The council fathers wrote:

And inasmuch as in this divine sacrifice which is celebrated in the mass is contained and immolated in an unbloody manner the same Christ who once offered Himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross, the holy council teaches that this is truly propitiatory and has this effect, that if we, contrite and penitent, with sincere heart and upright faith, with fear and reverence, draw nigh to God, we obtain mercy and find grace in seasonable aid [Heb 4:16]. For, appeased by this sacrifice, the Lord grants the grace and gift of penitence and pardons even the gravest of crimes and sins.⁴⁵

The theology may not be unique to Cajetan, having references as it does in earlier church writings, but it is a concise statement of the views traditionally taught by the church and defended by the Dominican Cardinal in a controversial time.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In Cajetan, then, there is a development of the teaching of the mass as sacrifice that follows a pattern very similar to that of Luther himself. In the movement of thought, it can be seen that Cajetan, like Luther, begins his treatises with a reaction against a misunderstanding of the *operata* and *operantis* arguments, then moves into a scriptural mode for understanding Old Testament sacrifice and the sacrifice of the new covenant. Finally, Cajetan establishes the primacy of “devotion” (which can be seen as the equivalent of “faith” in Luther’s writings) for the efficacious reception of the sacrament. Both men react against the same nominalist distortions prevalent in the medieval understanding of the sacramental system, just as both move toward theological insights that stress faith, scriptural proofs, and the sufficiency of the sacrifice of the cross (though not necessarily its efficacy in all cases).

Key theological differences between the two reformation controversialists can be noted in the manner in which the functional components of the sacrament are considered. Luther, for his contribution, makes a basic distinction between sacrifice (of prayer) and a promise or testament (received in faith). On the other hand, Cajetan makes the basic distinction between

sacrifice offered in faith and sacrament received in faith. This distinction, however subtle, allowed the Roman Catholic “reformer” to maintain the ongoing sacerdotal institution of sacrifice. Meanwhile, his Lutheran counterpart necessarily eliminated the sacrificing priesthood in the development of his theology of *sola fide* and the resulting doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers.

Additionally, Cajetan argues from the established Roman notion of sacred tradition in support of his arguments, especially where Scripture is not particularly clear on a given doctrinal point. Luther, on the other hand, remains loyal to his position of *sola Scriptura* and relegates those unclear areas to a place of little or no consequence. Without recourse to tradition, however, Luther ends

up fighting a two-front war on eucharistic theology against both Rome and the “fanatics” in the radical wing of the Reformation.

Despite the differences in development, both Cajetan and Luther were historically able to further the understanding of sacramental theology in ways that mutually informed each other. As Jared Wicks concludes, a Lutheran-informed Cajetan passed on works of “enduring significance” that eventually helped to reshape the landscape of Roman Catholicism.⁴⁶ Perhaps Luther, who saw the mass as “the decisive issue” between Lutherans and Roman Catholics,⁴⁷ would be amazed by “the growing harmony in ways of thinking about the eucharistic sacrifice” expressed in the Lutheran-Roman Catholic dialogue in the second half of the twentieth century.⁴⁸

NOTES

1. Jared Wicks, *Cajetan Responds: A Reader in Reformation Controversy* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1978), 21.

2. James F. McCue, “Luther and Roman Catholicism on the Mass as Sacrifice,” in *Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue III: The Eucharist as Sacrifice*, ed. Paul C. Empie and T. Austin Murphy (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1965), 46.

3. David Bagchi, *Luther's Earliest Opponents: Catholic Controversialists, 1518-1525* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 117.

4. Quoted in Carl F. Wisloff, *The Gift of Communion: Luther's Controversy with Rome on Eucharistic Sacrifice*, trans. Joseph M. Shaw (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1964), 15.

5. *Ibid.*, citing N. M. Halmer, *Der literarische Kampf Luthers und Melancthon gegen das Opfer heiligen Messe*, 1943, p. 64. Cf. Wisloff, note 42, 189.

6. Wisloff, 16.

7. *Ibid.*, 93. (Cf. note 21, page 93, where the Latin is translated as not “a benefit received but conferred.”)

8. It is a matter of debate as to whether Luther viewed the related ideas of the Mass as a “work” and the Mass as a “sacrifice” as being two distinct abuses, or two intertwined facets of the same abuse. See Wisloff, pages 41–72, for a detailed account of the distinction.

9. In *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings*, ed. Timothy F. Lull, with a preface by Jaroslav Pelikan (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 291. All subsequent references to this volume will be abbreviated as *MLBTW*, followed by the appropriate page numbers.

10. Jared Wicks, *Luther and His Spiritual Legacy*, *Theology and Life Series 7* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1983): 94–95.

11. *MLBTW*, 293.

12. *Ibid.*, 295.

13. *Ibid.*, 307.

14. *Ibid.*, 311, 312. Luther cites John 9:31.

15. Wicks, *Spiritual Legacy*, 98.

16. Eric W. Gritsch, *Martin—God's Court Jester: Luther in Retrospect* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 55.

17. *MLBTW*, 450.

18. As witnessed by his exegetical work on the Bible, and such works as *Concerning the Order of Public Worship* (1522), *Temporal Authority—To What Extent It Should Be Obeyed* (1523), and his *Letter To The Councilmen of All Cities in Germany That They Establish and Maintain Christian Schools* (1524).

19. *MLBTW*, 451.

20. *Ibid.*, 452.

21. *Ibid.*, 456, 459, 461.

22. *Ibid.*, 60–61.

23. *Ibid.*, 487–489.

24. Tappert, 447–457.

25. Luther here is thinking in terms of the supposed reconvening of the aborted council called in Mantua by Pope Paul III, as mentioned in his preface to the articles. See *MLBTW*, 497.

26. This does not mean the Mass itself in the Lutheran sense, but rather those masses that operate under the Roman understanding of them as sacrifice.

27. *MLBTW*, 503–504.

28. *Ibid.*, 505.

29. *Ibid.*, 505–508.

30. Heiko A. Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought Illustrated by Key Documents*, 2d ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), 246–247.

31. “Cajetan: The Celebration of the Mass,” in Oberman, 256–264.

32. *Ibid.*, 258.

33. *Ibid.*

34. It has remained a question as to the extent of Luther's familiarity with Thomism, and Aquinas was certainly not among the primary antagonists in Luther's *Disputation against Scholastic Theology* (1517). Thomism did not receive its unique role in Catholic theology until the Council of Trent, and Eck is regarded as having been forced to work within nominalist categories in the Leipzig meeting with Luther. See Oberman, 250.

35. The *via moderna* (of Ockham and eventually of Biel) stressed the freedom of God and his unpredictable will and actions (known as the *potentia absoluta*). In this way, God was seen as being “influenced” by the ecclesiastical work of indulgences and sacraments. This was in contrast to the predictable will and action of God (the *de potentia ordinata* described by Aquinas) that works along with the sacramental church in its reward of virtue and punishment of vice. See Bagchi, 25–27.

36. Wicks, *Cajetan Responds*, 153–73.

37. *Ibid.*, 168, 169.

38. *Ibid.*, 169–171.

39. *Ibid.*, 40, 189.

40. *Ibid.*, 197.

41. *Ibid.*, 198.

42. *Ibid.*, 199.

43. *Ibid.*, 201–203, 41.

44. In *Four Lutheran Errors*, Cajetan discusses the topic of Communion under both forms by referring to the “sacrifice of the chalice.” See *Cajetan Responds*, 208–09.

45. Trent Session 22, Ch. 2, in *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, trans. H. J. Schroeder, O.P. (Rockford, IL: TAN, 1978), 145–146.

46. Wicks, *Cajetan Responds*, 45–46.

47. See note 48.

48. See “The Eucharist: A Lutheran-Roman Catholic Statement,” in *Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue III*, 191.

Killing to Make Alive Again

Cruciform Proclamation in the Writings of Gerhard O. Forde

DAVID R. LIEFELD



CRUCIFORM PROCLAMATION IS NOT MERELY a preaching *about* the cross, but a preaching that is actually *shaped by* the cross. Paul writes that the cross is the power of God. This is not past tense; it is present tense. Therefore, cruciform proclamation actually *does* the cross to those who hear it. It is the tool of the Holy Spirit by which He kills and makes alive again. Cruciform proclamation takes seriously what Luther said about being a theologian of the cross, namely, that what is visible of God is visible only through suffering and the cross.

One voice in the wilderness of contemporary debates over what constitutes effective preaching is Gerhard O. Forde, recently retired from the faculty of Luther Seminary in St. Paul, Minnesota. After serving briefly in the department of historical theology, Forde served most of his career in systematic theology. Nevertheless, his systematic always had an historical cast: it was the theology of Luther revived. While a confessional Lutheran must carefully critique Forde's presuppositions,¹ he must also recognize in Forde's work Luther's own dynamic grasp of law and gospel—a dynamic as often obscured in the tradition that bears Luther's name as in the traditions of those who overtly oppose him.

Over a period of twenty-five years, Forde wrote four books with a variety of themes, but which all emphasized the preached God. In 1972 he published *Where God Meets Man: Luther's Down-to-Earth Approach to the Gospel*. His provocative book *Justification by Faith: A Matter of Death and Life* was published in 1982. In 1990 came his *Theology Is for Proclamation*. Finally, in 1997, he produced *On Being a Theologian of the Cross: Reflections on Luther's Heidelberg Disputation, 1518*. In each book Forde elaborated a theme regarding the proper understanding of law and gospel which was announced early in his 1972 book: "It is a question of how you hear the words, *what they actually do to you*."²

For Forde, law and gospel can never be reduced to the content of a sentence—as if the proper distinction between the two were merely a matter of dividing up the Bible's verses into the proper categories. Nor can the gospel successfully be reduced to a simple platitude like "Jesus died for your sins." Instead, for Forde, the proper distinction between law and gospel always has to do with

the way in which any verse, any sentence, any platitude is *used*. Used, not merely by the feeble designs of a human agent, but first and foremost by the divine Spirit who, in the show-stopping words of the Augsburg Confession, works faith when and where he pleases in those who hear the gospel (AC v). Used, according to Forde, first to kill in order that the Spirit might make alive again. Law and gospel, writes Forde, "do not designate merely aspects or parts of the text but the manner in which the text functions relative to the hearer. It kills and makes alive and is to be so preached."³

Forde is drawn to the Pauline maxim "the letter kills, but the spirit gives life." Surveying the misdirected medieval allegorical tradition of letter and spirit as textual hermeneutic, Forde points to Luther's revolutionary insight:

The letter-spirit problem so vexing in the tradition issues in the law-gospel dialectic fundamental to preaching and communicating the word. Not just what the word *means* is important—and the sorting out of levels of meaning or fancying such levels—but what the word *does*. And what does it do? It kills and makes alive.⁴

In his book *Justification by Faith* Forde wrote:

The search for the proper distinction between law and gospel is, in essence, nothing other than a search for an understanding and use of theological language that gives life beyond the death always administered by legal talk or law. It is a search for a use of language in church discourse, in proclamation, which does not merely talk about life or describe life but actually gives it.⁵

In his *Theology Is for Proclamation*, Forde put it bluntly: "We must learn to speak a Word that not only explains but does something."⁶

Already in his delightful primer on Luther's theology, *Where God Meets Man*, Forde wrote of preaching that "the cross and resurrection must be so understood and so preached that they bring about in us as well a death and a new life." Forde elaborated: "If you wish to be raised with him you must die with him. This is to say that there is no way to appropriate the cross other than to go through it. You can't have it in theory. . . ." Putting it succinctly, Forde concluded: "There is nothing to do about [the] death involved but to die it."⁷ As the apostle Paul once put it to the Galatians, "I have been crucified with Christ." Or, as Dietrich Bonhoeffer once wrote, "When Christ calls a man, he bids him come and die."⁸

DAVID R. LIEFELD, St. Peters, Missouri, is an LCMS English District Pastor currently in disability retirement with Fibromyalgia/Chronic Fatigue Syndromes. This essay was prepared for the May 1999 Symposium of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, "Expanding Homiletical Horizons: Part II—Reaching Out to the People."

It is through this killing and making alive, then, that proclamation becomes cruciform. Forde emphasizes that this

does not mean only that there is lots of talk about the cross. The point is that the proclamation itself ought to bear the form of the Word of the cross. It is to do the cross to the hearers. The proclamation is to kill and make alive. It purposes to make an end and a new beginning. What makes the proclamation the Word of the cross is not the fact that the cross is always the direct subject or the only subject of the address, but that the words themselves have the *form* of the cross, presuppose it, drive inexorably to it, and flow from it. To be a Word of the cross, the proclamation must cut in upon our lives to end the old and begin the new.⁹

If the goal is that we might no longer live, but Christ himself live in and through us, the proclamation cannot be an appeal to free choice or emotional persuasion. Cruciform proclamation necessarily presupposes the bondage of the will—a deservedly

If the goal is that . . . Christ himself live in and through us, the proclamation cannot be an appeal to free choice or emotional persuasion.

controversial subject in any age precisely because “free choice” is always the last refuge of the trapped “old Adam.” Writes Forde: “The hearer is afflicted with the bondage of the will, which consists, paradoxically, in the hearer’s very claim to free choice. That claim is the hearer’s defense mechanism against God and the proclamation.”¹⁰ Forde elaborates on this theme:

We simply cannot reconcile ourselves to God, nor surrender ourselves to a hidden God. We will not. We must claim the right to control our own eternal destiny over against a hidden God. But it is important to see that this is a *bondage* of the will, not a forcing of the will. The will cannot be forced, even by God. The will will what it will! But it is always bound to something or perhaps captivated by something. . . . it is essential to see that . . . God . . . is not some transcendent manipulator who secretly pulls strings to make us do something we do not want to do. . . . The trouble is simply that we do just what we want to do, and so find ourselves locked in opposition to God. We will not believe nor trust in God. We cannot reconcile ourselves to the very idea of God.¹¹

And so the proclamation is not rational or emotional persuasion but power. “The proclamation,” Forde writes, “is therefore shaped by the fact that the bound are to be set free.”¹²

To waver at this point is to reduce the pulpit to a platform from which the preacher tries to use Jesus as the ultimate enforcer of

whatever “mores or ‘life-styles’ or politics that the preacher has decided to push.” Forde elaborates:

The proclamation must be shaped by the realization that God does not work that way. God does not come hat in hand begging, “Won’t somebody please believe in me?” God does not come in ways that pander to our so-called freedom of choice. God comes to invade the house of the “strong man armed” who aims to keep his goods in peace. God comes to challenge the adversary to battle for the life of the captive.

Forde asserts bluntly: “The bound sinner will never choose the crucified God. Jesus said as much: ‘You did not choose me, but I chose you and appointed you . . .’ (John 15:16).” Thus

though the will is bound, it can be changed. . . . The change that takes place, however, fits none of our known schemes of human transformation, smooth or violent. The Scriptures speak of it as a dying and being raised through proclamation of Christ. It means that we can be reached by one who comes “from without,” something “no eye has seen, nor ear heard” (1 Cor. 2:9) in this age. The act of proclaiming proceeds on the hope that the hearer can be “gotten at” from without, that the proclamation in Word and sacrament is the means of grace, the “sword of the Spirit” which cuts through the bondage and sets the captives free.

“The sinner must die to be raised to newness of life,” Forde concludes. “The proclamation is shaped by that realization. It administers death in order to call to life.”¹³

Forde also warns that cruciform proclamation is not merely a matter of *once* converting the unbeliever, but also always a matter of producing repentance *anew* in the believer. A cruciform sermon, therefore, also must kill the spiritual pretensions of the religious by attacking their erroneous presuppositions, their so-called theology of glory. In *On Being a Theologian of the Cross*, Forde writes: “The cross is itself in the first instance the attack of God on the old sinner *and the sinner’s theology*.”¹⁴ Forde elaborates:

Therefore the theology of the cross is an offensive theology. The offense consists in the fact that unlike other theologies it attacks what we usually consider the best in our religion. . . . theologians of the cross do not worry so much about what is obviously bad in our religion, our bad works, as they do about the pretension that comes with our good works.¹⁵

Psychologically perceptive, Forde observes, “We are willing, if need be, to admit that our vices should go, but certainly not our virtues. We persist in picturing ourselves as ‘virtuous’ persons—at least to some degree.”¹⁶ Thus for Forde, “a theology of the cross is inevitably quite polemical. It constantly seeks to uncover and expose the ways in which sinners hide their perfidy behind pious facades. The delicate thing about it is that it attacks the *best* we have to offer, not the worst.”¹⁷ For this reason, even those who have already heard the word of the cross must be put to death again and again in order to die to spiritual pretension—in order to be raised anew in the power of the resurrected Christ.

One must therefore become wary of preaching methodologies that depend upon identifying the “needs” of the hearer, when those needs are not understood as arising from rebellion against God. Needs-based preaching too quickly dissolves into presenting a Jesus who is amenable to us—who in meeting our needs inevitably helps us to live our own self-directed lives more fully.¹⁸ Too quickly does the resilient sinner conclude that what God is really after, after all, is for us to live a better life—with the Spirit’s help, of course! The necessary death is in this way short-circuited by allowing an obvious continuity to exist between the dying “sinner” and the rising “believer.” There can be no such continuity. Indeed, there must be a radical discontinuity. There literally must be a death:

He [Jesus] does not come to protect us from death, he comes to do it to us. He brings death home to us. He does old beings [our sinful “old Adam”] to death. The suffering and dying Jesus is therefore the one in whom we meet our end, the eschatological end of our existence in bondage to sin and death.

In the same way, the new life in Christ is a participation in his sufferings (Phil 3:10)—a reminder that what is new is new precisely because it stands opposed to all of the self-centered notions of a meaningful life that are presupposed by the sinful being. In this way, proclamation does not merely pay lip service to the cross, to our death with Christ, but gives us to the Christ whose own life was the way of suffering and the cross.

We turn now to the pressing question: How exactly does the preacher do this? After all, if this *understanding* of cruciform proclamation does not lead to the *practice* of cruciform proclamation, it is of little help in our contemporary crisis. Since this question is necessarily broad in scope, involving as it does both doctrine and rhetoric, the assertions made here can only be illustrative and not exhaustive. They are but suggestive thoughts from one who is himself as yet only beginning to grasp the matter and whose reading of Forde admittedly may be deficient.

First, cruciform proclamation must focus.

If there is one criticism that I would level against most sermons I have heard, it is that they strive to say too much—even short sermons that nevertheless try to cover too much. I cannot say that this “too much” is always irrelevant or unhelpful, but only that it often distracts from getting the point. And I do not mean a point grounded in content, as in a three-point sermon, but a point grounded in the cruciform need for death and resurrection—the dying and rising of law and gospel *in the text for me*. There may be numerous interesting stories and anecdotes; there may be insightful observations about the historical or doctrinal meaning of the text. But if there is no dying and rising for me, in this encounter with the text, the sermon is not a cruciform proclamation (no matter what its intentions).

In his *Theology Is for Proclamation*, Forde complains that proclamation today is being “displaced by explanation, teaching, lecturing, persuasion, ethical exhortation, or public display of emotion about Jesus.” Forde does not care whether the displacing “lecture” about God is “conservative, liberal, evangelical, or fundamentalist.” In every case, lecturing about God “is of no great moment if it does not issue in proclamation.”¹⁹ For lectures about the past remain just

that: about the past. In a postmodern world that has such serious doubts about the past there is a desperate need for “present-tense unconditional proclamation”—a proclamation that answers authoritatively “the crucial question about what God has decided to do here and now.” Doctrine, however orthodox and however necessarily presupposed for effective preaching, is nevertheless past tense. Cruciform proclamation is present tense: “A sermon does indeed include explaining, exegesis, and informing, but ultimately it must get around to and aim at a doing, an actual pronouncing, declaring, giving of the gift.” For Forde, “Proclamation is present tense: I here and now give the gift to you, Christ himself, the body and blood of the Savior. I do it in both word and sacrament. This is God’s present move, the current ‘mighty act’ of the living God.”²⁰

Too often preachers substitute a new law for the gospel when they give priority to ponderous lectures about living the new life in Christ.

A cruciform proclamation therefore must be focused. It must zero in on something in the text that is to be done to the hearer. Whatever else is said, whatever rhetorical devices might be used, the sermon must do this something.

Second, cruciform proclamation must focus on what God does.

This does not mean that preaching will not talk about what we do, but only that what matters in the final analysis is what God does. It is God who breaks through to kill and make alive. The rhetoric of the sermon must be weighed against this standard. The preacher must not slip into popular language that presupposes free choice, moral exhortation or spiritual striving. Forde writes:

Death, you see, is [being] put in the position of not being able to do anything according to the ways of this world—the law, religion, the upward climb—with all its plans and schemes. They suddenly stop, come to an end: “I through the law died to the law that I might live to God.” Both our vices and our virtues come to a full stop. The justification declaration *is* precisely that: a full stop. “You have died,” Paul says. It is all over!²¹

It literally becomes ludicrous for the preacher to continue on at that point with what *we* will now do about this death of ours!

What *we* ought to do is the law (to which we die); what *God* does is gospel. Too often preachers substitute a new law for the gospel when they give priority to ponderous lectures about living the new life in Christ. It implies all too clearly that being a Christian is, after all, in spite of what they may have been told, ultimately about what *they* do. Forde treats this subject at length in most of his books because it is, he believes, the greatest failure of contemporary Lutheranism: “Justification is quickly given a lick and a promise so that one can get on to the ‘real’ (practical) business at hand: sanctification, ‘progress’ in ‘virtue’ under ‘the law.’”²²

In this way, in Forde's view, Lutheranism becomes *de facto*, just another theology of glory. Gone is the emphasis on a real death and resurrection at the hands of a cruciform proclamation. Gone

Cruciform proclamation is not manipulation, and the preacher dare not become merely a cheerleader for congregational programs.

is justification by faith as a total state, as a complete and unconditional gift. Gone is the realization that, as Forde writes, "there can be no *more* sanctification than where every knee bends and every mouth is silent before God."

Only those who are so grasped that they stand still and confess to sin and give God the glory, only they are "sanctified." And there cannot be *more* sanctification than that! Whoever knows this knows that there is an end to the old, there is a death involved, and that being a Christian means ever and anew to be blasted by that divine lightning (for we always forget it) and to begin again.

The so-called progress of the Christian is, in this view of things, according to Forde, "the progress of one who constantly has to get used to the fact that we are justified totally by faith, constantly has somehow to 'recover,' so to speak, from that death blow to pride and presumption—or better, is constantly being raised from the tomb of all pious ambition to something quite new." The "progress" is, Forde concludes, "not our movement toward the goal" but "the movement of the goal in upon us."²³

The preacher has one task: to do God to those who listen. In this way does proclamation remain cruciform—the power of God and not of man.

Third, cruciform proclamation focuses on what God does to kill us.

Many preachers are afraid of the law—afraid to be too hard on the people for fear that they will be motivated by guilt and live by the law. For them, one really only needs to preach an uplifting and encouraging gospel since, after all, people already feel the burden of living under the law. This so-called compassionate approach is, in fact, the greatest cruelty! By preventing the law from doing its work, one in effect preserves the life of the sinful old Adam and, thus, prevents the true gospel from taking hold.

One often hears stewardship sermons that only insipidly suggest that surely we love God enough to give a little more than we are giving now. Surely, we are thankful to God for all that he has done for us in the past and will want to part with a little more of our hard-earned money in the present. This is neutered law! It weakly suggests that we might not be doing what God wants us to do, but is afraid to let God's proclamation of himself *kill the hearer*. Let the hearer learn what God demands. Let the hearer know what sacrificial stewardship means. Let the hearer compare what

is given to God with what is spent on houses and furnishings, on sumptuous meals at home or eaten out. Let the hearer, in short, hear concrete illustrations of what it means to have other gods—indeed, to be our own god. There is absolutely no danger of legalism if that on which the sermon is focused is truly the death that alone can lead to life. If the goal is not merely to prod pious theologians of glory into giving a little more money, but rather to put them to death so that God can raise them up according to his own good pleasure, there is never a danger of Pharisaical legalism.

Cruciform proclamation is not manipulation, and the preacher dare not become merely a cheerleader for congregational programs. The preacher must let the law kill, because that is what it is intended to do; and this applies to money or any other aspect of everyday life.

Fourth, cruciform proclamation focuses on what God does to kill us and (surprise!) to make us alive.

The charge often made against cruciform proclamation is that it is too gloomy. All the talk about death is not uplifting and, well, people just get tired of it. The reality is precisely the opposite. It is those who keep promising moral or spiritual progress to those working at it, with the Spirit's help, of course, who get terribly burdensome and depressing. Writes Forde:

Few things are so deadly or depressing, Alvin Rogness used to say, as sermons on joy! . . . Everyone is expected to talk up and approve the life of piety, to live up to the life of the description. Everyone feels compelled to go along with the game because no one dares object to it.

Yet, as Forde observes, "talk about the Spirit does not impart the Spirit any more than talk about piety imparts piety." What finally needs to be done, as this article has said all along, is killing to make alive again:

One speaks *in* the Spirit and imparts the Spirit when one speaks the unconditional gospel of Jesus Christ, when one is not afraid to declare the Word that slays and makes alive. . . . Faith comes by hearing the gospel, not by describing it.²⁴

In his *Theology Is for Proclamation*, Forde's suggestion for getting right to the heart of the matter, without getting side-tracked by talk *about* the gospel, is to look for the hard sayings in the text—to look for that which surprises or offends:

In moving from text to sermon, one would do well to look first for the offense, the killing letter of the text, the hard saying, the uncompromising word, and start with that rather than with some cute story. Then one can subsequently turn it over as life-giving Spirit. The word of forgiveness spoken to the paralytic was a blasphemous offense. But the authority claimed was vindicated, so now it is to be used. In the parable of laborers in the vineyard, the keeper's retort, "Can I not do what I want with what is my own?" is tremendously offensive. But it must be so preached precisely as offense to kill the old so that it can be turned over into life-giving spirit. For our only chance is that God can do what God wants with what is his own! And the present moment, the

sermons, the sacrament, *is* what God has decided to do! The offense must be done so that the Word can give life.²⁵

In his *Justification by Faith*, Forde put the same thing this way:

Thus more and more I find myself looking for just that sort of thing in a text—the word which is a kind of startling abbreviation of the gospel—stark, unconditional. Often, I notice, that very word is a “hard saying,” the pronouncement that shocked, the announcement of mercy and forgiveness, the action that amazed and astonished, or even caused the hearers to take up stones to kill! I look for that and often lead with it, knowing full well that it is not at first going to help, that it is likely to be received not as relevant but as a frontal attack on the “ego” of the Old Adam. . . . I believe it is that word which is ultimately “relevant”—which will finally bring “relief,” lift us out of our self-made prisons—precisely because it *is* a frontal attack on all our defenses. Then, after letting the text set the agenda, I can go on and develop the material—calling on as much analysis of the current human scene and predicament as seems useful and helpful, always, however, with the goal of returning again finally to the pronouncement, the hard saying, the announcement, so that it will finally be heard as the word of life, the gospel, the unconditional word. In other words, whereas first it will be heard as an attack on the “ego,” a word which brings death, the aim is that in the end it will be reheard as a word of life.

But that means that in the end we return to the word of justification, the word of the forgiveness of sins, flat out, unconditional, as the last word, the last judgment. I find it

hard to escape from just those words, that kind of pronouncement. The reason is basically that only those kinds of words lend themselves to the pronouncement we can make in speaking finally for God: I declare you just for Jesus’ sake; I declare unto you the forgiveness of all your sins.²⁶

Surprise! The unconditional proclamation leaves us with nothing to say but “Amen.” Yet, in saying “Amen,” we also begin to live with trust that God is indeed having his own way with us. Forde summarizes:

It is to begin actually to trust God with our destiny, to believe God can actually be trusted with it, to want God to take it over, to let God be God. . . . One can be reconciled to God only through a faith that lets God be the God of mercy God has decided to be.²⁷

Let me conclude our exploration of cruciform proclamation in the writings of Gerhard Forde, then, with the words with which Forde himself ended his book *Justification by Faith*:

I have had one aim in mind—to establish the point that in the end we have to *say* it, pronounce it, do it again. The aim is to unlock, unleash once again the power of the gospel, the power of that word which does indeed judge, confront, attack, kill the old in order to give birth to the new. The art of doing that has perhaps been lost in a sea of images, options, myths, and paradigms. My hope is that we might at least think about how to regain the art of speaking the unconditional word and promise with power.²⁸

NOTES

1. As an LCMS pastor who left The American Lutheran Church in 1983, I wince at obvious signs of Forde’s seemingly uncritical adoption of Neo-orthodoxy. Nevertheless, I do believe that it would be a mistake to reject wholesale his theological insights—especially those about cruciform proclamation, since in my opinion they are well grounded in the theology of Paul and Luther.

2. Gerhard O. Forde, *Where God Meets Man: Luther’s Down-to-Earth Approach to the Gospel* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1972), 17 (emphasis added).

3. Gerhard O. Forde, *Theology Is for Proclamation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 154.

4. Gerhard O. Forde, *Justification by Faith: A Matter of Death and Life* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), 16.

5. Forde, *Justification by Faith*, 13.

6. Forde, *Theology Is for Proclamation*, 150.

7. Forde, *Where God Meets Man*, 38, 39.

8. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *The Cost of Discipleship* (New York: The MacMillan Company, SCM Press Ltd., 1959), 79.

9. Forde, *Theology Is for Proclamation*, 157.

10. *Ibid.*, 55.

11. *Ibid.*, 46, 47.

12. *Ibid.*, 55.

13. *Ibid.*, 55, 56.

14. Gerhard O. Forde, *On Being a Theologian of the Cross: Reflections on Luther’s Heidelberg Disputation, 1518* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997), 4.

15. *Ibid.*, 2.

16. Forde, *Justification by Faith*, 86.

17. Forde, *On Being a Theologian of the Cross*, 4.

18. Forde writes: “The basic paradigm for Christologies of continuity is

freedom of choice. Jesus is made over into the One who ‘meets our needs,’ whether they be high-sounding religious needs or more mundane psychological, moral, or social needs. . . . The cross itself is the discontinuity planted in our way. There is no detour around it; there can only be a way through it to the resurrection hope. Only a proclamation that puts the old to death and calls the new to life will get us there” (*Theology Is for Proclamation*, 72).

19. Forde, *Theology Is for Proclamation*, 1, 5. Forde also writes: “The problem with most christologies, conservative or liberal, right or left, is that they . . . substitute a lecture about Christ for the preaching of him” (*Theology Is for Proclamation*, 69).

20. Forde, *Theology Is for Proclamation*, 8, 35, 149–150, 2.

21. Forde, *Justification by Faith*, 35.

22. *Ibid.*, 46. I disagree with Forde’s rejection of the third use of the law as inherently legalistic. I do agree, however, with his assessment that there is almost a knee-jerk linkage between most third use of the law expositions and Reformed notions of progressive sanctification. For a Lutheran (and for Paul!), sanctification is a total state that is, like justification, a gift of God’s grace through faith alone in Christ. My difference with Forde is only that I do not necessarily think that a law that *always* accuses (its second use), necessarily *only* accuses. When we are simultaneously sinners and—by God’s grace—saints, we have *at the same time* an ambivalent attitude toward the law, which is, after all, God’s good will for us. This ambivalence, it seems to me, is also reflected in Luther’s explanation of the Ten Commandments where there is an implicit third use of the law.

23. *Ibid.*, 50, 51.

24. *Ibid.*, 137, 138.

25. *Ibid.*, 157.

26. Forde, *Justification by Faith*, 94–95.

27. Forde, *Theology Is for Proclamation*, 126, 127.

28. Forde, *Justification by Faith*, 97.

Was Bo Giertz a Pietist?

Bishop Giertz and the Order of Grace

ERIC R. ANDRAE



BISHOP EMERITUS DR. BO HARALD GIERTZ (Göteborg diocese, 1949–1970) died July 12, 1998, in Stockholm, Sweden, one month short of the age of ninety-three. Giertz was a staunch defender of the faith, known worldwide as a Lutheran writer and leader. While he was by all accounts one of the most prominent and influential Swedish churchmen of this century, the former vice-president of the Lutheran World Federation (1957–1963) is best known in North America as the author of the acclaimed novel *The Hammer of God*.¹ Other of his works have also been translated into English, but much more Swedish material remains inaccessible to the English reader. As such, the picture of Giertz remains incomplete in the United States.

Who was Bo Giertz? High-church, low-church, old-church, the new view of the church, confessional, non-confessional, biblically traditional, not biblically traditional, man of awakening, arch-Lutheran, catholic, exegete, dogmatician, practical theologian, sacramentalist,² not sacramental enough, non-Schartauan, non-pietist, Schartauan, and pietist are some of the labels that have been applied.³ It is these last two labels that will draw the attention of this essay. Bo Giertz himself, especially in various letters to Gunnar Rosendal,⁴ defended *pietism* and contended that he is a sacramental “Rosenius-influenced⁵ *Schartaun*.”⁶

Henric Schartau (1757–1825) was, according to some, the greatest theologian Sweden has produced.⁷ He served as pastor in the southern city of Lund and as dean of its cathedral from 1780 until his death. Though early in his ministry he was influenced by the German pietists,⁸ he strongly opposed emotionalism, lay preaching, separatist movements within the Church of Sweden,⁹ the discarding of the traditional liturgies, and conventicles, due to their lack of clerical supervision. Schartau rejected sentimentalism and subjectivism, “the pietistic stress on personal experience as the ground for spiritual certainty.”¹⁰ For him this ground is only the word of God, preached and taught through the exalted ecclesiastical office of the ordained minister. Schartau held a high regard for the church, her sacraments, and her ordinances, and thus separated himself from the pietists. He could be called a “high-church pietist.” So, as can be seen, the meaning, connotation, and usage of “pietist” has been quite different in Sweden than in the United States.

Schartau’s disciples, especially students at the University of Lund from the Göteborg diocese, spread Schartau’s message after his death, mainly in their home diocese. This diocese, covering the entire western coast of Sweden, has been synonymous with what is called West Coast Swedish Lutheranism, or “Schartauanism,” which, according to Robert Murray, “still carries the spiritual stamp of Schartau’s disciples with firm concentration on public worship, pure doctrine, and great respect for ‘the true teacher.’”¹¹ It is this west coast area in which Giertz served as bishop for twenty-one years.¹²

Schartau’s teachings centered on the order of grace, or *ordo salutis*, the way of salvation.¹³ The doctrine of the order of grace¹⁴ in our earthly life commands a third of Giertz’s *Kyrkofromhet*.¹⁵ “The special frame, in which . . . Bo Giertz’s writings fit [is] . . . the *ordo-salutis* theology.”¹⁶ It is to *Kyrkofromhet*, then, that we must turn in order to gain proper insight into his understanding of the order of grace. As such, and perhaps most importantly, much comprehension will be gained regarding Schartau’s influence upon Giertz’s confession of the doctrine of justification, of “undeserved grace and . . . Christ’s atonement . . . , the article of faith upon which the church stands or falls.”¹⁷ In his writings, Giertz himself often points to Schartau and his influence:¹⁸ “Schartau has given us the classic summary of all this [how conversion occurs] in his teaching on the order of grace.”¹⁹

Though originally published early (1939) in the writing career of Giertz, the bishop writes in the foreword to the 1962 edition that *Kyrkofromhet* “deals with questions that never lose their topical value.”²⁰ As such, he made no significant changes to the book during those twenty-three years. Seemingly, its views remained the bishop’s late into his writing career.²¹ Its views on the doctrine of the order of grace will be summarized below, providing a practical guide for pastoral care.

NÅDENS ORDNING: THE ORDER OF GRACE

First Giertz points out what the order of grace is *not*. It is not, as many assume, a teaching on how the soul finds its way to God. Rather, it teaches how God finds his way to man’s heart.²² This begins with holy baptism. “We can never think highly enough of our baptism.”²³ In baptism our heavenly Father breaks into our lives, unites us with the life of Christ, makes a covenant, and chooses the baptized for citizenship in his kingdom. Thus the baptized person has an inheritance, a home. I, the baptized, can deny and reject this, but

ERIC ANDRAE is pastor of St. John’s Lutheran Church, Jeannette, Pennsylvania.

I cannot erase the fact that I have a home and a Father who has not forgotten his child and never ceases to yearn for it. I also cannot prevent him from seeking me and sending offers to me. And this is exactly what God does. So this is how “a person finds the way to God.”²⁴

Baptism is foundational to the order of grace.

KALLELSEN: The Call, the Invitation

God’s invitation to come to him, to come to faith, is constant in and from baptism. God’s call comes in a number of ways, but it comes most clearly, most surely, through the word, in preaching. It places you before a “decision of eternal importance.”²⁵ After years of ignoring the call within baptism, its personal significance is now being felt, and then its initial peace. This feeling is caused by “the calling grace,” as Schartau and others, “the old spiritual guides,” called it. It says yes to God.²⁶ This is not yet conversion, however.

At this point, it is key to make use of God’s word and to pray, especially within the church of Christ, your home as one who is baptized. All that we need to know God publicly gives us in his word. Even prayer is learned and practiced in the church’s confession and praise. Individualism is rejected by Giertz, as it was by Schartau. The same is true of sentimentalism. There can be no reliance upon the wonderful new feelings, even if you think they are meritorious, but only upon the objectivity of the word of God and the praying church. Feelings and emotions waver, they fail.²⁷ And when they do, there is bitterness.

After you have been called, your faith is at first generally moralistic and legalistic.

Thus is encountered the first of what “the old spiritual guides” and Giertz call the three “obstacles to salvation . . . man’s natural aversion to prayer and the word.”²⁸ It is only the calling grace that can here overcome this obstacle and move you into the habit of the word: prayer, Bible, and worship. If you stand firm here, then you have truly said yes to God. You have become a disciple of Jesus.²⁹ It is now time for right use of his holy supper. For even though true (*rätta*) faith is not yet present, the person is a true disciple.³⁰ The Lord’s Supper is specifically for such people, for disciples, working faith in them. And it is the *Lord’s* supper, emphasizes the bishop. Indeed, with its continuous Christocentric theme, this section of *Kyrkofromhet* could have been entitled “Christ alone” as easily as “Nådens ordning.” It is through this Lord’s Supper, in the right use of the means of grace, that God works on man.

Giertz often gives some warnings. The order of grace has often been misunderstood and wrongly criticized. Giertz makes it clear that the essential in the order of grace is grace, not the order.³¹

Thus the focus is not when the turning point occurred in the journey: “Therefore a true Christian usually does not speak much about his first encounter with God. He knows that it is nothing to build upon. For if [God’s] work has not continued, then the call has been wasted.” A wasted call is a serious matter. God does always forgive anew, but we are not to test God, relying on what has been called “cheap grace.” “No one knows when the last call will be given” in this life.³²

UPPLYSNINGEN GENOM LAGEN: Enlightenment through the Law

You are now facing a choice: you know that you want to be a Christian.³³ You are on the way that might lead to true Christianity. You must be enlightened through the law and through the gospel. This division, Giertz warns again, cannot be thought of in terms of chronology. All the parts of the order of grace are intertwined. They are separated only in order to be studied more easily and understood more clearly. “In its deepest sense, the order of grace is a doctrine on faith, not a division of stages that you must go through in order to become a true Christian.”³⁴

After you have been called, your faith is at first generally moralistic and legalistic. Christianity is only viewed in terms of God’s commands and requirements, which are seen as within the reach of fulfillment. The focus is misplaced: it is on what “we are to do for God, instead of what God has done for us in Jesus Christ.”³⁵ While this may very well be in some ways an active faith, its activities are not really part of the whole and completed faith, the true faith.

It is here that God will slowly destroy the second obstacle to salvation: the love of sin. Through the word, God works regret, repentance. Giertz divides true repentance into three parts: confession of sins, sorrow over sin,³⁶ and a longing to be freed from sin. You realize, as repentance is worked, that “in your own efforts . . . you are much worse off than you ever imagined.”³⁷ The comprehension of that total depravity, the original sin that is the root cause of all obstacles to salvation, is a harsh reality. Hopelessness may set in.³⁸ If so, first you stay away from the Lord’s Table. Then you get lazy in your prayer life and Bible reading. This path that moralism takes must eventually meet its end in Paul’s cry of distress (Rom 7:24). At last, Paul reminds himself and us that even this is the work of God, his alien work, the work of the law. It is the excruciating time in which the law is, as always, accusing; the old spiritual guides called it the “awakening.”³⁹ Indeed, it is a strange blessing. The law shows us that we cannot save ourselves; it points to the gospel, which tells us that we have one who can save, a Savior.

At last it is clear also to you, that the foundation for our Christian faith, for that covenant that the living God made with us in baptism truly is not our righteousness or our improvement⁴⁰ or our fulfillment of his holy requirements, but rather God’s incredible mercy, his undeserved grace and our Lord Jesus Christ’s atoning work on Golgotha.⁴¹

When waiting for the light of this gospel to come totally clear, you must, no matter what, never abandon the church of Christ: God there proclaims the word, invites you to his Supper, and wants to hear your private confession.

**UPPLYSNINGEN GENOM EVANGELIUM:
Enlightenment through the Gospel**

Our incredible God knows our sinful lot. As has been shown, he even uses our sin in the way to salvation! In our rebellion, *he* repents *us*⁴² so that we may be given more than the self-righteousness of the Pharisees.

The law shows us our unholy sin, our separation from a holy God. Certainly we can be righteous through the law, but this is righteousness only toward neighbor, not *coram Deo*. Giertz speaks of the righteousness of the gospel: a righteousness that is a gift from God, through a faith in Christ that is also a gift from God. If we could improve ourselves, then God's law would be enough. But we cannot. We want to earn God's grace, but he gives freely the undeserved benefits of that blood-stained cross. This is the forgiveness of sins. This is the gospel.

We can either believe this or we can despair. Despair will occur at the awakening if we break the ties to the church of Christ and lose prayer and the word. But we are allowed to believe. And our Savior's faithfulness will not be moved one inch despite our unbelief, our struggles. *Christ* alone is the foundation of salvation. It is *Christianity*, after all, not *fideism*.

Nonetheless, the struggle is to believe that all God's work is *for you*. This is the third great obstacle to salvation: the struggle to believe that all depends on the Christ who is for you; this obstacle is unbelief, really. You will encounter doubt, struggles, and terrors of the conscience if you focus on self. The focus is to be on Christ alone, what he has done, his love, his death, his incredible mercy. The struggle in and with sin is brought to light by the law, in order that grace may be brought to light by the gospel.⁴³

The obstacle of unbelief is conquered as you are opened by the Lord to be given gifts from him, the giver.⁴⁴ These gifts come in the word, prayer, and the sacrament of the altar. Through these God erects faith in the Savior as exactly that: Savior and Atoner. It is when this faith is present that conversion has been completed!⁴⁵ This complete change effects justification and new birth. This is the very heart of Giertz's presentation on the order of grace:

These are not stages or steps in the process of grace One must be careful not to make the Order of Grace a staircase on which one gradually moves up to God. . . . It is rather a descent, a process of impoverishment, in which God takes away from man one after the other of his false grounds of comfort. At its heart it is a description of how God's love overcomes the obstacles and breaks down the dams which prevent the divine grace to freely pour itself over a life. These obstacles usually are in a certain context and group themselves in a complementary order. Therefore grace also has its order. But this order is not to be forced and is never allowed to be made a law. God's grace works everywhere it is given the opportunity. Therefore everything becomes intertwined in the work of conversion. Already in the call there can be a deep insight into the mystery of the Cross. Every meeting of the law and every new confession of sin usually carries with it a new

revelation of grace. And when finally faith victoriously enters in, then "justification" and "new birth" are already a reality.⁴⁶

**RÄTTFÄRDIGGÖRELSE OCH PÅNYTTFÖDELSE:
Justification and Rebirth**

Faith is lighted in the poverty of the spirit. The true faith, which is not the same as believing in God, for even the devils do that, is present when you realize that you are not what you should be and yet you hold onto Christ for dear life. Your spirit is poor, but your Savior is rich.⁴⁷ The atonement actually means something to you. True faith is faith in Christ, in the cross, for you. This realization and nothing else is conversion: God has led you to faith. It is not, as already mentioned, fideism: "If you have faith in your own faith, then it has ceased to be a faith in the Savior."⁴⁸ You cannot dare say *when* it happened, but simply *that* it happened.

What has happened in conversion is described from two perspectives. First, one has peace with God. This is not some feeling, but the objective truth: there is reconciliation. You are no longer under the wrath of God, but under his grace. God forgives, God justifies.

But while God is justifying in heaven, something is also happening on earth.⁴⁹ Man is born anew.⁵⁰ The reborn Christian, now united with Christ, does not willfully sin against his neighbor.

HELGELSEN: Sanctification

After conversion, the law does remain. Yet the new man delights in God's law and wants nothing more than to keep it.⁵¹ Here are distinguished the two kinds of righteousness, even the two realms. Civil righteousness consists of looking at oneself in light of God's commands in the word for benefit of the neighbor. On the other hand, Christ's righteousness comes only when looking upon the Atoner for salvation's sake. These two bring you to the realization that you are *simul justus ac peccator*.

But with man being set free from sin and the condemnation of the law, how is Christian liberty to be prevented from becoming license for evil? The "old spiritual guides" remind us: "Just make sure that you believe and are kept in the faith." But how? Again, it is through God's word, prayer, and the holy supper. And it must be remembered that these are enjoyed as a member of the body of Christ, the Church of Christ. The Lord's Supper is also "the heart of [God's] *sanctifying work*." In preparation to receive it, it has direct impact on everyday life. "It becomes so obviously clear what you are allowed and what you are forbidden to do. . . . It is easier to choose the right when you instinctively choose the road that leads back to the altar." This Christian life is limitless security, an unshakable trust in Christ's atonement, and, on the other hand, a never-ending battle for sanctification. So it is nothing more and nothing less than daily conversion effected by the foundation of baptism and by "the hammer of the word of God."⁵²

Sanctification has three results: sin is curbed, a Christian character is formed in which Christ has his word in all matters,⁵³ you grow in God's grace and thus firmness of faith. So it can be seen in Giertz's theology that faith and sanctification have a mutual rela-

tionship: in the three results of sanctification, you have “become fully complete,’ as complete as you can be on this earth.”⁵⁴

CONCLUSION

In the order of grace it is not for you to decide or even know where you are on the way to salvation, or to attempt to figure out what will occur next. Rather, it is for you to be in the word and in prayer, to listen to the church,⁵⁵ to see baptism as the foundation for all of Christian life, to make right use of the means of grace.⁵⁶

The question has been raised here and elsewhere: was Bo Giertz a pietist? Let Giertz answer for himself, in his own words:

We should stop stabbing at pietism. It is always misunderstood, so that one would think that we disdain conversion and lack a sense of the factor of personal responsibility in Christianity. . . . Personally, I am convinced that the portion of pietism that is found in Schartau is for salvation useful, not to mention necessary. [It is this] vigorous unifying of pietism and orthodoxy that comes to us in the awakening of the early 1800s.⁵⁷

Furthermore, Giertz contended that not all the forms of pietism can or should be judged the same. If so, “Schartau and the entire Kronobergian old-church piety would be lost.”⁵⁸ Then would be forfeited

the classic heritage of the Swedish church, in which Schartau and the other pastors of the awakening take the places of honor. Is there any branch of our church that provides such a solid and sharp, and yet merciful, care of souls, as that which was practiced during our classic time of church awakening? The order of grace is for me the very cornerstone in churchly preaching and the care of souls. A churchly renewal that is not thorough and genuine on these

matters is no true renewal. . . . As such, you understand why I so stubbornly hold fast to pietism. If by pietism is meant that pastoral⁵⁹ wisdom which is laid out in the doctrine of the order of grace, then it is just about the last thing that I would want to strike from my church program.⁶⁰

Finally, Giertz’s summary of our very salvation’s foundation, means, and order in his catechetical *Grunden* neatly brings it all together:

Salvation’s foundation: Christ alone, the Atoner of our sins, our heavenly King and Intercessor, Judge of the living and the dead. In no one else is there salvation, but each and every one who believes on him shall not perish, but have everlasting life.

Salvation’s means: God’s word and sacraments, administered by the *church of Christ*, our mother, which gives birth to and nourishes every Christian,⁶¹ by us received with prayer and obedience in the congregation’s worship and in daily devotions. Of these means alone can faith be awakened. Without them no one is a Christian, but through them every sinner can receive saving faith in Christ.

Salvation’s order: The work of sanctification that leads a person from sin’s and death’s power to life in Christ through *baptism* and *faith*, through *conversion* for the wayward, through the Spirit’s enlightenment for all, so that we through poverty of spirit are led to the riches of grace and in true faith in Jesus always remain, here on earth and in eternity, *children of our heavenly Father, members of the body of Christ, participants of⁶² the Holy Spirit.*⁶³

This is what Giertz refers to as “the traditional pietism and faith,” which he virtually equates with the doctrine of the order of grace.⁶⁴ LOGIA

NOTES

1. Bo Giertz, *The Hammer of God* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1973). The first American edition was published by Augustana Book Concern in 1960. The original: *Stengrunden* (Stockholm: Diakonistyrelsens Bokförlag, 1941). Since this is perhaps Giertz’s most important and certainly best-known work, the writer will herein indicate how the order of grace is its foundation by referring the reader to it often. References to *Stengrunden* will be from the paperback edition of 1963. References to *The Hammer of God* will be from the Augsburg paperback edition of 1973. Note that the last chapter of *Stengrunden*, “I syndares ställe,” “In the Place of Sinners” (272–316), has strangely not been translated into English.

2. Pastor and Giertz researcher Docent Folke T. Olofsson (Rasbo, Uppsala) points out that the order of grace is the subjective part of Giertz’s theology, developed to fight the charge of hyper-sacramentalism (objective) (personal interview, 12 June 1998). See *Stengrunden*, 277.

3. For some insight on why Giertz has been labeled in these ways, see Anders Jarlert, *Kontinuitet och Förnyelse i Bo Giertz Kyrkohistoriska Romaner* (Varberg, Sweden: Bröderna Carlssons Boktryckeri AB, 1990) and Hans Åkerberg, *Teologin i Stengrunden* (Stockholm: Petra Bokförlag, 1985).

4. Gunnar Rosendal (1897–1988), pastor in Osby, Sweden, leader of the liturgical renewal movement Kyrklig Förnyelse (Churchly Renewal), author. See Christian Braw, *Söka förstå* (Borås, Sweden: Norma Bokförlag, 1994), 64–83; and Stefan Ljungman, *Fader Gunnar i Osby* (Lund: Arcus förlag, 1997). Rosendal and Giertz were dear friends and generally worked together for the renewal of the church, but the latter

could be sharp in his criticism toward the former: “It seems that you support crypto-romanism . . . anti-pietism, disdain for the old-church awakening, ritualism without sufficient pietistic earnestness” (Letter to Rosendal, March 7, 1938, Uppsala University Library, Uppsala). All letter excerpts cited in this essay were transcribed and translated by this writer in the summer of 1998 at the Uppsala University Library, Uppsala, where they are archived.

5. Carl Olof Rosenius (1816–1868), Swedish Lutheran lay preacher influenced greatly by English Methodist evangelist George Scott. Rosenian Pietism is synonymous with New Evangelicalism (Giertz actually battled against the latter in the second novella of *Stengrunden*). Though not a separatist, Rosenius was influenced by “Readers,” a separatist group (see *Stengrunden*, 115; *Hammer of God*, 141. The word “pietists” does not appear in the original). Rosenius was one of the organizers of the National Evangelical Mission Society and a founder and editor of *Pietisten* (see *Stengrunden*, 126; *Hammer of God*, 155). “The word of God in the Bible is, for Rosenius, the foremost of the means of grace; baptism and communion are of less importance in his individualistic, Lutheran-pietistic understanding of Christianity” (Sweden’s *Nationalencyklopedien* 16: 43, author’s translation). The encyclopedia also refers the reader to S. Lodin, *C. O. Rosenius: Hans Liv och Gärning* (1956). Giertz calls him an “orthodox man of God” (*Stengrunden*, 111; *Hammer of God*, 135). Nevertheless, though admitting Rosenius’s influence, Giertz clearly and strongly took distance from the lay preacher’s non-sacramental views: “The rebirth of the liturgy strikes me as being just about necessary in order to preserve that which through the Word has been gained,

so that things do not go the way of Rosenianism: that you can certainly convert people, but not keep them in a healthy godly life of worship and sacramental fellowship” (Letter to Rosendal, March 7, 1938).

6. Letter to Rosendal, April 25, 1941.
7. Henrik Haeggglund, *Henric Schartau and the Order of Grace* (Rock Island, Illinois: Augustana Book Concern, 1928) 25.

8. “Schartau was friendly to German pietism, though he clearly saw its deterioration from the lofty beginnings of Spener and Francke. He fully appreciated the merits of these great leaders. The author whom he valued most of all, however, was Luther” (Haeggglund, 17).

9. See *Stengrunden*, 115; *Hammer*, 140.

10. *The Encyclopedia of the Lutheran Church*, ed. Julius Bodensieck (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1965), 2307.

11. Robert Murray, *A Brief History of the Church of Sweden* (Stockholm: SKDB, 1961), 87. The Swedish for “true teacher” is *rätt lärare*.

12. “If ‘the spiritual’ has not come forth on the West Coast, then I do not know [what] is meant by spirituality. Rather, it is certainly so, that the pietistic heritage, as it has been unified with sound orthodoxy in western Sweden and in old-church piety, is the spiritual foundation for our whole renewal of the church” (Giertz, letter to Rosendal, March 7, 1938).

13. For more on the origins of the doctrine of the order of grace, see, among much available material, John Theodore Mueller, *Christian Dogmatics* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955), 362–366, and Werner Elert, *The Structure of Lutheranism* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1962), 141–142, 153.

14. Swedish: *Nädens ordning*.

15. Bo Giertz, *Kyrkofromhet* (*Church Piety*), 7th ed. (Stockholm: SKDB, 1962. (The first edition was published in 1939.) All quotations from *Kyrkofromhet* are translated by this writer. This work is a continuation of Giertz’s *Kristi Kyrka*, 5th ed. (Stockholm: SKDB, 1960 (first edition, 1939). These two works, along with *Stengrunden*, are unanimously regarded as Giertz’s most important. Unfortunately, there are no English translations of *Kyrkofromhet* or *Kristi Kyrka*. The latter represents what could be called the objective part of Giertz’s theology. See note 2 above.

16. Åkerberg, 10, my translation.

17. *Kyrkofromhet*, 13.

18. See *Kyrkofromhet*, 14, Giertz, *Herdabrev Till Göteborgs Stift* (Stockholm: SKDB, 1949, second edition) 150ff., henceforth *Herdabrev*, and Giertz, “The Gothenburg Diocese” in Robert Murray (ed.), *The Church of Sweden: Past and Present* (Malmö, Sweden: Allhem, 1960) 151–157. “Schartauism for many means Lutheranism in its purest form. . . . Regarding pietism . . . , here in the [Linköping] diocese, Schartau has meant immensely much to us younger people” (Giertz, letter to Rosendal, March 7, 1938).

19. *Herdabrev*, 151, author’s translation. See also *Stengrunden*, 7–110 (especially 98–99), 164 ff., 271; *Hammer of God*, 3–131 (especially 116–117), 202 ff., 334.

20. *Kyrkofromhet*, 6.

21. According to Olofsson, there is no differentiation to be made between an “early” and a “late” Giertz (personal interview, 12 June 1998). See also Olofsson’s excellent piece “Kyrkan återupptäckt,” *Tro & Tanke* 1–2 (1994): 291, which strongly supports the material in this essay.

22. Giertz writes primarily to a Swedish audience. At that time, even more so than today, almost all Swedes were members of the Church of Sweden, a Lutheran state church. As such, they were baptized and confirmed, but were becoming increasingly distant from the church.

For other interpretations of Schartau’s order of grace see Nathan Söderblom, *Svenskarnas Fromhet* (Stokholm: SKDB, 1933) and Tore Hulthén, *Jesu Regering* (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1969).

23. *Kyrkofromhet*, 15.

24. *Ibid.*, 16.

25. *Ibid.*, 17. Giertz does not say that it is *man’s* decision.

26. *Ibid.*, 18.

27. See *Stengrunden*, 240; *Hammer of God*, 297.

28. *Kyrkofromhet*, 20. For more on the obstacles to salvation see Bo Giertz, “Frälsningshindren–I,” *Svensk Pastoraltidskrift* 3 (1977): 27, and “Frälsningshindren–II,” *Svensk Pastoraltidskrift* 7 (1977): 105.

29. The Swedish word for “doctrine,” *lära*, and the word for “disciple,” *lärling*, have the same root. In verb form *lära* means “teach.” It is by baptizing/teaching that *disciples* of Jesus are made (Mt 28:16–20). See *Kyrkofromhet*, 51–53 for more on the church’s responsibility to teach.

30. *Kyrkofromhet*, 7, 21. Giertz also refers to a true, or real, Christian (“en riktig kristen”), as well as to dead faith (“död tro”) (*Kyrkofromhet*, 32, 37). See also *Stengrunden*, 239 (“rätta tron”), 217; *Hammer of God*, 296 (“true faith”), 267. Martin Luther, in a sermon on Luke 16:19, remarks (1522):

Some people hear and read the Gospel and what it says about faith, quickly assent, and call what they are thinking “faith.” By they go no farther in their thinking than the notion that faith is something that lies in their own power For what is that notion which they call faith but a dream . . . , made with their own power, without the grace of God in their hearts? . . . But the *real* faith . . . cannot be brought into being by our own thoughts. On the contrary, it is entirely God’s work in us, without any co-operation on our part (*What Luther Says*, ed. Ewald M. Plass [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959] 474, emphasis added; also WA, 103: 285).

31. *Herdabrev*, 151.

32. *Kyrkofromhet*, 23. However, as indicated above, the call of baptism remains as God continues to send his offers. See *Kyrkofromhet*, 16.

33. It is important to realize that here Giertz is in all likelihood speaking for a corrupted *human* perspective, speaking in behalf of the perspective of one who is experiencing the order of grace. For, as we know, one who *wants* to believe, *does* believe. Furthermore, Giertz would contend that at this point, such a person has only “first-article faith,” but does not yet know God as the personal Lord and *Redeemer* (second article). This person is certainly a worshiping creature and is now aware of the law written on the heart, but has not yet understood Jesus as *Savior*. See *Kyrkofromhet*, 25.

34. *Herdabrev*, 151.

35. *Kyrkofromhet*, 26.

36. See *Stengrunden*, 69; *Hammer of God*, 78.

37. *Kyrkofromhet*, 28.

38. See *Stengrunden*, 32; *Hammer of God*, 28–29.

39. *Kyrkofromhet*, 31.

40. Or perhaps “repentance.”

41. *Kyrkofromhet*, 2.

42. See *Stengrunden*, 239; *Hammer of God*, 296.

43. See *Stengrunden*, 238–239; *Hammer of God*, 295. Cf. Romans 5:20–21.

44. *Kyrkofromhet*, 39.

45. Luther said (1538), “Faith must be complete and embrace everything. Although it may be weak and subject to trial, it must in any case be complete . . . and not false. To be weak in faith does not do the damage, but to be wrong—that is eternal death” (WA, 50: 269; cited in Plass, 488).

46. *Kyrkofromhet*, 40.

47. “The longer one proceeds in the order of grace, the poorer one becomes” (Giertz, letter to Rosendal, 2 May 1941).

48. *Kyrkofromhet*, 43.

49. For an excellent discussion of the heavenly and earthly work of God, see Giertz’s contemporary, Swedish theologian Gustaf Wingren, *Luthers Lära Om Kallelsen* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1942), especially 9–88; English translation *Luther on Vocation* (reprint Evansville, IN: Ballast Press, 1994), especially 1–77.

50. This new birth is very much like sanctification. See below for more on this subject.

51. *Kyrkofromhet*, 46.

52. *Ibid.*, 47, 48 (emphasis added), 53.

53. It is important to remember that this includes his word on the two realms and the two kinds of righteousness spoken of above.

54. *Kyrkofromhet*, 50. See also *Stengrunden*, 285.

55. See *Stengrunden*, 269; *Hammer of God*, 332. See also *Kristi Kyrka*, 40, 70. It has been said that faith in Christ and faith in the church is one act of faith.

56. *Kyrkofromhet*, 52. For a depiction of the centrality of the Lord's Supper to the order of grace, see *Stengrunden*, 311–312. See also *Stengrunden*, 70; *Hammer of God*, 79.

57. Letter to Rosendal, “the last of” February 1938.

58. Letter to Rosendal, 7 March 1938. Kronoberg is one of the twenty-five counties in Sweden within the province of Småland in the south. At the time that Giertz wrote this letter he was serving a small rural parish (Torpa) in Småland.

59. *Sjålasörjare*, literally “spiritual guide” or “tender of souls.” See *Stengrunden*, 136; *Hammer of God*, 166.

60. Letter to Rosendal, 7 March 1938.

61. See *Stengrunden*, 187; *Hammer of God*, 223.

62. Or, perhaps, “indwelt by.”


63. *Grunden*, 19th ed. (Stockholm: SKDB, 1962), 129.

64. *Kyrkofromhet*, 53. See also *Stengrunden*, 256–263; *Hammer of God*, 313–323; an excellent presentation of the heart of Giertz's theology.

The PIEPER LECTURES

Volume 4
• 1999

Published by Luther Academy



THE PIEPER LECTURES, sponsored by Concordia Historical Institute and the Luther Academy and hosted by Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, are dedicated to the study and discussion of historical theology. Established in honor of Dr. Francis Pieper, professor and president at Concordia Seminary, president of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, and teacher of the church, these lectures are intended to address issues currently under discussion in the church and to provide an historical context useful for this discussion. The lectures are held annually.

The newest publication in this series is *What Does It Mean to Be Lutheran?* with lectures by Patrick T. Ferry, Scott Murray, Carter Lindberg, Martin R. Noland, J. A. O. Preus III, and Dean O. Wenthe, and edited by John A. Maxfield and Jennifer H. Maxfield.

LOGIA BOOKS

15825, 373rd Ave. • Northville, SD 57465

E-mail at logia2@nvc.net

Order on-line at www.logia.org

Softcover • 99 pages • retail \$14.95 LOGIA price \$11.95

REVIEWS

“It is not many books that make men learned . . . but it is a good book frequently read.”

Martin Luther



Review Essay

Ordnungen der Allmacht. Paul Althaus der Jüngere über die Ordnungen. By Walther Mann. In *Arbeiten zur Geschichte und Theologie des Luthertums*, founded by Werner Elert and Karl Heinrich Rengstorff and edited by Bengt Haeggglund, Heinrich Kraft, et al., *Neue Folge Band 7*. Hannover: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1987. 149 pages.

❖ A pupil of Herbert Olsson at Uppsala and of Bengt Häggglund at Lund, Walther Mann offers here the publication of his Swedish doctoral dissertation. Mann has sought out the most scattered publications of Althaus and produced a good piece of research. In the debate between Barth and Althaus, however, Mann stands on the side of Barth. Nevertheless, he still presents a diligent study of Althaus’s doctrine of revelation, together with criticisms of that teaching by Werner Wiesner, Kurt Leese, Richard Hauser, Rudolf Gebhardt, Paul Knitter, and others. Thereby reasons are provided for and against a natural knowledge of God. The positions of Karl Barth and the Barmen Declaration are compared, as well as the theology of other contemporaries such as Emil Brunner, Walter Künneth, and, more sparingly, Werner Elert. As a German expatriate living in Sweden, Mann also supplies insights gleaned from Scandinavian thinkers such as Anders Nygren and Herbert Olsson.

Politically a conservative and a monarchist in sympathies, Althaus, like many other Germans in the 1920s, disliked the Weimar Republic forced upon Germany at the end of World War I. During the rise of Hitler after January 1933, Althaus thought that the new leader would deliver Germany and give it prosperity and dignity again. He became a cautious supporter during the first years of the Third Reich. He never trusted Hitler completely, however, and he refrained from joining either the Nazi party or its German Christian Movement. After 1936, Althaus became increasingly critical of the political changes. He courageously attacked such Nazi programs as the paganization of the youth, “eugenics,” the forced sterilization of women, birth control, abortion, euthanasia, and the killing of the mentally retarded, epileptics, and the physically handicapped. He also spoke out against anti-Semitism and defended Jews who had become the victims of Nazi persecution. Mann mentions (116) his courageous and public support for Jochen Klepper, the

prominent writer and journalist, who had been ostracized and degraded by the Nazis for being married to a Jewish woman.

It was typical of Althaus throughout his career that he thought theology should be engaged in active dialogue with current political and social trends. He imagined in 1933 that he could beneficially influence the developments that were being brought in by Hitler’s people. In attempting to foster a critical dialogue between Christian thought and the new Nazi ideology, he updated his theology of orders in a small but important book, *Theologie der Ordnungen*; a first edition was published in 1934 and an expanded second edition came out in the following year.

In *Theologie der Ordnungen* Althaus developed, as in other writings, his unique doctrine of revelation as a distinction between *Ur-Offenbarung*, an “original” or primal revelation accessible to human reason and therefore available to all people, contrasted to the special revelation of God in Christ, accessible only to believers. A theology of *Ordnungen* (*Ordnung* might be translated as order, arrangement, or disposition) had to do with social institutions said to be anchored in divine creation, such as the family, marriage, nationality or race, the state, society, the church, and so forth. Such an order is something like a “given” quality (*Schicksal*) from creation. *Schicksal*, from *schicken* (“give”), included such “givens” as whether I am male or female, short or tall, black or white, and so forth. It is under these circumstances that I work within my vocation or order. Orders might include my estate in life, my calling, or my place in life, as given by God and as measured by his act of creation. The theology of the orders has to do with conditions under which people live, conditions that are a part of God’s creative action, past and present.

If temporal authority is an order of divine creation, how does one account for the sin found in all earthly governments? Althaus established a connection between the orders and sin, which Mann presents under the following basic tenets: “First: some orders, such as law and the state, are there on account of sin and for a world of sin. Second: people, as sinners, misuse the orders ever and again.” The orders are part of God’s good creation, but they are wrongly exploited by man. “Third: The disfigurement of the orders through human sin is further established in the orders themselves: we become guilty of them *from* them” (45).

Mann cites the following statement: “State and politics are orders given and willed by God. However, something of the demonism of power clings to them, and this in itself is somewhat evil. . . . The demonic is a means of life [Das Dämonie ist

Mittel des Lebens]” (45). Actually, this was one of the statements that were held against Althaus during the “denazification” program of the American military occupation; he was discharged from his position on February 2, 1947, was deprived of his income and of ration coupons, and lived with his family in great need and uncertainty for about a year, until his professorship was restored to him.

It seems that Mann is unfair when, in the following statement, he puts these words into the mouth of Althaus—words that Althaus really did not say: “Therefore, in the political power struggles of the peoples [Völker], most things are allowed, also that which we should otherwise find dishonorable and immoral, e.g., ‘the deception of the opponent can be a power tool that is often indispensable.’” (Only the italicized words were by Althaus; the rest of the sentence is an invention by Mann, 56.) Mann has really presented his own interpretation. He then has completed his sentence with words taken out of context from a work of Althaus, the *Grundriß der Ethik* of 1931, of which the reviewer happens to possess a rare copy. In its original context, this statement is obviously correct: diplomats often employ deception to secure their goals with foreign governments.

Mann’s discomfort with Althaus’s acceptance of sin in civil government leads him to find support in opponents of Althaus, such as the Roman Catholic critic Hauser. Hauser, noting that in Althaus the “demonic powers” in government are needful and progressive powers of historical development, complains that this implies “a strangely divided conception of the term of *Ordnungen*, according to which God’s creative will and the might of sin occur simultaneously in the same view” (87). As Mann notes, this is connected with Althaus’s basic antinomy in the person of God as hidden and revealed. Here the thoughtful reader may recall similar statements about the monergism of divine actions in Luther’s *Bondage of the Will*. The ways of *Deus absconditus* (the hidden God) are totally inscrutable to human reason.

Certainly Mann did not intend to misrepresent Althaus, but his weakness as an interpreter of the Erlangen systematician appears in this telling statement: “In §33, which speaks of the people [Volk] and state in history, it says that the measurement for right and guilt in politics is not the Sermon on the Mount but the reality of a people, its gift, history, and tasks. The ethical norms under which political action stands are different from those that apply to the relationships of one person to another” (56). Mann seems unaware that Lutherans have always taught that the Sermon on the Mount does not apply to the government, or that Luther’s two-kingdoms teaching distinguished between behavior of the Christian as a private person and his conduct as a public person in the official employ of his government.

In his own confusion, Mann blames Althaus for the following statement from 1940: “Luther’s word, drawn from the Bible, signifies the clear renunciation of all Christian-theocratic demands upon the state and the politics” (119). Thereby, he has missed the point that the one-kingdom doctrine of Barth was dangerously close to the one-kingdom doctrine of Hitler. The main difference was not that Barth was right and Hitler was wrong, but that Barth wanted a theocracy in which the religious community dictated to the civil community, and Hitler wanted the civil community to dictate to the religious community. The

only true solution was Luther’s doctrine of the two kingdoms—not in the many wrong interpretations of recent scholars, but the way the reformer taught it in his mature theology.

Mann has written a book criticizing Althaus’s understanding of the two kingdoms without himself giving a clear and balanced presentation of this doctrine. He wrongly presumes that Althaus misinterpreted Luther’s doctrine of the *zwei Regimente* as a distinction of “two kingdoms” in which the secular “kingdom” is placed outside of God’s jurisdiction. Such a misunderstanding of the two kingdoms, which partly rested upon Augustine’s dichotomy of the two cities, had misled Luther scholars and historians such as Ernst Troeltsch to impute to the political order an autonomous legal instance. So far as the reviewer can find, Mann’s contention that Althaus placed only the spiritual kingdom under divine control but left the temporal kingdom to operate without divine direction cannot be sustained from the primary sources, and he offers a different interpretation below.

Mann imputes this wrong interpretation also to Walter Künneth, who was renowned in the 1930s as the principle opponent of Hitler and Rosenberg (77–79), and was forced out of his post in Berlin by the Nazis in 1938. After six quiet years in a parish in southern Bavaria, he was called to Erlangen in 1944. Mann’s citations from the works of Künneth are too meager. He refers only to Künneth’s *Antwort auf dem Mythos* (1935) and his autobiography (1979), but overlooks his great work on political ethos, *Die Politik zwischen Dämon und Gott* (1954). Therefore, his criticisms of Künneth are superficial and miss their mark (77–79). Mann’s Künneth is not the real Künneth of recent history, a heroic person who reached a ripe old age and died in the autumn of 1997.

Mann’s description of the two kingdoms in Althaus is also flawed by insufficient documentation. Since Althaus taught the two kingdoms doctrine correctly in the writings that are known to the reviewer, and since Mann does not deal with these writings and fails to supply other ones, one can only say that Mann is falsely interpreting Althaus as well as Künneth. In view of the lack of sufficient proof by Mann from the sources, the reviewer offers the following evidence.

There are many cases where Althaus clearly places the secular power under the control of God. For example, in his *Die Ethik Martin Luthers* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965), he expressly rejects any dualism between the two kingdoms. He admits that in Luther’s early writing of 1523, “On Secular Authority,” such a dualism might be construed (*Die Ethik Martin Luthers*, 56–57), but he maintains that the later Luther avoided such a construction and made the temporal kingdom dependent upon God (*Die Ethik Martin Luthers*, 50–51, 60, 62). “Luther at no time turned the political world over to its own autonomous rule [*Eigengesetzlichkeit*], but always fought against the vanity of the princes and their misuse of secular rule” (Althaus, *Die Ethik Martin Luthers*, 87).

Over against the claims of Mann that Althaus held the princes unaccountable before God for the exercise of their power, that is, the theory of an autonomous rule (*Eigengesetzlichkeit*), one should turn to the following additional sources. As early as his 1931 *Grundriß der Ethik*, Althaus had emphasized the dependence of true government upon the divine will: “There is no true

leadership [*Führertum*] without the certainty that it exists ‘by the grace of God,’ which means for the leader [*Führer*] the unconditionality of his responsibility, not before men but before God” (*Grundriß der Ethik*, 102–103). Althaus rejected “a political amorality as well as an unpolitical moralism,” since each standpoint produced its opposite as a reaction (104). In the second edition of his *Theologie der Ordnungen* (1935) Althaus had stated, “The fact that we cannot set up a holy law (as the Roman Catholics do) does not mean that we may entrust the orders to a secular and godless legal autonomy (*Eigengesetzlichkeit*),” and concluded that, since Lutherans do not have a teaching magisterium, it is the duty of theologians to challenge the government when it steps out of line (44). Today we know, of course, that such criticisms quickly became impossible in Hitler’s Germany because they would only have sent their writer to the concentration camp.

After rejecting the notion of a “Christian politics” or the application of the Sermon on the Mount to the state, Althaus added:

The truth of the cliché “Christian politics” is the reminder therein that the objectivity of politics is something different from any empirical, demonic autonomous rule [*Eigengesetzlichkeit*], and that therefore political seriousness can assert itself only in a standing struggle against such autonomous rule [*Eigengesetzlichkeit*]. Jesus was crucified in the name of “reason of state” (*Grundriß der Ethik*, 104).

It is possible that Althaus’s understanding of the two kingdoms was not as clear in 1931 and that it became increasingly defined up until and after World War II.

Unlike Klaus Scholder, and to his praise, Mann does not ascribe to Althaus the easy identification of God’s Law with the People’s Law as held by Stapel and Gogarten. In his *Theologie der Ordnungen* (1935), Althaus had protested:

It is not self understood that the people’s law considers the norms established in God’s revelation: the holiness of life, and also the unborn; the holiness of a single life-long marriage, the highness of the Creator who alone establishes the bounds and limitations of our life and who forbids suicide as well as euthanasia, “the destruction of useless life.” Human reason can always find situations that make the opposite seem meaningful and appropriate. But reason needs the criticism of God’s word. Therefore, Christian criticism of the orders is necessary and possible. (Althaus, *Theologie der Ordnungen*, 39).

In summary, even though he does not always succeed in accurately portraying Althaus, Mann must be commended for his diligence. Nevertheless, we cannot accept his Barthian tendencies, which tend to detract from his purpose. Mann is unwilling to accept Althaus’s criticisms of the Barmen Declaration, and he cites approvingly Gunnar Hillderal’s opinion that Lutherans today should find a middle ground between Luther’s distinction of law and gospel and Barth’s identification of law and gospel. For a true Lutheran, the distinction between

law and gospel dare not be trivialized. Nevertheless, and in spite of its heavy German style, the book is recommended to the reader, who can easily discern where Mann has been misled by the positions of Barth and Barmen. There is too little material available on the theology of orders and the work of Althaus, and this book helps to fill the gap.

Lowell Green
Adjunct Professor of History
SUNY, Buffalo, New York

Christology. By Hans Schwarz. Grand Rapids and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.

❖ The artistic goal of the post-impressionist artist Paul Gauguin was to combine the visionary and the real in one composition. Appropriately, therefore, the artist’s *Green Christ* graces the cover of Hans Schwarz’s *Christology*, in which there is a similar attempt to combine the christologically visionary and real: the “Christ of faith” and the “Jesus of history.” In his own words, the author (professor of Protestant theology and director of the Institute of Protestant Theology, University, and adjunct professor of systematic theology, Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary, Columbia, South Carolina) endeavors “to ascertain, as far as this is still possible, whether the confession of Jesus as Christ rests on the proclamation, person, and destiny of Jesus of Nazareth” (3). In so doing, Schwarz makes his contribution to the renewed “quest for the historical Jesus,” a quest that has been forced to accept the historicity of Jesus, but as this volume clearly (but not intentionally) demonstrates, struggles to interpret it.

There is now, apparently, enough scientific evidence to assert confidently that the historical figure Jesus of Nazareth actually existed. But what does his historical existence mean for modern humanity? According to Schwarz, J. A. T. Robinson had it right when he described Jesus of Nazareth as the “human face of God” (compare Robinson’s book by the same title, published 1973). The present-day Christian, in experiencing this “human face of God” through faith, is called simply to follow Jesus, to follow Jesus in humility, service, suffering, but chiefly in joy (335). In a nutshell, this is Schwarz’s *Christology*. In view of Schwarz’s adaptation of Robinson’s “human face of God” and his reliance on christological research that appeared before 1970 (as a cursory glance at the footnotes will demonstrate), it is clear that the *Christology* presented in this work is somewhat dated to the time when the author (b. 1939) was finishing his studies and first beginning to teach in a university setting. It is of the Antiochian tradition, as would any *Christology* be if its content were restricted exclusively to those aspects of the life and preaching of Jesus that can be historically verified.

The significance of this work is not found in the content of its *Christology*, however, but in the appearance of that content in an ongoing christological dialogue within a specific school of Euro-American Protestant *Christology*—a school that has long held to the idea that the historical Jesus is simply unknowable (Schweitzer), but at the same time, has asserted that a Christian

proclamation that retains some sort of christological content is of value (Bultmann). Schwarz argues against such a position, positing, as have many before him (albeit outside of this specific dialogue), that the kerygmatic Christ is meaningless if not historical. But how does Schwarz bridge the philosophical ditch between the “accidental facts of history and the necessary facts of reason,” the bridge that continues to separate modern academic Christology from its pre-eighteenth-century ancestors? The author, borrowing here apparently from Wolfhart Pannenberg, asserts that a basic confidence in reason itself suffers from the same logical weakness as a basic confidence in the historicity of a certain fact.

It has become clear that there is a historical dimension to reason unless it is reduced to a non-historical ideology. As long as there is advancement in knowledge, whether in the sciences or in the humanities, the present assessment and insight of reality is valid only unless refuted by future insight or correspondingly modified. Reason therefore stands under an eschatological proviso. Its insights still lack ultimate verification. *The necessary truth of reason does not have an advantage over the accidental truth of history* (208, emphasis added).

This is the philosophical concept that makes Schwarz’s Christology academically possible, and that allows him a voice in the christological dialogue mentioned above.

On the back cover of the paperback edition, the Lutheran theologian Carl Braaten is quoted as saying that “this is the best available one-volume textbook on Christology for college and seminary courses.” I hope this is not true, for any such volume must not be restricted to the somewhat myopic theological methodology of German Protestantism in the modern era, a methodology that in almost all its facets is dominated by questions of history. Such a textbook, this reviewer hopes, must include a consideration of the Christologies of Rome, Constantinople, and Wittenberg (1) as well, if the modern college and seminary student is even to begin to understand Schwarz’s German Protestant Christology within its proper theological context. That being said, it must be noted that there are many aspects of Schwarz’s work that are somewhat un-German. The author does not, for example, develop his own Christology, making fundamental assertions of an original nature and then drawing necessary conclusions from them. Instead, his work is more of a guided reader where on any given subject two opposing viewpoints are given, and then Schwarz’s comments appear (but not in the fashion of Hegel’s thesis, antithesis, synthesis). Also worthy of note is Schwarz’s lack of reference—already mentioned above—to the christological research of the last twenty years. Although modestly footnoted, a select bibliography would have been appropriate and helpful.

All criticism’s aside, Schwarz’s work is valuable; in a very readable style it provides an overview of the christological ideas being bandied about in modern Protestant seminaries. If modern Christology was never the strength (or interest!) of a current pastor’s seminary studies, this book will be extremely helpful not only in helping him to get somewhat up-to-speed in this

field of theology, but also in providing a clear explanation of the christological assumptions and ideas of pastors from other Protestant traditions within his local community. In making such a contribution to local christological dialog, this work has solid ecumenical value.

Paul Strawn
Immanuel Lutheran Church
Silver Creek, Minnesota

The Paul Quest. By Ben Witherington III. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1998. 347 pages. Hardcover. \$22.99.

✦ With the “quest for the historical Jesus” now, presumably, in its third phase can a similar search for his greatest apostle be far behind? Ben Witherington III, professor of New Testament at Asbury Theological Seminary, makes a very welcome contribution in these pages to the growing corpus of Pauline scholarship. Having published previously on the Book of Acts and St. Paul, Witherington is well equipped for his task and has produced a very readable text that is solidly documented.

Reconstructing the “trinity of Paul’s identity” as a Jew, a Roman citizen, and a Christian, the author explores the various facets of the apostle as writer, rhetor, prophet, apostle, realist, radical, exegete, ethicist, and theologian. Equally valuable, though tucked into the Appendix, is an excellent chronological grid and commentary on Paul’s career.

Predictably—also in view of the publisher—Witherington’s stance is conservative, but intelligently so. This is especially evident in his discussion of disputed New Testament writings related to Paul. Ephesians and Colossians, for example, ought not be dismissed out of hand as not from Paul’s pen: nothing in them is un- or anti-Pauline, and “differences in purpose, function, secretaries, and rhetorical character can quite readily explain the differences between the earlier Paulines and these documents” (111).

The same argument is partially used to support Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles, but with this proviso: they may be the only Pauline writings “that did not involve some form of reasonably close dictation” (112). Perhaps Luke or someone like him wrote the Pastoral Epistles on Paul’s behalf but in his own style, Witherington suggests, since the language and form between the Pastorals and Luke-Acts is similar.

Most illuminating are the snippets of fresh information on Paul’s world that Witherington scatters with abandon in these pages. Following are two examples. One reason that Saul changed his name to Paul—aside from the standard explanations—is that *saulos* in Greek connotes someone who strutted about suggestively, like a prostitute! Again, it has been estimated that only 20 percent of first-century ancients could read or write, and the writing utensil was a reed, not a quill, since the latter seems to have been first used in the seventh century A.D. Such items, including a delightful excursus on papyrus, garnish the work throughout.

In other debates within Pauline scholarship, Witherington sets Paul’s attitude toward women in a contemporary perspective that is anything but misogynist. He posits Galatians—not First

Thessalonians—as the earliest Pauline epistle. He correctly rejects the theory of an Ephesian imprisonment for Paul—in my opinion a cul-de-sac that should have been abandoned long ago. He also concludes, with a growing number of New Testament scholars, that Paul was indeed released after his first imprisonment in Rome and pursued a brief, continuing ministry.

To be sure, there are a few flaws in *The Paul Quest*. Pontius Pilate, for example, is termed a procurator (304) when he was a prefect in fact, as demonstrated in an inscription that includes his name and title discovered at Caesarea Maritima in 1961. Witherington prefers April 7, A.D. 30, for the date of the crucifixion, though there is strong evidence that it occurred on April 3, A.D. 33, but this is certainly an author's option. This reviewer also wondered about the long, italicized introductions to each chapter, which were a bit difficult to read and perhaps less than necessary.

But these are tiny cavils. For a thorough, penetrating, yet felicitous and readable study that avoids the sensationalist extremes of revisionist scholarship, *The Paul Quest* is the best book on the greatest apostle since F. F. Bruce's *Paul—Apostle of the Heart Set Free*.

Paul L. Maier
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan

The Wauwatosa Theology. Three volumes. Curtis Jahn, Editor. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1997. Hardcover. \$93.99.

◆ *The Wauwatosa Theology* is a three-volume collection of the works of the three most significant theologians of the Wisconsin Synod: J. P. Koehler, August Pieper, and John Schaller. During the first three decades of the twentieth century, these three theologians at the Wisconsin Synod seminary in Wauwatosa, whose devotion to the doctrine of the gospel and all its articles as presented in Holy Scripture influenced so many of their students, shaped and defined the Wisconsin Synod's approach to theology. This became known as the Wauwatosa Theology or the Wauwatosa Gospel.

Wayne Mueller writes in the Dedicatory Preface:

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the Missouri and Wisconsin synods emerged as strong partners, holding the line against the overseas threat of European liberalism and American Lutheranism's *intuitu fidei* at home. The unity of the Synodical Conference was personally reflected in the congeniality of Missouri's Walther and Wisconsin's Hoenecke.

But in 1903 a stress fracture began to develop. Hoenecke died, and the Cincinnati case confronted both synods with church and ministry issues that they have never mutually resolved. For these stressful times, God raised up three men whose devotion to the Scriptures continues to define Wisconsin's approach to change. These three men were Professors J. P. Koehler, August Pieper, and John Schaller—the Wauwatosa theologians.

In the first thirty years of this century, these professors at the Wisconsin seminary in Wauwatosa refreshed the church with a direct appeal to the Bible. They honored the disciplines of confessional, historical, and systematic theology, but they set exegetical theology on center stage. They honored the church's fathers in their writings but did not deify them. They studied the Lutheran Confessions but held them to their place as *norma normata*. In church and ministry, they distinguished biblical doctrine from deeply rooted European ministry traditions. God gave them grace to allow his Spirit to do the talking.

The essays in this three-volume set are arranged in six general categories: Survey and Samples, Interpretation and Exposition of Scripture, Law and Gospel, Church and Ministry, Evaluations of Trends and Figures in American Lutheranism, and Music and Hymnody.

A very informative introductory essay by Martin Westerhaus, "The Wauwatosa Theology: the Men and their Message," gives the reader a historical survey of what is meant by the term "Wauwatosa Theology." In eighty-three pages Westerhaus reviews the history of the synod and gives biographical sketches of the Wauwatosa theologians. He makes the point that to "define and describe the Wauwatosa theology adequately, it will be necessary to attempt first to distinguish it from what might be called the Milwaukee or Hoenecke theology" (1: 15). The Wauwatosa theology is the work of the second generation of teachers at the Wisconsin Synod seminary.

All three of the Wauwatosa theologians, Schaller, Pieper, and Koehler, received their theological training at the feet of C. F. W. Walther and his colleagues in St. Louis. The doctrinal content of the Wauwatosa theology is almost completely identical with Walther's theology. All three Wauwatosa men were faithful pupils of Walther. They never repudiated Walther, but rather claimed to interpret him, especially as the doctrine of church and ministry came under discussion in the first decade of the twentieth century.

All three Wauwatosa theologians have some interesting Missouri Synod background and ties. August Pieper was the brother of Francis and Reinhold Pieper, presidents of the St. Louis and Springfield seminaries. John Schaller's father, Johann Michael Gottlieb Schaller was one of the men sent to America by Wilhelm Loehe. Loehe referred to him as his "Timothy." He joined the Missouri Synod in 1850, and when the controversy between Loehe and the Missouri Synod regarding the doctrine of church and ministry came to a head, he declared himself to be in agreement with the Missouri Synod (1: 66). J. P. Koehler, in addition to studying under Walther, was especially influenced by the exegetical work and method of G. Stoeckhardt at the St. Louis seminary.

The Wauwatosa theologians were second-generation Wisconsin Synod Lutherans. Their approach to theology was intentionally exegetical in nature and practice. The first generation (Adolf Hoenecke and Johannes Bading) struggled for confessional Lutheranism against the "American Lutheranism" of the day. It was the second generation's theologians that set the watershed for the theology that has become known in the Wisconsin

Synod as the Wauwatosa Theology. In their writings there is no suggestion that they disapproved of Walther, their teacher, or of Hoenecke's dogmatical method. Westerhaus writes: "The doctrinal content of the Wauwatosa theology is almost completely identical with the Walther-Hoenecke theology If the Wauwatosa theology represents a change from the Walther-Hoenecke theology, it is first and foremost a change in method" (1: 85).

When Hoenecke died in 1908, John Schaller was called to be his successor. In his introductory essay Westerhaus writes, quoting from Pieper's remarks in Schaller's obituary, that Schaller

was a faithful pupil of Walther together with his colleagues who were of the same age, but he did not remain purely a pupil, but became a mature master in the knowledge of the gospel, and so he stood with us from the beginning for the one great thing: above all else the study of the gospel directly from the source, independent Scripture study, not passage by passage, but book by book, ultimately from the original text. . . . agreeing that the historical-exegetical studies must claim first place as laying the foundation (1: 69).

Westerhaus goes on to note that Schaller's *Biblical Christology* (1918) was the first volume of what was intended to become a complete Lutheran dogmatics in English. It appeared just shortly after the publication of the middle volume of Francis Pieper's work.

If one wants to understand the theology of the Wisconsin Synod, one must look to the writings of the Wauwatosa theologians. This new three-volume set contains the most significant articles and essays of the Wauwatosa theologians, many for the first time in English.

Other major writings of the Wauwatosa theologians have been available in English for some time. Koehler's great work *The History of the Wisconsin Synod* was translated and published by *Faith-Life*, edited and with an introduction by Leigh Jordahl. Koehler's commentary on the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians was translated by E. E. Sauer in 1957. August Pieper's great exposition of the book of Isaiah, chapters 40–66, was translated by E. E. Kowalke and published by Northwestern Publishing House in 1979. John Schaller's introduction to the books of the Bible was first published by Northwestern in 1924. Recently it has been revised by Loren Schaller and printed as part of the Peoples' Bible Series. Schaller's *Biblical Christology, a Study in Lutheran Dogmatics* was published again in 1981.

The most noteworthy essay in this collection is J. P. Koehler, "Legalism among Us" ("Gesetzlich Wesen unter uns") (2: 229–282). The essay was originally published in the *Theologische Quartalschrift* in 1914 and 1915. It was accorded a unique kind of recognition when it was read as the convention essay at the Thirty-Fifth Convention of the Wisconsin Synod in 1959. Koehler's major concern was the danger for the church in mixing gospel proclamation with the use of the law in seeking to further the kingdom of God. Koehler writes:

An example of the wrong emphasis of systematic logical consistency is the way Calvin in the election controversy infers, from the sovereignty of God, election and rejection; or where

on the Lutheran side, in order to avoid Calvinistic determinism, the *intuitu fidei* was invented. Both methods go beyond the scriptural statements in that they produce thought connections not stated by Scripture (2: 243).

Koehler further describes what is now called Wauwatosa theology:

This method, which treats Scripture with its content as a codex of so and so many fixed propositions that confront a person as something he must believe because after all, it is God's Word, this is legalistic compulsion. . . . The proper method is the following: At the apex stands the proposition of the forgiveness of sins. This has been called the material principle of theology, while the proposition of the divinity of Scripture is called the formal principle. By the way, I don't like these terms either because they are derived from Melancthon's completely distorted presentation of theology, which is purely intellectual and just on that account legalistically composed. For me, faith in the forgiveness of sins is the main point (2: 244).

Koehler gives several examples of legalism: "The constant allusion to one's own synod and its leaders, as if there were no other Christians" (2: 252). In another place Koehler writes:

Here too belong, for example, confessional addresses delivered according to the prescription: How a true penitent properly prepares for Communion; there, throughout the entire outline of the sermon, the sinner is wholly taken up with himself and his own activity, not only in the first part (and not properly even there), but above all in the second and third parts, instead of being directed entirely to the gift of grace offered in the Lord's Supper (2: 253).

The essays on church and ministry (Schaller's "The Kingdom of God" and "The Origin and Development of the New Testament Ministry," Pieper's "The Doctrine of the Church and Its Marks Applied to the Synod," "Concerning the Doctrine of the Church and of Its Ministry, with Special Reference to the Synod and Its Discipline," "Luther's Doctrine of Church and Ministry," and "Paul, a Model of the Certainty of Faith, Especially for All Servants of the Word") will be of special interest in view of current discussions of this doctrine.

The one doctrinal change or refinement of Walther's theology that was introduced and adopted by the Wauwatosa faculty was the altered understanding of the doctrine of church and ministry. A shift in understanding on the doctrine of the church developed after 1904 as a result of what is known as the Cincinnati case. This led to a series of articles on the topic of church and ministry. "The three Wauwatosa men stood shoulder to shoulder on this matter, and in time their *Amtslehre* was accepted by the whole synod" (1: 56). They taught that the local congregation is not the only divinely instituted form of the church. The church, according to Scripture, is where the gospel is in use. Therefore, they concluded, the synod is also church. Concerning the ministry they maintained that God "established only one office, one ministry, in the church—the ministry of

preaching the gospel” (3: 73). He has not instituted any particular form of this ministry.

The public ministry is not left to the freedom of the church. It is a command of God. The public ministry constitutes a special God-ordained way of practicing the one ministry of the gospel. Schaller writes:

If, therefore, we want to gain a correct understanding of the forms of the ministry as we find them in the church of all times, we have to free ourselves from the thought that only official public proclaiming is gospel preaching. This false view betrays itself immediately when one simply identifies the ministry [*Predigtamt*] with the pastoral ministry [*Pfarramt*], even when the clear presentation of thoughts demands something else, as for example, if one takes the sentence, “The ministry [*Predigtamt*] is the only office [*Amt*] that Christ ordained in his church,” and construes it without further thought as if it were speaking exclusively about the pastoral office (3: 81).

This teaching soon became known as the Wisconsin position on church and ministry. The differences between the Wisconsin and Missouri positions, however, were never viewed as divisive. Both sides existed and were accepted in the old Synodical Conference. Supporters of either position were found in both synods. It was often said that Wisconsin practices what Missouri teaches, and Missouri practices what Wisconsin teaches.

Some Missouri theologians (Paul Zimmerman and A.C. Stellhorn) found the Wisconsin position on the ministry acceptable. And in recent years the Wisconsin position on the ministry is being looked upon by some in Missouri as the answer to their theological discussions and problems concerning the ministry. Others in Missouri view the Wisconsin position on the church as being essentially Walther’s position, and claim that the so-called Missouri position first began with Theodore Graebner (synods exist by human command, and only congregations exist by divine command).

Some liberal theologians in the Missouri Synod have used this disagreement on church and ministry to try to prove that in the old Synodical Conference complete agreement in all doctrines was not necessary for church fellowship. This accusation led Pastor A. T. Kretzmann of Trinity, Crete, Illinois, in the 1960s to call for a series of meetings between the professors at Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary, Mequon, and some Missouri Synod pastors to discuss the differences on church and ministry with the purpose of showing that the two positions are not divisive of church fellowship. In the end, Kretzmann accepted the Wisconsin position and joined the synod, but never called the Missouri position false doctrine.

When Wisconsin broke fellowship with the Missouri Synod in 1962, the only reason stated was a disagreement on the doctrine of church fellowship. The differences on church and ministry were not mentioned. They were always viewed as differences of interpretation and not doctrinal differences. Both sides claimed Walther for support of their positions. When, however, some separated from the Missouri Synod in the second half of the twentieth century (Orthodox Lutheran Church, Concordia Lutheran Conference, Lutheran Churches of the Reformation), the

differences on church and ministry became *the* important issue and divisive of fellowship. But also with the breakup of the Synodical Conference, Wisconsin has gone on to define its position of church and ministry more clearly, claiming that it is the position of Walther and Hoenecke and the Wauwatosa theologians.

It might here be useful to reproduce the four resolutions, commonly known as the Thiensville Theses, which were accepted on April 16, 1932, by the faculty of the seminary at Thiensville and by representatives of the St. Louis faculty. In due course the presidents of both synods also accepted these theses of agreement.

It is God’s will and order, as we understand from Holy Scripture, that Christians living in the same locality also enter into outward union with one another, in order jointly to exercise the duties of their spiritual priesthood.

As we understand from Scripture, it is furthermore God’s will and order that such local congregations of Christians have shepherds and teachers who in the name and on behalf of the congregation carry out the ministry of the Word in their midst.

As we understand from Holy Scripture, it is also God’s will and order that local congregations of Christians give expression to their unity of faith with other congregations and carry on the work of the Kingdom of God jointly with them outside their own circle also, as for example this is done among us in the free form of a synod.

Since every Christian possesses the keys of the kingdom of heaven, a judgment pronounced in agreement with the Word of God by a single Christian or by a number of Christians in any kind of combination has validity also in heaven. But, as we understand from Holy Scripture, it is God’s will and order that an action against a sinning brother shall not be regarded as having been concluded until his local congregation has acted. The disciplinary action of a local congregation and synodical discipline, if matters are handled correctly, cannot come into conflict with each other, because the local congregation excludes from the local congregation and not from the synod, and the synod excludes from the synod and not from the local congregation.

John Schaller’s essay “Self-Examination, according to 1 Corinthians 11:28” (2: 363) is of special interest today in discussions concerning the Lord’s Supper and private confession. Schaller writes:

That lies in the words of institution. Because the Lord offers the body which he gave for us and the blood which is shed for us, a Christian’s going to Communion is a sermon on the death of the Lord. . . . The apostle also notes that in the Sacrament lies the entire holy gospel of God

That one misunderstands the catechism in this point comes in part from the fact that among us, confession has stood in close connection with the Lord’s Supper for a long time. For Luther, confession is a special establishment, which one also can use completely apart from the sacraments. . . . Christians so often do just that, if they come to their pastor with a troubled conscience in order to hear from him the comfort of the gospel

We are doing exactly the right thing, for example, when we draw the attention of our Christians to the fact that he who comes to the Lord's Supper only out of habit or who comes only because he has to or who comes in pharisaical self-righteousness without the desire for the forgiveness of sins, partakes in an unworthy manner. . . .

If the Christian approaches the Sacrament with the thought, the trust, Here I receive everything the Lord has won for me through his death—then he comes “in a worthy manner” (2: 366, 368–370).

Some other essays in these volumes that will provide thought-provoking and stimulating reading are Koehler's “Sanctification Is not Hurrah,” “The Decline of the Congregational Hymn in the Eighteenth Century,” and “The Analogy of Faith.” Schaller's “Redemption and Universal Justification according to 2 Corinthians 5:18–21” will provide much food for thought. And Pieper's “The Great Prophecy of the Virgin's Son in Its Historical Setting: Isaiah 7:10–16” is very timely.

Westerhaus raises the question in his essay, “Did the Wauwatosa theology move to Thiensville/Mequon when the seminary moved there in 1929?” The Protestants, who were originally put out of the Wisconsin Synod in the 1920s, would answer that the Wauwatosa theology left the seminary when J. P. Koehler was removed. Westerhaus denies this, claiming that the Wauwatosa theology was not the work of only one man, but of all three. One may also reflect on what the Wauwatosa theologians would say about such present ideas as a “theology of money,” pastors acting

more like a psychotherapist than *Seelsorger*, church-growth methods, living nativity sets, children's sermons, and the new hymn-book, *Christian Worship*.

There is much good theology presented in these three volumes. Northwestern Publishing House has done a great service to the church in making these essays by the Wauwatosa theologians available. They retained and passed on both to their students and to succeeding faculties the theology of Luther, the Lutheran Confessions, and Lutheran orthodoxy. They believed in the efficacy of the gospel and that the gospel alone would produce the desired results according to God's will and purpose, when and where it pleases him. They retained and passed on this doctrine of the gospel, especially in its articles of objective justification, conversion, election, and the plenary inspiration and inerrancy of Holy Scripture.

Mark F. Bartling
Mt. Calvary Lutheran Church
LaCrosse, Wisconsin

Jesus—The Miracle Worker. By Graham H. Twelftree. Downer's Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1999. 470 pages. Paper. \$24.99.

What sets this detailed study apart from the many Jesus books appearing recently is its concentration on the miracles of Jesus, a theme either overlooked as an embarrassment in liberal studies or somewhat scanted even by more conservative writers.

NUMEROUS LECTURES AND FREE CONFERENCES are held each year dealing with various topics related to our Confessions and parish practice. Sometimes these presentations have a relatively small audience due to remote locations, limited promotion, and schedule conflicts. LOGIA Tapes, however, is one way of surmounting such hurdles, extending the benefits of these lectures and conferences to you.

TAPES • Write for a complete listing or visit our website

— **In the Name of Jesus**

Sermons preached by Dr. Norman E. Nagel at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis (1983–1999). Detailed listing included. (7 tapes) ■ \$33.25

— **Advent Preaching Seminar**

Rev. Michael Albrecht, Dr. Dean Wenthe, Rev. John T. Pless. (6 tapes) ■ \$28.50

— **Lent and Baptismal Renewal**

Rev. John T. Pless ■ \$5.00

— **Preaching the Theology of the Cross in Lent**

Dr. Steven Hein. (4 tapes) ■ \$19.00

— **Preaching Hebrews in Lent: The Blood of Christ**

Dr. John Kleining. (4 tapes) ■ \$19.00

— **The Greatest Threat to the Church**

Rev. Harold Senkbeil ■ \$5.00

Phone ▲ 605-887-3145
E-mail ▲ logia2@nvc.net
Secure Website ▲ www.logia.org
Mail ▲ LOGIA Tapes • 15825, 373rd Ave.
Northville, SD 57465

When tapes of such conference speakers are made available to LOGIA, we reproduce them and serve as a clearing house for those who are interested. Listening to these tapes while driving or devoting a quiet hour to study in the morning can be most refreshing! One can gather from these tapes resources for sermons, catechesis, and Bible studies, or even recall the substance of pertinent lectures from seminary days.

ORDERING INFORMATION

Title (Rev., Mr., Mrs., Miss), Name _____

Mailing Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone number _____

Total # of tape titles ordered _____

For credit card—Visa or MasterCard: Card # and Expiration Date: _____

Overseas orders add \$2 extra shipping per tape

All funds U.S. • Price includes postage and handling _____

10/2000

• Total Amount

\$ _____

Submit taped presentations you would like LOGIA Tapes to consider offering to LOGIA Tape Review
15825 373rd Ave. • Northville, SD 57465.

The author, who is a scholar-pastor in Adelaide, Australia, has previously written on Jesus as exorcist, and so came quite naturally to this topic.

After dealing with the philosophical question of whether the modern mind can accept the miraculous in the first place—it can, according to Twelftree—the author moves on to a very thorough exegetical study of the miracles in Mark, Matthew, Luke, and the Fourth Gospel, in that order. Intriguing parallels, but also decided contrasts, emerge from this study, which should prove helpful reading to anyone preaching on the miracle episodes in the Gospels. The author asks—and answers—some knotty questions in this regard, such as, Why does the Gospel of John, in contrast to the Synoptics, offer no accounts of Jesus’ exorcisms?

Understandably, the reader’s concentration level increases when Jesus performs the ultimate sign: raising the dead. Jesus’ own resurrection is not covered in these pages, which are limited to those signs and wonders performed by Jesus. Happy to be a member of the “Third Quest” for the historical Jesus, Twelftree solidly affirms the historicity of the extraordinary episodes involving the young man of Nain, the daughter of Jairus, and Lazarus. He demonstrates that these accounts derive from the earliest stratum of Christian tradition.

A galaxy of scholars are commending Twelftree’s work, ranging from Jesus scholars John P. Meier to Craig Blomberg to Martin Hengel. I can join the chorus, though with one complaint: a little more attention to non-exegetical evidence for the miracles would have been helpful in so long a book. Examples would be the archaeological discovery of “the Galilee boat” in 1986, which provides important background information on Jesus’ “sea” miracles during his Galilean ministry. And why omit fascinating information that the early church historian Eusebius tells us about the woman whom Jesus cured of a hemorrhage? She later erected a statue of Jesus in front of her home in Caesarea Philippi, which Eusebius himself saw (*Church History* 7.18).

Again, a fascinating addendum to Jesus’ raising Lazarus from the dead comes from geography. Eusebius reports that already in his day, Lazarus’ home town of Bethany had been renamed “The Place of Lazarus,” and it is called such in Arabic—*El Lazariveh*—to the present day. I find this to be crucial evidence that might have been included in so large a book. I commend it to the next edition of this work, which certainly should enjoy a wide and continuing readership.

Paul L. Maier
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan

The Design of God’s Love: Overcoming Violence in Our Lives. Edited by Jeanie W. Reese. St. Peter, Minnesota: Gustavus Adolphus College. 136 pages.

❖ “I have killed a man for wounding me, even a young man for hurting me.” This boast by Lamech (Genesis 4:23) seems fitting for our times. We live in a society where violence is often seen as a legitimate response against people. The attacker is often portrayed as the victim and the violent acts excused.

Violence begets even more violence, and the brutality escalates. This is the way of the old Adam, which seeks to place itself above God and neighbor.

Lutherans have always maintained that the church and her members have an important role in society. Our Lord calls us to love our neighbors the same as we love ourselves (Mk 12:31). We are not to remain silent when our brother is injured but “help and befriend him in every bodily need” (Luther’s Small Catechism). We have a responsibility to speak the truth against violence and seek peace among our fellow men.

The editor, in keeping with this tradition, offers a collection of sermons that address the issue of violence. These sermons, covering such topics as domestic violence, hatred, war, and the environment, were among those submitted by ELCA clergy in response to a church-wide appeal. The purpose of this work is “to enlighten, give hope, and encourage others to address this important topic of violence.” It is offered “with the conviction that the power to confront violence is in ‘the design of the great love’ of God” (5).

While the intention of this collection is to be commended, the sermons in it fail to live up to the stated purpose. The most serious flaw is that the sermons do not distinguish properly between law and gospel. This distinction is critical to the preaching of a proper Lutheran sermon. By failing to distinguish properly between law and gospel the sermons in this collection preach a different gospel that is merely a rehashing of the law.

None of the sermons seriously addresses the root cause of violence: the sinful heart of man. The focus of each and every one of them is changing our behavior not our hearts. No matter how noble the preacher’s intention, the goal of a sermon is never sanctification, but rather justification of the sinner through the cross of Jesus Christ. The sermons in this book that mention the cross of Jesus Christ quickly degenerate into moralism—do this, don’t do that. Such sermons may make the reader more socially aware and responsible, but they do nothing to bring him closer to his Lord and Savior.

Another flaw of this collection is its pandering to political correctness. One of the greatest acts of violence in our society, the killing of unborn children, is ignored. No sermon on this topic is included. The sermon against hatred of homosexuals (76 ff.) is nothing more than the promotion of a sin condemned by God. The failure to speak against these sins is itself an act of violence—violence against both God’s word and our fellow man.

One would have hoped that a collection such as this, one that addresses such serious an issue in our society, would be an example of good Lutheran preaching. Sadly, it is not. It fails both from the perspective of law and gospel and in the choice of topics. These sermons are nothing more than a theology of glory, in which our works and our effort define our place as God’s people. The emphasis on moralism and the pandering to political correctness nullify whatever assistance the editor intended by these sermons.

Daryl Gehlbach
Prince of Peace Lutheran Church for the Deaf
Minneapolis, Minnesota

BRIEFLY NOTED

The Sunday Lectionary: Ritual Word, Paschal Shape. By Normand Bonneau. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1998.

✦ After a historical survey of the history of lectionary development from the synagogue to the *Missale Romanum* of 1570, Bonneau turns to the Second Vatican Council's reform of the lectionary, outlining the five guiding principles for lectionary renovation. This is a helpful book for understanding the theological themes that shaped the three-year lectionary.

Experience the Mystery: Pastoral Possibilities for Christian Mystagogy. By David Regan. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1994.

✦ Drawing on the Roman Catholic Church's *Rites of Christian Initiation for Adults*, Regan argues for a fuller use of final phase of this process, mystagogy, as a means for instilling a sense of mystery in the catechumen. Although Odo Casel is only mentioned in passing, the imprint of his theology is apparent throughout the book.

The Lord's Prayer. By Martin Chemnitz. Translated by Georg Williams. Saint Louis: CPH, 1999.

✦ Chemnitz writes that "as the Creed is the rule of faith, so the Lord's Prayer is the rule of all prayers" (21). With this in mind, Chemnitz provides an exposition of each petition of the Our Father aiming at instilling in his readers boldness and confidence in their praying, grounded in the promises of Christ.

Sin, Death, and the Devil. Edited by Carl Braaten and Robert Jenson. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000.

✦ The essays in this volume explore the "unholy trinity" of sin, death, and the devil. Robert Jenson introduces the collection with a discussion of the "nothingness" of these three villains. Stanley Hauerwas explores the relationship of sin to sickness. Gary Anderson takes another look at the doctrine of original sin, arguing that "the story of human beginnings is only intelligible in light of its end" (22). A. N. Williams contributes a chapter entitled "The Eucharist as Sacrament of Union," arguing that the chief benefit of the Sacrament is union with the life of the Trinity. Gilbert Meilaender uses Augustine, Saint Francis, and C. S. Lewis to give an answer to the Catechism's question "What does baptism give or profit?" Carl Braaten looks at the devil's demise in liberal Protestantism and notes that such a dismissal of the devil diminishes the gospel. Drawing on the liturgy of the Eastern Orthodox Church, Vigen Guroian holds up the resurrection of Jesus as the triumph of God over the grave.

Inside Out: Worship in an Age of Mission. Edited by Thomas Schattauer. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.

✦ Ten professors of worship at ELCA seminaries in the United States and Canada engage themes related to the church's liturgical life and mission in the world. Topics include the liturgical assembly as locus of mission, preaching, baptism, holy communion, the liturgical year, liturgical space, music, ritual practice, occasional services, and liturgy and mission in the North American context.

JTP

LOGIA Forum

SHORT STUDIES AND COMMENTARY

FIRST CONTACT

Augsburg and Constantinople: The Correspondence between the Tübingen Theologians and Patriarch Jeremiah II of Constantinople on the Augsburg Confession by George Mastrantonis (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982) is a frequently cited book regarding the relationship between Lutherans and the Eastern Orthodox. The following excerpt comes from the Introduction, pages 8-10. A chapter on common beliefs, adiaphora, and matters in dispute begins on page 20 of that work.

First contact between Lutheran theologians and the Orthodox Church took place when the Patriarch of Constantinople, Joasaph II (1555-1565), sent Deacon Demetrios Mysos to meet the leaders of the Lutheran movement so he could study their teachings, but also the personalities behind the movement. Mysos spent approximately six months as Melanchthon's guest in Wittenberg. From the beginning a warm, sincere friendship was established between the two. During this short period of time it is believed that the translation of the Augsburg Confession into the Greek language was completed and a copy supposedly given to Deacon Mysos to present to Patriarch Joasaph. Melanchthon sent a personal letter in which he expressed his delight in his friendship with Mysos and his respect and reverence for the Patriarch in Constantinople. It is surprising to note that before the arrival of Mysos, Melanchthon was unaware that the ancient Church in Constantinople had survived one hundred-odd years under Turkish domination. It was natural that Mysos be prepared for

the encounter with instructions from Patriarch Joasaph, and also with his own keen knowledge of theology and a knowledge of the language used in the dialogue. It is probable that Melanchthon could have used the spoken Greek language, as he was fluent in writing Greek.

It seems that Melanchthon and Mysos decided to present to Patriarch Joasaph the original Augsburg Confession, which contained the Lutheran teaching as it was accepted by all the leaders and adherents of the Lutheran Church at that time. The Augsburg Confession was written originally in Latin and German. It also seems that they decided to translate the Augsburg Confession into Greek. Melanchthon was capable of this task and Mysos probably helped him in its literal composition into Greek. The translation of the Augsburg Confession into Greek is a free translation, but without a change of meaning. The assumption that the Augsburg Confession was translated into Greek by Paul Dolscius, whose name appeared on the Greek text, is not substantiated. Dolscius may have assisted in copying the translation as a secretary or copyist. It is doubtful that a third person translated it while Melanchthon and Mysos were studying its content together. The claim that the Augsburg Confession was a free translation into Greek, without changing its meaning, tends to support the belief that Melanchthon was the translator. Only the original writer of this document could be prepared to translate it freely into Greek. Because Melanchthon was subsequently (although unjustly) accused of being a crypto-Calvinist, his name may have been replaced by that of one who assisted him as a copyist. It is not the intent of this study to review the controversy on this matter of the translator.

After the completion of Mysos' mission, he left Melanchthon, who gave him a warm personal letter for Patriarch Joasaph. But there is no evidence that Mysos returned to Constantinople and presented the Patriarch with the documents. The silence of Patriarch Joasaph was interpreted by Professor Ioannes Karmires to mean that the Patriarch received the letter and the Greek Augsburg Confession, discussed the matter with Mysos, and found that the Lutherans accepted many interpretations foreign to the ecumenical teaching of the ancient Church. But this interpretation concerning Mysos has no historical basis. On the contrary, Professor Ernst Benz traced the return journey of Mysos and showed that Mysos did not return to Constantinople, nor did

ARTICLES FOUND IN LOGIA FORUM may be reprinted freely for study and dialogue in congregations and conferences with the understanding that appropriate bibliographical references be made. Initialed pieces are written by contributing editors whose names are noted on our masthead. Brief articles may be submitted for consideration by sending them to Rev. Joel A. Brondos, 2313 S. Hanna St., Fort Wayne, IN 46803-3477.

When possible, please provide your work on a 3.5-inch Windows/DOS compatible diskette. Because of the large number of unsolicited materials received, we regret that we cannot publish them all or notify authors in advance of their publication. Since LOGIA is "a free conference in print," readers should understand that views expressed here are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the positions of the editors.

he give the Patriarch the Augsburg Confession in Greek. During the time that Mysos was with Melanchthon (1558) in Wittenberg, he became acquainted with a Dr. Peucer, the son-in-law of Melanchthon, a Slavophile, who was able to converse in Slavonic. Previously, Hans von Ungnad had approached Mysos and promised him a position as a translator of the writings of the reformers into Slavonic. Meanwhile, Prince Heraclides had retaken Romania from the Turks and established a Christian kingdom, reforming it after the pattern of the Reformation. Professor Benz established that Mysos decided to serve Prince Heraclides, and remained there after the Prince's death. Therefore, Melanchthon's letter never reached Constantinople.

The leaders of the Lutheran Church had some knowledge of the teachings of the Orthodox Church, although they had no knowledge of contemporary Orthodoxy because of the conquest of Greece and surrounding countries by the Ottoman Empire from 1453 with the fall of the Byzantine Empire. Luther invoked the teachings of the Orthodox Church in his discussion with theologian Eck in Leipzig (in 1519) and elsewhere. Also, the Greek Church was mentioned in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession in 1530 and in 1537 in the Smalcald Articles.

After the first endeavor in 1559 to establish cordial relations between the Lutheran movement and the Orthodox Church, a silence prevailed between the two. The death of Melanchthon in 1560, and Mysos' failure to return to Constantinople to complete his mission were events which contributed to this silence. With the death of Melanchthon, the Greek translation of the Augsburg Confession vanished, and its fate is unknown; it is not to be found in the archives of the Patriarchate. Nor are there any traces of its existence in the hands of other clergymen or laymen who shared the responsibility of the Patriarchate in Constantinople at that time. Even Martin Crusius had a difficult time in locating a copy of the Augsburg Confession in Greek.

INSTITUTIONALIZED PURSUITS

From Luther's To the Christian Nobility (1520), as found in the American Edition of Luther's Works, 44: 206-207.

We do not see this pitiful evil, how today the young people of Christendom languish and perish miserably in our midst for want of the Gospel, in which we ought to be giving them constant instruction and training. Moreover, even if the universities were diligent in Holy Scripture, we need not send everybody there as we do now, where their only concern is numbers and where everybody wants a doctor's degree.

We should send only the most highly qualified students who have been well-trained in the lower schools. A prince or city council ought to see to this, and permit only the well-qualified to be sent. I would advise no one to send his child where the Holy Scriptures are not supreme. Every institution that does not unceasingly pursue the study of God's Word becomes cor-

rupt. Because of this we can see what kind of people they become in the universities and what they are like now. Nobody is to blame for this except the popes, the bishops, and the prelates, who are all charged with training young people.

The universities only ought to turn out men who are experts in the Holy Scriptures, men who can become bishops and priests, and stand in the front line against heretics, the devil, and all the world. But where do you find that? I greatly fear that the universities, unless they teach the Holy Scriptures diligently and impress them on the young students, are wide gates to hell.

REFORMATION PARENTING

Does not our present society gain a better perspective of its ills and needs when considered in the light of history? Steven Ozment's work serves us well in this regard. His book When Fathers Ruled: Family Life in Reformation Europe (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983) stands as one example wherein one can find delightful sermon illustrations or insights for family life from the past. This portion comes from pages 132-135.

"Is there anything on earth more precious, friendly, and lovable," asked the Nuremberg reformer Veit Dietrich, "than a pious, disciplined, obedient, and teachable child?" For Dietrich and his contemporaries this question was highly rhetorical. Never has the art of parenting been more highly praised and parental authority more wholeheartedly supported than in Reformation Europe. "There is no power on earth that is nobler or greater than that of parents," declared Luther, the father of six children, in an oft-repeated statement. "The diligent rearing of children is the greatest service to the world, both in spiritual and temporal affairs, both for the present life and for posterity," agreed Justus Menius. "Just as one turns young calves into strong cows and oxen, rears young colts to be brave stallions, and nurtures small tender shoots into great fruit-bearing trees, so must we bring up our children to be knowing and courageous adults, who serve both land and people and help both to prosper." Therein Menius summarized the parental mandate of an age.

Parenting was not only or even primarily woman's work; it was too high a responsibility to be left to one parent. Mother and father shared it to an unusually high degree, the maternal role being greater in the infant and early childhood years, the father's role increasing in importance after age six or seven, when the maturing child could respond to a regular discipline. The bond between father and child was understood to be as intimate and as enduring as that between mother and child.

Like the selection of a spouse, the rearing of a child was a rational art, not an emotional venture. Even monkeys, the author of a housefather book pointed out, exercise "instinctual" parental love, protecting their offspring and fulfilling their basic material needs. Human parents must do more than this; they have a duty to prepare their children for both temporal

and spiritual wellbeing; in addition to caring for their physical and material needs, they must methodically inculcate virtues and values. “If God’s commandments are not impressed upon a child in his youth,” warned Menius, “they will be lost on him when he is grown; for ‘old dogs do not learn new tricks’ and ‘a tree rooted after it is grown will not yield fruit.’”

The cardinal sin of child rearing in Reformation Europe, a common one, according to the moralists, was willful indulgence of children. Critics perceived this to be especially true within wealthier families, which had the means to be indulgent, although permissiveness is said to have afflicted peasant households as well. Far from treating their children cruelly or with aloofness, as modern scholars have alleged, early modern parents were inclined to spoil their children rotten, according to contemporary German observers and critics. Conrad Sam wrote of the children of Ulm’s lords and Junkers:

As soon as the child can move about, one throws a ragged frock on him and treats everything he does in the same [unjudgmental] way. Soon there are outbursts and tantrums, but these only delight the old, since they come from a dear little son who can do no wrong. Where one sows thorns and thistles in this way, how can anything other than weeds be expected to grow?

In Sam’s view such permissive child rearing accounted for the presence in society of so many “mercenaries, murderers, and criminals.” The English “pediatricians” Thomas Phaire

and John Jones also traced crime and laziness to the coddling and spoiling of children; such “strangling” of children, more than any other cause, was said to fill the jails and burden parish charities. Sam offered parents the following advice:

Whether you are a king, prince, count, knight, or servant, whether a townsman or a peasant, if you want to know joy in your children, take care that you teach them virtue. Do not do as is now done in the world, where children are taught to rule, but not to serve; to curse and insult, but not to pray; to ride, but not to speak properly. Children today are badly raised; not only do parents permit them their every selfish wish, but they even show them the way to it. God will hold parents strictly accountable for their children, who [now] reward them [appropriately by their bad behavior].

Writers complained that too many parents thought childhood only a time for fun, joy, and amusement (*nur lust/freud und kurtzweil*) and viewed their main responsibility as that of giving their children as much money as possible. Such parents were said to treat their children as just another temporal possession (*ir eigenthumb*) rather than as God’s temple (*Gottes heylichthumb*); “This is why parents give no thought to God’s discipline and indulge their children’s every petulant demand.” To the extent that a parent subjected his child to standards that were pleasing to God, to that extent he treated his child with dignity, as a creature made in God’s image.

In midcentury the Nuremberg pastor Veit Dietrich found negligent, permissive parents “all too common.”

Today you find few parents who once mention study or work to their children. They let them creep about idly, eating and drinking whenever they please, casually dressed in ragged pants and jackets. Through bad example and lax discipline, children learn to curse and swear, lie and steal. Parents aid and abet such ill breeding by laughing at small children when they curse or repeat bawdy rhymes. Later [when their children are older] they rage at such indiscipline and self-indulgence [which has then ceased to be so funny]. When children stay out dancing till midnight or carouse around the public houses, father and mother do not say them nay; but neither do they wake them up on Sunday morning, take them to church, and ask them what they have learned from the sermon, as if in this too nothing were at stake.

No age subscribed more completely to the notion that the hand that rocked the cradle ruled the world. Today’s children were tomorrow’s subjects and rulers, and they would shape society as they had themselves been shaped at home. Indulgent parents who “loosened the reins too much” in rearing their children sowed the wind both for themselves and for society. “Your children will become wanton and scorn you,” warned Menius, “and when they are grown they will be wild and malicious, harmful people, who also scorn government.” The Hessian churchman Corvinus, criticizing the nobility, from whose ranks he assumed future political rulers would ascend, accused parents of corrupting their children with materialism and, by slighting their intellectual and spiritual growth, of betraying both present and future generations.

You think that if you leave your children many houses, much money, and property, it is not necessary to concern yourself also with their acquisition of the skills, wisdom, and cunning (*kunst/weisheyt/und kluckheyt*) by which a land and people must be ruled. . . . It was precisely for this reason [namely, to make them fit to rule] that the ancients schooled the nobility in the liberal arts.

For Corvinus, the fatal flaw of the upper classes was that parents let their children discover too soon just how fortunate they were. When aristocratic youth learn that they are rich and powerful and exalted above all other social groups, they thereafter “resist all rational rearing (*sie sic . . . nicht leiderlich ziehen lesset*) and develop a taste for horses, dogs, hunting, debauchery, feasting, and drunkenness, all the things that keep youth from study and learning.” When society’s leaders are thus raised without proper self-discipline and training in the Arts and religion, they can only come to rule as crude tyrants who burden their subjects to the point of revolt. Society’s political hope must rather be placed in children reared at the hand of “pious and learned disciplinarians” (*Zuchtmeister*); only as such children come to rule over a land, Corvinus concluded, can its subjects take heart that their fatherland is secure and will prosper.

WHEN ORTHODOX ISN’T ORTHODOX

Pieper opines the following in his Christian Dogmatics, 3: 422, note 29.

Orthodox Churches: in our day are those Lutheran congregations and church bodies which profess and actually teach the doctrines laid down in the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, because these doctrines, on examination, are found to be the teaching of God’s Word. Impure and heterodox churches are the Roman Catholic Church, the Eastern Orthodox Church, the Reformed Church with its many subdivisions, and, moreover, also the church bodies which, though bearing the Lutheran name, do not profess and actually teach the doctrine of the Church of the Reformation.

FOUR CHIEF PARADIGMS

Kurt Marquart notes the following in The Church and Her Fellowship, Ministry, and Governance, pages 9, 10, the ninth volume in the Confessional Lutheran Dogmatics series, available through LOGIA Books.

We have arrived here at the parting of the ways of the major Christian confessions. Exotic movements like Pentecostalism aside, there are four great alternative paradigms or “models” of the church, among which one must decide: the Eastern Orthodox, the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, and the Zwingli-Calvinist or “Reformed” (including Arminian derivatives). These four basic types may in turn be arranged into two sets of two.

Although Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy do have important differences, they tend to look alike when viewed from a Lutheran, and especially from a Calvinist perspective. Conversely, Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox observers are likely to perceive Lutheran and Calvinist theologies as tweedledee and tweedledum, despite the great gulf which divides Wittenberg and Geneva, historically and confessionally.

Is it possible to discern a pattern in the ecclesiologies of these major versions of Christianity? Without oversimplifying unduly, we may say that traditional Roman Catholicism (before Vatican II) particularly, but also Eastern Orthodoxy, *externalize* the church, while Calvinism *spiritualizes* her. Lutheran theology, by its innermost logic, understands the church *incarnationally*.

To put this in Christological terms, the traditional Roman ecclesiology tends toward “Eutyichianism,” in that it confuses Christ’s mystical body with the visible organization headed by the pope. Calvinist ecclesiology is “Nestorian” in letting an “invisible church” and a “visible church” stand side by side, without any real integration or bonding between them. The “Chalcedonian” approach of Lutheran ecclesiology distinguishes—without separating!—the church as inward com-

munion of faith and as outward participation in the means of grace. Since the external Gospel and sacraments are indispensable, God-given source, foundation, and sustenance of all faith and spiritual life, these means of grace bind in one the two “modes” of the church, and keep them from flying apart into two churches.

THE SIGN OF THE CROSS

Paul H. D. Lang records the following in his Ceremony and Celebration, (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1965), pages 70-73. Readers might also note Dr. Nagel’s sermon in the Holy Trinity 2000 issue of LOGIA (volume 9, number 3) entitled “The Cipher of His Name.”

Making the sign of the cross is another ceremony that has come down to us from apostolic times. We employ it in blessing persons and things. In the Order of Holy Baptism we use it with the words, “Receive the sign of the holy cross, both upon the forehead and upon the breast, in token that thou hast been redeemed by Christ the Crucified.”

When the minister pronounces the Benediction, he blesses the people with the sign of the cross. In the Holy Communion Service, the celebrant makes the sign of the cross over the bread and the cup. . . .

Crossing oneself was practiced by Christians from the earliest centuries and may go back to apostolic times. We know that it was already a common ceremony used daily in A.D. 200 for Tertullian writes: “In all our undertakings—when we enter a place or leave it; before we dress; before we bathe; when we take our meals; when we light the lamps in the evening; before we retire at night; when we sit down and read; before each new task—we trace the sign of the cross on our foreheads.” St. Augustine (A.D. 431) speaks of this Christian custom many times in his sermons and letters.

It is one of the traditional ceremonies that was most definitely retained by Luther and the Lutheran Church in the sixteenth-century Reformation. Luther prescribed in his Small Catechism under the heading, “How the Head of the Family Should Teach His Household to Bless Themselves in the Morning and in the Evening.” He says, “In the morning when you rise (In the evening when you go to bed . . .) you shall bless yourself with the holy cross and say: In the name of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Amen.” . . . This ceremony is also still authorized in many of the present-day Lutheran service books.

Crossing oneself is done by putting the fingers of the right hand to the forehead, to the breast, and to the left and right shoulders, with the words, “In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.” By doing this we profess our faith in the Triune God and in our redemption through Christ crucified. But it is more than a profession of faith; it is a prayer in action of thanksgiving or for blessing to God the Father, in the Holy Spirit, through our one and only

Mediator, Jesus Christ. The sign of the cross may also be made from the right to the left shoulder. This is the older form which has been retained in the Eastern church.

In the church's worship it is a laudable custom to cross ourselves at the beginning and end of all services and at the following places in the Service or in the Order of the Holy Communion Service: During the opening words, "In the name etc."; at the end of the Absolution; at the beginning of the Introit; at the end of the Gloria in Excelsis; when the Gospel is announced; at the end of the Creed; during the Sanctus at the words, "Blessed is He"; after the consecration at "The peace of the Lord"; when we receive the holy body and precious blood of Christ; when the minister says, "Depart in peace"; and at the end of the Benediction.

The holy cross is the symbol of our salvation. We were signed with it when we were baptized. It is the sign by which the church blesses people and things. By using it we become part of the wonderful history of our faith and companions in the company of the saints. It is right that we should make the sign of the cross frequently and to glory in it, saying with St. Paul, "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Gal 6:4).

MARKING THE DISTINCTION

Bo Giertz, Messages for the Church in Times of Crisis (Rock Island, Illinois: Augustana Book Concern, 1950), page 14.

He who cannot distinguish between a cow and a horse ought never to discuss questions of farming. He who cannot distinguish between evangelical and Roman Christianity better than that he believes that a man who makes the sign of the cross or bends his knees or makes confession must be a Roman Catholic, that man ought never to discuss matters that pertain to Christianity.

Such external things as confession, bowing our knees, making the sign of the cross mark no distinction between Protestants and Roman Catholics. Luther himself went often to confession, he bended his knees both at home and in the church, and in his little catechism he suggests that a Christian should make the sign of the cross both morning and evening. In such matters there is no difference between the pope and ourselves except that we consciously remove all ceremonies that are unscriptural, but make use of all others in evangelical freedom, when they serve the edification of believers.

The deciding factor is something entirely different. It is the doctrine of justification by faith. He alone is an evangelical Christian who possesses the secret of faith in his heart, so that he believes in the forgiveness of sins for the sake of Christ's atonement and through that faith is united with his Saviour. That faith is found only where God through His Spirit and His Word teaches us the poverty of the spirit and daily leads us to the cross of Christ.

Evangelical Christianity stands or falls with justification through faith. When men live in God's justification, then all of life, both worship and daily living, falls into a specific pattern.

WELCOME WORDS

In this excerpt, Olav, a character in volume 3 of Sigrid Undset's In the Wilderness: The Master of Hestviken (page 32), attends the divine service after a lengthy hiatus. His experience is described:

So he listened in calm meditation to the only voice that spoke to him in a tongue he understood—here in the foreign land, where all other voices shouted at him as though there were a wall between him and them. The voice of the Church was the same that he had listened to in his childhood and youth and manhood. *He* had changed—his aims and his thoughts and his speech, as he grew from one age into another—but the Church changed neither speech nor doctrine; she spoke to him in the holy mass as she had spoken to him when he was a little boy, not understanding many words, but nevertheless taking in much by looking on, as the child takes in its mother by following her looks and gestures, before it understands the spoken word. And he knew that if he journeyed to the uttermost limits of Christian men's habitation—folks' form and speech and customs might indeed be strange and incomprehensible to him, but everywhere, when he found a church and entered it, he would be welcomed by the same voice that had spoken to him when he was a child; with open hands the Church would offer him the same sacraments that she had nourished him with in his youth, and that he had rejected and misused.

ON INFANT COMMUNION

A footnote in Pieper's Christian Dogmatics, 3: 383, records a bit of the views by Luther and Walther on infant communion.

Walther, *Pastorale*, page 190: "Since according to God's Word everyone who would approach the Lord's Table should first examine himself and discern the Lord's body, it will not do to give the Lord's Supper to children incapable of examining themselves. It was a manifest abuse when this practice, as the examples of even Cyprian and Augustine prove, was quite general from the third to the fifth century, with the sanction also of Innocent I through a misinterpretation of John 6:53 as referring to sacramental eating and drinking.

"This misuse was prevalent also among the Bohemian Hussites and is canon law even today in the Eastern Church. Luther writes: 'I cannot side with the Bohemians in distributing the Lord's Supper to children, even though I would not call them heretics on that account.'

"Furthermore, those who cannot examine themselves and therefore are not to be admitted to the Lord's Supper include also those asleep or unconscious, those in the throes of death who are already deprived of the use of their senses, deranged people, and the like."

Walther, as we saw, points to the fact that the Lord's Supper does not, like bodily medication, work physically, but presupposes consciousness of the essence and faith in the purpose of the Lord's Supper. Further particulars, e.g., the question whether

lunatics, raving madmen, yes, also the bodily possessed, may be communed when they have lucid intervals (“*lichte Zwischenzeiten*”) belong to casuistry. See Walther *ibid.*, p. 192.

LUTHER AND AESOP

From G. M. Bruce, Luther as an Educator, pages 204, 205.

It may seem strange that Luther, the theologian and reformer, busy as he was with so many things, and often hard pressed both by his work and his bodily ailments, should take any interest in fables. Yet, there seemed to be nothing either human or divine in which he did not take an interest, especially if he could find something of value to train the child or sweeten, ennoble, and enrich life. Therefore he was deeply interested in folk-lore, folk-song, folk-proverbs, fairy-tales, and fables, for he was able to put all of these to good use in his preaching, his writing, and his private discourse. Since Luther was under the ban of the empire, and therefore technically an outlaw, he could not be present at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, but was obliged to remain at some distance from the seat of the Diet, at the Castle of Coburg. Here he was from the very first day busy with a number of things. In a letter to Melanchthon written the same day he arrived, April 22, 1530, he says: “We have at last reached our Sinai, my dear Herr Philip, but out of this Sinai we shall make a Zion and build three tabernacles: one to the Psalter, one to the Prophets, and one to Aesop. But time is needed for this.”

We soon find him at work on all three. His stay at Coburg was very trying for him, for he was severely troubled with head-aches, spiritual trials, great anxiety for the cause of the Reformation, and was also deeply grieved over the loss of his father, who died on May 29, and yet he accomplished a great deal while he was there. Besides the work on the Psalms and the Prophets, and a number of other literary works, he also managed to translate thirteen of Aesop’s Fables. It was his intention to translate all of them, purging them from any objectionable features they might contain, and publish them. This work he did not accomplish, however, but he did publish, with an introduction setting forth the nature and value of these fables, the thirteen he translated while at Coburg, in the year 1538. It was especially the moral and educational value of the fables that appealed to Luther. In the introduction to his translation of Aesop’s Fables, he gives an example of how they should be used in the home, saying that the father, when his family and servants are gathered about the table, may ask them what this or that fable might mean. This would bring out both the story and the meaning, and result in both entertainment and instruction. In his *Tischreden* he also speaks of the value of Aesop’s Fables and draws from them.

HE REMAINS FAITHFUL

A sermon preached by the Rev. Dr. Norman Nagel from 2 Timothy 2:1-13 for Thursday of Pentecost 21, 1998. A collection of Dr. Nagel’s sermons is available on CD produced by A. Collver. See LOGIA’s website (www.logia.org).

Young Pastor Timothy had at least three things going for him: what was put into him by his mother and his grandmother, what was given him at his ordination, and the clincher through it all: “Remember Jesus Christ.” He needed them.

From the admonitions given him we may suspect that Timothy was rather a timid sort, apt to get scared, a bit teary, perhaps even wimpish—a mother’s boy, grandmother’s boy. Check that out with Freud, if you can still find him somewhere. Or better, ponder the window, especially when the sermon is failing to deliver the text. Wouldn’t every Christian mother just love to have a boy like that, eager to learn from her the Scriptures? Just look how he stands toward his mother!

The Apostle reminds Timothy of all that God has blessed him with through such a mother and grandmother. There’s solid stuff been put into him. After recall of the tears at their last goodbye (would it be the last goodbye?), Timothy is not left at the tears point, but reminded of what can carry him through, what was built into him by his mother Eunice and his grandmother Lois. And then he is recalled to what was given him at his ordination: “the gift of God given through the laying on of my hands.” In 1 Timothy it was all the clergy who laid hands on him. Here the Apostle says “my hands.” Not that his hands ranked higher than the others, but the apostle is moving toward strengthening Timothy’s carrying forward, handing on to others where he is, what was given him at his ordination, and then toward carrying forward what was given him at his ordination where Paul is now, his place soon to be vacant. “Come as soon as you can.” Here is the place, in my place, for you now to carry on what was given you at your ordination. But do not leave that place vacant when you leave and come to Rome.

“What you have heard from me before many witnesses, entrust to faithful men who will be able to teach others also.” You can’t leave them without a pastor when you come to Rome.

But coming to Rome, know that it will be tough going. What’s happened already? You won’t score any points hanging out with me. Phygelus and Hermogenes saw that. Shame and loss were not for them. But Onesiphorus, he bore all that with me; he was not ashamed of me. He stuck with me. If you do that, Timothy, my child, you will be taking “your share of suffering as my companion as a good soldier of Christ Jesus.” Now a soldier isn’t much of a soldier if he is not prepared to get killed. Christ’s soldier’s service is to Christ. His victories come the Calvary way. Things of the kingdom of the left hand may not take over: “entangled in civilian pursuits.” Christ’s service may bring death, suffering certainly. To dodge that is to desert.

The apostle does not moralize the point of soldier, athlete, farmer. He simply lets them work in the confidence that “the Lord will grant you understanding in everything.” There is nothing outside that everything, no part of yourself, or your

life, around which you may try to draw a protective line, and say, “This I’m going to keep safe, this does not belong to the Lord.” “My welfare, my career, my family come first.” No idol can manage the God job.

Timidity and fearfulness may hope to protect something. Paul would free Timothy from such folly. There isn’t anything you can protect against the Lord, and he is not really your enemy, unless you insist on treating him as your enemy. The one you are dealing with, or rather the one who is dealing with you, remember:

Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, descended from David, as preached in my gospel, the gospel for which I am suffering and wearing fetters like a criminal. But the word of God is not fettered. Therefore I endure everything for the sake of the elect, that they also may obtain the salvation which in Christ Jesus goes with eternal glory. The saying is sure:

If we have died with him, we shall also live with him;
if we endure, we shall also reign with him;
if we deny him, he also will deny us;
if we are faithless, he remains faithful,
for he cannot deny himself.

If we are faithless, if we shrink from the total of his way with us, and fear what we may lose unless we protect it against him, if we’d rather have a seven-eighths ordination (*nec aliud*), turning its gifts into fractionary, calculating law—each of us here has no dearth of what faithlessnesses we are called to repent of, all of them—nothing held back.

If we deny him, he also will deny us;
if we are faithless, he remains faithful,
for he cannot deny himself.
Remember Jesus Christ.

Then the apostle points Timothy to the handing on he is to be doing before coming to Rome.

This sermon is now close to finished, and so we may rejoin those who’ve been having their devotions with the window.

Is that Timothy doing some ordaining as the apostle bade him do? Is it Titus ordaining pastors for the places that needed them in Crete as the apostle bade him do? And what of those who are there being ordained? Who are they?

As with icons, there’s more than one thing going on just at one time or one place. That recognizes that only the Lord can manage things like that, and he doesn’t stop. This is a window in a seminary chapel, a seminary where men are prepared for holy ordination. Such another Timothy or Titus may lay hands on you (WA, 38,428, 29).

You also will have three things going for you: what solid stuff was put into you early on in home, church and school. Then there is the Lord’s gift to you when he ordains you by his use of some Timothy or Titus. And the clincher: “Remember Jesus Christ.” He can’t ever become another sort of Jesus Christ; that Jesus Christ you are to learn ever more deeply here at seminary. Remember that, remember him. “If we are faithless, he remains faithful—for he cannot deny himself.” He lives. Actually, what was given him did in fact pull Timothy through, as witness the stone and the palm branch.

Inklings



God told you not to eat it? Oh, that’s just politics!

REPRISTINATION PRESS

Because the Truth never changes.

An Explanation of the History of the Suffering and Death of Our Lord Jesus Christ (1622)

by Johann Gerhard, translated by Rev. Elmer Hohle
ISBN 1-891469-22-3 • 330 pages • hardcover • \$20.00

“So much for ‘dead’ orthodoxy. *An Explanation of the History of the Suffering and Death of Our Lord Jesus Christ*, by Johann Gerhard, is possibly the best book on the passion of Christ and the best book on preaching I have read recently.”

Pastor Todd Peperkorn, *LOGIA*

Sacred Meditations

by Johann Gerhard

ISBN 1-891469-19-3 • 302 pages • paperback • \$13.95

Please include \$1.50 shipping per copy. Write to us for our catalog, or send e-mail to

hunnus@aol.com

REPRISTINATION PRESS

716 HCR 3424 E
Malone, TX 76660
(254) 533-2710

REPRISTINATION PRESS

Because the Truth never changes.

A Comprehensive Explanation of Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper (1610)

by Johann Gerhard, trans. by Rev. Elmer Hohle
ISBN 1-891469-28-2 • 540 pages • hardcover • \$33.50

Chytraeus on Sacrifice

by David Chytraeus translated by Dr. John Warwick Montgomery
ISBN 1-891469-23-1 • 152 pages • paperback • \$12.95

Elements of Religion

by Henry E. Jacobs
ISBN 1-891469-05-3 • 261 pages • hardcover • \$20.00

“Jacobs’s book unfolds God’s revelation with clarity and conviction . . . a solid introduction to Lutheran theology.” *LOGIA*

Please include \$1.50 shipping per copy. Write to us for our catalog, or send e-mail to

hunnus@aol.com

REPRISTINATION PRESS

716 HCR 3424 E
Malone, TX 76660
(254) 533-2710



Facsimile of Bach's Bible courtesy of Concordia Seminary Library, St. Louis. Used by permission.

Johann Sebastian

Bach's Bible

(Abraham Calov
Commentary)

with
Bach's signature
and annotations
(1733)

The cover art of the last issue of *LOGIA*, Holy Trinity 2000, was the title page facsimile as pictured here from the first volume of Abraham Calov's Bible commentary (Wittenberg, 1681) with signature of J. S. Bach (1733).

The three volumes the composer owned and notated are in the Concordia Seminary, St. Louis library. Next to passages are comments written by Bach in addition to underlinings and other markings he made in the text. Bach used his “study” Bible, and it is invaluable for understanding the composer's faith and the expression that it took in his music.

These fine, true-color reproductions suitable for framing may now be purchased through *LOGIA*. The title page with Bach's signature pictured here is available, as well as the full page and annotation from 2 Chronicles 5:13, and an enlargement of that verse and annotation. The whole set of three may be purchased at a discount.

Title page with Bach's signature (11" x 14") \$12

Full page with annotation from 2 Chron. 5:13 (11" x 14") \$12

Enlargement of verse and annotation (8" x 10") \$10

Set of all 3 \$30

Add postage and packing (per shipment) \$3

TO ORDER: Send your name, address, and payment by check or use credit card

LOGIA • 15825 373rd Ave. • Northville, SD 57465
or phone (605) 887-3145
or e-mail logia2@nvc.net

or order from our SECURE WEBSITE www.logia.org

LOGIA BOOKS

CONFESSIONAL LUTHERAN DOGMATICS

Qty _____

Baptism

Vol. XI—By David Scaer, J. Stephenson, Editor (236 pages) retail \$21.95 each—LOGIA price: • **\$18.95**

Eschatology

Vol. XIII—By J. Stephenson, R. Preus, Editor (176 pages) retail \$18.95 each—LOGIA price: • **\$15.95**

The Church and Her Fellowship, Ministry, and Governance

Vol. IX—By Kurt Marquart, R. Preus, Editor (264 pages) retail \$21.95 each—LOGIA price: • **\$18.95**

Christology

Vol. VI—By David P. Scaer, R. Preus, Editor (113 pages) retail \$17.95 each—LOGIA price: • **\$14.95**

For more information on the Dogmatic Series, contact us for a FREE brochure.

THE PIEPER LECTURES

The Pieper Lectures, sponsored by Concordia Historical Institute and the Luther Academy in honor of Dr. Francis Pieper, hosted by Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, present a series of lectures on topics addressing current issues in the church.

The Office of the Ministry

Vol. I—Lectures by D. Scaer, A. R. Suelflow, K. Shurb, R. Kolb, L. Rast. Edited by Chris Christopherson Boshoven. (180 pages) • **\$11.95** each

Church Fellowship

Vol. II—Lectures by W. C. Weinrich, C. P. Arand, S. Bruzek, K. Marquart, E. T. Teigen, D. A. Gustafson. Edited by Chris Christopherson Boshoven. (117 pages) • **\$11.95** each

Pietism and Lutheranism

Vol. III—Lectures by Gerald Krispin, Ronald Feuerhahn, Paul McCain, Wilhelm Petersen, Lawrence R. Rast Jr., John T. Pless, Naomichi Masaki. Edited by John A. Maxfield. (184 pages). • **\$11.95** each

What Does It Mean to Be Lutheran?

Vol. IV—Lectures by Patrick T. Ferry, Scott Murray, Carter Lindberg, Martin R. Noland, J. A. O. Preus III, Dean O. Wenthe. Edited by John A. Maxfield, Jennifer H. Maxfield. (99 pages) retail \$14.95 — LOGIA price: • **\$11.95**

Please allow 2-3 weeks for delivery

OTHER BOOKS

Qty _____

Communion Fellowship

A Resource for Understanding, Implementing, and Retaining the Practice of Closed Communion in the Lutheran Parish
By Paul T. McCain (33 pages) • **\$6.00** each

Preaching to Young Theologians

Sermons of Robert Preus
Klemet Preus, Editor. The Luther Academy
retail \$14.95 each—LOGIA price: • **\$11.95**

The Christological Character of the Office of the Ministry & Royal Priesthood

By Jobst Schöne. LOGIA Books, 1996 (24 pages)
\$3 each or **\$2.50** each for 4 or more

Dying to Live: A Study Guide

By John T. Pless. LOGIA Books. (28 pages)
Dying to Live by H. Senkbeil may be ordered from CPH
retail \$2.50 each—on sale for • **\$2.00**

God and Caesar Revisited

Luther Academy Conference Papers #1, 1995
(91 pages) • retail \$12.95 each—LOGIA price: • **\$9.95**

ORDERING INFORMATION

Title (Rev., Mr., Mrs., Miss), Name _____

Mailing Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone number _____

Total # of books ordered _____

For credit card (Visa or MasterCard): Card # and Expiration Date: _____

Overseas orders add \$3 extra shipping per book
All funds U.S. • Price includes postage and handling _____

10/00

• Total Amount

\$ _____

ORDER YOUR FAVORITE WAY!

Phone ▲ **605-887-3145**

E-mail ▲ **logia2@nvc.net**

Secure Website ▲ **www.logia.org**

Mail ▲ **15825, 373rd Ave.
Northville, SD 57465**

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Ulrich Asendorf
Pastor, Hannover, Germany

Burnell F. Eckardt Jr.
Pastor, St. Paul Lutheran Church, Kewanee, IL

Charles Evanson
*Professor, Seminary for Evangelical Theology
Klaipeda, Lithuania*

Ronald Feuerhahn
Professor, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, MO

Lowell Green
Professor, State Univer. of New York at Buffalo, NY

Paul Grime
*Executive Director, LCMS Commission on
Worship, St. Louis, MO*

Kenneth Hagen
*Professor Emeritus, Marquette University
Lake Mills, Wisconsin*

Matthew Harrison
Pastor, Zion Lutheran Church, Fort Wayne, IN

Steven Hein
*Headmaster, Shepherd of the Springs
Lutheran High School, Colorado Springs, CO*

Horace Hummel
*Professor Emeritus, Concordia Seminary
St. Louis, MO*

Arthur Just
*Professor, Concordia Theological Seminary
Fort Wayne, IN*

John Kleinig
*Professor, Luther Seminary, North Adelaide South
Australia, Australia*

Arnold J. Koelpin
Professor, Martin Luther College, New Ulm, MN

Peter K. Lange
Pastor, St. John's Lutheran Church, Topeka, KS

Paul Lehninger
Professor, Wisconsin Lutheran College, Milwaukee, WI

Alan Ludwig
*Professor, Lutheran Theological Seminary
Novosibirsk, Russia*

Cameron MacKenzie
*Professor, Concordia Theological Seminary
Fort Wayne, IN*

Gottfried Martens
*Pastor, St. Mary's Lutheran Church, Berlin,
Germany*

Kurt Marquart
*Professor, Concordia Theological Seminary
Fort Wayne, IN*

Scott Murray
Pastor, Memorial Luth. Church, Houston, TX

Norman E. Nagel
Professor, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, MO

Oliver Olson
*Professor Emeritus, Marquette University
Minneapolis, Minnesota*

Wilhelm Petersen
*President Emeritus, Bethany Lutheran
Seminary, Mankato, MN*

Andrew Pfeiffer
Professor, Luther Seminary, Adelaide, Australia

Roger D. Pittelko
*Professor, Concordia Theological Seminary
Fort Wayne, IN*

Hans-Lutz Poetsch
Pastor Emeritus, Lutheran Hour, Berlin, Germany

Daniel Preus
*Director, Concordia Historical Institute
St. Louis, MO*

Clarence Priebbenow
*Pastor, Trinity Lutheran Church
Oakey Queensland, Australia*

Richard Resch
*Kantor and Professor of Church Music
Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, IN*

David P. Scaer
*Professor, Concordia Theological Seminary
Fort Wayne, IN*

Robert Schaibley
*Pastor, Shepherd of the Springs Lutheran Church
Colorado Springs, CO*

Jobst Schöne
*Bishop Emeritus, Selbständige Evangelische
Lutherische Kirche, Germany*

Bruce Schuchard
Professor, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, MO

Harold Senkbeil
Pastor, Elm Grove Lutheran Church, Elm Grove, WI

Carl P. E. Springer
Professor, Illinois State University, Normal, IL

John Stephenson
*Professor, Concordia Seminary, St. Catharines
Ontario, Canada*

David Jay Webber
*Rector, Saint Sophia Lutheran Theological
Seminary
Ternopil', Ukraine*

Jon D. Vieker
*Assistant Director, LCMS Commission on Worship
St. Louis, MO*

William Weinrich
*Professor, Concordia Theological Seminary
Fort Wayne, IN*

George F. Wollenburg
President, Montana District LCMS, Billings, MT

STAFF

Michael J. Albrecht, Editorial Associate
*Pastor, St. James Lutheran Church West St. Paul,
MN*
sjlcwspmja@aol.com

Joel A. Brondos, LOGIA Forum and
Correspondence Editor
Pastor, Zion Luth. Church, Fort Wayne, IN
stimme@aol.com

Charles Cortright, Editorial Associate
*Pastor, St. Paul's First Lutheran Church, North
Hollywood, CA*
cortricl@yahoo.com

Gerald Krispin, Editorial Associate
*Professor, Concordia College, Edmonton
Alberta, Canada*
gkrispin@planet.eon.net

Alan Ludwig, Copy Editor
*Professor, Lutheran Theological Seminary,
Novosibirsk, Russia* lector@mail.nsk.ru

Martin Noland, Editorial Associate
Pastor, Christ Lutheran Church, Oak Park, IL
75113.2703@compuserve.com

John T. Pless, Book Review Editor
*Professor, Concordia Theological Seminary
Fort Wayne, IN*
PLESSJT@mail.ctsfw.edu

Tom Rank, Editorial Associate
*Pastor, Scarville and Center Lutheran Churches,
Scarville, IA*
thomrank@netins.net

Erling Teigen, Editorial Coordinator
*Professor, Bethany Lutheran College,
Mankato, MN*
74022.2447@compuserve.com

Robert Zagore, Editorial Associate
Pastor, St. Paul Lutheran Church, Niles, MI
pastorzagore@juno.com

SUPPORT STAFF

Dean Bell, Advertising, LOGIA Tape Reviews
Hendrum, MN revbell@means.net

Dianne Bisbee of Bisbee Enterprises,
Subscription Services, Cresbard, SD,
logia@hdc.net

Robert Franck, LOGIA Digest
*Pastor, Mt. Olive Lutheran Church,
Duluth, MN* revfranck@aol.com

Mark Loest, Cover Design
mloest@chi.lcms.org

Patricia Ludwig, Layout and Design
Novosibirsk, Russia
lector@mail.nsk.ru

David Magruder, LOGIA Digest
*Pastor, Mt. Olive Lutheran Church,
Duluth, MN*

Denise Melius, Advertising, LOGIA Books &
Tapes, Northville, SD
logia2@hvc.net

James Wilson, Cartoonist, Deer Lodge, MT
hayakawa@in-tch.com

Sarah Rausch, Proofreader, Aberdeen, SD
serausch@dtgnet.com