



LOGIA

A JOURNAL OF LUTHERAN THEOLOGY

REFORMATION 1997

VOLUME VI, NUMBER 4

CONTENTS

JAN 06 1998

ARTICLES

Philippism—Melanchthon and the Consequences: An Observation in the "Year of Melanchthon"
By Jürgen Diestelmann 3

Melanchthon and His Influence on the Lutheran Church
By Jobst Schöne 7

The Role of Philosophy in the Theology of Philipp Melanchthon: Is There a Need for Reappraisal?
By James Heiser 13

Melanchthon's Scottish Friend: Alexander Alane (1500–1565)
By Bruce W. Adams 25

Formula of Concord X: A Revised, Enlarged, and Slightly Amended Edition
By David P. Scaer 27

Bishops for the Church: Apostolic Origins and Lutheran Affirmation
By Allen C. Hoger 35

REVIEWS 41

REVIEW ESSAY: *Cosmos in the Chaos: Philip Schaff's Interpretation of Nineteenth-Century American Religion.* By Stephen R. Graham.
Annotations on First Corinthians. By Philipp Melanchthon. Introduced, translated, and edited by John Patrick Donnelly, S.J.
Heaven on Earth: A Lutheran-Orthodox Odyssey. By Robert Tobias.
The Diary of a Missionary. By Ernst H. Wendland.
Sharpening the Sword. By Stephen D. Hower.
The Menace of Multiculturalism: Trojan Horse in America. By Alvin J. Schmidt.
Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith. Edited by R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black.
Bible in the Pulpit. By Pastor William P. Grunow.
Evolution is not Scientific: Thirty-Two Reasons Why. By Albert Sippert.

BRIEFLY NOTED

LOGIA FORUM 53

- Twentieth-Century Indulgences • Ecumenical Council for Practical Christianity • The New Segregation Consortium for Classical Lutheran Education • Theology, Psychology, and Philosophy
- He Gave Gifts to Men • Dreaming of the Middle Ages • Men without Chests
- Ontotheology and the Theology of the Cross • W.W.J.D.
- Preaching Sanctification • The Return of the Moderates

A Call for Manuscripts 62

Formula of Concord X

A Revised, Enlarged, and Slightly Amended Edition

DAVID P. SCAER



The Melancthon Anniversary Year

FEBRUARY 16, 1997, MARKS THE 500TH anniversary of the birth of Philip Melancthon. Author of three of the Lutheran Confessions, Luther's co-reformer lies buried next to him in the Castle Church in Wittenberg. The Eleventh Annual Symposium on the Lutheran Confessions at Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, in 1988 studied two aspects of his theology and not unexpectedly arrived at no unanimous verdict on whether the second reformer was more villain than hero.¹ Roman Catholics and Reformed found various aspects of his theology at times attractive, but he belongs to Lutheranism and is arguably its most ecumenical sixteenth-century figure.

Article x on the Lord's Supper in the first edition (1530) of the Augsburg Confession was accepted by the papal party, a point that Melancthon seemingly welcomed in the Apology (1530–1531). He allows for transubstantiation by quoting Vulgarius: "the bread is not merely a figure but truly changed into the flesh of Christ" (Ap x, 2; Tappert, 179). While allowing that the pope could be the Anti-Christ in the Treatise of 1537 (Tr, 39–42; Tappert, 327–328), his signature to the Smalcald Articles of 1536 (Tappert, 316–317) kept the door ajar for papal self-reevaluation, an opportunity consistently ignored by occupants of Peter's chair.

Melancthon's 1540 edition of the Augsburg Confession, known as the *Variata*, took the same conciliatory attitude toward the Reformed that the first edition previously had taken toward Rome. By saying that Christ's body and blood are shown (*exhibeantur*) to those who eat in the Lord's Supper, he avoided saying that unbelieving participants (*manducation malorum*) received Christ's body with their mouths (*manducatio oralis*). To this day Lutherans repudiate Melancthon's "revised standard version" by putting U.A.C., "Unaltered Augsburg Confession," on their church cornerstones. The *Invariata* was as much a mark of confessional faithfulness as it repudiated Melancthon's accommodation to the Reformed. In quoting his confessions against him, the Formula of Concord delivered the unkindest cut of all.

Things Indifferent: The Adiaphora

With Charles v's armies occupying Lutheran Saxony after Luther's death in 1546, Melancthon assisted in preparing the Interims of 1548, two agreements with the papal party which required the reintroduction of customs that were neither good

nor bad (FC Ep x, 2. Latin: *adiaphora; res media et indifferentes*. German: *Mitteldinge*. Tappert, 492–493).² These lacked specific biblical mandates, but Christians were at liberty to practice them—for example, fasting and giving of alms. The Latin *indifferentes* and the German *Mitteldinge* need no translation. Melancthon had shown in the Augsburg Confession and the Apology that the Lutherans shared basic practices with Roman Catholics. Private confession and absolution was seen as a sacrament, but the Interim required it before receiving the Lord's Supper. The Treatise (§64) recognized that ordination historically was a bishop's prerogative, but this was by human arrangement.

An Apologia for the "Apologist"

Melancthon's position supporting conformance in indifferent matters is defensible. Should confession to a priest be desirable and even ideal, objections to requiring it are less compelling. If ordination by a priest is not inferior to one by a bishop, little reason exists for not accepting and even preferring the latter and more traditional.³ As Matthew C. Harrison points out, Melancthon "expressly refused as contrary to the article on justification, prayers to the saints, private masses and masses for the dead, and *canon missae*."⁴ His was not so much capitulation as striking a *via media* in the face of an overwhelming force.

To his lasting honor, Melancthon authored the Augsburg Confession, which is basic to Lutheran teaching. His Apology is the most closely argued and theologically profound of our confessions. Those embroiled in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) debate on whether its candidates for the ministry should be ordained by Episcopal bishops, or those in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod (LCMS) who struggle to find clarity on who is really a minister, need look no further than Melancthon's Treatise. There the pope is one bishop among other bishops, and bishops and priests differ only in function.

Melancthon's orderliness assures a clarity often not found in Luther. For doctrinal inconsistency, he became an unnamed defendant in the Apology articles on the Free Will (iv), the Lord's Supper (vi), and Church Rites or Adiaphora (x). Our dilemma is that confessional subscription calls us to embrace his theology with the same zeal with which we reject some of his later positions.⁵

In Search of a Theme

Any of Melancthon's three confessions and aberrations addressed in the Apology might provide a focus for his anniversary year. Proposed alliances between Reformed bodies and the

DAVID P. SCAER, a contributing editor for *LOGIA*, is Chairman of Systematic Theology and Professor of Dogmatics and Exegetical Theology at Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

ELCA in North America, and between Anglicans and Lutherans in northern Europe, call for careful review of articles on the Lord's Supper. Any Lutheran discussion with the Anglicans and Roman Catholics is compelled to grapple with the teaching on justification, which, to Melancthon's eternal credit, he called the main doctrine in the controversy with Rome (Ap iv, 2 [Latin]; 3 [German]). With this the Anglicans have already expressed discomfort. Justification still has not reached resolution in the ELCA rapprochement with Rome. Apology II, which repudiates the free will as an efficient cause of salvation, provides a basis for evaluating the practice of making decisions for Christ as proof of salvation. Smoke in the LCMS, however, points to liturgical flames. The *Reporter* featured an article with the self-explanatory headline "Worship Wars."⁶ Adiaphora is the issue.

Adiaphora in Our Situation

Defensible is the proposition that the 1970s debate over biblical inspiration, inerrancy, and historicity remains the defining moment for the LCMS. Assumed similarities with conservative Protestants on these issues provided an entrance, or at least an opportunity, for neo-evangelical practices to enter LCMS liturgical life. Assimilating these practices became possible when distinguishing differences were blurred. Practices do not come devoid of ideas.

This interpretation of adiaphora becomes the wild card in the deck allowing its players to trump every trick.

While inspiration and inerrancy is affirmed by both the Missouriian and the neo-evangelical, for each the Bible functions differently. Each looks for and sees something different in the Bible. Scriptures for the Reformed provide divine knowledge for spiritual growth. The Bible is fundamentally a rule book that reveals a pattern for life. This corresponds to their emphasis on sanctification and their understanding of the third use of the law as reimposition of laws in the Christian life. Law follows gospel. For Luther, "The Bible contains only one truth, but it is the decisive one: 'that Jesus Christ, our God and Lord, died for the sake of our sins, and was resurrected for the sake of our righteousness.'⁷ Justification of the sinner on account of Christ is the chief article. Christ is the Bible's content.⁸ Law is God's *opus alienum*.

Through seventeenth-century Pietism, the Reformed practice of the Bible as a source book for personal edification found a permanent place among some Lutherans. An equal and higher value was placed on private or informal Bible reading than on what the Augsburg Confession and the Apology called the Mass, which was the center of Lutheran liturgical life.⁹ Individual piety replaced corporate hearing of the gospel and

reception of the sacrament as the ultimate communion with God on earth. This change of focus may account for the warm welcome given to neo-evangelical practices by some Lutherans three centuries later and the excessive individualism experienced and disliked by the Reformed themselves.

Lutheran proponents of Sunday morning novelties rest their case on Augsburg Confession VII, which does not require uniformity in church ceremonies. This view rests on the false assumption that liturgies are the "ceremonies" and congregations are the "churches" referred to in the confessional articles dealing with adiaphora.¹⁰ Catholic liturgies in regular use in Lutheran church services are neither the "ceremonies" of Augsburg Confession VII nor the adiaphora of FC X. In the Formula, ceremonies that accompanied the liturgy could be those practiced by papists, with the proviso that they were neither mandated nor required for salvation. At stake was the Lutheran understanding of justification without works. An action allowed in one situation may be a denial of Christian truth in another. *Article X raises certain rituals to the same level of confession occupied by the formal written documents themselves.*

Amending Article X

Richard John Neuhaus belled the cat in calling the LCMS decision to allow lay ministers to celebrate communion the "Wichita Amendment to the Augsburg Confession XIV." While the amendment was rescinded by having the laymen ordained, a truly confessional spirit requires that a church transcend the original historical moment, recognize the confessional principle, and respond with the appropriate action.

It has been publicly conceded that liturgical uniformity in the LCMS has eroded in the last few years. A former worship commission executive predicts changes will soon be commonplace.¹¹ Innovative liturgies and practices are defended on the basis of the Bible and the argument that our confessions offer no specific proscriptions against liturgical change.¹² This interpretation of adiaphora becomes the wild card in the deck allowing its players to trump every trick. Questions of acceptable practice are swiftly swept off the table and consigned to the limbo of adiaphora where anything goes. Like a bad penny, it stays in circulation. Through the eye of this needle, a steady stream of previously unknown practices are funneled into the church.

Pure Doctrine and Liturgy

The theme "Things Indifferent: Limits of Formula of Concord Article X—New and Old Liturgical and Doctrinal Controversies," connects church liturgy, that is, what she does at worship, with her formal declarations of faith (confessions), that is, what she believes. This title does not intend to suggest that liturgy and doctrine are two different, or at best parallel, realities, which from time to time must be brought into synchronization with each other. If all matters liturgical are indifferent (adiaphora) and doctrines are matters of divine determination, then we are really dealing with two different realities with no essential relationship. Each congregation could then devise its own worship services, provided that what the LCMS determined to be pure doctrine was not contradicted. Theoretically

six thousand LCMS congregations could worship on a given Sunday with six thousand liturgies whose resemblance to each other would be only coincidental. This is effectively what we have now that the LCMS Commission on Worship has provided us with the "essentials" of what makes a service Lutheran.¹³ From a practical point of view, the laity would no longer have a way of recognizing a Lutheran congregation. Such liturgical diversity would have theological ramifications in contradicting and even denying the church's catholicity. It would be difficult to confess, "Credo in *unam* sanctam catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam." The church's historical moorings to God's actions with Israel and the incarnation would be severed.¹⁴

Dividing the Indivisible

Protestations notwithstanding, what the church believes is recognized by what she does on Sunday mornings. Removal of the creed from liturgy in the eighteenth-century Enlightenment was more than a change in form, a mere practical matter, but signaled that Lutheran theologians had no use for the confessional understanding of the Trinity, baptism, and other foundational articles of belief. Newly introduced rationalistic forms proclaimed the absence of Christian substance. Though these theologians had bound themselves by oath to the Lutheran Confessions, they proclaimed by how they worshiped that they had in fact disregarded them.

Form and Substance: A Theological Argument

Article x was not a response to a specific doctrinal aberration, as were the Formula's other articles, but *a confession that what the church does as church—how she conducts herself on Sunday—is as important as any formal confession she adopts.* This is the controverted issue.¹⁵ Francis Pieper, the LCMS's premier theologian, recognized the interconnection of Christian doctrines. An aberration in one place anticipates problems elsewhere. Church history demonstrates that the same principle applies to both confession and liturgy, and liturgy is the immediately available confession.

Liturgical deviations are bellwethers of future doctrinal changes. Pietism, by placing a higher value on *collegia pietatis*—what we call cell groups—than on the traditional worship, signaled the blossoming individualism of the Enlightenment. Here we see the strange linking of Pietism and the Enlightenment: the absolute sovereignty of the individual over the community of faith. In America this principle reigns supreme and is readily apparent in the LCMS, where individual congregations now stress their individual freedom from the synod with the support of a position expressed as early as 1934.¹⁶ In calling for a complete overhaul of all liturgical rites, the Enlightenment announced its disregard for the supernatural and began to annul the church's Catholic character.¹⁷ A liturgy in which the sacramental bread was not identified with Christ's body signaled the collapse of Lutheranism in Prussia. So today also a Sunday liturgy without communion speaks volumes.

Churches without established, unnegotiable confessions do not have to face the dilemma of coordinating confession and liturgy that confessional churches do. Without firm creedal

attachments, such non-confessional churches can hardly demand liturgical uniformity. But of course, they do. Baptist insistence on immersion proves that even the confessionally blasé can be downright liturgically legalistic. A crucifix in such churches would be tantamount to announcing papal primacy. Appropriate iconoclastic responses would promptly follow. Liturgy is not only a practical matter of who does what and how he does it, but a confessional matter of what the church believes. In her liturgy the church actually presents the confession that defines and identifies her.

Rites—call them liturgies—are never randomly chosen, but flow from the character of the organization.

When the gathered assembly sings or says her liturgy, those who are assembled recognize themselves and are recognized by each other no longer as individual Christians but as church in a particular historical context. In hearing of the Word and receiving the Sacraments, the church takes on that incarnational form that her Lord gives her. These forms identify her as the bride of Christ and confirm her as his body. The church is present apart from her worship, but only there can her presence be recognized with certainty. Only here we know that a particular assembly is truly church and not another kind of human association. Lutherans have always said that word and sacraments create and sustain the church and are her identifying characteristics, or "marks." Without these she is not church and not recognizable as church.

Form and Substance: A Philosophical Argument

Liturgy or rites are not exclusive church possessions. In addressing the question of ritual, we are also speaking of principles that have a wide application and not one that refers only to the church. No secular or religious association is completely devoid of rites or liturgy. Basic military training is but one example. Book-of-the-month clubs are another.

Rites—call them liturgies—are never randomly chosen, but flow from the character of the organization. Rites inform us about the nature of an organization and how its members relate to one another. The rites of societies are their marks. The inauguration of the American president is noticeably less elaborate than the British coronation. Each rite carries its own message. One cannot be substituted for the other without indicating a significant change. A MacDonald's franchise would immediately be taken away if its proprietor offered its products in the Burger King wrappings.

Readjustment in church ceremony alerts us to a change in doctrinal substance. Liturgy is not an "accident" to doctrinal "substance" (to borrow language from the philosophical distinction between a thing and its accidents), but belongs to the *thing* itself. In our context, FC x requires more than joining in

the historical condemnation of those who submitted to the Roman Catholic Interim, but forces us to ask whether we can adopt forms and practices that are common to and identify other denominational groups, such as Baptists, Methodists, and the Assemblies of God, and still remain Lutheran. *Church practice or lack of it already makes a confession to the world, which our formal confessions are never able to do so immediately and effectively.* A church without the creed in its liturgy and a baptismal font and an altar in its edifice has already delivered its confession to all those who are present. Adherence to formal confessions do not change this.

Article X in Reverse

If the Formula had been written after 1613 when Johann Sigismund, the Elector of Brandenburg, publicly took Communion according to the Reformed rite, FC x would certainly have taken on an entirely different hew.¹⁸ Mary Jane Haemig observes:

The Calvinist court sought to convert the common people by reforming popular piety. Central to these efforts was the reform of the celebration of the Lord's Supper, but the court also tried to reform the baptismal rite, change the place of art and music, and reform the church calendar.¹⁹

In protest the people rioted in the streets. Lutheran substance could not exist "in, with, and under" Calvinist forms. Adjust the forms and the substance is changed. *To them form mattered.* Forms that indicated capitulation to Rome were now confessional marks.

Haemig concludes:

Brandenburg [circa 1539] first retained many of the Roman ceremonies in order to demonstrate its continuity with the Roman church, then it retained the same ceremonies as a mark of Lutheranism, against the attacks of Calvinism. During the Second Reformation [1619] the Calvinist ruler tried to get rid of such ceremonies but ran into heavy resistance from Lutherans who regarded the liturgy as the mark of true Lutheranism.²⁰

FC x addressed "a specific situation of confession" and was not a call to be perpetually anti-Roman Catholic in liturgical matters.²¹ Rather, it places the burden on the church to refrain from biblically unmandated practices that give the impression she is surrendering her confession.²² At the same time the church must maintain practices that reflect her confession. In fifteenth-century Saxony, Lutherans were forced to act like Roman Catholics and in seventeenth-century Brandenburg like Calvinists. In each case, they applied the same principle and resisted. In each case, the Fourth Commandment requiring obedience to civil authority had no authority for the church.

The United States: Catholic-Controlled Saxony or Reformed-Controlled Brandenburg?

Unlike Europeans, Lutherans in America are not subject to governmental interference in matters of doctrine and liturgy,

but culture exerts a subtle—some would say *profound!*—control. This often unrecognized pressure does not evoke the resistance that overt government intervention does. If Latin-language-speaking countries have a predominantly Catholic culture, the American and British English-speaking countries are mainly influenced by evangelical Protestantism of the Arminian type.²³ Even American Roman Catholicism drinks these waters. What would a Roman Catholic Mass be without "Amazing Grace"?²⁴

FC x addressed "a specific situation of confession" and was not a call to be perpetually anti-Roman Catholic in liturgical matters.

Neo-evangelicalism comes as close as possible to being an official religion in the United States. Billy Graham is the official court preacher. More people probably know and definitely understand the words of "How Great Thou Art" than "The Star Spangled Banner." Our prototype is Reformed-dominated Brandenburg-Prussia rather than Catholic-controlled Saxony.

Maintaining (Reclaiming) Heritage

Pietism and the Enlightenment have made locating an unbroken doctrinal and liturgical succession from classical Lutheranism to the present LCMS impossible. If ours is a *Repristinatiotheologie*, then our liturgy has also been repristinated. LCMS confessional Lutheran theology was literally resurrected out of a German Protestant tradition whose most positive feature was Pietism.²⁵ No pure "apostolic tradition" in theology or liturgy exists for us. It is not surprising that our fathers' first attention was to theology and that only in this century have we looked for our liturgical foundations. The 1941 *Lutheran Hymnal* with the service for the Holy Communion was a monumental achievement in reasserting the ordinary of the Mass. Since we are still more likely to see things in a Protestant context, it may be difficult to imagine that the Reformation did not mean that the Lutherans stopped being Catholic and doing Catholic things. The Augsburg Confession is adamant about this:

We are unjustly accused of having abolished the Mass. Without boasting, it is manifest that the Mass is celebrated among us with greater devotion and more earnestness than among our opponents (AC xxiv, 1; Tappert, 56).

The Apology is hardly less reserved: "We keep traditional forms, such as the order of the lessons, prayers, vestments, etc." (Ap xxiv, 1; Tappert, 249). *Lutherans were claiming to be more Catholic than the papists.*

About twenty years later both sides in the adiaphoristic controversy kept a liturgy in place whose parts were found in the Roman Mass.²⁶ Liturgy for Luther, Melancthon, and Chem-

nitz was not a matter of creative construction or selection among several options, but liturgy rather belonged to their church. Churches were not voluntarily formed assemblies forging liturgies for themselves. Such was the legacy of the Enlightenment and Schleiermacher in Europe, as well as Charles Finney and revivalism in America. The latter's doctrine of the church differed essentially from Luther's.

For Luther, church and liturgy were inherited, gifts of divine grace. Synods or territorial churches, and not individual congregations, had liturgical responsibilities.²⁷ "Creating liturgies" is as much an oxymoron as "covenanting together" to form a church or even a synod. In being catholic in their liturgy, Luther and especially the Lutherans in Brandenburg were not Romanists or submitting to the pope, but maintaining their faith, which they confessed and inherited from Rome (Conclusion to first part of AC; Tappert, 47). Without this claim they were a sect.²⁸

Any thought of a liturgy adjusted to culture would have been strange to the reformers. An American liturgy is as repulsive as an Asian or German one. Freedom in adiaphora was never understood as self-emancipation from Rome, that final step which a recalcitrant Luther could never take. Martin Chemnitz, a chief architect of the Formula, enforced liturgical uniformity in the churches of Braunschweig, for which he was superintendent. *Article x was not a liturgical declaration of independence*, but unfortunately it has become so in American Lutheranism. The Lutheran claim that the Mass was celebrated with more solemnity than their opponents is not made inoperative by FC x but affirmed thereby.²⁹

Article X: Church Practice Does Matter

Even though the Formula has twelve articles, the tenth is the last of the articles in both the Formula and the Book of Concord to address church practice.³⁰ Each article of faith is played out in practice, which practice must correspond to what is believed. Practical matters, the adiaphora, are not devoid of theological consequences. Where practice is not seen as a matter of theological concern, church life is trivialized. Just as the last two of the Ten Commandments, which forbid coveting and so internalize God's law by applying it to the heart, inform the first eight, so FC x informs and shapes all other Lutheran articles of faith. Article x is, however, not the first confessional article to be concerned about the theological import of church practice.

At first, around 1520, Reformation Lutherans sought a precision in doctrine that they could not immediately demand of church practice. No such leeway was allowed ten years later in the Augsburg Confession and the Apology. Denying the cup to the laity, mandatory celibacy for the priests, and monastic vows were proscribed as wrong. Practices mattered. Article Ten of the Formula took another tack by placing the burden on the church to recognize those practices which are not offensive in themselves, but which become so because of specific situations.

The freedom and demand to distinguish between acceptable and unacceptable practices brought the early Christians to the brink of division in observing Jewish ritual. Paul, who had opposed Peter for eating with Jews and not Gentiles, returned to Jerusalem and performed rituals required of practicing Jews.

Scriptures, Confessions, and Liturgy

Subjecting ancient church liturgies to doctrinal, that is, confessional, review is not without problems, though it is synodically required. It may not take into account Scripture's origin in and for the early church's liturgical life. The Scriptures are as sacramental in their purpose as they are christological. Since the beginning, church liturgies have preserved the Scriptures and made them accessible to the people as no other medium has, including sermons. Pictures of Luther detaching the Scripture from church imprisonment with a chain cutter to give them to the people may be misleading. Scriptures are themselves confessions and are preserved in the liturgy as confessions of what the people believe.

Since people confess only what they have first heard, Scripture, liturgy, and confession constitute one reality in which each constantly informs the other. This process of mutual reciprocity is curtailed when the Scriptures are no longer recognized as the normative word of God, or when the church's formal confession is shelved as an historic relic, or when her liturgy is replaced by contemporary creations adjusted to fit the perceived desires and needs of the audience. Current examples of each aberration are commonly known.

"Where orthodoxy is labeled adiaphora, orthodoxy will sooner or later be proscribed."

Without both formal confession and liturgy, the church becomes no more than a community association with self-defined and continually redefined religious purposes. Such purposes are now called "mission statements." The church becomes a *Volkskirche* in the worst sense of that word, an association so defined by like-minded individuals. She forfeits her claim to catholicity and eventually her claim to being church. The Lutheran definition of the church as created and recognized by the word and sacraments requires that she must be believed to be a divine creation. The church must be believed to be Christ's body on earth, called, gathered, and enlightened by God, not chartered, constituted, and incorporated by the voters' assembly. Her liturgy and confession, as aspects of a common faith, are defined by her Lord and are not adiaphora (Rom 10:9).

Where the faith is preserved in formal confessions but not in the liturgical life of the church, those confessions are disregarded and her faith is already dead. For reasons of church practice, the LCMS has traditionally often refused fellowship to other Lutheran churches. To paraphrase James, faith without corresponding liturgical practice is dead. Doctrinal review for liturgies at best assures the absence of error without assuring its catholicity and the presence of truth. The process itself may assume, and so concede already, that each community is permitted *de novo* to create liturgy. Questionable is whether any liturgies copyrighted by Maranatha are really *creationes ex nihilo*.

Adiaphora: Optional Orthodoxy

The editor of *First Things* calls the proposition "Where orthodoxy is optional, orthodoxy will sooner or later be proscribed" the "Neuhaus law."³¹ He might have said, "Where orthodoxy is labeled adiaphora, orthodoxy will sooner or later be proscribed." If the Episcopal-ELCA alliance succeeds, it may do so only because Lutherans are willing to concede that justification as the chief doctrine is optional, namely, an adiaphoron.

In the 1970s the LCMS was brought to the brink of corporate destruction because one group, who descriptively called themselves "gospel reductionists," made the law and the gospel the only doctrines and regarded other doctrines and biblical history as optional, namely, adiaphora, or better, *res indifferentes*. Today more and more Lutherans see the historical liturgy as optional, that is, *res indifferens*. It may be hard to imagine a day when the traditional liturgy has no place in the church beyond being an historical oddity.

It is hardly likely that the horrors of the 1817 Prussian Union, where pastors were removed from churches, imprisoned, and evicted from their parsonages will be repeated. This might be an example of an amendment to the Neuhaus law: "Where traditional liturgy is optional, traditional liturgy will sooner or later be proscribed." When the Reformed Prussian authorities required a Calvinistic-friendly liturgy of Lutherans, they were giving more than lip service to the proposition that "by what the church does when she assembles, she is confessing what she believes to believers and unbelievers alike." On that account church practice is never incidental, that is, adiaphoron, a matter of congregational and personal choice, but it is a matter of inheritance and gift.

Our current definition of adiaphora has become so broad that anything beyond the doctrine of "justification by faith" could be considered adiaphoron. In seeking to resolve current differences, we must agree that the ordinary of the Mass, the historical service, was not understood by the confessors to be an adiaphoron.³² LOGIA

NOTES

1. On January 22, 1988, Michael Rogness offered "Was Melancthon a Philippist on the Doctrine of Conversion?" and Lowell Green lectured under the title of "When Did Melancthon Become a Philippist on the Lord's Supper?"
2. Charles V's Augsburg Interim (May 15, 1548) was opposed by both the ruling class and the people and was replaced by the more conciliatory Leipzig Interim (December 22, 1548).
3. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) faces this question in acquiescing to the ordination of its future pastors by Episcopal/Anglican bishops. If episcopal ordination is required for church unity, is such an ordination an adiaphoron anymore?
4. Matthew Harrison, "Martin Chemnitz and the Origin, Content, and Meaning of FC x," unpublished essay (August 1994), 7. Available from its author.
5. Bente judges him to be the culprit, a verdict not beyond challenge. See Bente's "Historical Introductions to the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church," *Concordia Triglotta* (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), 95-102.
6. Sean Parker, "Worship Wars," *Reporter* 22, no. 11 (November 1996): 8-9, 12.
7. Heiko A. Oberman, *Luther: Man between God and the Devil* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1982), 171.
8. Daniel Preus writes, "Like Luther, Robert Preus believed that to speak of justification was to speak of Christ, and to speak of Christ was to

speak of justification" ("Solus Christus," *LOGIA* 5, no. 3 [Trinity 1996]: 21).

9. Philip Jakob Spener, *Pia Desideria*, ed. and trans. T. G. Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), 87-89.

10. Eugene Klug observes that the ceremonies that Roman Catholics required of Lutherans were "Baptism (sprinkling with salt and exorcism), confirmation by bishops, extreme unction, Corpus Christi processions, and fasting rules" (*Getting into the Formula of Concord* [Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1977], 62).

11. "Worship Notes," *Reporter* 23, no. 1 (November 1996): 12.

12. "Can girls be acolytes?" is the topic of the "Q & A" column in the *Lutheran Witness* 115, no. 11 (November 1996): 25. Reasons for a negative answer cannot be that the Bible prohibits girl acolytes or that the LCMS has a position forbidding it. Answering this question may be more difficult than suggested by the article. Lighting candles can be done by anyone, even a church sexton who might happen to be a Baptist. Another factor comes into play if the acolyte functions within the eucharistic celebration. A non-Lutheran could not ordinarily take this role. Historically the position of acolyte was considered one of several preliminary ranks before becoming a deacon and a priest. The Reformation had no use for these distinctions, but in the past many Lutheran pastors have been not alone in seeing acolytes as a way of recognizing future candidates for the ministry and preparing them to conduct the church service. With this understanding of acolytes, it is understandable that some pastors might find girl acolytes inappropriate. If lighting the candles is seen as a janitorial-type function, then prohibitions against having girls do this are without merit. It cannot be overlooked that until recently the present Roman pontiff opposed the practice presumably because the innovation was demanded by feminists whose ultimate goal is the ordination of women. If this were the case, then he acted in accordance with the Lutheran understanding of adiaphora. He acquiesced when the American bishops authorized it for their dioceses and put him in a position where he could not have done otherwise. Here he was a Philippist. Looking for specific biblical prohibitions or mandates in resolving matters of church practice has echoes of the Lutheran controversy over adiaphora.

13. "Worship Notes," 9. It is noteworthy that a reading of the Word of God, without specification of the Gospel, is listed as an essential ingredient. Lost is the connection between the words of Jesus and his Sacrament in which he is corporally present. Historic liturgies know of no substitution for the Gospel.

14. Introits and graduals are composed of Old Testament psalms, and the Sanctus is taken from Isaiah 6. The established early church custom of two readings from the Old Testament has found its way back into the liturgy with at least one reading. See John Kleinig, "Worship in the Old Testament," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* (forthcoming issue).

15. See for example "Worship Wars," 8-9, 12, with subheading "Traditional worship vs. contemporary. What's right? And is anyone wrong?" One happy exception is Leonard Klein, "What Is to Be Done," *Lutheran Forum* 29, no. 2 (Pentecost/May 1995): 6-8.

16. Theodore Graebner, *The Borderland of Right and Wrong*, 6th ed. (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1941), 1. Each congregation had the right to determine how it should worship, a right now exercised with vengeance.

17. Carl Schalk, *Handbook of Church Music* (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1978), 64.

18. It was the beginning of an attempt that came to final resolution in 1830 with the amalgamation of Lutheran and Reformed churches in Prussia, the infamous Prussian Union against which our fathers protested.

19. Mary Jane Haemig, review of Bodo Nishan, "Prince, People, and Confession: The Second Reformation in Brandenburg," *Lutheran Quarterly* 10, no. 2 (Summer 1996): 211-12. [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994].

20. Haemig, 212.

21. Harrison, 8-9.

22. It is amazing that in the American situation, where the Baptists insist on immersion, the Wisconsin Synod (WELS) without discussion calls this form of baptism an adiaphoron. See John F. Brug, *Church Fellowship* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1996), 35-36.

23. Nathan Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

24. Jay P. Dolan, *Catholic Revivalism: The American Experience 1830-1900* (Notre Dame and London: Notre Dame Press, 1978).

25. See Michael Henrichs, "Liturgical Uniformity in Missouri," *LOGIA* 5, no. 2 (Eastertide 1996): 15-24.

26. Harrison writes, "So for instance the Leipsic [*sic*] Interim imposes an order for mass which contained the basic ancient liturgical profession and portions of the liturgy, the Lutherans hardly felt compelled to abandon this progression themselves" (9).

27. Harrison, 11-12.

28. James Nuechterlein leads the way in repudiating Rome's claim to catholic exclusivity, a position taken by his editorial colleague Richard John Neuhaus. See Nuechterlein, "In Defense of Sectarian Catholicity," *First Things*, no. 69 (January 1997): 12-13.

29. Klein writes, "Liturgy *per se* is not an adiaphoron, a collection of rites and ceremonies that embellish word and sacrament but are somehow indifferent to saving faith. Word and sacrament necessitate a liturgical *ordo*. So the Augsburg Confession affirms that we celebrate the mass faithfully every Sunday and Holy Day and at other times when there are communicants. The mass, not something else" (6).

30. FC XI distinguishes the Lutheran doctrine of election or predestination from that of John Calvin, but in the sixteenth century it was not a problem among Lutherans. From the title of FC XII, "Other Factions and Sects Which Never Accepted the Augsburg Confession," it is evident that internal problems among Lutherans are not being addressed.

31. Richard John Neuhaus, "The Unhappy Fate of Optional Orthodoxy," *First Things*, no. 69 (January 1997): 56-60.

32. Certain references were provided by my colleagues Lawrence Rast and Arthur Just.



Announcing the Second Annual

International Academy of Apologetics, Evangelism and Human Rights

STRASBOURG, FRANCE

Recognizing the need for serious academic and practical defense of historic biblical faith in an increasingly secular age devoid of a solid basis for human rights, the Academy offers an intensive two week course for those who wish to become Christian Apologists or refine their apologetic skills. Instruction will be provided in Historical, Scientific, Philosophical Juridical and Cultural Apologetics. Nonchristian world views will be subjected to rigorous criticism. On successful completion of the program, candidates shall be designated Fellows of the Academy

(F.C.A.). A second registration in the defense of a thesis on an approved topic leads to the Diploma in Christian Apologetics (D.C.A.) or Human Rights (D.H.R.). Recipients of the diploma with appropriate qualifications may proceed to a doctorate (Ph.D. or Th.D.) from Trinity College/Seminary, Newburgh, Indiana. The full cost of the summer program in Strasbourg July 7-18, 1998 (excluding transportation): \$2,495.00, covering tuition, board, room and social programs. Enrollment limited to 20; 10 \$1,000.00 scholarships for needy applicants.

Faculty for 1998

Prof. Dr. John Warwick Montgomery (Academy Director)

Prof. Dr. Michael Horton

Prof. Dr. Rod Rosenblatt

Prof. Craig Parton (United States Director)

For further information: Craig Parton phone (805) 682-3020 • e mail: Parton1@juno.com • Dr. Montgomery fax 011-44-171-583-1210
Registration Deadline: December 1 (Scholarships November 1)