

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Theological Students Fellowship (TSF) Bulletin (US)* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_tsfbulletin-us.php



BULLETIN

THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS FELLOWSHIP

MAY-JUNE 1984

Vol. 7, No. 5 \$3.50

Mark Lau Branson Editor
Thomas H. McAlpine Managing Editor

ADVISORY EDITORS

Clark H. Pinnock, McMaster Divinity College
Paul A. Mickey, Duke Divinity School

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Ray S. Anderson, *Systematic Theology*
Fuller Theological Seminary
Stephen T. Davis, *Philosophy*
Claremont McKenna College
Donald Dayton, *News Analysis*
Northern Baptist Theological Seminary
Roberta Hestenes, *Christian Formation*
Fuller Theological Seminary
Robert L. Hubbard, *Old Testament*
Denver Seminary

Stephen C. Mott, *Ethics*
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
Grant R. Osborne, *New Testament*
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Donald Tinder, *Church History*
New College, Berkeley
David Lowes Watson, *Evangelism & Missions*
Perkins School of Theology

PERSPECTIVES EDITORS

George Cummings Chicago Theological Seminary
Luis Cortes Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Atlanta, GA
Nancy A. Hardesty Mt. Paul Novitiate
Thomas F. Stransky Harvard University
Sze-kar Wan

FACULTY CONTRIBUTORS

Bernard Adeney New College, Berkeley
Donald Bloesch University of Dubuque Theological Seminary
Geoffrey W. Bromiley Fuller Theological Seminary
Harvie M. Conn Westminster Theological Seminary
Charles Ellenbaum College of DuPage
Vernard Eller University of LaVerne
Elouise Renich Fraser Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary
David Gill New College, Berkeley
Larry Hurtado University of Manitoba
Susanne Johnson Perkins School of Theology
Richard Mouw Calvin College
Richard Lovelace Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
PHEME PERKINS Boston College
Bernard Ramm American Baptist Seminary of the West
Gerald Sheppard Union Theological Seminary
Charles R. Taber Emmanuel School of Religion
Keith Yandell University of Wisconsin
Gregory A. Youngchild New Haven, CT

Is the Reformation Over?

Geoffrey Wainwright

2

Dispensationalism and the Salvation of the Kingdom

Robert Saucy

6

Jacques Ellul:

The Original "Liberation Theologian"

Thomas Hanks

8

Asking the Right Questions:

Evangelism through Eucharist and Prayer

Michele Matto

11

Contemporary Feminist Theology:

A Selective Bibliography

Kathleen Storrie

13

The Wholeness of Evangelism:

A Bible Study (Part D)

Alfred C. Krass

16

Summer Reading List

TSF Bulletin Associate Editors 17

Software Review: *The Word Processor*

Thomas H. McAlpine

19

Book Reviews (Itemized on back cover)

19

Index: *TSF Bulletin* volume 7

38

TSF Materials Order Form

(center pages)

Is the Reformation Over?

by Geoffrey Wainwright

Is the Reformation over? The question can be heard in several ways. The idea might be that the Roman Catholic Church has now, for good or ill, accepted the proposals by which Luther launched the Reformation. Alternatively, it could be argued that Protestant truth has sold out to Rome or, to construe the matter from the other end, that Protestantism is on the point of being welcomed back into the Catholic fold. A third, and more irenic possibility would be that the unfortunate mutual "misunderstandings" of the sixteenth century have at last been cleared up. Or again, the sixteenth-century controversies may be thought to have been real and important enough in their time but to have since become irrelevant or at least no longer church-dividing. Finally, it might be considered that genuine and substantial differences, which were insoluble when they first arose, can now be reconciled and overcome through the discovery of new insights into the gospel and the faith or the recovery of more original ones that antedate the Reformation.

We shall try each of these approaches to our question, endeavoring to match them in each case with doctrinal issues to which they may seem appropriate. Although we shall not limit ourselves entirely to Luther and Lutheranism as representatives of Protestantism, it is on them that we shall concentrate, and that for various reasons. First, Luther was the epoch-making Reformer, so much so that "Lutheran" is synonymous with "Protestant" in some languages. (In Bulgaria I was once introduced as an "English Lutheran"—a very rare bird!) Second, it is Lutheranism and Catholicism which together have the most developed history of "controversial theology." Third, among the bilateral dialogues which have taken place since Vatican II it is those between Catholics and Lutherans, both nationally and internationally, which have the greatest dogmatic solidity! Fourth, the Lutherans have known how to make use of favorable chronology: the 450th anniversary of the Augsburg Confession in 1980 stimulated at least the suggestion of a Catholic recognition of the Augustana on the part of V. Pfnuer and no less a figure than the future head of the Holy Office, Joseph Ratzinger; and with the 500th anniversary of Luther's birth we were reminded in 1983 that Catholics have become willing to call the Reformer "our common teacher" (Cardinal Willebrands),² a "doctor of the Church" (O.H. Pesch),³ a "father in the faith"⁴ (P. Manns). Lastly, a new interpretation of Luther's self-understanding, as we shall see, allows us from a surprising angle to answer "No" to our question in a way which is both ecumenically positive and an eschatological challenge. One final preliminary remark: the writer must declare his Methodist allegiance and recall that a Catholic historian, Maximin Piette, interpreted the Wesleyan movement as a Catholic reaction in the evolution of Protestantism.⁵

To our question, then, formulated, and over-sharply so, according to the several possible approaches.

Geoffrey Wainwright is Professor of Systematic Theology at Duke Divinity School, president of the Societas Liturgica, and author of Eucharist and Eschatology, Doxology: The Praise of God in Worship, Doctrine and Life, and The Ecumenical Moment.

1. Has the Catholic Church turned Protestant?

Listen first to the "conservative" prelate, Archbishop Lefebvre, on the post-Vatican II liturgy in the Roman Catholic Church:

It is obvious that this new rite is, if I may put it this way, of an opposing polarity, that it supposes a different conception of the Catholic religion, that it supposes a different religion. It is no longer the priest who offers the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, it is the assembly. Now this is a complete program. From now on it is also the assembly which will replace authority in the Church. . . . It is the weight of numbers which will give the orders from now on in the Holy Church. And all this is expressed in the Mass precisely because the assembly replaces the priest, to such an extent that now many priests no longer want to celebrate the Holy Mass if there is not an assembly there. Very quietly, it is the Protestant idea of the Mass which is creeping into Holy Church. And this is in accordance with the mentality of modern man, with the mentality of modernist man, completely in accordance, for it is the democratic ideal which is fundamentally the idea of modern man. That is to say that power in the assembly, authority is vested in men, *en masse*, and not in God. . . . This Mass is no longer a hierarchic Mass, it is a democratic Mass.⁶

It might be more truly Catholic to see Protestantism as having helped the Roman Church to recover what is, according to the Dominican Yves Congar, the authentically traditional notion of the baptismal priesthood of the faithful.⁷ Moreover, this does not require a classical Protestant to acquiesce in Lefebvre's caricature of Protestantism in its own weakest manifestation, as though the Church were an internally undifferentiated community in which all authority was self-generated "from below"; but more will be said about that in the next section.

There are certainly signs that the Roman Catholic Church has ceased to oppose a thing simply because Protestants affirm it, or to maintain it simply because Protestants reject it. In this sense, Vatican II may have signalled, as an ecumenical German study suggested, "the end of the Counter-Reformation."⁸ Thus the guarded

¹ In the United States: 1. *The Status of the Nicene Creed as Dogma of the Church* (1965); 2. *One Baptism for the Remission of Sins* (1966); 3. *The Eucharist as Sacrifice* (1967); 4. *Eucharist and Ministry* (1970); 5. *Papal Primacy and the Universal Church* (1974); 6. *Teaching Authority and Infallibility in the Church* (1978); 7. *Justification by Faith* (1983). Vols. 1-4 and 7 published by the Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, 1312 Massachusetts, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005; Vols. 1-3 as a single volume plus separately 4, 5 and 6 published by Augsburg. At the world level: *Das Herrenmahl* (1978); *Wege zur Gemeinschaft* (1980); *Das geistliche Amt in der Kirche* (1981).

² J. Willebrands, address to the Lutheran World Federation at Evian in 1970; text in *Herder-Korrespondenz* 24 (1970), pp. 427-431.

³ O. H. Pesch, *Hinführung zu Luther* (1982).

⁴ P. Manns, inaugural address at the Institute for European History, Mainz, in 1981 ("Vater im Glauben").

⁵ M. Piette, *John Wesley, sa réaction dans l'évolution du protestantisme* (1925).

⁶ The quotation comes from an ordination address given by Archbishop Lefebvre on July 29, 1976. English translation in Y. Congar, *Challenge to the Church: The Case of Archbishop Lefebvre* (1977), p. 29f.

⁷ Y. Congar, as in note 6, p. 30f.

⁸ J. C. Hempe (ed.), *Ende der Gegenreformation?* (1964).

TSF BULLETIN (ISSN 0272-3913) is published bimonthly during the academic year (September-June). Editorial address is Theological Students Fellowship, 233 Langdon, Madison, WI 53703. **Subscriptions:** \$15.00 per year (\$25/year for institutions) for five issues. Add \$2.00 per year for postage to addresses outside the U.S. U.S. currency only. Send subscriptions and address changes to TSF Subscriptions, 233 Langdon, Madison, WI 53703. Allow six weeks for address changes to become effective. **Manuscripts:** Although unsolicited material is welcomed, editors cannot assure response in less than three months. Please enclose a self-addressed envelope and return postage.

TSF BULLETIN is a member of the Associated Church Press and of the Evangelical Press Association, and is indexed in *Religion Index One: Periodicals*. Back issues are available from TSF, and are available on microfiche from Vision Press, 15781 Sherbeck, Huntington Beach, CA 92647. An annual index is published in the May/June issue. TSF BULLETIN does not necessarily speak for Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship in its articles and reviews. Although editors personally sign the IVCF basis of faith, our purpose is to provide resources for biblical *thinking* and *living* rather than to formulate "final" answers. © 1984 by Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, U.S.A. Second-class postage paid at Madison, Wisconsin. POSTMASTER: send address changes to TSF Subscriptions, 233 Langdon, Madison, WI 53703.

opening which the Council gave to the use of the vernacular has in fact led to the practical abandonment of the Latin Mass in ordinary use. Lay communion under both kinds has become widespread rather than exceptional (though one may wonder whether the intinction hygienically fashionable in some Protestant circles would itself meet Luther's insistence on "drinking the cup" in accordance with the Lord's institution). Nevertheless a married priesthood is not yet conceded in the "Latin" rite. Of greater doctrinal significance is the fact that the practice of indulgences, though it has become much more discreet, has not disappeared. Such facts as this last lead such suspicious Protestants as the Waldensian dogmatician Vittorio Subilia to conclude that, by accepting *selected* elements of the Protestant position, the "new catholicity of Catholicism" is in fact playing the old Catholic trick of integrating them into a "complex of opposites"—and thereby neutralizing them.⁹

2. Has Protestantism popped?

Subilia in fact characterizes Catholicism as the religion of the "and" (the "et" of Council of Trent's decree on "Scripture *and* Tradition"), whereas original Protestantism is the faith of the "either/or" (the "aut . . . aut"). Thus he blames Methodism for instance, for its version of faith *and* works.¹⁰ It is perhaps over the adjacent issue of "sacramentalism" that some Protestants, particularly in the Reformed tradition, consider that Protestant ecumenism is in danger of surrendering to Catholicism. Paolo Ricca thinks that the whole "impostazione" or approach of the Lima text on "Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry" magnifies the sacraments at the expense of the word and in this betrays an entire ecclesiology.¹¹ Yet it is hard to believe that the classical Reformers would quarrel with the Vatican II definition of the church, in Christ, as a "sign and instrument of communion with God and unity among all people" (*Lumen Gentium* 1). The Church's "sacramentality," in this sense, allows a vision and practice of order and authority in the Church which overcomes the polemical alternatives of a difference in kind or in degree or in nothing among ordained and lay members of the community. The Catholic theologian of ministry, David N. Power, writes as follows:

The needs of the Church and of its mission are what determine ministry. . . . The office-holder, through the service of supervision and presidency, represents back to the church that which in the faith of the ordination ceremony it has expressed about itself. . . . Because [the eucharistic president] is empowered to represent the Church in this vital action, to represent to it is very own ground of being, we say that he is empowered to represent Christ. . . . The role of the ordained minister is to represent in the midst of this community its work for the kingdom, its eschatological nature, and its relationship to Christ. . . .¹²

The Protestant Consultation on Church Union in the United States (C.O.C.U.) puts it concisely: "Their ordination marks them as persons who represent to the Church its own identity and mission in Jesus Christ."¹³ Expounding the Lima text on "Ministry," I myself wrote:

Precisely as *representatives* of Christ and his Church the ordained ministers are *distinct*, but *what* they represent is not *other* than the character and mission of the whole Church, and this itself is *nothing other* than participation, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, in the ministry of Christ the Saviour and Head of the Church.¹⁴

3. Were they mere misunderstandings?

In his great work *Die Reformation in Deutschland* (2 vols., 1939-40), which began a more positive phase in the Catholic historiography of Protestantism, Joseph Lortz argued that Luther both was influenced by and rebelled against an Ockhamism which obscured the true nature of Catholicism. That line was pursued by other authors, both Catholic and Protestant (particularly Anglican), to explain and excuse the Reformers' rejection of the sacrifice of the Mass. The Jesuit Francis Clark, in *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation* (1960), caused that little apple-cart to tremble for a while by showing that a pure line of Catholic teaching persisted from the middle ages to the Council of Trent (namely, that the sacrifice of the Mass and the sacrifice of Calvary are one and the same sacrifice,

so that there can be no question of repetition or addition of a pelagian or works-righteousness kind), and by arguing that the Reformers' destruction of the Mass was, *in consequence*, done with open eyes. In turn, Nicholas Lash, a fellow Catholic, charged Clark with greatly underestimating the complexity of the relationship between verbal orthodoxy and the practical context:

If what the Church is doing, in the concrete, can reasonably be said to be significantly different from what she ought to be doing [Clark admits the practical abuses prevalent in the late medieval period], then the theory according to which she interprets her activity may be calculated to mislead, even if that same theory, when employed as the interpretation of a more adequate state of concrete activity, were irreproachable.¹⁵

J.F. McCue had gone even further: "When theologians who defend the sacrificial concept of the Mass seem not to be disturbed by the development of a sub-Christian understanding of sacrifice within Roman Catholic piety, then there is at least some justification for thinking that the piety does express the doctrine."¹⁶

Catholics have become willing to call the Reformer "our common teacher," a "doctor of the Church," a "father in the faith"

On my reckoning, the question of eucharistic sacrifice is better placed in the fifth section among the issues that were awaiting the rediscovery of a primitive category.

The debate among Protestants and Catholics over justification—which Lutherans have seen as the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*—has recently been qualified as marked by many misunderstandings. In the original edition of his book *Justification (Rechtfertigung)*, 1957, Hans Küng argued that Karl Barth had "misunderstood" the Tridentine decree on justification, and that there is in fact a fundamental agreement between Barth's position and that of the Catholic Church. By the time of the first English edition (1964), Küng was stressing in his preface that remaining differences were "school differences," where "misunderstandings" are notoriously prevalent. In the new English edition of 1981, Küng goes so far as to say that the "anathemas pronounced by the Council of Trent against the Reformation doctrine of justification were based on misunderstanding and lack of understanding, that is, they were mistaken decisions like so many others in the course of history" (pp. xvii-xviii); though, admittedly, such writings of Luther's as *The Bondage of the Will* and *On Good Works* "were and are open to misunderstanding, in need of completion and correction, not infallible."

In the area of justification, O. H. Pesch has applied the category of misunderstanding to the two sub-themes of certainty of salvation, and faith and works.¹⁷ Regarding the later, Pesch speaks of "the most superfluous of all controversies." In rejecting certainty of *eternal* salvation, the Council of Trent was reverently drawing a line between the incomprehensible Creator and human pride and fickleness; Luther, on the other hand, was rightly preaching *present* certitude which accompanies trust in the reliable word and redemptive grace of God. For Luther, faith—which is of course the fruit of grace—*includes* love towards God and *expresses itself* in good works; whereas Catholic language tends to take faith as intellectual assent and in

⁹ V. Subilia, *La nuova cattolicità del Cattolicesimo* (1967); see already *Il problema del Cattolicesimo* (1962).

¹⁰ V. Subilia, *Tempo di confessione e di rivoluzione* (1968), pp. 147-151, and *La giustificazione per fede* (1976), pp. 318-22.

¹¹ P. Ricca, "Il 'BEM' e il futuro dell'ecumenismo" in *Protestantesimo* 38 (1983), pp. 155-169, 225-243.

¹² Composite quotation from D. N. Power, "The basis for official ministry in the Church" in *The Jurist* 41 (1981), pp. 314-342, and *Gifts that differ* (1980).

¹³ *In Quest of a Church of Christ Uniting*, 1980, chapter 7.

¹⁴ G. Wainwright, "Reconciliation in Ministry" in M. Thurian (ed.), *Ecumenical Perspectives on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (1983), pp. 129-139.

¹⁵ N. Lash, *His Presence in the World* (1968), p. 127f.

¹⁶ J. F. McCue, "Luther and Roman Catholicism on the mass as sacrifice" in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 2 (1965), pp. 205-233.

¹⁷ O. H. Pesch, *Hinführung zu Luther* (1982), pp. 116-133, 154-175.

that sense sees it in need of "supplementation."

But is the debate between Lutherans and Catholics over justification simply a matter of clearing up misunderstandings? The 1983 document of the U.S. Lutheran-Roman Catholic dialogue, *Justification by Faith*, speaks of a difference in "concerns," which presumably started in the sixteenth century and remain to this day characteristic of the two traditions. The group has nevertheless been able to agree on a "fundamental affirmation":

Our entire hope of justification and salvation rests on Christ Jesus and on the gospel whereby the good news of God's merciful action in Christ is made known; we do not place our ultimate trust in anything other than God's promise and saving work in Christ.¹⁸

Yet it remains significant that the dialogue has not reached agreement on the "faith alone." The group does not consider this issue to spoil its "fundamental consensus on the gospel"; but one must in that case ask how fundamental is fundamental. A difference seems to me to remain between the *Allwirksamkeit Gottes* and the *Alleinwirksamkeit Gottes*, the Lutheran stress that God does everything and the Catholic view that God does not do everything alone. Some recent Lutheran thinking, and the dialogue document alludes to it, indeed enhances the exclusive operation of God: it maintains the "unconditionality of God's promises in Christ" and, in what the document calls a "hermeneutical perspective," it declares that "God's word does what it proclaims or, in modern terminology, the gospel message is performative; it effects the reality of which it speaks. The preaching of the gospel has the force of decreeing the forgiveness of sins for Christ's sake. . . . In this hermeneutical perspective even the faith which receives the promise is not a condition for justification." This fits with the "pure passivity" of faith, which is what some modern Lutherans have seen expressed in infant baptism and the ground on which they have defended the practice.¹⁹ But when the insistence on "God alone" is taken so far, it seems to set Lutheranism over against not only Roman Catholicism but all the rest of Christianity also. It is, moreover, difficult to square with Luther's Large Catechism, which makes our forgiveness of the neighbor the condition of our receiving God's forgiveness, and it runs up against Eilert Herms' convincing interpretation of Luther's treatise *On Good Works*, which makes of faith a (doubtlessly graced) human act in response to God's revelation.²⁰

However that may be, help may perhaps be found in O. H. Pesch's distinction between the *sapiential* theologizing of Thomas Aquinas and the *existential* theologizing of Martin Luther.²¹ *Doxologically*, we ascribe all the work to God; but *on reflection*, we come to see that God also enables us to work. That again, however, raises the question of the proper relations between worship and doctrine. It may be that *doctrinally* the rest of Christianity has to go on living with the challenge Lutheranism addresses to it lest it exaggerate the grain of truth which resides in Pelagianism.

4. Is the truth variable?

Joseph Lortz detected and emphasized those elements in the man which made him "the Catholic Luther." More boldly, O. H. Pesch has argued precisely for "the Lutheran Luther" as a current "Catholic possibility."²²

While Y. Congar sympathized with Luther's contention that the gospel itself creates its own language,²³ Pesch goes so far as to suggest that Luther's *new experience and understanding* of the gospel made it (practically) inevitable that "the old believers" would condemn the new linguistic expression which it appropriately found. If Trent *did* exclude Luther's gospel, then it is difficult to see how a Church which invests such great magisterial authority in a general council could now admit "Luther's gospel" as a Catholic possibility. Pesch's fellow-Catholic critics raise that difficulty with him: can what was error in the sixteenth century become true in the twentieth?²⁴ It remains debatable, however, whether Luther was condemned by Trent (he is not mentioned by name), or whether it was not rather a caricatural Lutheranism such as naturally developed and continued in a situation of mutual separation and polemics. Insofar as Lutheranism has evolved over against Catholicism, it may be that by returning to Luther Lutherans may be reconciled to the Catholic

Church. The "Catholic Luther" becomes important again: Erwin Iserloh, for instance, has shown that precisely in his *Reformation* writing "Against Latomus" Luther presents a different view of sanctification and growth in grace than the unremitting paradox of the *totaliter iustus, totaliter peccator* of caricatural Lutheranism.²⁵ It appears that there may be Catholic bounds within which Luther can now be heard as being powerful testimony to the gospel.

The question of the variability of truth is not only posed diachronically but also synchronically. The Catholic veterans Karl Rahner and Heinrich Fries have argued that there exists today a "substantive possibility" for the reunion of Christianity.²⁶ The creedal and dogmatic base already exists in the Apostolic and Nicene-Constantinopolitan Symbols. But there is cause for concern when Rahner in particular then allows for an almost boundless pluralism in *theological interpretation*. Can theology be so clearly distinguished from dogma as to prevent such pluralism from sinking into dogmatic indifference? And what connection is there with Rahner's notion of "anonymous Christians"? Christian unity is not to be bought at the price of explicit confession of Christ.

5. The power of ancient keys?

Here I want to suggest three types of rediscovery that have begun to unlock some genuine and substantial controversies between Catholics and Protestants in ways that may open the door to reunion.

(a) *The one gospel*

In New Testament usage, exegetes have retaught us, "gospel" designates both the content and the proclamation of the one saving message. This gets behind the question of Scripture and tradition to their common source. It is significant that Vatican II dropped the preparatory draft on "the two sources of revelation" and produced instead, in *Dei Verbum*, a document which allows the "et" of Trent to be taken—according to a possibility which J. R. Geiselman and others have argued was always meant to be left open²⁷—as treating Scripture and unwritten tradition in the sense of two mutually interacting ways of transmitting and testifying to the one gospel. At the same time, the WCC Conference on Faith and Order at Montreal in 1963 produced its text on Scripture, the great Tradition (with a capital T), and the particular traditions (plural, and with a small t). While not everything is theoretically solved by *Dei Verbum* and the Montreal text, their principles have in fact allowed a way of working in which Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox theologians have made great

Doxologically, we ascribe all the work to God; but on reflection, we come to see that God also enables us to work.

material convergences in the areas of "Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry";²⁸ and they set the framework, too, for the more comprehensive and quite indispensable Faith and Order study—in which Catholic theologians share as full members of Faith and Order—entitled "Towards the Common Expression of the Apostolic Faith Today."

(b) *Anamnesis*

Modern biblical and patristic scholarship has also delivered to us a more ancient understanding of the notion of "memorial." Despite

¹⁸ *Justification by Faith*, text in *Origins: National Catholic Documentary Service*, October 6, 1983, paragraphs 4 and 157. For some background, see K. McDonnell, "Lutherans and Catholics on Justification" in *America*, December 3, 1983, pp. 345-348.

¹⁹ For example, E. Schlink, *Die Lehre von der Taufe* (1969).

²⁰ E. Herms, *Theorie für die Praxis: Beiträge zur Theologie* (1982), p. 26f.

²¹ O. H. Pesch, *Die Theologie der Rechtfertigung bei Martin Luther und Thomas von Aquin* (1967), pp. 935-948.

²² O. H. Pesch, "Der 'lutherische' Luther—eine katholische Möglichkeit?" in P. Manns and H. Meyer (eds.), *Oekumenische Erschliessung Martin Luthers* (1983), pp. 44-66.

²³ Y. Congar, *Martin Luther, sa foi, sa réforme* (1983), pp. 15-83.

²⁴ See the contributions of P. Manns and E. Iserloh to the book mentioned in note 21.

²⁵ E. Iserloh, *Luther und die Reformation* (1974), pp. 88-105 ("Gratia und Donum, Rechtfertigung und Heiligung nach Luthers 'Wider den Löwener Theologen Latomus' [1521]").

²⁶ H. Fries and K. Rahner, *Einigung der Kirchen—reale Möglichkeit* (1983).

²⁷ J. R. Geiselman, "Das Konzil von Trient über das Verhältnis der Heiligen Schrift und der nicht geschriebenen Traditionen" in M. Schmaus (ed.), *Die mündliche Ueberlieferung* (1957), pp. 123-206.

²⁸ See the "Lima text" of Faith and Order, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (1982).

some differences of detail, it is now clear that a liturgical or ritual memorial, whether against a Hebrew or a Greek background, is a God-given means of putting succeeding generations in touch with the original and normative events in which revelation and redemption were given. There is no room here to spell out the liberation which this has brought to those engaged in embittered Catholic-Protestant controversies over preaching and the sacraments. Very specifically, the old debates about eucharistic presence and sacrifice have come very close to resolution through the provision of the anamnestic category that had been largely forgotten in the Western Church of the sixteenth century.

(c) *Trajectories*

Scholars of the primitive and early Church have supplied us also with the historically and hermeneutically useful concept of a "trajectory." Certain lines of development can be shown to have at least their beginnings in the normative apostolic period. No doubt they open up a considerable vector of possibilities, only some of which were actually realized in later history, though perhaps more of them remain theologically open. The U.S. Lutheran-Roman Catholic dialogue made use of the notion of trajectory in its work on Peter and on Mary.²⁹ I myself have explored further the question of Mary in this broad perspective.³⁰ Recent ecumenical discussion, however, has tended to concentrate rather on the papacy as this might be seen along a Petrine trajectory. Under what conditions might Protestants see in the papal ministry a service of confessing the faith and strengthening the brethren and sisters? The Swiss Reformed theologian, Jean-Jacques von Allmen, has tried to recover the Irenaean vision of the bishop of Rome as the bishop of the local church of Peter and Paul.³¹ But will Protestants ever be able to reconcile the very checkered factual "history of the popes" with an office which in principle transcends its holders in a ministry of permanent and universal significance?³² Is a highly clericalized and secularized Rome the place for the present renewal of a petrine ministry? On the other hand, later Protestants may well come to see, not only in John XXIII but also in Paul VI and John Paul II, popes who have in certain respects borne faithful testimony to the gospel at a very difficult time when many Protestants have been drifting off into apostasy. Paul VI recognized that "the pope himself" might be the last and greatest obstacle on the ecumenical road. By the same token, John Paul II may prove to have performed a prophetic gesture of great magnitude when, in Advent of the Luther year of 1983, he accepted the invitation to preach in the Lutheran congregation present within his own diocese.

End-piece

The Churches of the Reformation have often spoken, sometimes rather too glibly, of "Ecclesia semper reformanda." On the one hand, that may trivialize the great upheaval which the Reformation repre-

sented—a disruption of fellowship which may indeed have been necessary for the sake of truth, but whose continuance without resolution and reconciliation has done untold harm to the Christian witness to a gospel of love.³³ In this respect, a better description of the permanent need of the Church may be that found by Vatican II, "Ecclesia semper purificanda": the earthly Church is ever dependent on the healing and sanctifying grace of God as it pursues its divine and apostolic calling of holiness. On the other hand,

***Luther understood himself as a mere
"precursor of the Reformation"***

Reformation may be too big a word even for what took place in the sixteenth century; and here we come to that new interpretation of Luther's self-understanding which I mentioned early on.

Heiko Oberman has recently marshalled considerable evidence to show that Luther understood himself as a mere "precursor of the Reformation," an evangelist whose task it was to prepare the way for the great Reformation which God alone could and would soon bring by the Final Judgment.³⁴ Our time again is taking on an apocalyptic hue. It is marked by at least two characteristics of biblical apocalyptic: a *universalization of horizons* is taking place as we move for good or ill towards "one world"; and each and all are thereby confronted with a *critical choice* between life and death. Luther said that if the world would end tomorrow, he would still plant an apple tree today.³⁵ That is a work of trust in the God who brings life out of death. Another might be the urgent reconciliation among Christians for a common testimony to the gospel offer of salvation in a God whose glory, said St. Irenaeus, is living humanity: "Gloria Dei vivens homo, vita autem hominis visio Dei."³⁶

²⁹ See the studies edited by R. E. Brown and others, *Peter in the New Testament* (1973) and *Mary in the New Testament* (1978).

³⁰ G. Wainwright, *The Ecumenical Moment* (1983), pp. 169-188.

³¹ J.-J. von Allmen, *La primauté de l'église de Pierre et de Paul* (1977).

³² Often it is not clear whether Luther himself was attacking the institution of the papacy or its incumbent at the time.

³³ Y. Congar (as in note 22, p. 771.) draws up an impressive list of contemporary Protestants who continue to affirm that their churches are a "temporary," "provisional," or "parenthetical" reality only.

³⁴ H. A. Oberman, "Martin Luther—Vorläufer der Reformation" in E. Jüngel and others (eds.), *Verifikationen* (1982), pp. 91-119; see also Oberman's book, *Luther: Mensch zwischen Gott und Teufel* (1982).

³⁵ See M. Schloemann, *Luthers Apfelbaumchen* (1976).

³⁶ "For the glory of God is a living human being; and the life of a human being consists in beholding God." *Against Heresies* 4.20.7.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST CONFESSING SYNOD OF THE GERMAN EVANGELICAL CHURCH

An international symposium of scholars and church leaders, commemorating the 50th anniversary of the First Confessing Synod of the German Evangelical Church will be held in Seattle. The topic is: A HALF-CENTURY AFTER BARMAN: RELIGION, TOTALITARIANISM, AND HUMAN FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD from April 24-29, 1984, in Seattle, Washington. For further information contact: THE INSTITUTE, P.O. Box 45745, University Station, Seattle, WA 98145.

BELIEVERS' CHURCH CONFERENCE

A Believers' Church Conference on the *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* statement of the World Council of Churches will be held from June 5-8, 1984 in Anderson, Indiana. This conference, though slanted for the Believers' Churches, is open to all who are interested in following this discussion. For further information contact Dr. John W. V. Smith, 1021 Martin Drive, Anderson, IN 46012.

EVANGELICAL WOMEN'S CAUCUS NATIONAL MEETING

"Free Indeed—The Fulfillment of Our Faith" is the theme for the 1984 EWC national meeting, to be held June 19-23 at Wellesley College in Massachusetts. In addition to Bible studies, plenary lectures and worship, several subjects will be explored in seminars and workshops: Women in Creative Arts, Women in Social Action, Women in Spirituality, and Women in Theology. For information and registration, write to EWC 1984 Conference, 40 Calumet Road, Winchester, MA 01890.

THE GOSPEL AND URBANIZATION

Theological Students Fellowship is among the co-sponsors of this conference to be hosted by the Overseas Ministries Study Center April 23-May 4. Conference leaders include Samuel Escobar, Raymond Fung, Raymond Bakke, Roger Greenway, and Michael Haynes. The first week will focus on urban evangelization; the second will concentrate on the role of the pastor. For further information, or to register for either or both weeks, write to Box 2057, Ventnor, NJ 08406.

GIVE THIS COPY TO A FRIEND

You can help others benefit from *TSF Bulletin*. If you give away this copy, we will give you another one free. Just write to TSF, indicating which issue you gave away: 233 Langdon, Madison, WI 53703.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

In order to acquire more subscribers for *TSF Bulletin*, we occasionally make arrangements with other publications and organizations for the exchange of mailing lists. TSF does not sell any lists, but only works with exchanges. We make selections which we believe will be helpful for our readers. If you do *not* want your name included in such exchanges, please notify us. Even if you have done this at an earlier time, we need to reestablish such requests for our new subscription service. Write to TSF Subscriptions, 233 Langdon, Madison, WI 53703. Include a recent label or all of the information from a label.